The Court may grant leave to file a motion which exceeds the pages limit set forth in LR 7-4 when good cause appears. See Sechrest v. Baker, 816 F. Supp. 2d 1017, 1025, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104139 (D. Nev. 2011) ("the court finds that there is good cause for respondents to file their 28-page response to the reply, and the court will, therefore, grant the motion for leave to file that document").

24

25

26

27

28

In this case, good cause exists for the Court to grant leave for CIT to file a motion which exceed the limit set forth in LR 7-4. The arguments raised in the Motion for Summary Judgment

### ase 2:11-cv-01028-PMP-RJJ Document 107 Filed 09/20/12 Page 2 of 6

28

MEDER & FINE

(the "Motion") filed by CIT require numerous references to a deposition transcripts, pleadings, loan application related documents, and other records which chronicle events which are alleged to have occurred between the years 2003 (signing a lease) and 2012 (paying for storage).

Plaintiff's breach of contract claim references no less than seven separate documents which each require analysis in order for CIT to fully defend itself. Likewise, Plaintiff's misrepresentation claims, while less voluminous in nature that the contract claims, still require sufficient discussion to warrant summary judgment. Finally, Plaintiff's alleged sources of damages are many and diverse, each requiring sufficient discussion and analysis to warrant summary judgment.

In order to comprehensively address these issues, CIT's Motion is approximately 45 pages in length. Based on the foregoing, CIT respectfully requests leave of Court to exceed the thirty-page limitation set forth LR 7-4.

Due to the upcoming deadline for dispositive motions, this Motion does not have time to be heard in the normal course. See Affidavit of Rachel E. Donn, annexed hereto as Exhibit "A."

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012.

MEIER & FINE, LLC

/s/ Rachel E. Donn, Esq.

MARILYN FINE, ESQ., #005949 RACHEL E. DONN, ESQ., #010568 PETER E. DUNKLEY, ESQ., #11110 2300 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 1150 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorneys for Defendant CIT Small Business Lending Corp.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 17th day of December, 2012.

Phy m. On

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the EMERGENCY EX-PARTE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT WHICH EXCEEDS PAGE LIMIT SET FORTH BY LR 7-4 was deposited in the United States mail and sent by email in Las Vegas, Nevada, this 20th day of September, 2012, addressed to the following:

Robert W. Lueck, Esq. 528 So. Casino Center Drive, Suite 311 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 <a href="mailto:luecklaw@yahoo.com">luecklaw@yahoo.com</a> Attorney for Plaintiff

/s/Melanie Grossman

An Employee of Meier & Fine, LLC

# EXHIBIT "A"

EXHIBIT "A"

## 3

1

2

5

7

8

6

9

11

10

12

13 14 14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

2627

28

## AFFIDAVIT OF RACHEL E. DONN, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY EX-PARTE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT WHICH EXCEEDS PAGE LIMIT SET FORTH BY LR 7-4

STATE OF NEVADA ) )ss COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, RACHEL E. DONN, ESQ., being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

- 1. I am an attorney with the law firm of MEIER & FINE, LLC, attorneys for Defendant CIT Small Business Lending Corporation (erroneously named CIT Group, Inc.) ("CIT") in the above-captioned action. As such, I am fully familiar with all of the facts and circumstances alleged herein except for those stated herein alleged to be upon information and belief.
- 2. Dispositive motions are due under the current scheduling order by October 24, 2012, the Motion to Exceed Page Limit would most likely not be heard in the normal course with sufficient time for CIT to timely file its Motion for Summary Judgment.
  - 3. The office address and telephone number of Movant and all effective parties are:

Meier & Fine, LLC 2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 1150 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 702-673-1000 Attorneys for Defendant

Robert Lueck, Esq. 528 So. Casino Center Drive, Suite 311 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 702-385-7385 Attorney for Plaintiff

4. I personally spoke to opposing counsel, Robert Lueck, on September 20, 2012, and he indicated he would be agreeable to stipulating to allow both parties to exceed page limits regarding dispositive motions for this matter. However, a review of LR 7.4 indicates that the Court would need to rule on a motion to grant such relief. As such, Mr. Lueck is being served a copy of this Motion contemporaneously as well as a proposed stipulation to grant this Motion and proposed order which, should he stipulate to will further be provided to the Court.

### ase 2:11-cv-01028-PMP-RJJ Document 107 Filed 09/20/12 Page 6 of 6

		$\ $
	1	
	1 2 3	
	3	
	4	
	5 6	
	7	
	8	
	9	-
	10	***************************************
	11	
	12	
-	13	
200	14	
100 (10 (10 ))	15	
•	16	***************************************
	17	
	17 18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	

28

MEIER & FINE

7. Further affiant sayeth naught. Executed this day of September, 2012.

RACHEL E. DONN, ESQ.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this <u>20</u> day of September, 2012.

OTARY PUBLIC in and for said County and State

> Carol M. Simpson Notary Public - State of Nevada No. 09-11544-1 My appt. exp. Nov. 5, 2013