

1 Gregory H. Guillot, Admitted *pro hac vice*  
[ggmark@radix.net](mailto:ggmark@radix.net)

2 GREGORY H. GUILLOT, P.C.  
13455 Noel Road, Suite 1000  
3 Dallas, TX 75240  
Phone: (972) 774-4560  
4 Fax: (214) 515-0411

5 John L. Krieger, Nevada Bar No. 6023  
[JKrieger@LRLaw.com](mailto:JKrieger@LRLaw.com)  
6 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
7 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
Phone: (702) 949-8200  
8 Fax: (702) 949-8389

9 George L. Paul, Admitted *pro hac vice*  
[GPaul@LRLaw.com](mailto:GPaul@LRLaw.com)  
10 Robert H. McKirgan, Admitted *pro hac vice*  
[RMckirgan@LRLaw.com](mailto:RMckirgan@LRLaw.com)  
11 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP  
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900  
12 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Phone: (602) 262-5326  
13 Fax: (602) 734-3857

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
DONNA CORBELLO

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
17 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

18 DONNA CORBELLO, an individual,  
19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 THOMAS GAETANO DEVITO, an  
individual, *et al.*,  
22 Defendants.  
23

Case No. 2:08-cv-00867-RCJ-PAL

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION  
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

(Eighth Request)

24 Plaintiff Donna Corbello, by her attorneys, and pursuant to LR 6-1 and 7-2, herewith  
25 requests a further extension of time to file Plaintiff’s *Reply to New Defendants’ Memorandum in*  
26 *Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration by the United States Magistrate Judge of*  
27 *Her Order Dated November 12, 2010, and New Defendants’ Supplement to Memorandum in*  
28 *Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (“Reply”)*, through Tuesday, February 1,

1 2011. Whereas, Plaintiff most recently requested that the deadline be extended through Monday,  
2 January 31, 2011, the requested extension would continue this deadline for one additional day.  
3 This is Plaintiff's eighth request for an extension of time, and hopefully, will be the last.

4 Plaintiff submits that good cause exists for grant of the requested extension, and that it is  
5 necessary. Plaintiff's *Reply* covers numerous issues, commensurate with the breadth and scope of  
6 Defendants' *Response*, and the many issues, numerous briefs, two hearings, and proposed  
7 findings consolidated and discussed in the Court's November 12, 2010 *Order*. Defendants'  
8 *Response* refers to numerous documents without attaching them as exhibits for the Court's  
9 review, and given that these "off-record" documents have been mischaracterized and do not  
10 show what Defendants allege, Plaintiff has been required to make a record of what they do show,  
11 and to discuss same in some detail. Defendants' *Response* also includes numerous assertions of  
12 fact that Plaintiff maintains are not true, but which cannot be controverted without explanations  
13 that include greater context for the Court.

14 Further, there are issues that implicate technology and which therefore necessitate  
15 explanations which are technical in nature. For example, Defendants maintain that they have  
16 produced files in "searchable format." Plaintiff asserts, and will prove in the *Reply* that this is not  
17 true. Thus, a discussion of search technology has been necessary, as well as a discussion of the  
18 types of files that are searchable, and not. So too, has the brief been complicated by the fact that  
19 Plaintiff must discuss the ramifications of the recent, 41,314 page "document dump," including  
20 what evidence was and was not in those pages, as Defendants have misrepresented their content,  
21 and, issues concerning when Plaintiff's counsel could have reasonably been expected to know  
22 what was in the new documents and be in a position to so apprise the Court, given their non-  
23 searchable format, the fact that attachments were separated from their parent emails, the fact that  
24 many of the documents are undated, and the fact that the files were "jumbled" randomly on  
25 Defendants' production disk in an order other than as maintained in the ordinary course of  
26 business. Given that Defendants also have alleged that the various emails were separated from  
27 their attachments in the course of preparing them for production, but a MacIntosh computer was  
28 involved, as to which such separation cannot inadvertently occur, discussion is also required

1 concerning how attachments and emails are handled on MacIntosh computers, as compared to  
2 Windows machines. There have also been misrepresentations concerning the file structure and  
3 native file types for *MovieMagic® Screenwriter*, and Plaintiff has been forced to explain how it  
4 works, and what capacities it actually has.

5 Finally, a thorough review of the record has been mandated by Defendants' responsive  
6 filing. At issue are not only a Motion to Compel, a Motion for Sanctions, Responses, and  
7 Replies, but also the *Order* for which reconsideration is requested, the Motion for  
8 Reconsideration itself, and the two responsive briefs to which the Reply is addressed. The point  
9 of the brief is that the record and evidence have been misrepresented, and for that reason, a  
10 meticulous discussion of the record, with citations, is imperative. And, though much of the brief  
11 has been completed; all Exhibits have been compiled and prepared; and, Plaintiff's counsel  
12 worked all weekend, including more than 24 consecutive hours in an attempt to complete and file  
13 the document today, this was simply insufficient, counsel is unable to work further without sleep,  
14 and accordingly, must resume the project tomorrow.

15 Defense counsel have indicated that they will accord Plaintiff with whatever time is  
16 necessary to complete Plaintiff's *Reply*, but of course, Defendants have not signed off on  
17 Plaintiff's assessment of the work required for her response, or her assessment of Defendants'  
18 arguments.

19 This request is not tendered for purposes of delay, or for any other improper purpose.

20 IN VIEW OF THE ABOVE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that her present Motion be  
21 granted, and that the Court enter the attached *Order*, indicating that she may file and serve her  
22 *Reply* on or by February 1, 2011.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on January 31, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing motion and this certificate of service with the clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Lawrence B. Hancock  
Christopher B. Payne  
Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
1000 Louisiana  
Suite 1800  
Houston, TX 77002

Booker T. Evans, Jr.  
Greenburg Traurig, LLP  
2375 East Camelback Road  
Suite 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Alma Chao  
Greenburg Traurig, LLP  
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Suite 500 North  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

*Attorneys for Thomas Gaetano DeVito*

Daniel M. Mayeda  
LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH, P.C.  
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3110  
Los Angeles, California 90067-3274

David S. Korzenik  
MILLER KORZENIK SOMMERS LLP  
488 Madison Avenue, Suite 1120  
New York, New York 10022-5702

Samuel S. Lionel  
Todd Kennedy  
LIONEL, SAWYER & COLLINS  
300 So. 4th Street #1700  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

*Attorneys for Defendants Frankie Valli, Robert J. Gaudio, Marshall Brickman, Eric S. Elice, Des McAnuff, DSHT, Inc., Dodger Theatricals, Ltd., and JB Viva Vegas, L.P.*

/s/ Gregory H. Guillot \_\_\_\_\_