7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SANTC	
SDW	

1	NICHOLAS J. SANTORO, ESQ.
	Nevada Bar No. 532
2	JAMES E. WHITMIRE, ESQ.
	Nevada Bar No. 6533
3	SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH,
	KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON
4	400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
5	Telephone: 702/791-0308
	_
5	Attorneys for the Served Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL POLICE EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHELDON GARY ADELSON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:11-cv-00595-RLH-(GWF)

DEFENDANT MICHAEL LEVEN'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S VERIFIED SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE COMPLAINT

Defendant Michael Leven respectfully requests an enlargement of time to respond to Plaintiff's Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint. In support of his motion, Defendant states as follows:

1. On April 18, 2011, Plaintiff filed a two-count shareholder derivative complaint against nominal defendant Las Vegas Sands Corp. ("LVS" or "the Company"), eight current directors of the Company, and one former director, among them defendant Leven. Dkt. 1. Plaintiff subsequently filed a corrected complaint on April 20, 2011. Dkt. 5. LVS was served with that complaint on May 6; Koo was served on May 8; Forman and Chafetz were served on May 17; and Ader was served on May 30. According to the plaintiff, Leven was served on July 22. Dkt. 52 at 4.

08764-04/778746.doc

- 2. On May 19, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion to consolidate this action with two other nearly identical shareholder derivative suits filed in this District. Dkt. 33; *Moradi et al.* v. *Adelson*, No. 2:11-cv-00490-GMN; *Hardy* v. *Adelson et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-00636-RLH. Plaintiff's counsel in *Moradi* has likewise filed a motion to consolidate the actions, and that motion was joined by Plaintiff's counsel in *Hardy*. Defendants agree that consolidation is in the best interest of all parties.
- 3. The Court in both *Moradi* (Dkt. 9) and *Hardy* (Dkt. 43) has issued a blanket enlargement of time for all defendants served and unserved to answer until forty days after the Court rules on the motions for consolidation.
- 4. This Court has already granted unopposed motions for enlargement of time for all defendants served prior to Leven. *See* Dkts. 38, 47.
- 5. In light of the various motions for consolidation, Defendant Leven requests that the time for all remaining defendants (including himself and all other directors not yet served) to answer or otherwise respond be enlarged to forty days after the Court rules on Plaintiff's motion.
- 6. Defendants' counsel raised the matter with Robin Winchester, counsel for Plaintiff in this action, but did not receive a response regarding whether Plaintiff opposes this request. Plaintiff did not previously oppose the extensions given to other defendants in this action.
 - 7. The requested enlargement of time is reasonable and will not prejudice any party.

^{. . .}

¹ Two more nearly identical shareholder derivative suits have also been filed in Nevada state court. *Kohanim* v. *Adelson et al.*, No. A-11-636656-B (Clark Cty., Nev., Mar. 30, 2011); *Gaines* v. *Adelson et al.*, Case No. A-11-639645-B (Clark Cty., Nev., Apr. 18, 2011).

WHEREFORE, Defendant Michael Leven respectfully requests that the Court enlarge the time within which all named defendants may respond to Plaintiff's Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint to forty days after the Court acts on Plaintiff's motion to consolidate.

DATED this 26th day of August, 2011.

SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH, KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON

/s/ James E. Whitmire
NICHOLAS J. SANTORO, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 532
JAMES E. WHITMIRE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 6533
400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

RICHARD A. SAUBER, ESQ.*
KATHRYN S. ZECCA, ESQ.*
ARIEL N. LAVINBUK, ESQ.*
ROBBINS, RUSSELL, ENGLERT, ORSECK, UNTEREINER & SAUBER LLP
1801 K Street, NW, Suite 411L
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-4500
Fax: (202) 775-4510

* Motions for admission pro hac vice forthcoming

Attorneys for the Served Defendants

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: August 29, 2011