Filed Supreme Court of New Mexico 4/10/2019 9:29 AM Office of the Clerk

SUPREME COURT
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

No. S-1-SC-37231

SUSAN L. SIEBERT,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VS.

REBECCA C. OKUN, M.D., AND WOMEN'S SPECIALISTS OF NEW MEXICO, LTD.,

 $Defendants\hbox{-}Appellants.$

DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS' RESPONSE TO MOTION TO AMEND PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE'S ANSWER BRIEF

Plaintiff-appellee Susan Siebert's motion for leave to amend her Answer Brief to include an appendix should be denied because Rule 12-318 NMRA prohibits parties from attaching documents to briefs and

establishes length limitations for briefs.

1. Siebert filed her Answer Brief on April 8, 2019 and filed her motion requesting leave to amend her brief to include an omitted appendix on April 9, 2019. Siebert's motion should be denied because Rule 12-318(F)(4) NMRA precludes parties from attaching documents to briefs.

2. In addition, although Siebert has not provided Defendants-appellees with a copy of the appendix, Siebert's counsel informed them that the appendix includes citations to case law. Rule 12-318(F) NMRA limits the length of an answer brief to 35 pages or 11,000 words. Siebert should not be permitted to evade this limitation by including citations to legal authorities in an appendix. Rules 12-318(A)-(B) and 23-112 NMRA also require parties to cite legal authorities in the text of a brief – not in an appendix.

For the foregoing reasons, Siebert's motion must be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP Bennett Evan Cooper 201 E. Washington St., Suite 1600 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2382 (602) 257-5217 bcooper@steptoe.com

LORENZ LAW Alice T. Lorenz 2501 Rio Grande Blvd. NW, Suite A Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104-3233 (505) 247-2456 alice@alorenzlaw.com

HINKLE SHANOR LLP

/s/ Dana S. Hardy

William P. Slattery
Dana S. Hardy
Post Office Box 2068
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2068
(505) 982-4554
wslattery@hinklelawfirm.com
dhardy@hinklelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendants-Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing response was electronically filed in the Court's Odyssey filing system, which caused all counsel of record to be electronically served, on this $10^{\rm th}$ day of April, 2019.

/s/ Dana S. Hardy