

Case No. _____

Appendix

Document #1-Jurisdiction documents	1
Appendix A-California First Appellate decision appeal A158005 of 9/14/2020.....	1
Appendix B-California First Appellate rehearing decision of 10/15/2020.....	5
Appendix C-Superior Court Reconsideration of motion to set aside default dismissal.....	8
Appendix D-Superior Court Denial of motion to set aside default dismissal.....	9
Appendix E-California State Supreme Court denial of review 12/30/2020.....	12
Document #2-United States v. Throckmorton.....	13
Document#3 California CCP 473.....	20
Document#4 California CCP 377.32.....	22
Document#5 California CCP 473B.....	23
Document#6 Underlying suit CIV536879.....	25
Document#7 Probate opened.....	71
Document#8 Motion to continue hearing to dismiss lawsuit.	73
Document#9 Chase bank answer to set aside dismissal of suit of February 27, 2019 (should move this until later number	79

Document#10 Service by Chase bank of the case dismissal sent to my deceased mothers address.....	108
Document#11 Probate appointment as estate administrator...	111
Document#12 Motion to set aside suit dismissal.....	113
Document#13 Motion to reconsider set aside of default dismissal.....	154
Document#14 Motion to gain standing in case under CCP377.32	154
Document#15 Transcript of hearing of motion for standing under CCP 377.32.....	175
Document#16 Appeal to California First Appellate opening brief.....	184
Document#17 Chase bank answer to state appellate continuing extrinsic fraud claim of an regarding an attorney that did not represent the case.....	196
Document#18 California Supreme Court Petition for Review	220
Document#19 Bryan v. Bryan et al, 220 S.C. 164 (S.C. 1951)	284
Document #20 Tamimi v. Tamimi, 38 A.D.2d 197 (N.Y. App.Div. 1972)	290
Document #21 Farris v. Burton, No. 16-3272 (10th Cir. Apr. 25, 2017).....	294

Filed 9/14/20 Thompson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank CA1/3

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

BRADFORD THOMPSON,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

**JPMORGAN CHASE BANK et
al.,**

Defendant and
Respondent.

A158005

(San Mateo County
Super. Ct. No. CIV536879)

Bradfield Thompson, acting in propria persona, appeals from an order declining to reconsider his unsuccessful motion to set aside a default dismissal due to mistake, surprise or excusable neglect. Dismissal of the appeal is compelled by Thompson's inadequate written arguments.

Jo Anne Thompson, Thompson's mother, sued JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., (Chase) and others in January 2016. Following her death in 2017, plaintiff's counsel informed Chase that a family member would substitute into the case as successor-in-interest.

Following a number of continuances, on July 2, 2018 the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the case with prejudice for delay in prosecution. On July 12, 2018, Chase served Thompson with notice of entry of the order. Over six months later, on January 15, 2019,

Thompson moved to set aside the dismissal under Code of Civil Procedure section 473. On February 27, 2019 the court denied the motion because (1) Thompson, as a non-party to the action, had no standing to bring it; (2) the motion was untimely, so the court lacked jurisdiction to consider it; and (3) it lacked substantive merit, because Thompson failed to identify any mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect that resulted in the dismissal.

On June 24, 2019, Thompson moved for reconsideration of the February 27 order. The court denied this motion as well. “Non-party Bradfield Thompson’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s March 7, 2019 Order is Denied. Mr. Thompson has failed to present any ‘new or different facts, circumstances, or law’ to warrant reconsideration.”

Based on the opening brief, we must dismiss Thompson’s appeal. The trial court’s judgment is presumed to be correct on appeal, and it is the burden of the party challenging it to affirmatively demonstrate prejudicial error. (*Bianco v. California Highway Patrol* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 1113, 1125) “ ‘The reviewing court is not required to make an independent, unassisted study of the record in search of error or grounds to support the judgment. It is entitled to the assistance of counsel [or the litigant if, as here, the litigant chooses to represent himself]. Accordingly every brief should contain a legal argument with citation of authorities on the points made. If none is furnished on a particular point, the court may treat it as waived, and pass it without consideration.’ [Citation.]” (*Sprague v. Equifax, Inc.* (1985) 166 Cal.App.3d 1012, 1050.) An appellant’s failure to articulate intelligible legal arguments in the opening brief may be deemed an abandonment of the appeal justifying dismissal. (*Berger v. Godden* (1985) 163 Cal.App.3d 1113, 1119.) Likewise, a failure to present arguments with adequate and comprehensible references to the record on appeal and citation to legal authority can result in forfeiture of any contention

that could have been raised on appeal. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.204(a)(1)(B) &(C); *Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246 (*Nwosu*).)

Thompson has failed to carry his burden. His brief primarily consists of a disjointed and incomplete recitation of the action's procedural history. It asks this court to set aside the dismissal, but presents *no* legal argument directed to the trial court's denial of his motion for reconsideration or its rulings on standing, timeliness, or the merits of his motion to set aside the dismissal. We are sympathetic to the fact that Thompson is representing himself without the benefit of an attorney, but his status as a self-represented litigant does not exempt him from the rules of appellate procedure or relieve his obligation to present intelligible argument supported by the record and legal authority. (*Nwosu, supra*, 122 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1246–1247.) In this case, Thompson's failure to articulate relevant legal argument supported by adequate references to the record and pertinent law requires dismissal of the appeal.

As a final matter, we note that Thompson filed a request for oral argument in response to a notice sent by the clerk of this court after the appeal was fully briefed. A party's right to oral argument exists in any appeal considered *on the merits* and decided by written opinion. (See *Moles v. Regents of University of California* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 867, 871; accord, *Lewis v. Superior Court* (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1232, 1254.) Because we are dismissing this appeal without reaching the merits, Thompson does not have a right to oral argument, and we consider it unnecessary to our procedural ruling.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

Siggins, P.J.

WE CONCUR:

Fujisaki, J.

Jackson, J.

Thompson v. JPMorgan Chase et al., A158005

COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
350 MCALLISTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
DIVISION 3

BRADFIELD THOMPSON,
Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

JP MORGAN CHASE N.A.,
Defendant and Respondent.

A158005
San Mateo County Super. Ct. No. CIV536879

BY THE COURT:

The petition for rehearing is denied.

Date: 10/15/2020

Siggins, P.J.

P.J.

PRESIDING JUSTICE

AFFIDAVIT OF TRANSMITTAL

I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, and not a party to the within action; that my business address is 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102; that I electronically served a copy of the attached material to those persons noted below using the email addresses of record kept by this office.

Those persons without email addresses were served a copy of the attached material via U.S. Postal Service in envelopes addressed as noted below. Said envelopes were sealed and postage fully paid thereon, and thereafter sent from San Francisco, CA 94102 or, alternatively, served via inter-office mail.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Charles D. Johnson, Clerk of the Court

G. King

October 15, 2020

Deputy Clerk

Date

CASE NUMBER: A158005

Office of the Clerk
San Mateo County Superior Court - Main (Redwood City)
Attention: Appeals Section
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Bradfield Thompson
329 Primrose Road # 113
Burlingame, CA 94010
bradtho788@icloud.com

John D. Freed
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111
jakefreed@dwt.com

Eugene Ashley
Hoge, Fenton, Jones & Appel, Inc.
60 S Market Street, Suite 1400
San Jose, CA 95113
eugene.ashley@hogefenton.com

Kevin B. Cullinane

Mark A. Scafina

Ashlee N. Cherry
eoruu

Hoge Fenton Jones & Appel, Inc.
60 South Market Street, Suite 1400
San Jose, CA 95113-2396
ashlee.cherry@hogequenton.com



SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
 400 County Center 1050 Mission Road
 Redwood City, CA 94063 South San Francisco, CA 94080
www.sanmateocourt.org

Minute Order

JO ANNE THOMPSON, ET AL VS. JPMORGAN CHASE

CIV536879

07/05/2019 9:00 AM

Motion for Reconsideration

Hearing Result: Held

Judicial Officer: Davis, III, Leland

Location: Courtroom 4C

Courtroom Clerk: Sarai Goulart

Courtroom Reporter: Annette Jaycox

Parties Present

Exhibits

Minutes

Journals

- 9:03 a.m. matter called.

No appearance by any parties herein or their counsel of record.

Case Events

- Tentative ruling adopted and becomes order;;

NON-PARTY BRADFIELD THOMPSON'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION.

Non-party BRADFIELD THOMPSON's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's March 7, 2019 Order is DENIED. Mr. Thompson has failed to present any "new or different facts, circumstances, or law" to warrant reconsideration. Code Civ. Proc. 1008.

If the tentative ruling is uncontested, it shall become the order of the Court. Thereafter, counsel for Defendant shall prepare a written order consistent with the Court's ruling for the Court's signature, pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1312, and provide written notice of the ruling to all parties who have appeared in the action, as required by law and the California Rules of Court.

Others

Comments:

Future Hearings and Vacated Hearings

FILED
SAN MATEO COUNTY

MAR 08 2019

Clerk of the Superior Court

By M. Ery
 DEPUTY CLERK

Joseph E. Addiego III (CA SBN 169522)
 John D. Freed (CA SBN 261518)
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
 Email: jakefreed@dwt.com
 joeaddiego@dwt.com

CIV536879
 ORD
 Order
 1696666



Attorneys for Defendant
 JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SAN MATEO COUNTY

JO ANNE THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CIV536879

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING NON-PARTY BRADFIELD THOMPSON'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT DISMISSAL

Action Filed: January 11, 2016

The Motion of Non-Party Bradfield Thompson to Set Aside Default ("Motion") came on for hearing on February 27, 2019. The Court, having considered all the papers submitted in support of and in opposition to the Motion, and good cause appearing therefor, the Motion is DENIED for the reasons set forth in the Court's uncontested Tentative Ruling, as follows:

Non-party BRADFIELD THOMPSON's Motion to Set Aside Default Dismissal is DENIED. Mr. Thompson, having failed to bring a motion to continue this action as deceased Plaintiff JO ANNE THOMPSON's personal representative or successor in interest pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 377.31, has no standing to bring the instant motion. Moreover, the motion is untimely pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), and the Court has no jurisdiction to consider it. *Manson, Iver & York v. Black* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 36.

Even if Mr. Thompson had standing and the motion was timely, it would be denied for lack of merit. Mr. Thompson provides no explanation as to what "mistake, inadvertence, surprise

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING NON-PARTY'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT
 Case No. CIV536879

SCANNED

RECEIVED
MAR 05 2019
SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION

1 or excusable neglect" resulted in entry of the Court's July 2, 2018 Order dismissing this action for
2 delay in prosecution pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 583.410. Accordingly, the motion is DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Date: MAR. 07 2019

5 
6 Hon. Leland Davis, III

DEC 30 2020

Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three - No. A158005

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

S265270

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**En Banc**

BRADFIELD THOMPSON, Plaintiff and Appellant,**v.****JPMORGAN CHASE BANK et al., Defendants and Respondents.**

The petition for review is denied.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

Chief Justice

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**