

21-6853  
No.

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

JAN - 5 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

ORIGINAL

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
\_\_\_\_\_

CHARLES N. BELSSNER — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

LINDEN GITTINGS — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES N. BELSSNER  
(Your Name)

c.o: 725 N. ROYAL CREST CIRCLE # 217  
(Address)

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169-8307

(City, State, Zip Code)

c/o: (612) 341-9201 VOICE MESSAGING  
2nd (702) 225-0839 VOICE MESSAGING  
(Phone Number)

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) WITH A GOVERNOR'S MANDATE TO STAY HOME SHOULD THE 5<sup>TH</sup> PRO TEMPORE WHOM RECENTLY TOOK OFFICE SCHEDULE A HEARING- WAS THIS APPROPRIATE?
- 2) SHOULD SAID HEARING OCCUR WITH ONLY 3 DAY NOTICE AFTER BEING CANCELLED BY PRO TEMPORE 3 TIMES, MOVED TO & THEN BACK FROM THE DISTRICT COURT WITH NO TIME TO REQUEST SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS?
- 3) SHOULD THE PRO TEMPORE HAVE REVIEWED THE FILE & SEE THAT THE THEN PLAINTIFF REQUIRED ADA SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATION THAT RULE OUT TELEPHONIC HEARING IF CAPTIONING IS NOT AVAILABLE THRU THE OFFICE OF DIVERSITY?
- 4) WHY IS THE ORDER SETTING HEARING SIGNED ON THE ON THE 9<sup>TH</sup> OF NOVEMBER, 2020 AND ELECTRONICALLY FILED ON THE 5<sup>TH</sup>?
- 5) WHY THE RUSH TO SCHEDULE THIS DEFENDANT'S SUMMARY JUDGMENT WHEN THE PREVIOUS 3 PRO TEMPORE WHOM RESIGNED ONE OVER CONCERNS OF APPEARANCE OF IMPARTIALITY DID NOT?
- 6) WHERE ANY OF THE COURTS LIKE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (HEREIN AFTER DOJ) AWARE OF CONSENT BY DOJ TO OPEN A COMPLAINT OUT OF THE 100'S OF ADA VIOLATIONS COMPLAINT & COMMIT A REPRESENTATIVE TO TRAVEL TO LAS VEGAS FEDERAL COURT?
- 7) WITH AN EXPERT(S) HANDLING SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THEN PLAINTIFF FOR OVER 12 YEARS WAS THE PRO TEMPORE WILLFUL IN DISCARDING THE APPROVED REQUESTS REQUIRING CAPTIONING @ ALL HEARINGS THAT REQUIRED BEING THERE IN PERSON?
- 8) WHY WASN'T THE ALL IMPORTANT TRANSCRIPT & ORAL HEARING EXAMINATION OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2021 BEFORE JUDGE DAVID M. JONES ORDER & REVIEWED FOR PERJURY UNDER OATH OF DEPARTMENT 29?

9) WHY IS THE E-MAIL FROM ADA EXPERT ESQ. SUZ THOMAS IN THE COURT SUMMARY, PETITION TO REVIEW STATING COURTS ARE HORRIBLE- HOPE YOU (PLAINTIFF) CAN FIX THEM IMPORTANT TO EQUITY FOR MILLIONS OF AMERICANS?

10) WHY ISN'T THE ORDER TO DISMISS BY THE PRO TEMPORE CATAGORIZED AS A DEFAULT ORDER?

11) WHY WASN'T WHEN PLEADINGS FILING AFTER FILING PUT IN PLACE FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE-ALLEGATIONS OF PRO SE ENACTED BY THIS PRO TEMPORE (SEE HAINES VS. KERNER 404 U.S. 519,92S.CT.594) (SEE ERICKSON V. PARDUS 551U.S. 89, 94(2007) QUOTING ESTELLE V. GAMBLE 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)-SEEKING LESS STRINGENT STANDARDS?

12) WHY WASN'T THIS ORDER DISMISSING LITIGATION SET ASIDE (SEE RULE 60B) WHEN FILED EXHIBITS (SEE EXHIBIT E) WITH THE SUPREME COURT DEMONSTRATE LIABILITY ACCEPTED BY THE DEFENDANT?

13) WHY WASN'T THIS ORDER DISMISSING LITIGATION DISMISSED IN Rule 55 (C) WHEN THE DISCOVERY RECEIVED WAS FILED WITH NOT ONLY THE DEFENSE COUNSEL & THE PRO TEMPORE WITH THE STATEMENT:

"ANYTHING ELSE" -?

12) WHEN THIS SYSTEM SEEMS TO BE FRAUGHT WITH POTENTIAL CRONYISM, BIAS AND PREJUDICIAL FAVORITISM IN ITS RULINGS INVOLVING PRO SE LITIGANTS WHOM HAD TO REMOVE ADDICTED INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL WHOM THE APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL NOT ONLY DID NOT GET A HEARING BUT HAS DISTORTED THE COURT RECORDS (SEE CASE SUMMARY A-18-76908-C) THAT EVEN TO AN EXPERT APPEAR THAT THE THEN PLAINTIFF "WAS DUMPED"- TARNISHING THE WORLD WIDE INTERNET AND CHANCE TO RETAIN COUNSEL -CORRECTED WITH A REMAND BACK FOR TRIAL ON MERITS?

## LIST OF PARTIES

☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as for:

**RELATED CASES**

**SUBSTANTIAL THREAT TO SERIOUS HARM TO THE PUBLIC**

**PREJUDICIAL COLLUSION FOR ILLEGAL PURPOSES**

**A GROSS ERROR OF LAW IN DETERRING MATTER FROM TRIAL**

#1 BELSSNER VS. INTEGRITY ONE, INC. dba GONZALEZ AUTO REPAIR

CASE NO. A-19-803115-A ENVELOPE 5397965- DECEMBER 26, 2019

DEFAULT JUDGMENT-

3 PLUS YEARS OF LITIGATION ABUSE OF DISCRETION BY LOWER COURT

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE TO PREVAIL WITH WRIT AGAINST DEFENDANT

ASSETS-DEMONSTRATING THE SUBSTANTIAL THREAT TO THE PUBLIC

#2 BELSSNER VS. NAV-LVH LLC dba as WESTGATE HOTEL &

CASINO

CASE NO. A- 20-808231-C DEPT 14- 8<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

VOID OF FILED ADA SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS TO PUBLIC

HEARING

SCHEDULE FOR JULY 13, 2021 ORAL ARGUMENTS-

DENY ACCESS TO COURT FOR HEARING WHEN OTHER DOCKET

ENTITIES WERE ALLOWED ADMITTANCE TO COURT

SAME SCENARIO FOR REMOVAL OF COUNSEL – NO HEARING

RELATED CASES

#3

FAILURE OF COURT TO TRANSCRIBE HEARING FOR APPEAL

JUDICIAL MISS CONDUCT

1) BELSSNER VS. CIRCLE DENTAL

CASE NO. PSS1901933 – SUPERIOR COURT PALM SPRINGS, CA.

SCHEDULE FOR 12-24-2019 CONTINUED

PRIOR TO CONTINUANCE PLAINTIFF FILED & WAS GRANTED ADA

SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS TO INCLUDE CAPTIONING

COURT GRACIOSULY PROVIDED VISUAL LIGHT TABLE

FAILURE:

PLAINTIFF ASKED & ACCEPTED COSTS FOR TRANSCRIPT

BY PROFESSIONALLY SKILLED TRANSCRIBER WHOM COMPLETED

TRANSCRIPT BUT HER SUPERVISOR WOULD NOT ALLOW HER TO

GIVE IT TO PLAINTIFF.

DISTORTION OF RECORD/ INHERENT DAMAGE TO APPEAL TO U.S

DISTRICT COURT

RELATED CASES

#4

ABUSE OF DISCRETION

CHRIS RICHARDS VS. KEYS OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CASE NO. 42697

CHARLES N. BELSSNER AUTHORED APPEAL

COURT AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSING IN PART AND REMANDING

FAILURE

INTENT BY DEFENSE COUNSEL COMPARABLE TO BELSSNER VS.

GITTINGS

TO AVOID IMMEDIATE TRIAL

ABUSE OF DISCRETION BY JUDICIARY

ORDER OF FAVORITISM TO PRO SE LITIGANT

DELAY CAUSED DETRIORATION OF WITNESS AVAILABILITY FOR

TRIAL

OLDEST STANDARD IN DESTROYING A PARTIES CLAIM-

SAME ISSUE BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN BELSSNER VS.

GITTINGS

RELATED CASES

#5 BELSSNER VS. BERKSHIRE HOME SERVICES

CASE# A-20-820836-C

LOWER JUSTICE COURTS CASE NO. 20000157

DISMISSING APPEAL TO REMOVE FROM JUSTICE COURT

COURT FAILURE TO PROVIDE EITHER ADA ACCOMMODATIONS OR

SCHEDULE ORAL ARGUMENT

#6 BELSSNER VS. ATT dba as DIRECT TV

CASE NO. A-20-818307-A

DEPARTMENT 5

FAILURE OF COURT TO PROVIDE ADA ACCOMMODATIONS -  
SCHEDULED ORAL ARGUMENTS THEN CANCELLED WITHOUT  
NOTICE

# 7 BELSSNER VS. GEICO

SUPERIOR COURT CALIFORNIA

JUDGMENT TO PLAINTIFF IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,449.20

COURT PROVIDED ADA ACCOMMODATIONS TO INCLUDE  
CAPTIONING



RELATED CASES

# 8

BELSSNER VS. TRAVELERS INSURANCE

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

CASE NO. SWS1401985

JUDGMENT TO PLAINTIFF IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,256.20

COURT PROVIDED ADA ACCOMMODATIONS TO INCLUDE

CAPTIONING

#9

BELSSNER VS. INTERINSURANCE OF CALIFORNIA dba AAA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA

CASE NO. 5:17-CV-01046-FMO-PJW-

FAILURE: LOWER COURT FAILED TO PROVIDE TRANSCRIPT AS  
REQUESTED

RELATED CASES

#10-

PEOPLE VS. BELSSNER

SUPERIOR COURT TRAFFIC

CASE NO. 19IN-146375

APPELLATE COURT CASE NO. ACRAS 20000051

COURT OF APPEALS 4<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT CASE NO. E0777089- APPLICATION  
TO TRANSFER STAMPED 9/12/2021- PENDING

LOWER COURT FAILED TO PROVIDE ADA ACCOMMODATIONS, COURT  
WAS CLOSED TO PUBLIC DAY OF HEARING WITHOUT PROPER  
NOTICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGES
QUESTIONS	2, 3
OPINIONS BELOW.....	59.....
JURISDICTION.....	60.....
LIST OF PARTIES	4
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	61.....
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	62
RELATED CASES	4, 5, 6 7, 8 9, 10 67
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	69.....
APPENDIX A ORDER -ADA VIOLATIONS (BY COURT )	12

#### INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	12
PLAINTIFF' MOTION FOR ADA VIOLATIONS (BY COURT)	
APPENDIX B PRO TEMPORE ORDER SETTING HEARING ON DEFENDANT'	17
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
APPENDIX C PRO TEMPORE ODRER DISMISSING LITIGATION	26
APPENDIX D SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA DENIAL OF REVIEW	35
APPENDIX E SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA- RETURNED OF	49
UNFILED TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES – ADA LAW SECTION 504 REQUEST FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES-----PLEASE NOTE PROFESSIONALLY PREPARED WITH REPEATED MEETINGS WITH MEDICAL EXPERT KARIN HUFFER, M.F.T LICENSED MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPIST (PROFESSIONAL ETHICS,POST TRAUMA STRESS & LEGAL ABUSE -----AUTHOR & SPEAKER-----M.D. HUFFER PERSONALLY WROTE THE ADA SITE COORDINATOR BEGINNING IN 2008----- STATING LIMITATIONS, ACCESS REQUIRED TO COURT TO ENSURE DUE PROCESS. M.D. HUFFER STATED THE COURT IS MANDATED TO PROVIDE ACCOMMODATIONS AS LONG AS THE REQUESTS ARE REASONABLE. SINCE SAID DATE NO REQUEST HAS BEEN DENIED!  
ANNE SCHNEIDER PH.D, LP MN. STATE LICENSE LPO 0383 BEGINNING IN AUGUST OF 1993 STATED ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME & DURATION OF DISABILITY  
OTHER

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

**STATE OF NEVADA VS. MARGARET RUDIN  
(BINION MURDER TRIAL)**

**COUNSEL NOT PREPARED / WASN'T AFFECTIVE**

**HAD TO BE REMOVED BUT RECORD IN BELSSNER VS. GETTINGS BEFORE  
THE COURT WAS TAINTED FROM THE GET GO WHEN DEPARTMENT 29  
REFUSED HEARING / APPLICATION TO REMOVE COUNSEL THEN RECORDS  
("CASE SUMMARY") TAINTED BY MULTIPLE LISTING(S) THAT COUNSEL  
WITHDREW)**

**SOWING FALSE NARRATIVE THAT PLAINTIFF WAS "DUMPED"  
NEW TRIAL GRANTED**

**STATUTES AND RULES – ADA LAW SECTION 504 REQUEST FOR PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES-----PLEASE NOTE PROFESSIONALLY PREPARED WITH REPEATED  
MEETINGS WITH MEDICAL EXPERT KARIN HUFFER, M.F.T LICENSED MARRIAGE  
& FAMILY THERAPIST (PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, POST TRAUMA STRESS & LEGAL  
ABUSE -----AUTHOR & SPEAKER-----M.D. HUFFER  
PERSONALLY WROTE THE ADA SITE COORDINATOR BEGINNING IN 2008-----  
STATING LIMITATIONS, ACCESS REQUIRED TO COURT TO ENSURE DUE PROCESS.  
M.D. HUFFER STATED THE COURT IS MANDATED TO PROVIDE  
ACCOMMODATIONS AS LONG AS THE REQUESTS ARE REASONABLE. SINCE SAID  
DATE NO REQUEST HAS BEEN DENIED!  
ANNE SCHNEIDER PH.D, LP MN. STATE LICENSE LPO 0383 BEGINNING IN AUGUST  
OF 1993 STATED ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME & DURATION OF DISABILITY  
PERMANENT  
OTHER**

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix c to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ **HIGHEST COURT** \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix c to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Oct. 26, 2021.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix D.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:  
DECEMBER 20, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing  
DECEMBER 20, 2021 appears at Appendix E (RETURNED UNFILED)

**NOT REVIEWED**

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. RIGHT TO NON\_ADDICTIVE COUNSEL\*
2. RIGHT TO EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL.
3. RIGHT TO ADA SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES \*\*(2)
4. RIGHT TO PROPER NOTICE TO APPEAR  
(A NOTICE SIGNED NOV. 9~~th~~ (FILED NOV. 5th FOR HEARING ON NOVEMBER 9~~th~~ TELEPHONICALLY VOID OF ADA ACCOMMODATIONS IS NOT PROPER) SEE APPENDIX B).
5. RIGHT TO HEARINGS
  - A) APPLICATION TO REMOVE COUNSEL NOT ALLOWED/S SCHEDULED
  - B) APPLICATION TO BE PRESENT PER ADA SECTION 504 ON NOVEMBER 9, 2020 VOIDED
  - C) RIGHT TO ADA ACCOMMODATIONS ON FEBRUARY 02, 2021 NOT PROVIDED
6. RIGHT TO ACCURATE COURT RECORDS 9 TERMINOLOGY AS" CASE SUMMARY IN 8th JUDICIAL COURT OF CLARK COUNTY")  
GIVING WORLD WIDE INTERNET ASSUMPTION THAT PLAINTIFF WAS  
"DUMPED"  
VOIDING OPPORTUNITY & RIGHT TO COUNSEL
8. FEDERALLY FUNDED LEGAL AID REFUSAL TO SEARCH FOR COUNSEL PER REFERRAL FROM ADR COMMISSIONER IS GOOD CAUSE FOR REMAND .

---

\* CONFIRMED BY ESQ. E. BRENT BRYSON

1. APPLICATION TO REMOVE COMPLIMENTED BY COUNSEL E. BRENT BRYSON  
\*\*(2) SEE DISABILITIES ACT, 42 USC 12101 ET SEQ?



## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

IN RESPECT TO JUDICIAL ECONOMY WHICH HAS BEEN GREATLY AFFECTED BY GOVERNOR'S MANDATE TO STAY @ HOME ON MORE THE 5 OCCURENCES & CLOSURE OF ESSENTIAL SERVICES EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO A CASE THAT WAS GREATLY AFFECTED BY A NOT ACKNOWLEDGE ADDICTED & THEN INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL WHOM THE COURT DID NOT ALLOW AN APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL TO BE HEARD & ENTER APPROPRIATE INTO THE COURT RECORDS (ACKNOWLEDGED AS: "CASE SUMMARY CASE NO A-18-769908-C, DEPT 14) DUE PROCESS UNDER ADA SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATIONS RESULTED IN APPENDIX A ORDERING OF A HEARING THAT DISMISSED THIS LITIGATION BY A 5<sup>TH</sup> ASSIGNED PRO TEMPORE

ATTORNEY @ LAW E. BRENT BRYSON, PC. A NOTED STRONG ADVOCATE FOR DUE PROCESS & ADEQUATE LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE INDIGENT WHOM HAS NO LEGAL ACCESS CONFIRMED THE APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF COUNSEL WAS PREPARED IN EXCELLENCE BY THE THEN PLAINTIFF & THAT FORMER COUNSEL WAS KNOWN FOR HAVING PAST TENSE OF HAVING A RESPECTED PRACTICE.

WITH THE DISCARDING OF A HEARING FOR APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL COUNSEL BY THE CLERK OF DEPARTMENT 14 THE CLERK ALLOWED COUNSEL TO WITHDRAW THAT NOT ONCE, THE TWICE BUT AS OFTEN AS 3 TIMES INDICATED IN SAID CASE SUMMARY THAT WITHDRAW WAS APPROVED GIVING THE WORLD WIDE INTERNET THAT THE PLAINTIFF WAS "DUMPED". THUS MAKING IT NOT DIFFICULT BUT IMPOSSIBLE TO THE RIGHT TO RETAIN COUNSEL. THE ADR COMMISSIONER ON THE EVE OF A SHORT TRAIL PROGRAM REFERRED THEN PLAINTIFF TO LEGAL AID OF SOUTHERN NEVADA TO COMPLETE A SEARCH A LEGAL SEARCH WHICH THE COMMISSIONER WAS LITERALLY SHOCKED THAT LEGAL AID REFUSED.

WAITING MONTHS FOR APPROVAL OF AN INFORMA PAUPERIS THAT OVER THE NEXT 2 ½ YEARS DEPARTMENT 29 IGNORED 5 TIMES -DID THE DEPARTMENT APPROVE SAID APPLICATION FOR INFORMA PAUPERIS ON FEBRUARY 02, 2021.

AFTER 14 SOLID YEARS AS A POLICE INFORMANT AS RECORDS ILLUSTRATE TO INCLUDE EXHIBITED IN PLAINTIFF' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN BELSSNER VS. GITTINGS BEFORE THIS COURT (SEE CASE # 99MI7987X STATE OF NEVADA VS. CHRIS RICHARDS) THE THEN PLAINTIFF WAS AN EXTREMELY SUCCESSFUL EYEWITNESS, WHISTLEBLOWER AND VICTIM IN NOT ONLY THE CONVICTIONS OF CRIMINALS BUT THE APPREHENSION OF MANY FELONS ON PAROLE THAT SAID SUMMARY IF EXCLUDED FROM COLLUSION BY THE JUDICIARY IN THIS LITIGATION SHOULD HAVE BEEN MANDATED ON MERIT

STATEMENT OF CASE  
PAGE 2

THE MAJORITY OF THE PRO TEMPORE' WHOM RECUSE IN THIS LITIGATION SAW THE LACK OF IMPARTIAL INTEGRITY ON THE PART OF THE COURT THAT RESULTED IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> PRO TEMPORE WHOM RECUSE TO ENCOURAGE IN HIS LETTER TO RECUSE TO REMAINE IMPARTIAL AND REFRAIN FROM EXPARTE.

THE DEPARTMENT FAILED ON ALL ACCOUNTS.

THE RECORD SHOWS THAT THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS CITED @ THE SCENE AFTER HIS UNWARANTED / NON DEFENSIVEABLE RUSH TO TRUN IN FRONT OF AND BEAT ON UPCOMING TRAFFIC THAT IN THE AFOREMENTION 14 YEARS OF LITIGATION SHOULD HAVE RESULTED INCRIMINAL ARREST.

WHY:

@ THE SCENE WAS A WOMAN WHOM WAS CLOSET TO THE IMPACT OF THE DEFENDANT TRUCK WHO HIT THEN PLAINTIFF CAR HEAD WHILE WAITING FOR TRAFFIC TO CLEAR BEFORE TURNING OUT OF THE MALL WHEN THE DEFENDANT ATTEMPTED TO ENTER A STRIP MALL LOT ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE. IN BEARLY MSSING MULTIPLE LANES OF CARS & IN THE LAST LANE OF TRAFFIC TO THE ENTRANCE THE DEFENDANT MISSED A FEMAL DRIVER. SHE RUSHED FROM HER CAR IN RAGE TO ATTACK THE DEFENDANT BUT WAS STOPPED BY A 2<sup>ND</sup> EYEWITNESS TO THE EVENT -A LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE OFFICER.

THE DEFENDANT TRUCK WAS STICKING OUT FROM THE MALL ENTRANCE DIRECTLY IN FRONT OF THE THEN PLAINTIFF' CAR INTO 2 LANES OF SOUTH BOUND TRAFFIC JUST ACROSS FROM SUNRISE HOSPITAL.

CUT TO THE CHASE OFFICER MILLS SAID HE WOULD CALL THIS IN AS HE HELD VALERIE JONES APART FROM THE DEFENDANT. HE THEN TOOK HE TO EXTREME DISTANCE, RETURNED TO SAID HE CALLED IT IN AND ESCORTED VALERIE JONES BUT NOT BEFORE SHE SIGNED HER NAME & PHONE NUMBER TO A PAPER TABLET.

THE POLICE OFFICER FAILED TO FILE A REPORT, FAILED TO GET A STATEMENT FROM VALERIE JONES AND INEFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL FAILED TO SECURE EITHER. JUDGE JONES WAS REPEATEDLY ASK TO SUBPOENA THE OFFICER TO SIMPLY ASK-----"WHAT WERE YOU THINKING?"

A WITNESS TAKEN FROM A SCENE THAT WAS INCHES FROM CLAIMING MULTIPLE LIVES!

STATEMENT OF CASE  
PAGE 3

SEE SOMETHING - SAY SOMETHING

TAUGHT SINCE 1<sup>ST</sup> TRAFFIC SCHOOL-----

YOU DO NOT LEAVE THE SCENE OF AN ACCIDENT

ALL LOST

THE OVERWHELMING MERIT TO EVIDENCE FILED IN THE ONLY DISCOVERY  
SERVED ON THE THEN PLAINTIFF CONTRIBUTES TO THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
LIABILITY BY DEFENDANT INSURANCE COMPANY- HARTFORD IN THE PAYMENT  
OF DAMAGES TO THE DEFENDANT CAR IN EXCESS OF BOOK VALUE

THIS WAS FILED STAMPED WITH THE SUPREME COURT APPEAL (SEE EXHIBIT E)  
AND AGAIN FILED AS EXHIBIT D IN THE PETITION)

ALONG WITH BOTH FILINGS IT WAS SERVED NOT ONLY ON DEFENSE COUNSEL  
BUT WITH THE PRO TEMPORE WHOM DISMISSED THE LITIGATION WITH  
NOTATION SEEKING CONFIRMATION OF COMPLETING DISCOVERY WITH THE  
ADDED NOTATION TO DWARF FALSE NARRATIVE OFTEN ATTRIBUTED IN  
DISCOVERY WITH THE STATEMENT:

'ANYTHING ELSE"

PHOTOS TAKEN @ THE SCENE SHOWS THE DEFENDANT MOVED HIS TRUCK  
WITHOUT NOTICE TO (ALTERING EVIDENCE) FROM STICKING OUT OF THE FRONT  
END OF THE THEN PLAINTIFF' CAR & WELL INTO THE STREET (MARYLAND  
PARKWAY)

LIQUIDS DRAINING FROM THEN PLAINTIFF' CAR INTO THE GUTTER OF THE  
STREET STRONGLY DEMONSTRATES WHERE OCCURRED. DAMAGES TO CAR &  
MARKING ON FRONT OF DEFENDANT'S TRUCK DEMONSTRATE WHERE IMPACT  
ALSO OCCURRED.

OFFICER BENGEL THE REPORTING OFFICER SPENT OVER 30 MINUTES  
EXPLAINING TO THE DEFENDANT AND GREAT EXERTION TO RAISE HIS ARMS  
ABOVE HIS HEAD TO POINT TO THE SPOT WHERE DEFENDANT TRUCK MADE  
IMPACT TO THE THEN PLAINTIFF' CAR.

STATEMENT OF CASE

PAGE 4

TO DEMONSTRATE INEFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL:

COUNSEL SCHEDULED PREP TO REQUESTED DEPOSITIONS THE DAY BEFORE IT WAS TO BE HELD

STAFF MEMBER(S) STATED THAT IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE EARLIER

DURING PREP THE FIRM PARALEGAL & ASSOCIATED ARGUED ABOUT NUMEROUS ITEMS-----

A) WHAT HAPPEN TO VALERIE JONES INFO;

INTO PREP MR. CALLISTER LEFT THE ROOM -RETURNED & SAID DEPOSITIONS WERE CANCELLED BECAUSE DEFENSE COUNSEL COULD NOT ATTEND

IN THEN PLAINTIFF INTEREST TO HAVE DEPOSITIONS TAKEN TO FINALIZE ACCIDENT SCENE INFORMATION THE THEN PLAINTIFF CALLED DEFENSE COUNSEL & WAS ADVISED THAT IT WAS MR. CALLISTER WHOM CANCELLED DEPOSITIONS-----STAFF PERSON AGREED

IT WAS THEN THAT REMOVAL OF COUNSEL STARTED- LIES- DELAYS INEFFECTIVENESS IN CONTACTING VALERIE JONES GETTING STATEMENT FROM POLICE OFFICER MILLS

UPON REMOVAL OF COUNSEL THEN PLAINTIFF CONTACTED DEFENSE COUNSEL WHOM DID ALLOW DEPOSITIONS OR DISCOVERY TO RESUME

BUT NOW NEVER SERVED REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS WHICH WOULD HAVE CONFIRMED LIABILITY OF THE ACCIDENT OF ON DEFENDANT GITTINGS IS AN OMISSION THAT THE THEN PLAINTIFF CAUSED THE ACCIDENT!

STATEMENT OF CASE  
PAGE 5

ON TOP OF THE AFOREMENTION SERVICE TO COMMUNITY AND EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE STANDARD OF LIVING FOR EVERYONE THAT THEN PLAINTIFF HAS COMPLETDD 53 YEARS OF EITHER EMPLOYMENT, CONTRACT, SERVICE AGREEMENTS OR SIMPLE ASSOCIATION WITH THE LEGAL PUBLISHING AND PRINTING PROFESSIONS TO INCLUDE ANNUAL RATINGS AND PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WITH ATTORNEYS, THE JUDICIARY, LAW PROFESSORS AND DEANS OF LAW SCHOOLS.

THE PLAINTIFF PORTFOLIO INCLUDES BEING TITLED A PERSON WITH INTEGRITY WITH ACTION FOR HIS DEDICATION TO HIS COMMUNITY AND OTHERS.

AS A PRICE FOR HIS EFFORTS THE THEN PLAINTIFF HAS BEEN ASSAULTED TWICE DUE TO POLICE LEAKS AND HAS BEEN FORCED TO LIVE IN FEAR OF RETALIATION. FORCING HIM TO LIVE IN ACAR FOR YEARS AND SPENDING OVER \$150,000.00 IN HIS ENDEAVORS TO:

SEE SOMETHING / SAY SOMETHING

DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR MR. GITTINGS CALLS THIS

QUID PRO QUO

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. FAILURE BY PRO TEMPORE TO TIMELY SCHEDULE TELEPHONIC HEARING WITH ONLY A 3 DAY NOTICE AFTER MINIMUM OF 3 DELAYS BY TEMPORE, AN ATTEMPT BY DISTRICT COURT TO SCHEDULE HEARING, THEN A REMOVAL FROM SUCH ATTEMPT BY TO THE PRO TEMPORE WITH AN ORDER SIGNED ON NOVEMBER 9, 2020 BUT FILED ON NOVEMBER, 5, 2020.
2. TOTAL DISREGARD FOR THE TIME REQUIRED TO FILE FOR ADA SECTION 504 ACCOMMODATION WITH A CLOSED OFFICE OF DIVERSITY DUE TO THE GOVERNOR' MANDATE TO STAY @ HOME.
3. NO RESOURCES DUE TO GOVERNOR'S MANDATE- EVERYTHING WAS CLOSED.
4. IN THE DISCOVERY RECEIVED BY THE PLAINTIFFTHERE WERE BO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS.
5. SAID COMPLETION OF DISCOVERY RECEIVED WHERE FILED, SENT TO DEFENSE COUNSEL, SENT TO PRO TEMPORE WITH A NOTATION:

"ANYTHING ELSE"

ALL FILED WITH THE COURT WITH PROOF OF SERVICE  
TO PROTECT FROM THE OLDEST TRICK IN THE BOOK OF

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

PAGE 2

5. CONTINUED

CLAIMING FAILURE THIS, FAILURE THAT -THAT APPEARS  
IN TOO MANY FALSE NARRATIVE IN IN CULTURE OF TODAY  
LITIGATIONS

## CONCLUSION


The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
CHARLES N. BELSSNER

DATE SUBMITTED:

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2022



  
NOTARY PUBLIC