

ORIGINAL

No. 23-5448

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 25 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL LLC — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

NEVADA COURT OF APPEALS
(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)

(702) 225-0839
(Phone Number)

— 0 —

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

ISN'T THE APPELLANT ENTITLED TO
NOTICE TO APPEAR?

SHOULD NOT THE RESPONDENT
RESPONSIBLE TO SERVE THE
APPELLANT @ THE CORRECT
ADDRESS?

WHEN USPS RETURNED THE NOTICE
TO APPEAR DUE TO INSUFFICIENT
ADDRESS SHOULD THE RSEPDNDENT
NOT RESPONSIBLE TO NOTIFY THE
COURT?

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 follows:

RESPONDENT KEEPS CHANGING THE NAME OF THE PARTIES LIABLE FOR
INJURY TO THE APPELLANT ON THIS PROPERTY?

EXAMPLE:

NAV-LVH, LCC

PARTIES DIFFERENTIAL FROM:

WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A REMITTUR SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

APPENDIX B ORDER DENYING REHEARING COURT OF APPEALS STATE OF NEVADA

APPENDIX C ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL COURT OF APPEALS STATE OF NEVADA

APPENDIX D NOTICE OF TRANSFER SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

APPENDIX E ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS MOTION TO CLOSE CASE

APPENDIX F- ORDER TO DENY REASSIGNMENT

APPENDIX G ORDER TO DENY WRIT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

BELSSNER VS. GITTINGS

PAGE NUMBER

CASE NO.

21-6853

PAGE 3

ITEM 13

STATUTES AND RULES

NEVADA RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

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 ^A_____ to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at NEVADA COURT OF APPEALS; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ 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.

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 JUNE 28, 2023.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: JUNE 28, 2023, 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. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE APPELLANT HAS THE RIGHT TO BE PROPERLY SERVED MOTION TO DISMISS AS WELL AS SERVICE AS TO WHEN SAID MOTION WAS TO BE HEARD.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

DUE TO THE NEGLIGENCE OF THE RESPONDENT THE APPELLANT WAS STRUCK BY
FALLING CEILING BEAMS AS HE SAT IN THE CASINO.

THIS WAS NOT A CONSTRUCTION ZONE

RESPONDENT NEGLIGENCEFULLY AND WILLFUL INTENT DID NOT CALL FOR MEDICAL
RELIEF WHICH WOULD HAVE SIMULTANEOUSLY RESULTED IN A POLICE REPORT.

EVEN WITH THAT NEGLIGENCE THE RESPONDENT SECURITY AUTHORED A SIGNED
STATEMENT THAT THE APPELLANT WAS STRUCK BY FALLING CEILING BEAMS

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE COURTS OF NEVADA WITH PREJUDICIAL COLLUSION AND BIAS TO PRO SE LITIGANTS DID NOT PROVIDE THE APPELLANT NOTICE TO APPEAR

THE APPELLANT VIRTUALLY ENJOYS THE OPPORTUNITY TO STAND UP FOR ADVOCACY THOUGH THE COURTS OF AMERICA SIMULTANEOUSLY WORKS TO DEPRIVE AMERICANS THE RIGHT TO IMPARTIAL JUSTICE

AFTER DECADES CONTRACTED. EMPLOYED OR ASSOCIATED WITH LEGAL PUBLISHING AND PRINTING WITH SECURITY CLEARANCE IN INSIDER TRAINING TO INCLUDE ANNUAL RATINGS OF BOTH BAR & BENCH THE APPELLANT STRIVES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL BEINGS.

ALL HE ASK IS THE RIGHT / PRIVILEGE TO BE HEARD BECAUSE OF THE LACK OF ETHICS IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION(S).

THAT PRIVILEGE IN THIS INSTANCE HAS BEEN CRIMMINALLY TAKEN FROM THE APPELLANT.

AS IN BELSSNER VS. GITTINGS COURT(S) TO SUBJECTIVELY REVIEW NO-RECEIPT OF DISCOVERY ("PORTION") THAT RESPECTFULLY DID NOT ASK / & EXCLUDED DISCOVERY OF ADMISSIONS LEADING 1ST PLAINTIFF IN DISTRICT COURT TO ASK:

"ANYTHING ELSE"

AND THEN TO FILE THIS PROTECTIVE MEASURE IN THE STATE OF NEVADA SUPREME COURT AND THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

THIS WAS TO VOID AGGRESSIOUS CLAIM(S) AND LACK OF OVERSIGHT THAT THEY THEN PLAINTIFF DID NOT COMPLY WITH DISCOVERY REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS

ADMISSIONS:

IN WHICH THE DEFENDANT ACCEPTED LIABILITY NOT ONLY IN IN BELSSNER VS. GITTINGS BUT IN THIS WRIT:

AS DEFENDANT THE SECURITY GUARD AUTHORED ACCEPTANCE OF LIABILITY IN HIS REPORT THAT THEN PLAINTIFF WAS STRUCK FROM FALLING CEILING BEAMS IN A NON- CONSTRUCTION ZONE OF THE CASINO

CAUSING INJURY THAT NOT ONLY PRESIST BUT HAS BEEN AGGRAVATED BY THE PASSAGE OF TIME.

DEFENDANT SENT NOTICE TO AN EXPIRED ADDRESS WHICH WAS WITH HIGH PROBABILITY RETURNED AS NON-DELIVERABLE-- CAUSING DEFENDANT TO COMMIT PERJURY TO THE STANDARD FORM OF PROOF OF SERVICE


THE CLERK OF COURT IS OF RECORD OF WRONGFULLY ISSUANCE OF REGISTRY OF ACTION NOT ONLY IN BELSSNER VS. WESTGATE BEFORE THE COURT BUT IN NUMEROUS CASES TO INCLUDE BELSSNER VS. GITTINGS LEADING TO LACK OF NOTICE TO APPEAR.

IN BELSSNER VS. CASABLANCA HOA, CASABLANCA VS. CITY OF LAS VEGAS, BELSSNER VS. WELLS FARGO THE CLERK' OFFICE HAS CONSISTENTLY FAILED TO MAINTAIN AN ACCURATE REGISTRY OF ACTION. IN WHICH ALL 3 CAUSED THE PLAINTIFF/ APPELLANT TO FILE MOTION FOR CONSOLIDATION -AT EXTREME COSTS AND LACK OF JUDICIAL ECONOMY TO MR. BELSSNER WITH NO EXCEPTION.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


CHARLES N. BELSSNER

Date: 07/21/2023