

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC, A  
FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY;  
AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED  
LIABILITY COMPANY,  
Respondents.

Supreme Court No. 84877  
District Court Case No. A808231

FILED

AUG 01 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *Heather*  
DEPUTY CLERK

REMITTITUR

TO: Steven D. Grierson, Eighth District Court Clerk

Pursuant to the rules of this court, enclosed are the following:

Certified copy of Judgment and Opinion/Order.  
Receipt for Remittitur.

DATE: July 24, 2023

Elizabeth A. Brown, Clerk of Court

By: Elyse Hooper  
Administrative Assistant


cc (without enclosures):

Hon. Michael A. Cherry, Senior Justice  
Charles N. Belssner  
Browne Green Trial Lawyers \ Jared P. Green\ Brian J. Ungurean

RECEIPT FOR REMITTITUR

Received of Elizabeth A. Brown, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, the  
REMITTITUR issued in the above-entitled cause, on JUL 25 2023

*Heather*  
Deputy District Court Clerk



RECEIVED  
APPEALS  
JUL 25 2023

CLERK OF THE COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC, A  
FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY;  
AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED  
LIABILITY COMPANY,  
Respondents.

Supreme Court No. 84877  
District Court Case No. A808231

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATE**

STATE OF NEVADA, ss.

I, Elizabeth A. Brown, the duly appointed and qualified Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true and correct copy of the Judgment in this matter.

**JUDGMENT**

The court being fully advised in the premises and the law, it is now ordered, adjudged and decreed, as follows:

"ORDER this appeal DISMISSED."

Judgment, as quoted above, entered this 7<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2023.

**JUDGMENT**

The court being fully advised in the premises and the law, it is now ordered, adjudged and decreed, as follows:

"Rehearing Denied."

Judgment, as quoted above, entered this 28<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2023.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court at my Office in Carson City, Nevada this July 24, 2023.

Elizabeth A. Brown, Supreme Court Clerk

By: Elyse Hooper  
Administrative Assistant

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN  
INDIVIDUAL,

Appellant,

vs.

WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC,  
A FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A  
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,

Respondents.

No. 84877-COA

FILED

JUN 28 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

**ORDER DENYING REHEARING**

Rehearing denied. NRAP 40(c).

It is so ORDERED.<sup>1</sup>

*[Signature]*, C.J.  
Gibbons

*[Signature]*, J.  
Westbrook

*[Signature]*, Sr.J.  
Silver

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Abbi Silver, Senior Justice, participated in the decision of this matter under a general order of assignment.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN  
INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC,  
A FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A  
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondents.

No. 84877-COA

FILED

APR 07 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK


**ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL**

Charles N. Belssner appeals from a district court post-judgment order granting respondents' motion to close his case. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Michael A. Cherry, Senior Judge.


Having considered the documents before us, we conclude that this court lacks jurisdiction over this appeal. This court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only when the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule. *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach, LLC*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013). Here, Belssner purports to appeal from the district court's post-judgment order granting respondents' motion to close the underlying case. But as recognized in *Brown*, orders indicating that "no further action is contemplated and directing the clerk to mark the case closed" are not substantively appealable. *Id.* at 347, 301 P.3d at 852 (recognizing that orders indicating that "no further action is contemplated and directing the clerk to mark the case closed" are not final orders for purposes of appellate jurisdiction (citing *Morton Int'l, Inc. v. A.E. Staley Mfg. Co.*, 460 F.3d 470, 481–82 (3d Cir. 2006)) (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Moreover, to the extent Belssner seeks to challenge the district court's September 14, 2021, judgment on the arbitration award, which is treated as a final judgment under NAR 19(B), that rule also provides that "[a] judgment entered pursuant to this rule . . . may not be appealed" unless "the district court entered a written interlocutory order disposing of a portion of the action." And because the district court did not enter such an interlocutory order, NAR 19(B) prohibits appellant from appealing the September 2021 judgment. Accordingly, we conclude that this court lacks jurisdiction, and we therefore

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.



M. Gibbons, C.J.  
Gibbons



Bulla, J.



Westbrook, J.

cc: Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court  
Hon. Michael A. Cherry, Senior Judge  
Charles N. Belssner  
Browne Green Trial Lawyers  
Eighth District Court Clerk

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC, A  
FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY;  
AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED  
LIABILITY COMPANY,  
Respondents.

Supreme Court No. 84877  
District Court Case No. A808231

NOTICE OF TRANSFER TO COURT OF APPEALS

Pursuant to NRAP 17(b), the Supreme Court has decided to transfer this matter to the Court of Appeals. Accordingly, any filings in this matter from this date forward shall be entitled "In the Court of Appeals of the State of Nevada." NRAP 17(e).

DATE: December 14, 2022

Elizabeth A. Brown, Clerk of Court

By: Rory Wunsch  
Deputy Clerk

Notification List  
Electronic  
Browne Green Trial Lawyers \ Jared P. Green

Paper  
Hon. Michael A. Cherry, Senior Justice  
Charles N. Belssner  
Browne Green Trial Lawyers \ Brian J. Unguren  
Steven D. Grierson, Eighth District Court Clerk

# Nevada Court of Appeals Docket Sheet

Docket: 84877-COA    BELSSNER VS. WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC

Page 1

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC, A FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondents.

Case No. 84877-COA

Consolidated with:

## Counsel

Charles N. Belssner, Las Vegas, NV, Appellant, in proper person

Browne Green Trial Lawyers, Las Vegas, NV \ Jared P. Green, Brian J. Unguren, as counsel for Respondents,  
NAV-LVH, LLC and Westgate Las Vegas Hotel, LLC

## Case Information

Panel: COA2022

Panel Members: Gibbons/Tao/Bulla

Disqualifications:

Case Status: Rehearing Filed

Category: Civil Appeal

Type: General

Subtype: Proper Person

Submitted:

Date Submitted:

Oral Argument:

Sett. Notice Issued:

Sett. Judge:

Sett. Status:

Related Court Cases:

84877

## District Court Case Information

Case Number: A808231

Case Title: CHARLES N. BELSSNER VS. NAV-LVH, LLC

Judicial District: Eighth

Division:

County: Clark Co.

Sitting Judge: Michael A. Cherry

Replaced By:

Notice of Appeal Filed:

Judgment Appealed From Filed: 05/19/22

## Docket Entries

### Date    Docket Entries

12/14/22 Transferred from Supreme Court. (COA).

04/07/23 Filed Order Dismissing Appeal. "ORDER this appeal DISMISSED." Court of Appeals- MG/BB/DW. (COA) 23-010644

04/26/23 Filed Appellant's Petition for Rehearing. (SC) 23-013079

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER, AN  
INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC,  
A FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; AND NAV-LVH, LLC, A  
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondents.

No. 84877

**FILED**


JUN 23 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DIRECTING TRANSMISSION OF RECORD*

Having reviewed the documents on file in this pro se appeal, this court concludes that review of the complete record is warranted. NRAP 10(a)(1). Accordingly, within 30 days from the date of this order, the clerk of the district court shall transmit to the clerk of this court a certified copy of the trial court record in District Court Case No. A-20-808231-C. See NRAP 11(a)(2) (providing that the complete "record shall contain each and every paper, pleading and other document filed, or submitted for filing, in the district court," as well as "any previously prepared transcripts of the proceedings in the district court"). The record shall not include any exhibits filed in the district court. NRAP 11(a)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Charles N. Belssner  
Browne Green Trial Lawyers  
Eighth District Court Clerk

22-19875

1 **OGM**  
2 Jared Green – Nevada Bar No. 10059  
3 Brian Unguren – Nevada Bar No. 14427  
3 **BROWNE GREEN, LLC**  
4 3755 Breakthrough Way, Suite 210  
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
5 Phone/Fax: (702) 475-6454  
6 E-mail: [jared@bgtriallawyers.com](mailto:jared@bgtriallawyers.com)  
6 E-mail: [brian@bgtriallawyers.com](mailto:brian@bgtriallawyers.com)  
7 Attorneys for Defendants  
8 WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC and  
8 NAV-LVH, LLC

9 **DISTRICT COURT**

10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

11 CHARLES N. BELSSNER, an individual,

Case No.: A-20-808231-C  
Dept.: 14

12 Plaintiffs,  
13 vs.

14 WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC,  
15 a Foreign Limited-Liability Company;  
16 NAV-LVH, LLC a Nevada Limited  
16 Company; NAV-LVH CASINO, LLC, a  
17 Domestic Limited-Liability Company;  
17 WESTGATE RESORTS, INC, a Foreign  
18 Corporation; DOES I through X; and ROE  
19 CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  
19 Defendants.

20 Defendants.  
21

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO CLOSE CASE**

22 On May 18, 2022, Defendant NAV-LVH, LLC d/b/a WESTGATE LAS VEGAS  
23 RESORT & CASINO's Motion to Close Case was heard before the Honorable Michael  
24 Cherry. Jared P. Green, Esq. of Browne Green, LLC, appeared on behalf of Defendant  
25 Westgate, Plaintiff did not appear at the hearing.  
26

The facts do not demonstrate the extreme bias or prejudice against Mr. Belssner that would be necessary for Judge Escobar's disqualification. There is no evidence that Judge Escobar's actions or rulings have been influenced by bias toward or prejudice against any party to this case. As a result, the Motion for Recusal and Affidavit are DENIED.

## Conclusion

Mr. Belssner does not bring any cognizable claims supported by factual or legal allegations against Judge Escobar. The record does not support Mr. Belssner's allegations of bias by Judge Escobar, and Judge Escobar's rulings and actions in the course of official judicial proceedings are not evidence of bias or prejudice. Thus, Mr. Belssner's request to disqualify Judge Escobar is denied. Further, the hearing scheduled for December 2, 2021 is vacated.

**Dated this 2nd day of December, 2021**

FA9 B85 4A98 B4CC  
Linda Marie Bell  
District Court Judge

1 DAO

## 2 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4  
5 CHARLES BELSSNER,

6 Plaintiff,

7 vs.

8 NAV-LVH, LLC,

9 Defendant.

10 Case No. A-20-808231-C

11 Dept. No. XIV

12 **DECISION AND ORDER**

13 Plaintiff Charles Belssner filed a Motion to Recuse on October 17, 2021, and also an  
14 Affidavit of Prejudice on October 24, 2021. Judge Escobar responded to the Affidavit on November  
15 2, 2021. In his Affidavit, Plaintiff alleges that Judge Escobar suppressed his due process by using  
16 BlueJeans for remote appearance in a hearing. Based on a review of the papers, Judge Escobar's  
17 response, and pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c), Plaintiff's motion is denied.

18 **I. Factual and Procedural Background**

19 On January 9, 2020, Plaintiff Charles Belssner filed a complaint against Westgate Las Vegas  
20 Resort, later amended to add NAV-LVH, LLC, *et al*. On November 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Request  
21 for Exemption from Arbitration, which was denied by the ADR Commissioner. On February 11,  
22 2021, the parties appeared for an Early Arbitration Conference by telephone. On May 7, 2021,  
23 Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On July 13, 2021, Judge Escobar denied the Motion  
24 for Summary Judgment. On July 25, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Vacate the denial of summary  
25 judgment.

26 On July 29, 2021, the matter went before an arbitrator, and Plaintiff did not appear. Upon  
27 learning of the arbitration award in Defendants' favor, Plaintiff emailed Defendants stating he had  
28 not received notice of the arbitration, though a Notice of Change of Arbitration Hearing was filed,

LINDA MARIE BELL  
DISTRICT JUDGE  
DEPARTMENT VII

1 mailed and emailed on May 20, 2021, stating the arbitration date of July 29, 2021. Plaintiff later  
2 filed an Objection to Arbitrator's Bill for Fees and Costs, which was granted by the ADR  
3 Commissioner on September 2, 2021 on the basis of Plaintiff's *in Forma Pauperis* status.

4 On October 14, 2021, the hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate came on calendar. A  
5 review of the hearing shows that Plaintiff failed to appear, and that the court provided  
6 accommodations to Plaintiff for the hearing, including a CART provider (a real-time caption  
7 provider), who was present to accommodate Plaintiff. The court discussed that Plaintiff had arrived  
8 early for the hearing, which was on calendar for 10 a.m., but he arrived around approximately 8:00  
9 a.m., and declined to stay for the calendar time and did not make a remote appearance at the  
10 calendar time.<sup>1</sup> The court noted that it provided accommodations for Plaintiff to make his  
11 appearance, and that upon contacting Plaintiff around the time of his hearing, he hung up on court  
12 staff. The court stated that Plaintiff had not provided a reason for his non-appearance. Thereafter, the  
13 Motion to Vacate was denied. In his Motion and Affidavit to Disqualify Judge Escobar, Plaintiff  
14 stated that the failure to accommodate his needs to modify remote appearance indicates bias against  
15 him.

16 On November 2, 2021, Judge Escobar responded to Plaintiff's Affidavit. Judge Escobar  
17 reiterated her duty to preside over cases assigned to her, pursuant to Nevada's Code of Judicial  
18 Conduct (NCJC) 2.7. Judge Escobar further denied Plaintiff's allegations that she is biased, and  
19 stated that she provided the requested and/or required accommodations under the law.

20 As a result of the above, the Court finds as follows.

21 **II. Discussion**

22 **A. Legal Standard**

23 Nevada Revised Statute 1.230 provides the statutory grounds for disqualifying district Court  
24 judges. The statute in pertinent part provides:

25 1. A judge shall not act in an action or proceeding when the judge entertains actual  
26 bias or prejudice for or against one of the parties to the action.

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> This Court notes that the Clerk's Notice of Hearing stated the October 14, 2021 hearing would begin at 10:00 a.m.

1           2. A judge shall not act as such in an action or proceeding when implied bias exists  
2           in any of the following respects:  
3           (a) When the judge is a party to or interested in the action or proceeding.  
4           (b) When the judge is related to either party by consanguinity or affinity within the  
5           third degree.  
6           (c) When the judge has been attorney or counsel for either of the parties in the  
7           particular action or proceeding before the court.  
8           (d) When the judge is related to an attorney or counselor for either of the parties by  
9           consanguinity or affinity within the third degree. This paragraph does not apply  
10          to the presentation of ex parte or contested matters, except in fixing fees for an  
11          attorney so related to the judge.

12         Rule 2.7 of the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct provides that a "judge shall hear and  
13          decide matters assigned to the judge, except when disqualification is required by Rule 2.11," the rule  
14          which details substantive grounds for judicial disqualification. Pursuant to NCJC 2.11(A):

15           (A) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the  
16          judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited  
17          to the following circumstances:  
18           (1) The judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party's  
19          lawyer, or personal knowledge of facts that are in dispute in the proceeding.  
20           (2) The judge knows that the judge, the judge's spouse or domestic partner, or a  
21          person within the third degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse or  
22          domestic partner of such a person is:  
23           ...  
24           (c) a person who has more than a de minimis interest that could be substantially affected  
25          by the proceeding; or  
26           ...  
27           A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's  
28          impartiality might be reasonably questioned. Ybarra v. State, 247 P.3d 269, 271 (Nev. 2011). The  
29          test for whether a judge's impartiality might be reasonably questioned is objective and courts must  
30          decide whether a reasonable person, knowing all the facts, would harbor reasonable doubts about a  
31          judge's impartiality. Id. at 272.

32         The burden is on the party asserting the challenge to establish sufficient factual and legal  
33          grounds warranting disqualification. Las Vegas Downtown Redevelopment Agency v. District  
34          Court, 116 Nev. 640, 643 (2000). A judge has a duty to preside to the conclusion of all proceedings,  
35          in the absence of some statute, rule of court, ethical standard, or compelling reason otherwise. Id. A  
36          judge is presumed to be unbiased. Millen v. District Court, 148 P.3d 694, 701 (Nev. 2006). A judge  
37          is presumed to be impartial, and the burden is on the party asserting the challenge to establish  
38          the grounds for disqualification.

1 sufficient factual grounds warranting disqualification. Ybarra, 247 P.3d at 272. Additionally, the  
2 Court must give substantial weight to a judge's determination that the judge may not voluntarily  
3 disqualify themselves, and the judge's decision cannot be overturned in the absence of clear abuse of  
4 discretion. In re Pet. To recall Dunleavy, 104 Nev. 784 (1988).

5 The Nevada Supreme Court has stated "rulings and actions of a judge during the course of  
6 official judicial proceedings do not establish legally cognizable grounds for disqualifications." Id. at  
7 1275. The personal bias necessary to disqualify must "stem from an extrajudicial source and result  
8 in an opinion on the merits on some basis other than what the judge learned from participation in the  
9 case." Id. "To permit an allegation of bias, partially founded upon a justice's performance of his [or  
10 her] constitutionally mandated responsibilities, to disqualify that justice from discharging those  
11 duties would nullify the court's authority and permit manipulation of justice, as well as the court."  
12 Id.

13 **B. Disqualification is not warranted because Mr. Belssner has not established sufficient  
14 factual and legal grounds for disqualification.**

15 As the party seeking disqualification, Plaintiff bears the burden of establishing sufficient  
16 factual grounds to warrant disqualification. Las Vegas Downtown Redevelopment Agency v.  
17 District Court, 5 P.3d 1059, 1061 (Nev. 2000). However, the rulings and actions of a judge during  
18 the course of official judicial proceedings do not establish legally cognizable grounds for  
19 disqualification. In re Pet. To recall Dunleavy, 104 Nev. 784, 789 (1988).

20 Here, Mr. Belssner has failed to establish sufficient factual grounds to warrant  
21 disqualification of Judge Escobar because his claims stem from Judge Escobar's actions during  
22 official court proceedings and rulings. Mr. Belssner states that he has been denied accommodation.  
23 Mr. Belssner cites specifically to a June 14 hearing in his Affidavit, and to an October 14 hearing in  
24 his Motion, however this Court finds no record of a June 14 hearing. As to the October 14 hearing, a  
25 review of the hearing shows that Mr. Belssner failed to appear for the hearing, and that the court  
26 provided accommodations to Mr. Belssner for the hearing, which he was not present to take  
27 advantage of. This does not indicate bias or prejudice to warrant disqualification.  
28

The facts do not demonstrate the extreme bias or prejudice against Mr. Belssner that would be necessary for Judge Escobar's disqualification. There is no evidence that Judge Escobar's actions or rulings have been influenced by bias toward or prejudice against any party to this case. As a result, the Motion for Recusal and Affidavit are DENIED.

## Conclusion

Mr. Belssner does not bring any cognizable claims supported by factual or legal allegations against Judge Escobar. The record does not support Mr. Belssner's allegations of bias by Judge Escobar, and Judge Escobar's rulings and actions in the course of official judicial proceedings are not evidence of bias or prejudice. Thus, Mr. Belssner's request to disqualify Judge Escobar is denied. Further, the hearing scheduled for December 2, 2021 is vacated.

**Dated this 2nd day of December, 2021**


FA9 B85 4A98 B4CC  
Linda Marie Bell  
District Court Judge

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF  
CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

5800 4088865168



Mr. Charles N. Belssner  
726 N. Royal Crest Circle  
#217  
Las Vegas, NV 89169-8307

Received  
3-28-22  
Dovey

Supreme Court of the United States  
Office of the Clerk  
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris  
Clerk of the Court  
(202) 479-3011

March 21, 2022

Mr. Charles N. Belssner  
725 N. Royal Crest Circle  
#217  
Las Vegas, NV 89169-8307

Re: Charles N. Belssner  
v. Linda Gittings  
No. 21-6853

Dear Mr. Belssner:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,



Scott S. Harris, Clerk

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 CATEGORIZED 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 SEEKS 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?