

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 *[Signature]*
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. Unguren

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



[Signature]
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 7th 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 28th 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 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING REHEARING

Rehearing denied. NRAP 40(c).

It is so ORDERED.¹


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook


_____, Sr.J.
Silver

¹The 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.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Westbrook

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.

Case No. 84877-COA

Consolidated with:

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

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


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 OGM

2 Jared Green – Nevada Bar No. 10059

3 Brian Unguren – Nevada Bar No. 14427

4 **BROWNE GREEN, LLC**

5 3755 Breakthrough Way, Suite 210

6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

7 Phone/Fax: (702) 475-6454

8 E-mail: jared@bgtriallawyers.com

9 E-mail: brian@bgtriallawyers.com

10 Attorneys for Defendants

11 WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC and

12 NAV-LVH, LLC

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 CHARLES N. BELSSNER, an individual,

Case No.: A-20-808231-C

Dept.: 14

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

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

20 WESTGATE LAS VEGAS HOTEL, LLC,

21 a Foreign Limited-Liability Company;

22 NAV-LVH, LLC a Nevada Limited

23 Company; NAV-LVH CASINO, LLC, a

24 Domestic Limited-Liability Company;

25 WESTGATE RESORTS, INC, a Foreign

26 Corporation; DOES I through X; and ROE

Defendants.

Defendants.

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

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

5
6 **Conclusion**

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

Dated this 2nd day of December, 2021

12
13 

14
15 **FA9 B85 4A98 B4CC**
16 **Linda Marie Bell**
17 **District Court Judge**
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 DAO

2 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5 CHARLES BELSSNER,

6 Plaintiff,

7 vs.

Case No. A-20-808231-C

8 NAV-LVH, LLC,

Dept. No. XIV

9 Defendant.

10
11 DECISION AND ORDER

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

17 I. Factual and Procedural Background

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

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

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.¹ 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 ¹ 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
test for whether a judge's impartiality might be reasonably questioned is objective and courts must
decide whether a reasonable person, knowing all the facts, would harbor reasonable doubts about a
judge's impartiality. Id. at 272.

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

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

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

5
6 **Conclusion**

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

12 • Dated this 2nd day of December, 2021

13 

14
15 **FA9 B85 4A98 B4CC**
16 **Linda Marie Bell**
17 **District Court Judge**
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

9800 7066365168



NEED POST
03/21/2022
US POSTAGE \$000.



FIRST-CLASS
US OFFICE
\$300 P
For Private
ZIP 20
041M11

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

*Received
3-28-22
Duke*

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 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?