

1 ROBERT BEADLES
2 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386
3 Reno, NV 89503
4 *Plaintiff, Pro Se*

5
6 **FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA**
7 **CARSON CITY**
8

MR ROBERT BEADLES, an individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JAMIE RODRIGUEZ, in her official capacity
as Registrar of Voters and in her personal
capacity; the WASHOE COUNTY
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government
agency; ERIC BROWN in his official capacity
as WASHOE COUNTY MANAGER and in his
personal capacity, ALEXIS HILL in her official
capacity as CHAIRWOMAN OF WASHOE
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
and in her personal capacity; WASHOE
COUNTY, Nevada a political subdivision of the
State of Nevada, and DOES I-X; and ROE
CORPORATIONS I-X.

Defendants.

Case No.: 23oc001051b

DEPT. NO.: 1

9
10 **Response to Defendant's Opposition to Limited Motion for Reconsideration of Change of**
11 **Venue Location**

12 **Introduction**

13
14 The Plaintiff filed a Motion for a Change of Venue in Washoe County District Court 2, presided
15 over by the Honorable Judge Drakulich. While Judge Drakulich granted the Plaintiff's motion,
16 the case was relocated to Carson City instead of Lyon County, as initially requested by the
17 Plaintiff. Washoe County features significant news coverage of the Plaintiff, making a fair trial
18 there unattainable. Although Carson City's population comprises merely 10% of Washoe

1 County's, a staggering 90% of Washoe's media influence extends into Carson City. This
2 saturation similarly impedes the Plaintiff's prospects of a fair trial in Carson City. The Plaintiff
3 respectfully petitions this Honorable Court to authorize the motion to transfer the venue to Lyon
4 County. It is possible that the Honorable Judge Drakulich was unaware of the extent to which
5 Washoe's media dominates Carson City. Had this been known, it's doubtful she would have
6 selected it as the alternative venue. While she cited convenience as the principal reason for her
7 decision — and indeed, Carson City might be more accessible than Lyon County — it is crucial
8 to consider the overarching need for impartiality. Lyon County, being reasonably accessible to
9 all parties yet adequately removed from the extensive media reach of Washoe County, provides a
10 more promising environment for an unbiased trial. Furthermore, in our technologically advanced
11 age, a significant portion of court proceedings can be facilitated through platforms like Zoom or
12 other video-conferencing tools. This capability considerably diminishes the inconvenience for
13 those traveling from Washoe to Lyon County. Every individual, including the Plaintiff, is
14 entitled to an unbiased trial, and relocating to Lyon County undoubtedly presents the optimal
15 path to achieving that fundamental right.

16 **Background**

17 The Plaintiff has brought forth two causes of action against the defendants. The first cause
18 alleges violations of various NRS, Voting Laws, and the Nevada Constitution, specifically
19 concerning our most fundamental right: the right to suffrage. The second cause of action seeks
20 the removal of Defendants Hill, Brown, and Rodriguez from office under NRS 283.440, citing
21 malfeasance, nonfeasance, and malpractice.

22 This case urgently needs to proceed to trial, given the significant volume of evidence and witness
23 testimonies corroborating the Plaintiff's allegations. The Defense is attempting to divert this

1 Honorable Court's attention with their motions to dismiss and motions for sanctions. Far from
2 being frivolous or falling under the purview of a 12(b)(5) or Rule 11 violation, this case is solidly
3 grounded. The Plaintiff has fortified his position with over 156 exhibits and numerous pleadings,
4 amply surpassing the burden of proof required to counter the Defense's oppositions.

5 Now, the Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to transfer the venue to Lyon
6 County from Carson City. Although the Honorable Judge Drakulich approved the Change of
7 Venue from Washoe, the case was relocated to Carson City rather than Lyon County, as initially
8 sought by the Plaintiff. Given the extensive unfavorable media coverage against the Plaintiff in
9 Carson City and the notable connections the defendants maintain there with prominent
10 policymakers, judiciary members, and media entities, the likelihood of the Plaintiff receiving an
11 impartial trial in Carson City is nonexistent at best. The Plaintiff requests this Honorable court to
12 grant the submission of the Plaintiffs "Limited Motion For Change Of Venue Location".

13 *Specifically, the court chose a different venue than the Plaintiff had requested.*

14 **Argument** *of counsel's resistance to the Plaintiff's limited motion for reconsideration appears*

15 The defense seeks to cast the Honorable Judge Drakulich in an unfavorable light, asserting she
16 misstated that all three defendants are elected when, in fact, only two are. They argue that her
17 Venue Order was erroneous, largely because it cites merely the convenience of parties traveling
18 from Washoe to Carson City. Furthermore, she observed, "There is no denying that the parties in
19 this case have unique and far-reaching popularity in northern Nevada. Accordingly, this factor
20 favors a change of venue." The Plaintiff concurs with Judge Drakulich's decision to move the
21 case from Washoe but believes she may not have fully grasped the extent to which Washoe's
22 media dominates Carson City. Ultimately, evidence provided in the original motion demonstrates
23 a substantial 90% media overlap from Washoe into Carson City. This observation aligns with

1 Judge Drakulich's sentiment: "There is no denying that the parties in this case have unique and
2 far-reaching popularity in northern Nevada. Accordingly, this factor favors a change of venue."
3 To ensure fairness and impartiality, this case should be relocated to Lyon County, where all
4 parties stand a better chance at an unbiased trial. ~~They then claim based on the merits.~~
5 Given page constraints, the Plaintiff will address the key points raised in the defendants'
6 opposition. Contrary to their claims, the Plaintiff does not believe he was required to seek the
7 court's permission before filing a "limited motion for reconsideration." The relevant court rules
8 dictate that such a motion must be filed within 14 days after receiving written notice of the entry
9 of the order or judgment. The Plaintiff does not believe he needed to obtain the court's leave
10 before submitting a "limited motion for reconsideration." If the Plaintiff is required to do so, he
11 apologizes to all for his misunderstanding. The basis for the Plaintiff's limited motion for
12 reconsideration is a new consideration not available during the original motion for a change of
13 venue. Specifically, the court chose a different venue than the Plaintiff had requested. ~~see 1.13~~
14 The opposing counsel's resistance to the Plaintiff's limited motion for reconsideration appears
15 aimed at preventing a fair hearing. The court's primary responsibility is to ensure all parties
16 receive a fair trial. The counsel's opposition seems to jeopardize the Plaintiff's opportunity for an
17 impartial trial in the most unbiased venue for both the Plaintiff and his witnesses. It's essential to
18 note that the defendants would not suffer any prejudice by considering this limited motion for a
19 reconsideration of the venue. This Honorable Court should evaluate the case and its limited
20 motion on their merits. Additionally, established case law asserts that critical pleadings should
21 not be dismissed merely for procedural oversights, assuming any were indeed breached. If the
22 Plaintiff inadvertently violated a rule, he sincerely apologizes; it was never his intention to
23 deviate from protocol. It's noteworthy that NRC 61 mandates, "At every stage of the

1 proceeding, the court must disregard all errors and defects that do not affect any party's
2 substantial rights." Liberal Construction and Application: Courts often interpret procedural rules
3 generously to advance justice. This perspective endorses the belief that minor procedural errors
4 shouldn't inherently obstruct litigants from presenting their claims based on the merits.
5 Moreover, it seems somewhat redundant to ask this Honorable Court to consider a motion that
6 effectively seeks permission to present another motion.

7
8 **Conclusion**

9 Your Honor,

10 If I erred in drafting a motion without first seeking leave of the court to present another motion, I
11 sincerely apologize. Out of an abundance of caution, I will also file a motion for leave. It is
12 paramount to understand that, in the interest of justice, an unbiased trial is essential. According
13 to Google Maps, the distance between Washoe County D2 and Lyon County D3 is a mere 1.15
14 hours. Regardless of whether court hearings are held in Carson or Lyon, both parties would need
15 to allocate a day for proceedings. Given this, it is in everyone's best interest to ensure an
16 unbiased trial in Lyon. The Honorable Judge Drakulich granted my motion for a change of
17 venue, but it seems she might not have been aware that media from Washoe County has a 90%
18 reach into Carson City. Considering the negative media attention the plaintiff has received, a fair
19 trial in Carson City is impossible. I respectfully request this honorable court to grant my limited
20 motion for reconsideration regarding the change of venue and to relocate from Carson City to
21 Lyon County. It is truly in the best interest of all parties involved to ensure an unbiased trial. As
22 is proudly proclaimed on your walls, outside your courtroom, "Equal and impartial justice for
23 all."

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Dated: 10/1/23

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

ROBERT BEADLES, Plaintiff Pro Se

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the Social Security Number of any person.

DATED: October 1st, 2023.

Robert Beadles, Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that on October 1st, 2023, I electronically served all parties of record electronically as per the agreed upon arrangement with the Defense.

Robert Beadles, Plaintiff