| 1 | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 2 | ROBERT BEADLES 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386 | | |
| 3 | Reno, NV 89503 Plaintiff, Pro Se | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA CARSON CITY | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | MR ROBERT BEADLES, an individual, | Case No.: 23 OC 00105 1B | |
| 8 | Plaintiff, | Dept. No.: 1 | |
| 9 | vs. | [Oral Argument Requested] | |
| 10 | JAMIE RODRIGUEZ, in her official capacity as Registrar of Voters and in her personal capacity; | - 0 1 - | |
| 11 12 | the WASHOE COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government agency; ERIC BROWN in | | |
| 12 | his official capacity as WASHOE COUNTY MANAGER and in his personal capacity, ALEXIS | | |
| 13 | HILL in her official capacity as CHAIRWOMAN OF WASHOE COUNTY BOARD OF | | |
| 15 | COMMISSIONERS and in her personal capacity; WASHOE COUNTY, Nevada a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and DOES I-X; | | |
| 16 | and ROE CORPORATIONS I-X. | | |
| 17 | Defendants. | | |
| 18 | MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDER GRANTING D | EFENDANTS MOTION FOR | |
| 19 | ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS | | |
| 20 | I. INTRODUCTI | ON | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | On 11/20/23, Judge Russell ruled in favor of the defend | | |
| 23 | venue location and granting their motion to dismiss my | case with prejudice. I filed an appeal | |
| 24 | with the Supreme Court of Nevada on 11/30/23, and case #87683 has been assigned to my | | |
| 25 | appeal. Additionally, I have filed my MOTION TO STAY ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT | | |
| 26 | PENDING APPEAL, as well as an OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR | | |
| 77 | 1 | | |
| | | | |

ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS in this court. Neither of these documents has been addressed by this court. The court improperly issued an order granting the defendants attorney fees and costs a day after the defendant filed their motion for attorney fees and costs. This action was taken without providing me an opportunity to respond to the defendant's motion for attorney fees and costs, consequently denying me due process. This not only violates court rules but also results in a repeated denial of due process and a failure to adhere to established court procedures. The court is obliged to afford me the same opportunities as any other litigant appearing before it, including the chance to oppose the motion. Given that my appeal is currently under consideration by the Supreme Court, I respectfully request that all orders, as well as the enforcement of fee and cost payments, be stayed pending the Supreme Court's final decision.

II.

MY RIGHTS ARE BEING INFRINGED UPON

On 12/12/23 the Defense filed DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS. In this motion when I state "court orders" this is the order that was granted I am referring to. On 12/13/23 this court granted their motion and signed court orders granting them everything they wished for. First, I object to numerous conclusions they come to in their motion that is now a court order. Second, I have already objected to their fees and costs, which this court has not addressed via my OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS. Third, I have an existing motion called my MOTION TO STAY ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT PENDING APPEAL that was filed prior to their motion for attorney's fees and costs. That motion requests the court to stay the orders, and all enforcements thereof. None of these documents have been addressed by this court prior to granting and signing the defendant's order granting the defendants' motion for attorney's fees and costs court orders.

Issuing the court orders one day after the defense's motion is in violation of this court's own rules, as well as the rules that govern all courts in Nevada. NRCP Rule 12 (A) (1)(i) states "within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint;" and additional rules within the NRCP grant me 21 days to Oppose any Motions by the defense as well. In the RULES OF PRACTICE FOR THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA it states under Rule 3.8, "Time for filing opposition. Unless otherwise ordered by the court, an opposing party will have 14 days after service of the motion to file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the motion. The failure of an opposing party to timely file a memorandum of points and authorities shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion." Under Rule 13.3 it states, "Reconsideration of orders:

(a) Leave required. Issues once heard and disposed of will not be renewed in the same cause except by leave of court granted upon motion. The court may reconsider a decision if the court overlooked or misunderstood a material fact, or overlooked, misunderstood, or misapplied law that directly controls a dispositive issue.

(b) Opposition. An opposition to a motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration will not be filed unless ordered by the court."

I have demonstrated my entitlement to at least 14 days to oppose the Defendants' Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs, a period I was not granted. The court's granting of their order without providing me these 14 days contravenes its own rules. Moreover, under this Court's Rule 3.13, a decision may be reconsidered if a material fact was overlooked or misunderstood, or if a <u>law</u>

directly controlling a dispositive issue was misapplied or misunderstood. I am requesting that this court reconsiders its granting of the court orders, as my due process rights were denied. Additionally, I request a stay on all enforcement of these orders and on the defendants' collection of attorney fees and costs until the Supreme Court adjudicates my appeals.

III. **MOTIONS and OPPOSITIONS I FILED ARE STILL UNADDRESSED**

On 12/15/23 I filed my MOTION TO STAY, REQUEST FOR LEAVE, and PROPOSED ORDERS. They have never been addressed by this court. On 12/20/23 I filed my OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS. It has never been addressed by this court. On 12/21/23 I will file this MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS. I request that these documents all be addressed by this court and that this court grants a stay on all enforcement of these orders and on the defendants' collection of attorney fees and costs until the Supreme Court adjudicates my appeals.

IV. STAY ALL ORDERS UNTIL SUPREME COURT RULES

I request this court grant me the same courtesy you granted the defense. The court stated on 11/20/23 that its granting of the defendant's motion to dismiss was due to Judicial Economy. I ask you to do the same for me. If the Supreme Court rules in my favor, it will create an enormous amount of unneeded work to recoup my monies paid to the defense and undo any orders, filings, etc., that this court imposed and would need to be undone. By simply waiting until the Supreme Court rules, no harm nor prejudice will occur to the defendants. It is in everyone's best interest that this court stays its orders until the finality of the Supreme Court is determined.

V. ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

I request under this court's Rule 3.12 that this court allow me to defend my positions in person to ensure all the matters are properly addressed and nothing is lost due to a potential misunderstanding of my pleadings.

VI. CONCLUSION

In summary, this motion has highlighted significant procedural and due process concerns that warrant the court's immediate attention and action. The court's previous rulings, notably the rapid granting of the defense's motions and the lack of due consideration to my filings, have not only infringed upon my rights but also breached the court's own established rules and the principles of judicial fairness. I have underscored the necessity of a stay on all orders and enforcement actions until the Supreme Court rules on my appeal, arguing that such a stay is not only in my best interest but also prevents potential unnecessary judicial labor and preserves the integrity of the appellate process. In light of these arguments and in accordance with the court's rules, I respectfully request the court to grant this Motion to Set Aside the Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs, to address all unaddressed motions and oppositions I have filed, and to allow me the opportunity for oral argument to clarify and emphasize the critical points of my case. It is imperative that the court acknowledges the gravity of these issues and ensures that justice is served by upholding the principles of fairness and due process. I request Stay is granted upon the court orders and any collection for Attorney Fees and Costs until the Supreme Court has ruled.

Dated: 12/20/23

| 1 | Submitted, | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | By: | | |
| 3 | ROBERT BEADLES, Plaintiff Pro Se | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030 | | |
| 6 | The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the Social | | |
| 7 | Security Number of any person. | | |
| 8 | DATED: December 20 th , 2023. | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | Robert Beadles, Plaintiff | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | | |
| 14 | Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that on December 20th, 2023, I served all parties by | | |
| 15 | electronically emailing the defense counsel and by sending via first-class mail with sufficient | | |
| 16 | postage prepaid to Lindsay Liddell, the respondents' defense attorney. | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | Haldeman, Suzanne shaldeman@da.washoecounty.gov | | |
| 19 | Hickman, Elizabeth ehickman@da.washoecounty.gov | | |
| 20 | Liddell, Lindsay L lliddell@da.washoecounty.gov | | |
| 21 | And mailed to: | | |
| 22 | One South Sierra Street Reno, Nevada 89501 | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | Robert Beadles, Plaintiff | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 77 | 6 | | |
| | | | |