

1  
2 ROBERT BEADLES  
3 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386  
4 Reno, NV 89503  
5 Appellant, In Pro Per

6 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

7 MR ROBERT BEADLES, an individual,  
8 Appellant,  
9 vs.

NVSC Case No.: 87683  
District 1 Case No: 23-OC-00105 1B  
District 2 Case No: CV23-01341

10 JAMIE RODRIGUEZ, in her official  
11 capacity as Registrar of Voters and in her  
12 personal capacity; the WASHOE COUNTY  
13 REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government  
14 agency; ERIC BROWN in his official  
15 capacity as WASHOE COUNTY  
16 MANAGER and in his personal capacity,  
17 ALEXIS HILL in her official capacity as  
18 CHAIRWOMAN OF WASHOE COUNTY  
19 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS and in her  
20 personal capacity; WASHOE COUNTY,  
21 Nevada a political subdivision of the State  
22 of Nevada, and DOES I-X; and ROE  
23 CORPORATIONS I-X.

24 Respondents.

25 **Certificate of Compliance**

26 I hereby certify that this petition complies with the formatting requirements of [NRAP](#)  
27 [32\(a\)\(4\)](#), the typeface requirements of [NRAP 32\(a\)\(5\)](#), and the type style requirements  
28 of [NRAP 32\(a\)\(6\)](#) because:

This petition has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft  
Word Version 16.75 in 14 point Times New Roman Font.

1 I further certify that this brief complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of  
2 [NRAP 32\(a\)\(7\)](#) because, excluding the parts of the petition exempted by [NRAP](#)  
3 [32\(a\)\(7\)\(C\)](#), it is:

4 Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, contains 4,505 words,  
5 which does not exceed 4,667 words.

6  
7 Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this petition, and to the best of my knowledge,  
8 information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I  
9 further certify that to the best of my knowledge, this petition complies with all  
10 applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular [NRAP 28\(e\)\(1\)](#), which  
11 requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by  
12 a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where  
13 the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the  
14 event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the  
15 Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.  
16

17 Dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024  
18

19  
20  
21  
22 By: \_\_\_\_\_

23 ROBERT BEADLES, Appellant In Pro Per,

24 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386,

25 Reno, NV 89503 916-573-7133  
26  
27  
28

1 ROBERT BEADLES  
10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386  
2 Reno, NV 89503  
3 Appellant, In Pro Per

4 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

6 MR ROBERT BEADLES, an individual,  
7 Appellant,  
8 vs.

NVSC Case No.: 87683  
District 1 Case No: 23-OC-00105 1B  
District 2 Case No: CV23-01341

9 JAMIE RODRIGUEZ, in her official  
10 capacity as Registrar of Voters and in her  
11 personal capacity; the WASHOE COUNTY  
12 REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government  
13 agency; ERIC BROWN in his official  
14 capacity as WASHOE COUNTY  
15 MANAGER and in his personal capacity,  
16 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.

17 Respondents.

18  
19  
20 **MOTION TO EXPEDITE RULING ON PETITION FOR REHEARING**

21 **NRAP RULE 40**

22  
23 **I. INTRODUCTION**

24  
25 Pursuant to NRAP Rule 27, I, Robert Beadles, hereby submit this Motion to Expedite  
26 the Ruling on my Petition for Rehearing following this Court's affirmation of  
27 dismissal with prejudice by lower Court D1. This request is critical due to the  
28

1 forthcoming election and the pressing public need to address significant legal issues  
2 swiftly. This Courts initial ruling contains substantial legal and procedural errors that  
3 significantly impact the principles of justice, accountability, and the integrity of public  
4 office, necessitating urgent resolution far before the November general elections.  
5

## 6 **II. NECESSITY FOR REHEARING**

7

8 The court’s prior dismissal fundamentally misapprehends the duty of public officials  
9 to respond to lawful grievances. This misapprehension of material questions of law or  
10 fact, if uncorrected, threatens to create unconstitutional case law and perpetuate  
11 injustice. My Petition for Rehearing contends that this Court has overlooked or  
12 misapplied critical statutory obligations and jeopardizes the principles of transparency  
13 and accountability in governance.  
14  
15  
16

## 17 **III. ARGUMENT AND ANALYSIS**

18

- 19 **1. Urgency Due to Imminent Election:** The forthcoming election underscores the  
20 necessity for swift judicial intervention to ensure that electoral integrity is  
21 maintained and that public trust in the legal system is not eroded.
- 22  
23 **2. Significant Public Interest and Precedent:** This Court has historically  
24 recognized the urgency in cases impacting public governance and electoral  
25 integrity. As stipulated under NRAP Rule 27 and Rule 40, an expedited  
26 rehearing is essential to prevent an erosion of public trust and ensure that the  
27  
28

1 upcoming electoral processes are conducted within a just and recognized legal  
2 framework.

3 **3. Legal Ramifications of Non-Expedition:** Failure to expedite the Rehearing  
4 will create erroneous case law and allow the perpetuation of legal errors that  
5 absolve public officials from accountability, undermining the rule of law and  
6 denying justice to the citizens of Nevada.  
7  
8

9 **VI. PRECEDENT FOR EXPEDITED RULINGS:**

10 The Nevada Supreme Court has the authority to expedite proceedings in situations of  
11 significant public interest or urgency with elections as shown in *Miller v. Burk*, 124  
12 *Nev. 579, 188 P.3d 1112 (Nev. 2008)* and in *Election Integrity Project of Nevada, LLC*  
13 *v. Eighth Judicial District Court in and for County of Clark*, 136 *Nev. 804, 473 P.3d*  
14 *1021 (Nev. 2020)*. Additionally, NRAP Rule 2 shows this honorable court can  
15 expedite its decision or for other good cause.  
16  
17  
18

19 **V. CONCLUSION**

20  
21 Your Honor, I am aware of your tremendous caseload, and I apologize for adding to it  
22 with my motion and request. However, given the substantial issues at stake and the  
23 impending general elections, the need for an expedited rehearing cannot be overstated.  
24 This Court plays a pivotal role in ensuring that public officials are held to the highest  
25 standards of accountability and that the electoral system operates transparently and  
26 justly. I respectfully urge the Court to grant this Motion to Expedite the Rehearing  
27  
28

1 under NRAP Rule 27 to address these significant issues promptly and to ensure the  
2 restoration of public trust in our judicial and electoral systems.

3  
4  
5 Respectfully submitted,

6  
7 By: \_\_\_\_\_

8  
9 ROBERT BEADLES, Appellant In Pro Per,

10 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386,

11  
12 Reno, NV 89503 916-573-7133

13  
14  
15 **AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030**

16 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document  
17  
18 does not contain the Social Security Number of any person.

19 DATED: May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Robert Beadles, Appellant In Pro Per

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024, I served all parties by electronically emailing the defense counsel and by sending via first-class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to Lindsay Liddell, the respondents' defense attorney.

Haldeman, Suzanne shaldeman@da.washoecounty.gov  
Hickman, Elizabeth ehickman@da.washoecounty.gov  
Liddell, Lindsay L lliddell@da.washoecounty.gov

And mailed to:  
One South Sierra Street Reno, Nevada 89501

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Beadles, Appellant In Pro Per

1  
2 ROBERT BEADLES  
3 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386  
4 Reno, NV 89503  
5 Appellant, In Pro Per

6 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

7 MR ROBERT BEADLES, an individual,  
8 Appellant,  
9 vs.

NVSC Case No.: 87683  
District 1 Case No: 23-OC-00105 1B  
District 2 Case No: CV23-01341

10 JAMIE RODRIGUEZ, in her official  
11 capacity as Registrar of Voters and in her  
12 personal capacity; the WASHOE COUNTY  
13 REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government  
14 agency; ERIC BROWN in his official  
15 capacity as WASHOE COUNTY  
16 MANAGER and in his personal capacity,  
17 ALEXIS HILL in her official capacity as  
18 CHAIRWOMAN OF WASHOE COUNTY  
19 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS and in her  
20 personal capacity; WASHOE COUNTY,  
21 Nevada a political subdivision of the State  
22 of Nevada, and DOES I-X; and ROE  
23 CORPORATIONS I-X.

24 Respondents.

25 **NRAP RULE 40 Petition For Rehearing**

26 Robert Beadles, in Proper Person  
27 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386  
28 Reno, NV 89503  
916-573-7133  
[RobertBeadles@protonmail.com](mailto:RobertBeadles@protonmail.com)



**NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE**

The undersigned in proper person appellant certifies that the following are persons and entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a), and must be disclosed. These representations are made in order that the judges of this court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal. There are no parent corporations or publicly-held companies that own 10% or more of the Appellant. The Appellant is not using a pseudonym.

DATED: 5/28/24

---

Robert Beadles, Appellant In Pro Per

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1

2 NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE.....ii

3 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv

4

5 EXHIBIT GLOSSARY .....viii

6 INTRODUCTION.....1

7 STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1

8

9 REASONS FOR GRANTING A REHEARING .....2

10 NVSC ERROR: EARLY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE

11 VIA NAC 293.025 WAS ADHERED TO.....2

12

13 NVSC ERROR: MY EXHIBITS WERE NOT ROGUE .....5

14 NVSC ERROR: THE RESPONDENTS DO HAVE A DUTY TO RESPOND .....7

15 NVSC ERROR: THERE ARE NUMEROUS CLAIMS REMEDY CAN BE

16 GRANTED ON.....10

17

18 NVSC ERROR: NRS 283.440 DOES APPLY .....14

19 NVSC ERROR: CHANGE OF VENUE VS JURY TRIAL.....16

20

21 NVSC ERROR: LEAVE TO AMEND OR ERRORS NOT GRANTED.....17

22 CONCLUSION.....19

23 APPENDIX WAIVER.....21

24

25

26

27

28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

Anthony v. Miller Supreme Court of Nevada June 10, 2021 137 Nev. 276488 P.3d 573  
.....5

Cahill v. New York, N. H. & H. R. Co Supreme Court of the United States May 14,  
1956 351 U.S. 18376 S.Ct. 758.....2

Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., Inc. Supreme Court of the United States June 08,  
2009 556 U.S. 868129 S.Ct. 2252.....7

Clem v. State Supreme Court of Nevada August 25, 1988 104 Nev. 351760 P.2d  
103.....9

Darby v. Cisneros Supreme Court of the United States June 21, 1993 509 U.S. 137113  
S.Ct. 2539.....4

DeSoto v. Yellow Freight Systems, Inc. United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.  
February 19, 1992 957 F.2d 6551992 WL 26919.....17

Ex parte McCardle Supreme Court of the United States December 01, 1868 74 U.S.  
5061868 WL 11093.....7

Herrera v. Collins Supreme Court of the United States January 25, 1993 506 U.S.  
390113 S.Ct. 853.....7

Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co. Supreme Court of the United States February 24, 1982  
455 U.S. 422102 S.Ct. 1148.....7

Madsen v. Brown Supreme Court of Utah. June 05, 1985 701 P.2d 1086.....15

1 Myers v. Reno Cab Company, Inc. Supreme Court of Nevada. July 29, 2021 137 Nev.  
2 365492 P.3d 545.....8  
3  
4 Nutton v. Sunset Station, Inc. Court of Appeals of Nevada June 11, 2015 131 Nev.  
5 279357 P.3d 966.....17  
6 Oregon v. Mitchell Supreme Court of the United States December 21, 1970 400 U.S.  
7 11291 S.Ct. 260.....13  
8  
9 Paterson v. Condos Supreme Court of Nevada March 10, 1934 55 Nev. 26030 P.2d  
10 283.....18  
11  
12 Roethlisberger v. McNulty Supreme Court of Nevada August 04, 2011 127 Nev.  
13 559256 P.3d 955.....17  
14  
15 Zgombic v. State Supreme Court of Nevada September 13, 1990 106 Nev. 571798 P.2d  
16 548.....9  
17  
18 **Statutes**  
19  
20 NAC 293.311 § 4.....11  
21  
22 NAC 293B.110(1)(b).....11  
23  
24 NAC 293.025.....2,3,4,5,7,19  
25  
26 Nev. Const. Art 1 § 3.....15  
27  
28 Nev. Const. Art 2 § 1A § 1B.....12  
Nev. Const. Art 1 § 8 .....8  
Nev. Const. Art 2 § 1.A § 11.....4  
NRS 266.430.....14

1	NRS 283.440.....	14,15,19
2	NRS 293.124.....	3
3	NRS 293.2546 .....	4,7,11
4		
5	NRS 293.407.....	7
6	NRS 293.530.....	11
7	NRS 293B.033.....	11
8		
9	NRS 293.269927.....	11
10	NRS 293.740.....	11
11	NRS 293B.063.....	11
12		
13	NRS 293B.104.....	11
14	NRS 293B.1045(1).....	11
15	NRS 293.269931(1).....	11
16		
17	NRS 293.3606(1).....	11
18	NRS 293.363(1).....	11
19	NRS 293.269931 § 1.....	11
20		
21	NRS 293B.353.....	11
22	NRS 293B.363(1).....	11
23		
24	NRS 293B.354.....	11
25	NRS 293B.380 § 2(a) .....	11
26	NRS 293.423.....	11
27		
28	NRS 293.269927(4)(b).....	11

1	NRS 293.277(3).....	11
2	NRS 293.285(1)(b)(4).....	11
3	NRS 293.3075(4).....	11
4		
5	NRS 293.3585(1)(d).....	11
6	NRS 293.403(2).....	11
7	NRS 293.404(2).....	11
8		
9		
10	<b>Rules</b>	
11	NRAP Rule 2.....	xi
12		
13	NRAP Rule 40.....	2
14	NRAP Rule 26(b).....	xi
15	NRAP Rule 26(d).....	xi
16		
17	NRAP Rule 30 (i).....	21
18	NRCP Rule 8(a)(2) .....	1,2,10,12,13,19
19	NRCP 8(e).....	18
20		
21	NRCP Rule 12(b)(5).. .....	1,2,5,6,10,12,13,16,19
22	NRCP Rule 15.....	17
23		
24	NRCP Rule 39.....	16
25	NRCP Rule 39.....	16
26	NRCP Rule 61.....	xi,18
27		
28		

## Exhibit Glossary

- 1
- 2 Exhibit A Original Complaint Filed On 8/4/23 in D2. 19 pg.
- 3 Exhibit 1 ROV 11-17-22- Petition. 40 pg.
- 4
- 5 Exhibit 2 11-23-22 Contest 12 pg.
- 6 Exhibit 3 Unanswered Petition served upon defendants 12/1/22. 19 pg.
- 7 Exhibit 4 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 5 pg.
- 8
- 9 Exhibit 5 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 5 pg.
- 10 Exhibit 6 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 7 pg.
- 11 Exhibit 7 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 1 pg.
- 12
- 13 Exhibit 8 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 2 pg.
- 14 Exhibit 9 Email exchange between the plaintiff and defendants. 16 pg.
- 15
- 16 Exhibit 10 Addresses from tax records appearing in conflict to vote. 6 pg.
- 17 Exhibit 11 Addresses from tax records appearing in conflict to vote. 56 pg.
- 18 Exhibit 12 Addresses from tax records appearing in conflict to vote. 51 pg.
- 19
- 20 Exhibit 13 Addresses from tax records appearing in conflict to vote. 22 pg.
- 21 Exhibit 14 Addresses from tax records appearing in conflict to vote. 99 pg.
- 22 Exhibit 15 Detailed report showing tax record vs voter record concerns. 15 pg.
- 23
- 24 Exhibit 33 Petition proof 1 pg.
- 25 Exhibit 34 Petition proof 20 pg.
- 26 Exhibit 72 Washoe Observation Court Orders 6 pg.
- 27
- 28 Exhibit 109 Highlights of Supplemental Statements 4 pg.

1 Exhibit 120 NV SOS 700 Complaints RGJ Article.pdf 4 pg.

2 Exhibit 127 Small Sample Of Violation Complaints sent to the SOS 33 pg.

3 Exhibit 163 11\_20\_23 Hearing Transcript-Court Reporter 37 pg.

4  
5 **NRAP RULE 2 and NRCP RULE 61:**

6 I ask this Honorable Court to adhere to NRAP Rule 2:

7 "On the court's own or a party's motion, the court may—to expedite its decision or for  
8 other good cause—suspend any provision of these Rules in a particular case and order  
9 proceedings as the court directs, except as otherwise provided in NRAP Rule 26(b),"  
10 if it applies. I additionally ask this Honorable Court to adhere to NRAP Rule 26(d),  
11 which grants the authority to: "Shorten Time. Except as otherwise provided in these  
12 Rules, or when not otherwise controlled by statute, the time prescribed by these Rules  
13 to perform any act may be shortened by stipulation of the parties, or by order of the  
14 court or a justice or judge."  
15  
16  
17

18 If I made any errors in the procedures or structure of this brief or prior filings with this  
19 Honorable Court, I ask, in the pursuit of justice, to allow this appeal and brief to  
20 proceed as per NRCP Rule 61, which states, "Unless justice requires otherwise, no  
21 error in admitting or excluding evidence—or any other error by the court or a party—  
22 is ground for granting a new trial, for setting aside a verdict, or for vacating,  
23 modifying, or otherwise disturbing a judgment or order. At every stage of the  
24 proceeding, the court must disregard all errors and defects that do not affect any  
25 party's substantial rights."  
26  
27  
28



1           **1. Introduction**

2  
3   On 5/15/95, this Court affirmed the lower D1 Court's ruling to dismiss my case,  
4   with prejudice. I am now appealing this Court's decision seeking a rehearing. Three  
5   Justices in this Court made several egregious errors in siding with the lower Court's  
6   ruling, which requires a rehearing so my Constitutionally enshrined rights are not  
7   further harmed. Of paramount importance too is that even if I somehow failed to  
8   state a claim in which I could be granted relief, I must be granted leave to amend  
9   as it is to be freely given, and I requested it numerous times.  
10  
11

12  
13           **2. Statement of the Case**

14  
15   On 8/4/23, I filed my complaint with the 2nd District Court in Washoe County.  
16   Judge Drakulich granted my motion to change venue; however, she granted it to  
17   D1 under Judge Russell, rather than the unbiased courts I had requested she send it  
18   to. According to statute, Judge Russell in D1 is required to accept all assertions in  
19   my complaint as true. However, Judge Russell overlooked the explicit language of  
20   my complaint and the supporting evidence provided, as well as what *NRCP Rule*  
21   *12(b)(5)* and *Rule 8(a)(2)* require to successfully defeat a motion to dismiss. Judge  
22   Russell dismissed my complaint with prejudice, despite my request for leave to  
23   amend, which should be freely given. I filed an appeal with this Court. Three  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 Justices within this Court either ignored or mistakenly missed the very things I  
2 included within my appeal that would have overcome their reasons for affirming  
3 the lower court's ruling. It is now paramount that this court shows the world it has  
4 not been politicized and will actually follow the law, and apply it equally for all.  
5  
6 Key points this court used to affirm Russell's ruling are below. You will see I  
7 overcame the reasons this court affirmed Russell's ruling. It's paramount that this  
8 court realize that even if I somehow failed to state a claim as per *NRCP Rule*  
9 *8(a)(2)*, it is this court's duty to allow me leave to amend my complaint.

### 11 **3. Reasons for Granting Rehearing**

12  
13 As per NRAP Rule 40, this court has overlooked or misapprehended a material  
14 fact, that if it stands, deprives me of my due process, and creates case law in  
15 Nevada that now completely undermines what NRCP Rule 12(b)(5), and Rule  
16 8(a)(2) mean, and how valid court orders are no longer enforceable in Nevada.  
17  
18 This court additionally has a duty to reverse its decision as implied in *Cahill v.*  
19 *New York, N.H. & H.R. Co., 351 U.S. 183, 76 S.Ct. 758, 100 L.Ed. 1075 (1956).*

### 21 **4. NVSC Error: Early Engagement With The Secretary of State via NAC** 22 **293.025 Was Adhered To**

1 NAC 293.025 *Submission of complaint concerning violation of provision of title*  
2 *24 of NRS. (NRS 293.124) A person who wishes to file a complaint concerning*  
3 *an alleged violation of any provision of title 24 of NRS must:*

- 4
- 5 1. *Submit the complaint in writing to the Secretary of State; and*
- 6
- 7 2. *Sign the complaint.*
- 8

9 *-The complaint may include proof of the alleged violation.*

10 Pursuant to NAC 293.025, I diligently filed a written complaint to the Secretary of  
11 State about alleged violations under NRS 293.124, concerning Title 24 of the NRS.

12 Exhibit 1 and 3 show my grievances were first filed per NAC 293.025 with the  
13 Secretary of State, Exhibit 33-34 shows proof the SOS received my grievances,  
14

15 Exhibit 120 shows the Secretary of State received over 700 complaints via NAC  
16 293.025, Exhibit 127 shows several examples of me following NAC 293.025 as  
17

18 well. All without any remedy from the Secretary of State, or Respondents. I  
19

20 exhausted all administrative processes with the Secretary of State with no remedy  
21 nor redress of my grievances. Despite this thorough adherence to prescribed  
22

23 administrative procedures, no adequate remedy or acknowledgment was  
24

25 forthcoming. This neglect persisted through subsequent interactions, documented  
26 in Exhibits 1-15, involving the respondents and Secretary of State, signaling a  
27

1 systemic refusal to address election grievances as mandated by Nevada law, even  
2 after they said they would, but failed to.

3  
4 The silence from the Secretary of State and Respondents contravenes the due  
5 process and equal protection clauses stipulated in the *Nev Const.* and *Nev. Const.*  
6 *Art. 2 Sec. 1A § 11* and *NRS 293.2546*. Such inaction transforms *NAC 293.025* into  
7  
8 an unconstitutional barrier that hinders public redress against official misconduct, a  
9 concern notably underscored by *James Madison in the Federalist Papers #10*  
10 regarding the impartiality required of those in positions of adjudication when he  
11 warned us, "*No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest*  
12 *would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his*  
13 *integrity.*" Allowing the Secretary of State to police itself, or the Respondents to  
14 police themselves is appalling; it is this court's duty to step in and enjoin them to  
15 do what is lawful  
16  
17

18  
19 Further, the Supreme Court's stance in *Darby v. Cisneros, 509 U.S. 137 (1993)*,  
20 reinforces the principle that judiciary intervention is necessary when all  
21 administrative avenues have been exhausted without resolution—precisely the  
22 scenario presented in my case. This precedent underpins the necessity for this  
23 Court to acknowledge the procedural diligence exercised in compliance with *NAC*  
24 *293.025* and to correct the lower court's oversight.  
25  
26

1 Moreover, referencing cases like *Law v. Whitmer* (136 Nev. 840, 2020) and  
2 *Anthony v. Miller* (137 Nev. 276, 2021), though dismissed on different grounds,  
3 emphasize the essential judicial consideration of election-related complaints  
4 irrespective of their initial outcomes. This illustrates that even if my adherence to  
5 *NAC 293.025* was in question—which it is not—precedent supports the argument  
6 that my case warrants judicial review.  
7

8  
9 This Court’s duty extends beyond mere procedural review to ensuring that  
10 substantial justice is served through the fair application of law, especially in cases  
11 impacting electoral integrity and public trust.  
12

### 13 14 **5. Error NVSC, My Exhibits Were Not Rogue**

15  
16 The Respondents Council was allowed to write the lower court's ruling that Judge  
17 Russell then just signed. They state that my exhibits were rogue, simply because  
18 they are so damning to their case. The Exhibits can not be rogue as I filed them at  
19 the same time as my **8/4/23 Original Complaint**. Additional exhibits were filed at  
20 the same time as the additional pleadings were filed. In my original complaint, this  
21 Court can clearly see from the docket that I filed 4 exhibits on 8/4/23 the date of  
22 my original complaint. Those exhibits, 1-3, 109 show all the proof in the world to  
23 overcome a *NRCP 12(b)(5)* ruling. They clearly show the numerous allegations,  
24 proof of the allegations, affidavits, petitions, etc. destroying the narrative that I  
25  
26  
27

1 failed to meet the *NRCP Rule 12 (B)(5)* standard and that the exhibits were rogue. I  
2 then filed 112 more supplemental exhibits to the original 4 exhibits 5 days later, as  
3 exhibit 109 that was filed on 8/4/23 showed, and have filed 54 more exhibits with  
4 the various responses and motions since 8/9/23. As the docket will show, and as  
5 the exhibits show, they are not rogue, 116 were filed with the original complaint,  
6 and 54 more with the additional pleadings. Further, these exhibits show that I have  
7 gone above and beyond to obliterate the erroneous ruling stating I failed to state a  
8 claim in which I could be granted remedy. This is a ridiculous ruling as just the  
9 **first 4 exhibits and complaint filed on 8/4/23** do this. Additionally, the court  
10 orders I was granted Exhibit 72, clearly overcome a *Rule 12(B)(5)* as the  
11 Respondents are on video breaking the court orders (Exhibit 23-24), and NRS  
12 laws, the **Original Complaint filed on 8/4/23, on pages 15-16, viii**, show with  
13 zero doubt that court or this court could have, and can, simply enjoin the  
14 respondents to follow the law going forward. Again this one fact, easily overcomes  
15 the erroneous *Rule 12(b)(5)* dismissal. The Exhibits are not rogue, exhibits 1-3, and  
16 109 were filed with the original complaint on 8/4/23, on 8/9/23 the rest of the 116  
17 exhibits were filed, that were shown on exhibit 109, filed with the original  
18 complaint on 8/4/23. Many of these 1-116 exhibits easily overcome a *Rule*  
19 *12(B)(5)* dismissal and the dates of filings and what were filed show to anyone  
20 who looks they were not and are not rogue exhibits.

1 **6. Error NVSC, The Respondents Do Have A Duty To Respond**

2 As stated in section 1 above, I went through and followed *NAC 293.025* and *NRS*  
3 *293.407*. I exhausted all administrative avenues prior to filing my complaint in  
4 Washoe D2 Court. So, if the Secretary of State, the Washoe County ROV, the  
5 Respondents who run our elections have no duty to respond to my election  
6 grievances, who does? If this Court refuses to enjoin them to respond, who will? If  
7 this court fails to read the plain language of the US Constitution and of our Nevada  
8 Constitution and interpret the duty of these people to redress my grievances in  
9 favor of the people it is to protect, like myself, versus the people who are hiding  
10 from the crimes they may be committing, like the Respondents, there is no justice  
11 in this Court. *Cases Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (2009, Ex*  
12 *parte McCardle, 74 U.S. 506 (1868), Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S.*  
13 *422 (1982), Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390 (1993)* all demonstrate this to a large  
14 degree.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 *NRS 293.2546(11)* states, “To have complaints about elections and election  
21 contests resolved fairly, accurately, and efficiently.” That has never happened;  
22 there has been nothing fair, accurate, or efficient in this process, and I certainly  
23 was never granted resolution. I jumped through the administrative hoops via *NAC*  
24 *293.025* with again no remedy. I brought forth my complaints to the lower court  
25  
26  
27

1 just to have it thrown out erroneously, to then have this court throw out my  
2 complaint, all of this is clearly a violation of my NV Constitutional Rights under  
3 *Article 1 Section 8* and my 14th Amendment rights via the US Constitution: “*nor*  
4 *shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process*  
5 *of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the*  
6 *laws.*”  
7  
8

9 In the landmark case of *Myers v. Reno Cab Co., Inc.*, 137 Nev. Adv. Op. 36 (July  
10 29 2021), the Supreme Court of Nevada emphasized the critical importance of  
11 applying precise legal standards to assess employment status, firmly establishing  
12 that mere contractual labels are insufficient to bypass statutory and constitutional  
13 safeguards. This principle is directly applicable to my situation, where despite the  
14 respondents’ attempt to characterize our relationship through contractual terms, the  
15 actual dynamics of our interaction and my reliance on their statutory obligations  
16 call for a substantive judicial examination. Much like Myers, who pursued all  
17 required administrative remedies before approaching the courts, I too methodically  
18 fulfilled every procedural requirement, engaging thoroughly with both the  
19 Secretary of State and the respondents before seeking judicial recourse. This  
20 conscientious adherence underscores the necessity for judicial intervention to  
21 uphold accountability. The Nevada Supreme Court's role transcends simple  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27



1 procedural reviews; it acts as a stalwart guardian of justice, charged with  
2 preserving the integrity of both administrative and legal processes, ensuring that  
3 public trust is not breached and that individuals like myself are afforded the justice  
4 they seek. The court's decisions in *Zgombic v. State* 798 P.2d 548 (1990) and *Clem*  
5 *v. State*, 104 Nev. 351, 760 P.2d 103, among others, illustrate its pivotal  
6 responsibility to interpret statutory language fairly and judiciously, protecting all  
7 citizens from disproportionate or unjust outcomes. In my case, the premature  
8 dismissal of my complaint, disregarding my exhaustive pursuit of all available  
9 administrative remedies, risks setting a dangerous precedent where public officials  
10 can evade accountability, thus undermining the rule of law and contradicting the  
11 judiciary's duty to prevent the misapplication of administrative powers. It is  
12 therefore crucial for the Supreme Court of Nevada to correct this oversight,  
13 reaffirming that no one, especially those in public service, is above the law. The  
14 court must assert where administrative mechanisms and self-regulation fail,  
15 reinforcing its dedication to equal justice and the strict enforcement of legal  
16 standards. This is not merely a procedural necessity but a fundamental imperative  
17 to maintain public confidence in the judicial system's capacity to dispense  
18 unbiased justice.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 **7. Error NVSC, There are Numerous Claims Remedy Can Be Granted On**

2 There are multiple claims in the **original complaint** as drafted that do not warrant  
3 dismissal, pursuant to NRCP Rule 12(b)(5). I will highlight a few examples of  
4 specific claims that survive.  
5

6  
7 **The Original Complaint filed on 8/4/23**, as drafted, and the exhibits that  
8 accompanied and were referenced therein should not have been dismissed on their  
9 face pursuant to *NRCP Rule 12(b)(5)* for the reasons set forth below, and in this  
10 petition. The plain language of the **complaint** and accompanying exhibits starting  
11 with Exhibit 109 submitted with the **Original Complaint on 8/4/23**, are in  
12 accordance with *NRCP Rule 8(a)(2)*. Exhibit 109 lists dozens of allegations  
13 corroborated by the **8/4/23 submitted Exhibits 1-3** and further evidenced by the  
14 116 additional exhibits also referenced in Exhibit 109. Example, Exhibit 3 contains  
15 affidavits from Washoe County Election Workers and observers, stating that the  
16 Respondents failed to perform signature verification required by law. These  
17 witnesses, under penalty of perjury, declared they were either instructed by the  
18 ROV to disregard lawful signature verification procedures or observed others  
19 doing so. All witnesses have agreed to be cross-examined in court in addition to  
20 their affidavits. Another simple example is Exhibit 72 which are valid court orders  
21 that the defendants broke, on video, shown in exhibits 23-24, all of which was  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 originally plead in the **original filing on 8/4/23** in Exhibit 109. In my **Original**  
2 **Complaint** it very clearly lists 2 causes of action, on page 12 paragraph 80 it states:  
3 “In addition, Defendants have failed to address, correct, or rectify the issues  
4 raised in the underlying Petitions, including but not limited to, **(1) updating and**  
5 **resolving the voter registration lists; (2) providing proper vote counting**  
6 **mechanisms; (3) counting votes in secret; (4) inadequate signature verification;**  
7 **(5) illegal function within the election system; (6) violations of election**  
8 **procedures as required under Nevada law. [Exhibit 109].** Plaintiff seeks an  
9 injunction regarding the foregoing.” Further, the **8/4/23 Original Complaint** states  
10 on page 11, paragraph 70, “Defendants, and each of them, have a duty to uphold  
11 Plaintiff’s constitutional rights.” The respondents, each of them swore an oath to  
12 defend and uphold our constitution, by breaking the law, not redressing my  
13 grievances, they have harmed me in which this court can grant me remedy as **per**  
14 **pages 15-16 of the Original Complaint vii**, where it states, **“Enjoin Defendants**  
15 **from their continued violations of the following NRSs and strictly comply with NRS**  
16 **293.530, NRS 293.2546(11), NRS 293B.033, NRS 293.269927, NRS 293.740, NRS**  
17 **293B.063, NRS 293B.104, NRS 293B.1045(1), NAC 293B.110(1)(b), NRS**  
18 **293.269931(1), NRS 293.3606(1), NRS 293.363(1), NRS 293B.353, NRS 293B.354,**  
19 **NRS 293B.380(2)(a), NAC 293.311(4), NRS 293.423, NRS 293.269927(4)(b), NRS**  
20 **293.277(3), NRS 293.285(1)(b)(4), NRS 293.3075(4), NRS 293.3585(1)(d), NRS**  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 293.403(2), NRS 293.404(2), Nev. Const. Art. 2 Sec.1A § 1(b)” 8/4/23 filed

2 **Exhibit 109** states they broke my court orders and counted our votes in secret. A  
3 complete disregard of my court orders Exhibit 72. In these clear examples, this  
4 court has the duty to reverse its ruling and the ruling of the lower court as  
5 numerous remedies are available to me. At a minimum, all this court or lower court  
6 had to do was simply Enjoin the Respondents to follow the law!  
7

8  
9 NRCP Rule 12(b)(5) states, “failure to state a claim upon which relief can be  
10 granted.”  
11

12 NRCP Rule 8(a)(2) states, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that  
13 the pleader is entitled to relief.”  
14

15 In just these quick examples shown in my **Original Complaint**, and its attached  
16 exhibits, I overcome the *NRCP Rule 12(b)(5)* dismissal and adhered to *Rule*  
17 *8(a)(2)*.  
18

19  
20 There is no legitimate reason why my **Original Complaint** does not overcome a  
21 *NRCP Rule 12(b)(5)* motion based on the examples above. If this court says the  
22 respondents have no duty to answer me, I urge you to read section six above. If the  
23 respondents, who are conducting the elections, have no duty to follow the law or  
24 face consequences for breaking it, then what is the use of having courts in Nevada  
25  
26

1 if they won't distribute law and justice equally amongst all who live under it? An  
2 example of the necessity of this court's role to grant my petition is *Oregon v.*  
3 *Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112 1970, the Supreme Court upheld key provisions of the 1970  
4 Voting Rights Act amendments, emphasizing the judiciary's vital role in enforcing  
5 laws that ensure fair electoral processes. This case underscores the necessity of  
6 judicial oversight in maintaining the integrity of elections and adherence to  
7 constitutional standards. Our case similarly requires such judicial intervention to  
8 uphold the legality and fairness of election administration.  
9  
10

11  
12 In the case of *Jason A. Crowe v. McCarthy & Holthus, LLP et al*, the United States  
13 District Court for the District of Nevada meticulously outlined the legal standards  
14 for amending complaints and the dismissal of cases that fail to state a claim under  
15 *Rule 12(b)(6)* or do not meet the pleading requirements of Rule 8. This framework  
16 is crucial when comparing it to my case, where numerous well-documented  
17 allegations conform to the requirements of *NRCP Rule 12(b)(5)* for stating a claim  
18 upon which relief can be granted, and *Rule 8(a)(2)*, which demands a clear and  
19 concise statement of claims showing entitlement to relief. My **Original**  
20 **Complaint**, backed by a wealth of evidence and detailed in multiple exhibits,  
21 points to systematic violations of legal procedures and rights, each potentially  
22 grounding separate claims for relief.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 In Crowe's scenario, failure to procedurally conform to court rules resulted in  
2 dismissal; however, his opportunity to amend was also curtailed by these failures.  
3 In contrast, my complaint presents a situation where, even if some claims might be  
4 dismissed as in Crowe's case, the multitude of other claims—each substantiated by  
5 specific allegations and evidence—provides an absolute need for the case to  
6 proceed. This not only underscores the necessity of the court's oversight in  
7 ensuring that each claim is individually assessed for its merit but also illustrates  
8 that even a single viable claim can suffice to sustain an action. Therefore, the  
9 principles laid out in Crowe's dismissal should justify a reevaluation of my case,  
10 emphasizing that the presence of multiple claims, if even one is actionable,  
11 mandates the continuation of legal proceedings to ensure justice and the proper  
12 application of the law. This is integral to uphold the judicial responsibility to  
13 distribute law and justice equitably, adhering to the established legal standards and  
14 principles, thereby safeguarding the procedural rights of individuals against  
15 arbitrary dismissals.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 **8. Error NVSC, NRS 283.440 Does Apply**

22  
23 In **Cause Two** of my **Original Complaint**, I state the Respondents need to be  
24 removed from office under *NRS 283.440*. *NRS 266.430* was listed as another  
25 option; however, *NRS 283.440* does apply, and the entire cause of action must not  
26

1 be thrown out simply because I listed two means by which removal can be granted,  
2 even if only one means is available to me as a citizen. The Respondents at the time  
3 of my **Original Complaint** all held public office. *NRS 283.440(1)* states, “Any  
4 *person who is now holding or who shall hereafter hold any office in this State and*  
5 *who refuses or neglects to perform any official act in the manner and form*  
6 *prescribed by law, or who is guilty of any malpractice or malfeasance in office,*  
7 *may be removed therefrom as hereinafter prescribed in this section.”* That means  
8  
9 ANY PERSON holding office can be removed from it; the Respondents all fit the  
10 positions from which they can be removed. This is demonstrated in *Mason v.*  
11 *Gammick, No. 71691 (Nev. App. June 26, 2017), Charles A. Muth v. Robert Loux,*  
12 *No. 2008 WL 6498697 (Nev. Dist. Ct., First Judicial Dist., Carson City County,*  
13 *Trial Order).* The defense acknowledges I have the authority to remove the  
14 respondents from office via *NRS 283.440*, citing *Madsen v. Brown, 701 P.2d 1086,*  
15 *1093 (Utah 1985)* in their *Motion to Dismiss, page 11, lines 5-15.*  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Exhibit 109, originally filed on 8/4/23, with my Original Complaint shows  
21 numerous allegations in which the respondents committed malpractice or  
22 malfeasance, further backed by proof Exhibit 109 points to. Breaking election  
23 laws, court orders, etc. as shown in the exhibits filed at the same time as the  
24 original complaint, all justify removal from office. It's insane to allow public  
25  
26  
27

1 officials to break laws at will, with no potential for legal repercussions or removal  
2 from office. The *NRCP Rule 12(b)(5)* dismissal must be overturned for this second  
3 cause of action in my **Original Complaint**, and a trial must be held to weigh the  
4 evidence of the respondents' guilt and potential for removal from office. At a  
5 minimum, leave to amend must be granted.  
6

### 7 **9. Error NVSC, Change Of Venue VS Jury Trial**

8  
9 I won't rehash all the reasons in which I should be granted a change of venue; the  
10 evidence is and was clear and convincing. Simply reading my motions, and  
11 pleadings to change venue paints a clear picture as to how I wouldn't receive a fair  
12 hearing in Russell's courtroom, and as Judge Russell's ruling proved me right. The  
13 laughable metric Judge Russell used to deny my motion to change venue was he  
14 stated he didn't know who I was, so he would not change the venue. See *Official*  
15 *Transcript, Exhibit 163, page 13, lines 12-24, and page 14, lines 1-6*. I don't  
16 believe he was telling the truth, as several people have come forward and told me  
17 he absolutely knew who I was prior to his erroneous ruling. If he wouldn't, and  
18 you won't change the venue to an unbiased court, then you must uphold my  
19 constitutionally enshrined rights and grant me a jury trial in District 1, Carson City  
20 court for the citizens themselves to weigh the evidence. Per *NRCP Rules 38-*  
21 *39*, additionally the constitution grants me these rights under *The NV Constitution*  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27



1 *Article 1 Section 3: “The right of trial by Jury shall be secured to all and remain*  
2 *inviolate forever; but a Jury trial may be waived by the parties in all civil cases in*  
3 *the manner to be prescribed by law; and in civil cases, if three-fourths of the*  
4 *Jurors agree upon a verdict it shall stand and have the same force and effect as a*  
5 *verdict by the whole Jury...”* I did not waive my right to a Jury Trial, my  
6 complaint, evidence and exhibits overcome a *Rule 12(b)(5)* dismissal, if I am not  
7 granted a change of venue, then I demand my right to a Jury Trial be granted in  
8 Carson City D1 Court as per the Constitution entitles me. Additionally,  
9 *Roethlisberger v. McNulty, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 48, 54774 (2011), 256 P.3d 955,*  
10 *127 Nev. Adv. Op. 48 (Nev. 2011)* shows that even if a motion to change venue is  
11 denied, the case still goes forward in the original court where the motion to change  
12 venue was filed.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 **10. Error NVSC, Leave to Amend or Errors Not Granted**  
18

19 *“In the absence of any apparent or declared reason—such as undue delay, bad*  
20 *faith, or dilatory motive on the part of the movant—the leave sought should be*  
21 *freely given.”* This is demonstrated in *Stephens v. S. Nev. Music Co. in the Nevada*  
22 *Supreme Court, in DeSoto v. Yellow Freight Sys., Inc., 957 F.2d 655, 658 (9th Cir.*  
23 *1992)*, as well as *Nutton v. Sunset Station, Inc., Court of Appeals of Nevada, June*  
24 *11, 2015, 131 Nev. 279, 357 P.3d 966,* and *NRCP Rule 15.*  
25  
26  
27

1 Further, if I made any errors, the law states, “*at every stage of the proceeding, the*  
2 *court must disregard all errors and defects that do not affect any party’s*  
3 *substantial rights.*” This is demonstrated in:

4  
5 NRCP Rule 61, *Paterson v. Condos*, 30 P.2d 283 (Nev. 1934), *Sweeney v. Schultes*,

6  
7 NRCP 8(e) and *S. Nev. Adult Mental Health Servs. v. Brown*.

8  
9 Lastly, the NRCP, like the FRCP, requires the district court to construe pleadings  
10 in favor of, not against, the person pleading them. See *Charles Alan Wright &*  
11 *Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil § 1286, at 747-48 (3d ed.*  
12 *2004)*.

13  
14  
15 I drafted and filed all of these pleadings myself. If I made a mistake, or needed to  
16 amend a pleading for it to survive, it should have been granted, not dismissed with  
17 prejudice. Additionally, my case and pleadings should be construed in my favor,  
18 not the defense's. What's seriously saddening is the defense is paid for by my tax  
19 dollars, and my dollars are used to protect the very people I allege are harming  
20 myself and citizens. It is incumbent upon this Court to overturn Russell's ruling.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 **11. Conclusion**

2 The request for a rehearing is driven by a critical need for justice and adherence to  
3 legal integrity, both egregiously overlooked in the prior rulings. This isn't merely  
4 procedural; it's about ensuring justice, equity, and the proper application of law as  
5 mandated by our constitutions.  
6

7  
8 I've provided substantial evidence, including affidavits and statutory references,  
9 proving breaches of duty and malfeasance by the Respondents that directly violate  
10 *NRS 283.440*. Notably, I fully exhausted all administrative remedies under *NAC*  
11 *293.025*, firmly adhering to *NRCP Rule 8(a)(2)*, and easily overcoming an *NRCP*  
12 *Rule 12(b)(5)* dismissal. This court and the lower court's dismissal on procedural  
13 grounds unjustly ignored these merits, depriving me of my fundamental right to a  
14 fair trial and undermining judicial integrity. Even if for the sake of argument I still  
15 didn't plea my complaint properly it is the duty of this court to grant me leave to  
16 amend my complaint.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 This procedural oversight sets a dangerous precedent that threatens the due process  
22 rights guaranteed by our constitutions. Judicial responsibility demands that claims,  
23 especially those involving public officials and electoral integrity, are thoroughly  
24 examined and impartially adjudicated. The requested rehearing must be granted;  
25 it's imperative this court corrects these overt errors by overturning the dismissal  
26  
27

1 for a comprehensive reevaluation of my claims and to remedy the procedural errors  
2 that led to the initial dismissal, thus granting me justice and preventing future  
3 judicial failures.  
4

5 Granting this rehearing is essential to uphold the judiciary's role in enforcing the  
6 law impartially, ensuring no individual, particularly those in public service, can  
7 sidestep legal accountability. This Court must affirm its commitment to justice and  
8 the meticulous application of the law, restoring public trust in the judicial process.  
9

10 My case must go forward as implied in *New York Times Co. v. United States*  
11 *(1971)* for the benefit of the public. This is a demand for justice and accountability  
12 at the highest echelons of our legal system.  
13

14  
15 You now have a chance to show Nevada, other lawyers, and the people, that the  
16 Nevada Supreme Court is not a political machine that has been corrupted but is a  
17 legitimate failsafe to prevent the perversion of our laws and courts and ensure  
18 equal due process and justice for all. **We will now wait and see which this court**  
19 **is or has become, the Supreme Court of Justice or the Supreme Court of**  
20 **Injustice.**  
21

22  
23  
24 Respectfully submitted,

25  
26 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
27

1 ROBERT BEADLES, Appellant In Pro Per,

2 10580 N. McCarran Blvd. #115, Apt. 386,

3 Reno, NV 89503 916-573-7133

4  
5  
6 APPELLANT DID NOT DRAFT AN APPENDIX

7  
8  
9 NRAP Rule 30 (i)

10 **(i) Pro Se Party Exception.** This Rule does not apply to a party who is not  
11 represented by counsel. A pro se party shall not file an appendix except as  
12 otherwise provided in these Rules or ordered by the court. If the court's review of  
13 the complete record is necessary, the court will direct the district court to transmit  
14 the record as provided in Rule 11.  
15

16  
17 **AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030**

18 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not  
19 contain the Social Security Number of any person.  
20

21 DATED: May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Robert Beadles, Appellant In Pro Per  
26

1  
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
3  
4  
5

6 Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that on May 28th, 2024, I served all parties  
7 by electronically emailing the defense counsel and by sending via first-class mail  
8 with sufficient postage prepaid to Lindsay Liddell, the respondents' defense attorney.  
9

10  
11 Haldeman, Suzanne shaldeman@da.washoecounty.gov  
12

13 Hickman, Elizabeth ehickman@da.washoecounty.gov

14 Liddell, Lindsay L lliddell@da.washoecounty.gov  
15

16  
17 And mailed to:

18 One South Sierra Street Reno, Nevada 89501  
19  
20

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Robert Beadles, Appellant In Pro Per  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27