

Loehr, Rosemary Ann

From: Eric Sutherland [mailto:sutherix@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2019 10:19 PM

To: Loehr, Rosemary Ann <RLoehr@shermanhoward.com>

Cc: Mill, John W. <jmill@shermanhoward.com>; Carrie Daggett <cdaggett@fcgov.com>; John Duval <jduval@fcgov.com>

Subject: Re: Filed today in 2018CV149

DATE FILED: July 25, 2019 10:54 AM

FILING ID: 1243363B9C700

CASE NUMBER: 2018CV149

Ms. Loehr,

Please see my Response to the City's Motion to Dismiss. My theory of law regarding a petitioners standing to bring a declaratory judgment action when faced with a non-claim statute was clearly articulated in that Response. pages 5-10. There was no need to articulate this theory of law in the complaint. Stating the theory when I stated it was the first and best time to do so.

You are apparantly unschooled in law and the procedural history of this case. You have just wasted more money that is coming out of the pockets of my neighbors and friends.

As I have written before, I have since found authority from another jurisdiction that props up my theory of law completely. Remarkably, the reasoning of the court in that case is nearly identical to the reasoning I presented. Alternatively, I have not found any authority where a court has denied standing to a petitioner in the face of the nonclaim statute. Even if an authority contravening my theory of law existed, you could not raise an argument on appeal that you did not raise in the trial court.

Thank heavens for the First Amendment. It will survive your ignorance and willingness to argue that citizens have no right to petition.

Eric Sutherland