

conclude on prejudice of court

*when year begins*

The court also reflects bias and prejudice in what it fuzzes over, what it ignores and what it misrepresents, as the very ~~decisions~~ authorities it cites make clear. One of the more important examples, which cannot be accidental when considered with its ignoring Weisberg's invocations of the last three clauses of Rule 60(b) while it pretends that he invoked only the first three clauses and mentioned them only, is its ambiguity, stated in a footnote on page 6, is only that "(a) change in liability of attorneys' fees occasioned by the remand... is not a substantial change" and thus "the period is not tolled." (citing *Transc Transit Casualty*, check it) Although the court cited *FTC v. Minneapolis-Honeywell*, it omits what that decision states, that "when the court changes matters of substance" the time begins to run with that change; and that if the change "disturbed ~~matters of substance~~ or revised legal rights ~~xxxxrevised~~ which, by its prior judgement, had been plainly and properly settled with finality." (Questionable, Lesar's legal rights were revised and disturbed) under and to be handled Citations.