

Judgement against Weisberg was ~~reversed~~ ordered April 28, 1983. The judgement was amended by the court January 31, 1984, to assess the same fees against Weisberg's then counsel. After remand the judgement against Weisberg'd counsel was cancelled by the court. Weisberg believes that this was a substantial, substantative change in the judgement, within the meaning of the Rule. If it was not, then he believes that under the Rule the controlling date is that of the entering of the judgement against him, April 28, 1983, because the only change in that judgement was amending it to include his counsel.

The precedent of ~~in~~ entering a judgement against counsel whose advice his client substantive refuses to follow is simply enormous and abandoning that precedent is a major change in the judgements, ~~This change is not what the court states,~~ no more than

Check Transit Casualty on this, he cites it on 6, fnote 2