

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 R ule 60(b) while it pretends that he invoked only the f irst 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, bytx 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.