

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

_____	)	Case 1:18-cv-00931-LM
Rod Webber	)	(Chief Judge Landya McCafferty)
v.	)	
Deck, Trump, et al.	)	Feb 6, 2020
_____	)	

**REPLY TO NO LABELS’ OBJECTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER**

Respectfully, the Defendants don’t want the Court to see the video evidence because it is indefensible. The video evidence which the Court has erroneously dismissed, and which No Labels is demanding the Court tear to shreds is doubtlessly the most important evidence submitted in the case, and is referenced 95 times in the second amended complaint. To what lengths must Plaintiff go to receive justice? Is it too much to expect that the complaint is simply read in it’s entirety, and that everything presented to the Court is given the same consideration as the millionaire and billionaire Defendants in this case with countless lawyers fighting to make sure that this evidence will never be seen? The Plaintiff’s inclusion of video time-code and descriptions of video in the motion to reconsider (Doc 157) should not be considered new evidence, but a time-saver.

These are the links in question, originally submitted in the second Amended Complaint:

[Trumpers fears Bible reading. Police side w Webber](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bN7Dy5r2eeY) (https://www.youtube.com/watch?

v=bN7Dy5r2eeY)

<https://vine.co/v/eElaxhDp3Xl>

The videos linked by Plaintiff, plainly stated, were in the second amended complaint. They should not be ignored. The C-SPAN videos incorporated by reference in Document 101 by the Manchester Defendants, had already been referenced in the second amended complaint. If the Court has taken the time to look at the videos, Plaintiff hopes it has driven home the seriousness of the case, and that the allegations made within should not be dismissed due to a pro se Plaintiff's unusual formatting, or unorthodox procedure. What Plaintiff may lack in procedural knowledge is more than made up for by the actual evidence presented in the case, though evidence is not needed at this stage, just plead facts that create a reasonable inference of a cause of action. The Court needs to simply see the evidence that is pled.

The Defendant has presented no facts, nor an affidavit as to whether No Labels had a contract asserting that the Manchester Defendants were independent contractors. They haven't submitted any such documents in support of their motion because they don't have evidence. They are hiding behind their motion like a hunter behind a duck blind. You know he has a loaded gun but only by looking on the camouflaged blind will you discover it. All the plaintiff has to show is a glimpse of the hunters body or gun to cast doubt on the motion and the truth of what the Defendant is covering up. So, if the court sees a single pled fact casting doubt on the relationship being anything other than at arm's length, the court must deny Defendant's motion. Plaintiff has done so in many ways and through a combination of details. The expression of remorse by No Label's Clancy demonstrates that something unkosher transpired behind the scenes. Otherwise, he would have said that the Manchester Defendants were operating independently. Clancy said this clearly when he said it shouldn't have happened, and "it isn't right." Clancy didn't say the Manchester Defendants shouldn't have done what they did.

Even if the Court decides that this evidence is "new evidence" it is certainly admissible.

The case of *Barrows v. Boles* 141 N.H. 382 (N.H. 1996) holds that, "A motion for reconsideration allows a party to present 'points of law or fact that the Court has overlooked or misapprehended.'" Super. Ct. R. 59-A(1). It continues, "We will uphold a trial court's decision on a motion for reconsideration absent an abuse of discretion." *Fortin v. Manchester Housing Auth.*, 133 N.H. 154, 160, 574 A.2d 945, 950 (1990).

Humbly submitted

Pro se Plaintiff, Rod Webber