

March 30, 2010

The Honorable Denise D. Reilly
Hennepin County District Court
300 S. 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487

Re: Moore v. Hoff *et al* (27-CV-09-17778)


Dear Judge Reilly:

Plaintiff has submitted proposed order(s) for judgment (one for Mr. Hoff and one relating to Mr. Allen and his company) for the Court's consideration, via email to your Clerk.

Plaintiff has reviewed the defense motion for "stay." We can only assume this means stay entry of judgment - apparently for some indefinite amount of time. Under modern law, there appears no reason for this rule (or motion). Therefore, Plaintiff opposes the motion (which was not supported by any facts or even argument and certainly not a showing of prejudice). Defendant Hoff had had plenty of time to prepare post verdict motions should he desire to do so. Therefore, Plaintiff requests that judgment be entered forthwith.

Further, Plaintiff has reviewed the motion and memorandum filed by Mr. Borger at Faegre & Benson. We find no mention of any rule, statute or case that would permit an "amicus" brief to be filed (even upon obtaining prior permission) in the district court. Plaintiff opposes any notion that Mr. Borger can file a motion or memorandum in a case where he is not counsel for one of the *parties*. Plaintiff opposes any oral argument for a non-party being set on this purported "amicus" issue. Imagine if each of the bloggers or media associations across the country wanted to file a motion/memorandum in this case? The result would be a waste of judicial resources, and prejudice and undue costs for Moore.

Sincerely,



Jill Clark

JEC/PMK
Enclosure

c: Original to civil filing; Client; Paul Godfreed

JILL CLARK, P.A. ATTORNEY AT LAW

2005 AQUILA AVENUE NO. • GOLDEN VALLEY, MINNESOTA 55427 • PHONE: 763-417-9102 • FAX: 763-417-9112 • E-MAIL: JILL@JILLCLARKPA.COM