

Todd Robben
In Pro Se
P.O. Box 4251
Sonora, CA 95370
(209)540-7713

FILED

SEP 18 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY Mehsa Miller
DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TODD ROB BEN,

Appellant,

vs.


THE ESTATE OF THOMAS JOSEPH
HARRIS; AND THOMAS J. HARRIS
TRUST,

Respondents.

Supreme Court Case No.: 86096

**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE LAST
REMAINING NON-VIOLENT
RESOLUTION(S) AS RESPONDENT
ESCALATES THE HARASSMENT AND
ABUSE OF PROCESS USING
UNDERCOVER AGENTS TO STALK,
HARASS AND TRESPASS TO THREATEN
THE APPELLANT**

EMERGENCY MOTION



1 Appellant, Todd Robben, *in pro se* urges the Chief Justice of
2 this Court, Lidia S. Stiglich, to reconsider the order denying three
3 request for relief including sanctions against Respondent's counsel
4 for clear, undisputed violations of laws and ethics.
5

6
7 The Respondent's counsel, Fred M. Wallace has apparently
8 hired a process server named Larry Martin who on or about
9 September 13, 2023 attempted to serve the Appellant some legal
10 paperwork on private property where Appellant does not live or work.
11

12 The Appellant considers said stalking a threat to Appellant's
13 safety and security based on past occurrences and the current
14 conflict.
15

16
17 This Appellant did present three righteous remedies that this
18 Court should have considered and taken seriously because of the
19 profound and grave situation it has caused this Appellant.
20

21 Very simply put, the Appellant is being robbed, harassed and
22 now threatened by Fred M. Wallace. This is considered legal
23 retaliation for complaining about Fred M. Wallace's continued abuse
24 of the legal process and obvious theft, conspiracy to commit theft,
25 aiding and abetting of robbing the trust as alleged in the underlying
26 motion for sanctions.
27
28

1 Fred M. Wallace may have had his feeling hurt and this
2 Appellant has the legal right pursuant to the First Amendment and
3 privileged speech to communicate his position and avoid niceties ad
4 he is being raped, molested and solemnized of his rights and his
5 money in front of his face.
6

7
8 The Appellant made no true threats to kill or harm Fred M.
9 Wallace and made clear there is no subjective intent to do so, instead
10 the Appellant will make sure Fred M. Wallace is removed and cannot
11 victimize anyone else with his abusive litigation tactics and criminal
12 wrongdoing.
13

14
15 This Court and Chief Justice Lidia S. Stiglich has ignored to
16 extensive proof of ethical and lawful conduct by Fred M. Wallace and
17 the Trustee of the Trust, Tara Flanagan who is an activist LGBTQ
18 judge from Alameda County, CA and whi has an extensive history of
19 wrongdoing and ethics violations as proven in the underlying motion
20 and affidavit filed by this Appellant.
21

22
23 Lidia S. Stiglich has a duty to disclose any conflict of interest
24 and here, we have a total cover-up of the entire set of issues
25 presented by the Appellant of unlawful and illegal conduct by Tara
26 Flanagan, Fred M. Wallace and others listed in the underlying motion.
27
28

1 The Appellant went into this case knowing there could be a
2 conflict with Lidia S. Stiglich and Tara Flanagan since both are
3 LGBTQ judges and the appearance of bias existed and is now a real
4 concern.
5

6 This case cannot be used to cover-up the wrongdoing of
7 another LGBTQ judge and her lawyer Fred M. Wallace all to protect
8 fellow LGTBQ class of people.
9
10

11 The fact Lidia S. Stiglich is a member of the LGTBQ class of
12 people is not the reason this Appellant has concern, it is the fact Lidia
13 S. Stiglich has violated ethical duties that mandate the Judge to
14 report the offenders (Fred M. Wallace and Tara Flanagan) to the
15 appropriate authorities.
16
17


18 The totality of the situation mandates reconsideration of the
19 instant issue imposing sanctions against the Respondent. This
20 Appellant has won the case and the Court keep giving the
21 Respondent another bite at the apple and totally ignores all
22 Appellants legal merits and requests...
23
24

25 The Appellant also prevails on the other two cases where this
26 Court is in the position to right the wrongs of the past and allow
27 Appellnat to have custody to see his son and be made whole for the
28

1 unlawful termination of his State employment case where he
2 prevailed in federal court against the State of Nevada.
3

4 The Appellant is suffer from null & void judgments in these
5 cases and this Court is allowing thus to happen and intentionally
6 preventing a non-violent remedy as explained in the case law and
7 legal authority in the underlying motion. This is not a threat to harm
8 anyone – it is a demand for a non-violent remedy as the Appellant
9 has and is being attacked with violence.
10
11
12
13

14 Respectfully signed under penalty of perjury,


15 
16
17 /s/ Todd Robben
18

19
20 September 14, 2023
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

3 I certify that on the date indicated below, I served a copy of this
4 Surreply to the parties pursuant to NRCP 5(b) by depositing an email to: F.
5 McClure Wallace, counsel for Respondent, mcclure@wallacemillsap.com
6

7
8 September 14, 2023
9

10 
11 /s/John Flynn
12 John Flynn

13 180 Upper Sunset

14 Sonora, CA 95370
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28