1 2 3	GRAHAM E. BERRY, Bar No. 128503 Attorney at Law 3384 McLaughlin Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90066 Telephone: (310) 745-3771 Email: grahamberry@ca.rr.com		
4	Defendant pro se		
5 6 7	BARRY VAN SICKLE, Bar No. 98645 Attorney at Law 1079 Sunrise Avenue Roseville, CA 95661 Telephone: (916) 549-8784 Email: bvansickle@surewest.com		
8	Attorney for cross-complainant		
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
11	CENTRAI	DISTRICT	
12	· ·		
13	KENDRICK MOXON) Case No. BC 429217	
14	Plaintiff, v.	Assigned to Hon. Rolf M. Treu, Dept. 58	
15 16 17	GRAHAM BERRY, Defendants.	[Proposed] ORDER	
18	GRAHAM E. BERRY, an individual;	Date: April 14, 2010 Dept: 58	
19	Cross-Complainant,	Action filed: January 5, 2010	
20	V.	CMC: May 6, 2010 Motion to compel plaintiff's dep. May 6, 2010	
21	KENDRICK L. MOXON, an individual; Cross-Defendant.	Trial Date: None	
22	Cross-Defendant.	Unlimited jurisdiction in equity	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
20			

UPON READING THE MOVING, OPPOSITION AND REBUTTAL PAPERS submitted in connection with cross-defendant's *Ex Parte* Application filed on March 22, 2010, and defendant and cross-complainant's *Ex Parte* Application filed April 13, 2010, and upon considering the documents filed in support thereof, the oral arguments at the hearing, and upon the record herein, and in all of the circumstances herein.

IT IS HERBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. <u>Cross-complainant's Ex Parte Application filed April 13, 2010</u> (to "[r]estore Plaintiff's pending Ex Parte, filed and stayed March 22, 2010, for hearing and determination pursuant to the Court's Minute Order of that same date") is granted.
- 2. The stay of this "matter" entered herein, by Minute Order signed March 22, 2010, is lifted.
- 3. The cross-complaint, filed herein on March 9, 2010, was signed by Barry Van Sickle, Esq. as attorney for cross-complainant Graham E. Berry, Esq. The declaration of Barry Van Sickle, Esq., filed April 14, 2010, states (para. 6) that he has reviewed the matters of record herein and is of "the professional opinion that there is a reasonable probability that defendant and cross-complainant should prevail in the pending litigation." The cross-defendant has shown that cross-complainant has been deemed a vexatious litigant but the cross-defendant has made no showing "that there is not a reasonable probability that the cross-complainant will prevail in the litigation." In part, the verified cross-complaint seeks to set aside the vexatious litigant order. In these circumstances, and in the circumstances alleged in the verified cross-complaint herein, cross-defendant's request for a bond is denied.
- 4. The verified cross-complaint filed herein on March 9, 2010, may now proceed.
 Cross-defendant may file a verified answer or other responsive pleading no later than

- April 30, 2010. Should a responsive pleading be filed it shall be calendared for hearing on Monday June 7, 2010.
- 5. Counsel for cross-defendant, Barry Van Sickle, has filed a declaration dated April 13, 2010, stating that he is undergoing surgery on May 5, 2010 will then be recuperating for three weeks. In these circumstances, <u>defendant and cross-complainant's motion to compel the deposition of plaintiff and cross-defendant, currently calendared for May 6, 2010, is continued until Monday June 7, 2010.</u> Opposition papers shall be filed and hand served no later than May 7, 2010.
- 6. Counsel for cross-defendant, Barry Van Sickle, has filed a declaration dated April 13, 2010, stating that he is undergoing surgery on May 5, 2010 will then be recuperating for three weeks. In these circumstances, the Case Management Conference herein, currently scheduled for May 6, 2010, is continued until Monday June 7, 2010.
- 7. Cross-complainant's *Ex Parte* Application filed April 13, 2010 (to "to continue the hearing on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment ... to permit discovery ... and to enable the filing of a cross-motion for summary judgment by defendant and cross-complainant") is granted in part. Although the defendant would have been entitled to the *ex parte* continuance requested under Code Civ. Proc. §437c (h), the plaintiff's Code Civ. Proc. §437c motion for summary judgment herein was filed only fifty (50) days after the general appearance of the defendant herein, and not "after sixty (60) days" as set forth in Code Civ. Proc. §437c (a). Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment filed herein on April 7, 2010, is now off calendar without prejudice to its later renewal or re-noticing.
- 8. Except for the filing of papers (including any appropriate motions) relating to: (a) cross-defendant's response to the March 9, 2010, cross-complaint on file herein, and

1	PROOF OF SERVICE BY HAND	
2		
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss.:	
4	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES MOXON V. BERRY BC42917	
5	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18.	
6	My business address is 3384 McLaughlin Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90066. I am an officer of the court herein.	
7 8	On April 14, 2010, I personally served on interested parties in said action the within:	
9	[Proposed]	
10	ORDER	
11	by hand to:	
12	by mane to:	
13	Kendrick L. Moxon, Esq, Moxon & Kobrin	
14	3055 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900 Los Angeles, CA 90010	
15	Telephone: (213) 487-4468 Facsimile: (213) 487-5385	
16	Email: kmoxon@earthlink.net	
17	Executed on April 14, 2010 at Los Angeles, California.	
18	I 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
19	foregoing is true and correct.	
20		
21	Graham F. Berry Schlaun Denry	
22	Graham E. Berry (Type or print name) (Signature)	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		