

20150040

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

FILED
IN THE OFFICE OF THE
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

David Gray,) Supreme Court No 20150040
Plaintiff and Appellant,) Civil No. 08-2014-CV- 0312
VS)
Terry Berg,)
Defendant and Appellee)

JUN 03 2015

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Appellant's Response to Appellee's Brief

Appeal from judgement dated January 5, 2015

Burleigh County, North Dakota

South Central Judicial District

Judge Gail Hagerty Presided

David B. Gray, Appellant pro se

3800 93rd ST SE

Bismarck ND 58504

(701) 595-3133

David B. Gray 6/3/15

Table of Contents

Paragraph number

Table of Authorities

Jurisdictional Statement

Statement of the Complaint

1

Gray's response to appellee's brief

2

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 8

3

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 9

4

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 10

5

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 11

6

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 12

7

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 13

8

Gray's response to appellee's paragraph 16

9

Gray's response to appellee's Attorney General Opinion

10

Conclusion

11

Table of authorities

NDCC-20.1-01-19

4

NDCC 20.1-01-21

4

Judicial Code of Conduct 3.10

7

[1] Statement of the complaint: *“DEFENDANT DID FORCABLY INTERFER WITH PLAINTIFF’S POSSESSION AND ENJOYMENT OF HIS LAND.” This is the complaint, this is the issue. Trespassing is NOT the issue. The issue is: Berg interfering in Gray’s enjoyment of Gray’s land and life. It is written in the complaint. Laura Ringsak and William Severin are desperate to rewrite Gray’s complaint. Do not allow the defense to write the complaint.*

[2] Gray’s response to Appellee’s brief: Ringsak/Severin are NOT attorneys for the plaintiff and should not argue for the plaintiff. Ringsak/Severin cleverly and deceitfully try to represent their opinions as Gray’s arguments, their opinions as Gray’s complaint. Gray will present his case, and his arguments. All Ringsak/Severin present are groundless opinions in Appellee’s brief wherein they try to retry this case. Appellee’s brief is without merit and not written in good faith intended only to confuse and mislead the court, devoid of truth, devoid of facts. Appellee has the “cause of action” in paragraph 1 totally wrong and conflicts with paragraph 2 in appellee’s own brief. This is proof of wrong doings; when stories do not match or make sense. The cause of action is stated clearly in the complaint.

[3]Appellee’s brief is without page numbers; under Law and Argument, paragraph 8 is without merit as there is no law with argument only an opinion.

[4]In paragraph 9 Ringsak/Severin misapply the law and misrepresent Gray’s case. Berg does not remain on his land. The law NDCC 20.1-01-21 does apply to Berg when Berg enters upon the premises of another (Gray’s LAND). Further NDCC 20.1-01-21 is a special law, a penal law, revised in 1975 after NDCC 20.1-01-19 (1973) and should be construed in favor of the plaintiff over NDCC 20.1-01-19.

[5]In paragraph 10 Ringsak/Severin again talk on behave of Gray. Ringsak/Severin are not Gray’s attorneys nor are they privileged with any information. Paragraph 10 is without merit as it is just their opinion.

[6]Paragraph 11 is without merit as it is an argument for trial and was not raised at trial. Further Ringsak/Severin want to play word games with hunt and pursue which has no merit.

[7]Paragraph 12 has no merit as the Judicial Code 3.10 clearly states “A judge may not practice law --- etc” and Ringsak/Severin do not contest that wording.

[8]Paragraph 13 is without merit; costs are not relevant.

[9]Paragraph 16 has no merit as again it is just an opinion and seeks to misrepresent Gray.

[10]The Attorney General’s opinion is yet another opinion based on Minnesota Law wherein hunters were allowed to hunt and destroy in a standing field of corn upon which the landowner depends for livelihood and the landowner expressly forbade them from entering his unharvest crop.

[11]CONCLUSION: Appellee’s brief has no merit as it is a collection of self-serving opinions, devoid of facts and the truth.

RECEIVED BY CLERK
SUPREME COURT

JUN - 3 2015

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

COUNTY OF BURLIEGH

OF NORTH DAKOTA

BURLIEGH CO. # 2014-cv- 00312

CASE # 20150040

David B. Gray,)

APPELLANT PRO SE,)

certificate of service

VS)

Terry Berg)

APPELLEE)

)

)

A true and correct copy of Gray's response to appellee's brief was sent to


William C. Severin/ Laura Ringsak,

Att. For Defendant

411 North 4th st, PO Box 2155

Bismarck, ND 58502-2155

This 3 day June 2015

 pro-se
David B Gray