NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCY

TO: \boxtimes U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE / \square U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE: The Hon. Cynthia Bashant

FROM: S. Dunbar, Deputy Cl	lerk	RECEIVED DATE: August 5, 2020
CASE NO. 18-cv-00325-BAS	S-DEB	DOC FILED BY: Darryl Cotton
CASE TITLE: Cotton v. Gera	nci et al	
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion to add page to Ex Parte		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
LR 5.1 - Improperly Titled Do	ocument	
LR 5.2 - Missing Proof of Service		
Date Forwarded: August 5, 2020		
ORDER O IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:	OF THE JUDGE	E / MAGISTRATE JUDGE
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: ☑ The document is to be file	ed nunc pro tunc to o	
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: ☐ The document is to be file ☐ The document is NOT to	ed nunc pro tunc to o be filed. But instead on all parties.	late received. REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: ☐ The document is to be file ☐ The document is NOT to serve a copy of this order Rejected documents to be return Any further failure to	ed nunc pro tunc to on all parties. ned to pro se or inmate comply with the Lo	late received. REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: ☐ The document is to be file ☐ The document is NOT to serve a copy of this order Rejected documents to be return Any further failure to	be filed. But instead on all parties. ned to pro se or inmate comply with the Lot Local Rule 83.1 or	date received. REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk ate? Yes. Court copy retained by chambers cal Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to

CKSS9:3818vcv032825ASDEBDoomment 1868File (1869) 18120 PAGH 13:29 AUG 0 3 2020 DARRYL COTTON 1 CLERK US DISTRICT COURT 6176 Federal Boulevard 2 San Diego, CA 92104 Telephone: (619) 954-4447 3 Facsimile: (619) 229-9387 NUNC PRO TUNC 4 8/5/20 Plaintiff Pro Se Aug 06 2020 5 **CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT** 6 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA** UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 10 DARRYL COTTON. Case No. 3:18-cv-00325-BAS (DEB) 11 Plaintiff. PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF EX PARTE APPLICATION AND EX PARTE 12 LARRY GERACI, an individual, REBECCA APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF 13 BERRY, an individual; GINA AUSTIN, an COUNSEL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. individual; AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP, a §1915(e)(1): MEMORANDUM OF POINTS 14 Professional Corporation; MICHAEL AND AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF WEINSTEIN, an individual: SCOTT H. DARRYL COTTON 15 TOOTACRE, an individual; FERRIS & 16 BRITTON, a Professional Corporation; CITY OF Hearing Date: N/A SAN DIEGO, a public entity, and DOES 1 through Hearing Time: N/A 17 10. Inclusive. Judge: Hon. Cynthia A. Bashant Courtroom: 4B 18 Defendants. 19 20 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on Lify 31, 2020, Plaintiff DARRYL COTTON will move this 21 22 Court ex parte for an order appointing him counsel for representation in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 23 24 Please all page 27, as attached here to the motion. It was Provided in my Submission as lan be soon by Email Service but for Whatever reason twas Not uthorded to the Court parket. Thankyou! 25 26 27 28 Dauy Grow

10 11

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13 14

12

16 17

15

18

19 20)

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Hannibal on Netflix, the fictional chameter made famous in Silence of the Lambs. In season 1, episode 3, the daughter of an individual she just learned is a serial killer asks "Can you catch somebody's crazy?" To which Hannibal responds: "One cannot be delusional if the belief in question is accepted as ordinary by others in that person's culture or subculture. Or family." There are state and federal judges at the trial and appellate level who have directly or indirectly stated I am crazy without explaining why. On the other hand I have had over a dozen attorneys and half a dozen paralegals work or consult on my case over the course of the last three plus years and with facts, law, reason and logic explain to me that Austin, Weinstein, Demian, Phelps, Feldman and every other attorney at issue here are, in so many words. criminal pieces of shit that are knowingly aiding and abetting other criminal pieces of shit to defraud me of the Property and the cannabis CUP or avoid to avoid liability for having done so.

How can I be crazy when an attorney, Flores, is livid with rage at having his TRO denied on the alleged grounds that he filed suit against the defendants in Cotton V because they did not commit a crime? I can read. Flores did not file suit on those grounds. So how can I be the crazy one when even this Court's order could lead a reasonable person to believe that this Court is trying to distract from the walking disgrace of all judges known as Wohlfeil? I have been driven insane by everything that has taken place. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a psychiatrist assessment describing how I have been obsessed with the factual and legal import of the Confirmation Email since this litigation has begun. And yet not one judge has ever addressed the Confirmation Email and the Mutual Assent Issue.

If I am crazy, if nothing else, please explain why the Request for Confirmation and the Confirmation Email are not evidence that I did not consent to the November Document being a sales contract? I fucking loathe Wohlfeil for never addressing this question in over three years. I have repeatedly and literally begged him in person and in my submission to him to please answer this question. He is a worse criminal than Geraci. For the 100th time, it is appalling to think about how many people have lost their life, liberty or property because he is a biased imbecile.

August 3, 2020 DATED: