



*"The trick is to determine which is the alpha male."*

I WASN'T TEXTING OR  
EATING AND THERE'S NO LAW  
SAYING I CAN'T JUGGLE.







*"Okay, maybe I did run that red light a little. But in my defense, I was too drunk to notice."*





**DRINKING?  
CALL A CAB**

**TAXI**

**POLICE**

**EMERGENCY 911**

**THIS RIDE is cheaper than THIS RIDE**

HERE'S ONE. THE STORY OF A LITTLE REINDEER WHOSE EXCLUSION FROM REINDEER GAMES LED HIM TO STUDY MATH AND SCIENCE, ENABLING HIM TO DEVELOP LEVITATION TECH AND THUS ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR FLYING REINDEERS, THEREBY CONSIGNING HIS EARLY TORMENTORS TO A LIFE OF UNENDING PETTING ZOO HUMILIATION.



Almost no one likes  
those who send them to  
jail. Understandably.

*Reneau v. Mahoney*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 14-1128

Per Curiam



Mr. Warrence's appeal fails to make any improvement on the rambling incoherent statements he made below.

*Warrance v. Obama*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 14-1279.

Judge Stephen H. Anderson



Plaintiff Richard Gene Guy, appearing pro se, is no stranger to the federal court system. Between March 2008 and September 2012 Guy filed at least 7 lawsuits against the United States and various federal agencies and contractors. All have been dismissed, many with prejudice. One would think that after so much experience, Guy might have learned to avoid bringing frivolous actions. Not so. Instead, the audacity of Guy's filings appears to have increased over time.

*Guy v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 14-2046

Judge Bobby R. Baldock

To say Plaintiff Denny Lovern has a problem with alcohol, and in particular drinking and driving, is an understatement. During one of many such incidents in Arapahoe County, Colorado, Lovern attempted to pull out of a carport. Instead, Lovern hit a cinderblock wall, passed out at the wheel, came to, attempted to pull out again, hit the wall again, passed out again, came to again, drove out into the road, passed out again, came to again, drove off, and hit a wooden fence in an alley.

*Lovern v. Dorscheid*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 14-1089

Judge Bobby R. Baldock

Henry Griffin, a Colorado prisoner, filed this suit alleging that prison canteen officials violated his constitutional rights and federal antitrust laws by selling televisions to inmates like himself at prices too high and with too few channels. He also contended that his rights were violated because prisoners in other state prisons enjoy better access to pizza deliveries, double mattresses, and “mature . . . movies.”

*Griffin Jr. v. Smith*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 14-1149

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

Also not relevant are the following contentions Mr. Brunsilius presented in his opening brief on appeal: the federal district court ignored criminal actions allegedly committed by Colorado officials under admiralty law; Colorado officials conspired to conceal fraud, misrepresentation, and perjury and further conspired to create “Illegal Reclusion,” . . . Colorado officials concealed Mr. Brunsilius’s medical records and “fil[ed] charges under commercial papers for profit,” . . . the State of Colorado defaulted on “the Bill for ‘Back Wages’ and for Services Rendered,” . . . claims pertaining to a “remedy of House Joint Resolution 192” and Mr. Brunsilius’s sovereignty “as the flesh and blood man,” . . . and a claim that the Jefferson County District Attorney’s Office initiated fraudulent bonds and forged all supporting documents.

*BRUNSILIUS v. Montez*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 13-1430

Judge Monroe G. McKay



This case stems from a collision between two vehicles in a signal-controlled intersection. Larry Keller argues that Gerardo J. Martinez, who was turning left, had a duty under the Utah Traffic Code to yield to Keller, who was in the oncoming travel lane, even if Keller had run a red light.

*Keller v. Martinez*, 2014 UT App 2

Judge Stephen L. Roth

Following the practice of the parties and the district court, we use the term “handyman” in a “non-gender-specific fashion.”

*Knitter v. Corvias Military Living, LLC*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 13-3027

Judge Scott M. Matheson, Jr.

Mardoniz-Rosado suggests that we can excavate between the district court's expressed findings to unearth an implied finding that he did not receive a proper rule 11(e) plea colloquy and therefore was never made aware of the timing requirements for a motion to withdraw his plea

*State v. Mardoniz-Rosado*, 2014 UT App 128

Judge John A. Pearce

The incongruity between Larsen's claimed experience level and his pure-heart/empty-head defense put his credibility at issue, and one deputy county attorney explored the incongruity.

*Larson v. Davis County*, 2014 UT App 74  
Judge J. Frederic Voros



Should a manufacturer be required to pay damages because a product performs its intended function too well? . . . .

The lay opinion evidence appears to be little more than partisan cheerleading. . . . .

*Brett* appears to have been wrongfully decided and entitled only to a place in ether of anomalous results.

*Yeaman v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co.*, 10<sup>th</sup> Case No. 12-6254

Senior Judge Terrence L. O'Brien

With like understatement, one could say that Shakespeare's Mark Antony "disagreed with" Caesar's detractors

*NLRB v. Canning*, USSC No. 12–1281 (Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, concurring)

Must an employer allow employees more than six months' sick leave or face liability under the Rehabilitation Act? Unsurprisingly, the answer is almost always no.

*Hwang v. Kansas State Univ.,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. No. 13-3070

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

Rather than insist that Congress  
clean up a mess that I helped  
make, I would overrule *Kiowa* and  
reverse the judgment below

*Michigan v. Bay Hills Indian  
Community,*

*USSC No. 12–515*

Judge Antonin Scalia, dissenting



The import (or even relevance)  
of these arguments is far from  
pellucid.

*Maynard v. Governor Mary  
Fallin,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 13-6239

Judge Jerome A. Holmes

I, alone, am responsible for the  
delay in resolving this matter

*Potter v. Synerlink Corp.,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case Nos. 11-5092 &  
12-5117

Senior Judge Terrence L. O'Brien

Parties should not have to endure years of waiting and exhaust legions of photocopiers in discovery and motions practice merely to learn where their dispute will be heard. The Act requires courts process the venue question quickly so the parties can get on with the merits of their dispute in the right forum. It calls for a summary trial — not death by discovery.

*Howard v. Ferrellgas Partners,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. No. 13-3061

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

Litigants and the public at large are entitled to receive decisions from our court rooted in precedent and based on rigorous analysis of the parties' submissions. Today's decision meets neither test. Instead, the majority conveniently defenestrates controlling precedent and proceeds on substituted premises.

*Planned Parenthood v. Moser,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Nos. 11-3235, 12-3178 & 13-3175

Judge Carlos F. Lucero, dissenting

For another double tap thriller, read Gary J. Crawford, *Double Tap* (2013), or this one, Greg Trapp, *The Doubletap* (2004), or maybe this one, Stephen Leather, *The Double Tap* (1996).

*Hornaday v. Doubletap,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 13-4085

Judge Paul J. Kelly, Jr.

James Kirby says the jury's award against him is too much. True, he helped start and served as a director of StorageCraft, a computer software company. True, after a falling out with his colleagues he stole the computer source code on which the company's products depend. True, he shared the source code with NetJapan, a rival company that quickly produced a competing software product much like StorageCraft's. But the jury's \$2.92 million trade secret misappropriation award is still too much.

*Storagecraft v. Kirby*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 12-4182

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

This case comes to us with a  
tortured past and an ironic twist

*USA v. James*, 10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No.  
11-1270

Senior Judge Terrence L. O'Brien

In this case, defense counsel's comment was asinine and the State's characterization of it as such during rebuttal did not rise to the level of prosecutorial misconduct.

*State v. Fouse*, 2014 UT App 29

Judge Gregory K. Orme



But conclusory legalese (borrowed from far-flung substantive due process doctrine, no less) does no more to prove a compelling interest than post-hoc rationalizations unsupported by record evidence

*Yellowbear v. Lampert,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 12-8048

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

At a meeting to discuss the [Performance Assessment and Development Review], Mr. Cox's managers warned him that if he failed to improve, he could be placed on a Personal Improvement Plan . . . . During the meeting Mr. Cox wore earphones to avoid hearing his managers' criticisms and he refused to sit down

*Cox v. Lockheed Martin Corp.,*

10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No. 13-1038

Judge Harris L. Hartz

