

STATE OF MICHIGAN

SUPREME COURT

TAMARA FILAS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

Supreme Court No. 151198

Court of Appeals No: 317972

Circuit Court No: 13-000652-NI

-vs-

KEVIN THOMAS CULPERT, AND
EFFICIENT DESIGN, INC., A Michigan
Corporation.

Defendants-Appellees.

TAMARA FILAS Plaintiff-Appellant 6477 Edgewood Rd. Canton, MI 48187 (734) 751-0103 e-mail redacted	MICHAEL C. O'MALLEY (P59108) Attorney for Defendant Efficient Design Vandever Garzia 840 W. Long Lake Rd., Suite 600 Troy, MI 48098 (248) 312-2940 momalley@vgpclaw.com
DREW W. BROADDUS (P64658) Attorney for Defendant Culpert Secrest Wardle 2600 Troy Center Drive, P.O. Box 5025 Troy, MI 48007-5025 (616) 272-7966 dbroaddus@secrestwardle.com	JAMES C. WRIGHT (P67613) Attorney for Defendant Efficient Design Zausmer, Kaufman, August & Caldwell, P.C. 31700 Middlebelt Rd., Suite 150 Farmington Hills, MI 48334 (248) 851-4111 jwright@zkact.com

**PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S MOTION TO WAIVE 10-PAGE LIMIT ON
PL-AT'S REPLY TO DF-AE CULPERT'S ANSWER
TO PL-AT'S APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE MSC**

Now comes Plaintiff-Appellant (“PL-AT”), Tamara Filas, requesting a waiver of the 10-page limit on her Reply Brief e-filed with the Supreme Court on 4-13-15.

1. PL-AT is filing *pro se*.
2. On 4-13-15, PL-AT e-filed “PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT’S REPLY TO DEFENDANT-APPELLEE THOMAS K. CULPERT’S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT’S APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL” with the Michigan Supreme Court. The Defendant-Appellee’s attorney, incorrectly listed the name of the Defendant-Appellee as Thomas K. Culpert in his answer. The correct name of the Defendant Appellee is Kevin Thomas Culpert.
3. PL-AT is unable to reduce her filing down to 10 pages without compromising her ability to properly address the arguments in DF-AE’s 3-23-15 Answer to PL-AT’s Application for Leave to the MSC.
4. As required by MCR 7.212(G), PL-AT did confine her arguments to rebuttal of the arguments in DF-AE’s brief.
5. DF-AE’s 3-23-15 Answer to PL-AT’s Application for Leave to the MSC was over 18 pages, and contained numerous false statements in regard to the history of the case, and the events occurring at the 3-3-15 hearing on oral arguments that were related to the 11-25-14 Order which is the basis of this appeal.
6. DF-AE’s 3-23-15 Answer to PL-AT’s Application for Leave to the MSC also contained arguments from DF-AE’s first Motion to Affirm dated 12-30-13 that were already ruled upon by the COA by its denial of this Motion on 2-11-14.
7. To fail to rebut the statements and cite evidence for justification would indicate that PL-AT agreed with them. Because of the inaccurate history presented by the DF-AE

and the associated arguments, to adequately reply required comprehensive responses from PL-AT, even though in regard to some arguments, she merely cited pages to reference in other filings, i.e. those already presented by DF-AE in the 12-30-13 Motion, which were rejected by the COA on 2-11-14.

8. Thereby, PL-AT's Reply required more than 10 pages to properly address the history, issues, and arguments presented by DF-AE.
9. Even if PL-AT's leave of appeal to the MSC is not granted, all filings in this case, including those in DF-AE's brief in opposition to her application for leave to appeal to the MSC that have erroneous information or statements made by the Defendants that will remain available in the public record for a considerable length of time, if they are not rebutted by PL-AT in her Reply Brief to DF-AE Culpert's Answer to PL-AT's Application for Leave to Appeal to the MSC. These erroneous statements or information could cause harm to Plaintiff and/or others who consider them as fact, if not addressed as untrue or rebutted in PL-AT's Reply Brief.
10. PL-AT did her best to limit the number of pages without compromising the integrity of her brief. Reducing the number of pages will result in the elimination of important information and arguments from being taken into consideration that will clearly compromise her ability to have fair chance of having her leave of appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court granted.
11. PL-AT has no legal training or education which may have facilitated the reduction of pages in this filing. Preparing a brief is a more difficult and arduous task for anyone who is not an attorney who does not have the staff assistance or the experience of an attorney to prepare unfamiliar legal filings, but for Ms. Filas it is even more difficult

due to the extent and volume of the numerous other legal issues she has to attend to as a result of being in an auto accident in which she suffered personal injuries.

12. PL-AT's resources are limited and PL-AT has other lawsuits that require attention. To devote more time to the 4-13-15 Reply Brief would compromise the amount of time available to answer DF-AE Efficient Design's 3-30-15 Answer, to write two other Applications for Leave to Appeal to the MSC in regard to the 3-10-15 Opinion in this case and a 3-4-15 Order in COA Case No. 325172, and tend to issues related to her Office of Retirement Services case filed in the Ingham Circuit Court, Case No. 14-692-CZ.

Wherefore, PL-AT prays her Motion to Waive the 10-page limitation on her Reply to DF-AE's Response to PL-AT's Application for Leave to Appeal to the MSC is granted, and her 45-page brief filed 4-13-15 is accepted as "effective."

Thank you for your consideration of this Motion.

Respectfully submitted on 4-13-15,

signature redacted

Tamara Filas
6477 Edgewood
Canton, MI 48187
(734) 751-0103

e-mail redacted