

20161022_00ack

1. Your honor: I am the appellant in this controversy and I represent myself. The issue in this appeal is the interpretation of an order issued by this Court three years ago in 2013-P-1536.

2. The Appeals Court ruled as follows:

"The judgment is reversed.

We remand this case to the Superior Court for entry of a new judgment that directs the board to conduct a hearing to determine whether the order that the plumbing must be completely removed is justified by the specific violations that are noted in the inspection report and substantiated by photos.

Both parties are required to provide competent evidence to the board concerning the effect of the deficiencies and whether they support an order to completely remove the plumbing. The board shall be directed to make specific findings about why the entire system needs to be removed or, if that is not necessary, what needs to be fixed by a plumber."

2a. Poor workmanship is not a "specific violation".

2b. The Board's conclusions may not be based on its clandestine interpretation of an exhibit in its possession for 2 1/2 years.

2c. The Board's conclusions must be based solely on the competent evidence at the Hearing.

2c1. The only competent evidence at the Hearing was the testimony of Christopher Gordon to the effect that the few specific deficiencies which he noted did not require destruction of the entire system, and that these deficiencies if left uncorrected would not impair the functioning of the system.

2c2. Mr. Gordon's Testimony must be the basis of the Board's ruling.

3. The Superior Court was remiss in its failure to take judicial notice of:

3a. Items 2a through 2c2 above.

3b. The laws of optical perspective

3c. The definition of full S-trap

3d. Previous judgments of the Appeals Court in this case.

3e. FTC v NC Board of Dental Examiners

4. The explanation for the alleged need that the system be destroyed is incongruous, inasmuch as it implies that no plumbing system could ever be built.