

<b>COURT OF APPEAL,</b>	<b>APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION</b>	Court of Appeal Case Number: <b>H035035 &amp; H035318</b>
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, state bar number, and address): Geoffrey Mangers, 4124 Ross Park Dr., San Jose, CA 95118-1761 My website case document filing repository: PUBLICFORALL.COM (sorry late on completing it, am struggling to update it)		Superior Court Case Number: <b>1-08-CV-109152</b>
TELEPHONE NO.: (408) 978-8646 FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): geoffrey@mangers.org ATTORNEY FOR (Name): in pro per (because I can't afford a lawyer)		<b>FOR COURT USE ONLY</b>
APPELLANT: Geoffrey Mangers		
RESPONDENT: All parties (served or not) in 108-CV-109152		
<b>APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE BRIEF (CIVIL CASE)</b>		

**Notice: Please read *Information on Appeal Procedures for Unlimited Civil Cases* (Judicial Council form APP-001) before completing this form.**

1. I (name): **Geoffrey Mangers**  
 request that the time to file  appellant's opening brief (AOB)  respondent's brief (RB)  appellant's reply brief (ARB), now due  
 on (date): **June 21, 2010** be extended to (date): **60** days from whence all my CCP §382 parties join  
 me and the court grants me a complex designation or  
 can explain to me how to serve the rest of the parties  
 I need to enjoin in this suit without it.
2. I  have  have not received a rule 8.220 notice.
3. I have received:  
**2 extensions on H035035 but none on H035318**  
 (which are the same case)

*"5. The reason I need an extension to file this brief is.."*  
 is what this suit ultimately is all about and can be found upon  
**www.publicforall.com**  
 that Judge Cabrinha read into the record encouraging me to continue with. Along with the Appeal itself. Whereupon the  
 answer to this question (#5) can be found which (lacking space upon this form) requires a few more pages. And becomes too  
 expensive and time consuming for me to serve upon all the parties I must. So I will serve this upon the court. And also upon  
 www.publicforall.com. For all to see.

6. The last brief filed by any party was:  AOB  RB filed on (date):
7. The record in case H035035 is:
- |                             | <u>Volumes (#)</u>   | <u>Pages (#)</u>     | <u>Date filed</u>    |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Appendix/Clerks Transcript: | <u>2</u>             | <u>460</u>           | <u>Jan. 11, 2010</u> |
| Reporters Transcript:       | <u>3</u>             | <u>48 (thus far)</u> | _____                |
| Augmentation/other:         | <u>Not yet filed</u> | _____                | -                    |
8. For attorneys filing application on behalf of client:  
 I certify that I have delivered a copy of this application to my client (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.60).  
 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the information above is true and correct.  
 Date: **June 21, 2010**

**Geoffrey Mangers** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

EXTENSION OF TIME IS: **ORDER**

Granted to \_\_\_\_\_  
 Denied

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (SIGNATURE OF PRESIDING JUSTICE)

CASE NAME: G. Mangers Vs The County Of Santa Clara, Et Al	CASE NUMBER: H035035 & H035318
--	-----------------------------------

**PROOF OF SERVICE**
 **Mail**     **Personal Service**

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age CORRECTION: I just discovered *another* error I've been making in this.

2. My residence or business address is (*specify*):

Date of mailing: June 21, 2010  
Place of mailing (city and state): San Jose, California

My residence address is:  
4124 Ross Park Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95118-1761

3. I mailed or personally delivered a copy of the *Application for Extension of Time to File Brief (Civil Case)* as follows (*complete either a or b*):

a.  **Mail**. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred.

(1) I enclosed a copy in an envelope **and**

(a)  **deposited** the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.

(b) 7 envelopes were addressed and mailed as follows. Service was also made upon www.publicforall.com for all to see.

Tyler Draa, Esq.  
Barry C. Marsh, Esq.  
Scott Kanter, Esq.  
Hinshaw, Draa, Marsh, Still & Hinshaw  
12901 Saratoga Ave  
Saratoga, CA 95070-9998

The Board of Directors of  
UnitedHealth Group (PacifiCare parent)  
c/o Chair of the Board  
UnitedHealth Group Center  
9900 Bren Rd. East  
Minnetonka, MN 55343

Miguel Marquez, Esq.  
Mark Bernal, Esq.  
Office of the County Counsel  
70 West Hedding St. (East Wing, 9th Fl.)  
San Jose, CA 95110

Board of Directors of El Camino Hospital, et. al.  
c/o Wesley Alles, Chairman of the Board  
2500 Grant Road - M/S ECH123  
Mountain View, CA 94040

Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
Harry T. (Chip) Gower  
State of California Attorney General  
455 Golden Gate Ave. Ste 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004

Board of Directors of WellPoint, Inc.  
(Blue Cross / Anthem parent)  
c/o Chair of the Board  
120 Monument Circle  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Jonathan A. Corr  
Sara A. H. Sayles  
350 University Ave., Ste 200  
Sacramento, CA 95825

**This case is COMPLEX**

Barry Marsh (AMR) and Mark Bernal (County) told me on Aug. 26, 2009 in front of Judge Cabrinha that they'd be willing to accept service by myself and the court agreed to it. But I think it improper to serve only them leaving out everyone else in this class action suit. To wit, the insurance interests (which include the state itself i.e. Medi-Cal). I'd like to know how the court expects an indigent to do all this without a complex designation.

**"See me"** the court told me, and twice so. And I am negligent.

"How do I serve the rest of my defendants?" I asked (hoping the court understood the purpose of CCP §382) *"I don't know"* the court sighed. And requested a stay from me which I granted.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: June 21, 2010

Geoffrey Mangers

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

**Motion to redesignate this case as COMPLEX**  
**Motion to properly consolidate and bifurcate 1-08-CV-109152**  
**Motion to re-title this case as filed.**

**Motion to augment the record**  
The clerk's transcript is not in order.

---

**STAY REQUESTED**

*"Absent Exceptional Circumstances"*

It's upon the Appeal court's website itself:

"Civil Appellate practices and Procedures for the Self-Represented"

*.. it is necessary to have knowledge of the relevant legal authorities as they apply to the various decisions the trial judge made. This is the part of the brief that is hardest for self-represented parties. This law can be learned, but for anyone not trained as a lawyer, that learning process will probably be slow and difficult." (p.24)*

To this I must add the problems of a complex case misdesignated as not.

*"Absent Exceptional Circumstances"*

Suffice to say that if I'm to be held to this deadline today that I simply wish to file as my AOB all that I have thus far in 1-08-CV-109152 and H035318/H035035 itself. I think it speaks for itself. And far more eloquently than anything else I can think of in making the case for the plight of my class of *a//* disenfranchised litigants. Abandoned simply by their indigence and nothing else whatever. Which I expect will generate a default notice complaining about my lack of concision. And that I have yet to serve copies of the ream of pages upon the licensed attorney membership of the Santa Clara County, American, and California Bar Associations. Plus a thousand or so others comprising Board members and their lines of supervision enjoined in this. With the possibility I might have perhaps one chance in a half-million of one of them joining me as plaintiff.

---

**Motion to re-title this case as filed:**

**The LPS ("Mental Health") \$Malpractice\$ Complex**

It's confusing. I'm not suing the entirety of Santa Clara County. Only a line of supervision up from EPS. The defendants also include (among many others) billing and collection agencies (the enforcement arm of this complex). Maybe someone didn't like my punctuation or something.

1 **Motion to properly consolidate and bifurcate 1-08-CV-109152**  
2

3 I shouldn't even be talking to AMR counsel until I've served UnitedHealth Group  
4 (PacifiCare parent) on their behalf as well as the others in my class of malpractice victims  
5 who've been taken for their \$900 ride. I'm lucky it wasn't Sacramento, the county will  
6 actually do that. A quick look at the map tells me this "mental health" could have easily  
7 cost me and my insurance company over 5 grand.  
8

9 I actually know little if anything about the law and find it somewhat unusual that I seem to  
10 need to educate the court and counsel about it. I wish the AMR counsel would read the  
11 complaint that was served upon them by James Gottstein. I have yet to hear from anyone  
12 assigned to this case anything to indicate they have.  
13

---

14  
15  
16 *"Absent Exceptional Circumstances"*  
17

18 **National Medical Enterprises (1992)**  
19

20 "You can't fix it" Dr. Florence Keller told me in a moment of honest candor. The issues I  
21 am raising in this suit are intractable. And Exceptional by their lack of absence despite  
22 lawsuits and Grand Jury Investigations.  
23

24  
25 *"Absent Exceptional Circumstances"*  
26

27 It would be nice to have the CCMS "up and running" here also. And was hoping David Yamasaki's  
28 presence here would bode well for it. But hear it's still years away. And am starting to appreciate why. I've  
29 had to learn some hard lessons about software over the years. It would be nice to have a few months to get  
30 the remaining developmental work I need to do behind me. That also requires me to learn a whole new  
31 level of skills I was hoping to be spared from. I have made what I consider excellent progress in this area.  
32 But it's the debugging that constantly consumes my time. I cannot afford the resources I need to properly  
33 manage this case. As such I must build them myself. And I need to build it from the ground up. Which  
34 means I need to build the 'building' software itself if I'm to ever have any hope of being able to keep up  
35 with it all. I still have many Notices of Appeal that need to be served. And many names and addresses I've  
36 collected in my research with several hundred pages of notes.

37 Even with complex designation I'd still need to develop this capacity: "spreadsheet" .. "data base  
38 management", it's all new to me. I've just discovered OpenOffice which so far looks promising and is free.  
39 The research into this also consumes time. As does the writing of which I have done much but is still in the  
40 very rough draft stage.  
41

42 The simplest of tasks of simply automating the addressing of envelopes took me a week to finally debug.  
43 Each and every one blocking my path must be solved. It's so frustrating to *"know what it all is"* and the  
44 solution and to be held up by one's own inability to simply get it all into print.  
45

46 With all my heart I dearly wish I could complete this task "yesterday" .. "ahead of schedule" and grateful  
47 for the deadlines. Without which I would have gotten nowhere. I'm doing the best I can with what I have.  
48 And diligently attend to this task every single day.  
49

# Writ Petition

In the Sixth District Court of Appeal  
Appeal case numbers: H035035 and H035318  
These are the same case.

## **STAY REQUESTED** **Related Appeal Pending**

"See me"

the court told me and *twice* so. I've been negligent. Very negligent.

Superior Court of the County of Santa Clara case 1-08-CV-109152  
"G. Mangers Vs The County Of Santa Clara, Et Al"

"Rule 8.486. Petitions" says:

8.486 (c) (2) :

"The clerk must file any supporting documents not complying with (1), but the court may notify the petitioner that it may strike or summarily deny the petition if the documents are not brought into compliance within a stated reasonable time of not less than 5 days."

This document supports itself.

8.486 (b)(2):

"In exigent circumstances, the petition may be filed without the documents required by (1)(A)-(C) if counsel or, if the petitioner is *unrepresented*, the petitioner files a declaration that explains the urgency and the circumstances making the documents unavailable and fairly summarizes their substance."

8.486 (e) (6 )".The court may allow the petition to be filed without proof of service."

**It's impossible for me to serve all my parties without a complex designation.**  
By denying it to me the court is in essence telling me I'm not to be allowed to bring this case at all.

1 "See me" -- then again maybe I'm delusional. And think it would be wise to get an opinion  
2 from the court itself on this matter before I continue any further in it.

3 "See me" I was told. And was asked to stay any further service upon my enjoined parties.  
4 Which I granted.

5 **Secondly:**

6 I'd like the court to explain to me how it expects me to continue in the appeal of  
7 1-08-CV-109152 with all of its unserved and unjoined parties *without a complex designation*.  
8 For which I've already registered and possess all the technical skills to accomplish it with.  
9 And be able to serve *all* of my enjoined parties most of which still haven't been. Especially  
10 and including the interests of all of the unserved CCP §382 ones who should be joining me as  
11 plaintiffs. I'm an indigent and the simple cost of postage makes it impossible to meet my  
12 deadlines.

13 Neither an indigent nor a *pro se* has ever been allowed a complex designation. Why?  
14 That's blatantly discriminatory.

15 **Thirdly:**

16 Ironically, I need time to properly complete the writing of this Writ Petition itself. All this is  
17 new to me and I'm lucky to get *anyone* willing to clue me to these things.

18 **Finally:**

19 I have some issues and unanswered questions about unpublished CCP §384 *cy près*  
20 distributions and the court itself regarding the plight of all the rest in my class disenfranchised  
21 litigants. I won't even call them "unrepresented", they have been totally *abandoned* by their  
22 indigence. Because the intent of CCP §384 is being subverted.

---

23 Ultimately this suit turns into questions I have of the court itself. "See me" -- sometimes  
24 I *do* get it wrong. My problem is that I'm slow. The court was entirely correct.

25 Submitted on behalf of all those in my classes:  
(LPS malpractice victims, disenfranchised litigants and unpaid CCP §384 plaintiffs),

Geoffrey Mangers  
June 21, 2010