

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Middle District of Florida
Jacksonville Division

BRUCE AND WENDY ANDERSON,) Case No.: 3:07-cv-844-J-25JRK
(in propria persona))
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
AMWAY/QUIXTAR, INC., a)
corporation;)
MICHAEL YOUNG McCORMICK,)
DONALD E. CHRISTOPHER,)
HAL GOOCH,)
Defendants,)

Copy

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

The Andersons are in receipt of the ORDER dated January 24th, 2008 and apologize to the court for overlooking the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Andersons are not attorneys and have not been able to find one that will talk to them once the Order of September 6th, 2000 is presented (see Amended Claim) and the mysterious ramifications of that concealed Order realized.

The Order of January 24th, 2008 stated "Plaintiffs have filed numerous improper pleadings". Also, "Plaintiffs are admonished that they are expected to review and follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of this Court". Yet, no rule was specifically cited or referred to. The Andersons found in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

Rule 12.

**Defenses and Objections: When and How Presented;
Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings; Consolidating
Motions; Waiving Defenses; Pretrial Hearing**

(a) Time to Serve a Responsive Pleading.

(1) In General.

Unless another time is specified by this rule or a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows:

(B) A party must serve an answer to a counterclaim or crossclaim within 20 days after being served with the pleading that states the counterclaim or crossclaim.

(C) A party must serve a reply to an answer within 20 days after being served with an order to reply, unless the order specifies a different time.

The Andersons ask the Courts forgiveness and understand that, **"A party must serve a reply to an answer within 20 days after being served with an order to reply"**. Yet, Rule 3.01 (a) and (b) in the Local Rules requires a reply in 10 days to motions, and (g) provides guidelines to reply, of which all have ignored and violated so far. The Andersons find the rules obscure, confusing and hieroglyphic often creating more questions than supplying answers. The Andersons do not find the rules to state that they can not, should not or will not reply. The Andersons have been tricked by the defendants many times using "times-up, statute of limitations, acquiescence, failure to respond" etc...

Even now, Mr. Gooch is trying to invoke the statute of limitations of four years on the missing court Order of September 6th, 2000, stating that the Andersons should have known about it. When in fact, the Andersons did not discover the missing document until 2004, within the four years, and have a video record of the discovery event. To this day, no "officer of the court" or official of any capacity has revealed to the Andersons the full "OFFICIAL" meaning of the document and why it was concealed from the Florida state court record. Until the Andersons get an official answer of what the document is and why the document was concealed, the statute of limitations is legally tolled by the doctrine of fraudulent concealment.

However, the Andersons do stand ready to reinforce their claims with documents and evidence against the defendants upon this Court's request. The Andersons are of the opinion that justice would be served to require the defendants to produce documents to evidence their position, such as, a "signed" agreement to arbitrate (not just a claim) and a court order validating that agreement IAW Title 9 USC section 4, (the Federal Arbitration act) not just "the arbitrator said". Something the Florida state courts failed to do. Should the defendants not be able to produce the evidence of a valid arbitration, the award should be vacated (IAW Title 9 USC Section 10) and all relief available to the Andersons awarded. Then, proceed with the charges of racketeering, discovery and to a jury trial.

The Andersons are still under the impression that a reply is required to the motions filed by Mr. Gooch for the reason they address the Amended Claim of December 12th, 2007 and the MOTION TO VACATE THE ARBITRATION AWARD filed January 3rd, 2008. The Andersons are still confused at the courts response to their reply to Mr. McCormick's "NON" answer/motion, and why it was not allowed into the record. The Andersons have evidence to falsify both Mr. Gooch's and Mr. McCormick's position and claims, and respectfully plan to file replies to Mr. Gooch's motions by February 1st (IAW Rule 3.01) if not notified otherwise by this court.

Dated this 28th, day of January, 2008

Bruce Anderson

Wendy Anderson

11211 Portside Dr

Jacksonville, Florida 32225

904 236 8615