

Appeals Case # 13-15-307 (previously 03-15-357)  
Travis District Court Case # D-1-GN-13-001230  
Hamilton v Davila  
Alan L. Hamilton  
9902 Childress Dr  
Austin, Texas 78753  
512-832-6384  
[AlanHamilton@ProBaitCourt.com](mailto:AlanHamilton@ProBaitCourt.com)

November 27, 2015

Dorian E Ramirez  
13<sup>th</sup> COA Court and Clerk  
NUECES COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
901 LEOPARD, 10TH FLOOR  
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78401  
361-888-0416 (TEL)  
361-888-0794 (FAX)

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING  
([www.greenfiling.com](http://www.greenfiling.com))  
and with check via US Mail.

Dear Clerks and Appeals Court,

This is in response to your letter dated 11/18/2015 (6:01pm via email). A 10 day response would then be due on 11/30/2015.

The dealings with the courts get curiouser and curiouser. We have been asked for \$5 and now \$10 more, for the privilege of asking the court clerks to do their job and fix what we already paid \$1200 for. When returning something to department store because it is not functional, you do not get charged for returning the damaged item, indeed you get an apology and a quick replacement. Regardless of the law, there are standards for customer service, that should be a goal of any office that serves the public.

We shall remit a \$15 check today, to the above snail mail address, as we do not wish to give you a \$15 reason not to do your job. Why the Clerk's Record was not rejected simultaneously as your letter to the Appellant on 11/18/2015, in order to save time and begin the bug fix process, remains a mystery. Indeed, rejecting the Clerk's Record would have made the request for \$15 from the Appellant unnecessary at that point, and solved the problem completely for everyone, once and for all.

Why this has not been the chosen action will be a question for the 2016 Campaign Trail. This has all been an unnecessary emotional and financial abuse of an elderly man, with only a \$500 social security check to depend on each month. After the theft of his retirement, he is being further robbed by the court, not even getting the *minimum-standards* document he paid for, needed in order to seek justice in the courts.

As well, GreenFiling charges \$5 for each electronic filing. These amounts may not seem like much to the court, but to an elderly man, who depends on his \$500 monthly social security check while seeking his stolen retirement, these fruitless filings for seemingly common sense issues, is draining, emotionally and financially.

The point of the 11/13/2015 letter, which has now been turned into a "\$10 Motion", was: we need to know if we are in agreement with the court clerk on how to count "court days", as described in detail in the 11/13/2015 letter. It is regularly done by the clerk without court assistance, but is apparently being done erroneously. Unless necessary, we do not want to waste any of our allotted "Motion" words on an issue which only involves counting days and should be easily agreed upon with the court clerk.

As well, we are asking the Appeals Clerk for equal application of the TRAP rule 9.4, which would eliminate the need for the motion at all.

Sincerely,

  
Alan L. Hamilton, Appellant, Pro Se

cc:

Appellee's Attorney:  
Hon. Karen L. Landinger  
Cokinos, Bosien and Young  
10999 W Ih 10 Ste 800  
San Antonio, TX 78230-1349

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING  
([www.greenfiling.com](http://www.greenfiling.com))

cc:

Velva L. Price  
Travis County District Clerk  
1000 Guadalupe Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING  
([www.greenfiling.com](http://www.greenfiling.com))