

**United States District Court
District of Minnesota**

Christopher Roller
(Plaintiff)

vs.

Anthony Ostlund & Baer, P.A.,
(Defendant)

Civil Action No. 07-1296 (JRT/FLN)
Memo in Support of Motion for Partial
Summary Judgment

Memo in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment

ARGUMENTS

There is an undisputed allegation that Richard Ostlund conspired to kill me. Here's the story... On 06Feb2007, I sent Richard Ostlund my discovery interrogatories for related case 06-04702 asking for things of the godly nature, crimes committed against Chris Roller, etc. That night, I was attending a Texas Hold'em poker game at Benchwarmer Bobs in Burnsville, MN. Just after I got there, about 7:00pm, after sitting at the table, someone informed me of the astronaut lady who wore diapers on an escapade to remedy a lovers triangle - Lisa "diaper" Nowak. Here's the allegation - Ostlund forwarded my controversial interrogatories to James Randi and other mob/mafia, and those groups tried to kill me that same night, resulting in the "loss of mind" of Lisa Nowak side-effect similar to the "loss of mind" school shootings. Normally these hits result in a school shooting and death. Lisa "diaper" Nowak was the result of another hit on Chris Roller. I wish all my hits had this funny of a side-effect. The hit occurred approximately when I was told about Lisa Nowak, at Benchwarmer Bobs. I

would like to bring suit against the owners of Benchwarmer Bobs, among dozens of others, in my motion for joinder.

I read the defense's statement "that AOB, acting herein solely as defense counsel to JREF, committed no actionable offense of any sort against Mr. Roller."



I'm going to believe this statement. It says acting "solely". Have to pay attention to the wording. I allege Ostlund can't make the statement, "that AOB, committed no actionable offense of any sort against Mr. Roller." The "solely" is important because I believe many companies/organizations were involved in the alleged hit.

I need to see a statement in the reply about this hit attempt, otherwise my allegation is the truth and a fact. I charge \$1 trillion/hit. I recommend making the statement denying the claim.

Understand, I'm accusing Richard Ostlund of trying to kill me. Make a statement denying it and I go away. Please make a direct statement, "Richard Ostlund did not conspire to kill Chris Roller on 06Feb2007".

Don't want to hear this is not proof. The truth is the proof. If somebody robbed me and then sold everything, leaving no evidence, all the evidence that remains is the truth of the accused under oath. Simple interrogation. I ask the robber and if he doesn't deny it, he did it. I realize the defense finds this truth stuff unusual, but here's how it works. I make accusations, and you need to deny it, otherwise the accusation is true. If I accuse you of trying to kill me, then simply state it didn't happen. If you don't, then it's because you can't lie, and thus you did it. If I say I have an infringeable patent and I'm wrong, then deny it. This is what you did. Good job. See, you can do it! If I say you were in a car wreck with me and I'm

mistaken, then tell me. This is how an investigation works. If a police officer asks if you committed a crime, you simply deny it if you didn't do it because it's comfortable and it's the truth under oath. Of course, if you did do it, you might not admit it because it's uncomfortable, and you're incapable of lying under oath, thus tongue-tied. I'm conducting an investigation in a similar fashion. You see, I need discovery to get to the truth. The defense runs away trying to say I don't have any proof. It's the chicken and egg concept. I need discovery to have a claim so I can get discovery. So, what I did was to create opening discovery by making accusations. I still have yet to have any acknowledgement of those claims of murder conspiracy against Chris Roller. I assume this is a provable (fact) methodology, but I wanted to further my method of discovery. You see, I'm making the motion for partial summary judgment to help provide evidence of the hit. What I expected in the reply is "Ostlund did not try to kill you, Chris. Thus you have no claim." which would put my mind at ease. Instead I got an ignoring of the hit. You see, it's an interrogation method without the torture. Nobody is going to make a statement in a reply, "Yes Richard Ostlund tried to kill you, Chris Roller". What the defense does is avoid the question if the truth is uncomfortable (can't lie), and sidetrack it with something else, like ignoring the hit allegation completely. When I make an accusation, I expect something in direct response to it. Like when I said, "I'm suing for patent infringement", defense spoke right up and said "Chris, you're not ripe with no issued patent and thus nothing to infringe, and thus no claim." Defense defended that claim, but didn't acknowledge my hit claims. That's because the defense is trying to avoid the uncomfortable truth, that Chris Roller has been conspired against.

Normally, a dispute for summary judgment would argue a different viewpoint.

For example, I claim "I stopped at an intersection prior to the crash", and the defense comes back and says, "no you ran the stop sign and crashed". If I say, "Ostlund tripped me.", I expect a statement of counter, "Ostlund did not trip you Chris. You're mistaken". That's all I'm asking, to acknowledge the accusation with a true statement, not side-step it. With nothing said to deny the accusation, it means it's an undisputed claim for relief.

So please make a statement, "Richard Ostlund did not conspire to kill Chris Roller 06Feb2007". This is truth under oath time. Tell me that Richard Ostlund didn't do it, and it's the truth and I go away. Otherwise, it happened, and I have an undisputed claim to avoid dismissal and grant partial summary judgment.

This "fess-up" phenomenon (truth serum) has been proven by a number of cases now, including this one. Further proof of the phenomenon is the fact that no one under oath can make the statement "[Name] does not have godly powers". Try it! I do suspect everyone can fly outside of Chris Roller's reality bubble, or walk on water. Try this one, "[Name] cannot walk on water." We got ourselves a weird world if no one can make that statement.

Here's the problem with all the hit attempts and poisoning attempts. Take a sample of a hundred people, and ask them if hit attempts and poisonings would be good for a holy godly entity. ≥ 90 of the 100 are going to say, "Oh crap, those poisonings and hits can't be good! Chris Roller is going to hell in a hand-basket. Chris Roller is probably going to turn tables on us at the 11th hour and initiate a hell-ish world-wide magic whoop-ass on the planet." So see, this is the major detriment to the crimes committed against Chris Roller. Perhaps the poisonings are a mental/spirit cancer for Chris Roller. Perhaps there's a breaking point, a

point of no return for Chris Roller's good-ness. Maybe the effects won't be apparent for years. There is also emotional/mental distress related to the hits - I'm nuts now because of the hits/poison.

This partial summary judgment is partially a civil tort for criminal wrong - for assault (U.S.C 18 § 111), fraud, projected wrongful death, attempted murder (U.S. C 18 § 1113), conspiracy to commit murder (U.S.C 18 § 1117), and emotional/mental distress (I'm nuts now because of the hit/poison). Statute of limitations is 6 years from the date of discovery of the fraud/crime per MN § 541.05.

In the reply to this motion, all I need to see is

"Richard Ostlund did not conspire to kill Chris Roller on 06Feb2007"

and I will rescind this motion. Otherwise, the hit occurred, and the fact remains undisputed, and this is the evidence needed for partial summary judgment.

CONCLUSION

For reasons stated above, Chris Roller is asking for partial summary judgment. I seek relief in the amount of \$trillion. Ostlund has yet to deny the James Randi's hit. Will/can he deny his own.

Date: __10 Sep 2007__

__s/_ Christopher A. Roller__
Christopher Roller (pro se)
13150 Harriet Ave. S #273
Burnsville , MN 55337
952.239.6410