



DOCKET (Southern District Court of Ohio), last updated Mar. 28, 2015

Jonathan N. Waters v. Michael V. Drake, Joseph E. Steinmetz, PhD, and The Ohio State University, 14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK, September 26, 2014 (S.D. Ohio 2014).

Doc. No.	Date	English translation; Commentary	Filename	Size
01	Sep. 26, 2014	Jon Waters' Complaint against Ohio State (including Michael V. Drake, Joseph A. Steinmetz)	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-09-26-Doc-No-01-COMPLAINT-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Sep-26-2014.pdf	31.5 MB
02	Sep. 26, 2014	Judge Algernon L. Marbley was assigned to the case, then recused himself. Marbley has since been sanctioned by the Ohio Ethics Commission for violating Ohio Revised Code 3335.09 which prohibits trustees from being paid as instructors. Marbley has received over \$140,000 in compensation as an adjunct professor of law from 2007-2014. Marbley's egregious disregard for Ohio law taints ALL proceedings of the OSU Trustees in which he participated. In law, fraud <i>undoes</i> decisions made by bodies whose proceedings are tainted by the defrauder—including the decision to fire Jon Waters. <i>Ab initio</i> —as if they had never occurred.	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-09-26-Doc-No-02-JUDGE-MARBLEY-RECUSAL-ORDER-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Sep-26-23-2014.pdf	15 KB
08	Oct. 23, 2014	Drake et al Answer the Complaint	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-10-23-Doc-No-08-DRAKE-ANSWER-TO-COMPLAINT-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Oct-23-2014.pdf	22.1 MB
09	Oct. 23, 2014	Drake et al ask the Court to dismiss the Complaint based solely on their Answer. (Rarely granted. According to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a judge cannot	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-10-23-Doc-No-09-DRAKE-MOTION-FOR-JUDGMENT-ON-PLEADINGS-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-	420 KB

		dismiss a case unless there are <i>no disputes of material fact</i> ; otherwise, the disputed facts must be presented to a jury — "the trier of fact")	Oct-23-2014.pdf	
11	Nov. 17, 2014	Waters opposed Drake's motion	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-11-17-Doc-No-11-WATERS-MEMO-IN-OPPOSITION-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Nov-17-2014.pdf	2.4 MB
13	Dec. 04, 2014	Drake et al reply to Waters' opposition. (This is normal procedure: (a) motion, (b) response, (c) reply. The one making the motion gets two shots at making their argument, but the one opposing only one.)	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2014-12-04-Doc-No-13-DRAKE-REPLY-MEMO-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Dec-04-2014.pdf	5.2 MB
15	Jan. 09, 2015	Drake et al claim Waters' discovery requests are "overbroad and burdensome." Sometimes true, other times just lawyer stonewalling and stalling.	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-01-09-Doc-No-15-DRAKE-MOTION-TO-STAY-DISCOVERY-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Jan-09-2015.pdf	171 KB
17	Feb. 02, 2015	Waters' opposed the Stay delay in discovery.	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-02-02-Doc-No-17-WATERS-MEMO-IN-OPPOSITION-TO-STAY-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Feb-02-2015.pdf	46 K
21	Feb. 19, 2015	Drake et al reply to Waters' opposition.	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-02-19-Doc-No-21-DRAKE-REPLY-MEMO-IN-SUPPORT-OF-STAY-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Feb-19-2015.pdf	159 K
22	Mar. 18, 2015	Court approves Drake et al's Stay motion. (Not surprising; courts usually grant a first request such as this to avoid complaints of unfairness to the one requesting the delay, as long such requests are not abused.)	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-03-18-Doc-No-22-ORDER-STAY-OF-DISCOVERY-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Mar-18-2015.pdf	50 K
23	Mar. 23, 2015	Court asks for clarification of some evidence. Since Drake has asked the Court to dismiss this case based solely on his allegedly indisputable facts, the Court is evaluating his evidence. This request appears to be helping Drake, who is required by the Rules to have fully argued his case in his pleadings—without the Court's assistance. This request may be improper since the Court is also required by the Rules to reject Drake's request if his pleadings are insufficient to make his case <i>on their face</i> (without help from the Court). This request may be prejudicial to Jon.	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-03-23-Doc-No-23-ORDER-INFO-REQUEST-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Mar-23-2015.pdf	54 K
Dckt.		This is merely a snapshot of the docket for this case as it is on Mar. 28, 2015	http://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/jonwaters/2015-03-28-DOCKET-SNAPSHOT-Waters-v-Drake-Steinmetz-et-al-14-cv-01704-JLG-TPK-Mar-28-2015.pdf	228 K

NOTICE: This document may contain opinion. As with all opinion, it should not be relied

upon without independent verification. Think for yourself.

Prepared by WE STAND WITH JON friends.

Reinstate Jon Waters.