9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Jeremy L. Bass, Perforce Pro Se 1515 21st Ave Lewiston, ID 83501-3926 Ph: 208-549-9584 Quantum.J.L.Bass@RAWdeal.io

FILED

2024 NOV -6 P 3: 05

IN THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT PATTY θ . WEEKS FOR THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR NEZ PERCE COUNTYERK OF THE DIST COUR

DIANE ASH

DPW Enterprises LLC and Mountain Prime 2018 LLC,

Plaintiff.

VS.

Jeremy L. Bass, Dwayne Pike, and Current occupant, and Unknown Parties in Possession of the real property commonly known as 1515 21st Avenue, Lewiston, Idaho 83501

Defendants.

Case No. CV35-24-1063

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

DEMAND FOR JURY

COMES NOW the Defendant Jeremy L. Bass, (hereinafter "Defendant Bass"), Perforce Pro Se, and hereby submit to the Honorable Court's a *MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION* and moves this Court for reconsideration of its interlocutory order granting summary judgment in favor of Plaintiffs on November 5th 2024, pursuant to *Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 11.2(b)*. This motion is supported by the following:

I. Grounds for Reconsideration

- 1. Misinterpretation of *Idaho Code § 45-1508*.
 - The summary judgment decision failed to fully interpret the requirements of "good faith for value" under *Idaho Code § 45-1508*. The statute protects foreclosure purchasers only when they act in good faith and for value, not under collusive or unfair conditions.
 - The case of Baker v. Nationstar Mortg., 574 B.R. 184 (Bankr. D. Idaho 2017) clarifies that
 these protections are invalid where foreclosure sales lack evidence of default or violate
 procedural fairness, directly supporting Defendant's argument.
- 2. Failure to Consider Material Disputes of Fact:
 - Defendant's responses addressing Sections C, D, and E of PLAINTIFFS' REPLY
 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS AGAINST

 PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS IN SECTION C, DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S

ALLEGATIONS IN SECTION D, and DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS

IN SECTION E, were submitted within a limited timeframe due to service by Plaintiffs

occurring some time mid-day on Sunday, the 20th of October 2024 leaving only Monday

to put together any manor of filing while determining the correct path to respond before
the hearing on Tuesday, the 22nd of October 2024. These responses were rejected without
proper review despite raising significant procedural questions regarding notice and
procedural integrity.

- Evidence in Section D, for example, indicates Plaintiffs failed to provide verified proof of notice, an essential requirement under Idaho law. Additionally, Section C highlights evidence of pre-auction collusion, which undermines the validity of Plaintiffs' claim as bona fide purchasers.
- 3. Prejudice to Defendant and Manifest Injustice:
 - Proceeding on the basis of this order deprives Defendant of a fair opportunity to address issues essential to his property rights. The current judgment disregards statutory requirements that safeguard due process in trustee sales.

II. Procedural Grounds for Filing

The right to file a Motion for Reconsideration in Idaho courts is directly authorized by the *Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure 11.2(b)*.

- *Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 11.2(b)* (Motion for Reconsideration):
 - o Provision: *IRCP 11.2(b)* explicitly permits a party to file a motion to reconsider any order entered by the court before final judgment. This includes interlocutory orders, such as summary judgments that do not resolve all claims in a case.
 - o Timing: The rule states that a reconsideration motion can be filed "at any time prior to or within 14 days after the entry of a final judgment."
 - o Application: Since the order on summary judgment is interlocutory (not a final judgment on the entire case), *IRCP 11.2(b)* serves as the procedural basis for filing this motion,

8

allowing Defendant to request the court to review its decision before the case fully concludes.

Supporting Language for Filing: This rule provides a clear procedural pathway to challenge perceived misinterpretations or overlooked facts in a ruling. Defendant's motion, therefore, seeks to revisit the court's order based on procedural fairness and due process, with IRCP *11.2(b)* serving as the basis for reconsideration.

III. Relief Sought

Defendant respectfully requests that the Court vacate its summary judgment order, accept the previously filed memorandums, and reconsider the case with the valid authorities which at the least should allow the case to proceed to trial through the detailed legal standards set forth in the accompanying MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF RECONSIDERATION to this motion.

Dated this 6th day of November 2024. Respectfully submitted, Jeremy L. Bass Defendant/ Perforce Pro Se

Signature

[🗸]

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I have sent by email and first-class mail this MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION to Plaintiffs and Co-Defendant's counsel on November 6th, 2024, at the following email address and postal address:

lewis@hwmlawfirm.com Email: Postal: Lewis N. Stoddard, Bar No. 7766 Halliday, Watkins & Mann, P.C. 376 East 400 South, Suite 300 Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Ken Nagy

Idaho Legal Aid Services, Inc.

Email: kennagy@idaholegalaid.org

Counsel for Dwayne Pike

[

Jeremy L. Bass

Defendant/ Perforce Pro Se

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGMENT STATE OF IDAHO : ss.	COMI	NIE HAUEF M. #201901 ARY PUBLIC TE OF IDAH	60 C			
County of NEZ PERCE)		~~~~				
On the 6th day of Novem	<u>ber</u> , 20:	24, before	me, the ur	idersigned I	Notary Pu	blic,
personally appeared <u>Jeremy Bass</u> to the foregoing instrument, and acknowledge.	_, known owledged	to me to t	ne the pers at s/he exe	on whose n cuted the s	ame is su ame.	bscribea
TN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my ha	and and s	eal the da	ay and year	as above w	vritten.	
Notary Public for Idaho						
Residing at Olviston						
		Commiss	sion Expires	1/28/	2025	
		Commiss	sion expires	s: <u>c1001</u>		