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



IN THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR NEZ PERCE COUNTY:

DPW ENTERPRISES LLC and MOUNTAIN PRIME 2018 LLC.

Plaintiff -Respondents,

٧.

JEREMY L. BASS,

Defendant-Appellant,

and

DWAYNE PIKE, and CURRENT OCCUPANT, and Unknown Parties in Possession of the real property commonly known as 1515 21st Avenue, Lewiston, Idaho 83501

Defendants,

DIANE ASH

Docket No. 52552-2024

Case No. CV35-24-1063

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

11

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Jeremy L. Bass ("Defendant"), perforce pro se, submits this *Memorandum in Support of Motion to Stay*. This Court entered judgment against Defendant on <u>December 16th, 2024</u>, ordering enforcement against his property located at 1515 21st Avenue, Lewiston, Idaho. Defendant has filed a timely *Notice of Appeal* and now seeks a stay of enforcement pending appellate review pursuant to *Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d)* and *Idaho Appellate Rule 13(b)*.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Under *Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d)*, the Court has the authority to stay the enforcement of a judgment pending appeal. *Idaho Appellate Rule 13(b)* further provides that a stay may be granted under such terms and conditions as the Court deems just. When determining whether to grant a stay, courts consider:

'	'-	The tiketinood of success on appeal,	
2	2.	The threat of irreparable harm to the movant if a stay is not granted;	
3	3.	The potential harm to the opposing party from granting the stay; and	
4	4.	The public interest.	
5			
6		III. ARGUMENT	
7	1.	Substantial Questions Are Raised on Appeal	
8		The appeal raises significant legal questions concerning the validity of the foreclosure	
9		sale and compliance with Idaho Code §45-1508. Defendant's appeal challenges:	
10		a. Procedural irregularities and potential collusion at the trustee's sale, including	
11		pre-printed bid checks and improper notice;	
12		b. The failure of the foreclosure process to meet statutory and constitutional	
13		requirements, which voids the Plaintiffs' claim to the property; and	
14		c. The lack of bona fide purchaser protections due to substantive defects in the	
15		foreclosure sale process.	
16	These issues are non-frivolous and warrant careful appellate review to ensure the fairness		
17		and integrity of Idaho's foreclosure system.	
18	2.	Irreparable Harm to Defendant	
19		Absent a stay, Defendant will face:	
20		a. Immediate eviction from his primary residence, resulting in the loss of his home	
21		and disruption to his tenant's rights;	
22		b. Loss of over \$400,000 in equity in the property, which cannot be adequately	
23		compensated by monetary damages; and	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
าว

24

c. Severe financial hardship caused by the enforcement of the judgment,
exacerbated by ongoing property-related expenses totaling approximately \$600
per month for utilities, taxes, and insurance.

These harms are irreparable and justify granting a stay to preserve the status quo during the appellate process.

3. Minimal Harm to Plaintiffs

Granting a stay will impose minimal, if any, harm on Plaintiffs because:

- a. Plaintiffs purchased the property at a trustee's sale for \$165,346.71, significantly below its assessed value of \$306,545, and can recover their bid amount if the appeal voids the sale;
- Defendant's diligent maintenance of the property ensures its value is preserved,
 protecting Plaintiffs from financial loss; and
- c. A temporary delay in possession is unlikely to cause significant harm, particularly given the ongoing care provided by Defendant.

4. Public Interest Supports Granting a Stay

The public interest is served by:

- Ensuring meaningful access to appellate review, particularly in foreclosure disputes involving significant property rights;
- Promoting fairness and preventing unjust enrichment, as Plaintiffs would
 otherwise benefit from Defendant's financial contributions to maintaining the
 property; and
- Preserving stability in property ownership while substantive legal issues are resolved on appeal.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Defendar	nt respectfully requests that this Court grant the
Motion to Stay Judgment Pending Appeal ar	nd enjoin enforcement of the judgment during the
pendency of the appeal.	
Dated this <u>2nd</u> day of January 2025. Respectfully submitted,	
Jeremy L. Bass Defendant-Appellant / Perforce Pro Se	
Defendant Appellant / Periorce P10 Se	
() m () m	
Jeremy L. Bass Signa Defendant-Appellant / Perforce Pro Se	ature
=	=
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
	 Ken Nagy - Idaho Legal Aid Services, Inc. Counsel for Dwayne Pike Email: kennagy@idaholegalaid.org [✓]
	Jan Bon
	Jeremy L. Bass Signature Defendant-Appellant / Perforce Pro Se
	<u></u>
CERTIFICATION AFFIDAVIT STATE OF IDAHO)	
: ss. County of NEZ PERCE)	
Jeremy L. Bass, being sworn, deposes and sa	N/C·
That the party is the appellant in the above-	entitled appeal and that all statements in this notice
of appeal are true and correct to the best of	nis knowledge and belier.
	ature
Defendant-Appellant / Perforce Pro Se	

1

2

3

Subscribed and Sworn to before me this 2nd Notary Public for Idaho	, day of <u>January,</u> 20 <u>25</u> .
Residing at Lewiston, Id	Commission Expires: 11 21 29
ACKNOWLEDGMENT STATE OF IDAHO : SS. County of NEZ PERCE	Commission #20234757 Notary Public State of Idaho
Jeremy L. Bass , known to me to be the person whacknowledged to me that s/he executed the same. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and Notary Public for Idaho	
	KYLEE STAMPER Commission #20234757 Notary Public State of Idaho