

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION ONE

ALKIVIADES DAVID, et al.,
Defendants and Appellants,

v.

JANE DOE,
Plaintiff and Respondent.

Case Nos. B341119 (consolidated with B345361)
Trial Court No. 20STCV37498

APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL DEVELOPMENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Appellant Alkiviades David, appearing in propria persona, respectfully submits this Supplemental Notice to advise the Court of recent procedural developments and matters in the record that bear on the fairness and reliability of the proceedings below.

This Notice is submitted for informational purposes only. It does not seek to augment the record or request relief. It is offered solely to assist the Court in evaluating whether the judgment arose from a materially fair process.

II. RESPONDENT'S CONTINUED DEFAULT

On March 17, 2026, this Court issued a Notice of Default pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.220. Respondent has not filed a Respondent's Brief. Absent cure, the appeal will proceed on Appellant's Opening Brief alone, and the Court may decide the matter without oral argument.

III. ADA ACCOMMODATIONS AND ACCESS TO THE COURT

Appellant is a disabled litigant with a documented neurological condition that affects executive functioning, stress regulation, and cognitive processing under litigation pressure. The record reflects denial of meaningful accommodations, interference with Appellant's service animal, and conduct that materially impaired his ability to participate.

These circumstances directly implicate Appellant's constitutional right of meaningful access to the courts and his opportunity to be heard.

IV. PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES

The proceedings below included lack of effective notice after counsel's withdrawal, Requests for Admission deemed admitted without Appellant's meaningful participation, and directed findings and jury instructions predicated on those admissions.

Taken together, these irregularities raise substantial concern as to whether the adversarial

process functioned as intended.

V. EVIDENTIARY IRREGULARITIES

The record further reflects exclusion or limitation of relevant evidence and irregularities in exhibit handling that affected the completeness of the evidentiary presentation.

These issues bear directly on whether the fact-finder received a fair and accurate record.

VI. RELATED FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS

Appellant is involved in related federal litigation involving overlapping allegations of interference with electronic storage devices, removal of surveillance materials, and restricted access to evidentiary items. While those matters are not before this Court for adjudication, they supply relevant context for understanding the environment in which the state-court proceedings occurred.

VII. PREJUDICE

The foregoing procedural and evidentiary issues impaired Appellant's ability to pursue legal remedies, maintain access to important data and evidence, and avoid practical prejudice extending beyond ordinary litigation burden.

VIII. CORROBORATING MATERIALS

California attorneys Matthew Huzaineh and James C. Bohm have provided statements describing concerns regarding evidentiary issues, procedural irregularities, and the broader litigation environment. In addition, attorney Ellyn S. Garofalo provided a declaration in related proceedings describing document production and exhibit-handling irregularities. These materials provide additional professional context regarding the matters raised.

IX. CUMULATIVE PREJUDICE

Viewed cumulatively, the denial of meaningful ADA accommodations, procedural irregularities, evidentiary limitations, and resulting prejudice impaired Appellant's fundamental right to a fair hearing. These combined factors raise serious doubt as to whether the judgment below was the product of a reliable and fair adjudicative process.

X. CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully submits this Notice to assist the Court in its review of the record and its evaluation of the fairness and reliability of the proceedings. The matters identified herein are relevant to whether the judgment below was the product of a materially fair adjudicative process.

Dated: March 28, 2026

St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda

/s/ Alkiviades David

ALKIVIADES DAVID

Appellant, In Propria Persona