

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF WAKE

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
DISTRICT COURT DIVISION
FILE NO. 24-CV-022933-910

CHARITY MAINVILLE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
ANNA DE SANTIS and)
DE SANTIS RENTALS, LLC,)
)
 Defendants.)

**NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL
IRREGULARITY AND RECORD
TAMPERING RISK**

NOW COMES Plaintiff, Charity Mainville, pro se, and respectfully provides notice to the Court of significant procedural irregularities and the potential for selective record withholding, which raise serious due process concerns and impair Plaintiff's ability to seek timely and meaningful appellate relief:

1. On May 2, 2025, immediately after Plaintiff filed an Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order under Rule 65(b) and related filings, the district court docket reflected a series of appellate denials, including:
 - a. Denial of Plaintiff's Motion for En Banc Rehearing;
 - b. Denial of Plaintiff's Petition for Writ of Prohibition;
 - c. Denial of Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions.
2. However, despite these appellate actions being made visible, the docket does **not reflect** several key orders, including:
 - a. The Court's order granting Defendants-Appellees' Motion Directing Plaintiff-Appellant to Proceed with the Record Settlement Process under Rule 11(c), or in the Alternative, Motion for Retroactive Extension of Time;

- b. The Court's order denying Plaintiff's Motion for Leave;
 - c. The Court's order denying Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider;
 - d. The Court's order denying Defendants' Motion to Strike.
- 3. The selective appearance of only certain rulings on the public record, while excluding others of equal or greater procedural consequence, raises serious concerns of biased or inconsistent docketing.
- 4. This concern is heightened by the fact that Defendants specifically referenced these orders in their April 30, 2025, response to the North Carolina Supreme Court. The appearance of these three denials only after Defendants invoked them in a higher court filing while leaving out others raises the risk of selective posting to support a narrative adverse to Plaintiff. In addition, these orders were issued after the time of the orders that are missing.
- 5. These actions further compound the documented pattern of procedural misconduct, one-sided rulings, and inconsistent application of the rules, which Plaintiff has previously brought to the Court's attention.
- 6. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:
 - a. Identify and publish **all orders and filings** related to motions filed by both parties since the initiation of appellate activity;
 - b. Ensure that all record-related activity is properly docketed and accessible to both parties.

This notice is made to preserve Plaintiff's objections, protect the appellate record, and place the Court on formal notice of potential due process violations.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of May, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charity Mainville", is written over a horizontal line.

Charity Mainville
Plaintiff, Pro Se
2025 Watchorn St, Apt 504
Durham, NC 27703