# COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

# FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

### DIVISION ONE

BRUCE J. KELMAN,
Plaintiff and Respondent,
v.
SHARON NOONAN KRAMER,
Defendant and Appellant.
D062764
San Diego County No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC



#### THE COURT:

The court has received the Appellant's letter and declaration dated January 28, 2013, in which she demands that this court recall and rescind the remittitur issued in *Kelman v. Kramer* (Sept. 14, 2010, D054496 [nonpub. opn.]). As the Appellant's same request was denied in that earlier proceeding, the court declines to take any action on the current request. The court also takes no action in response to the Appellant's demand that it "prove [that it has] subject matter jurisdiction" over in the pending appeal, which the Appellant initiated by filing a notice of appeal on September 28, 2012. (See Cal. Const., art. VI, § 11, subd. (a); Code Civ. Proc., § 904.1, subd. (a) [recognizing that a court of appeal has subject matter jurisdiction over appeals from judgments or appealable orders arising in unlimited civil cases].)

MCCONNELL

Presiding Justice

cc: All Parties

# COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

### FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

FEB 6 2013 Stephen W. Kelly, Clerk

BRUCE J. KELMAN,
Plaintiff and Respondent,
v.
SHARON NOONAN KRAMER,
Defendant and Appellant.
D062764
San Diego County No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

#### THE COURT:

The court has received the Appellant's letter filed on February 1, 2013, reiterating her previous demands that it prove its subject matter jurisdiction over her appeal in this matter and that it recall and rescind the remittiturs issued in *Kelman v. Kramer* (Nov. 16, 2006, D047758 [nonpub. opn.]) and *Kelman v. Kramer* (Sept. 14, 2010, D054496 [nonpub. opn.]). The court takes no action on the Appellant's repetitive demands.

MCCONNELL

Presiding Justice

cc: All Parties