

JAN 11 2023

Bowen Greenwood  
Clerk of Supreme Court  
State of Montana

Annelies Aiking-Taylor  
430 Evans Ave.  
Missoula, MT 59801  
[annelies.aikingtaylor@gmail.com](mailto:annelies.aikingtaylor@gmail.com)  
Appellant

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA  
No. DA-22-0393

Annelies Aiking-Taylor,  
Appellant

**NOTICE OF ERRATA**

v.

Oliver Serang,  
Appellee

Appellant Annelies Aiking-Taylor respectfully submits this errata to her Reply Brief, which was filed on Friday, January 6, 2023. She asks the Court to please disregard the last section of argument 3a on page 11, as this passage does not fit the scope of the Brief, and is un-edited as Aiking-Taylor had meant to take this passage out.

Upon review after filing the Brief, Aiking-Taylor realized that she had failed to take the passage out.

DATED Monday, January 9, 2022,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Annelies Aiking-Taylor", written over a horizontal line.

Annelies Aiking-Taylor, Appellant pro se

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have emailed a copy of this Notion of Errata to the attorney of the opposing party as follows:

Lou Villemez,  
[lou.villemez@mso.umt.edu](mailto:lou.villemez@mso.umt.edu)

DATED Monday, January 9, 2022,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Annelies Aiking-Taylor", written over a horizontal line.

Annelies Aiking-Taylor, Appellant pro se

ATTACHMENT: Page 11 of Aiking-Taylor's Reply Brief with the passage in question crossed out.

the very beginning, and Aiking-Taylor has reason to suspect prejudice. Aiking-Taylor

Taylor thinks that DC violated 3 Federal Laws against her:

1. Federal Law about how prevailing parties are determined (which is what this appeal is about),
2. Federal Rules of Civil procedure, Rule 56(A), the conditions under which summary judgment may be granted, and
3. The Constitution's Equal Protection Clause; Aiking-Taylor knows of more pro se females in this particular DC court whose lives were destroyed by the same dismissive treatment; Aiking-Taylor also knows that the same thing happens throughout the country to pro se females, as the Guardian has been publishing.

Aiking-Taylor has solid reason to not feel safe in Judge Larson's Court, and since Judge Larson made very clear that he does not want her in his Court either (Order p.2), Aiking-Taylor once again respectfully implores SC to not remand this case back to his Court.

3b.) In order to convince SC that Aiking-Taylor is vexatious, Serang's Appellee's Brief puts forward a dizzying array of derisive adjectives and derogatory descriptions of Aiking-Taylor's filings. None of the allegations are proven or true. Aiking-Taylor obviously cannot react to all of them in this Reply