

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

SAMUEL K. LIPARI,	)
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)
	)
v.	) Civil No. 07-0849-CV-W-FJG
	) Formerly 06-0573-CV-W-FJG
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, <i>et al.</i> ,	) Formerly 16 <sup>th</sup> Cir. Case No.0616-
<i>Defendants</i>	) CV07421

**AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Comes now the plaintiff Samuel K. Lipari appearing *pro se* and respectfully files this amended notice of appeal.

The plaintiff appeals this court's 07-0849-CV-W-FJG order (doc. 59) dated 7/30/08 granting defendants' motions for dismissal and denying plaintiff's Motion to Amend his Complaint (Doc. 49)

The plaintiff appeals this court's denial as moot the plaintiff's motion for recusal (doc. 24) Case 4:06-cv-00573-FJG in the order (doc. 29) filed 11/29/2006.

The plaintiff now amends his appeal to include an appeal of appeal of the court's rulings and findings of law regarding the plaintiff's Rule 59(e) Motion (doc.61); the plaintiff's Motion to Disqualify Attorney General Michael Mukasey (doc. 68); the court's denial of an evidentiary hearing; the court's failure to recuse itself and to uphold rulings during the pendency of the plaintiff's motion for recusal in the same matter or controversy being the present case previously removed to Western District of Missouri through fraud by the counsel for the General Electric defendants, and the plaintiff's proposed amendments to the complaint to cure the recognizable business property injury caused by the conspirators in the disruption of the plaintiff's contracts with AT&T and Sprint.

The plaintiff amends his notice of appeal to include review of clear error of the court in its findings of facts mistakenly finding the present action is a different case or controversy because the plaintiff had initiated a new suit in the Western District of Missouri court when the record of the court clearly shows the defendants removed it from the Missouri 16<sup>th</sup> Circuit and mistakenly finding the basis of the court's personal interest in the outcome is a previous recusal before Judge Ortrie D. Smith when in fact the plaintiff filed a motion for recusal in the present case or controversy when the defendants had previously removed it to this court.

Respectfully submitted,

S/ Samuel K. Lipari

Samuel K. Lipari

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify I have sent a copy via email to the undersigned and opposing counsel on 3<sup>rd</sup> of November, 2008.

John K. Power  
Leonard L. Wagner  
Michael S. Hargens  
Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP  
1200 Main Street  
Suite 2300  
Kansas City, MO 64105  
(816)283-4651  
Fax: (816)421-0596  
john.power@husch.com  
lwagner@kcsouthern.com  
michael.hargens@husch.com  
via email  
Attorneys for the GE Defendants

J. Nick Badgerow  
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne, LLP  
9401 Indian Creek Parkway  
Suite 700  
Overland Park, KS 66210  
(913)327-5134  
Fax: (913)345-0736  
Email: nbadgerow@spencerfane.com  
Attorney for Seyfarth Shaw LLP

USA John Wood  
Jeffrey P. Ray  
Office of the United States Attorney  
400 E. 9th St.  
Room 5510  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
(816) 426-3130  
Fax: (816) 426-3165  
Jeffrey.Ray@usdoj.gov  
Attorney for Bradley J. Schlozman

S/ Samuel K. Lipari

---

Samuel K. Lipari  
3520 NE Aiken  
Lee's Summit, MO 64064  
816-365-1306  
saml@medicalsupplychain.com  
*Pro se*

