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**ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR**

1. THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED IN GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT WITHOUT GIVING THE PETITIONER PROPER NOTICE AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD
2. THE CIRCUIT COURT APPLIED AN OUTDATED STANDARD WHEN EVALUATING THE PETITIONER'S SHOWING OF GOOD CAUSE
3. DEFAULT JUDGMENT WAS IMPROPER BECAUSE THE PETITIONER DEMONSTRATED GOOD CAUSE FOR REINSTATEMENT

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. Fusce est. (A.R. 14)[[1]](#footnote-1).

Vivamus a tellus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Proin pharetra nonummy pede. Mauris et orci. Aenean nec lorem. (A.R. 56-72). In porttitor. Donec laoreet nonummy augue. Suspendisse dui purus, scelerisque at, vulputate vitae, pretium mattis, nunc. Mauris eget neque at sem venenatis eleifend. Ut nonummy. (A.R. 78).

Fusce aliquet pede non pede. Suspendisse dapibus lorem pellentesque magna. Integer nulla. Donec blandit feugiat ligula. Donec hendrerit, felis et imperdiet euismod, purus ipsum pretium metus, in lacinia nulla nisl eget sapien. Donec ut est in lectus consequat consequat. Etiam eget dui. Aliquam erat volutpat. Sed at lorem in nunc porta tristique. Proin nec augue. (A.R. 6-7, 72).

Quisque aliquam tempor magna. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Nunc ac magna. Maecenas odio dolor, vulputate vel, auctor ac, accumsan id, felis. Pellentesque cursus sagittis felis (A.R. 88).

**SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. Fusce est. Vivamus a tellus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.

Proin pharetra nonummy pede. Mauris et orci. Aenean nec lorem. In porttitor. Donec laoreet nonummy augue. Suspendisse dui purus, scelerisque at, vulputate vitae, pretium mattis, nunc. Mauris eget neque at sem venenatis eleifend.

**STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT AND DECISION**

 Because the principle issues in this case have been authoritatively decided in the Court's recent decision in Blank v. Blank, *infra*, oral argument under Rev. R.A.P. 18(a) is not necessary unless the Court determines that other issues arising upon the record should be addressed. If the Court determines that oral argument is necessary, this case is appropriate for a Rule 19 argument and disposition by memorandum decision.

**ARGUMENT**

1. **THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED IN GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT WITHOUT GIVING THE PETITIONER PROPER NOTICE AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. R.Civ. P. 41(b). Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. Fusce est. Vivamus a tellus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Proin pharetra nonummy pede. Mauris et orci. Aenean nec lorem. (A.R. 56). In porttitor. Donec laoreet nonummy augue. Suspendisse dui purus, scelerisque at, vulputate vitae, pretium mattis, nunc. Mauris eget neque at sem venenatis eleifend. (A.R. 57-67).

Ut nonummy. Fusce aliquet pede non pede. Suspendisse dapibus lorem pellentesque magna. Integer nulla. Donec blandit feugiat ligula. Donec hendrerit, felis et imperdiet euismod, purus ipsum pretium metus, in lacinia nulla nisl eget sapien. Donec ut est in lectus consequat consequat.

Etiam eget dui. Aliquam erat volutpat. Sed at lorem in nunc porta tristique. Proin nec augue. Quisque aliquam tempor magna. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Nunc ac magna.

1. **THE CIRCUIT COURT APPLIED AN OUTDATED STANDARD WHEN EVALUATING THE PETITIONER'S SHOWING OF GOOD CAUSE**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. Fusce est. (A.R. 54). Vivamus a tellus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Proin pharetra nonummy pede. Mauris et orci. (A.R. 72-81).

Aenean nec lorem. In porttitor. Donec laoreet nonummy augue. Suspendisse dui purus, scelerisque at, vulputate vitae, pretium mattis, nunc. Mauris eget neque at sem venenatis eleifend. Ut nonummy. Fusce aliquet pede non pede. Suspendisse dapibus lorem pellentesque magna. Integer nulla. Donec blandit feugiat ligula. Donec hendrerit, felis et imperdiet euismod, purus ipsum pretium metus, in lacinia nulla nisl eget sapien. Donec ut est in lectus consequat consequat:

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. **[Quotations of more than fifty words may be single-spaced.]**

Syl. Pt. 3, Blank v. Blank, *see also* String v. Cite #2, 897 W.Va. 456, 13 S.E.3d 657 (2040), String v. Cite #3, 897 W.Va. 456, 13 S.E.3d 657 (2040), String v. Cite #4, 897 W.Va. 456, 13 S.E.3d 657 (2040), String v. Cite #5, 897 W.Va. 456, 13 S.E.3d 657 (2040). **[Citations to five or fewer cases must be placed in the body of the text. Rev. R.A.P. 38. Citations to more than five cases may be placed in a footnote. See footnote 2 on page 6 for an example.]** Etiam eget dui. Aliquam erat volutpat. Sed at lorem in nunc porta tristique. Proin nec augue. Quisque aliquam tempor magna. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.

Nunc ac magna. Maecenas odio dolor, vulputate vel, auctor ac, accumsan id, felis. Pellentesque cursus sagittis felis. Pellentesque porttitor, velit lacinia egestas auctor, diam eros tempus arcu, nec vulputate augue magna vel risus. Cras non magna vel ante adipiscing rhoncus. Vivamus a mi. Morbi neque. Aliquam erat volutpat. Integer ultrices lobortis eros. W. Va. Code ' 88-7-6 (2035).

Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Proin semper, ante vitae sollicitudin posuere, metus quam iaculis nibh, vitae scelerisque nunc massa eget pede. Sed velit urna, interdum vel, ultricies vel, faucibus at, quam. Donec elit est, consectetuer eget, consequat quis, tempus quis, wisi. In in nunc. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Donec ullamcorper fringilla eros. Fusce in sapien eu purus dapibus commodo. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

1. **DEFAULT JUDGMENT WAS IMPROPER BECAUSE THE PETITIONER DEMONSTRATED GOOD CAUSE FOR REINSTATEMENT**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Maecenas porttitor congue massa. Fusce posuere, magna sed pulvinar ultricies, purus lectus malesuada libero, sit amet commodo magna eros quis urna. Nunc viverra imperdiet enim. Fusce est. Vivamus a tellus. Blank v. Blank, *supra*. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.

Proin pharetra nonummy pede. Mauris et orci. Aenean nec lorem. In porttitor. Donec laoreet nonummy augue. (A.R. 15). Suspendisse dui purus, scelerisque at, vulputate vitae, pretium mattis, nunc. Mauris eget neque at sem venenatis eleifend. Ut nonummy. Fusce aliquet pede non pede. Suspendisse dapibus lorem pellentesque magna. Integer nulla. (A.R. 28). Donec blandit feugiat ligula. Donec hendrerit, felis et imperdiet euismod, purus ipsum pretium metus, in lacinia nulla nisl eget sapien. Donec ut est in lectus consequat consequat. Etiam eget dui. Aliquam erat volutpat. Sed at lorem in nunc porta tristique. Proin nec augue. Quisque aliquam tempor magna. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Nunc ac magna.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Maecenas odio dolor, vulputate vel, auctor ac, accumsan id, felis. Pellentesque cursus sagittis felis. Pellentesque porttitor, velit lacinia egestas auctor, diam eros tempus arcu, nec vulputate augue magna vel risus. Cras non magna vel ante adipiscing rhoncus. Vivamus a mi. Morbi neque. Aliquam erat volutpat.

**CONCLUSION**

 The Circuit Court's order granting default judgment should be reversed, and this matter should be remanded for further proceedings.
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