/s/ Darl W. Poling
Circuit Court Judge
Ref. Code: 26OPAMNWX

E-FILED | 9/4/2026 9:50 AM
CC-41-2025-C-328
Raleigh County Circuit Clerk
Angelia Price

**In the Circuit Court of Raleigh County, West Virginia**

**Christopher A. Jackson,**
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. CC-41-2025-C-328
Judge Darl Poling

**Alan D. Abrams,**
Defendant

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD AND CLARIFYING THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER ON SUPPLEMENTATION**

Pending before the Court is *Plaintiff's Second Motion to Supplement the Record* (hereafter Motion) which was filed on June 25, 2026. The Defendant has not filed a Response to this Motion but the Court has determined that no response is necessary for the Court to rule upon this Motion.

In analyzing the Motion, the Court must first note that the Motion, like many of the Plaintiff's other filings, although labeled as a "Motion," is not truly a motion as contemplated by the Rules of Civil Procedure but is merely a filing of vast amounts of documents under the heading of "motion" or "the record." The filings further do not comply with the contemplated procedures because the Plaintiff files his "motion" seeking permission to something which he proceeds to have the Circuit Clerk do without obtaining a ruling from the Court.

While this Court has generally attempted to give the Plaintiff vast latitude with his filings, the Court believes that the Plaintiff has taken advantage of the Court's latitude with burdensome filings which do not comply with the procedural rules. Therefore, the Court believes additional guidelines and rulings are necessary at this time.

While the Court recently ruled that Plaintiff's First Request for leave to supplement the record was Moot, based upon the Plaintiff's attachment and filing of all the documents he wanted to "supplement" having already been filed through the Circuit Clerk's office, without having obtained leave of the Court, that ruling needs to be clarified. First, the Court's finding that the request or motion was MOOT, was merely acknowledgment that there was no need to rule on the filing of the information since the Plaintiff had already filed the information through the Circuit Clerk. The ruling was not intended and does not make the information an "admitted" part of the record and it does not classify the information as evidence for full consideration at this time. Proposed evidence must be submitted to the Court and subject to objection by the opposing party before a determination is made as to the admissibility of the proposed evidence.

In reviewing the Plaintiff's Second Motion for Supplement, the Court noticed the hand-written notation "*Please be sure to review paragraphs 21-26. Respectfully." In focusing first on these paragraphs and to ensure the record reflects that the Court did review the Motion, it is clear that those paragraphs relate entirely to the Plaintiff's "non-related" Federal Court Case against the City of Beckley and members of the Beckley City Police Department. Those matters are not relevant to the Plaintiff's allegations arising out of the Defendant's pursuit of a Personal Safety Order through allowed court proceedings.

Other components of the Motion reference matters arising from the Plaintiff's involvement in a Domestic Violence Petition on or about May 6, 2025, with his wife. Some of this information or information similar in nature, was proffered by the Plaintiff as part of a Motion for Protective Oder and as a part of other motions previously ruled upon and denied by the Court. While the Plaintiff offers allegations that there is new evidence to support this information, he has failed to provide a proper procedural rule or any authority

which would cause this Court to find the information is now relevant to the current Complaint or require a reconsideration of the prior rulings related to the information.

Finally, the Plaintiff references transcripts and recordings from various sources, individuals, or events which on the surface are not relevant to the current Complaint. Again, the Plaintiff appears to be attempting to submit "evidence" through a pleading or filing and not through proper court procedures.

Therefore, for all the reasons set forth above, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The *Plaintiff's Second Motion to Supplement the Record* is hereby **DENIED** as being improperly presented.
2. The information attached to the *Plaintiff's Second Motion to Supplement the Record* is hereby deemed to be improperly filed and shall not be considered properly before the Court.
3. The *Plaintiff's Second Motion to Supplement the Record* is deemed to not be a proper motion but merely an attempt to file proposed evidence prematurely and without proper hearing and ruling from the Court.
4. To the extent that the Plaintiff has previously filed similar "motions" or pleadings, all documents identified as "supplement to the record," "evidence," or which fails to comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure or incorrectly identifies the true character of the pleading or filing, are hereby **REJECTED** as being improperly submitted for consideration, response and ruling.
5. All documentation, pleadings or other forms of filing submitted by the Plaintiff through the Circuit Clerk's Office must be reviewed at a properly noticed hearing before the Court to allow for a determination as to the relevance and/or admissibility of said filing **BEFORE** it shall be considered an appropriate part of the court file in this matter.

6. The Plaintiff is **ORDERED and DIRECTED** to restrict future pro se filings to properly recognized pleadings without attaching any "evidence" he believes supports his motion or pleading. Any evidence must be presented during a properly scheduled hearing and ruled upon by the Court before being placed in the court file.
7. The Circuit Clerk is hereby **ORDERED and DIRECTED** to review all proposed filings of the Plaintiff which attaches exhibits or incorporates exhibits or excessive pages, regardless of the title of the proposed filing and to contact the undersigned Judge if the Clerk's office believes that the proposed filing exceeds the pages limits or is contrary to any Order of this Court related to the filing of documents by the Plaintiff. This directive is not intended to restrict the Plaintiff's access to filing appropriate documents but is designed to prevent the filing of burdensome and voluminous "proposed evidence" or content which has not been subject to review by the Court or subject to objection by the opposing party before it is subject to proper Court argument as to whether the evidence should be admitted or should be considered a proper part of the record.
8. The Plaintiff is still entitled to request a hearing via a proper Motion and Notice of Hearing on any future motion which can be properly brought before the Court for consideration of whether detailed information can be properly attached to a pleading and/or whether the proposed filing can exceed the procedural page limits.
9. The Circuit Clerk shall mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff via United States Postal Service to last known address and to all counsel of record via the e-filing system.
10. The Plaintiff's OBJECTION to this ruling is hereby preserved.

ORDER:

Entered this 3rd day of September 2026.

**/s/ Darl W. Poling**
Circuit Court Judge
14th Judicial Circuit

Note: The electronic signature on this order can be verified using the reference code that appears in the upper-left corner of the first page. Visit www.courtswv.gov/e-file/ for more details.