

Matthew D. Hardin (*pro hac vice*)
HARDIN LAW OFFICE
101 Rainbow Drive # 11506
Livingston, TX 77399
Telephone: (202) 802-1948
Email: MatthewDHardin@gmail.com
Attorney for Defendants
Joshua Moon and Lolcow, LLC

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH

<p>RUSSELL GREER, Plaintiff, v. JOSHUA MOON, <i>et al.</i> Defendants.</p>	<p>DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISQUALIFY</p> <p>Case No. 2:24-cv-00421-DBB</p> <p>District Judge David Barlow Magistrate Judge Jared C. Bennett</p>
--	--

NOW COME Defendants, Joshua Moon and Lolcow, LLC, by and through their undersigned counsel, and protectively file this Memorandum of Law Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Disqualify. ECF No. 400. Defendants state as follows:

1. Defendants sought various forms of relief, including an extension of time to oppose Mr. Greer's Motion, at ECF No. 402. Because the Court has not ruled on those motions, and the current deadline for Defendants to respond expires today, Defendants file this Opposition solely to protect their rights and ensure the time for them to file a response does not elapse. DUCivR 7-1 (a)(4)(D). The defense incorporates by reference all arguments made at ECF No. 402 in their entirety here.

2. Defendants respectfully assert that Mr. Greer has shown no legally cognizable misconduct or grounds for disqualification. Instead, Mr. Greer's entire

premise appears to be that the defense should not investigate the Plaintiff's claims or his potential fraud on this Court in previously proceeding in forma pauperis. But there is nothing improper about the defense investigating Mr. Greer's (dubious) claims. In fact, it would be malpractice if undersigned counsel did not investigate all available defenses.

3. If the Court were to find, somehow, that Mr. Greer's motion could be liberally construed in a manner that would support disqualification, Defendants request that the Court identify any basis for disqualification and issue a show cause order which will afford Defendants proper notice and an opportunity to address any concerns. Defendants will happily respond further if the Court deems a further response is necessary.

WHEREFORE, Defendants' position is that Mr. Greer's Motion to Disqualify is a thinly-veiled Motion for Sanctions, and an improper effort to "pile on" to Mr. Greer's numerous and thus far unsuccessful efforts to prevent the defense from conducting its ongoing investigation into Plaintiff's potential fraud on this Court in obtaining in forma pauperis status. See, e.g., ECF Nos. 424, 423, 421, 416, 414, 411, 406, 394. This Court should deny the Motion to Disqualify and all of Mr. Greer's motions in the same vein. This Court should also enjoin Mr. Greer from seeking relief in state court that would have the practical effect of working a disqualification, as explained by Defendants at ECF No. 421.

DATED December 22, 2025

HARDIN LAW OFFICE

/s/ Matthew D. Hardin

Matthew D. Hardin

Attorney for Defendants

Joshua Moon and Lolcow, LLC