Jurimpudence

(November 2026)

WHEN JUDICIAL PRECEDENT CAN ONLY BE VIRTUAL

Consider an appeal in a supposedly un-authoritarian State of the United States of America, and the search for pertinent jurisprudence in an action in which, among other peculiarities:

a. the complaint was filed after the expiration of the statute of limitations;
b. the very existence of one of the two plaintiffs was never established;
c. the authority of either plaintiff to initiate litigation was lacking;
d. the accused was denied the opportunity to attend his own trial;
e. a mere accusation was regarded as clear and convincing evidence;
f. elementary arithmetic escaped judicial scrutiny in a fabricated exhibit which
g. was never produced during discovery; and
h. the disclosure of information was presented as evidence of concealment.

Most remarkably, the very same action had previously been adjudicated in favour of the accused by a United States District Court, notably on the grounds of the statute of limitations.

All of the above made the case quite a rarity, if not a uniquity in its inequity.

Now, the accuracy of certain jurisprudential citations was vehemently challenged by the accusers. On that basis (apparently), the appellate court summarily rejected the appeal and denied a request for a written opinion.

One may ponder whether jurisprudence was devised to assist in the rational application of the law, or whether rationality itself must first be substantiated by jurisprudence.

We shall petition for special repositories of irrational virtual jurisprudence.