


SCOTT H. STEGE
Attorney-at-Law
P.O. Box 403
Majuro, MH 96960
Marshall Islands
Tel.: 011-692-625-3107 cell -- 455-3107
e-mail scottstege@gmail.com

FILED

MAY 10 2019


ASST. CLERK OF COURTS
REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

May 10, 2019

Ms. Ingrid Kabua
Chief Clerk
Marshall Islands Judiciary

Re: Plaintiff/Appellee's Answering Brief Supreme Court 2017-05 errata corrections

Dear Ingrid,

Per our conversation this morning, I understand you will ensure that the two pages I enclose herewith, both Title (page 1) and Table of Contents (page 2), will be added to all copies of the referenced ANSWERING BRIEF which I filed on Monday May 6, 2019. Thank you for your help.

Regards,



Scott Stege

Enclosures: two errata pages correcting pages 1 and 2 of the ANSWERING BRIEF

FILED

MAY 10 2019

ASSY. CLERK OF COURTS
REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

Supreme Court 2017-05

IN THE SUPREME COURT
REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

JERAKOJ J. BEJANG, AUN JAMES; and
HERING DREBON, GEORGE INOK
Defendants/Counterclaimants, Appellants

v.

BERNIE HITTO and HANDY EMIL.
Plaintiffs, Appellees

On appeal from the High Court
H.Ct. CA 21-80 and 1986-149 (Consolidated)
Hon. Colin R. Winchester, Justice

Answering Brief of Appellees

Scott H. Stege, Law Offices
PO Box 403 Rita Village
Majuro, MH 96960
phone 692-625-3107 mobile: 692-455-3107
e-mail: scottstege@gmail.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs, Appellees

TABLE OF CONTENTS – SUBJECT INDEX

Title Page	1
Table of Contents – Subject Index	2
List of Authorities cited	3
I. STATEMENT OF GROUNDS ON WHICH JURISDICTION IS INVOKED	4
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
III. POINTS ON WHICH APPELLANT RELIES	5
IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	5
V. QUESTIONS PRESENTED	5
VI. ARGUMENT	5 - 14
I. The May 22, 2015 Judgment was not a judgment for payment of money	5
A. Marshall Islands law only provides for Post Judgment Interest when the Judgment provides for payment of money by a debtor	5
B. Judgments adjudicating an interest in Land are not Money Judgments	5
C. By denying the Post Judgment Interest motion, High Court considered US Case law and held the Judgment a Judgment determining customary land titles, and not a judgment for payment of money.	6
D. The three US state court decisions cited by Appellants as having a land connection are not adjudications of land per se as Appellants assert	8
II. The Post-judgment calculation, be it characterized as "ministerial in nature" or otherwise, fails to alter the fact "This was not a judgment about Funds" but rather a Judgment adjudicating an interest in land, for Judge Tuttle's judgment was explicit in that it clearly adjudicated land interests	12
A. A reference to "Fund" and authority for the Clerk of Courts to distribute from a Fund, does not convert a Judgment adjudicating an interest in land into a Money Judgment	12
III. The Division of Funds, unlike designation of alab and senior dri jerbal land interests on the three wetos, was not part of Judge Tuttle's Judgment	12
IV. Equity does not favor Appellants in their claim for Post Judgment Interest.	12
A. By appealing the Bikej Case Plaintiffs relied on the High Court Judgment of Justice H.D. Johnson and the well supported doctrine of three wetos referred to as one weto.	12
B. No law or Dictionary definition of the word "shall" can justify Appellants claim of entitlement to Post Judgment Interest.	13
C. This Court should sustain the High Court Order denying the Motion for Post Judge Interest	13
VII. CONCLUSION WITH SPECIFIC RELIEF SOUGHT.....	14
VIII. STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES.....	15
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	16