452 Berman v. Pohnpei Legislature 17 FSM Intrm. 452 (App. 2011)

FSM SUPREME COURT APPELLATE DIVISION

	APPEAL CASE NO. P3- (Civil Action No. 2005)	-0091
Appellant,	corume supulation. Appending Str. at 14-53. Further, there are no ta	
of Labor Information showing	he time of her application in 2003, provided the Pohnpel Department she was domiciled in Pohnpel, had made Pohnpel her permanent	
ens benotvs.de dan ons temo	vious domicile. Appellant's Br. at 24.	
POHNPEI LEGISLATURE,		
The record only shows that	At trial, neither party was able to produce a copy of her application	
all a malleggA Appellee.	trial court accepted the parties' stipulation that an application had be	
rnment job applications, was	6. Niomi Phillip, the person who reviewed and certified Pahnpei gor	
	ble to recall receiving Berman's application and therefore was unable	
	ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING	
	Decided: March 24, 2011 beiliggs erts nedw autsta meb	
BEFORE:	VI. CONCLUSION	
Hon. Dennis K. Yamase, A	g Chief Justice, FSM Supreme Court sociate Justice, FSM Supreme Court sociate Justice, FSM Supreme Court	
	gal resident, the trial court must determine it the Pohnpei Departme	

resident status at the time of her job application in 2003. Knowing these two facts, :: APPEARANCE

For the Appellant: Mary Berman, Esq. and of nonspillings a named published big Department of Labor acted incorrectly, then it must 0.01 xo8 .0.9 damages, nominal or otherwise, Kolonia, Pohnpei FM 96941

HEADNOTE

Appellate Review - Rehearing

When, after a careful consideration of a petition for rehearing, the appellate court has determined that it has neither overlooked nor misapprehended any points of law or fact, it may deny the petition. Berman v. Pohnpei Legislature, 17 FSM Intrm. 452, 452 (App. 2011).

COURT'S OPINION

PER CURIAM:

On March 4, 2011, appellant Mary Berman timely filed her petition for rehearing. After a careful consideration of Berman's petition, we have determined that we have neither overlooked nor misapprehended any points of law or fact and accordingly deny the petition. Nahnken of Nett v. Pohnpei, 7 FSM Intrm. 554, 554-55 (App. 1996) (when an appellate court has not overlooked or misapprehended any points of law or fact, it may summarily deny a petition for rehearing).

The mandate shall issue in seven days. FSM App. R. 41.