

**IN THE MONROE CIRCUIT COURT 6
STATE OF INDIANA**

Mark White, Plaintiff

v.

Indiana University and Monroe County Community School Corporation, Defendants

Cause No. 53C06-2508-CT-002221

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL, SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM, AND
PROPOSED ORDER**

I. MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, respectfully moves this Court to set this matter for trial at the earliest possible date, on or before September 5, 2025, and in support states as follows:

1. **Right to Speedy Trial.** Plaintiff asserts his right to a fair and speedy trial. Indiana law requires that civil cases be resolved without unnecessary delay. Prolonged scheduling favors defendants and prejudices plaintiff.
2. **Nature of the Dispute.** The case turns on a single, simple question: *Can any flat codon table ever possibly be true?*
 - If so, defendants may produce one or explain how such proof could ever be achieved.
 - Plaintiff asserts that because a true round codon table exists, a true flat codon table is mathematically impossible.
3. **Defendants' Knowledge and Burden.** Defendants have publicly asserted the truth of flat codon tables for more than sixty years and have publicly denied plaintiff's contrary proof for more than twenty years. Defendants therefore either (a) possess the necessary evidence, or (b) must concede they do not.
4. **Judicial Economy.** This case requires no lengthy discovery. Defendants can resolve the matter immediately by producing evidence they claim to have, or by conceding their inability to do so. Delay burdens not only the plaintiff, but also the Court and the public interest in accurate scientific representation.

5. **Prejudice of Delay.** On August 22, 2025, the Court scheduled a telephonic attorney conference for October 30, 2025, more than two months after service was perfected. Such a schedule is disproportionate to the simplicity of the dispute and favors defendants by allowing them to suppress resolution while continuing to benefit from the status quo.
-

II. MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT

1. **Indiana Trial Rule 1** provides that the rules “shall be construed to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action.”
2. **Indiana Code of Judicial Conduct, Rule 2.5(A)** requires judges to “perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently,” which includes avoiding unnecessary delay.
3. Indiana courts have long recognized that “[u]nnecessary delay in the administration of justice is to be avoided, and trial courts are obligated to move cases forward toward resolution.” See, e.g., *Clark v. State*, 659 N.E.2d 548, 552 (Ind. 1995).

Together, these authorities confirm that litigants in civil cases are entitled to timely adjudication, especially where delay has no substantive justification.

Application to this Case

- The dispute is narrow and dispositive.
 - Defendants have had decades to prepare their position.
 - No protracted discovery is required; the evidence is either available now or it is not.
 - Further delay is prejudicial to Plaintiff, contrary to judicial economy, and harmful to the public interest.
-

III. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Set this matter for trial on a date between today and September 5, 2025; or
2. In the alternative, immediately grant Plaintiff’s pending Motion for Summary Judgment; or

3. In the further alternative, compel defendants to immediately produce evidence that a flat codon table is true, or explain their inability to do so; or
4. In the further alternative, encourage Defendant Indiana University to contact Plaintiff directly to explore a prompt and private resolution of this matter; and
5. Grant all other just and proper relief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark White
Plaintiff, Pro Se

IV. PROPOSED ORDER

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL

Plaintiff, Mark White, having filed his Motion for Speedy Trial, and the Court being duly advised, now finds as follows:

1. Plaintiff asserts his right to a fair and speedy trial under the Indiana Rules of Trial Procedure.
 2. The case presents a narrow, dispositive question capable of prompt resolution.
 3. Delay in adjudication would unduly prejudice Plaintiff and is unnecessary to the just determination of this action.
-

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

1. This matter is set for trial on a date between August 25, 2025, and September 5, 2025, at a time to be determined by the Court;

OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE:

2. Plaintiff's pending Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED;

OR, IN THE FURTHER ALTERNATIVE:

3. Defendants shall, within ten (10) days of this Order, either (a) produce evidence supporting their position that a flat codon table may be true, or (b) file with the Court a written explanation for their inability to do so;

OR, IN THE FURTHER ALTERNATIVE:

4. Defendant Indiana University is encouraged to contact Plaintiff directly in order to explore prompt and private resolution of this matter;
5. The Court shall retain jurisdiction for all further proceedings.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

Hon. Kara E. Krothe
Judge, Monroe Circuit Court 6

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 22nd day of August, 2025, a copy of the foregoing **Plaintiff's Motion for Speedy Trial, Supporting Memorandum, and Proposed Order**: served upon each Defendant via UPS

- **Indiana University**

Office of the Vice President & General Counsel

107 S. Indiana Avenue

Bloomington, IN 47405

UPS Tracking No.: 1ZV7730X0328776278

Monroe County Community School Corporation

Dr. Jeff Hauswald, Superintendent

315 E. North Drive

Bloomington, IN 47401

UPS Tracking No.: 1ZV7730X0305520505

/s/ Mark White, MD

Mark White, MD

Plaintiff, Pro Se