

Guy Harrison
Chairman, Commission for Lawyer Discipline
P.O. Box 12487
Austin, Texas 78711-2487
% Guy Harrison
@ www.gnhlaw.com
217 North Center St.
Longview, Texas 75601
guy@hnglaw.com

A. Trey Apffell, III, P.C.
President. State Bar of Texas
406 West Main
Hometown Bank Building
Texas City, Texas 77573
trey@apfellaw.com

Linda Acevedo,
Chief Disciplinary Counsel
Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel
State Bar of Texas
PO Box 12487
Austin, Texas
78711-2487
Linda.acevedo@texasbar.com

Stanley M. Serwatka
Chair, Grievance Oversight Committee
700 E. San Antonio Ave., Suite 200
El Paso, Texas 79901
(915) 534-3409 (direct line)
(915) 471-3712 (cell)
(915) 534-3461 (fax)
Stanley.serwatka@usdoj.com

Larry McDougal
Chairman, Discipline Client Attorney Assistance Program
809 Houston Street
Richmond, Texas 77469
mcdougal-law-larry@comcast.net

February 5, 2015

Dear Appellate Justices:

I have repeatedly objected to the fraudulent scheme of pretending that the OCDC is representing the Commission for Lawyer Discipline. All of these metamorphoses of the Texas Supreme Court create a

dangerous legal subterfuge that is allowing the OCDC to maliciously abuse process designed to protect the public and use it against certain attorneys the OCDC or Texas Supreme Court wishes to silence, suppress, or oppress. Both Bob Bennett and I were targeted for our opinions and the expression of our views concerning unethical conduct and the failings of the OCDC. The State Bar of Texas, the CFLD, and the OCDC are the agents, representatives, or wholly owned subsidiaries of the Texas Supreme Court. There is no real and meaningful review of the disciplinary process by an independent and neutral entity; and, in that regard, the process violates due course of law and equal protection under the law particularly when all members in the prosecutorial and review process are members of the same political party.

Both Bob and I were summarily disbarred for alleged actions we took as individuals and not as attorneys acting for a client. Neither Bob nor I were guilty of the alleged conduct and the OCDC did not meet its burden of proof consistent with due course of law. However, due to the structural and fundamental defects in the disciplinary set-up and process, we are deprived of any meaningful appeal as there is no oversight when the only appellate body is the principal behind the various agents involved.

In my dealings with the OCDC, they have been on the side of the corrupt bar members 100% of the time; and they have maliciously prosecuted the good and ethical lawyer. It is not a coincidence that they are continuing to act consistent with this habit, practice, and policy of protecting the corruption by using the disciplinary process to silence those lawyers they want to suppress or punish for their speech only conduct.

The case with Bob is another great example of the inherent flaws in the system. One can site many examples of attorneys who have seriously harmed a client or repeatedly engaged in unethical conduct and taken advantage of clients and grossly neglected legal matters entrusted to them. Yet, none of these unethical attorneys are disbarred and many are not even disciplined. Yet, Bob and I, upon the very first time of being found “guilty” of conduct we did not engage in, we are summarily disbarred.

In my case, I never even received any semblance of due process and the OCDC was engaged in the criminal conspiracy and fraud on the court from the inception and work hand-in-glove with the predatory prosecutors led by John Bradley. The OCDC actually conspired with the criminals and aided and abetted the fraud on the court and violation of my constitutional rights.

Unlike me, Bob had a trial and process, but when he appealed the procedural defects he encountered during the trial, he is disbarred. The punishment of disbarment is excessive, shocking and outrageous, and serves no legitimate purpose or governmental interest. This excessive punishment violates due course of law and equal protection. There is absolutely no legitimate purpose or reason to disbar Bob based on the facts of his case; especially with all his years of exemplary service to the bar.

One must question, like I have, why the OCDC protects the liars and disbars the ethical lawyers who have worked to improve the standard of conduct and to have the same standard of conduct apply

equally to all members of the bar in a consistent and uniform manner without favoritism and special privileges. The OCDC, the State Bar, the CFLD, and the Supreme Court are political animals and we are all forced to be a member to practice our profession and earn a livelihood. Likewise, we are forced to financially support this protection racket for certain privileged members while being subjected to harsh treatment for our efforts to improve the profession and make it more honest. It is clear that the OCDC, the State Bar, the CFLD, and the Supreme Court really do not want the profession ethical or its members honest. I know from my own personal experience that the OCDC has been operating in this same horrendous fashion ever since 1988. There has always been a jealous, lazy, unethical bar member behind every oppressive, predatory action taken by the OCDC against me. The OCDC has violated Rule 13 of the Texas Rules of Procedure repeatedly in the numerous harassing actions they have filed against me. Yet, the OCDC never has to compensate the lawyer they target for their abusive filings and they are never sanctioned for their inexcusable conduct. Bar members employed by the OCDC are immune from their violations of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct.

The Supreme Court, through its nominees, protects the lawyers it favors and ignores those who have been targeted by the OCDC, its protection and enforcement arm. This is clearly racketeering by a new form of corrupt organization—the black robe mafia. If this syndicate did not give itself immunity, I personally would sue all these entities for their clear violations of RICO and 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. I would file a class action Anti-SLAPP suit and reform the unequal and abusive treatment by the OCDC. Clear ethical violations are deemed to be “no evidence of a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct” whereas, any frivolous, groundless, and meritless claim made against targeted lawyers are embellished, distorted, and fraudulently exaggerated by the OCDC to make a false claim—often these fraudulent claims are filed by, investigated by, and prosecuted by the same person employed by the OCDC. Not one time has the OCDC reimbursed the hundreds of thousands dollars they have cost me or compensated me for the damages, destruction, and losses they have caused. Their actions are beyond reckless, they are willful violations of the law.

Carolyn Barnes