

To: Gregory G. Sapakoff, Esq.	From: Chas Clements
Fax: 303-893-5302	Pages: 1
Phone: 303-893-8121	Date: 5/20/2004
Re: Thomas C. "Doc" Miller	CC: Bryan Shaha (970) 392-9897

Regarding: Brown Investigation 03-03413

1. Regarding the grievance by Kevin Brown, the ethical violations and extortion in the Frank Pugliese complaint, and the complaint filed by Steve Gartin (04C1779) as regards fee-splitting and a failure to rise to minimal professional standards of conduct and performance, I am a witness to much, if not all, the actions perpetrated the filing of these complaints and grievances.
2. I'm a witness to Attorney Thomas C. Miller's defamation of Frank Pugliese as well as his fee agreement with Steve Gartin, and his conduct as regards the Kevin Brown matter, the Rich Wyatt matter, the Joel Costello matter, and a number of other significant ethical and legal violations or professional omissions. It would be my suggestion that no investigation of Attorney Miller go forward without interviewing me, reviewing my documentary and other evidence.
3. Yesterday, I received notice from Attorney Miller that he intends to withdraw from my ostensible divorce case, citing the fact that I may be called as a witness against him in various actions commenced by others and irreconcilable differences. Attorney Miller did not elucidate any "differences" that he construed to be irreconcilable. It is not my fault that I am a Witness, nor that I've been called/named in the various cases, and Attorney Miller's withdrawal from representing me is a sham and a continuing fraud which I will expound upon in greater detail.
4. Attorney Miller has depleted my very limited resources, and now seeks to abandon his professional commitments to me and to make good on his threats to see me jailed and impoverished as part of continuing malicious prosecution and retaliatory harassment viz my witness in Federal Court on several 42 U.S.C. 1983, 1985 & 1986 actions and a R.I.C.O. action. (See Attachment A)
5. I initially contacted Thomas C. Miller through Frank Pugliese of AFP Investigations in 2002, and he represented Steve Gartin in a related case to mine. I spent a lot of time with the Court's investigator, Mr. Pugliese, to bring him up to speed on the intricacies of that very complex case, and spent a great deal of time with Attorney Miller on the same agenda. Mr. Gartin has been subjected to continuing malicious and retaliatory prosecutions for over a decade now, with no relief in sight. Attorney Miller presented as a "trial lawyer" crusading for the rights of the innocent and down-trodden, which seemed a perfect match for Mr. Gartin.
6. A secret statewide grand jury was convened contrary to statutory authority by Special Prosecutor State Attorney. Without so much as a mention of my name in grand jury testimony, I was charged with 15 felonies and 1 misdemeanor in addition to the one charge in which my name was mentioned, but no probable cause could be proven that would support the charge. My case (Case 00CR3373) was dismissed at the petition of Marleen Langfield, and my attorney, Cynthia Sheehan. Attorney Sheehan advised me that I had a very strong case for malicious prosecution and gave me a list of civil attorneys who handle 'malicious prosecution' type cases. Her files are with Attorney Miller at present, and he refuses to return

them, I suspect as part of the continuing conspiracy to prevent me from filing suit against the government actors who perpetrated these crimes against me.

7. I approached Lawyer Miller for representation in the civil suit, as he was familiar with the whole situation and had committed to represent Steve Gartin civilly as well as criminally. You can see my grievance against Marleen M. Langfield, Registration Number 10355 in late 2001 (Attached as Langfield Grievance) That grievance forms the basis of my complaint that Attorney Miller agreed to prosecute in my behalf.

8. Reference also the grievance from Eric Gordon Mitchell as regards Marleen Langfield, filed about 19 October 2001, and the Federal R.I.C.O. action filed by Mr. Gartin (01-ES-1145).

9. Attorney Miller originally advised that there might be a conflict of interest and demurred until the case was 'more settled'. I approached the A.C.L.U. (Attachment ??) through Attorney Lisa Culpepper and was considered for about five or six months before they demurred, saying it wouldn't affect enough people. I consulted with Attorney Kevin Massaro (Brega & Winters) at length before he advised me that his firm defended the police and it would be inappropriate to take my case.

10. On January 20, 2003 Attorney Miller invited me to his law office at 1032 Lincoln Place to discuss the merits of my civil action. He introduced me to his legal team, outlined the strategy he expected to place into effect and he accepted my case. He advised that any action I commenced would raise the ire of the State Attorney General's Office and create problems for Steve Gartin's probation period, so he advised that the interim from that date until Mr. Gartin's probation was completed would provide time for preparation and planning. Attorney Miller advised me that Mr. Gartin's probation agreement prevented him from filing any lawsuits until 8 April 2004. Initially, I performed specialty leather work for Mr. Miller as a retainer. Then in August 2003 I gave him \$5,000 against costs and fees; \$3750 by check and endorsed an uncashed \$1250 check for his **trust account** record as if paid for studio work ordered by Attorney Miller and his significant other, Judith Phillips, who Mr. Miller bragged owned all the assets so that he could not be sued.

11. He enjoined me to trust him; made plain he was my lawyer and had the case well in hand in front of many witnesses, including clients, his family, his associates in the lawfirm and associated professionals such as his investigators. We had strategy sessions, informational instruction, assignation and development of damages, informal conversation about allied cases and so on.

12. I also did other work as payment in kind for Attorney Miller; studio work as an artist, bodyguarding, consultant, researching, and so on. In these capacities, I was privy to attorney/client privileged information as regards clients Brown, Costello, Wyatt, Gartin, some partners in a gun shop, and so on. I was privy to his home life, his professional associations and knew members of his lawfirm 'Docs Law'.

13. Attorney Miller actively and directly solicited me to handle my divorce purportedly as a gift to me in respect for my mentoring and instruction, close personal friendship and as 'practice' for his prospective entrance into domestic law as a specialty. I had just lost a simple question in front of Magistrate Chapman and Attorney Miller insisted that he could rectify the matter easily.

14. Attorney Miller represented that he would go forward on my primary complaint against the Bonilla's (or whatever appropriate charging) when Gartin's case was resolved as per the supposed probation agreement- which agreement proved to be a sham and a lie. We learned on 8 April 2004 in Judge Munsinger's court that Attorney Miller had been in collusion with Attorney Langfield to divert any

complaints of malicious prosecution or other associated actions arising from their vindictive prosecution of 00CR3373 in order to intimidate me against testifying in the Federal Civil Rights actions noted above. Attorney Miller's lies to Steve Gartin were the basis for his lies to me.

15. Attorney Miller intentionally allowed the statute of limitations to expire on my complaints, kept me unaware of that for some further months. On 4 March 2004, Attorney Miller told me he was 'welshing' on our agreement, but if I didn't allow him to go forward on my divorce, I would go to jail. Attorney Miller cited his conversation with Attorney Katherine Grier Register Number 30948, Attorney for Victoria Lawler's threats to him per phone call that very day. Citing a collusion between she and several Adams County Judicial Officials to incarcerate me for acting pro se in a civil action.

16. The same witness, his paralegal and research assistant was present during that phone call, discussed the nuances of the conversation between Attorney Grier and Attorney Miller and was also present at the subsequent meeting in which Attorney Miller reneged on his agreement with me, and when Attorney Miller threatened me with jail if he didn't represent me in my 'divorce' action. He clearly and repeatedly stated that only he was standing between me and jail.

17. Attorney Miller was clearly in collusion with Katherine Grier Reg. #30948, representing my long-term associate Victoria Lawler in his intentional failure to report such a violation of the Ethical Rules to the proper authority. On 4 March 2004, Attorney Grier represented to Attorney Miller that the Judges in the Adams County Court system were prejudiced against me, had extra security whenever I was in the building, and were capable of making 'trumped up charges (against me) like they did with Gartin' unless he protected me, and that I would surely go to jail if I did not accept his representation.

18. Attorney Miller relayed to me, in the presence of witness, that Attorney Grier maintained that my petition for habeas corpus in the Colorado Supreme Court had angered the judiciary of Adams County, and they were going to put me in jail.

19. The phone call was witnessed by Attorney Miller's paralegal; they were attending a Thursday Lexus Nexus training workshop and received Attorney Grier's phone call as they were leaving the class. They came directly to my home to inform me of that conversation and the issues it raised. I also noted the contents of that conversation on 5 March 2004 by e-mail to Attorney Miller and have a taped phone call in which we discuss those issues.

20. The factual basis of Attorney Miller's conversation with Attorney Grier was borne out in court when the Magistrate, Janice Chapman, observed that they 'knew where these filings come from'. Supposedly, Judge Harlan Bockman's wife had been threatened by someone, and they sought to conflate my conduct with his in some manner.

21. The discussion of the ex parte hearings, sans notification to me, was referenced in the court setting, as was the improper denial of both 1st Amendment rights and my rights to due process of the law conducted without favor or prejudice against me. This was all relative to the "divorce" action in which both Attorney Grier and Attorney Miller give the appearance of conspiratorial collusion to my detriment.

22. Threats of jailing for filing pro se have been made by Attorney Miller, to me, on numerous other occasions, including within the courthouse itself at hearings. He has acted as if my arrest were imminent but for his protection of me from the stated judicial bias, and Attorney Grier's malice towards me expressed in her collusion in the denial of my right to due process and equal application of the law. I am now afraid that Attorney Grier's threats will be made manifest, and that I stand in hazard of arrest if I

don't have a lawyer and attempt to answer the Court when I can't afford a lawyer any longer, due to their conspiratorial collusion in my case.

23. Attorney Miller agreed to, but failed to get the transcripts of the judicial exchange regarding Attorney Grier's failure to notify me, and her exploitation of ex parte access to have critical judicial orders set aside or changed. The orders in question were from Magistrate David Juarez as regards permanent restraining orders against Ms. Grier's client, Victoria Lawler, and his custody directions as regards my youngest son, Mason Clements. Attorney Miller has failed to attend to any of the issues he agreed to handle.

24. Attorney Miller failed to move forward on Katherine Grier as regards improper ex parte hearings on my restraining orders for Domestic Violence, on behalf of myself and my two sons, against Victoria Lawler. Also an improper ex parte hearing on child custody issues, and such other improprieties as Attorney Grier might have committed in failing to report judicial bias as related to her; using the threat of criminal prosecution in order to gain advantage in a civil matter, and moving forward on the fraud as I allege in the Supreme Court submission.

25. Attorney Miller failed to file timely motions to change the venue for prejudice, recuse the judiciary of Adams County from hearing this purported divorce case, set aside the orders made in a prejudicial context, censure Katherine Grier for her ethical lapses and set aside the orders made ex parte, and to revisit my application to the Supreme Court, as it has been vindicated by subsequent events.

26. On or about 8 April 2004, it came to light that Attorney Miller had improperly colluded with Marleen Langfield to prevent the filing of any complaint by Steve Gartin, and that Attorney Miller had likewise deceived me, as my case was related to the Gartin situation. (Attached as 'Response to Motion to Withdraw –Attachment E) His performance of 04 March 2004 had been another lie and his acceptance of a retainer and good faith work had been a complete fraud from its inception. He had continued an improper collusion against his client Gartin with Marleen Langfield, and with Attorney Anstine, and on behalf of their various clients and co-conspirators.

27. Subsequent to the 4 March 2004 meeting, Attorney Miller returned some of the paperwork I had given him- completely unopened, unread, unopened. He didn't review video tape, or sound recordings, or familiarize himself with the case at all. He neglected to return the 'Sheehan' portion of the file- the most cogent material to the malicious prosecution case. He had done absolutely nothing of due diligence of the most basic process of familiarization with a case.

28. I further find out that he is a crony of the putative Defendants to the case in the person of the Bonilla lawyer and primary complainant in the false charges against me, Glenn Roscoe Anstine II, Esquire #14384. Attorney Anstine was the Trustee of the disposition of Tom Miller's bankruptcy, as well as the attorney mentioned in grievance of 7 September 2000 (attached as Anstine Grievance) and numerous court filings complaining of major ethical and criminal violations. Unknown to me, Attorneys Miller and Anstine are in a relationship of subordinate to superior, and that has colored his representation of me at all times.

29. Attorney Miller is well known for extorting his clients with threats of jail, either by his own direct complaint, or by giving slight diligence and ineffective representation in a court hearing, resulting in jailing of his client or in deliberately missing court appointments so that warrants for failure to appear are issued against his clients. His clients Costello, Wyatt, Brown, Elaison, Gartin and I have all experienced such shenanigans and been subjected to the consequences that he avoids, as a holder of a B.A.R. card.

30. Attorney Miller is a continuing threat to any client. He is careless, destructive, lazy, incompetent, mendacious and willing to betray his client's interests to their opposition for his own personal aggrandizement and pecuniary gain.

31. Attorney Miller has made it known that you and he are longtime friends, dating back to law school. It has been reported to me that he asserts enjoying a certain confidence in the disposition of his various grievance cases because of that association. If it is known to me, it is known to others as well. While I would hope that his expectations are unfounded, I would also hope that any possible misperception of a bias would also be assiduously avoided.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns,



Charles H. Clements
1741 Dallas Street
Aurora, Colorado 80010-2018
303-364-0403

Attachment A:

Charles Harry Clements

1741 Dallas Street
Aurora, Adams County
Colorado

Honorable Leland P. Anderson, District Court Judge

JEFFERSON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT: Div. 2
100 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Jefferson County
Colorado

Reference: Case No. 00CR3373
Colorado State Grand Jury Indictment: 00CR0001
Dismissal Order: 3 OCT 01

Date: 30 NOV 01

Your Honor;

This is in the nature of a Complaint of Criminal Charges stemming from the prosecution of the above numbered case by the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office and a Request for Investigation and subsequent prosecution of such charges.

I submit that yours is the Court of Jurisdiction, the matters were before you for adjudication, the crimes were committed in front of your Honor and in your Courtroom and are an affront to the peace, dignity and probity of your Honor and your honorable Court.

I am an adult, I tell the truth and I am the Proper Party Injured in this instant matter.

1. I submit as fact that Jefferson County Special Assistant District Attorney Marleen M. Langfield (Att'y Register Number 10355) knowingly and deliberately, willfully, wantonly, with malice, reckless of the law and contemptuous of the integrity of your court, filed seventeen (17) false and frivolous charges against me for prosecution in your Court. She did these actions under color of her authority; as an attorney, as a State Officer in the Attorney General's Office, and as a Special Prosecutor for the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office.

Each and every of the seventeen charges constituted a separate and distinct offense against my person, my family, my business and public reputation and dignity.

2. I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, Special District Attorney (SDA) Marleen M. Langfield failed to adequately supervise her Investigatory Team and her Prosecutory Team and, moreover, led and directed them to do various improper acts which seem themselves actionable in nature. This would be to include Jefferson County Deputy Sheriff Don Estep, Investigator Gary Clyman, and such others unknown to me at present, and them known as the 'Multi-Jurisdictional Domestic Terrorism TaskForce', so-called, and such others as will be discovered by diligent investigation.

3. Further; I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, that Special District Attorney (SDA) Langfield deliberately and in a high knowledge of the law, withheld, secreted and concealed exculpatory evidence that would have precluded either the initial submission to a Grand Jury, the return of a True Bill Indictment, or the initial charging or the continued prosecution of those charges against me. SDA Langfield knew, or should have known through her investigatory team, that large amounts of legal and business materials had been confiscated, and are held or have been destroyed, by both law enforcement personnel and, improperly, by Attorney Glen R. Anstine II, Esq. and such exculpatory evidences were reserved and concealed from proper discovery and publication to the Honorable Court's attention.

4. Further; I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, that SDA Langfield suborned material perjury before the Grand Jury from several Witnesses; Arabella T. Bonilla, Hector Bonilla, Victoria de Thouars-Tollman and such others, and proceeded with charges before your Honorable Court based on that perjury that she knew, or should have known, were utterly unfounded and untenable.

5. Further; I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, that SDA Langfield has knowingly enabled the operation and continuing operation of a racketeering influenced criminal endeavour; to wit, the Bonilla Crime Family, in recompense for the perjured testimony of Arabella T. Bonilla, Hector Bonilla and the inclusion of information from Carlos Bonilla.

6. I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, that SDA Langfield engaged in Witness Intimidation and Obstruction of Justice by charging me with these seventeen (17) unfounded and frivolous charges in the attempt to influence my testimony in regards another Defendant in her prosecution; Mr. Steve D. Gartin, both in the instant case against him and in the various actions taken, and contemplated to be taken, by Mr. Gartin in complaint for damages concerning previous abuse and denial of his civil rights.

7. I believe that SDA Langfield, knowingly and deliberately, negotiated in Bad Faith throughout my prosecution, as she knew, or should have known, that the seventeen charges lodged against me were utterly unfounded and no accusation had ever been made against me in those charges, save one, and that dismissed, after months of vigorous prosecution, in the interests of justice at the petition of the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office.

8. I believe that SDA Langfield gave orders for my arrest to be painful and humiliating, my confinement to be strait and my arraignment unnecessarily delayed past the statutory limit so as to debilitate me physically, deprive me of mental acuity, deny me exculpatory evidence, or give me access to knowing the charges laid against me, in order to prevent me from forming a knowing defense. SDA Langfield lied to me, and through her agents, about the status of availability of the Indictment, reserved any charging document for weeks, threatened me with vigorous prosecution fullknowing that there was no accusation, no evidence of wrongdoing, no injured party and no valid interest by the State of Colorado in my activities or lack thereof.

9. I believe, and on the basis of that belief allege, that SDA Marleen M. Langfield, or those in her immediate supervision and at her direction, took confidential information from her investigation; to wit, my secret computer password authorizations, and destroyed my lawful businesses in order to deny me the fruits of those businesses; unlawfully, maliciously, vindictively, selectively, and in a high knowledge of the law. This Computer Crime is an egregious abuse of her special knowledge and serves no legal purpose, doesn't aid in any investigation and serves only to harm my family and myself.

10. SDA Marleen Langfield deliberately and knowingly misled the Grand Jury and your Honorable Court to believe that I am a 'Patriot', considered as a pejorative; to link me somehow with the Oklahoma City Bombing, the Columbine Massacre, aspects of 'Domestic Terrorism', the 'Christian Identity' movement, 'anti-government' political positions and other such calumnies so as to seem to add justification, credence and substance to her case.

No evidence exists for such an accusation, and in the light of the terrible terrorist acts to which we've all been subjected, the characterization is outrageous and shocks the conscience at the lack of integrity, sense of honor, professional/ethical conduct, and Langfield's shameful representation of the legal process and its administrators.

SDA Marleen M. Langfield's outrageous conduct is shocking in its impropriety and wanton and willful recklessness. I submit that an investigation at your instigation is warranted and that Criminal Charges will result from these improprieties and abuses by SDA Langfield and her associates and subordinates.

I make these charges with no intent to deceive or to mislead the Honorable Court and pray your Honor to initiate and expedite an investigation forthwith.

Respectfully submitted to your Honor;

Charles Harry Clements

**Attorney Regulation Committee
Office of Regulatory Counsel
Notice of Attorney Misconduct and Petition to Suspend License to Practice for Cause**

Complainant:

Eric Gordon Mitchell

c/o 1741 Dallas Street

Aurora, Colorado

Respondent:

Marleen M. Langfield, Esquire, Registration Number 10355

1525 Sherman Street, 5th Floor

Denver, CO 80203

Rule 241.12. Complaint (2) Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 241.11 (a)(2), (a)(3), or (a)(4) by any complainant in the complainant's own name. Eric Gordon Mitchell makes complaint as follows;

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.9 (1), Eric Gordon Mitchell requests the Grievance Committee to initiate an investigation of the above listed party, Marleen M. Langfield, a lawyer.

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.8 "...or because *he has engaged in conduct which poses an immediate threat to the effective administration of justice*, the Supreme Court may order the lawyer's license to practice law immediately suspended."

Eric Gordon Mitchell recommends and requests the immediate suspension of the license to practice law of the above listed party, Marleen M. Langfield as her continued practice of law constitutes an immediate threat to the effective administration of justice.

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (1) The above listed attorney, Marleen M. Langfield is subject to the jurisdiction of the State Supreme Court of Colorado; the lawyer, Marleen M. Langfield, is before the Colorado Bar

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (2) The allegations, when proved, will constitute grounds for severe disciplinary action against Marleen M. Langfield.

Rule 241.12. Complaint (b) Service of Complaint. The Disciplinary Counsel shall promptly serve the respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, as provided in C.R.C.P. 241.25 (b), a citation and a copy of the complaint filed against the respondent.

Rule 241.6. Grounds for Discipline

Misconduct by a lawyer, individually or in concert with others, including the following acts or omissions, shall constitute grounds for discipline, whether or not the act or omission occurred in the course of an attorney-client relationship:

(1) Any act or omission which violates the provisions of the Code of Professional Responsibility or the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct;

(2) Any act or omission which violates accepted rules or standards of legal ethics;

(3) Any act or omission which violates the highest standards of honesty, justice, or morality;

(4) Any act or omission which constitutes gross negligence, if committed by a lawyer in her capacity as a lawyer;

(5) Any act or omission which violates the criminal laws of the state or any other state, or of the United States;

(6) Any act or omission which violates these Rules or which violates an order of discipline or disability;

Rule 8.4. Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

(a) violate or attempt to violate the rules of professional conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the act of another;

(b) commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects;

(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

(d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

(f) knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law;

(g) engage in conduct which violates accepted standards of legal ethics;

or

(h) engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law.

The enumeration of acts and omissions constituting grounds for discipline is not exclusive, and other acts or omissions amounting to unprofessional conduct may constitute grounds for discipline.

Reference attached COLORADO STATE GRAND JURY INDICTMENT 00CR0001 (Exhibit 1) and incorporated herein as if fully reproduced.

Reference 00CR3372 Jefferson County Colorado

Complainant Eric Gordon Mitchell believes, and on the basis of that belief alleges;

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count One. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Two. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Three. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Four. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Five. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Six. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Seven. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Eight. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Nine. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Ten. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Eleven. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Criminal Extortion (F4), Count Twelve. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Fourteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Computer Crime/Scheme to Defraud over \$15,000 (F3), Count Fifteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Attempt to Influence a Public Servant (F4), Count Sixteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Unlawfully Carrying a Concealed Weapon on a Jefferson County School Ground (M2), Count Seventeen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and Attorney Langfield knew of the highly charged emotional atmosphere in Jefferson County subsequent to the massacre at Columbine High School and she fully intended that opprobrium be improperly attached to Eric Gordon Mitchell during arrest by the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department Fugitive Arrest Team and detention by Jefferson County Detention Center, arraignment by a Jefferson County Judge and such knowledge by Jefferson County residents. Any such charge was improper and deliberately inflammatory to custodial personnel.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately assisted in the improper issuance of a Fugitive Warrant of Arrest for Eric Gordon Mitchell on Sixteen Felony Counts and One Misdemeanor charge.....

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately applied for an unconscionably high bond for Eric Gordon Mitchell on the basis of being charged with Fifteen Felonies and One Misdemeanor charge, full knowing the charges were false on their face and an abuse of process.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately delayed arraignment while Eric Gordon Mitchell was subjected to severe debilitation by deliberate cold, deliberate sleep deprivation, deliberate psychological stress and abuse and physical discomfort of a nature in order to gain improper advantage by torture and abuse.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, deliberately withheld any charging document stating the nature of the charges against Eric Gordon Mitchell for **two weeks** or more knowing that an understanding of the charges is necessary to formulate a response by the detainee.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, deliberately withheld any copy of the Statewide Grand Jury Indictment to Eric Gordon Mitchell during four days of incarceration.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Eric Gordon Mitchell with Criminal Extortion, Count Thirteen in Case 00CR3372 full knowing that the charges

stemmed from the expression of Criminal Perjury suborned from witnesses by her investigative team; Gary Clyman, Don Estep and Curt Maleri.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office, and her training as an attorney to manipulate and mislead the Statewide Grand Jury to gain unfair advantage in civil proceedings to which Eric Gordon Mitchell is Plaintiff; Federal District Court case 00D670.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to conspire to obstruct justice and gain an unfair and improper advantage with, and on behalf of, associates who are Defendants in civil proceedings to which Eric Gordon Mitchell is Plaintiff; Federal District Court case 00D670.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to conspire to obstruct justice, impede investigation, conceal culpability, limit liability exposure and to gain an unfair and improper advantage with, and on behalf of, associates who are accused in Verified Criminal Charges to which Eric Gordon Mitchell may be a 3rd Party and Material Witness.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office, and her training as an attorney in an abuse of process to manipulate and mislead the Statewide Grand Jury to gain unfair advantage in criminal proceedings to which Eric Gordon Mitchell is a possible 3rd Party Witness for Defendants; 00CR3371, 00CR3373, 00CR2419 and such others.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit material perjury by Arabella T. Bonilla against Eric Gordon Mitchell.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit perjury by Hector Bonilla against Eric Gordon Mitchell.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit perjury and deliberate misrepresentation from Attorney Glen Roscoe Anstine II, Esquire against Eric Gordon Mitchell.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to act in bad faith and participate in the intimidation of witnesses and informers to give false and misleading material information to the Grand Jury about Eric Gordon Mitchell.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to retaliate against a Plaintiff in a Federal civil rights action (00D670) to which her associates and co-conspirators are Defendant, constituting a further and oppressive violation of the rights of Eric Gordon Mitchell to due process of the law in the petition of plait for redress of grievances.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to impede law enforcement in a criminal investigation of civil rights violations to which Eric Gordon Mitchell is a Material Witness.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney acting in bad faith, to Obstruct Justice, abuse the Grand Jury process and to deliberately and materially mislead the Grand Jury to indict Eric Gordon Mitchell.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to improperly impede the proper progression of the due process of the law and to abuse the process and to subvert the process.

Senior Assistant Attorney General Marleen M. Langfield failed to rise to minimal standards of professional performance to adequately supervise her Investigation Team; 'The Multi- Jurisdictional Domestic Terrorism Taskforce; Gary Clyman, Don Estep, or Curt Maleri.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has failed to conduct herself to the minimal standards of professional performance on such a broad scale and in so many incidents and over such a period of time as to demonstrate an unfitness to practice amongst ethical practitioners and to impede, mislead, injure and defame the legal process and administration of justice.

Affiant: **Eric Gordon Mitchell**

State of Colorado)
) ss.
County of _____)

Affirmed and Attested to before me by Eric Gordon Mitchell on the ____th day of _____, 2001.

Notary Public

My commission expires:

Attachment C:

**To the Attorney Regulation Committee
Regulation Counsel Office**

Request for Investigation, Verified Notice of Misconduct, and Petition to Suspend the License to Practice of Marleen M. Langfield for Cause

Complainant:

Charles Harry Clements
1741 Dallas Street
Aurora, Adams County, Colorado

against

Respondent:

Marleen M. Langfield, Esquire, Registration Number 10355
1525 Sherman Street, 5th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203

Rule 241.12. Complaint (2) Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 241.11 (a)(2), (a)(3), or (a)(4) by any complainant in the complainant's own name. Charles Harry Clements is an adult; of sound mind and tells the truth, has firsthand knowledge and respectfully declares as follows;

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.9 (1), Charles Harry Clements requests the Grievance Committee to initiate an investigation of the above listed party, Marleen M. Langfield, a lawyer, for unethical behavior by act or omission and professional misconduct.

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.8 “...or because *he has engaged in conduct which poses an immediate threat to the effective administration of justice*, the Supreme Court may order the lawyer's license to practice law immediately suspended.”

Charles Harry Clements recommends and requests the immediate suspension of the License to Practice Law of the above listed party, Marleen M. Langfield, as her continued practice of law constitutes an immediate threat to the effective administration of justice.

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (1) The above listed attorney Marleen M. Langfield is subject to the jurisdiction of the State Supreme Court of Colorado; the lawyer, Marleen M. Langfield, is before the Colorado Bar

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (2) The allegations, when proved, will constitute grounds for severe disciplinary action against Marleen M. Langfield.

Rule 241.12. Complaint (b) Service of Complaint. The Disciplinary Counsel shall promptly serve the respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, as provided in C.R.C.P. 241.25 (b), a citation and a copy of the complaint filed against the respondent.

Rule 241.6. Grounds for Discipline

Misconduct by a lawyer, individually or in concert with others, including the following acts or omissions, shall constitute grounds for discipline, whether or not the act or omission occurred in the course of an attorney-client relationship:

- (1) Any act or omission which violates the provisions of the Code of Professional Responsibility or the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct;
- (2) Any act or omission which violates accepted rules or standards of legal ethics;
- (3) Any act or omission which violates the highest standards of honesty, justice, or morality;
- (4) Any act or omission which constitutes gross negligence, if committed by a lawyer in his capacity as a lawyer;
- (5) Any act or omission which violates the criminal laws of the state or any other state, or of the United States;
- (7) Any act or omission which violates these Rules or which violates an order of discipline or disability;

Rule 8.4. Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- (a) violate or attempt to violate the rules of professional conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the act of another;
- (b) commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects;
- (c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;
- (d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
- (f) knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law;

(g) engage in conduct which violates accepted standards of legal ethics;

The enumeration of acts and omissions constituting grounds for discipline is not exclusive, and other acts or omissions amounting to unprofessional conduct may constitute grounds for discipline.

Exhibits:

Reference: COLORADO STATE GRAND JURY INDICTMENT 00CR0001 (Exhibit 1)

Reference: Warrant of Arrest Docket Number D0302000CR003373 02 Combined Court, Jefferson County Colorado (Exhibit 2)

Reference: Motion and Order to Dismiss Case no. 00CR3373 of 01 Oct 01 (Exhibit 3) and all incorporated herein as if fully reproduced.

Complainant Charles Harry Clements states the following as fact;

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted in action 00CR3373, Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count One. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Two. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Three. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Four. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Five. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Six. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Seven. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Eight. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Nine. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Ten. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Eleven. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Criminal Extortion (F4), Count Thirteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Offering a False Instrument for Recording in the First Degree (F5), Count Fourteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Computer Crime/Scheme to Defraud over \$15,000 (F3), Count Fifteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Attempt to Influence a Public Servant (F4), Count Sixteen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and such charge was improper on its face. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged and maliciously prosecuted Charles Harry Clements with Unlawfully Carrying a Concealed Weapon on a Jefferson County School Ground (M2), Count Seventeen. No such evidence was ever presented to the Grand Jury and Attorney Langfield knew of the highly charged emotional atmosphere in Jefferson County subsequent to the Massacre at Columbine High School and she fully intended that opprobrium be improperly attached to Charles Harry Clements during arrest by the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department Fugitive Arrest Team and detention by Jefferson County Detention Center, arraignment by a Jefferson County Judge and such knowledge by Jefferson County residents. Any such charge was improper and deliberately inflammatory to custodial personnel and viciously defamatory to Charles Harry Clements. (Exhibit 1)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately assisted in the improper issuance of a Fugitive Felony Warrant of Arrest for Charles Harry Clements on Sixteen Felony Counts and One Misdemeanor charge full knowing that Charles Harry Clements had lived in the same domicile for many years and was not aware of any charges against him nor fugitive in the least, and such arrest solely to harass and molest Charles Harry Clements and create a false image of violence and criminality. (Exhibit 2)

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately applied for an unconscionably high bond for Charles Harry Clements on the basis of being charged with Sixteen Felonies and One Misdemeanor charge, full knowing the charges were false on their face and maliciously prosecuted and an abuse of process.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly, deliberately and maliciously caused Charles H. Clements to be paraded in a particularly humiliating and degrading manner at his home, before Family and Neighbors, whilst dressed in Orange Jail Clothes and shackled hand and foot, by the threat of vigorous prosecution, and her full knowing that the charges were false and unfounded and maliciously prosecuted and represented the threat of decades of possible incarceration.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately delayed arraignment for several days of incarceration while Charles Harry Clements was subjected to severe debilitation by deliberate cold, deliberate sleep deprivation, deliberate psychological stress and abuse and physical discomfort of a nature to debilitate a 57 year old man of infirm constitution in order to gain improper advantage by torture and abuse.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, deliberately withheld any charging document stating the nature of the charges against Charles Harry Clements for two weeks or more knowing that an understanding of the charges is necessary to formulate a reasoned response by the detainee and seeking to gain an unfair advantage in a malicious prosecution.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, deliberately withheld any copy of the Statewide Grand Jury Indictment to Charles Harry Clements during four days of incarceration.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield, knowingly and deliberately falsely charged Charles Harry Clements with Criminal Extortion, Count Twelve in Case 00CR3373 full knowing that the charge was groundless, frivolous, unfounded and stemmed from the expression of Criminal Perjury suborned from witnesses Hector Bonilla and Victoria de Thouars-Tollman.

All the charges against Charles Harry Clements were subsequently dismissed on application from the District Attorney's Office. (Exhibit 3)

Allegations of Misconduct:

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office, and her training as an attorney in an unethical and unprofessional manner to manipulate and mislead the Statewide Grand Jury. That is to say; to gain unfair advantage in civil proceedings to which Charles Harry Clements is a 3rd Party Witness for the Plaintiff; Federal District Court cases 97N1501, 97D1036, 97B1747, 01ES1145, and to which cases her office, office clients and associates, and investigative team are Defendant.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has unethically misused her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to conspire to obstruct justice and gain an unfair and improper advantage with, and on behalf of, her associates who are Defendants in civil proceedings to which Charles Harry Clements is a 3rd Party Witness for the Plaintiff; Federal District Court cases 97N1501, 97D1036, 97B1747, 01ES1145 contrary to the accepted standards of professional conduct.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has unethically and unprofessionally used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to conspire to obstruct justice, impede investigation, conceal culpability, limit liability exposure and to gain an unfair and improper advantage with, and on behalf of, associates who are accused in Verified Criminal Charges to which Charles Harry Clements may be a 3rd Party and Material Witness.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office, and her training as an attorney in an abuse of process to manipulate and mislead the Statewide Grand Jury to gain unfair advantage in criminal proceedings to which Charles Harry Clements is a Witness; 00CR3371, 00CR2419 and such others.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit material perjury by Arabella T. Bonilla against Charles Harry Clements.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit material perjury by Hector Bonilla against Charles Harry Clements.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to suborn and submit material perjury by Victoria de Thouars-Tollman against Charles Harry Clements.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has mis-used her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to act in bad faith and participate in the intimidation of witnesses and informers and the manipulation of evidence to give false and misleading material information to the Grand Jury.

The Respondent, Marleen M. Langfield has abused her position as a Senior Assistant Attorney General in the Colorado State Attorney General's Office and training as an attorney to impede Federal law enforcement in a criminal investigation of civil rights violations to which Charles Harry Clements is a Material Witness by trying to impeach witness' credibility and intimidate by abuse of process.

Marleen M. Langfield, as Senior Assistant Attorney General of the State of Colorado improperly and unethically used her knowledge of Charles Harry Clements' proprietary and confidential business information as extorted by threat of prosecution, to destroy, or have destroyed by her skilled subordinates, the website business endeavors; informational sites, business and personal e-mail and webspace allocations for posting such information and advertising, in malicious interference to gain unfair advantage and cause malicious and vindictive harm to Charles Harry Clements and to abridge his Constitutionally guaranteed civil rights.

Senior Assistant State Attorney General, Special Deputy District Attorney Marleen M. Langfield has utterly failed to competently supervise her Investigation Team; 'The Multi- Jurisdictional Domestic Terrorism Taskforce; to include Senior Investigator Gary Clyman, Jefferson County Deputy Sheriff, Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Agent, Special Deputy United States Marshal Don Estep, or FBI Special Agent Curt Maleri and such others as presently unknown to Affiant, and engaged in conspiracy and a meeting of minds to deliberately and maliciously abuse the civil rights of Charles Harry Clements in order to gain unfair advantage on behalf of her co-conspirators and accomplices by an abuse of process and position far beyond the scope of any discretion.

There is reasonable evidence and credible allegations submitted to the Jefferson County Court in case 00CR3371 which would indicate, in the most generous interpretation, that this is not an isolated instance for Marleen Langfield, but is indicative of a continuing pattern of ethical mis-conduct and poor professional performance reflecting her low Ethical standard and ignoring her onus to the Code

of Professional Responsibility. Marleen M. Langfield is named in Notice of Conspiracy to Commit State & Federal Crimes filed 10/13/01 in case 00CR3371.

Marleen M. Langfield has failed to comport herself to the least standards of professional performance and ethical rigor; on such a broad scale, and in so many incidents, and over such a period of time, as to demonstrate an unfitness to practice amongst ethical practitioners; and to impede, mislead, injure and defame the legal process and administration of justice by malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect and incapacity as an honored representative of the Legal Profession.

Her continued practice would tend to bring opprobrium upon the Legal Profession, to hold our system of jurisprudence to incredulity, and to add to any unfortunate public perception of the integrity of the system and its Senior administrators.

This Request is based on the very best of my firm belief and affirms by the broad range of documentation and related evidence known to me.

I declare it to be truthful and without any intent to deceive or mislead.

Affiant: Charles Harry Clements

State of Colorado)
) ss.
County of _____)

Affirmed and Attested to before me by Charles Harry Clements on the ____th day of _____, 2001.

Notary Public

My commission expires:

Attachment D:

Colorado Supreme Court Grievance Committee Verified Notice of Misconduct and Petition to Suspend License to Practice for Cause

Notified:

Steve Douglas, Gartin
'expressly without the U.S."

C/o Eighty Seven Eighty One Sheridan Boulevard, #124
Arvada [80003], Colorado

Regarding Federal Criminal Cases:

00-CR-122

99-CR-443

99-M-1509

Jefferson County Cases

00CV1927

00CR2419

Respondent:

Glen Roscoe Anstine II, Esquire #14384

4704 Harlan Street Suite 320
Denver, Colorado 80212

Rule 241.12. Complaint (2) Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 241.11 (a)(2), (a)(3), or (a)(4) by any complainant in the complainant's own name.

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.9 (1), Steve Douglas, Gartin requests the Grievance Committee to initiate an investigation of the above listed party, Glen Roscoe Anstine II, a lawyer.

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 241.8 "...or because *he has engaged in conduct which poses an immediate threat to the effective administration of justice*, the Supreme Court may order the lawyer's license to practice law immediately suspended."

Steve Douglas, Gartin recommends and requests the immediate suspension of the license to practice law of the above listed party, Glen Roscoe Anstine II.

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (1) The above listed attorney, Glen Roscoe Anstine II is subject to the jurisdiction of the State Supreme Court of Colorado; the lawyer, Glen Roscoe Anstine II, is before the Colorado Bar

Rule 241.9. Request for Investigation (b) (2) The allegations, when proved, will constitute grounds for severe disciplinary action against Glen Roscoe Anstine II.

Rule 241.12. Complaint (b) Service of Complaint. The Disciplinary Counsel shall promptly serve the respondent, Glen Roscoe Anstine II, as provided in C.R.C.P. 241.25 (b), a citation and a copy of the complaint filed against the respondent.

Rule 241.6. Grounds for Discipline

Misconduct by a lawyer, individually or in concert with others, including the following acts or omissions, shall constitute grounds for discipline, whether or not the act or omission occurred in the course of an attorney-client relationship:

- (1) Any act or omission which violates the provisions of the Code of Professional Responsibility or the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct;
- (2) Any act or omission which violates accepted rules or standards of legal ethics;
- (3) Any act or omission which violates the highest standards of honesty, justice, or morality;
- (4) Any act or omission which constitutes gross negligence, if committed by a lawyer in his capacity as a lawyer;
- (5) Any act or omission which violates the criminal laws of this state or any other state, or of the United States;
- (6) Any act or omission which violates these Rules or which violates an order of discipline or disability;

This enumeration of acts and omissions constituting grounds for discipline is not exclusive, and other acts or omissions amounting to unprofessional conduct may constitute grounds for discipline. Reference attached Affidavit (Exhibit 1) and incorporated herein as if fully reproduced.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II is a member, facilitator and fiduciary agent of the Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization (see Exhibit 2 incorporated herein as if fully reproduced), herein characterized as the 'Bonilla Crime Family', clients; Arabella T. Bonilla, Carlos Ivan Bonilla-Tafoya and Hector Bonilla-Tafoya and engaged in the service of their criminal enterprise, not to manage the enterprise, but to facilitate and enable those that do.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to launder money gained from criminal enterprise (see exhibit 2).

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to facilitate the management of the criminal enterprise.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to manipulate and mislead the Courts to gain unfair advantage in civil proceedings.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to give false and misleading information to the court and to law enforcement officials to facilitate the criminal enterprises of the Bonilla Crime Family.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to suborn and submit perjury by Arabella T. Bonilla.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to participate in the intimidation of witnesses and informers.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to retaliate against Plaintiffs in a civil question.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to impede law enforcement in a criminal investigation.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to obstruct justice and to mislead the Court.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to improperly impede the proper progression of the due process of the law.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to attempt to find Steve Douglas, Gartin and Eric Gordon, Mitchell in order to inform criminal agents of the Bonilla Crime Family to assist in the effectuation of their deaths.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to attempt to find Steve Douglas, Gartin and Eric Gordon, Mitchell in order to misinform and mislead law enforcement officials so as to assist in the effectuation of their deaths.

Rule 8.4. Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- (a) violate or attempt to violate the rules of professional conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the act of another;
- (b) commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects;
- (c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;
- (d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
- (f) knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law;
- (g) engage in conduct which violates accepted standards of legal ethics; or
- (h) engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to convert the proceeds of criminal enterprise to the acquisition of real property.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to manage such property full knowing that criminal enterprise was the sole purpose and function of the property he has managed.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to facilitate and enable the function of the criminal enterprises; drug trade, gun running, illegal immigration and attendant enterprises.

Rule 3.4. Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel

A lawyer shall not:

(a) unlawfully obstruct another party's access to evidence A lawyer shall not counsel or assist another person to do any such act;

(b) falsify evidence, counsel or assist a witness to testify falsely, or offer an inducement to a witness that is prohibited by law;

...or state a personal opinion as to the justness of a cause, the credibility of a witness, the culpability of a civil litigant or the guilt or innocence of an accused.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to reserve and delay legal documents in his possession in order to hide and sequester them from Steve Douglas, Gartin.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has claimed proper service when none was made, to gain improper advantage and to mislead the Court.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to make improper ex parte applications to the Court, using the proper apprehension of Steve Douglas, Gartin of Death Threats made by agents of the corrupt crime family to mislead the Court as to the reasons for non-appearance.

Rule 4.5. Threatening Prosecution

A lawyer shall not threaten to present criminal, administrative or disciplinary charges to obtain an advantage in a civil action nor shall a lawyer present or participate in presenting criminal, administrative or disciplinary charges solely to obtain an advantage in a civil matter.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II has used his position and training as an attorney to threaten prosecution of false and frivolous charges against Affiant in various communications to Affiant and in submissions to the Court.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II knowingly made and suborned false filing of criminal charges to gain advantage in civil case against two parties; Steve Douglas, Gartin and Eric Gordon, Mitchell.

The Respondent, G. Roscoe Anstine II's **false filings** were for malicious personal advantage, financial gain, and criminal facilitation which goes beyond common advocacy or a professional's ethical adversarial position

Rule 3.4. Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel

A lawyer shall not:

(a) unlawfully obstruct another party's access to evidence or unlawfully alter, destroy or conceal a document or other material having potential evidentiary value. A lawyer shall not counsel or assist another person to do any such act;

G. Roscoe Anstine II knowingly and willingly reserved and hid contractual agreements entrusted to his care and for his professional services. Such contractual agreements between Steve Douglas, Gartin and Carlos Ivan Bonilla-Tafoya establish the contractual relationship of Plaintiff with the clients of G. Roscoe Anstine II and are evidence in several ongoing disputes over real property and monies as owed to Plaintiff.

Affiant: Steve Douglas, Gartin

State of Colorado)
) ss.
County of _____)

Affirmed and Attested to before me by Steve Douglas, Gartin on this 12th day of October, 2000 Anno Domini.

Notary Public

My commission expires:_____

Exhibit 1

DISTRICT COURT, COUNTY OF GILPIN, STATE OF COLORADO

Case No. _____

Division _____

AFFIDAVIT OF Steve Douglas, Gartin

ARABELLA T. BONILLA,

Petitioner,

v.

STEVE DOUGLAS a/k/a STEVE DOUGLAS, GARTIN, and
ERIC GORDON a/k/a ERIC GORDON, MITCHELL,

Respondents.

I, Steve Douglas, Gartin, after first being sworn, state as follows:

1. The purported ownership by Petitioner Arabella T. Bonilla in fee simple of the three contiguous Gilpin County mining claims known in legal fiction as the John Q.A. Rollins Placer Mine, the Empire State Lode Mining Claim, and the Dundee Lode Mining Claim is a sham and a fraud and a criminal enterprise in service to the *Bonilla Crime Family* d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C., a Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization as described in U.S.C. Title 18 Sec. 1961 et seq.
2. The purported ownership by Petitioner Arabella T. Bonilla of such properties in the City & County of Denver as liened by Affiant, Steve Douglas, Gartin is a sham and a fraud and a criminal enterprise in service to the *Bonilla Crime Family*, a.k.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and Bonilla Services, Inc., a Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization as described in U.S.C. Title 18 Sec. 1961 et seq.
3. The purported ownership by Petitioner Arabella T. Bonilla of such properties in the County of Jefferson as liened by Affiant, Steve Douglas, Gartin is a sham and a fraud and a criminal enterprise in service to the *Bonilla Crime Family* a.k.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and Bonilla Services, Inc., a Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization as described in U.S.C. Title 18 Sec. 1961 et seq.
4. The Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Services, Inc. and/or Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. is a multigenerational and broad based criminal enterprise involved in interstate and international illegal gun purchase, illegal distribution of such firearms interstate and internationally; the interstate and international felonious manufacturing, importation, receiving, concealment, buying, selling, and otherwise dealing in controlled substances and listed chemicals, transportation, distribution and sale of multiple dangerous drugs and chemicals, as well as other contraband; the illegal importation, transportation, and clandestine housing and employment of illegal immigrants also involved in the international illegal gun and drug trade, illegal money laundering, obtaining fraudulent immigration documentation and their sale to such illegal immigrants, and such properties described above are used for those illegal purposes and were purchased with monies from such criminal enterprises. (Page 1 of 3)
5. Steve Douglas, Gartin has provided to Arabella T. Bonilla all of the services and materials described in the filed and attested documents entitled "CLAIM OF LIEN." Any assertion to the contrary is in furtherance of theft by fraud and is intended to further mislead the Government of the United States, the honorable court and to advance the criminal enterprises of the Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and/or Bonilla Services, Inc.
6. Carlos Ivan Bonilla-Tafoya is the son of Arabella T. Bonilla, her **managing agent** and close co-conspirator in the Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and/or Bonilla Services, Inc, and their fraud perpetrated on Steve Douglas, Gartin.
7. Hector Bonilla-Tafoya is the son of Arabella T. Bonilla, her acknowledged agent and close co-conspirator in the Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and Bonilla Services, Inc, and their fraud perpetrated on Steve Douglas, Gartin.

8. The lien filings are a proper and lawful attempt to receive proper payment for goods and services rendered and the proper performance to the agreements and contracts made with the agents of Arabella T. Bonilla, matriarch and leader, upon her father, “Charlie” Tafoya’s death, of the Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and/or Bonilla Services, Inc.

9. Arabella T. Bonilla is, and has always been, fully and completely aware of the agreements made and the commitments made by her agents, Carlos Ivan Bonilla-Tafoya and Hector Bonilla-Tafoya; a full party to every agreement and all made with her full understanding and complete knowledge. Any assertion to the contrary is a lie and an attempt to mislead the Government of the United States and the Honorable Court in furtherance of a theft by fraud and theft of services by the Bonilla Crime Family, a.k.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and Bonilla Services, Inc., a Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization.

10. Arabella T. Bonilla has been presented with all information concerning this dispute both in hand and through her legal representative, Glen Roscoe Anstine II, Esquire. Attorney Glen Roscoe Anstine II is her co-conspirator, tactical advisor, fiduciary agent and Attorney in Fact of the Bonilla Crime Family, d.b.a. Bonilla Family Investments, L.L.C. and Bonilla Services, Inc., a complicit and knowing actor in this criminal conspiracy, not to manage the criminal enterprise, but to facilitate and enable those that do.

11. Affiant has received death threats from the criminal agents of the Bonilla Crime Family and believes and on the basis of that belief alleges, that they have, in fact and practice, sent agents to kill him. Affiant believes, and on the basis of that belief alleges, that **appearance before the Honorable Court would constitute a perfect opportunity for the execution of said death threat** and reserves his participation by other than Special Appearance for that reason and no other.

12. Affiant is further aware of threats and **proffering of false information** made and given by members in association of the Bonilla Crime Family in conspiracy with the criminal money laundering enterprise of **Terrell Wayne Sisson**, Dr. Berry Auger, Dean Earl Golden, James Perin and James John Jorrisen d.b.a. **Y2K in Paradise** to Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Deputy Marshals of the United States Marshal’s Office, and Law Enforcement Officers of numerous Counties in the immediate area of Metropolitan Denver. Such false information is knowingly and intentionally constructed to instigate, precipitate and to cause Affiant’s death at the hands of the agents and officers. These ultimate facts are documented by direct statements by Terrell Wayne Sisson in open court on August 29, 2000 and verified by James John Jorrisen.

(Page 2 of 3)

13. These associates of the Bonilla Crime Family; Terrell Wayne Sisson, James John Jorresen, also known as ‘James Jorgeson’, ‘James Jorressen’, ‘James Jorensen’ *and other such criminal aliases*, Melanie Sisson, Dean Earl Golden, James Perin and such others have threatened affiant and given false information to the agents of the United States Government and such others to attempt to hide and conceal their criminal enterprise, an international Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization as described in Title 18 sec. 1961 et seq. and to obstruct law enforcement and to intimidate the witness of Affiant to the proper authorities in an on-going criminal enterprise.

14. The criminal enterprises of the above named parties and such others, including but not limited to; **South Sea Trust, Ranch Management Trust, Y2K in Paradise** and such others as to be discovered, are deliberate and knowing credit frauds, formed and managed by the above named parties as a deliberate fraud to obtain monies, a means to launder monies from other criminal enterprises as with the proceeds of the Bonilla Crime Family and others, to hide and conceal such monies from the Internal Revenue Service

and evade proper taxation, to transfer such monies overseas and to effect fraudulent monetary instrumentation, engaging in fraudulent monetary activity on property obtained by criminal enterprise.

15. Affiant incorporates paragraphs 1-14 herein by reference and as if fully reproduced herein and alleges that he has received serious and credible threats from these Mexican criminal agents and U.S. citizens, to wit: Arabella T. Bonilla, Carlos Ivan Bonilla-Tafoya, Hector Bonilla-Tafoya and **Glen Roscoe Anstine, Esquire**, Terrell Wayne Sisson, James John Jorrisen, James Perin, Dean Earl Golden and Melanie Sisson in conspiracy with an on-going Law Enforcement Conspiracy involving Agents from multiple jurisdictions to include but not limited to; **Donald Estep, Jefferson County Sheriffs** and **Federal Agent, Jefferson County Sheriff** John P. Stone, Ex-Jefferson County Sheriff Ronald Beckham, Bruce W. Hartman, *Gilpin County Sheriff*, Patrick Sullivan, *Arapahoe County Sheriff*, Stephen Zotos *Douglas County Sheriff*, William T. Shearer, *Adams County Sheriff*, the Northglenn Police and the Broomfield Police and a multi-jurisdictional Economic Terrorism Unit and believes and on the basis of that belief alleges, that they have, **in fact and practice**, attempted to and continue to induce agents to kill him. Numerous such agents have appeared on a liened property in dispute in Adams County, to wit: 15155 North Washington – Thornton - Colorado with the means, the intent and the opportunity to murder Affiant on or about August 28, 2000. **Conspirator Terrell Wayne Sisson** admitted these facts on the record in open court in Adams County on or about August 29, 2000. Affiant believes, and on the basis of that belief alleges, that **appearance before the Honorable Court would constitute a perfect opportunity for the execution of said death threats** and reserves his participation by other than Special Appearance for that reason and no other.

Affiant: Steve Douglas, Gartin

State of Colorado)
) ss.
County of Arapahoe)

Affirmed and Attested to before me by Steve Douglas, Gartin on this 7th day of September, 2000.

Sharon L. Davis

Notary Public

My commission expires: **4/21/04**

(Page 3 of 3)

Exhibit 2- Applicable Sections of USC Title 1961, et seq. to the criminal enterprises of the Bonilla Crime Family in association with G. Roscoe Anstine II, Esquire.

US Code as of: 01/05/99
 Sec. 1961.

(1) “racketeering activity” means (A) any act or threat involving murder,..... robbery,or dealing in a controlled substance or listed chemical (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act), which is chargeable under State law and punishable by imprisonment for more than one year;
 (B) any act which is indictable under any of the following provisions of title 18, United States Code: **section 1028** (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents), **section 1341** (relating to mail fraud), **section 1425** (relating to the procurement of citizenship or nationalization unlawfully), **section 1426** (relating to the reproduction of naturalization or citizenship papers), **section 1427** (relating to the sale of naturalization or citizenship papers), **section 1503** (relating to obstruction of justice), **section 1510** (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations), **section 1511** (relating to the obstruction of State or local law enforcement), **section 1512** (relating to tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant), **section 1513** (relating to retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant), **section 1951** (relating to interference with commerce, robbery, or extortion), **section 1952** (relating to racketeering), **section 1956** (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments), **section 1957** (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity),
 (D) or the felonious manufacture, importation, receiving, concealment, buying, selling, or otherwise dealing in a controlled substance or listed chemical (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act), punishable under any law of the United States,
 (F) any act which is indictable under the Immigration and Nationality Act, **section 274** (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens), **section 277** (relating to aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter the United States), or **section 278** (relating to importation of alien for immoral purpose) if the act indictable under such section of such Act was committed for the purpose of financial gain.

Attachment E:

<p>First Judicial District Division 2 CourtRoom 5-A 100 Jefferson County Parkway Golden, Colorado 80401</p>	<p>▲ Court Use Only ▲</p>
<p>PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO - Plaintiff v. STEVE DOUGLAS GARTIN - Defendant</p>	<p>Case Number: 00CR3371 Division 2 LPA</p>
<p>Defendant In Propria Persona: Steve D. Gartin 2363 ½ South Decatur Street Denver, Colorado 80219 sheriffsteve@justice.com</p>	<p>CourtRoom: 5A</p>

Response to Motion to Withdraw

Comes now, Steve D. Gartin, in propria persona (pro-se) and moves this Honorable Court to grant Attorney Miller's Motion to Withdraw and as grounds therefore states as follows:

Note: Attorney Miller's comments are in italics, applicable codes and statues are indented, my responses are in normal typeface.

1. *"The Alternative Defense Counsel appointed Mr. Miller as Advisory Counsel to Mr. Gartin in March, 2002."*

Attorney Miller advised that it would take several months for him to prepare for trial, and although my case was very strong, it was also very complex and would require a great deal of preparation for him to properly present my case to a jury.

2. *"On April 8, 2002, Mr. Miller converted from advisory to representative counsel for Mr. Gartin for purposes of Mr. Gartin's entry of pleas to guilty in 00CR3371."*

Attorney Miller advised me to commit perjury and gain release from the draconian prison conditions at the Jefferson County Detention Facility, rather than to suffer the debilitation and physical deterioration that those conditions were subjecting me to. Attorney Miller advised me to take the plea bargain and get on with my life on the outside. Under the oppressive conditions created by the Detention Facility Staff, it appeared as valid advice.

3. *"Mr. Miller agreed to remain on Mr. Gartin's case through the pendency of the two year probationary period from April 8, 2002 until April 8, 2004."*

I began working for Mr. Miller as a legal assistant, computer expert and database manager soon after my release from jail. Mr. Miller seemed very proud that he had "cut a deal" to get me out of jail and I explained to him that Ms. Langfield had offered me that same deal in April 2001 and that I believed that a jury would find in my favor if my case were simply presented. When I asked Mr. Miller if he had ever actually read any of my pleadings or briefs, Mr. Miller informed me that he had placed my records out on the curb to be recycled and had never read any of them. Aside from the breach of attorney/client confidentiality that openly exposing such information would signify, Mr. Miller should be sanctioned for refusing to return those papers and the evidence from Case #02CR3011, as well as the slight diligence reflected in his failure to familiarize himself with the case..

After withdrawing as Brown's attorney, Ain failed to return Brown's papers upon request in violation of Colo. RPC 1.16(d)(upon termination of representation, taking steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, and refunding any advance payment of any fee not earned).

4. *"During the probationary period, Mr. Gartin demanded that Mr. Miller seek the seating of his criminal record in 00CR3711."*

I am unaware of any such request. During the course of my indenture with Attorney Miller, several of his clients paid to have records sealed. I pulled the records at the courthouses, found the forms on-line and prepared the motions. Mr. Miller agreed to pay me for those services, but never did. I asked if he would sign my petitions to seal the many cases which had been dismissed against me, but remained on my record. He agreed to assist me in that regard. 00CR3711 was not among those cases.

RPC 1.3 (an attorney shall not neglect a legal matter entrusted to that attorney)

5. *“A hearing on a Motion for Forgiveness and Petition to Seal in this matter was held before the Honorable Stephen M. Munsinger on April 8, 2004.”*

6. *“The Motion for Forgiveness and Petition to Seal was denied.”*

It was no wonder that this motion was denied. Although Attorney Miller failed, neglected and refused to provide me a copy of the motion, it was obvious that Mr. Miller relied on the wrong statutes to bring the petition to seal the records and that he failed to present the fact that it was I who was offering forgiveness to FEDERAL, STATE and County actors who had perpetrated atrocities on me and not me asking forgiveness of the court, for what was also unclear and undefined by Mr. Miller's performance. His failure to do due diligence, or to prepare authorities for the cites he did raise is reflective of his general performance as defense counsel.

7. *“For several weeks prior to the April 8, 2004, hearing on this matter, Mr. Gartin would provide no address or phone number for Mr. Miller, nor would he communicate by any other means than email.”*

I spoke with Attorney Miller on 13 March, 2004. He asked me, again, the same questions he had asked several times concerning the continuing S.W.A.T. team assaults that had been perpetrated upon me – dates, times, case numbers and the like. I explained to him again that all that information was indexed and contained in the Supreme Court Brief and that although he had placed the original discovery out on the curb to be recycled, I had provided him with three copies since he destroyed or disseminated the originals. He explained that he was billing the STATE for our phone conversations so I shouldn't worry about it, but I countered with the need for accuracy and that all the information he needed was already in writing so he would not need to worry about me remembering or him writing it down correctly over the phone. I then FAXed the information to him, but he turned off his FAX machine after the first page and refused to accept the documentation by FAX. Mr. Miller had also prepared a letter to Tamara Ann Lee concerning a modification of parenting time and he had asked me for her address several times and I provided that information. When he asked for the information again, I attempted to FAX it to him, but Mr. Miller refused to turn his FAX machine on to receive that information. He ultimately sent the letter to the wrong address and refused to complete the legal process.

Several days later, Mr. Miller sent a letter to me at the wrong address. I did not receive the letter until about 10 days later. The letter contained many mischaracterizations and several lies and some new information concerning Marlene Langfield and Gary Clyman that made me very uncomfortable about Attorney Miller's loyalty and interest in my welfare.

I again telephoned Attorney Miller on 3-31-2004 to report the sighting of Carlos Bonilla outside my residence. He said that he was busy with “his Cookie” a.k.a. Judith Phillips, to not be paranoid and call him the following afternoon after he and “his Cookie” woke up.

*Under the "joint action" test, a § 1983 claim may arise when a private actor **conspires** with a **state actor to deprive** a person of **constitutional rights** under **color** of state law.*

8. *“Mr. Miller does not use e mail with Mr. Gartin as anything reported to Mr. Gartin by Mr. Miller is often forwarded to others, and undermines attorney/client privilege.”*

Attorney Miller's refusal to provide me with the motion he had filed with the court or Ms. Langfield's response to it caused me great concern and trepidation and I felt that it would be in my best interest to document my continuing attempts to communicate with him, so I did, indeed, copy many people into my e-mails to Mr. Miller's business partner, Judith Phillips. Although I had purchased e-mail services for Mr. Miller, he refused to use that method of communications since he sent an e-mail to Harold Brown demanding an additional \$5000.00 from him, which Mr. Brown construed to be extortion and filed a grievance against Mr. Miller based upon that and other malfeasance. I have continually advised Thomas

C. Miller against threatening his clients with going to jail if they don't pay him more money, but he continues to blame e-mail and not his unethical practices for the grievances that many of his clients have filed against him and many more that are currently being prepared.

Under Colo. R. Prof. Conduct 1.4(a), a lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.

9. *"Mr. Miller does not use the internet or e mail in any client matters for security of information."*

Yet, Attorney Miller has no qualms about placing the entire court file in case #00CR3371 out on the street for the recycler to pick up, or not. The information that I was requesting from Attorney Miller was his motion to the court and Ms. Langfield's reply ~ none of which was in any way privileged or confidential.

10. *"Mr. Gartin, without authorization from Mr. Miller,"*

I believe Mr. Miller is supposed to be working for me in this case. I worked for Mr. Miller in many other cases and accepted his authority without question, even when his avarice and his habit of threatening his clients with going to jail if they did not give him more money, revulsed me.

"the Alternative Defense Counsel,"

Mr. Miller advised me that he was petitioning the ADC to retain Mr. Pugliese.

"or this Honorable Court,"

I recall this Honorable Court denying any authority to retain a private investigator in case #02CR3011 and referred Mr. Miller to Brian Shaha at ADC.

"employed the services of a bail bondsman and quasi private investigator, Frank Pugliese, for investigative work in 00 CR 3711"

Mr. Pugliese was appointed by this Honorable Court as the private investigator in case #00CR3371.

"and 02 CR 3011."

Mr. Pugliese did indeed arrange bond in this case, after he had done a full investigation, provided Mr. Miller with the fruits of that investigation and Mr. Miller refused to provide that information to either Ms. Gilstrap or to the Deputy District Attorney who was assigned to prosecute the case, Mr. Joseph Gilmore. If Mr. Pugliese's investigation report had been given to either Ms. Gilstrap or Mr. Gilmore, this case would never have been filed, let alone prosecuted for 14 months. If Mr. Pugliese is a "quasi" private investigator, Wally Barrett is a small mendacious child, working with dull tools and common material. I have observed them both work and Mr. Pugliese is my choice.

11. *"Mr. Pugliese mailed unsupervised and disapproved reports to this Honorable Court and to opposing Counsel in 00 CR 3711 without the knowledge of, consent, or approval of Mr. Miller."*

Mr. Miller refers to a case to which I am not a party and have no knowledge of.

12. *"Mr. Pugliese, acting outside the authority or permission or this Honorable Court, the Alternative Defense Counsel, or Mr. Miller violated the work product privilege of Mr. Gartin."*

Mr. Pugliese did no such thing. I would require Mr. Miller to clarify this statement. Mr. Pugliese did nothing except expose a conspiracy between the State Attorney General's Office, Mr. Miller and Mr. Barrett to prevent me from seeking redress of grievance through lawful process. That is not "work product privilege" nor should that conspiracy be concealed any longer.

13. *"Further, Mr. Gartin refuses to work directly with Wally Barrett,"*

My experience with Wally Barrett has been completely disappointing and greatly disturbing. Mr. Barrett disappears for weeks at a time, has never completed an assignment that I am aware of, and has proven to

be completely unreliable. Three other clients and associates of Mr. Miller has informed me that they have paid Mr. Barrett, in advance, for work that he then failed to perform. I was present in Douglas County Court when Mr. Barrett testified as the investigator in a case that he knew absolutely nothing about. Mr. Miller's clients had never met Mr. Barrett. Mr. Barrett committed perjury in that instance and in several others that I am aware of. Mr. Miller is correct, I refuse to work with Mr. Barrett.

“the appointed Alternative Defense Counsel Investigator, who is supervised by Mr. Miller in 00CR3371”
Mr. Miller is lying. This Honorable Court appointed Mr. Pugliese as the Private Investigator in this case before Mr. Miller was appointed as advisory counsel.

“or 02 CR 3011.”

Investigator Pugliese completed his investigation and proved my innocence as well as Ms. O’Ferrill and Mr. Van Dusen’s guilt before this case was even filed. I requested that Mr. Pugliese be retained for further investigation after this case was filed. Mr. Miller advised me that he would see to it that Mr. Pugliese was appointed. Mr. Miller lied.

Colo. RPC 8.4(c)(engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation).

14. *“On April 9, 2004, without approval or discussion with Mr. Miller, Mr. Gartin filed a pro se Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea.”*

Under Colo. R. Prof. Conduct 1.4(b), a lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.

Mr. Miller refused to communicate with me except by ‘Ben Franklin’s’ mail. The probation period ended on 8 April, 2004 and without legal advice, I felt compelled to confess that I had been coerced into committing perjury.

15. *“Despite hundreds of hours of legal counseling,”*

Despite Mr. Miller’s characterization, it is well known, even in judicial circles that Mr. Miller refers to me as his “law guru.” I can confirm this fact with a judicial officer who witnessed this fact as Mr. Miller knocked on his chamber door and interrupted our conversation, to call me into court in another courtroom, should this Honorable Court require confirmation. Mr. Miller did indeed bill the STATE for counseling, but it was I who counseled him and not he counseling me.

“freedom from incarceration in 00 CR 3711,”

I have never been in jeopardy in this matter. I do not understand the reference.

“and dismissal of 02 CR 3011,”

This case was dismissed due to the sterling investigation conducted by Mr. Frank Pugliese and the integrity of the Prosecuting Attorney, Mr. Joseph Gilmore. Mr. Miller did nothing except create ill-will with Mr. Gilmore and collect somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30,000 for work he did not perform.

“Mr. Gartin continues to ignore or refuse the advice and counsel of Mr. Miller,”

Mr. Miller’s advice has proved to be erroneous and detrimental to every client he has had during the course of my involvement with him. I am unaware of any client Mr. Miller has had who has been satisfied with Mr. Miller’s legal work or who has not been threatened with jail if they did not give Attorney Miller more money than they based their agreement on.

“and proceeded to file an ill advised pro se motion.”

Mr. Miller refused to communicate with me except by U.S. Postal Service. Mr. Miller could not possibly advise me of anything in less than a business week. He did not advise me at all in regard to my Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. My conscience and my relationship with my Creator is all the advice I needed to tell me that I had to clear the record of perjury while the case was open. I did not know until arriving at the court house on 8 April, 2004 that Ms. Langfield opposed my Motion for Forgiveness and Mr. Miller failed to explain that it was I who was willing to forgive all the criminal actions committed against me and that I would not pursue legal action if the records were sealed and the police caution removed from the CBI/NCIC database. I still have not been provided with the motion Mr. Miller filed, so I don't know that he even got the facts right, it was obvious from the proceeding that he did not study the statutes upon which he based his motion.

Monday, April 5th Mr. Miller contacted Mr. Chas Clements and informed him that he was withdrawing from my case and that he would not consummate any of the other agreements we had made. I did not know until April 8, 2004 that Mr. Miller would even appear for the motions hearing. Mr. Miller refused to communicate with me, he refused to provide me a copy of his motion, he refused to provide me a copy of Ms. Langfield's reply.

Under Colo. R. Prof. Conduct 1.16(d), upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, surrendering papers and property to which the client is entitled and refunding any advance payment of fee that has not been earned.

16. *“Paragraph fifteen (15) of the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea alleges ineffective assistance of counsel, and thus precludes further representation.”*

As we departed the courthouse after the 8 April, 2004 motions hearing, Mr. Miller suggested that we prepare a Rule 35c Motion based upon all the constitutional violations that Mr. Miller could not remember when directly asked by Judge Munsinger to enumerate. Mr. Miller again apologized for never reading any of the materials in my case and suggested that he would arrange an appointment with Brian Shaha to procure another \$25,000 to \$50,000 that would be required to fund a Rule 35c motion that would include all the constitutional violations that I had suffered over the course of this extended persecution by Jefferson County, Arapahoe County, STATE and Federal officials. Mr. Miller suggested “ineffective assistance of counsel” as the appropriate rubric under which to bring the Rule 35c motion. It was his point of fact and admission in the presence of witnesses.

OVERVIEW: The State alleged that respondent violated Colo. R. Prof. Conduct 1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), and 1.16(d). The supreme court held that the facts clearly established each of those violations. Respondent agreed to represent a client in connection with a contested matter in court. She accepted a retainer and filed a responsive pleading, but knowingly failed to pay the required filing fee although she had client funds to do so. Thereafter, respondent failed to correct her failure to pay the required fee, failed to keep her client informed of developments in the case, did not attempt to set aside the default judgment, and misinformed her client that the entry of the default resulted from a mistake by the court. Once the client discovered respondent's deception, terminated the attorney/client relationship and secured replacement counsel, respondent failed to deliver the file to replacement counsel and refused to refund any portion of the retainer. 2001 Colo. Discipl. LEXIS 24; 35 P.3d 547

17. *“The probationary period in 00CR3711 was to conclude on April 08, 2004.”*

It was actually case #00CR3371 which concluded on 8 April, 2004. The two year period of probation expired on that date. The alleged “agreement” not to pursue legal action against FEDERAL, STATE and

COUNTY officials was absolved as well. But Attorney Miller had taken the initiative to “welsh” on the agreement and retainer of \$3750.00 that he had accepted from Chas Clements in a meeting on 4 March, 2004 at Mr. Clement’s home. That event caused me concern that perhaps Mr. Miller and his agent, Wally Barrett were conspiring with Ms. Langfield and the State Attorney General’s Office to shield them from legal liability until the statutes of limitations could be invoked to support a F.R.C.P Rule 12b Motion to Dismiss any action that Mr. Clements or myself may institute.

18. *“Mr. Gartin was charged with misdemeanor violations in Coconino County, Arizona on November 17, 2003.”*

Attorney Miller offered to enter his appearance in this matter. He contacted the court, spoke with the District Attorney and there was no case on file at that time. Mr. Miller asked me to research the statutes and provide him with witnesses and affidavits; I did. Attorney Miller informed me that he was in continuing contact with the Coconino County District Attorney’s Office and that no case had been filed. Mr. Miller was scheduled to confer with them on 3-31-2004. I was never apprised of the out-come of that telephone conference or any other development in that case until Mr. Miller’s agent, Wally Barrett appeared on 8 April, 2004 with information that was purportedly FAXed to him late the previous night by Ms. Langfield. It should be noted that I have specifically instructed Mr. Miller not to involve Mr. Barrett in any matter that involves me. Mr. Barrett and his practices are repulsive and abhorrent in my opinion.

Under Colo. R. Prof. Conduct 1.3, a lawyer shall not neglect a legal matter entrusted to that lawyer.

19. *“The Attorney General’s Office in 00 CR 3711 has now filed to revoke Mr. Gartin’s probation on April 7, 2004, based upon the charges in Arizona, and Mr. Gartin’s failure to pay restitution.”*

I have no knowledge of case #00CR3711. I have received no such notice from the Attorney General’s Office. On 8 April, 2004 a person named Wally Barrett appeared at the hearing and told me that he had received a FAX from Marlene Langfield the previous night but refused to provide me a copy of that FAX. Wally Barrett is not involved with my case #00CR3371 nor any other case that I am aware of. Attorney Miller has attempted to impose Mr. Barrett upon me in many instances, but I don’t want anything to do with Mr. Barrett. I have spoken with at least four people who have paid Mr. Barrett for legal services and he has failed to perform even to minimal standards. I have explained to Attorney Miller on numerous occasions that I do not want Mr. Barrett to have anything to do with any case to which I am a party.

If indeed Ms. Langfield did FAX such a motion to Mr. Wally Barrett, I would submit to the Honorable Court that such an action would present a breach of attorney/client privilege and would constitute a conflict of interest wherein Mr. Miller and Ms. Langfield are conspiring to cause damage to me.

From 13 March, 2004 until 8 April, 2004 Mr. Miller refused to communicate with me, to relay either his motions to the court or Ms. Langfield’s replies. Attached, please find an email record of my untiring attempts to communicate with Mr. Miller and to receive information concerning the motions hearing on 8 April, 2004. Included in that record is Mr. Miller’s refusal to provide that information.

abandonment of an attorney’s clients also results in disbarment. See People v. Wallace, 936 P.2d 1282, 1284 (Colo. 1997) (disbarring lawyer who abandoned clients, causing them serious harm, and knowingly misappropriated client funds); People v. Townshend, 933 P.2d 1327, 1329 (Colo.1997)(lawyer disbarred who effectively abandoned two clients after accepting retainers and failing to account for or return the unearned retainers); People v. Gilbert, 921 P.2d 48, 50 (Colo. 1996)(attorney disbarred for converting client funds in conjunction with abandonment of practice); People v. Steinman, 930 P.2d 596, 599-600 (Colo.1997) (lawyer disbarred who accepted fees from clients and then abandoned them while keeping their money and causing serious harm); People v. Jenks, 910 P.2d 688, 692 (Colo. 1996)(attorney disbarred for accepting

legal fees from a number of clients and then abandoning them, causing some of the clients substantial harm); People v. Tucker, 904 P.2d 1321, 1325 (Colo.1995)(lawyer disbarred who abandoned clients while continuing to collect attorney fees for work that would not be performed); People v. Fritsche, 897 P.2d 805, 806-807 (Colo.1995)(lawyer who effectively abandoned clients and disregarded disciplinary proceedings disbarred).

Mr. Miller made a verbal agreement with me to pay me 10% of his gross income in return for the work I was doing for him. He failed to do so. Additionally, I paid for traveling to Boulder every day and for travel to the courts to support his legal practice. Not only did Mr. Miller not pay me as he had agreed, I was shouldering the expenses of maintaining insurance and an automobile to support his legal practice, as well as paying for his websites and email services. Between Mr. Van Dusen's breach of our written contract and Mr. Miller's breach of our verbal contract I have not had a dime to spare or with which to pay the restitution that Mr. Miller told me I did not have to pay. Mr. Miller refused to provide me with a copy of the probation agreement until February 2004. It was then that I discovered that there was also no condition or stipulation that I would not pursue legal action during the pendency of probation. Then Mr. Barrett's report of his interview with State Attorney General Investigator, Gary Clyman confirmed that such an agreement was made verbally, but never committed to writing.

If indeed Ms. Langfield actually filed a motion to revoke my two year probation on the very last day, it would confirm the invidious discriminatory animus against me that I have been complaining of from the filing of my first motion in case #00CR3371 after I was unlawfully extradited from California and unlawfully prosecuted by the State Attorney General's Office sans authorization from the Governor, as required by statute.

For Defendants in a Federal Civil Rights action to be placed in a supervisory position of the Plaintiff in such an action is a prima facie conflict of interest and a flagrant disregard for any law or morality. When such Defendants brazenly commit acts in furtherance of the very conspiracy complained of in that instant matter, any reasonable person would be shocked by such unconscionable government action.

20. "On November 22, 2002, Mr. Gartin was arrested and charged in 02 CR 3011."

It was November 23rd that I was arrested after meeting with one of Attorney Miller's clients in the Broomfield jail; a client that ultimately brought Attorney Miller twice before the Attorney Regulatory Commission – Mr. Kevin Brown. Attorney Miller had been in communication with Lakewood Detective Monique Gilstrap and had assured me that everything was under control. Investigator Pugliese had provided Attorney Miller with his completed investigation, audio tapes of interviews with all the witnesses and originals of the van title that Mr. VanDusen stole from me, my credit card statements for the computer equipment Mr. Van Dusen reported as stolen as well as the hard drive used to set up the master database for the inventory integration and the original customer mailing list on a floppy disk. Attorney Miller refused to produce that evidence to Ms. Gilstrap. He then refused to present that evidence to D.A. Joseph Gilmore. Mr. Gilmore would never had prosecuted case #02CR3011 if Attorney Miller had produced the evidence provided to him by Investigator Pugliese. I believe that Mr. Miller pursued a plan whereby he billed the Alternative Defense Counsel for thousands of dollars while maintaining the hazard of probation violation over me and thus receiving the benefits of my expertise and labor without pay by peonage. Mr. Miller, Ms. Langfield, Mr. Clyman and Donald L. Estep all benefited by their agreement to keep me in hazard of probation violation while preventing me from filing suit against the very people who were administrating my probation. When Investigator Pugliese exposed the conspiracy between Mr. Miller, Wally Barrett and the State Attorney General's Office, Mr. Miller was livid, as was Wally Barrett. They each threatened me that if I had anything to do with Mr. Pugliese they would drop my case. I was unaware that Mr. Barrett had anything to do with my case until Attorney

Miller provided me a copy of his report. That report and other information provided by Investigator Pugliese exposed the conspiracy between defense, prosecution and probation.

21. *“Mr. Miller was again appointed to represent Mr. Gartin in 02 CR 3011 by the Alternative Defense Counsel.”*

When Mr. Miller was appointed, I requested that he also get Investigator Pugliese appointed to the case. He said that he would, in light of the fact that Mr. Pugliese had already conducted the investigation at his own expense. During the fourteen months this case kept me in hazard, Mr. Miller never got Mr. Pugliese appointed. I suspect that Mr. Miller approached Brian Shaha and got Mr. Shaha’s friend, Wally Barrett, appointed and paid for the investigation work that Mr. Pugliese did. Mr. Miller made a remark in passing once that Wally Barrett had been paid \$3000 on my case. Mr. Miller was paid close to ten times that amount for a case that was proven false, frivolous and malicious before its inception by Mr. Pugliese’s immediate investigation.

Colo. RPC 7.3(a)(a lawyer shall not solicit professional employment from a prospective client with whom the lawyer has no family or prior professional relationship where a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain).

22. *“Through assiduous work”*

The records, that Mr. Miller has NOT lost or deliberately set out on the curb for “recycling,” will reflect my notes, my tabs, my legal research and my development of an assiduous work product that Mr. Miller herein attempts to co-opt. Mr. Miller extended absolutely no effort, time, or expertise regarding this matter, although he charged vast amounts of time to the Alternate Defense Counsel, purporting to have done the work. Quite to the contrary, if Mr. Joseph Gilmore were to be questioned concerning his first meeting with Mr. Miller, I would expect that he would recall the vulgar and unprofessional presentation that directly caused this case to proceed for over a year before Mr. Gilmore’s professional discretion resulted in a dismissal. Mr. Miller exacerbated the jeopardy rather than mitigated it. Additionally, each time I accompanied Mr. Miller on his cases to Grand Junction, Castle Rock, Littleton, Broomfield and Denver, Mr. Miller calculated those hours as “working on my case” and billed the STATE. Mr. Miller even flew with his business partner, Judith Phillips to California during my first trip to DragonFest under the rubric of “monitoring my probation,” and I believe that he billed the STATE for those hours as well, even though none of that time was spent on my case.

“and investigation,”

Investigator Frank Pugliese conducted interviews of all individuals named in Ms. Monique Gilstrap’s Police Report within one week of my arrest on November 23, 2002. He investigated the actual theft of my van by Mr. Van Dusen, the contract agreement, the store records, and all related events and found that Mr. Van Dusen and Renita O’Ferrill were the actual criminals and relayed that information to Mr. Miller and accompanied him to the meetings with Lakewood Police Agent Monique Gilstrap. Ms. Gilstrap, however, avoided any meetings with Investigator Pugliese and refused to accept any exculpatory evidence that tended to exonerate Mr. Gartin. She relied on information from Colorado State Attorney General Investigator, Gary Clyman and proceeded upon her prosecution in defiance of the overwhelming facts proving not only the innocence of Mr. Gartin, but the guilt of the complaining/reporting parties: Renita O’Ferrill and Charles F. Van Dusen. Renita O’Ferrill was ultimately charged with theft of over \$350,000.00 and Mr. Pugliese’s investigation uncovered Mr. Van Dusen’s own theft, insurance fraud and other crimes that Attorney Miller committed to me that he would pursue in civil court before turning the evidence over to the proper authorities. Mr. Miller has now refused to pursue my legal interests after

receiving a year and a half of my labor, expertise and the cost of maintaining his websites and email accounts.

“02 CR 3 011 was dismissed by the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office on December 18, 2003.”

And here again Mr. Miller's penchant for inaccuracy begs correction. Deputy D.A. Gilmore's motion was received by the Honorable Court on 12-19-2003 but was not granted until 12 January, 2004 and FAXed to Mr. Miller on the 14th of January, 2004. At this point in time the record reflects the fact that Mr. Miller had FAX capabilities. On March 13, 2004 Mr. Miller denies having this capability when requested to receive pertinent information VIA FAX by this Client; information which Attorney Miller then fails to professionally act upon to the detriment of this Client.

23. *“Mr. Gartin requires no further representation in 02 CR 3011.”*

Mr. Miller volunteered information garnered during his conversation with Mr. Gilmore prior to the hearing on 8 April, 2004 that Mr. Gilmore was concerned that Mr. Gartin was preparing to sue him for malicious prosecution in dismissed case #02CR3011. Attorney Miller purportedly assured Attorney Gilmore that no such action would be forthcoming. Attorney Miller appears to have some sort of vested interest in preventing this party from seeking redress of grievance through application to the courts. The prevention of any legal action by Mr. Gartin appears to be a consistent thread throughout the permutations of this and related cases. Although in this instance, Mr. Miller's comments to Mr. Gilmore was a correct characterization of my intent, his continuing efforts to prevent me from pursuing legal recourse has formed a “pattern of conduct” that reeks of conspiracy with the State Attorney General's Office. The fact that Attorney Miller also prevented any legal action by Chas Clements even after he retained Mr. Miller with \$3750 confirms my suspicions. On 4 March, 2004 Mr. Miller confessed to Mr. Clements that he was “welshing” on the agreement Mr. Clements had retained him to consummate.

24. *“Brien Shaha, Director of the Alternative Defense Counsel, does not object to Mr. Miller's withdrawal from 00 CR 3711”*

This reflects Mr. Miller's continuing haphazard approach to his profession. I have no knowledge of 00CR3711, nor have I ever been involved, personally, nor as Mr. Miller's legal assistant in this case. As Mr. Miller's legal assistant, I was appalled at the lack of diligence Mr. Miller exhibited. No matter how industriously I or Pamela Hadas organized Mr. Miller's files, he would loose motions, orders and pertinent information in every case he had. Without Ms. Hadas or myself, Mr. Miller could not find or access any information in his office or in his computer. In spite of teaching him to use ACT!, *the premier contact management program on the market*, Mr. Miller would continually miss court appointments and cause damage to his clients by having warrants issued against them. Mr. Miller even missed my pre-trial hearing on Case #02CR3011 and several filing deadlines. Mr. Miller missed deadlines in every case he had. In order to escape censor by the attorney regulatory commission, Mr. Miller feigned “West Nile” disease, even though he was never diagnosed with that illness. Mr. Miller used that excuse for his lack of performance, failure to meet deadlines, slight diligence and missed court appointments even in the Federal Court.

“and 02 CR 3011.”

This case illustrates in bold, unambiguous terms the very malicious, vindictive and retaliatory prosecution that I have complained of since Donald L. Estep and the Jefferson County S.W.A.T. Team breached the door of my domicile in Golden on 26 February, 1997 and then filed false, frivolous and vexatious charges to cover up the violation of 18 U.S.C. 241 & 242 and the criminal sanctions and civil penalties pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1986, 1985 and 1983 that such an unlawful act would make all actors involved liable for. Each ensuing act of aggression these people have committed against me is compelling evidence of the continuing effort to cover-up and conceal their lawless conspiracy. Mr. Miller and Wally Barrett have now confirmed their participation in this on-going criminal enterprise. It was after Mr. Pugliese's Final

Report in this matter revealed this unholy alliance and continuing conspiracy that Mr. Miller and his agent, Wally Barret began making threats that I would go to jail because of Mr. Pugliese's "harpooning" my case by sending that report to the Honorable Leland Paul Anderson. Mr. Miller and Wally Barrett also began making broad threats that they would "get" Frank Pugliese and Mr. Miller advised Chas Clements that he would report Mr. Pugliese to Brian Shaha and see to it that Mr. Pugliese never worked in this town again.

Further, Ms. Langfield, in open court on 8 April, 2004 – before the Honorable Stephen Munsinger, in response to Attorney Miller's affirmative statement that Ms. Langfield and Mr. Gary Clyman were Defendants in Federal Civil Rights Case #01-ES-1145, and concomitantly the probation officer and CBI/NCIC reporting contacts during the probation period at issue herein and surely both interested and biased and that such association established a prima facie conflict of interest; Ms. Langfield replied that the case had been dismissed three weeks after its filing, knew, or should have known that case #01-ES-1145 was not dismissed until 6-4-2002 for "failure to prosecute" based upon the phantom agreement between Mr. Miller and Ms. Langfield to prevent this Plaintiff from seeking redress of grievance during the period of probation.

*American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions § 6.11 (1986) provides that **disbarment** is generally appropriate when a lawyer, with the **intent to deceive** the court, makes a **false statement**, submits a **false document**, or improperly **withholds material information**, and causes serious or potentially **serious injury** to a party, or causes a significant or potentially **significant adverse effect** on the legal proceeding.*

"Therefore, in the interests of substantial Justice and fundamental fairness, Thomas C. "Doc" Miller requests this Honorable Court to grant the foregoing Motion to Withdraw."

I taught Mr. Miller the terms, 'substantial justice' and 'fundamental fairness' but I know now that he has no concept of those terms. On the way to California in November, I dropped in to visit Pamela Hadas, Mr. Miller's ex-legal assistant and office manager. When I realized the horrible crimes Mr. Miller and Judith Phillips had committed against her, I determined to distance myself from Mr. Miller and Ms. Phillips and their unethical and immoral business practices. Unfortunately, Mr. Miller and Ms. Phillips continued their nefarious activities and I was already involved with some of Mr. Miller's clients and had to act as an arbitrator and investigator in a few instances after returning from California. I have only set foot in Mr. Miller's house once again after discovering the depths of depravity to which he, Ms. Phillips and Mr. Barrett will dive for money, and that was the occasion when I reported the unlawful traffic stop and unlawful search, seizure and arrest in Flagstaff Arizona and arranged Attorney Miller's contact with the Coconio County District Attorney's Office and entry into that matter.

Because of Mr. Miller's complete failure to rise to minimal standards of professional performance and his lack of honor and integrity I do not oppose his motion to withdraw from all cases in which I am involved either as a Plaintiff or Defendant.

*In the absence of mitigating factors, **disbarment** is generally appropriate when a lawyer, with the **intent to deceive** the court, makes a **false statement**, submits a **false document**, or improperly **withholds material information**, and causes serious or potentially **serious injury** to a party, or causes a significant or potentially **significant adverse effect** on the legal proceeding. American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions **6.11** (1991 & Supp. 1992). Further, **disbarment** is warranted when: (a) a lawyer engages in serious criminal conduct, a necessary element of which includes intentional interference with the administration of justice, false swearing, misrepresentation, fraud, extortion, misappropriation, or theft; . . . or (b) a lawyer engages in any other intentional conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation*

that seriously adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice. 897 P.2d 807; 1995 Colo. LEXIS 251; 19 BTR 931

“Respectfully submitted this Thursday, April 15, 2004,”

I remain unconvinced that Mr. Thomas C. “Doc” Miller, esquire has respect for anything or anyone and I am in complete agreement that he should be granted the opportunity to withdraw from any and all representation and association with me and everything related to me.

Ms. Marlene Langfield has repeatedly falsified information before this Honorable Court and intentionally withheld discovery in contravention of both statute and the Rules of Professional Conduct. Attorney Miller has joindered her infidelity and deceit. Wally Barrett has exposed their conspiracy to obstruct justice and subvert the well-meaning and honorable intent of this court and Investigator Pugliese has reported those violations to this Honorable Court. Ms. Langfield, Attorney Miller and his agent Wally Barrett have all profited handsomely from their nefarious collusion and conspiracy to cover-up and conceal the lawless acts of their cohorts, Donald L. Estep, Gary Clyman and their comrades.

It is time for a jury trial and I feel confident in my ability to present my case to a jury of my peers.

Contrary to what I believe is Mr. Miller’s attitude toward respect, I hold this Honorable Court and in particular Judge Leland Paul Anderson in high esteem and do, without reservation, respectfully submit this Motion of Unopposed Agreement with Attorney Miller’s Motion to Withdraw.

Humbly submitted in good faith,

Steve Gartin – In Propria Persona (pro-se)
2363 ½ South Decatur Street
Denver, Colorado 80219
sheriffsteve@justice.com
720-404-1812

Sunday, April 18, 2004

Affidavit of Service by FAX

Clerk of the District Court
Division 2
303-271-6114

Deputy District Attorney Joseph Gilmore
303-271-6888

Investigator Frank Pugliese
303-750-6304

Thursday, May 20, 2004

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
VIA DEPOSIT IN BEN FRANKLIN'S MAIL SYSTEM**

I, Steve D. Gartin, oversigned, do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing, **Response to Motion to Withdraw** was personally deposited in the Ben Franklin U.S. Postal System on the Ninth day of the Fourth month in the Year of our Lord Two Thousand and Four, addressed to the following parties:

The Honorable Leland P. Anderson
Division 2 First Judicial District
100 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401

Thomas C. Miller, Esquire
Counselor At Law
1026 Lincoln Place
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Marlene M. Langfield, Esquire
Deputy State Attorney General
Special Prosecutions Unit
d.b.a. "Special" Jefferson County Deputy District Attorney
c/o District Attorney David J. Thomas, Esquire
Jefferson County District Attorney's Office
500 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401