

# 9

By Evan Gutman CPA, JD (2002)

## THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS BEEN WAITING FOR THIS CASE

Judges loves cases dealing with legislative or executive power. They love to sit in judgment of another branch of government and render the final determination of the proper scope of another branch of government's power. Judges will not hesitate to hear cases dealing with murder, robbery, extortion, rape, personal injuries, defective products, environmental claims, police conduct, abortion, religion, political funding, children, education and virtually every other single category that a person can imagine. There is one glaring exception. Judges detest cases addressing the proper scope of judicial power and State Bar authority. That needs to change.

If the Judiciary is going to continue to regulate the practice of law in form, then it must begin to do so aggressively as a matter of substance, and with a keen concern for constitutional freedoms which are in fact applicable to the Judiciary just like everyone else. The power to interpret law does not carry with it a general exemption from the law. Contrary to what the hypocritical State Bars believe, when I became a member of the Pennsylvania and District of Columbia Bars, I did not check my First Amendment rights at the door.

It has now been approximately thirty years since the U.S. Supreme Court rendered its' 5-4 decisions in *Baird*, *Stolar* and *Wadmond* on the exact same day (those cases are discussed later herein). Those opinions read in conjunction with each other established nothing. They simply demonstrated that the Court did not know how to deal with the issue. The Court ruled in favor of the Applicants in *Baird* and *Stolar*, and in favor of the Bar in *Wadmond*, with Justice Potter Stewart being the swing vote in all three cases. All of the Bar admission cases that have addressed the moral character issue, including *Willner*, *Anastaplo*, *Konigsberg I*, *Konigsberg II*, and *Schware* focused on the First Amendment and freedom of expression. The heart and soul of the issue however, is really the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court has never directly addressed that issue. And it is the weak spot. The proudest point of vulnerability. It is the Achilles Heel, so to speak, because to rule in favor of the Bar, requires the Court in a high profile case to somehow convince the general public that allowing licensed attorneys and Judges to be held a lower standard of moral conduct than Nonattorney Bar applicants is a good idea. No matter how such an opinion were written, the public will never buy into it. It is time for the U.S. Supreme Court to take a decisive stand. They must stand with the general public, or it will be clearly known that they stand with the State Bars.

I have an absolutely perfect fact set for this case, which I have spent almost a decade building. I have already passed the character review process of two Bars. I gained admission even after presenting the most derogatory information about myself and without being required to attend a personal interview. Stated simply, I outplayed the Bar admissions process. I have never been professionally disciplined and never had even one single ethical complaint of any nature ever filed against him. I am currently the most knowledgeable person in the entire nation regarding the State Bar admissions process. I have no current intention of degrading myself by actually engaging in the practice of law, and now simply seek to reform the admissions process for the purpose of improving the nation's legal profession. It's a perfect fact set by the Ultimate Backdoor Applicant. I snuck in the backdoor, and now I'm going to open the front door.

I believe the U.S. Supreme Court wants to remedy this situation, and further believe their opinions over the last two decades have been slowly setting the groundwork in place. They have been waiting however, for the right litigant with the right fact set to come along. I am that individual. I have complete faith and confidence that the U.S. Supreme Court will ultimately rule in favor of the general public on this critically important issue which affects every single other litigation in this country.

The U.S. Supreme Court has been waiting for this case, or they are simply afraid of it.