#### Casee1122200rf000086-BAH Document 67 FFilee0095298/23 PRgeje bfof024

### BERYL A. HOWELL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | : | Docket No.: 0090 1:22CR00086-001 |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
|                          | : |                                  |
| VS.                      | : | Disclosure Date: April 24, 2023  |
|                          | : |                                  |
| Roche, Michael           | : |                                  |

#### PARTIES OBLIGATION AND RESPONSE TO PRESENTENCE REPORT

Pursuant to Fed. Rules of Crim. Proc. Rule 32(f)(1) and (2), the parties shall submit any material inaccuracies or disputes to the presentence investigation report (PSR), by May 8, 2023. This form and/or objections to the PSR shall be filed via CM/ECF.

Note: The probation office never includes information about 18 USC § 3553(e) or USSG § 5K1.1, pursuant to Rule 32(c)(3).

#### For the Government

#### (CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)

- () There are no material/factual inaccuracies therein.
- () There are material/factual inaccuracies in the PSR.

#### For the Defendant

#### (CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)

- () There are no material/factual inaccuracies therein.
- $(\checkmark)$  There are material/factual inaccuracies in the PSR.

#### **Restrictions on Use and Redisclosure of Presentence Report**

The presentence investigation report and this form are not public documents.

It is the policy of the federal judiciary and the Department of Justice that further redisclosure of the presentence investigation report is prohibited without the consent of the sentencing judge.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)

) )

)

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| v.                       |  |
| MICHAEL LEE ROCHE        |  |

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00086-BAH JUDGE BERYL A. HOWELL

### NOTICE OF MATERIAL/FACTUAL INACCURACIES IN THE PSI REPORT

### Page 15, Paragraph 45:

Mr. Roche does not believe the 3-point enhancement pursuant to U.S.S.G.  $\S2J1.2(b)(2)$  for substantial interference with the administration of justice should apply in this case. Application Note 1 states, "Substantial interference with the administration of justice' includes a premature or improper termination of a felony investigation; an indictment, verdict, or any judicial determination based upon perjury, false testimony, or other false evidence; or the unnecessary expenditure of substantial governmental or court resources." This is clearly not applicable in this case. See *United States of America v. Hunter Seefried*, 2022 WL 16528415, (October 29, 2022) (attached).

Page 20, Paragraph 78:

The drug screen yielded *negative* results for marijuana. This was confirmed by Officer Logan from the Arizona probation office.

Page 22, Paragraph 87:

Mr. Roche is supporting himself and his family as a freelance musician working with his brother, Seth Roche.

Respectfully submitted,

### <u>s/ Paul Bruno</u>

Paul Bruno, B.P.R. #17275 Attorney for Michael Lee Roche Barrett, Johnston, Martin & Garrison, LLC 414 Union Street, Suite 900 Nashville, TN 37219 (615) 244-2202 pbruno@barrettjohnston.com

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and exact copy of the foregoing *Notice Of Material/Factual Inaccuracies In The PSI Report* has been electronically delivered to Christopher Amore, Assistant United States Attorney, DOJ-USAO, District of New Jersey, 970 Broad Street, Suite 700, Newark, New Jersey 07102, on this the 8<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2023.

### <u>s</u>/ **Paul Bruno** Paul Bruno

2022 WL 16528415 Only the Westlaw citation is currently available. United States District Court, District of Columbia.

> UNITED STATES of America v. Hunter SEEFRIED, Defendant.

Case No. 21-cr-287 (TNM) I Signed October 29, 2022

#### **Synopsis**

**Background:** Defendant was convicted in a bench trial in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Trevor N. McFadden, J., of obstructing an official proceeding. Government requested the application of sentencing enhancements for obstructing or interfering with the administration of justice.

**[Holding:]** The District Court, Trevor N. McFadden, J., held that obstructing an official proceeding, when the official proceeding at issue is the certification of electoral votes, does not qualify for sentencing enhancements for obstructing or interfering with the administration of justice.

#### So ordered.

**Procedural Posture(s):** Sentencing or Penalty Phase Motion or Objection.

West Headnotes (8)

[1] Sentencing and Punishment - Construction in general

In interpreting the Sentencing Guidelines, courts apply the ordinary tools of statutory interpretation and look to the plain meaning of its terms.

# [2] Sentencing and Punishment - Construction in general

## Sentencing and Punishment - Commentary and policy statements

To discern the plain meaning of the text of the Sentencing Guidelines, courts look to dictionary definitions and analyze the word or phrase in context; relevant context may include the commentary to the Sentencing Guidelines.

# [3] Sentencing and Punishment - Construction in general

To discern the plain meaning of a word or phrase in the Sentencing Guidelines, courts looks to precedent to analyze how other courts have interpreted the phrase or similar phrases.

#### [4] Statutes 🤛 Dictionaries

In interpreting the meaning of a statute, courts may assess the customary usage of a phrase by searching relevant databases of naturally occurring language; this method is known as corpus linguistics.

### [5] Constitutional Law Executive Exercise of Statutory Authority as Encroaching on Judiciary

Congress has delegated substantial responsibility to the Sentencing Commission, but the interpretation of the Sentencing Guidelines ultimately remains in the hands of the courts.

# [6] Sentencing and Punishment - Obstructing justice and bribery

## Sentencing and Punishment - Obstruction of justice

Conviction of obstructing an official proceeding, when the official proceeding at issue is the certification of electoral votes, does not qualify for sentencing enhancements for obstructing or interfering with the administration of justice.

■ 3 U.S.C.A. § 15; ■ 18 U.S.C.A. § 1512(c); U.S.S.G. § **2J1.2**(b)(1)(B), (b)(2).

# [7] Sentencing and Punishment - Construction in general

#### Statutes 🤛 Language

Terms may carry different meanings in a statute versus a Sentencing Guideline.

#### [8] Sentencing and Punishment Burden of proof

It is the government's burden to prove that a sentencing enhancement applies.

Verdict, ECF No. 109. Hunter Seefried was a 22-year-old forklift technician when he came to Washington on January 6. *See* PSR ¶ 76; *see also* Def.'s Mem. in Aid of Sentencing at 15, ECF No. 114. He watched as other protestors used a police riot shield and a wooden beam to shatter the Capitol's large windows. *See* PSR ¶ 19. He then cleared glass from a window and clambered through it, followed by other protestors. *See id.* ¶¶ 19–20. Once inside the Capitol building, Seefried joined other protestors in confronting U.S. Capitol police and even chasing an officer through the Senate corridors. *See id.* ¶ 21. Seefried's fellow rioters searched for Members of Congress and the location of the certification proceeding. *See id.* ¶ 22.

#### II.

#### **Attorneys and Law Firms**

Benet Kearney, Assistant U.S. Attorney, DOJ-USAO, New York, NY, Brittany LaShaune Reed, Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, New Orleans, LA, for United States of America.

Edson Bostic, Pro Hac Vice, The Bostic Law Firm, Philadelphia, PA, for Defendant.

#### **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

TREVOR N. McFADDEN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*1 Did the electoral certification on January 6, 2021, involve the "administration of justice"? The answer determines whether significant sentencing enhancements may apply to convictions under 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c) for obstruction of an official proceeding. In the Court's view, the answer is no. Text, context, and precedent show that the "administration of justice" most naturally refers to a judicial or related proceeding that determines rights or obligations. The electoral certification was not such a proceeding.

#### I.

This Court found Hunter Seefried guilty of obstructing an official proceeding—the electoral certification—under 1512(c), along with four other counts. *See* Presentence Investigation Report (PSR) ¶ 9; *see also* Tr. of Bench Trial

Section 1512(c)(2) provides that "whoever corruptly ... obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so" faces a fine or up to 20 years imprisonment.

**18** U.S.C. § **1512(c)(2)**. The Government has charged many defendants in the January 6 cases with violating this statute. *See, e.g., United States v. Hale-Cusanelli,* No. 21-cr-37, Superseding Indictment, ECF No. 59; *United States v. Reffitt,* No. 21-cr-32, Second Superseding Indictment, ECF No. 34; *United States v. Rubenacker,* No. 21-cr-193, Superseding Indictment, ECF No. 33.

The "official proceeding" at issue in these cases is the certification of electoral votes. During this proceeding, the "certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes ... [are] opened, presented, and acted upon in

the alphabetical order of the States." <sup>3</sup> U.S.C. § 15. Then, tellers "make a list of the votes as they [] appear" and "the result ... [is] delivered to the President of the Senate," who announces the outcome of the election. *Id.* Finally, a list of the votes is entered in the House and Senate journals. *See id.* This Court has held—along with most other judges in this district —that the certification qualifies as an "official proceeding"

under \$\\$ 1512(c). See, e.g., United States v. Hale-Cusanelli, 2022 WL 4300000, at \*1 (D.D.C. Sept. 19, 2022).

But does the electoral certification also involve the "administration of justice"? That is a thornier question. For defendants convicted under  $\sim$  § 1512(c), the Government has argued that sentencing enhancements for obstructing or interfering with "the administration of justice" should apply.

U.S.S.G. §§ 2J1.2(b)(1)(B), (b)(2). One provision triggers

an eight-level enhancement "[i]f the offense involved causing or threatening to cause physical injury to a person, or property damage, in order to obstruct the administration of justice."

*Id.* § 2J1.2(b)(1)(B). And another prompts a three-level enhancement "[i]f the offense resulted in substantial interference with the administration of justice." *Id.* § 2J1.2(b)(2).

\*2 For Seefried, this is not an academic question. If these enhancements apply, his sentencing guideline level is 25, with a recommended sentence of 57–71 months; if they do not, his level is 14, with a recommended sentence of 15–21 months. The Court finds that the enhancements in \$\$ 2J1.2(b)(1) (B) and (b)(2) do not apply because the electoral certification does not involve the "administration of justice."

#### III.

[1] In interpreting the Sentencing Guidelines, the Court applies the ordinary tools of statutory interpretation and looks to the plain meaning of its terms. Many circuits agree. *See, e.g., United States v. Savin,* 349 F.3d 27, 35–36 (2d Cir. 2003); *United States v. Peterson,* 629 F.3d 432, 434 (4th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Bustillos-Pena,* 612 F.3d 863, 868 (5th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Bashlur,* 200 F.3d 917, 927 (6th Cir. 2000); *United States v. Smith,* 989 F.3d 575, 586 (7th Cir. 2021); *United States v. Collins,* 754 F.3d 626,

630 (8th Cir. 2014); United States v. Kirilyuk, 29 F.4th 1128, 1137 (9th Cir. 2022).

[2] [3] To discern the text's plain meaning, courts look to dictionary definitions and analyze the word or phrase in context. *See, e.g.*, *Kaufman v. Nielsen*, 896 F.3d 475, 485–87 (D.C. Cir. 2018). The relevant context for a sentencing guideline may include the commentary. *See, e.g.*, *Kirilyuk*, 29 F.4th at 1137–39. Finally, the Court looks to precedent to analyze how other courts have interpreted this phrase or similar phrases.

A.

First, text. Black's Law Dictionary defines the phrase "administration of justice" as "[t]he maintenance of right within a political community by means of the physical force of the state" and "the state's application of the sanction of force to the rule of right." Administration of Justice, Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019). Similarly, "due administration of justice" is defined as "[t]he proper functioning and integrity of a court or other tribunal and the proceedings before it in accordance with the rights guaranteed to the parties." Id. Although the Guideline only contains the phrase "administration of justice," not "due administration of justice," the Government has given the Court no reason to believe these are not closely associated phrases. These definitions suggest that the "administration of justice" involves a judicial or quasi-judicial tribunal that applies the force of the state to determine legal rights.

The certification does not share the characteristics of these definitions. The best evidence for what actually occurs during the certification is the statute proscribing its procedures. *See* 

<sup>3</sup> U.S.C. § 15. During the proceeding, "certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes ... [are] opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States." *Id.* Then, tellers "make a list of the votes as they ... appear" and deliver the result to the President of the Senate after Members resolve any objections. *Id.* Finally, the votes are entered in the House and Senate journals. *See id.* 

The certification is thus largely a ceremonial proceeding where Members and staff open, read, list, and announce the electoral votes. See id. It takes place within the deliberative branch of government-Congress-not the branches that typically exercise judgment (the judiciary), or force (the executive). See generally The Federalist No. 78 (Alexander Hamilton). Congress applies no "physical force" or "sanction of force" during the certification. And the proceeding involves no possibility of punishment by the state, as a judicial, investigatory, or enforcement proceeding might to "maint[ain] [] right within a political community." Nor does the certification involve the "proper functioning and integrity of a court or other tribunal ... in accordance with the rights guaranteed to the parties." These definitions evoke traditional judicial or quasi-judicial bodies that decide or maintain the legal rights of the parties before them. In contrast, the certification confirms, announces, and officially records whom the people have chosen to be President and Vice President. See -3 U.S.C. § 15. In other words, it commemorates and completes the peaceful transfer of executive authority.

\*3 Consider another relevant definition. Black's Law Dictionary defines "obstructing the administration of justice" and "interfering with the administration of justice" as "[t]he skewing of the disposition of legal proceedings, as by fabricating or destroying evidence, witness-tampering, or threatening or intimidating a judge." *Perverting the Course of Justice*, Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019) (cross-referencing these phrases). This definition is probative because **2J1.2** uses the terms "obstruct" and "interference" when discussing what a defendant might

impermissibly do to the "administration of justice."

This definition further corroborates that the "administration of justice" involves something like a legal proceeding, such as a trial or grand jury hearing. Obstruction or interference with such a proceeding occurs through action that could "skew … the disposition." The definition suggests that possible actions include falsifying or destroying evidence, tampering with witnesses, or threatening a judge. The certification does not resemble a trial or similar judicial proceeding where evidence could be falsified or destroyed, witnesses could be tampered with, or a judge could be intimidated so as to interfere with the disposition of parties' legal rights.

Indeed, the Government could have charged Seefried with violating § 1503, a different provision in the same statute that defines "obstruction of justice" as an act that "corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the *due administration of justice.*" 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (emphasis added). But to the Court's knowledge, none of the January 6 defendants have been charged under § 1503. Though the Court hesitates to derive meaning from exercises of prosecutorial discretion, the existence of similar language elsewhere with a clear relationship to the enhancements in  $\mathbb{P}$  § 2J1.2 is curious. The official proceeding statute under which this Court convicted Seefried contains no such language. *See*  $\mathbb{P}$  18 U.S.C. § 1512.

To be sure, some courts have recently interpreted the "administration of justice" in **231.2** more broadly. In *United States v. Miller*, another judge in this district defined the individual words in the phrase by looking to Webster's Third New International Dictionary. *See* 21-cr-75, Tr. at 16

(May 23, 2022), ECF No. 73. The court explained that "administration in this sense means to mete out, and justice means fair treatment." *Id.* The court reasoned that these definitions are broad enough to encompass the certification because Congress was "adjudicating in some ... limited sense, subject to very substantial constraints, the results of the election." *Id.* 

But this Court hesitates to slice and dice a term of art. "Adhering to the *fair meaning* of the text (the textualist's touchstone) does not limit one to the hyperliteral meaning of each word in the text .... The full body of a text contains implications that can alter the literal meaning of individual words." Antonin Scalia & Brian A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 356 (2012) (Scalia & Garner);

see also Bostock v. Clayton County, — U.S. —, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 1825, 207 L.Ed.2d 218 (2020) (Kavanaugh, J., dissenting) ("[C]ourts must adhere to the ordinary meaning of phrases, not just the meaning of the words in a phrase."); William Eskridge, *Interpreting Law* 62 (2016) (noting that judges should follow ordinary meaning "when two words combine to produce a meaning that is not the mechanical composition of the two words separately").

\*4 And even if segmenting the terms of the phrase were appropriate, another legal dictionary supports this Court's reading. Ballentine's Law Dictionary defines "administration" as the "execution of a law by putting it in effect, applying it to the affairs of men." *Administration*, Ballentine's Law Dictionary (3d ed. 1969). And it defines "justice" as "[t]hat end which ought to be reached in a case by the regular administration of the principles of law involved as applied to the facts." *Justice*, Ballentine's Law Dictionary (3d ed. 1969). Even separating the words supports the reading that the "administration of justice," as a legal term of art, refers to state action vis-à-vis legal rights.

#### In United States v. Rubenacker, another judge in this district

interpreted the administration of justice broadly to apply  $\sim$  § 2J1.2's enhancements to a January 6 defendant convicted under  $\sim$  § 1512(c). See United States v. Rubenacker,

under [-§ 1512(c). See United States v. Rubenacker, 21-cr-193, Tr. at 71–72 (May 26, 2022), ECF No. 70. In *Rubenacker*, the court reasoned that the Black's Law Dictionary definition of "administration of justice" suggests "that the state would use mechanisms, such as the police or prosecutors, to force compliance with or maintain a right; that is not necessarily tied to a court or a particular tribunal." *Id.* at 72. The court explained that "the physical force of the state" was present during the certification "in the form of law enforcement officers located in and around the Capitol to secure the proceedings." *Id.* at 75. And it suggested that legislators' statutory right to object during the certification "can be analogized to evidentiary objections." *Id.* at 66.

This Court is unconvinced. The fact that law enforcement is present at an official proceeding—which will often be the case—surely cannot mean that the administration of justice is occurring. Consider a presidential inauguration. Police and Secret Service are present at this official proceeding to protect the incoming President and other distinguished attendees. But no one would say that the inauguration involves the "administration of justice"; it is a ceremonial proceeding that formally installs the Nation's new leader.

The definitions of the "administration of justice" discussed above suggest that a judicial or quasi-judicial body must itself be applying the force of the state to decide legal rights, not that force need merely be present. The *Rubenacker* court's other argument—that legislators have the right to object to the certification—also does not mean that the certification involves the administration of justice. Simply because Members may debate whether a certified vote is proper, and rules exist for resolving objections, does not mean they are administering justice. Indeed, if this were the case, it is hard to imagine a congressional proceeding that would not qualify, given that the legislative process often involves these same characteristics.

Admittedly, the dictionary definitions here are a bit unwieldy. Dictionary definitions are valuable because they are evidence of how ordinary speakers of language understand words and how legal interpreters understand terms of art. But dictionaries do not end the inquiry. This is so because not all "meanings appropriate to particular contexts are to be found in the dictionary." Scalia & Garner at 70.

A reader therefore must look to context to determine "which of several possible senses a word or phrase bears." *Id.*; *accord* 

*Bostock*, 140 S. Ct. at 1827 (Kavanaugh, J., dissenting) ("If the usual evidence indicates that a statutory phrase bears an ordinary meaning different from the literal strungtogether definitions of the individual words in the phrase, we may not ignore or gloss over that discrepancy. Legislation cannot sensibly be interpreted by stringing together dictionary

synonyms of each word." (cleaned up)); see also Pid. at 1766 (Alito, J., dissenting) ("[T]he meaning of language

depends on the way a linguistic community uses words and phrases in context."). So the Court looks to both the context in which the "administration of justice" most often appears

and the immediate context found in the commentary to [-] § **2J1.2**.

#### B.

\*5 The Court undertakes two analyses to understand how the "administration of justice" is properly understood in context. The first uses a methodology called "corpus linguistics" to assess the customary usage of the phrase at the time the Sentencing Commission crafted the Guidelines. The second looks to 2J1.2's commentary, which the Court finds helpful but not dispositive.

1.

Although dictionaries provide a useful starting point, "[b]ecause common words typically have more than one meaning, you must use the context in which a given word appears to determine its aptest, most likely sense." Scalia & Garner at 418; *see generally* Stephen C. Mouritsen, *The Dictionary is Not a Fortress: Definitional Fallacies and a Corpus-Based Approach to Plain Meaning*, 2010 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1915 (2010) (describing the shortcomings of collecting dictionary definitions and advocating for a broader, corpus-based approach to linguistic meaning). To understand what meaning the Guideline most naturally evokes, the Court also looks to customary usage at the time.

[4] Courts may assess the customary usage of a phrase by searching relevant databases of naturally occurring language. This method is known as corpus linguistics. "Corpus linguistics is an empirical approach to the study of language that uses large, electronic databases" of language gathered from sources. Thomas R. Lee & Stephen C. Mouritsen, *Judging Ordinary Meaning*, 127 Yale L. J. 788, 828 (2018); *see also* Lawrence B. Solum, *Triangulating Public Meaning: Corpus Linguistics, Immersion, and the Constitutional Record*, 2017 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1621, 1643–49 (2017) (explaining why the method helps clarify linguistic meaning).

Other courts have deployed corpus-based approaches to textual meaning. For example, Justice Breyer, writing for

the Court, adopted a corpus-based approach to illuminate the

meaning of the phrase "carries a firearm." *See Muscarello v. United States*, 524 U.S. 125, 128–31, 118 S.Ct. 1911, 141 L.Ed.2d 111 (1998) (recounting the phrase in context from dictionaries, literature, and newspaper articles found in computerized databases). Other courts have also conducted corpus-based analyses using publicly available databases. *See, e.g., Wilson v. Safelite Grp., Inc.*, 930 F.3d 429, 439 (6th Cir. 2019) (Thapar, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment); *United States v. Rice*, 36 F.4th 578, 583 n.6 (4th Cir. 2022); *Health Freedom Def. Fund, Inc. v. Biden*, No. 8:21-cv-1693, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2022 WL 1134138, at \*7 (M.D. Fla. Apr. 18, 2022).

Because various publicly-available databases of language exist, see, e.g., https://www.english-corpora.org/; lncl8.lawcorpus.byu.edu, courts must choose a corpus carefully. The database searched should include texts from the relevant linguistic community that would read and understand the text at issue. Cf. Felix Frankfurter, Some Reflections on the Reading of Statutes, 47 Colum. L. Rev. 527, 536 (1947) (explaining that texts "addressed to specialists, [] must be read by judges with the minds of the specialists"); James A. Heilpern, Dialects of Art: A Corpus-Based Approach to Technical Terms, 58 Jurimetrics J. 377, 389-97 (2018) (explaining the promise of a corpus-based approach for terms of art).

The primary linguistic community using and understanding the Sentencing Guidelines is an informed legal audience —most notably, lawyers and judges. Unlike most statutes, which are at least theoretically intended to be read and understood by citizens, the Guidelines are a practitioner's guide to federal sentencing. The Court therefore focused on the Corpus of Caselaw Access Project (COCAP), which compiles the text of federal and state court decisions. *See* https://lncl8.lawcorpus.byu.edu/.<sup>1</sup>

\*6 But just in case one thinks the Guidelines should be read like criminal statutes—directed to the general public—the Court also searched the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA), which collects sources across genres, including fiction, magazines, newspapers, and academic articles. *Cf. Rice*, 36 F.4th at 583 n.6 (looking to a database collecting "documents an ordinary speaker of English would interact with regularly" when interpreting a criminal statute). At the very least, it would be notable if these corpora produced wildly different results. As it turns out, they did not.

The Court queried the COCAP for the years 1977–1987. This period represents the decade before and including the

year in which the Commission promulgated **2J1.2**. See

U.S.S.G. § 2J1.2 (effective Nov. 1, 1987). *Cf. Safelite*, 930 F.3d at 444 (Thapar, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment) (looking to a ten-year period to generate a sample of written text around the time Congress first passed the relevant language). This search returned 14,118 hits, or "concordance lines." Given such a large universe, the Court reviewed a random sample of 375 concordance lines containing the phrase "administration of justice" to see what sorts of official proceedings were discussed. This sample size produces a 95% confidence interval. A random sample can be generated through the database itself by filtering for a specific number of results.

The most frequent usage of the "administration of justice" about 65% of the total hits—corresponds with the sense described above: a judicial proceeding deciding legal rights. The phrase appeared in conjunction with witness tampering, contempt of court, various evidentiary privileges, the effect of jury instructions on court proceedings, and the conduct of juries. The phrase also accompanies issues of judicial management, including delays in court proceedings, repeat litigants, and even courtroom dress code. Other hits dealt with media access to judicial proceedings. Finally, some hits reflected more general concerns about retroactivity and the "fair," "proper," "effective," or "thorough" administration of justice by courts.

The next most common context in which the "administration of justice" appeared—around 25% of hits—involved disciplining judges or lawyers for conduct that interfered with judicial proceedings. Some hits referenced violations of various ethical rules, contempt of court, recusal, disqualification of counsel, and perjury when a lawyer testified before a grand jury. Again, the customary usage of the phrase was closely linked with judicial proceedings, or an actor who is intimately involved with the judicial process.

Another category of note—about 4% of hits—involved law enforcement activities. Some hits referenced conduct such as resisting arrest. Others discussed the need for anonymous informants to promote cooperation with law enforcement, the rationale for the exclusionary rule, and prosecutorial discretion. One discussed setting standards for roadside intoxication tests. These hits differed from those described above in that they did not always involve a formal proceeding or a judicial body. But they all contemplate the state's application of force or the government's role in investigating and prosecuting crimes.  $^2$ 

\*7 In contrast, the least common usage of "administration of justice" was as a broad term referring to government function generally. The Court identified three such entries out of the 375 it coded. One dealt with a public utility commission that discussed the administration of justice in broad terms. Another noted that local commissioners' power to issue licenses involves the administration of justice. And another suggested that Texas counties are involved in the administration of justice. No entries discussed a Congressional proceeding.

This is not to say that because the administration of justice most often appeared in the context of a judicial proceeding means that it takes on that meaning in all contexts. And of course, the certification of electoral votes *could* involve the administration of justice, despite not appearing in this sample. But the vast majority of examples in the sample shared certain hallmarks such as action disruptive of, or prejudicial to, a court proceeding; discipline of judges and lawyers; and conduct that would disrupt or aid law enforcement investigations. The certification does not share these characteristics.

Even if the proper linguistic community is not lawyers and judges, a review of a broader set of sources does nothing to undermine the Court's findings. Querying COHA for the same time period returned 12 results for "administration of justice." Though the Court hesitates to draw conclusions from such a small sample size—four of which are from the same book these results largely support the Court's prior interpretation. The phrase most often appeared in the context of judicial decision-making, courts generally, bar associations, or law enforcement. Two concordance lines could be interpreted as referring to government generally, and two were unclear. These limited exceptions seem to be outliers.

In short, there is essentially no evidence that either judges, lawyers, or speakers more generally used the term "administration of justice" to refer to legislative proceedings like the certification of the electoral count. Instead, both professional and lay speakers overwhelmingly used this term to reference judicial proceedings or activities closely related to them. To be sure, corpus linguistics is but one tool in the interpretative toolbox. But "[i]ts foremost value may come in those difficult cases where ... dictionaries diverge. In those cases, corpus linguistics can serve as a cross-check on established methods of interpretation (and vice versa)." *Wilson*, 930 F.3d at 440 (Thapar, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment). Even though dictionaries do not necessarily diverge here, corpus linguistics provide further evidence that the Government is stretching the Guideline beyond its natural meaning.

2.

The Government offers a different bit of context. It argues that the commentary to \$2J1.2 defines the administration of justice broadly enough to encompass the certification. *See* Gov't Mem. in Aid of Sentencing (Gov't Mem.) at 29.

To begin, query whether the commentary to a sentencing guideline is authoritative. *See, e.g., United States v. Winstead*, 890 F.3d 1082, 1089 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (noting disagreement over this issue). The Supreme Court held in *Stinson v. United States* that the commentary should "be treated as an agency's interpretation of its own legislative rule." 508 U.S. 36, 44–45, 113 S.Ct. 1913, 123 L.Ed.2d 598 (1993) (citing *Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co.*, 325 U.S. 410, 414, 65 S.Ct. 1215, 89 L.Ed. 1700 (1945)). The Court explained that commentary which "interprets or explains a guideline is authoritative unless it violates the Constitution or a federal statute, or is inconsistent with, or a plainly erroneous reading of, that guideline." *Id.* at 38, 113 S.Ct. 1913.

\*8 [5] Yet other circuits have explained that Stinson should be applied with care. This is so because it rests on Seminole Rock (later called Auer) deference, which the Supreme Court recently clarified. See generally Kisor v. Wilkie, — U.S. —, 139 S. Ct. 2400, 204 L.Ed.2d 841 (2019). When Stinson was decided, courts were far more willing to defer to agency interpretations of text. After Kisor, they must be more careful to reduce ambiguity using the standard tools of statutory interpretation before deferring. See 139 S. Ct. at 2414. "Congress has delegated substantial responsibility to the Sentencing Commission, but, as the Supreme Court emphasized in Kisor, the

interpretation of [the Guidelines] ultimately 'remains in the hands of the courts.' " United States v. Nasir, 17 F.4th 459, 472 (3d Cir. 2021) (en banc) (quoting Kisor, 139 S. Ct. at 2420); see also United States v. Riccardi, 989 F.3d 476, 485 (6th Cir. 2021) ("Kisor must awake us from our slumber of reflexive deference to the commentary" (cleaned up)).

And the D.C. Circuit has suggested that courts should eschew deference to the Commission where the commentary expands the meaning of the text of the Guidelines themselves. *See Winstead*, 890 F.3d at 1092 ("[S]urely *Seminole Rock* deference does not extend so far as to allow [the Commission] to invoke its general interpretive authority via commentary ... to impose such a massive impact on a defendant with no grounding in the guidelines themselves.").

But the Court need not wade into that debate. Even if 2J1.2's commentary bound the Court, it supports a narrower interpretation of the "administration of justice" than the Government offers. The commentary to 32J1.2 provides:

"Substantial interference with the administration of justice" includes a premature or improper termination of a felony investigation; an indictment, verdict, or any judicial determination based upon perjury, false testimony, or other false evidence; or the unnecessary expenditure of substantial Governmental or court resources.

U.S.S.G. § **2J1.2** cmt. n.1. The modifying phrase "substantial interference" appears only in the three-level enhancement. *Compare* **2J1.2**(b)(2), *with id.* (b)(1)(B) (eight-level enhancement referencing only the "administration of justice").

As it has in prior cases, the Government relies on the last portion of the definition, "the unnecessary expenditure of substantial Governmental or court resources," to argue that the enhancement applies. *See* Gov't Mem. at 29. According to the Government, this part of the definition means that the "administration of justice" encompasses more than judicial proceedings. *See id.* Because the rioters' disruption of the electoral certification caused "unnecessary expenditure of substantial Governmental ... resources," the argument goes, they substantially interfered with the administration of justice. *Id.* While the events of January 6 caused the Government to commit significant resources—evidenced in part by the number of cases charged in this district—this argument proves too much. If courts may enhance an obstructionrelated sentence by eleven levels any time the Government can show that the offense caused unnecessary expenditure of its resources, "substantial interference with the administration of justice" could encompass just about anything. Indeed, the Government could theoretically trigger the enhancements at will.

The Government's reliance on the "unnecessary expenditure" clause also obscures the rest of the definition. In short, it fails to read that phrase in context. Substantial interference with the administration of justice also "includes a premature or improper termination of a felony investigation; an indictment, verdict, or any judicial determination based upon perjury, false testimony, or other false evidence[.]" CU.S.S.G. § 2J1.2 cmt. n.1. This portion of the definition fits the Court's textual interpretation of the "administration of justice" in Part III.A. The list refers to investigations, verdicts, and judicial determinations—all of which involve the coercive force of the state and the actual or potential determination of legal rights in judicial or enforcement proceedings.

\*9 Isolating the "unnecessary expenditure of substantial Governmental ... resources" clause also cuts out the "or court" part of the phrase. That "Governmental" appears next to "court" in a phrase about "resources" suggests that the term really refers to prosecutorial resources rather than the expenditure of resources by any public agency. See Scalia & Garner at 195-98 (explaining that words "associated in a context suggesting that [they] have something in common ... should be given related meanings" under the canon noscitur a sociis). After all, a broad definition of "Governmental" would include court resources, rendering the phrase "or court" superfluous. See id. at 176-79 (explaining that under the surplusage canon, "courts must ... lean in favor of a construction which will render every word operative, rather than one which may make some idle and nugatory" (citation omitted)). That the other portions of the definition also refer to judicial-like proceedings bolsters this conclusion.

More, the Government ignores another section of the commentary that lists exemplar offenses to which this Guideline applies. *See* U.S.S.G. § 2J1.2 cmt., Background. These offenses fit with the Court's definition of "administration of justice" in Part III.A. For example: "using threats or force to intimidate or influence a juror or federal

officer; obstructing a civil or administrative proceeding; stealing or altering court records; unlawfully intercepting grand jury deliberations ... [and] using intimidation or force to influence testimony [or] alter evidence[.]" *Id.* All the examples that the Commission provides evoke traditional notions of judicial or enforcement proceedings and are consistent with the Court's corpus linguistics analysis. None of them relate to a legislative proceeding.

[6] True, the commentary cross-references \$ 1512, along with a slew of other statutes. *See*  $\clubsuit$  U.S.S.G. § 2J1.2 cmt, Statutory Provisions. But that does not mean that the threeand eight-point enhancements apply to *every* situation in which the Government charges  $\clubsuit$  § 1512(c)—only that they could apply at times. Indeed, the mine run of  $\clubsuit$  § 1512(c) cases may well qualify for the  $\clubsuit$  § 2J1.2(b)(1)(B) and (b)(2) enhancements. For there are many "official proceedings" that involve the official application of force to decide legal rights, like a trial. But the key here is that the electoral certification is not one such proceeding. It does not qualify for these enhancements because it involves no judicial or quasi-judicial application of force to decide or maintain legal rights.

### C.

Finally, precedent. Seefried cites decisions that he claims limit the "administration of justice" to "judicial or grand jury proceedings." Def.'s Mem. at 4. The Government counters that other courts have applied the enhancement to proceedings that would not fit Seefried's "narrow definition." Gov't Mem. at 30.

Seefried cites *United States v. Aguilar*, in which the Supreme Court construed the phrase "due administration of justice" in another section of the same statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1503. *See* 515 U.S. 593, 598–99, 115 S.Ct. 2357, 132 L.Ed.2d 520 (1995). Section 1503 makes it a crime to "corruptly ... influence[], obstruct[], or impede[], or endeavor[] to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice[.]" 18 U.S.C. § 1503. This particular clause in the statute follows other prohibited conduct, most of

which pertain to judicial proceedings. See  $\frown$  *id.* (forbidding the influencing, intimidating, or impeding any juror or officer who may be "serving at any examination or other

proceeding before any United States magistrate judge or other committing magistrate," or injuring any such officer).

In Aguilar, the Court held that a man who made false statements to FBI agents—a potential grand jury witness—did not violate § 1503. See Aguilar, 515 U.S. at 599, 115 S.Ct. 2357. The Court reasoned that the FBI agents were not an "arm of the grand jury" and that grand jury had not "even summoned them to testify." Id. at 600, 115 S.Ct. 2357. Because the defendant did not know that his false statements were likely to affect the grand jury proceeding, the Court explained that he could not be found guilty for "imped[ing] the due administration of justice." Id. at 599–601, 115 S.Ct. 2357. Ultimately, Aguilar's reasoning suggests that the "administration of justice" in § 1503 is analogous to a "judicial or grand jury proceeding." Id. at 599, 115 S.Ct. 2357.

\*10 Seefried also cites various appellate decisions that follow *Aguilar* to interpret the "due administration of justice" in § 1503 to mean "interfering with the procedure of a judicial hearing or trial." *United States v. Richardson*, 676 F.3d 491, 502–03 (5th Cir. 2012); *see also United States v. Brenson*, 104 F.3d 1267, 1280 (11th Cir. 1997) ("Section 1503 employs the term 'due administration of justice' to provide a protective cloak over all judicial proceedings."); *cf. United States v. Warlick*, 742 F.2d 113, 115–16 (4th Cir. 1984) ("[O]bstruction of the administration of justice requires ... some act that will ... thwart the judicial process.").

#### [7] Admittedly, terms may carry different meanings in a

statute versus a guideline. *See, e.g.*, *DePierre v. United States*, 564 U.S. 70, 88, 131 S.Ct. 2225, 180 L.Ed.2d 114 (2011). But *Aguilar*'s reasoning, and that of the circuit courts following it, is still a building block in the wall of evidence supporting the reading that the "administration of justice" involves a judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding applying the force of the state to decide legal rights.

The cases the Government cites do not cast doubt on this Court's interpretation of the "administration of justice." *See* Gov't Mem. at 30. Indeed, many of its authorities involve judicial or investigative proceedings from which punishment could follow. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Pegg*, 812 F. App'x 851, 860 (11th Cir. 2020) (defendant's action "prevented the

government from prosecuting" another investigative target); *United States v. Atl. States Cast Iron Pipe Co.*, 627 F. Supp. 2d 180, 200–04 (D.N.J. 2009) (defendants' actions obstructed agency's efforts to investigate a deadly accident);

*United States v. Weissman*, 22 F. Supp. 2d 187, 194–98 (S.D.N.Y. 1998) (defendant withheld subpoenaed documents from an investigative congressional committee and lied at his deposition). And even the case it cites that is furthest from a judicial proceeding still involved a law enforcement

investigation. *See United States v. Ali*, 864 F.3d 573, 574 (7th Cir. 2017) (affirming application of the three-level administration of justice enhancement where man absconded abroad with children and several federal agencies and agents worked for days to complete his seizure). This Court's interpretation fits comfortably alongside these holdings.

Finally, though it is historical rather than legal precedent, recall that the phrase "administration of justice" appears in one of our seminal founding documents: the Declaration of Independence. And it does so in the context of judicial proceedings. In castigating King George III, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to law for establishing Judiciary powers. He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries." *The Declaration of Independence* para. 8 (U.S. 1776). In short, text, context, and precedent suggest that the Government reads the "administration of justice" too broadly.

\* \* \*

An inconsistency in the Government's litigating position also bears noting. January 6 defendants have argued in motions

to dismiss their indictments that they have not violated 1512(c) because the statutory phrase "official proceeding" only references proceedings that involve the administration of justice, and the electoral certification does not. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Sandlin*, 575 F. Supp. 3d 16, 23–24 (D.D.C. 2021). Seefried made the same argument here. *See* Mot. to Dismiss at 2, ECF No. 36.

\*11 The Government has argued in opposition that \$ 1512(c) "operates as a catch-all to cover otherwise obstructive behavior that might not constitute a more specific" obstruction offense—such as obstruction of the administration of justice. *See* Opp'n to Mot. to Dismiss at 7– 8, ECF No. 44. Most judges in this district have agreed. *See*, *e.g.*, *United States v. Montgomery*, 578 F. Supp. 3d 54, 61–65 (D.D.C. 2021) (explaining that Congress does not engage in the administration of justice). The Government cannot have its cake and eat it too. It would be incongruous for this Court to say pre-trial that the "official proceeding" of the electoral certification is more expansive than proceedings only involving the administration of justice, but then turn around at sentencing to say the opposite.

[8] It is the Government's burden to prove that a sentencing enhancement applies. *See United States v. Bapack*, 129 F.3d 1320, 1324 (D.C. Cir. 1997). It has not done so here.

#### IV.

The Court acknowledges that this is a close interpretative call. If the Sentencing Commission had foreseen the Capitol breach, it may well have included "official proceeding" in the text of 2J1.2. But the Commission did not. Given

that courts should interpret the Guidelines using traditional tools of statutory interpretation, this Court declines to rewrite

**2J1.2** to say what it does not. If the Commission wishes to expand the text of the Guideline to include official proceedings such as the electoral certification, "it may seek to amend the language of the guidelines by submitting the

change for congressional review." Winstead, 890 F.3d at 1092.

In the meantime, this Court may still consider the concerns underlying the Government's requests for these enhancements under the § 3553(a) factors at sentencing. But for all of these reasons, the Court finds that Seefried did not obstruct, impede, or interfere with the "administration of justice" and that the enhancements in **2J1.2**(b)(1)(B) and (b)(2) are inapplicable.

#### SO ORDERED.

Attachment

| Year | Corpus | Source or Source Type  | Excerpt of Concordance Line  | Contextual summary   | Classification/Desc<br>ription                          |
|------|--------|--|--|--|---|
| 1986 | COCAP  | Maine, In the Matter of<br>Ronald L. KELLAM,<br>503 A.2d 1308                    | As we said in both Benoit and Ross, in determin<br>ing appropriate disciplinary sanctions, we must<br>be careful to assure the orderly administration of<br>justice in the public interest.  | Considering appropriate sanctions for<br>a judge whose discourtesy to parties<br>rose to violation of the Judicial Code.     | Judicial discipline,<br>judicial proceeding             |
|      |        |  | We agree with the finding of the barrieg board in the respondine '', conduct visitable C R.C.P. 24 Lo and the following disciplinary rules in the Co of Professional R approximation (E.R.P. 1102 (A) (1) (a lawyer shall not visitate a disciplinary rule ); DR 6 - 1001 (A) (2) (a lawyer shall not targlect a legal matter aromator group rules in the circumstances ); DR 6 - 1001 (A) (2) (a lawyer shall not neglect a legal matter aromator law share the rule of the circumstance of the law (A) | Finding lawyer's failure to acterise   |   |
| 1987 | COCAP  | Respondent, 745 P.2d<br>218  |  | elient of case status violated state<br>professional conduct rules.  | Discipline of lawyer,<br>judicial proceeding            |
| 1979 | COCAP  | S.W.2d 795   | Nevertheless, there comes a time when the order<br>ly administration of justice requires that the appe<br>llate process be not delayed further by the absenc<br>of the statement of facts.   | Discussing failure of court reporter<br>timely to prepare statement of facts<br>needed for appeal.                           | Judicial proceeding,<br>not delaying                    |
| 1979 | COCAP  | CARGILL; PEOPLE v.<br>HARRISON, 405 Mich.<br>482                                 | In Rich, this Court refused retroactive application<br>on a jury instruction on the defense of intoxicati<br>on and specific intent because of the marked effe-<br>et on the administration of justice in view of the<br>profound reliance on the old rule.  | Discussing reasons for a new rule's<br>exclusively prospective application   | Judicial proceeding,<br>jury instruction                |
| 1977 | COCAP  | INC., Plaintiff-<br>Appellant, v. THE<br>CITY OF EVANSTON<br>et al., Defendants- | Although summary judgment is an important tool<br>in the administration of justice and its use encou-<br>raged in proper cases (Fashen V. 1000 of Gover<br>ners (1971). 48 III. 2d 580, 586, 272 N. E. d<br>977, Althen V. Meyer (1985). 14 III. 2d 2424, 29<br>2, 152 N. E. 2d 576), courts must remain cautio<br>us not to preempt the right to trial by jury where<br>a material dispute may exist (Anderson V. Doric<br>K (3rd Dist. 1975), 28 III. App. 3d 225, 227,<br>337 N. E. 2d 571).  | Discussing impropriety of grant of summary judgment below.   | Judicial proceeding                                     |
| 1980 | COCAP  |  | Because the issue has potentially far -<br>reaching ramifications with respect to the orderly<br>and effective administration of justice in the di<br>strict court, it is appropriate that this court detail<br>the basis for its determination.   | Asserting the ability of the court to<br>defer ruling on an evidentiary motion<br>against Government's contrary<br>argument. | Judicial proceeding,<br>judicial power &<br>prerogative |
| 1980 | COCAP  | Russell, Respondent,   | The imposition of the efficient obligation of honest<br>y upon lawyers under DR 1 = $^{-1}$ 102 ( A ) ( 4 ) and subsequent discipline for viol<br>ation of the rule is permissible and may be neces<br>sary in the interests of the administration of justi<br>ce.   | Discussing tenstion between ethical<br>rules and lawyer's First Amendment<br>rights.   | Discipline of lawyer                                    |

| 1980 ( | COCAP | N. Dakota, KFGO<br>RADIO, INC. and<br>WDAY, Inc., Plaintiffs<br>and Appellees, v.<br>Cynthia ROTHE, 298<br>N.W.2d 505 | A literal interpretation of Article I, § 22 of the C<br>omittation of North Dakots would weak have<br>with stabilishe judicial practice and that it would<br>allow public access to all phases of the administ<br>allow public access to all phases of the administ<br>of paties, including chambers' conference a,<br>plan bargaining and settlement conferences a,<br>deptine proceedings, shee juvenilg proceedings<br>presently closed, grand jury proceedings, and ap<br>pellac cost conferences.  | Discussing ramifications of state   | Judicial proceeding,<br>judicial power &<br>prerogative |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|
|        |       | Cal., Mosk v. Superior<br>Ct. of Los Anaeles  | In a providing in which the Commission finds<br>that (-1) the subject matter is generally known<br>to the pribles (-2) here is broad public interest;<br>(-2) confidence on the administration of patistic is<br>threatened due to lack of public information co-<br>merning the status and conduct of the proceedin-<br>g, and (-1) the public information on the integrity of<br>the administration of justice requires that some<br>- all aspects of rode proceeding should be public<br>by conducted or otherwise reported or disclosed by<br>y conducted or otherwise reported or disclosed by<br>household or otherwise reported or disclosed by household<br>by bondfield with reporters that spreeceding, and<br>d, after completion of the investigation a, public<br>housing that the that and hall be publicly condu-  | Discussing when the Contrainion on<br>Judicial Performance may allow  | Judicial proceeding.                                    |
| 1979/  | COCAP | Crity, 25 Cal. 3d 474   | cted .  | disciplinary hearings to be public.   | discipline, judge                                       |
|        | COCAP | Pa., Smith v. Mason,<br>328 Pa. Super. 314  | (3) The misbehavior of any person in the presen<br>ce of the court, thereby obstructing the administr<br>ation of justice.  |   | Judicial proceeding,                                    |
| 1981 ( | COCAP | Colo., Pcople v.<br>Gottegen, 623 P.24 878  | After reviewing the record, we conclude the can be for disciplino be how contribution due and a public constant is the appropriate discipline. In the discipline, in the order of the orde | Concluding public constructions the<br>appropriate disciplines for a dialatory<br>and a cherwise negligient attorney.                               | Judicial proceeding,<br>discipline, lawyer              |
| 1984 ( | COCAP | DDC, Hastings v.<br>Judicial Conf. of the<br>United States, 593 F.<br>Supp. 1371                                      | It was for this reason that a separate standard for<br>misbehavior, " conduct prejudicial to the admini-<br>tation of justice by bringing the justical office i<br>net disrepute, " was deleted by the Senate Judici<br>ary Committee for for that such a general disrep<br>tote standard directly embedded in the statute could<br>be used to intract into a judge" yearonal life<br>unrelated to his or her judicial conduct.   | Limiting a statute controlling<br>consumble judicial behavior to that<br>which would interfere with judge's<br>duties or taint public's perception. | Judicial proceeding,<br>discipline, judges              |
| 1984 ( | COCAP | Ind., In re Colestock,<br>461 N.E.2d 137  | The proper administration of justice necessitates<br>the maintenance of independent professional jud<br>gment by a lawyer on behalf of his client.  | Finding that a lawyer violated rules of<br>professional responsibility.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>discipline, lawyer              |
| 1987 ( | COCAP | Wash., In re<br>Disciplinary Proceeding<br>against Mark S. Demig,<br>108 Wash. 2d 82                                  | Further, the holding of a private hearing would h<br>ave damaged the public's confidence in the admi<br>nistration of justice and led to suspicions as to th<br>e objectiveness of the hearing.   | Finding appropriate the procedure of a<br>judicial conduct proceeding below.  | Judicial proceeding                                     |

|       |       |                          | tion plucked from Blackmer v. United States , 28<br>4 U.S. 421 , 438 , 52 S.Ct . 252 , 255 , 76 L.Ed .     |   |  |
|-------|-------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
|       |       |                          | 4 U.S. 421, 438, 52 S.Ct. 252, 255, 76 LEd.<br>375 (1932): " one of the duties which the citize            |   |  |
|       |       |                          | n owes to his government is to support the admin   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | in owes to his government is to support the admin<br>istration of justice by attending its courts and givi | Painting company of another             |  |
|       |       | DDC In a Saulad Cara     | ng his testimony whenever he is properly summo   |   | Judicial proceedi                      |
| 1987  | COCAP | 832 E 24 1268            | ng his destiniony wherever he is property summo  | incriminating documents.                | court procedure                        |
| 1.707 | cocru | 0.0211.201200            |  | are and any obtained as                 | court procedure                        |
|       |       |                          | In order to promote the expeditious administratio  |   |  |
|       |       | N.C., LEA COMPANY        | n of justice , we elect to exercise the rarely used  |   |  |
|       |       | v. NORTH CAROLINA        | general supervisory powers given this Court in ar  |   |  |
|       |       | BOARD OF                 | ticle IV, section 12 (1) of the Constitution of N  |   | Judicial proceedi                      |
|       |       | TRANSPORTATION,          | orth Carolina and choose to address two collatera  |   | powers &                               |
| 1986  | COCAP | 317 N.C. 254             | l issues not raised by the parties .   | Guiding determination of damages.       | prerogatives                           |
|       |       |                          | On the other hand , there are other dining occasio   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | ns that support activities germane to the State Ba   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | r 's performance of its duties in the improvement  |   |  |
|       |       | Mich., Falk v. State Bar | of the administration of justice and the advance   | Assessing propriety of judges at        | Bar association                        |
| 1981  | COCAP | of Mich., 411 Mich. 63   | ment of jurisprudence.<br>The concluding clause of the statute penalizes an                                | various social functions.               | regulating judge                       |
|       |       |                          | The concluding clause of the statute penalizes an<br>yone who " corruptly endeavors to influence ,         | Outlining provisions of s. 1503 against |  |
|       |       | ED Vo. U.S Comm          |  | improper influence of witness, juror,   | Judicial proceed                       |
| 1082  | COCAP | 551 F. Supp. 662         | ustice . "   | or court official.                      | periury                                |
| 1704  | cocar | 551 F. Supp. 662         | The administration of justice would be greatly bu  | or court official.                      | perjury                                |
|       |       |                          | rdened if required to accommodate separate trials  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | in all cases where multiple parties have participa   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | ted in a criminal offense and where one or more  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | have confessed to its commission . " State v. Fer  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | guson, 3 Wn. App. 898, 906, 479 P. 2d 114 (  |   |  |
|       |       | Wash., State v. Samsel,  | 1970 ), review denied , 78 Wn .2 d 996 ( 1971 )  | Finding no error in refusal to grant    | Judicial proceed                       |
| 1985  | COCAP | 39 Wash. App. 564        |  | motion to sever.                        | court procedure                        |
|       |       |                          | The committee found that respondent had violate  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | d D.R. 1 -   | requiring lawful behavior where         |  |
|       |       | No. 60 D.B. 83, 33 Pa.   |  |   | Judicial proceed                       |
| 1984  | COCAP | D. & C.3d 187            | l to the administration of justice .   | with drug dealers.                      | discipline, lawye                      |
|       |       |                          | The Commission , based upon its findings of con  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | duct prejudicial to the administration of justice w  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | hich brings the judicial office into disrepute, as   |   |  |
|       |       | Miss., In re Inquiry     | opposed to willful misconduct in office , has dete   |   |  |
|       |       | Concerning County        | rmined that a public reprimand is an appropriate   |   |  |
|       |       | Court Judge Kelly        | sanction finding that this case is somewhat simila   | Describing appropriate sanctions for    |  |
|       |       | COLLINS, 524 So. 2d      | r to the trilogy of check collecting cases filed by t  |   | Judicial proceed                       |
| 1987  | COCAP | 553                      | he Commission .  | prisogers.                              | discipline, judge                      |
|       |       |                          |  |   | in the second second                   |
|       |       |                          | In a mandamus action in which petitioner seeks t   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | o have discovery orders involving a claim of priv  |   |  |
|       |       | 1                        | ilege reviewed, we have held that review is appr   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | opriate when : " '(1) disclosure of the allegedly  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | privileged or confidential information renders i   |   |  |
|       |       | 1                        | mpossible any meaningful appellate review of th  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | e claim of privilege or confidentiality; and (2) t   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | he disclosure involves questions of substantial im   |   |  |
|       |       |                          | portance to the administration of justice . ' " Unit   |   |  |
|       |       | 1                        | ed States v. West , 672 F. 2d 796 , 798 -  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | 99 (10th Cir.1982) (quoting United States v.<br>Winner, 641 F. 2d 825, 830 (10th Cir.1981) (               |   |  |
|       |       |                          |  |   |  |
|       |       |                          | quoting Iowa Beef Processors , Inc. v. Bagley , 6<br>01 F. 2d 949 ( 8th Cir .1979 ) ) , cert . denied , 4  |   |  |
|       |       |                          |  |   |  |
|       |       | C.A. 10,                 |  |   | to the last second second              |
| 106.4 | COCAP |                          | 57 U.S. 1133, 102 S.Ct. 2959, 73 L.Ed. 2 d 13<br>50 (1982).  | Refusing to breach judicial privilege,  | Judicial proceedi<br>discipline, judge |

|      | COCAP | Md., Adams v. Peck,<br>288 Md. 1<br>Ak., Friedman v.<br>District Court, 611 P.2d<br>77   |  | Uphelding absolute privilege for<br>defanatory statements in documents<br>prepared for use initigation but not<br>filed.<br>Uphelding court's requirements of<br>minimum standards of dress. | Judical proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| 1982 | COCAP | Ga., Dowdy v. Palmour,<br>164 Ga. App. 804   | a command, if you want to call it that, of the co-<br>urt, which tended to obstruct the administration<br>of justice.  | Reviewing proceedings below to find<br>in contempt attornets who did not<br>stand to reply to the court.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>discipline, lawyer   |
| 1984 | COCAP | D. P.R., U.S. v.<br>Acevedo-Ramos, 600 F.<br>Supp. 501   | Finally, the Magistrate concluded that no conditi<br>on or combination of conditions would assure the<br>safety of the Government 's winesses and the c<br>ommunity or insure the proper administration of<br>justice in defendant 's case.  | Reviewing magistrate judge's pretrial detention of witness.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives                                     |
| 1983 | COCAP | CITY CONSUMER<br>SERVICES, INC.,<br>Plaintiff, v. David G.<br>HORNE, et al.,<br>Defendants   | Disqualification will not hinder the efficient adm<br>inistration of justice   | Consdering motion to disqualify counsel.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives                                     |
| 1986 | COCAP | D.C., In re James D.<br>Hutchinson, 518 A.2d<br>995  | The term "serious crime " shall include any folo<br>ny and any laster crime a necessary element of w<br>hich, as determined by the statistory or common<br>law definition of such crime, involves impropor-<br>endation and the series, intellevence with the ad-<br>ministration of justice, false swearing, misrepre-<br>sentation, frand, are willfif fullure fold income ta<br>x returns, deceit, bribery, extortion, misappropo-<br>ition, shell, or an attenty or a comprisency or so<br>licitation of another to commit a " serious crime. "  | Considering whether conduct of<br>atomey was "serious crime" requiring<br>diabarment.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>discipline, lawyer   |
| 1979 | COCAP | ria, reason o<br>SUPREME COURT<br>SPECIAL<br>COMMITTEE FOR<br>LAWYER<br>DISCIPLINARY<br>PROCEDURES TO<br>AMEND<br>INTEGRATION RULE,<br>ARTICLE II AND<br>ARTICLE XI, 373 So.<br>24 1 | The goals of the Court 's program are to improve<br>the administration of juncto: in this state and you<br>require the delivery of legal articies to the or  |  | Judicial proceeding,<br>policy   |
| 1979 | COCAP | D.C., U.S. v. Walton,<br>411 A.2d 333  | Although the court concluded that " there was an<br>ample independent source of identification ", is a<br>dided that it was to tainted by duress and imprope<br>r suggestiveness " that it would , be an aberration<br>in the administration of justice " and the administration<br>Courts exist for the administration of justice , and<br>courts exist for the administration of justice and the administration of a street administrati |  | Judical proceeding, procedure  |
| 1979 | COCAP | Ala., Hall v. State, 377<br>So. 2d 1123  | d in the conduct of trials in general much must,<br>of necessity, and in the very nature of things, be<br>left to the discretion of the court charged with th<br>6 duty of administering justice, and having the i<br>nherent power to regulate such matters in the tria<br>1 forum.   | Explaining finding of no abuse of<br>discretion below.   | Judical proceeding, procedure  |

|      |       |   | Therefore, we sustain charge II, but only insola<br>r as it charges respondent with engaging in " con   |  |  |
|------|-------|---|---|--|--|
|      |       |   |   |  |  |
|      |       |   | duct that is prejudicial to the administration of ju-<br>stice " ( DR 1 -   |  |  |
|      |       |   |   |  |  |
|      |       |   | 102 [ A ] [ 5 ] ) and " [ c ] onceal [ ing ] or kno   |  |  |
|      |       |   | wingly fail [ ing ] to disclose that which he is req  |  |  |
|      |       |   | uired by law to reveal " ( DR 7 -   | comply with subpoena of documents  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1987 | COCAP | A.D.2d 1024   | 102[A][3]).   | as predicate to censure.   | discipline, lawyer                               |
|      |       |   | The hearing committee found that while respond  |  |  |
|      |       |   |   |  |  |
|      |       |   | ent had not violated Disciplinary Rule 1 -  |  |  |
|      |       |   | 102 (A) (3), which provides for illegal condu   |  |  |
|      |       |   | ct involving moral turpitude, it did find that resp   |  |  |
|      |       |   | ondent violated Rules of Professional Responsibi  |  |  |
|      |       |   | lity D.R. 1 -   |  |  |
|      |       |   | 102 (A) (4), in that he had engaged in conduc   |  |  |
|      |       |   | t amounting to a form of misrepresentation , D.R.   |  |  |
|      |       |   | . 1 -   |  |  |
|      |       |   | 102 (A) (5), in that he had engaged in conduc   |  |  |
|      |       |   | t that is prejudicial to the administration of justic   |  |  |
|      |       |   | e , and D.R. 1 -  |  |  |
|      |       |   | 102 (A) (6), in that he had engaged in conduc   | Characterizing behavior of lawyer  |  |
|      |       | Pa., In re Anonymous  | t that adversely reflects on his fitness to practice I  | who misrepresented facts in  | Judicial proceeding.                             |
| 1978 | COCAP | No. 25 D.B. 77  | aw :  | transaction.   | discipline, lawyer                               |
|      |       |   | " This is a serious crime because the true admini   |  | ,,,  |
|      |       | C.A. 2. U.S. v. Assi.   | stration of justice is the cornerstone of all our lib   |  |  |
| 1984 | COCAP | 748 F.2d 62   | erties .  | Judge providing jury instructions  | Judicial proceeding                              |
|      |       | N.Y., People v.   |   | Discussing incentives back of  |  |
|      |       | Grissom, 128 Misc. 2d   | Requiring the party who wants the minutes to ord  | production requirements as between   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1985 | COCAP | 246   | er them promotes the administration of justice .  | parties.   | procedure  |
|      |       |   |   |  |  |
|      |       |   | Bredemann v. Bredemann , 253 Minn. 21 , 24 -  |  |  |
|      |       |   | 5 , 91 N.W. 2d 84 , 87 ( 1958 ) stated the rule th  |  |  |
|      |       |   | at dissolution judgments may be set aside " unde  |  |  |
|      |       |   | r such circumstances as amount to a fraud on the  |  |  |
|      |       |   | court and the administration of justice . * * * To  |  |  |
|      |       | Minn., In re Marriage of  | be fraud on the court and the administration of ju  |  |  |
|      |       | Adams, 393 N.W.2d   | stice , there must be found to be fraud on [ the wi   |  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1986 |       |   |   | Explaining controlling precedent.  |  |
|      | COCAP | 508   | fe]."   |  | procedure  |
|      | COCAP | 508   | fe]."   | Explaining controlling precedent.  | procedure  |
|      | COCAP | 508   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad   | Explaining controlling precedent.  | procedure  |
|      | COCAP | 508   |   | Explaining controlling precedent.  | procedure  |
|      | COCAP | 508   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad   | Explaining controlling precedent.  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
|      | COCAP | 508<br>C.A. 3, U.S. v.  | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary t  |  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 | COCAP |   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary t<br>rials, and also of the crushing financial burdens   |  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary t<br>rials, and also of the crushing financial burdens<br>placed on the taxpayers who ultimately pay the e<br>xpenses of federal criminal Etigation.   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also consciour of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary t<br>rials, and also of the crushing financial burdens<br>placed on the taxpayers who ultimately pay the e<br>sprenses of fideral criminal fligation.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad-<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary t<br>rials, and also of the crushing financial burdens<br>placed on the tarapysers who ultimately pay the e-<br>spenses of federal criminal htigation.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>paragraph 5 provides : It was pay of the pattern of  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary tri-<br>rials, and also of the renthing financial burdens<br>placed on the taxpayers who utilimately pay the e<br>sprenses of fideral ariminal hitigation.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>paragraph 5 provides. It was part of the pattern or<br>final-teering activity that in or about September  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of junctics produced by unnecessary<br>risks, and also of the erathing financial burdens<br>placed on the tappayers who ultimately pay the a<br>perience of fidear arimmal higgsing.<br>The obstruction of junctics predicate contained in<br>gauging the provides (1: was part of the pattern o-<br>f nacktoreing activity that in or about September<br>1981, in the Battern District of New York and   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the ad<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary trials, and also of the ronthing financial bredens<br>placed on the taxpayers who ultimately pay the e<br>sprenses of federal ariminal hitigation.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>paragraph Sprovides. It was part of the pattern o<br>fracktaering activity that in or about September<br>1 (1984), in the Eastern District of New York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, Joseph Massino  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of anche delays in the at<br>minimitrie of justice produced by unnecessary trials, and also of the crushing financial bardens<br>placed on the taxpayers who ultimately pay the e-<br>sprense of facted reminal Bingations.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gaugingh 5 provides. It was part of the pattern o-<br>frackateneting activity that is or about Styenabure<br>1984. , in the Eastern District of New York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, Joseph Massion<br>$a_1 k' (x = Joseph Massing, -x' (k = Joseph Massion$   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of muche delays in the ad-<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary,<br>this, and also of the consist granulate bardens<br>placed on the targayners who atlanted pay the e-<br>geness of fasteria erannal flugations.<br>The obstruction of justice products contained in<br>paragraph 5 provides. I was part of the pattern o-<br>frackateening activity the in or about 5 sponterior<br>frackateening activity the in or about 5 sponterior<br>elevelence , that the defaultary, $\lambda_{\rm eff}(x) = \lambda_{\rm eff}(x)$ .<br>Moreover, that the defaultary, $\lambda_{\rm eff}(x) = \lambda_{\rm eff}(x)$ .  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of anche delays in the at<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary trains, and also of the combing financial burdens<br>placed on the tarayours who utilized by the e-<br>sprense of facted remined linguistics. The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gaugingh 5 growthes. It was part of the pattern o-<br>frackatenesis activity that is or about Stycember<br>1998), a the E-factom Dimits of Power York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, longth Massim<br>$a_{i} k' k a^{-3} compt Massim, a^{-i} k' k a^{-3} longthMassim, a^{-i} k' k a^{-3} longth - makeships, while the distribu-tion of the distribution of the distribution of the distributionof the distribution of the distribution of the distribution of themassimal activity of the distribution of the distribution of thedistribution of the distribution of the distribution of thedistribution of the distribution of the distribution of thedistribution of the distribution of the distribution of the distribution of thedistribution of the distribution of the distribution of the distribution of thedistribution of the distribution of the distribu$   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of anche delays in the ad-<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary time.<br>This, and also of the transfor financial bardens<br>phased on the targayour who thinmed pup the ex-<br>openses of finand examinal linguistics.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>grangingh 5 provides. I was part of the pattern o-<br>f nodax metry in the site of the pattern o-<br>f nodax metry in the site of the pattern o-<br>f pattern of the pattern of the pattern o-<br>f pattern of the pattern of the pattern o-<br>the site of the pattern of the pattern of<br>nodax metry in the pattern of the pattern of<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern<br>of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the<br>pattern of the pattern of the patt  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the at<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary trains, and also of the combing financial burdens<br>placed on the taxpayors who utilized by the e-<br>spreness of facted remined linguistics. The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gaugingh 5 growthes. It was part of the pattern o-<br>frackatering activity that is or about Sprember<br>2014. In the Eastern Denist of Peve York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, longth Maximum<br>( $a_1 / k + a^{-1} \log h$ malority), "and balance the<br>Maximum, $a_1 / k + a^{-1} \log h$ malority," and balance the<br>movingly would and did computy underest to influe<br>move, obstruct and impact the aux athinistrati   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of anche delays in the ad-<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary ti-<br>ins, and also of the conhing financial bacelons<br>phased on the taxpaysers who ultimodel pays the<br>operator of fasted arcminal linguistics.<br>The obstraction of justice products contained in<br>grangendy 5 provides. I was part of the pattern o-<br>frackateening activity that is or about Styromber<br>(1984), as the Eastern District of New York and<br>elsewhere, that the defondants, loogth Massimo<br>(1984), and the Easternay - and the store bar<br>$e_{x,x}(x) = 2\pi s_{x,y}(x) $ | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the at<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary trains, and also of the combing financial burdens<br>placed on the taxpayors who utilized by the e-<br>spreness of facted remined linguistics. The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gaugingh 5 growthes. It was part of the pattern o-<br>frackatering activity that is or about Sprember<br>2014. In the Eastern Denist of Peve York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, longth Maximum<br>( $a_1 / k + a^{-1} \log h$ malority), "and balance the<br>Maximum, $a_1 / k + a^{-1} \log h$ malority," and balance the<br>movingly would and did computy underest to influe<br>move, obstruct and impact the aux athinistrati   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of anche delays in the ad-<br>ministration of justice produced by unnecessary ti-<br>ins, and also of the conhing financial bacelons<br>phased on the taxpaysers who ultimodel pays the<br>operator of fasted arcminal linguistics.<br>The obstraction of justice products contained in<br>grangendy 5 provides. I was part of the pattern o-<br>frackateening activity that is or about Styromber<br>(1984), as the Eastern District of New York and<br>elsewhere, that the defondants, loogth Massimo<br>(1984), and the Easternay - and the store bar<br>$e_{x,x}(x) = 2\pi s_{x,y}(x) $ | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1978 |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.   | We are also conscious of undue delays in the at<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary trains, and also of the combing financial bardens<br>placed on the tanyours who utilized by the e-<br>spreness of facted routing linguistics. The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gauging by Spreads. It was part of the pattern o-<br>frackatering activity that is or about Spreamber<br>1984), a the Eastern Denist of Peve York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, longth Massim, $a = (k + a^{-2} \log h)$<br>Mussim, $a = (k + a^{-2} \log h)$ , "mainstylity, walling and<br>using by yould and did computy underweits using<br>a $n + (k + a^{-2} \log h)$ - mainstylity, walling and an<br>oningly yould and did computy underweits would and<br>did computy networks to caused another person to  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,                             |
|      |       | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Moskow, 588 F.2d 882<br>S.D.N.Y., U.S. v.  | We are also conscisus of muche delays in the ad-<br>minimum of justice produced by unnecessary, this, and also of the reaching financial last bedges<br>and the second second second second second second second<br>perms of fideral arminal Higgsino<br>The obstraction of justice products contained in<br>programs of product products and the patterns<br>of the second second second second second second<br>programs of products and the second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second fields that are done second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second second<br>second second se  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments   | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|      | COCAP | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Moskow, 588 F.2d 882   | We are also conscisus of muche delays in the ad-<br>minimum of justice produced by unnecessary, this, and also of the reaching financial last bedges<br>and the second second second second second second second<br>perms of fideral arminal Higgsino<br>The obstraction of justice products contained in<br>programs of product products and the patterns<br>of the second second second second second second<br>programs of products and the second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>products and the second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second fields that are done second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second second<br>second second se  | Rejecting judicial accountry arguments<br>against allowing conditional pleas.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|      | COCAP | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Moskow, 588 F.2d 882<br>S.D.N.Y., U.S. v.  | We are also conscious of anche delays in the at<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary. It<br>will be a start of the transformation of the produced by<br>pheed on the tapaysers who tiltimadely pay the e-<br>geners of fideal entimal Highdran.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>gamma physics (b) with the produce of the pattern of<br>frackatering activity that is or about Sayomber<br>(1981), a the Eastern District of Poly Vok and<br>devolver, that the defendants, Joseph Massimo<br>(1981), and the Eastername Theritis of Poly Vok<br>Massima, $a = k/a = 30$ , $a = k/a = 30$ , $a = k/a = 10$ ,<br>a = k/a = 10, $a = k/a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ , $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10,<br>a = 10, $a = 10$ ,<br>a = 10,<br>a =   | Rejecting judicial economy arguments<br>against allowing conditional pleas.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|      | COCAP | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Moskow, 588 F.2d 882<br>S.D.N.Y., U.S. v.<br>Viade, 635 F. Supp. 194   | We are also conscisus of muche delays in the ad-<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary,<br>this, and also of the crushing financial bardens<br>placed on the targayners who atlanted pay the e-<br>geness of fasteria erround linguistics.<br>The obstruction of justice products contained in<br>paragends 5 worked. Is was part of the pattern o-<br>f produced structures and the structures of<br>produced structures and the structures of the<br>eleventres. That the deformation, how the sponten-<br>tice obstructures and the deformation, how the sponten-<br>tice obstructures and the deformation is deformed and<br>$a_{-}a_{-}k_{-}a_{-}^{-}$ states, "and work by with the and the<br>moment, "and the deformation is denoted with the<br>company bard and and decremptly makement to a structure in the<br>deformation of partice in that the defordant works and and did<br>corruptly subscene to consumed number persons to<br>on of "This 1.1, United Status Code, Section 150<br>3.  | Rejecting judicial accountry argaments<br>against allowing conditional pleas.<br>Becalling the indictment,<br>Rejecting argument that grant jury | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1986 | COCAP | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Moskow, 588 F.2d 882<br>S.D.N.Y., U.S. v.<br>Vinla, 633 F. Supp. 194<br>E.D. Pa, U.S. v.                       | We are also conscious of anche delays in the at<br>ministritor of justice produced by unnecessary. It<br>will be a start of the transformation of the start of the<br>pheter of the targayners who ultimately pay the e-<br>queress of facted remning Hingsitos. The<br>bottering activity that is or about Septomber<br>paragraph 5 provides 1: was part of the pattern o-<br>frackteering activity that is or about Septomber<br>1981, as the Eastern District of Pew York and<br>elsewhere, that the defendants, longth Massimo<br>( $z_{i}, k', z'' = longth models), a couple Massimoactivity of the start of the start of the startmovingly would and did corruptly endance to andmovingly would and did corruptly endance tomorphy endance to councel another process toconstruct the start of the start of the startmorphy endance to councel another process toand ensuits of agreed pay subparent, in violationof The 11, United States Code, Section 1503.$  | Rejecting judicial economy arguments<br>against allowing conditional pleas.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1986 | COCAP | C.A. 3, U.S. v.<br>Medow, 588 F.2d 882<br>S.D.N.Y., U.S. v.<br>Vada, 635 F. Supp. 194<br>E.D. Pa, U.S. v.<br>Simmon, 444 F. Supp. | We are also conscious of muche delays in the ad-<br>minimizing of justice produced by unnecessary. This,<br>and also of the transport who thinked pay the e-<br>operator of the transport who thinked pay the e-<br>present of fixed resumal linguistics.<br>The obstruction of justice predicate contained in<br>paragraph 5 provides. It was part of the pattern o-<br>f makeneting activity the it is or about Steptime-<br>transport of the steptime of the steptime of<br>predicate steptime of the steptime of the steptime<br>of predicate steptime of the steptime of the steptime<br>part is a "a shape", mainweak the steptime of the<br>steptime of the steptime of the steptime of the step-<br>time of parties in the the defination is valued and did<br>comparity undexord to consult another person to<br>of 10 for the 11 st. United State Code, Scelens 100<br>10 for the definition of the definition of the steptime of<br>the definition of the stepsime of the the step of the stepsime of the<br>of the definition of the stepsime of the stepsime of the stepsime of the<br>stepsime bases the stepsime of the  | Rejecting judicial scorency arguments<br>against allowing conditional pleas.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |

| 1984 | COCAP | Ore., In re Complaint as<br>to the Conduct of<br>RICHARD F. CRIST,<br>Accused, 683 P.2d 85  | The complains alleged that his described conduct<br>voltand DB (c ) which provide that a la<br>101 (A) (1) and (3), which provide that a la<br>vey reduit to that the la lagd matter when he kno-<br>way, or abould know, that he is not competent to<br>do so, and that he shall not neglest a lagd matter<br>eministic to him. Violation of DR 1 -<br>DQ (A) (5) was also cherged. That rule forbi-<br>ds a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudici<br>al to the administration of junice.  | Assessing discipline of lawyer whose<br>inserperience made him incompetent<br>to handle a probate.                     | Discipline, Lawyer   |
|------|-------|---|---|--|--|
|      |       | Bankr. N.D. Ga., In re<br>Seven Springs<br>Apartments, Phase II,  | As the Supreme Court noted in Northern Pipelin<br>e Construction Co. v. Marnthon Pipe Line Co., s<br>upra, 458 U.S. 50 at 64, n. 15, 102 S.Ct. 2858<br>at 2867, n. 15, 73 LEd. 2 d 598 at 610, n. 15:<br>" The Framers chose to leave to Congress the pre<br>cise role to be adved by the lower foderal courts  | Explaining why courts cannot arrogate powers not given to them by  | Judicial proceeding, powers &  |
| 1983 | COCAP | 33 B.R. 458   | in the administration of justice . "  | Congress.  | prerogatives   |
|      | COCAP | Ore., In re: Complaint<br>as to the Conduct of<br>WILLIAM C.<br>ROCHAT, Accused,<br>295 Or. 533   | The accused 's conduct with respect to his intera-<br>ction with Calvin and with Wade was boorish in<br>the extreme, but the issue is whether that conduc<br>t was "prejudicial to the administration of justice<br>" or " adversely reflects on his fitness to practice<br>law " or both.  | Finding that badgering of clerks was   | Discipline, Lawyer   |
| 1987 | COCAP | E.D. Va., U.S. v. Allen,<br>666 F. Supp. 847  | Cortainly this court recognizes the importance of<br>the orderly and efficient administration of justice<br>but acknowledges the court 's primary responsib<br>ility of assuring individuals their rights to a prope<br>rly selected jury, based upon the Batson standar<br>ds.   | Qualifying criticisms of imprecion of<br>guidance to lower courts.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure  |
| 1986 |       | Mass., Michael J. Foley<br>vs. Lowell Division of<br>the District Court<br>Department, 398 Mass.<br>800   | Although the single justice was not in error, it is<br>appropriate that we consider the matter under our<br>broader inherent common law and constitutional<br>powers to supervise the administration of justice :   | Taking cognizance of a justice's<br>conduct.   | Discipline, judge  |
| 1987 |       | Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Cherpes, 360 Pa. Super.<br>246  | bits , while the nonlinition of control is based upon<br>the principile of principile impartality. , clinitarents<br>duess, and faincess percenting the whole system<br>of phications , so have content may an easi may<br>ble be above suspicions, dues is , on the other side<br>is non-cont to suspicions. The side is that cause<br>is may not be unfinity projektoral, unday delences<br>or so of perjoidscore runtimenses made against the ju-<br>or discontent creation. It is of great importan-<br>ce to the administration of justice that such should<br>not excern. | Outlining the daties and discretion of   | Discipline, judge  |
| 1987 |       | Ore., In re Complaint as<br>to the Conduct of<br>FERRIS F. BOOTHE,<br>Accused, 740 P.2d 785   | None of these cases contains any reasoned analysis<br>is explaining why the "administration of justice<br>" language should include har proceedings. Upo<br>n reflection, however, we conclude that it does.<br>Bar disciplinary proceedings, a hhough sui gene<br>ris in nature, strongly resemble judicial proceeding<br>ings in that they primarily involve factual adjudic<br>ations.   | Asserting that bar proceedings are<br>"administration of justice" for<br>purposes of rules of professional<br>conduct. | Discipline, lawyer   |
| 1979 |       | C.A. 6, DETROIT<br>POLICE OFFICERS'<br>ASSOCIATION et al.,<br>Plaintiffs-Appellees, v.<br>Coleman A. YOUNG,<br>Mayor of the City of<br>Detroit, et al.,<br>Defendants-Appellants,<br>608 F.2d 671 | see also President's Commission on Law Enforce<br>ement and the Administration of Austice, Task F<br>orce Report: The Police 169, 174 (1967) (citi<br>ing practices and racially discriminatory job assis<br>memts in Detroit Police Department).   | Adducing evidence and citations that<br>hiring program did not violate Title<br>VII.                                   | Referencing<br>President's<br>Commission on Law<br>Enforcement and the<br>Administration of<br>Justice |

|         |       |  | Not only did Respondent engage in conduct preju<br>dicial to the administration of justice in ignoring<br>the various inquiries sent to him by Bar Counsel<br>in the Jones Conservatorship case, but he made  |   |                                   |
|---------|-------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1985    | COCAP | D.C., In re Melvin J.<br>WASHINGTON, 489<br>A.2d 452   | arguments and gave testimony at the hearing in t<br>his case that the Hearing Committee charitably c<br>haracterized as " frivolous . "   | Characterizing conduct that resulted in three months' suspension.   | Discipline, Lawyer                |
|         |       |  | This is a distinction well recognized in Common<br>Omenantian Visional ( $\mu_{\rm BW}$ , showing the Supreme<br>Court and ) - The nature and duranted [ of the di-<br>j] and the practical used the common how and<br>related tataties music control the interpretation of<br>the terms' court. The dury of which nature as 1<br>to require joint consideration by all the members<br>of the court ? The appointment and removal of public efficial<br>s |   |                                   |
| ***1977 | COCAP | Pa., Hamill Estate, 3 Pa.<br>D. & C.3d 100   | the general administration of justice ( that may b<br>e done by fewer members ) . "<br>As pointed out in United States v. Tateo , supra ,   | Elaborating on the court's functions.   | Judicial powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1980    | COCAP | Md., Sweetwine v.<br>State, 288 Md. 199  | 377 U.S. at 466, the rule of United States v. Ball<br>is also grounded upon fairness in the administrat<br>ion of justice, considering the interests of the pu<br>blic as well as those of the defendant.   | grant of retrial.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure |
| 1981    | COCAP | Ore., In Re: Complaint<br>as to the conduct of<br>HECTOR E. SMITH,<br>Accused, 292 Or. 84  | Smith , by persuading his secretary to make a fal<br>se acknowledgement , engaged in conduct that pr<br>ejudicial to the administration of justice .  | Asserting liability under disciplinary<br>rule for causing secreatary (also a<br>notary) to make a false      | Discipline, Lawyer                |
|         | COCAP | D. Minn., U.S. v.<br>Bonnell, 483 F. Supp.<br>1070   | In re Murphy states that opinion work product " e<br>an be discovered only in very raw and extraordin<br>a of public policy and a proper administration of<br>justice would militate against the nondiscovery o<br>f an attensey 's mental impressions."  |   | Judicial proceeding,              |
| 1986    | COCAP | C.A. 9, U.S. v. Kamer,<br>781 F.2d 1380  | As discussed in Section I.A., supra, by developi<br>ng a complete and searching record, the trial cou<br>rt can, and should, ensure the thor ough and eff<br>ective administration of justice.  | Grounding the insufficieny of trial judge's process.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure |
| 1984    | COCAP | Ind., In re McDaniel,<br>470 N.E.2d 1327   | Interpretation is further charged with violating Dis-<br>ciplinary Radis 1 - $(1)$ , $(4)$ , $(5)$ and $(6)$ , by engagin<br>g in conduct involv -<br>ing dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentati<br>on and engaging in conduct prejudicial to the ad-<br>ministration of justice which adversely reflects o<br>in his filmests to practice law.   | Describing basis of liability for<br>knowingly false testimony to grand<br>jury.                              | Perjury, Discipline,<br>Lawyer    |
|         |       | Conn., State v. Carr, jr.,   | Section 53a -<br>147, a part of our penal code, covers the crime<br>of bribery in broad terms and is not limited to the<br>administration of justice and attempts to influen  | Describing basis of liability for   |                                   |
| 1977    | COCAP | 172 Conn. 458  | ce legislation .<br>The administration of justice under our adversary<br>system largely depends upon the public 's ability  | bribing a police officer.   | Law enforcement                   |
| 1981    | COCAP | Md., Atty Gen'l of Md.<br>v. Waldron, 289 Md.<br>683   | to rely on the honesty of attorneys who are place<br>d in a position of being called upon to conduct th<br>e affairs of others both in and out of court .   | Asserting and explaining judicial<br>oversight of the bar.  | discipline, judges                |
|         |       |  | The court notes that to try both of these charges s<br>eparately is not in the best administration of justi<br>ce, for among other reasons — a ) the cost and ti<br>me of two trials, and b ) inconvenience to witnes   |   |                                   |
| 1977    | COCAP | Fla., State v. Patrus, 46<br>Fla. Supp. 19   | ses returning for a second trial, and c) delay in u<br>ltimate resolve of the accusations.<br>We recognize that the fair and orderly administra   | Finding trial court exceeded discretion<br>in requiring separate trials.                                      | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure |
| 1981    | COCAP | Miss., Jones v. State,<br>398 So. 2d 1312  | tion of justice requires that trial judges must have<br>reasonable discretion in dealing with errant juror<br>s who demonstrate their unwillingness to abide b<br>y the instructions of the coart, or other unanticip<br>ated occurrences which transpire during trials -<br>rmany, we so not occurre unar retroacture appre-   | Defending discretion of judges to<br>discontinue trials.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure |
| 1985    | COCAP | Wash., In the Matter of<br>the Marriage of Joyce E.<br>Hilk, Respondent, and<br>Daniel M. Hilt,<br>Appellant, 41 Wash.<br>App. 434 | ation of Brown will " cast substantial doubt type<br>in the validity of numerous prior judgments, and<br>would impose a great burdton on the administratial<br>on of justice by allowing many cases to be reliting<br>ated<br>"Milikeadt, 103 Wn. 2 d at 342, quoting Ann<br>ot, .Comment Nets.— Prospective or Retroactiv<br>Operation of Overnling Destriction, 10 A.L.R. 3<br>d 1371, 1391 (1966.).  | Deciding to allow retroactive application of new rule.  | Judicial proceedings              |
|         |       | Pa., Jones v. Montefiore   | he public [has ] an interest, with regard to whice<br>h legislative action, in the interest of the public is<br>a absolutely necessary<br>. [The use of stenographers to report judicial pro-<br>ceedings] expedites judicial procedure, econom<br>izes the time of public tribunals, and so promote<br>the prompt administration of justice and reduce   |   | Judicial proceeding,              |
| 1980    | COCAP | Hosp., 418 A.2d 1361   | ended<br>Because the court could not sanction the method<br>by which the jury panel was formed, it reversed<br>the judgment below " in the exercise of our powe   | stenography.<br>Quoting precedent in discussion of  | procedure                         |
| 1987    | COCAP | Colo., Fields v. People,<br>732 P.2d 1145<br>Fla., Fla. Bar v.   | r of supervision over the administration of justice<br>in the federal courts. "<br>The Bar states that acceptance of this petition will<br>not adversely affect the public interest, underm-<br>ine the purity of the courts, or hinder the admini  | calling potential jurors.<br>Granting peition for leave to resign   | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure |
| ***1985 | COCAP | Hawkins, 467 So. 2d<br>998<br>Md., ATTORNEY<br>GRIEVANCE<br>COMMISSION OF  | stration of justice or the confidence of the public<br>in the legal profession .  | where attorney repeatedly failed in his duties.   | Discipline, Lawyer                |
| 1982    | COCAP | MARYLAND v.<br>WILLIAM H.<br>PATTISON, JR., 292<br>Md. 599   | Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the admi<br>nistration of justice .  | Quoting disciplinary rule as basis for<br>liability of attorney who converted<br>client funds to his own use. | Discipline, Lawyer                |
| 1980    | COCAP | Kan., State v. Russell,<br>227 Kan. 897  | An attorney may also be disciplined for conduct<br>which interferes with the processes of the admini<br>stration of justice   | Quoting bases of liabilty for attorney's statements.  | Discipline, Lawyer                |
|         |       | D.C., Synanon<br>Foundation, Inc. v.<br>Bernstein, 503 A.2d  | Rule 60 (b), however, does not subsume or abr<br>ogate the court 's " inherent power to dismiss an<br>action when a party has willfully deceived the co<br>urt and engaged in conduct utterly inconsistent w  | Assessing remedial options against  | D                                 |
| 1986    | COCAP | 1254   | ith the orderly administration of justice . "<br>He voiced concern that the holding of the majorit  | attorney's fraud on the court.  | Discipline, Lawyer                |

|   |                         |   | In determining the retroactivity of constitutional r   |  |  |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|   |                         |   | ules in criminal cases , the Supreme Court has co<br>nsidered three criteria : " * ( a ) the purpose to be   |  |  |
|   |                         |   | served by the new standards , ( b ) the extent of t<br>he reliance by law enforcement authorities on the   |  |  |
|   |                         |   | old standards, and (c) the effect on the admini<br>stration of justice of a retroactive application of t   | Reciting doctrinal basis for   | Judicial proceeding,   |
| 1985                                    | COCAP                   | C.A. 7, 757 F.2d 811  | he new standards . '<br>Neither good -   | retroactivity determination.   | procedure  |
|   |                         |   | faith reliance by state or federal authorities on pr<br>ior constitutional law or accepted practice, nor s   |  |  |
|   |                         |   | evere impact on the administration of justice has<br>sufficed to require prospective application in thes   |  |  |
|   |                         | N.Y., People v. Molina,   |  | Reciting doctrinal basis for giving<br>retroactive effect to motion to   | Judicial proceeding,   |
| 1983                                    | COCAP                   | 121 Misc. 2d 483  | US 537.)<br>The speedy and efficient administration of justic  | suppress evidence.   | evidence   |
|   |                         | E.D. Ark., Curl v. Gen.<br>Tele. Co. of the   | e requires , however , that ' [ m ] eritless claims .<br>be disposed of at the first appropriate opportuni   |  |  |
|   | COCAP                   | Southwest, 669 F. Supp.<br>930  | ty. 'Hungate v. United States , 626 F. 2d 60 , 62<br>(8th Cir. 1980)   | Discussing the dismissal of a<br>complaint.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure  |
| 1987                                    | COCAF                   | 950   | He noted , for example , that " although the rule i  | composine.   | procedure  |
|   |                         |   | s thought to deter unlawful police activity in part<br>through the nurturing of respect for Fourth Amen  |  |  |
|   |                         | C.A. 3, Morrison v.   | dment values , if applied indiscriminately it may  |  |  |
|   |                         | Kimmelman, 752 F.2d   |  | Discussing Powell, J. on the   |  |
| 1985                                    | COCAP                   | 918   | d . 428 U.S. at 491 , 96 S.Ct . at 3051 .<br>The majority would do well to hear in mind the e  | exclusionary rule.   | Law enforcement  |
|   |                         |   | omment of Judge Markell for this Court in the ca   |  |  |
|   |                         |   | se of In re Meyerson , 190 Md. 671 , 678 , 59 A.<br>2d 489 ( 1948 ) , quoted many times since then ,   |  |  |
|   |                         | Md., In re Application  | to the effect that " due regard for the administrati<br>on of justice does not permit disbarment and rein  |  |  |
| 1979                                    | COCAP                   | of Howard C., 286 Md.<br>244  | statement to be made mere adjuncts to reform sc<br>hools and the parole system . "   | Discussing timing of admission to the<br>bar aafter criminal acts.   | Discipline, Lawyer   |
| 5.5                                     | M                       |   | The following acts or omissions by an attorney, i  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | interfollowing acts or omissions by an atomey, i<br>individually or in concert with another person, ar<br>e misconduct and grounds for discipline, whethe  |  |  |
| ļ                                       |                         |   | r or not occurring in the course of an attorney -  | Citing grounds of liability for attorney   |  |
| 1982                                    | COCAP                   | Mich., In re Grimes,<br>414 Mich. 483   | client relationship : " (1) conduct prejudicial to<br>the proper administration of justice ; "   | who backdated and persuaded client to<br>backdated a loan agreement.   | Discipline, Lawyer   |
|   |                         |   | Steinle mistakenly believes that his duty to his cli   |  |  |
|   |                         |   | ent extends even to commencing a frivolous and<br>meritless action intended to harass appellees and  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | to impede and obstruct the due administration of<br>justice by intentionally forcing a United States Di  |  |  |
| 1985                                    | COCAP                   | C.A. 7, Steinle v.<br>Warren, 765 F.2d 95   | strict Judge to recuse himself from a pending cri<br>minal case on the eve of trial .  | Characterizing attorney's conduct.   | Discipline, Lawyer   |
|   |                         | Ind., In re Friedland,  | There are limits which have been drawn to guara  | Characterizing attorney's repeated<br>violations of rules of professional  |  |
| 1981                                    | COCAP                   | 416 N.E.2d 433  | ntee the effective administration of justice .<br>Attnough a detendant 's right to counsel must be   | conduct.   | Discipline, Lawyer   |
|   |                         |   | respected, this right can not be manipulated in s<br>uch a manner as to impede the efficient administ  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | ration of justice . People v. Lucero , Colo. , 615<br>P. 2d 660 ( 1980 ) ; United States ex rel . Basker   | Discussing rejection of defendant's  |  |
|   |                         | Colo., People v. Barnes,  | ville v. Deegan , 428 F. 2d 714 ( 2d Cir . 1970 ) ,<br>cert . denied , 400 U.S. 928 , 91 S.Ct . 193 , 27   | request to discharge counsel and<br>represent himself after jury was   | Judicial proceeding,   |
| 1981                                    | COCAP                   | 636 P.2d 1323   | L.Ed .2 d 188 .  | empanneled.  | procedure  |
|   |                         |   |  |  |  |
|   |                         | 1   | However, because of the strong constitutional i  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | mplications of the attorney -<br>client privilege , " it would serve the orderly ad  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | mplications of the attorney -<br>client privilege, " it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defe  |  |  |
|   |                         |   | nuplications of the attorney -<br>client privilege, 'i twould serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defe<br>ndant a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ attor<br>ney -   | Explaining use of motion to suppress   |  |
| 1987                                    | COCAP                   | La., State v. Taylor, 502<br>So. 2d 537   | mplications of the attorney -<br>client privilege, " it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defe<br>ndant a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ attor  | Explaining use of motion to suppress<br>to test admissibility of attorney-client<br>communications before trial.   | Judicial proceeding,   |
| 1987                                    | COCAP                   |   | mplications of the attorney -<br>client privilege, " it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defe<br>ndart a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ attor<br>ney -<br>client communications ] could be determined in<br>a pretrial proceeding. " State v. Tanner, supra ,  | to test admissibility of attorney-client   | Judicial proceeding,   |
|   |                         | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe   | mplications of the attorney<br>clicate priviley, - it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insue the defi-<br>ndant a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ attor<br>ney -<br>clicate communications ] could be determined in<br>a profrial proceeding, ." State v. Tamner , supra,<br>at 1174.<br>The interests embodied in rules dealing with pret<br>rial disclosure are significant and are an essential   | to test admissibility of attorney-client<br>communications before trial.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
|   | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White  | mplications of the attorney -<br>clicate privilege, " it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>dents a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ ator<br>ney -<br>clicate communications ] could be determined in<br>a pretrial proceeding. " State v. Tamer , supra,<br>at 1174.<br>The interests embodied in rules dealing with pret  | to test admissibility of attorney-client   | procedure  |
|   |                         | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning  | mplications of the attorney<br>clicate priviley, - it would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insue the defi-<br>ndant a fair trial if the admissibility of the [ attor<br>ney -<br>clicate communications ] could be determined in<br>a profrial proceeding, ." State v. Tamner , supra,<br>at 1174.<br>The interests embodied in rules dealing with pret<br>rial disclosure are significant and are an essential   | to test admissibility of attorney-client<br>communications before trial.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
|   |                         | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>y. U.S., 4 CL CL 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Henorable Robert<br>Crune WINTON, Jr.,   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>disting privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the deli-<br>ment a fair trial if the adminishibly of the failor<br>ney-<br>client communications ] could be determined in<br>a pertrait proceeding. "State v. Tamaer, supra,<br>at 1724.<br>The interests embodied in rules dealing with pret<br>rial discharge are significant and are an essential<br>pret of the diministration of justice.  | to test admissibility of attorney-client<br>communications before trial.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Henorable Robert<br>Crime WINTON, Jr.,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Hennepin Courty, State  | mplications of the attorney<br>disting privilage, "It would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>ment a fair trial if the adminishibly of the failor<br>ney-<br>client communications ] could be determined in<br>a perturb proceeding" State v. Tamaer, supra,<br>at 1724.<br>The interests embodied in rules dealing with pret<br>rial discharace are significant and are an essential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Conduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et focuse on conduct prejudicial to the administra-  | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure   |
|   | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Henorable Robert<br>Crine WINTON, <i>Jr.</i> ,<br>Judge of District Court,  | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indication privilege, "It would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further inware the defi-<br>tion at fair trail if the adminishibity of the faitor<br>to a second straight and the administration of the faitor<br>approximation of the administration of the administra-<br>generation proceeding. "State v. Tannor, supra-<br>al 1724.<br>The intersection ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>riad declosure are organized at an are accessing<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et forbases on conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>ation of faultice, which includes but is not limited<br>to extended.  | to test admissibility of attorney-elient<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Henorable Robert<br>Crime WINTON, Jr.,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Hennepin Courty, State  | mplications of the attorney.<br>discing privilege, "It would save the orderly all<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>ministration of justice and matteries the same state<br>and the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>privilege state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same<br>state of the same state of the same state of the same state of the<br>state of the same state of the same stat                                     | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure   |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Henorable Robert<br>Crime WINTON, Jr.,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Hennepin Courty, State  | mplications of the attorney. —<br>disting privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>ficient privilege, "It is deminishibly of the future<br>ney-<br>disting exercising," State v. Tamar, supra,<br>at 1747.<br>The internets embedded in rules dealing with pret<br>right decloreme are significant and are an essential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Conduct The Code of Judicial Condu<br>et focuses on conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>tion of justice, which include be bits in not limited<br>to reference which includes bits in not limited<br>to reference which includes betwine the future of the<br>advection to be taken into account in determining whether a decision is to be applied prospectively on<br>the structure of the advection of the new restored the new re-<br>stordance of the structure of the structure of the new re-<br>stordance of the structure of the structure of the new re-<br>stordance of the structure of t   | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure   |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Monatini Apashe. Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL Cz. 575<br>Completer Concerning<br>The Honorable Robert<br>Crane WINTON, <i>In</i> ,<br>Judge of Diaris (Court,<br>Herneyin Courty, State<br>of Minneseta   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>disting privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>ficient privilege, "It is admissibility of the justor<br>ney-<br>disting examinations ] could be determined in<br>a perturb proceeding. "State v. Tamar, supra,<br>at 1724.<br>The internets embedded in rules dealing with pret<br>right declosure are implicated at ad use on essential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu<br>et Consers on conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>tion of partice, which includes but is not limited<br>to erithmic arounds.<br>Extern to be taken into account in determining whether a decision is to be applied prospectively on<br>the protoxitively are: (1) the prepares of the new en<br>less. (2) the greener release on the odd rule, and   | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge  |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Mountain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL CL 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Honorable Robort<br>Crane WINTON, Jr.,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Hemepin County, State<br>of Minnesota  | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent privilege, "I would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion of a fair trail (1) is admissibling of the fairs<br>regretary proceeding. "State v. Tanner, supra-<br>al 1174.<br>The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>riad disclosure are organized and are ascential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et Grantes, and the indication of justice.<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et forcases on conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, which include but is not limited<br>to extend the administration of justice.<br>Tactors to be taken into account in determining we<br>refronzatively are: (1) the prepares of the new rule<br>(2) (2) the green chance on the dot rule, and<br>(3) the fifter on the administration of justice).   | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of curoons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure   |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 2d 537<br>U.S. Chima, White<br>Montain Ayache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 Cl. Ct. 575<br>Complaint Concerning<br>The Honorable Robert<br>Crane WINTON, <i>Ize</i> ,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Honnepin County, State<br>of Minnesotta<br>Mich., Hardigree v.<br>Green, 97 Mich. App.   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent privilege, "I would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion at a fart rull (1) the animishibity of the faither<br>the animal state of the animishibity of the faither<br>approximation of the animishibity of the detarging in<br>pertial proceeding. "State v. Tanner, supra-<br>al 1734.<br>The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>riat disclosure are organized and are ascential<br>pert of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et floaties, which includes but is not limited<br>in criminal conducts.<br>Tactors the taken into account in determining (3) the faiter on the administra-<br>(3) the faiter on the administration of pusice.<br>(3) the taken in the account in determining (3)<br>(4) the faiter on the administration of pusice.<br>(4) the advection is the administration of pusice.<br>(3) the faiter on the administration of pusice.<br>(4) the advection of the advection of pusice.<br>(4) the purpose of the new rule<br>(4) the faiter on the administration of pusice.<br>(4) the purpose of the new rule<br>(4) the faiter on the administration of pusice.<br>(4) the purpose of the new rule<br>(4) the faiter on the administration of pusice.  | to test admissibility of attenesy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of carons<br>within Cacle of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
| 1984                                    | COCAP                   | So. 24 537<br>U.S. Claims, While<br>Montain Apache Tribe<br>v. U.S., 4 CL CL 55<br>Completer Concernition<br>Terme WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> ,<br>Judge of District Court,<br>Henrepin Courty, State<br>of Minnesota<br>Mich., Hardigree v.<br>Green, 97 Mich. App.<br>62  | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indication of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dient privilege, "I would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion of a fair will be adminishibly of the fairor<br>they are also as a second of the same second and<br>period proveding. "State v. Tanner, upper,<br>and 174.<br>The interacts ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>tif declosure are asympticated and are an essential<br>per of the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Conchect The Code of Judicial Conduc-<br>et flocause on ecodoter prejudicial to the administra-<br>ation of printice, which includes but is not limited<br>to crimical conduct.<br>Externs to be taken in the azeministration of justices<br>(1) the prayers of the administration of guides of rule,<br>(2) the green of leases of the administration of<br>relevance of the administration of guides of rule,<br>(2) the green of leases of the definition of guides of<br>relevance of the administration of guides of<br>relevance of the relevance of the relevance of the relevance<br>relevance of the relevance of the relevance of the relevance<br>relevance of the relevance of the relevance of the relevance<br>relevance of the relevance of the relevan           | to test admissibility of attenes-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Cude of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>retractive or prospective application<br>of a devision.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedent   |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980                 | COCAP                   | So. 24 537<br>U.S. Claims, White<br>Montain Appach: Tribe<br>v. U.S., «CL CL 575<br>Complaint Conserving Con-<br>tingent Control (Control<br>Apple of District Court,<br>Hennesota<br>Mich., Hardigree v.<br>Green, 97 Mich. App.<br>62   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dient privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>ficient communications ] could be determined in<br>a pretral proceeding. "State v. Tunner, tuppa,<br>at 1747.<br>The interests embedded in rules dealing with pre-<br>rial declosure are using/increat and are an evential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>State for the administration of justice and<br>Standards of Coches of Indicational Con-<br>density of the administration of justice.<br>Standards of Coches of Indicational Con-<br>tensity of the administration of justice.<br>Standards of Coches of Indicational Con-<br>density of the administration of justice.<br>Factors to be taken into account in determining the<br>herbar a decision is to be applied prospectively on<br>reductive of the administration of justice.<br>Factors to be taken into account in determining the<br>herbar a decision is to be applied prospectively on<br>the administration of justice.<br>Textors to be taken into account in determining the<br>herbar advection of justice.<br>State of the administration of justice.<br>The state of the administration of justice.<br>The state of the administration of justice.   | to test admissibility of attenesy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of carons<br>within Cacle of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,  |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980                 | COCAP                   | So. 24 53     So. 24 537     U.S. Chaims, White     Montain Appach: Title     v. U.S., 4 Cl. Ct. 575     Complaint Concerning     Construct Concerning     Construct Concerning     Construct Concerning     Construct Concerning     Mich., Harnelignee v.     Greene, 97 Mich. App.     G2     C.A. 5, U.S. v. Bullock,     S51 F.24 1377     N.J. Greenberg v.     N.J. Greenberg v.   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>discing privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further insure the defi-<br>discing privilege, "It is admissibility of the justice<br>networks and the admissibility of the justice<br>appendix a fair trail of the admissibility of the justice<br>appendix and the set of the set of the set of the<br>appendix and the set of the set of the set of the<br>privilege and the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the<br>set of the set o                                 | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of curons<br>within Code of Indicial Conduct.<br>Receiling Detors for determining<br>rotroscrive or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>precedent                          |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977         | COCAP                   | So. 24 537<br>U.S. Claims, While<br>Montain Appach: Tible<br>v. U.S., 4 CL CL 557<br>Complexit Concernition<br>Tenne WINTON, Jr.,<br>The Homorable Andreas<br>Andreas Consulty, State<br>of Minnesota<br>Micha, Harclignee v.<br>Green, 97 Mich. App.<br>62<br>C. A. 5, U.S. v. Bullock,<br>551 F.24 1377   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent privilege, "It would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion of justice and investment of the func-<br>regeneration of proceedings. The summary of the func-<br>regeneration of the summary of the definition of the<br>pretrial proceeding. "State v. Transer, supra-<br>al 1734. —<br>The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>trial declosure are organized and are as essential<br>part of the administration of justice. —<br>Standard of Cenduct The Code of Judicial Condu-<br>et floates, which includes but is not limited<br>in criminal conducts. The code of Judicial Condu-<br>et floates, which includes but is not limited<br>in criminal conducts. The account in determining and<br>(3) the fifter on the administration of pusice. —<br>Partners the taken into account in determining (3)<br>(4) (1) the prepares of the acc-<br>(3) the advection (1) the prepares of the acc-<br>(3) the advection (1) the advantation of pusice). —   | to test admissibility of attornsy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>precedent                          |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 53 U.S. Claims, While Montain Ayouch: Tribe v. U.S., et Cl. Cr. 55 Complexit Conservation Terms WINTON, <i>Ir.</i> , <i>Italiage of District Court, Itannegia County, State of Memocian</i> Mida, Handigree v. Green, 977 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v. Bullock, 551 F24 1377 N.J., Greenberg V.   | mplications of the attorney. —<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent privilege, "It would serve the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>ficient communications] could be determined in<br>a pretral proceeding. — State v. Tamar, supra,<br>at 174.<br>The interests embedded in rules dealing with pret<br>rid declosure are usignificant and are an evential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>State v. Tamar, supra,<br>at 174.<br>The interests embedded in rules dealing with pret<br>rid declosure are usignificant and are an evential<br>part of the administration of justice.<br>State of the administration of justice.<br>The tensors are conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>ation of partice, which includes but is not limited<br>to estimate conduct.<br>Textors to be take into account in determining to<br>here a dealing with the includes but is not limited<br>to a simulate conduct.<br>Textors to be taken into account in determining to<br>here a dealine transmission of justice.<br>The transmission and administration of partice,<br>which, includes the dealing with the includes but is not<br>functional to the prepare of the new ru<br>la (. 2) the affect on the administration of partice,<br>which, includes the administration of partice,<br>to the extension of administration of partice,<br>the texton, as a corellar, reward defindents with<br>the rescaled of all judges to a sile deal of using the area in<br>the rescaled of all judges to a sile deal of using the texton<br>the texton of the sile of the administration of partice,<br>the limits as signed and the partice of the texton of the texton of the administration of partice,<br>the limits as signed and the partice of the administration of partice,<br>the limits as signed and the partice of the administration of partice,<br>the limits as signed and the administration of partice, the limits as the partice of the administration of partice, the limits as the administration of partice, the limits as the partice of the limits as the partice of the administration of partice, the limits a     | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.<br>Resiting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure                               |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 53 U.S. Claims, While Montain Ayouch: Tribe v. U.S., et Cl. Cr. 55 Complexit Conservation Terms WINTON, <i>Ir.</i> , <i>Italiage of District Court, Itannegia County, State of Memocian</i> Mida, Handigree v. Green, 977 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v. Bullock, 551 F24 1377 N.J., Greenberg V.   | mplications of the attensy<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent parvillage, "It would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion of a fair will be adminishibly of the fairor<br>terms and the administration of the same term<br>perturbal proceeding. "State v. Tanner, supra-<br>al 1734. The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>tation of the same term of the same terms of the<br>perturbal proceeding. "State v. Tanner, supra-<br>al 1734. The interests ambodies in rules dealing with pre-<br>tation of the same terms of the same terms of the<br>perturbal proceeding. The same terms of the same<br>same terms of the same terms of the same terms of the<br>effect on the same terms of the same terms of the<br>same terms of the same terms of the same terms of the<br>same terms of the same terms of the same terms of the same<br>same terms of the same terms of the same terms of the same<br>(3) the affect on the administration of pusice, (2)<br>(3) the affect on the administration of pusice, (2)<br>(4) the present of the same terms of the same terms of the same<br>(3) the affect on the administration of pusice, (2)<br>(4) the present of the Dataret A Tana persuades<br>that, funcing it houses the court, users of underscale<br>the advections of the Dataret A Tana persuades the advections<br>in automatic dominasis in all causes of underscale<br>the advections of the Dataret A Tana persuades the advections of the advections<br>in automatic dominasis in all causes of underscale<br>the advections of the Dataret A Tana persuades the advection of the advections<br>in automatic dominasis in all causes of underscale<br>the advections of the Dataret A Tana persuades of the advections<br>in automatic dominasis in all causes of underscale<br>the advections of the data same of the advection of the advections of the advections<br>of the causes of the baset of the maniperscale advections of the advection                | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.<br>Resiting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure                               |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernition Terms WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.G. 2000, Control Control Control Vision Control Grant, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v. Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v. Bullock, 531 F.24 1377 N.J., Greenberg v. Kimmelman, 99 N.J. 552 III., Ranson v. Licems III., III., IIII., IIII., IIII., IIIIIIII   | mplications of the attorney  | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Indicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>rotextrice or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management.<br>Reciting matadatory reenaal of judges<br>whose sponses work in the kind of<br>havings at her.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge                          |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attorney  | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions<br>Explaining significance of canons within Code of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining retrotective or prospective application of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for case manyment.<br>Assessing a District Court's plan for factors of the list of planeses at her.<br>Allowing different review procedures  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 53 U.S. Claims, While Montain Ayache, Tribe v. U.S., et Cl. Cr. 55 Complexit Conserving Complexit Conserving Control (Control Control (Control (Cont | mplications of the attensy.<br>indications of justice and further invest the defi-<br>dent parviloge, "It would save the orderly ad-<br>ministration of justice and further invest the defi-<br>tion of a fair trail (1) is adminishibly of the fairor<br>train a fair trail (1) is adminishibly of the fairor<br>train and the second second second second second<br>perturbal proceeding. "State v. Tamor, supra-<br>al 1174.<br>The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>ting the second second second second second second<br>perturbal proceeding." State v. Tamor, supra-<br>al 1174.<br>The interests ambodied in rules dealing with pre-<br>ting the second second second second second second<br>perturbal proceedings. The second second second second<br>et focuses on conduct prejudical to the administration of justice.<br>Standard of Comhet: The Code of Judicial Conduct<br>et focuses on conduct prejudical to the administration of protect<br>to ether advision in the bargheid processor of the second<br>(2) the attraction to be applied processor of the second<br>(3) the affect on the administration of protect.<br>(2) the presence of the advisor of the deal of the second<br>ether a decision is to be applied processor of the second<br>(3) the affect on the administration of protect.<br>(4) the State (4) (12) 10.<br>For the second of the District 7 Than persuadus to<br>the attraction of the deal of the second of the second<br>the advisorial in the administration of protect.<br>The recent al call judges so affected could impose<br>the advisorial barbon the solution states of underscheden<br>the advisorial the size of the emissiphiles<br>the advisorial the size of the emissiphiles<br>the differences in the size of the emissiphiles<br>the differences in the size of the emissiphiles<br>the differences in the size of the emissiphiles in sourced<br>on with many activities which judges so affected could impose<br>tracket prevents the size of the emissiphiles in sourced<br>on with many activities which judges the size of the emissiphiles<br>the differences in the size of the emissiphiles and the size of the emiss | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial.<br>Discussing sanctions.<br>Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct.<br>Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision.<br>Assessing a District Courty plan for<br>case management.<br>Rejecting mundatory retensal of judges<br>whose sponses way in the kind of<br>basiness at her.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Local |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attensy   | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections groups with the land of<br>passings at bar. Atlonning different review procedures<br>for location of the manipulation.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attorney.<br>   | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections groups with the land of<br>passings at bar. Atlonning different review procedures<br>for location of the manipulation.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attorney.<br>   | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections groups with the land of<br>passings at bar. Atlonning different review procedures<br>for location of the manipulation.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attorney  | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections groups with the land of<br>passings at bar. Atlonning different review procedures<br>for location of the manipulation.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537 U.S. Chaims, White Montain Apache Tribe v, U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint Concernite Robort Content Concernition Crane WINTON, <i>Iz.</i> , U.S., et Cl. Ct. 575 Complaint County, State of Minnesota Mich., Hardigree v, Green, 97 Mich. App. 62 C.A. 5, U.S. v, Bullock, 551 E 24 1377 N,J., Greenberg v, Kimuneham, 99 N, 552 III. 24 1377 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County, 64 III., Runcott v, Licerne Appeal County of Lingeage, 62 III.   | mplications of the attensy   | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections groups with the land of<br>passings at bar. Atlonning different review procedures<br>for location of the manipulation.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge     |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 537<br>U.S. Claims, While<br>Montain Ayache, Tribe<br>V. U.S., 4 CL CL 55<br>Completion Construction<br>Terms WINTON, Jr.,<br>The Hostorable Robert<br>Crane WINTON, Jr.,<br>Jadge of Diatrice Court,<br>Hamagin County, State<br>of Minnesota<br>Midda, Handigree V.<br>Green, 97 Mich. App.<br>62<br>C.A. 5, U.S., V. Bulloch,<br>551 F 24 1377<br>N.J., Greenberg V.<br>Kimmelman, 99 N.J.<br>552<br>III., Rincott V. License<br>Cry of Chicago, 62 III.<br>App. Machon 2011  | mplication of the attorney.<br>  | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections of plant for<br>case management. Rejections of the same of plant for<br>homoson of the same of the same of the<br>homoson of the same of the same of the<br>homoson of the same of the manipulation.   | procedure Judicial proceeding, procedure Discipline, judge Judicial proceeding, procedent Discipline, judge Discipline, judge Inceal Commissioneeus    |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 |                         | So. 24 53 U.S. Claims, White Montain Ayache Tribe v. U.S., 4 CL CL 55 Complete Control Content Control of Montain Ayache Tribe v. U.S., 4 CL CL 55 Complete Control of Montain Control  | mplication of the attorney.<br>  | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions Explaining significance of canons<br>within Cacle of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision<br>a decision application of a decision<br>Reciting a District Courty plan for<br>case management. Rejections and the set of the<br>homoson of the set of the set of the<br>homoson of the set of the set of the<br>homoson of the set of the set of the set of the<br>homoson of the set o | procedure Judicial proceeding, procedure Discipline, judge Judicial proceeding, procedure Discipline, judge Incal commissioners simme Receives         |
| 1984<br>***1984<br>1980<br>1977<br>1985 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | So. 24 53 So. 24 53 U.S. Chaims, While Montain Apache Tribe v. U.S., 4 CL CL 57 Completer Concerning the Hostorial Real Concerning the Hostorian Real Concerning the Hostorial Real Conce | mplications of the attorney.<br>   | to test admissibility of attensy-client<br>communications before trial. Discussing sanctions. Explaining significance of canons<br>within Code of Judicial Conduct. Reciting factors for determining<br>retroactive or prospective application<br>of a decision. Assessing a District Court's plan for<br>case management. Rejections of plant for<br>case management. Rejections of the same of plant for<br>homoson of the same of the same of the<br>homoson of the same of the same of the<br>homoson of the same of the manipulation.   | procedure Judicial proceeding, procedure Discipline, judge Judicial proceeding, procedent Discipline, judge Discipline, judge Inceal Commissioneeus    |

|  |  | The trial judge 's knowledge of the condition of<br>his docket, considered against the need for an or<br>derly and prompt administration of justice, place   |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | La., Thomas v. State,  | d him in a unique position to determine whether i<br>he dismissal should be with or without prejudice  | Allowing dismissal with prejudice<br>considering previous continuances and   | Judicial proceeding   |
| 1980 COC   | CAP 383 So. 2d 108   |  | judge's docket.  | procedure   |
| 1985 COC   | Colo., In re Stone, 703<br>CAP P.2d 1319   | Here, sufficient evidence was presented from w<br>high the trait occurd conclude that the respec-<br>dent inserve that the preliminarity qualified areas<br>were prochard for moting to anyone, including<br>a member of the melia, show the case, it that<br>is a sequentiant is constanting the arrows of<br>a sopile this howevelaps was "voltament and<br>only the this howevelaps was "voltament and<br>a show the system their conduct was weegenful<br>", and that the respondents" constants was "care<br>approximations of the second strain the strain<br>the law level Coder of the coarts of the minimum of<br>provide the coart.  |  | Judicial proceedin,<br>powers &<br>percogatives   |
|  |  |  |  |   |
| 1983 COO   | N.J., In re Application<br>CAP of Matthews, 94 N.J. 55   | His actions undertaken with such knowledge wo<br>uid demonstrate a fundamental lock of honessty a<br>nd ruthfulness, a deep want of trustworthiness a<br>nd fidelity to those with whom he has entered a ho<br>usiness relationship, and a chronic contempt for<br>the administration of justice and the laws that go<br>vern the affairs of individuals.  | Characterizing lawyer's engagement in<br>criminal activity.  | Discipline, Lawve   |
| 1500 000   | or pandaron, y river of  |  | erminist dearny.   | Discipline, Davide  |
| 1982 COC   | Az., Dicenso v. Bryant<br>Air Conditioning Corp.,<br>131 Ariz, 605<br>Mass., Commonwealth  | The policy underlying the strutter of limitation is<br>primarily for the protection of the defauldar, and<br>it due constraints, from itigation of state laims where<br>a paintifik have also en cheir rights and evidence<br>may have been lost or witnesses "montests ful-<br>dd. This policy is normal and measurement for the<br>ordery administration of justics. "Decoks v. Son<br>mer Parcific Co., 100 Aries, 420, 444, 466 P. 24<br>726, 738 (1970). "The initial purpose concludes that the administr<br>ation of justics would not be facilitated by repeti-<br>tion of purise would not be facilitated by repeti-<br>ng the appeal to the full bands, the Commonwa   | Discussing doctrine.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin   |
| 1981 COC   | v. Dunigan et al., 384<br>CAP Mass. 1  | Ith can not proceed as if no determination had be<br>en made .   | Affirming judicial prerogatives under<br>state law.  | powers &<br>prerogatives  |
| 1980 COC   | C.A. 4, U.S. v. Endo,  | To the extent such a charge is valid at common fa<br>w, it is constitutionally impermissible as it disco-<br>urages defendants from exercising their rights to<br>testify, without substantially benefiting the admi-<br>nistration of justice.  |  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure   |
| 1986 COG   | N.C., Hogan et al. v,<br>Forsyth Country Club<br>CAP Co., 79 N.C. App. 483   | The Court noted that , according to her allegation<br>s , plaintiff was discharged in retaliation for her r<br>efixed to commit a criminal act and that to permit<br>her discharge , without legal recourse , upon sue<br>h grounds would be offensive to the compelling<br>ublic interest in the administration of justice .  | Assessing the bounds of at-will<br>employment; plaintiff getting her day<br>in court   | Judicial proceeding   |
| 1986 COC   | Az., State v. Garcia, 15<br>CAP Ariz. 245  | In so holding, we are aware of the consideration<br>s regarding possible prior good -<br>faith reliance on RADI 4.01 and the administratio<br>of justice as the result of vacating prior convicti<br>ons in cases where that instruction was given.  | Discussing retroactive application of a new rule.  | Judicial proceedin<br>powers &<br>prerogatives  |
|  |  | We are further satisfied that Judge Blair did not e<br>rr in concluding , based on his factual findings , t  |  |   |
| 1986 COC   | Ala., Blakesley v. State,<br>CAP 715 P.2d 269  | hat Santamour 's conduct did not " [ fall ] below<br>an acceptable standard for fair and honorable ad<br>ministration of justice . " Bruce v. State , 612 P.<br>2d 1012 ( Alaska 1980 ).   | Rejecting defense of entrapment.   | Law enforcement   |
| 1986 COC   | CAP 715 P.2d 269   | an acceptable standard for fair and henorable ad<br>ministration of justice . " Bruce v. State , 612 P.<br>2d 1012 ( Alaska 1980 ).  | Rejecting defense of entrapment.   | Law enforcement   |
| 1986 COC   | CAP 715 P.2d 269<br>Va., Stockton v.<br>Commonwealth, 227  | an acceptable standard for fair and honorable ad<br>ministration of justice, " Bruce v. State, 612 P.<br>2d 1012 (Alaska 1980).<br>The orderly administration of justice requires tha<br>t tackical matters, such as continuances, be left<br>with coursel.<br>Respondents assert that these requirements facilit  | Rejecting defense of entrapment.<br>Finding meritless dispute with court-<br>appointed counsel.  |   |
|  | Va., Stockton v.<br>Commonwealth, 227<br>Va. 124   | in acceptable standard for first and honorable an<br>innistration of guides Bruce v, State , 612 P.<br>24 1012 ( Alaska 1980 ) .<br>The orderfor administration of junifice requires the<br>Lackscil mattery, such as continuousces, be 160<br>with coursel.<br>Respondents assert that these requirements facilit<br>at the efficient administration of junice , because<br>to nonexident theorys allengdy are less compet  | Finding merifless dispute with court-<br>appointed counsel.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure   |
|  | Va., Stockton v.<br>Commonwealth, 227<br>Va. 124<br>Sup. Ct., Frazier v.   | an acceptable standard for thir and honorable an<br>innitration of publics Proce v, State, 612 P,<br>2d 1012 ( Alaska 1980 ).<br>The orderly administration of justice requires tha<br>t tackical matters, such as continuous be left<br>with coursel.<br>Respondents assert that these requirements full<br>at the efficient administration of jountics. Include<br>the efficient administration of jountics. Include<br>a nonexident attensys allogody are less compet<br>that adds is a state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state o   | Finding meritless dispute with court-  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru   |
| 1984 COC   | Va., Steedaton v.<br>Commonwealth, 227<br>Va. 124<br>Sup. Ct., Frazier v.<br>Heebe, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55  | an acceptable standard for fair and homorole at<br>minimization of systems "Brace v. State, e152 P.<br>24 1012 (Anika, 1980).<br>The orderly administration of spatial requires the<br>thickned mattern, such as continuous, be left<br>with control.<br>Respendition source that these requirement facility<br>in the efficient administration of justice, because<br>on tand less available to the court than resident at<br>torneys.  | Finding meritless dispute with court-<br>appointed counsel.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru   |
| 1984 COC   | Va., Stockton v.<br>Commonwealth, 227<br>Va. 124<br>Sup. CL, Frazier v.<br>Heebe, 96 L Ed. 2d 55<br>Cal, Wenger v.<br>Cemmin on Judicial<br>Performance, 29 Cal. 3   | an acceptable standard for thir and honorable an<br>innitration of publics Proce v, State, 612 P,<br>2d 1012 ( Alaska 1980 ).<br>The orderly administration of justice requires tha<br>t tackical matters, such as continuous be left<br>with coursel.<br>Respondents assert that these requirements full<br>at the efficient administration of jountics. Include<br>the efficient administration of jountics. Include<br>a nonexident attensys allogody are less compet<br>that adds is a state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state o   | Finding meritless dispute with court-<br>appointed counsel.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru   |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 269           Va., Stockken v.         Commonwealth, 227           CAP         Sup, Ct., Francier v.           Bag, Ct., Francier v.         Heebe, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55           Cal., Wenger v.         Centmin on Judicial           Performance, 29 C.al., St.         615           W.D. Mo., Williams v.         Trans. World Arkines,  | an acceptable standard for fair and homorabe a<br>minimization of patience. "Brace v. State, e122 P.<br>24 1012, Alaska 1980 ).<br>The orderly administration of pasted requires the<br>tactical matters, such as continuouses, be left<br>with council.<br>"Repeatition of the fair measurements. The Dif-<br>ter of the state of the state of the state of the<br>production of the fair measurements and the<br>Repeatition of the fair measurements and the<br>repeatition of the fair measurements and the<br>repeatition of the fair measurements and the<br>sources the administration of patient has resident at<br>temps."<br>Prejudical conduct must be "count prejudical<br>data of the two dimension." Of the state and the state<br>of the administration of patient data the bring the ju-<br>dical difficult conduct must be "count at v. V.,<br>15 , such e(-z) subace added. )<br>The preservation of patient and the shift his ensure<br>those administration of patient and the shift his ensure."  | Finding mertiless dispute with coart-<br>apointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory bar admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for dispusification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>dispusification of atmery likely to   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regulating lawyers<br>Discipline, judge  |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC   | CAP         715 P.2d 209           Va., Shedken v.         Commenwealth, 227           Commenwealth, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazior v.         Sup, CL, Frazior v.           CAP         Heebe, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55           Cal, Wenger v.         Cenim's on Judicial Performance, 99 Cal. 3d.           CAA         615           VA         104           Vander, 99 Cal. 3d.         Vander, 90 Cal. 3d.           CAP         Kob, Williams v.           Caper Vander, 988 T. Supp. 1037         Vander, 1037   | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of patience. "Proce v. State, e122 P.<br>24 1012 (A aducta 1980)."<br>The orderly administration of patient regimes that<br>tactical matters who a continuous each of the<br>with control."<br>The orderly administration of patient regimes that<br>the effection distribution of patient regimes that<br>the effection distribution of patient regimes and<br>a non-solution of the state provided in the<br>physical administration of patient regimes in the<br>physical effect on the discrete provided in the<br>target and the strategiest $n^{-1}$ contact regimes in the<br>physical effect on the discrete provided in the<br>target administration of patient regimes in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient and in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient regimes in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient and in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient regimes in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient and in the integrity<br>of the integration of patient regimes in the integrity<br>of the inthe patient regimes in the provided the bar<br>is administration of patient regimes in the provided the bar<br>is administration of patient regimes in the provided the bar<br>is administration of patient regimes in the integrity of the patient regimes in the regimes in the strategiest of the patient regimes in the regimest of the strategiest of the patient regimest of the strategiest of the patient regimest of the strategiest of the patient regimest of th  | Finding mertiless dispute with court-<br>appointed council.<br>Finding discriminatory bar admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for exquiring<br>disquifiliation of attorney likely to<br>reveal confidernial information.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regulating lawyers<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, Lawye   |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC   | ZAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Shedkon v.         Commowskih, 227           Commowskih, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heelee, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55*           Cal., Wanger v.         Commows on Inducial<br>Performance, 29 Cal. 3c           CAP         W.D. Moe, Williams v.           Tana World Arithms,<br>Inc., 384* E. Supp. 1037         CA. 9, Wineder v. U.S.   | m acceptable standard for fair and homorabe<br>minimization of patience. "Prace v. State, e12 P.<br>24 1012 (Alaska 1980)."<br>The ordering administration of patient reports the<br>tractical matters when one continuous explores the<br>with control."<br>With control."<br>The ordering administration of patient reports the<br>the administration of patient reports and<br>concession atomic patient reports and the resolution<br>of the administration of patient reports and<br>the administration of patient reports and the<br>patient reports and the report of the resolution of<br>\$13, mbd. (c); halves added)<br>The preservation of patient reports the interpret<br>work administration patient reports of protect the<br>the relation is paramount.  | Finding mertiless dispute with court-<br>appointed council.<br>Finding discriminatory bar admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for exquiring<br>disquifiliation of attorney likely to<br>reveal confidernial information.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association rul<br>regulating lawyers  |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Stackton v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heehe, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           W. 124         Commonwealth, 227           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 226           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 227           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 226           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 227           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 226           Cal, Wanger v.         Commonwealth, 226           Cal, Wanger v.         Cal, 2d 55           Cal, Wanger v.         Cal, 2d 51           Cal, Wanger v.         Cal, 2d 51           Cal, Wanger v.         Cal, 2d 51           Cal, G. Supp. 107         Cal, 9           Cal, 9         Cal, 9         Wanger v. U.S. v.   | an acceptable standard for fair and homorable a<br>minimization of systace. "Brace v. State, e12 P.<br>24 1012 (Alaska 1980)."<br>The orderly administration of yastica requires the<br>thickned matter, work as continuousce, be left<br>with council.<br>Respondents assure that these requirements faulti<br>at the efficient administration of justice, becaus<br>nonexistent atmospheric algorithm is a consequent<br>atmospheric and the state of the state of the<br>accession atmospheric algorithm is a state of<br>the administration of justice that braces and<br>the administration of justice that braces and<br>the administration of justice and the strength the ju-<br>dicial efficient of galaxies and the the scenge<br>allows administration of justice and the strength the<br>administration of justice and the strength the<br>administration of justice and the strength the<br>administration of justice and in the integrity<br>of the box is approach." The trait occurs of justice that the scenge<br>allows administration of justice and in the integrity<br>of the origination added. J<br>The trait occurs "inflatering proves after the the<br>the momentary and the protect proves after the the<br>advisor of stute and protection of justice. The trait occurs and<br>the fair advisor of stute and proves after the the<br>harm model."  | Finding mertiless dispute with court-<br>appointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory bar administon<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Asseming bases for disqualification of<br>a Judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification of attorney likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regulating lawyer<br>Discipline, jadge<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Judicial preventione<br>prevogatives  |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Shukkon v.         Commonwealb, 227           Commonwealb, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL., Frazier v.         Heebe, 96 L Ed. 2d 55           Cal., Wonger v.         Commonwealb, 237           Commonwealb, 237         Va. 124           Commonwealb, 237         Commonwealb, 237           Cal., Wonger v.         Commonwealbed Additions, 29 Gal. 3, 46 15           VD, Mo, Williams v.         Tras World Additions, 106 Val. 1116           CAP         C.A. 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           G40 F 2.41 116         E.D. Pau, U.S. v.           Comsidiated Foods         Consolidated Foods   | an acceptable standard for fir and homorabe a<br>minimization of patients "Brace v. State, e12. P.<br>24.1012 (Alaska 1980).<br>The order of the state requirements the<br>initial mattern view how continuous equations<br>in the initial mattern view homorability and the<br>state of the state of the state requirement facility<br>in the order of the state requirements facility<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of state. The state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of   | Finding mertiless dispute with coart-<br>apointed counsel.<br>Finding discriminatory bar admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a Judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification of atomery file by reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regulating lawyer<br>Discipline, jadge<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Judicial preventione<br>prevogatives  |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1984 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va., Shockken v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L Ed. 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L Ed. 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Common on Indicial<br>Performance, 29 Call, 3           CAP         O. Mo. Willims v.           Trass, World Admines,<br>Commondated Foods         Call, 9           CAP         Comp., 455 F. Supp. 142           Call, Pau, U.S.,         Core, 455 F. Supp. 142   | an acceptable standard for fir and homorabe a<br>minimization of patients "Brace v. State, e12. P.<br>24.1012 (Alaska 1980).<br>The order of the state requirements the<br>initial mattern view how continuous equations<br>in the initial mattern view homorability and the<br>state of the state of the state requirement facility<br>in the order of the state requirements facility<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of state. The state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of   | Finding merities dispute with court-<br>appointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory bar administon<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Asseming bases for disqualification of<br>a Julga.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification of attemps likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.  | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regularing invyers<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Judge<br>portors &<br>percognitive         |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1984 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va., Shockken v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Hecke, 96 L, Ed. 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commonwealth, 227           Commonwealth, 227         Va. 124           Commonwealth, 227         Call, Wenger v.           Commonwealth, 227         Gall, Wenger v.           Call, Wenger v.         Commonwealth, 237           CAP         Object and Admines, 29 Gall, 3d 615           WD, Mo, Willimsv. v.         Trass, World Admines, 2002           CAP         C.A. 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CD, Pa, U.S. Y.         Consolidated Foods           CAP         Cerp., 455 F. Supp. 142           Tex., Howall v. State,         Tex., Howall v. State,  | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>a minimization of guidates. – "Brace v. States, e52.P.<br>24.102.C. Alaska 1980.).<br>The order of the state requirement of the state states<br>in the state matter of the states requires the the<br>with control.<br>The production and the states requirement facility<br>in the efficient administration of justice because<br>and the state of the states of the states of the states<br>in the efficient administration of justice because<br>to the administration of spincle that brings the pro-<br>duction of the states of the states of the states of the<br>distal efficient administration of spincle that brings the<br>production of spincle that brings the states of the<br>distal efficient of distates and the states of the states<br>into administration of justice that be received the sta-<br>tes of the states of the states of the states of the<br>distal efficient. The administration of justice<br>has been the subject of rands existing of the states of the<br>states of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>planty set.<br>The administration of disposites in the distribution of justice<br>has been the subject of rands existing of the judges<br>ent into efficient. These states and the distribution of distrates and<br>planty set.<br>The administration of disposition is the states of the judges<br>ent into efficient. The states of the distribution of distrates and<br>planty set.<br>The administration of the states were the the line glant<br>of the states of the states of the distribution of distrates and<br>the program and indicates that volves the the states of the distribution of the                    | Finding meritless dispute with court-<br>appointed council.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for expering<br>disqualification of atomey likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.   | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regularing invyers<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Discipline, Judge<br>portors &<br>percognitive         |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1984 COC<br>1988 COC<br>1988 COC   | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va., Sheckken v.         Coremowski, 227           Coremowski, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Hecke, 96 L, Ed. 2d 55           Cal., Wenger v.         Commowski, 227 Cal. 3           Coremowski, 227 Cal., Wenger v.         Commowski, 227           Cal., Wenger v.         Commowski, 227           Cal., Wonger v.         Commowski, 227           Cal., Wonger v.         Cal. 3615           W.D. Mo, Willims v.         Tras. World Arkines, 106           CAP         C.A. 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Core, 358 F. Supp. 1037           CAP         C.A. 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CONSINIZATION         Consolitated Foods           CAP         Core, 455 F. Supp. 142           CAP         Sys W. 2d 432           C.A. 1, Austin v.         Unarce Indus, Inc., 702   | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of guides. – "Brace v. States, e12: P.<br>24 1012 (Alaska 1980).<br>The order y administration of guider requires the<br>trictical matter, who is continuouses, be left<br>with council.<br>The trictical matter, who is continuoused, be left<br>with council.<br>The order of the trictical programments for the<br>end of the artificiant of guider of the trictical matter,<br>and less available to the court memory and<br>projection of the trictical programments for the<br>projection of the trictical programments for the<br>projection of the trictical programments of the<br>projection of the trictical projection of the trictical<br>programment of projectic prosess after the trictical<br>and handware instead on projectical programments of the<br>projection of the trictical programments of the trictical<br>projection of the trictical programments of projectical programments<br>and the trictical constant and the order of the trictical<br>and handware of protects prosess after the tri-<br>tical model and individual the trictical projectical programments of the<br>projectical the trictical protect prosess after the tri-<br>tical model and individual the trictical protectical pro-<br>person and trictical protect protects after or the trictical<br>provess and individual the trictical protectical p   | Finding merities dispute with court-<br>apointed council.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification of atomery likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.   | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Bar association rat<br>regularing lawyers<br>Discipline, Jadge<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceeding<br>procedure  |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1984 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1988 COC<br>1988 COC                                     | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Shedkon v.         Cormonwadh, 227           Cormonwadh, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazierv.         Heelee, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55           CaL, Wenger v.         Commonwadh, 227           Cormonwadh, 227         Taxawadh, 227           Call, Wenger v.         Commonwadh, 237           Call, Wenger v.         Call, Wenger v.           Carmon on Judicial         Performance, 29 Call, 3           CAP         615           CAP         610 F.2d 1116           CAP         CA, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Corp., 455 F. Sapp, 142           CAP         Tex., Howell v. State, 559 K.W.2d 482           CAP         C.A. 1, Austin v.           CAP         F.2d 1   | an acceptable standard for fir and homorabe<br>a minimization of guides. "Brace V, States, e12: P.<br>24.1012 (Alaska 1980).<br>The orderly administration of guides requeres the<br>tractical matters: who a continuous end-<br>tractical matters: who a continuous end-<br>tractical matters is the second matter of guides. Pro-<br>teomorphic is a second matter of guides of guides<br>are the filter of administration of guides in the<br>area of the second matter of guides in the second<br>matter of the second matter of guides in the<br>merginesis and that these requirements facility<br>the definition of guides in the order than resident at<br>mergine.<br>Projudical combact must be "contribute projudical<br>to the administration of guides in the second matter<br>of the second matter of guides in the second<br>matter of the second matter of guides and<br>mergines. The preservation of guides matter of guides and<br>the integration of guides in the integrity<br>of the integration of guides and the integrity<br>of the comparison statistical conduction of guides and<br>inferentiation and dispension for guides consist in<br>the constant statistical conduction of guides and the integrity<br>or again and individual the administration of guides.<br>In constant to the problems of duides of founds of guides<br>in the administration of guides are on similar bracks the duity<br>or constant of again protection when a duites<br>in the administration of guides are on the fiber of<br>function of guides are on similar bracks the duity of<br>constant of again protection when a duites of the constant<br>of the indiget in the s | Finding merites dispute with court-<br>apointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory be administon<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Asseming bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification of attorney likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chideng the government/s lack of<br>preparation.<br>Discussing state bar rules and refuting<br>vagmenes challengs in disciplinary<br>case.  | Indicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Bar association rul<br>regulating horyers<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, judge<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Judicial proceedin<br>powers &<br>percoptives<br>Judicial proceedin                                |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1984 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1988 COC<br>1988 COC                                     | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va., Sheddan v.         Commowship, 227           Commowship, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L, Ed, 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commowship, 227           Commowship, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L, Ed, 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commo on Iduicial<br>Performance, 29 Call, 3<br>615           WD, Mo, Willims, v.         Tras, World Arkines,<br>Tras, World Arkines,<br>Consolidated Foods           CAP         Car, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.<br>Consolidated Foods           CAP         Sys K. 2d 432           CA, I, Austin v.         Unarco Indus, Inc., 705           CAP         E24 1   | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of guidates "Brace v. States, e32.P.<br>24.102.C. Anaka.1000.).<br>The ordering administration of guidate requires the<br>taccial matters who is continuous set. In the<br>heat of the standard states of guidates and the<br>states of the states of guidates and the states<br>more states and the fittee measurements. In the<br>more states and the states of guidates and the<br>states and the states and the states of guidates and<br>the states and the states and the states and the<br>states and the states and the states and the states and<br>the states of guidates and the states and the states<br>and administration of paties and in the integrity<br>of the trait of states in the correct plates and the<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the state of states in the states and the states and<br>the states and the states and the states and the states and<br>the states and the states and the states and the states and<br>the states and the states and the states and the states and<br>the states and the states and the states and the states and<br>the states and the states and th             | Finding merites dispute with court-<br>apointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification dromey likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.  | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regularing lowyers<br>Discipline, Judge<br>Discipline, Lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>procedure<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Discipline, Lawye   |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1983 COC<br>1977 COC<br>1977 COC                                     | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va., Sheddan v.         Commowship, 227           Commowship, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L, Ed, 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commowship, 227           Commowship, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Heche, 96 L, Ed, 2d 55           Call, Wenger v.         Commo on Iduicial<br>Performance, 29 Call, 3<br>615           WD, Mo, Willims, v.         Tras, World Arkines,<br>Tras, World Arkines,<br>Consolidated Foods           CAP         Car, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.<br>Consolidated Foods           CAP         Sys K. 2d 432           CA, I, Austin v.         Unarco Indus, Inc., 705           CAP         E24 1   | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of guidae. "Process Visities, e622 P.<br>24 1012 (Alaska 1980)."<br>The ordering administration of guidae requires the<br>tractical matters, who is continuous each of the<br>with council.<br>with council.<br>The ordering administration of guidae requires the<br>the efficient distribution of guidae requires the<br>encouncil of the ordering administration of guidae<br>in and leas available to the count means the efficient<br>encouncil encodes at most particle data to projudae<br>in and leas available to the count means the efficient data<br>to may a straight of guidae and the straight of the efficient<br>encouncil encodes at most particle data to projudae<br>in a dista available to the count theory is a straight of<br>the efficient data to the straight of the efficient<br>encouncil encodes at most particle data to projudae<br>is also administration of guidae data to projudae<br>is also administration of guidae data to the integratic<br>of the birst of guidae is a guidae data to the integratic<br>of the straight of guidae data to the integratic<br>of the straight of guidae data to the integratic<br>of the straight of guidae data to the projudae is and<br>infinited. Tables in the count, and the juddael<br>in the order issued to proteet proven after the traight<br>may bandy aff."<br>In the endower of guidae "lanks the method the band<br>in for orders issued to guidae." The too endower of the<br>the straight of the straight may be at the straight of the projudae is the<br>projudae is the straight "lanks the straight of the protect<br>may band administration of puscine consists the<br>traight of the straight "lanks the straight of the protect<br>and the straight of the straight of the straight of the straight<br>or straight in the problems of choices of future." The<br>theory of the administration of justice are straight to straight<br>or straight of the straight of the straight of the straight<br>or straight in the straight of the straight o                | Finding merites dispute with court-<br>apointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for requiring<br>disqualification dromey likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure Bar association re-<br>regularing hovers Discipline, Judge Discipline, Lawye Judicial proceedin proceedine Discipline, Lawye Judicial proceedin proceedine Lawyenforcement Lawyenforcement                          |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1983 COC<br>1977 COC<br>1977 COC                                     | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Shedkon v.         Commonwalh, 227           Commonwalh, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Reehe, 96 L Ed. 2d 55           Cal, Wenger v.         Commonwalh, 227           Commonwalh, 227         Cal, Wenger v.           Commonwalh, 237         615           Cal, Wenger v.         Common on Indicial<br>Performance, 29 Cal, 34           CAP         Cal, Wenger v.           CAP         For More of Actinos,<br>Inc., 588 F. Supp. 1037           CAP         CA, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Cal, 24 51           CAP         Cal, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Cal, 258 F. Supp. 1037           CAP         Cal, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Cal, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           Carsonidiated Foods         Carsonidiated Foods           CAP         S98 K. 2d 432           CAP         S9 S. W.2d 432           CAP         Zal           CAP         Zal 12           CAP         Zal 12           CA 2, In re U.S., 565           CA 9, Vaaman v. U.S.   | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of guidance "Brace v. States, e32 P.<br>24 102 (Alaska 1980).<br>The order of the state requires the<br>traction matters, who is continuouse, be left<br>with counter.<br>The production and the firm argumments: Feature<br>Responsible and the firm argumments from the<br>Responsible and the firm argumments from the<br>traction matters, who continuouses, be left<br>with counter.<br>Projuction and the firm argumments from the<br>the administration of justice that brings the justice<br>and less arailable to the court than resident at<br>promession and the firm argumments from the<br>data of the issue of justice that brings the justice<br>and less argumments. The first state of the state<br>issue administration of justice that brings the justice<br>and the state of public tract both in the court<br>biose administration of justice that be in the integrit<br>y of the brin is paramont.<br>The fore-events of courted public tract both in the court<br>is for orders i source and the state of the state<br>public of the state of public tract both in the court<br>public of the state of the state of the state<br>public of the state of the state of the state<br>public of the state of the state of the state<br>in the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the st       | Finding mentions dispute with court-<br>appointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for expering<br>disqualification of atomes likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.<br>Discussing state bar rules and refusing<br>vagencies challenge in disciplinary<br>case. | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Bar association ru<br>regulating lawyers<br>Discipline, Jadge<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Discipline, Lawye<br>Judicial proceedin<br>procedure               |
| 1984 COC<br>1987 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1981 COC<br>1983 COC<br>1977 COC<br>1977 COC | CAP         715 P.24 289           Va, Sheddon v.         Commowship, 227           Commowship, 227         Va. 124           Sup, CL, Frazier v.         Reebs, 96 L. Ed. 2d 55           Cal, Wenger v.         Commowship, 227           Cal, Wenger v.         Commowship, 227           Cal, Wenger v.         Commowship, 237           G15         Cal, Wenger v.           Commowship, 227         Cal, Wenger v.           Cal, Wenger v.         Trans. Work Actions, 106           CAP         D. Mo, Williams v.           CAP         C.A. 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Can, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Can, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           CAP         Can, 9, Wheeler v. U.S.           Care of the 2.41 116         Comp. 455 F. Supp. 142           CAP         Sys K. 2.4 432           CAP         Sys W. 2.4 432           CAP         Sys W. 2.4 432           CAP         Sys S. 2.4 432           CAP         Can 9, Vannan v. U.S.           CAP         Dist. Ct., 557 F.24 650           CA. 9, Vannan v. U.S.         CA. 9, Vannan v. U.S.           CAP         Dist. Ct., 557 F.24 650 | m acceptable standard for firm and homorabe<br>minimization of paties "Brace v. States, e12. P.<br>24 1012 (A aloka 1980).<br>The order y administration of paties regimes the<br>tactual matter, when a continuous each of the<br>with cound.<br>The order of the order firm regramments finally<br>the the efficient distribution of paties and<br>the order of the order of the order of the<br>regramment of the time the production<br>of the efficient distribution of paties and<br>the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the<br>regramment of the order of the order of the order of<br>the distribution of paties and the integrap<br>of the integramment. The order of the order of the<br>order isomed to protect proves after the tri<br>distribution of paties and the integrap<br>of the order isomed to protect proves after the tri<br>isomed administration of paties and the integrap<br>of the order isomed to protect proves after the tri<br>isomed administration of paties and the order of the<br>paties of the order isomed to protect proves after the tri<br>isomed administration of paties and the order of the<br>paties of the order isomed to protect proves after the tri<br>isomed administration of paties and the order of the<br>production of paties and the order of paties are associated by the<br>production of paties and the order of the order isomed or the order<br>of the order of the order. The bose described is<br>proverse while distribution of paties are of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order of the order<br>of the order of the order of the order        | Finding mentions dispute with court-<br>appointed councel.<br>Finding discriminatory har admission<br>rules not backed by evidence.<br>Assessing bases for disqualification of<br>a judge.<br>Explaining motivations for expering<br>disqualification of atomes likely to<br>reveal confidential information.<br>Discussing a post-trial protective<br>order.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.<br>Chiding the government's lack of<br>preparation.<br>Discussing state bar rules and refusing<br>vagencies challenge in disciplinary<br>case. | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure Bar association ro<br>regularing invyers Discipline, Judge Discipline, Lawyer Discipline, Lawyer Judicial proceeding procedure Discipline, Lawye Judicial proceeding procedure Law enforcement Judicial proceeding |

|      |       |   | I  | I   |  |
|------|-------|---|--|---|--|
| 1982 | COCAP | S.D. W. Va., Dostert v.<br>Neely, 537 F. Supp. 912                                      | The Court reflected upon the extracediary nature<br>e of the state ''s interest in Dostert v. Neely, super<br>a : '' In declining to enjoin the imposition of the do<br>isophiany superiors against the physical ''s the e-<br>ount visites to emphasize the extraordinary state i<br>nateria in disciplinary proceedings which affect a<br>tate judges. Disciplinary proceedings which affect a<br>discate the nost finalmonatual of state interests, th<br>e need for a fair and impartial administration of ['<br>unice for the heard for all the state's exitzens.   | Discussing sanctions against judges.  | Discipline, judge                                |
|      | COCAP | Mich., In re Hotchkiss,<br>415 Mich. 1101   | (5) Respondent's conduct aforesaid constitute<br>d misconduct in office, in that said conduct was<br>clearly projudicial to the administration of justice<br>within the provisions of article 6, § 30 of the Mi<br>chigan Constitution of 1963, as an amended, and<br>GCR 1963, 932.4, as amended.   | Adopting a statement of reprimand against a judge.  | Discipline, judge                                |
|      |       | Pa., Commonwealth v.  | In Strouble V. Denno, 388 U.S. 293, 478 S.C. 1, 9<br>G. 18 E.B.2 d 2 199 (1967), a majority of th<br>e United States Supreme Court agreesd on the fait<br>on which about finem a decision regarding retrievant<br>on which about (e 1) also purpose to be served<br>purches implicute (a 1) the purpose to be served<br>by the new standards. (b 1) the costen of the relat<br>materies, and (c 1) the effect on the administration<br>of junice. "(Fortostee emitted.) Jul. 4 297. 8  | Reciling standards for retroactive  | Judicial proceeding,                             |
| 1980 | COCAP | Miller, 417 A.2d 128  | 7 S.Ct. at 1970.   | application.  | prerogatives                                     |
| 1986 | COCAP | Wash., In re<br>Disciplinary Proceeding<br>Against Fred R. Staples,<br>105 Wash. 2d 905 | The Commission has held that Judge Staples ' act<br>ions nevertheless do not fit within the " administr<br>ation of justice " exclusion . We disagree .  | Allowing a judge to engage in limited<br>law reform efforts.  | Judicial conduct                                 |
| 1980 | COCAP | S.D.N.Y., Wingate v.<br>Harris, 501 F. Supp. 58   | Factors to be considered in determining whether<br>transfer is appropriate typically include whether to<br>hostitute of limitations has oft evisier run, the co-<br>orvenines of the parties and witnesses, and the<br>effect on the efficient and expeditions administra-<br>tion of justice. E. g., Sherra V. Harless, supra,<br>50 Fl. 2 Ad. at 924. Ecolev. United States, 396 F<br>Supp. 792, 796 (D.N.D. 1975).  | Considering transfer.   | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|      |       | C.A. 5, U.S. v.   | United States ex rel. Brown v. Fogel, 395 F. 2d<br>291, 293 (4th Cir. 1968) (for breach of condit<br>ion other than nonappearance, court may do all t<br>hat is appropriate to orderly progress of trial and   | Collecting citations supporting history   | Judicial proceeding, powers &                    |
|      | COCAP | Williams, 594 F.2d 86   | fair administration of justice ).<br>The coart may crack a preparating mental nearth-<br>and physical examination of a defendant and a pr<br>epleading investigation by the Department of Pro-<br>bation to provide material that would reasonably<br>aid in the administration of justice by facilitating<br>the plea bargaining process. (People v Crosby,<br>87 Mis Cel (1079, 1080) [Say C, Bronx Compt)   | of criminalization of bail-jumping,   | prerogatives                                     |
| 1985 |       | 128 Mise. 2d 831<br>Colo., Fanning v.<br>Denver Urban Renewal<br>Auth., 709 P.2d 22     | 1976 [].)<br>The doctrine of equitable estopped is premised up<br>on principles of fair dealing and is designed to ai<br>d the law in the administration of justice where,<br>without its aid, injustices might ensule. City & C<br>outry of Denser × Stackbenes, 135 Colo. 289,<br>310 P. 24 296 (1957); Corporation of Presiding<br>Biology N. Dand of Courty Commissioner, 689<br>F. 24 738 (Colo. App. 1984).  | Discussing pretrial abilities of court.<br>Discussing doctrine estopping plaintieff<br>from raising issue in separate action<br>that could have been raised in first. | procedure<br>Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure   |
| 1986 | COCAP | N.J., Battista v. Olson,<br>213 N.J. Super. 137   | In surgulously gausding this fundamental right,<br>our Supreme Court has noted that . [ a ] jury is a<br>in integral part of the court for the administration<br>of jurices and on elementary principles its varifict<br>must be obtained to the court 's charge, based a<br>didy on lagal evicence produced before it and on<br>farely free from the taint of extransense considerat<br>ions and influences.  | Discussing juries.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>perrogatives |
| 1980 | COCAP | Olda., Amoco<br>Production Co. v.<br>Lindley, 609 P.2d 733                              | Therefore , Appellee asserts that the court can im<br>pose a default judgment by analogy to the interro-<br>gatory statute, or in the alternative it is within the<br>e inherent power of the court 'to do all things th<br>at are necessary for the administration of justice<br>within the scope of its -<br>justisfiction Layman v. State , 355 P. 2d.444 (<br>O&RC-App. 1960)  | Assessing whether default judgment would be appropriate.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1986 | COCAP | Colo., Rodriguez v.<br>District Court, 719 P.2d<br>699                                  | The interest of the public in the fair and proper a<br>dministration of justice includes concerns that in<br>a be conduced as an evenhanded numer, that<br>the participants in the adversary process, isoladil<br>any witnesses. Jee protoced from unifair tackics 1 a<br>rul that the courts maintain the integrity of the ju-<br>dicital system and the highest thickal tatudark of<br>the legal profession. James, 708 F. 2d 40, (kee<br>a, 517 F. 2d 72; G. Lowenhal, 2009a, at 61.1   | Protecting privilege of communication<br>of sitnesses with counsel.   | Procedure; policy                                |
|      |       | Colo., People v. Yost,<br>729 P.2d 348  | The hearing board concluded that the respondent<br>'s submission of false documents to the grivenes<br>eccumittee violated C.R.C.P. 241.6 (7) and D<br>R 1-<br>102 (A) (1) (violation of a disciplinary rule)<br>102 (A) (4) (conduct involving disbonsty , f<br>rand, deceil comisepresentation), and DR 1-<br>102 (A) (5) (conduct that is projudicial to the<br>administration of justice).   | Recalling findings below.   | Discipline, Lawyer                               |
| 1979 | COCAP | Cal., People v. Perez, 24<br>Cal. 3d 133  | Alternatively, the bar asserts that it adopted the<br>Rules under its authority to make regulations to a<br>id in the administration of justice (Bus , & Pref.<br>Code , § 6031 and to ensure that persons admin<br>ed to the bar have received peoper training (see<br>Bas , & Prof. Code , § 6047 ).   | Recalling State Bar's justifications for<br>allowing supervised law students to<br>participate in criminal matters.   | Bar association<br>adopting rules                |
|      |       | C.A. 5, U.S. v. Partin,   | defendants EDWARD G. PARTIN, JACK P. F.<br>GREANLEANN, JR., HAROLD SYKES, BEN-<br>TANATIKAM and GRECKETT CARLTON, a<br>nationfully, willingly and knowingly did cembine-<br>comprint, confederated and gaves taggingthe and wi<br>fit cards often and with their cost-<br>omorphicans. Charles McRecheron, Mitchell Ha<br>comprinter, and Charles W. Recherons, Mitchell Ha<br>comprinter, and their barries and the strength of the<br>fitner application. The strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>fitner application. The strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>heads. W. Roberson was a material Government |   | Judicial proceeding, powers &                    |

| 1981 COCAI | Mich., Falk v. State Bar<br>of Mich., 411 Mich. 63           | definishing EDWARD O, PARTIN, JACK F. F.<br>OREMILLON, JR., HAROLD SYLES, ISB<br>TLANTHAM and COCKETT CARLTON, in<br>Infordity, willindly and havingsly did combine-<br>compring, confidencia and agase topedime and wi<br>th each other und work. Roberton, Michield Ha<br>surr and other undown partice, is commit and<br>freme against the Urield States, to-<br>war, Title 19, United States, to-<br>sh, this to comprehension of the max-<br>sh the isto comprehension of the max-<br>sh the isto comprehension of the size<br>in the Urield States. To-<br>stice in the Urield States. To-<br>tander Michigan and the size of the size of<br>the size of the size the size of the size of<br>the michigan size of the size in that lowering that one<br>Linde W. Roberton was a material Government<br>witness at the total of the orinnial case, she pen-<br>ding | fuffacenting winees  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powars &<br>percogatives            |
|------------|--|--|--|---|
| 1981 COCAI | Mass., Commonwalth v<br>Brown, 11 Mass. App.<br>Ct. 288      | Public confidence in the fairness of the criminal j<br>ustice system and community participation in the<br>administration of justice are also ertical by -<br>products of jurise composed of a representative<br>cross section of the community. People V. Whell<br>er, 22 Col. 30 258, 2707–272 (1978).   | Discussing the proportionality<br>requirements for juries. | Judicial proceeding,  |
| 1982 COCAI | Oh., Vill. Of Onkwood<br>v. Wuliger, 69 Ohio St.<br>2 d 453  | This is so because the mayor had the power to in<br>sue a warrant for the arrest of defindant to comp<br>ellis appearance at stated time by reacon of the<br>emayor 's statutory powers emanmented in R. C.<br>1955.20, relating to criminal matters which, and<br>et alia, provides $-^{n} + *^{-n}$ The mayor shall assued<br>and insue all worrism and process that the necessary<br>to enforce the administration of justice throughout<br>the manispile exponention. $+^{n} -^{n}$  | Citing ordinance.  | Law enforcement;<br>Mayoral powers                          |
| 1989 COCAI | W. Va., Re: Boun<br>Brown, 166 W. Va. 226                    | Woven throughout our disciplinary cases involvi<br>ng attorneys is the thought that they occupy a spe-<br>cial position because they are actively involved in<br>administering the legal system whose utilinate g<br>oil is the evenhanded administration of justice.  | Discussing the disciplinary system.                        | Discipline, Lawyer  |
| 1983 COCAI | III., People v. Siegel, 94<br>PIII. 2d 167                   | The fact that she chose instead to make her dema<br>nds in the midst of an already unstable, difficult<br>, and conceivably dangerous setting gives rise to<br>a reasonable inference that her conduct was calcu-<br>lated to embarras, hinder or obstruct the court i<br>n its administration of justice.   | Evaluating conduct of disruptive individual                | Judiical proceeding;<br>disruptive incident                 |
| 1981 COCAI |  | When a definidant, for one reason or another, re-<br>fines the assistance of countal, trial counts are fa-<br>dow with a difficult question : should be Court re-<br>quire "standby" counsal, even against the with<br>ear of the defendant, in order to protect the defin-<br>dant 's have rights ? Three is no right to standby<br>counted. Nevertheless, the appointment of stand<br>by counsel may benefit not only the definition to<br>it should be count. by instring an orderly and fair a<br>deministration of justice.   |  | Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure, fairness<br>to defendant |
| 1983 COCAI | Bankr. N.D. III., in re<br>Wildman, et al., 30 B.R.<br>2 133 | The following assertion of Judge Will is not true-<br>and to that extent crustes an appearance of deeps<br>tion in attempting to statisfish a point "- "The<br>Judgied Council 's order was undersitely "near-<br>tures of the state of the state of the state of the<br>limits of spatiace - "The chaon and harships to bit<br>the Manufactor state, Judgied the state of the<br>product for carrying forward the basismess of Id<br>eral harships jurisdiction, are universally akky<br>modeling."   |  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives            |
|            | 1  | (A) On making which data the second second   |  |   |

| 1983 COCAP | Bankr. N.D. III., In re<br>Wildman, et al., 30 B.R.<br>133                           | pants in a work of the control of the comparation of<br>the Marathon stay, had there been no uniform p<br>recedure for carrying forward the business of fed<br>eral bankruptcy jurisdiction, are universally ackn<br>owledged. "  | Judge's assessment of delegations to<br>bankruptcy judges.                     | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
|------------|--|---|--|--|
| 1982 COCAP | Wash., State c. Kelly,<br>32 Wash. App. 112<br>C.A. 10, Plastic                      | (2) On motion of the state, the court or a party,<br>the court may continue the case when required i<br>n the administration of justice and the defendant<br>will not be substantially prejudiced in the present<br>ation of his or her defense.<br>Considering that this case is on appeal from an or  | Ordering conditions for grants of<br>continuances.                             | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure                |
| 1979 COCAP | Container Corp. v.<br>Continental Plastics of<br>Oklahoma, 607 F.2d<br>885           | der granting summary judgment, the court has, i<br>n furtherance of the proper administration of just<br>ice, decided the issue of collateral estoppel on th<br>e merits of the case.   | Discussing procedure in patent cases.  | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure                |
| 1980 COCAP | N.D. Tex., Bullard v.<br>Estelle   | In Ex Parte Reynolds, supra, the progenitor of t<br>his line of cases, the court interpreted Robinson<br>as diminishing the importance of the "relance "<br>prong of the tripartite test of Stevall and Dexist,<br>and virtually eliminating the third branch of the t<br>et ( effect on administration of justice ).   | Discussing retroactivity.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1977 COCAP | E.D. III, Persico v. U.S.<br>DoJ, 426 F. Supp. 1013                                  | For these reasons, this Court feels that unless rel<br>iance upon the old rule is so great that the accom<br>panying difficulties in the rotroactive administra-<br>on of justice forbid; it is important that some ave<br>out of rollef be made open to the petitioner.  | Discussing retroactivity.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1982 COCAP | C.A. 1, Fernandez v.<br>Chardon, 681 F.2d 42<br>D. Mass., Lombard v.                 | There would also seem to be little impact on -<br>the administration of justice whether or not Rick<br>s is applied retroactively .   | Discussing retroactivity.  | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1985 COCAP | Eunice Kennedy<br>Schriver Ctr. for Mental<br>Retardation, Inc., 556 F.<br>Supp. 677 | This is not a case, therefore, in which the unspe-<br>cified duration of $M.G.L.c. 260$ , § 7 's tolling p<br>eriod would have pernicious consequences for th<br>e administration of justice.   | Assessing the effects of mental<br>incompetence on state tolling<br>provision. | Judicial proceeding,<br>powers &<br>prerogatives |
| 1977 COCAP | Pa., In re Anonymous<br>No. 65 D.B. 75, 7 Pa.<br>D. & C.3d 519<br>BOARD              | Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the admi<br>nistration of justice .  | Citing basis of liability for not<br>informing client and not filing action.   | Discipline, Lawyer                               |
| 1986 COCAP | U.S. Claims, Park v.<br>U.S., 10 CL Ct. 790  | This court also has said that a minimal showing o<br>n the part of defendant serves the administration<br>of justice because it is much assire for defendant<br>than plaintiff to determine. For example, the abs<br>ence of defendant's witnesses and loss of defend<br>ant's documents.   |  | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure                |
| 1986 COCAP | N.Y., In re Padilla, 67<br>N.Y.2d 440  | Dy status, sin Suprems Coard has "your and to<br>their over attriowym documellwr-s i<br>han and il person practicing er assuming to<br>actic hwr "en the stats", and the Argellae. Dwi-<br>tion in specifically " authorized to consure, sup-<br>mer and from practice or remove from efficie any aith<br>and so admitted to peractice who is guide of profe-<br>sional miscondust, randpractice, final, deceit,<br>enume or maintename, or any conduct prejudic<br>al o the subminimution of justice " (Audicary La<br>w 90 (21)). | Reiterating court's control of conduct of lawyers.                             | Discipline, Lawyer                               |

|       |                | Tex., State v. Rotello,  | As was said by this court in Southern Pacific Tra<br>nsportation Go. v. Stoot, 530 S.W. 2d at 931:   | Affirming dismissal for prejudicial   | Judicial proceedin  |
|-------|----------------|--|--|---|---|
| 1984  | СОСЛР          | 671 S.W.2d 507<br>M.D. Fla., U.S. v.   | Delay haunts the administration of justice .<br>The court found that the district court 's conclusi  | delay.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceedir   |
| 1987  | СОСЛР          | M.D. Fla., U.S. v.<br>Lehder-Rivas, 667 F.<br>Supp. 827  | The court found that the district court's conclusi<br>on that publicity posed a serious and imminent th<br>reat to the administration of justice was correct.  | Discussing restraining order on<br>attorneys regarding media contacts.  | powers &<br>prerogatives  |
| 1984  | COCAP          | C.A. 9, U.S. v. Tertou,<br>742 F.2d 538  | (footnote citing the Speedy Trial Act)   |   | Judicial proceedir<br>procedure   |
| 1979  | COCAP          | Ct. Customs & Patent<br>Appeals, ASG Indus. et<br>al. v. U.S., 610 F.2d 770  | Accordingly, and in furtherance of the<br>administration of justice, we conclude that a trial<br>de novo is indicated in this case so that the<br>merits of the issue of the amount of the net<br>bounty herein involved can be fully developed.   | Considering impacts of recent<br>statutory amendments on procedure.   | Judicial proceedir  |
| 1977  | COCAP          | N.C., In re Inquiry<br>Concerning Judge W.<br>Milton Nowell, 293<br>N.C. 235   | We are entirely convinced that the ex parte dispo-<br>sition of a criminal case out of court, or the disp<br>contien of any case. For reasons other than an hore<br>st appraisal of the facts and law as disclosed by the<br>he evidence and the advocacy of both parties, wi<br>Il amount to conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>tion of justice.   | Finding a violation of ethical rules in<br>judge's dispositoin of a case outside of<br>normal procedures.   | Discipline, judicis<br>procedure  |
| 1977  | COCAP          | Fla. Pub. Serv. Comm'n,<br>Petition of Myers, 46<br>Fla. Supp. 74  | Hisck 's Law Dictionary', Rev. 4th Ed., unforms<br>us that such a body is (p. 425) — " A tribunal o<br>ficially assembled under authority of law at the a<br>ppropriate, time and place, for the administratio<br>n of justice. In re Carter 's Estate, 254 Pa. 518,<br>00 a. 58.  | Public utility commission querying<br>attributes of a body that can<br>constitutionally exercise judicial<br>functions  | Broad description   |
|       | COCAP          | C.A.D.C., Grace v.<br>Burger, 214 U.S. App.<br>D.C. 375  | 99 A. 58<br>Of this occasion, however, / ywicks informed 1<br>he police offser that a decision of the District of<br>Columbia Superier Court had anxword the appli-<br>eation of 40 U.S.C. § 13k to prohibit only conduc<br>transgoal in "with the intert to destrupt or interfer<br>re with or impode the administration of justice or<br>with the intert of influencing the administration<br>of justice."   | Recounting conduct of officers at<br>Supreme Court.   | Judicial proceedin  |
|       | COCAP          | C.A. 2, Lockett v.<br>Montemago, 784 F.2d<br>78<br>N.C., In re Inquiry<br>Concernign a Judge,<br>309 N.C. 635          | The trial court also found , pursuant to § 220<br>13. that appelle had the capacity to undestand<br>the proceedings against him , its joet was known<br>ingly and voluntarity made ; and acceptance of the pables in<br>the effective administration of justice.<br>The finaling an $9 \times 10^{-1}$ m ( $3 \times 10^{-1}$ m), which we have<br>adopted , constitute conduct projudicial to the ad-<br>ministration of justices that through builded off)   | Assessing courts finding that pleas<br>was voluntary.<br>Assessing judge's involvement with<br>female probation officer.  | Judicial proceedin  |
|       |                | Tex., District Judges v.<br>County Judge, 657  | ce into disrepute.<br>The raising of revenue and the allocation of finan-<br>cial resources among all government entities is in<br>itially and primarily the responsibility of the legi-<br>larice branch of government, and sound public p<br>objecy considerations demand that when the juicit<br>ary secks to use in kinearin power to overcome t-<br>his peculication is indirect power to overcome t-<br>his peculication is indirect power to overcome t-<br>howers, that the indirect power to overcome t-<br>howers, that the indirect overce that the peculication<br>to overcome the provided overcome to overcome t-<br>howers, that the indirect overce the peculication over<br>the peculication overcome to overcome t-<br>the peculication overcome to overcome t-<br>border to overcome the peculication overcome to<br>the peculication overcome to overcome t-<br>the peculication overcome to overcome to overcome to overcome t-<br>the peculication overcome to overcome to overcome t-<br>the peculication overcome to overcome to overcome to overcome t-<br>the peculication overcome to | Reciting standard for judicial, as  | Discipline, judge   |
| 1983  | COCAP          | 8.W.2d 908<br>N.Y., In re Newman, 64   | its constitutional and statutory duties . " conduct that is prejudicial to the administration  | opposed to legislative, exactions.<br>Basis of liability for a lawyer's   | financing   |
| 19781 | COCAP          | A.D.2d 145   | , DR 1 - 102, subd [ A ], par [ 5 ] );   | repeated violations of ethical rules.   | Discipline, lawyer  |
| 1983  | COCAP          | Az., în re Appeal, 680<br>P.2d 163   | To permit the losing party in an ongoing depende<br>ney custody dispute, as in the case before us, to<br>file a later adoption proceeding before a different<br>Arizona juvenile judge while the dependency pr<br>occedings are being processed by another Arizon<br>a juvenile judge would cause havee to the orderly<br>administration of justice.   | Discussing prudential concerns of lack<br>of jurisdictional limits.   | Judicial proceedir<br>procedure   |
|       | COCAP<br>COCAP | S.D.N.Y., U.S. v. Reed,<br>601 F. Supp. 685<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>Petzold, 788 F.2d 1478<br>Fla., State v. Patrus, 46 | Applying this interpretation of the 1811, As the<br>factor is by a more than to accord that the<br>factor is by a the segment Court reduce that the<br>factor is a second that the second is which the tender<br>thing action was peading, and couched that that<br>a action was even to more that as to obtru-<br>t the administration of justice, "and therefore e<br>and not be pumished by the offended court.<br>(fortunet eating s. 1503)<br>This discretion bound the exercised in fairness to  | Recalling criteria for "obstruction."<br>Obstruction statute<br>Announcing bounds for courts'   | Judicial proceedia<br>powers &<br>prerogatives<br>Unclear<br>Judicial proceedia |
| 1977  | COCAP          | Fla. Supp. 19<br>W. Va., Puchinsky v.<br>W. Va. Bd. of Law<br>Examiners, 164 W. Va.                                    | all parties and the administration of justice .<br>* Rather we think the language of these cases an<br>phy indicates that the purpose of the requirements<br>was to insure that dishonest, unscruppions or co<br>rangt individuals would not use their knowledge<br>of the law to perpertuale fraud upon the unsuspect<br>ing and unknowledgable public or to obstruct the<br>proper administration of justice for their own o   | exercises of discretion.<br>Citing, and then distinguishing, the motivationd of bar rules from a  | procedure   |
|       | COCAP          | Examiners, 104 W. Va.<br>736<br>Minn., In re Marriage of<br>Nordmark, 388 N.W.2d<br>436                                | e proper auministration or justice for inter own o<br>r their clients' benefit .<br>A court retains inherent power to grant relief to a<br>party who has been denied an opportunity to def<br>end in a divorce action under such exicumstances<br>as amount to a fraud on the court and the admini<br>stration of justice. Breedmann v. Breedmann , 2<br>SM imm, 21, 24, 91 N.W. 24 det x8 (71 (578 N).  | anyyer's noome or oner<br>political philosophy.<br>Describing powers of the court.  | Discipline, Lawyu<br>Judicial proceedir<br>powers &<br>prerogatives             |
|       | сослр          | W. Va., State ex rel.<br>The Herald Mail Co.,<br>165 W. Va. 103  | Typical of the reasoning of these courts is E. W.<br>Scripps Co. v. Fullon, supra, where the public in<br>nerest was stated as follows: " It can never be el<br>aimed that in a democratic society the public has<br>no interest in or does not have the right to observ<br>e the administration of justice.   |   | Judicial<br>proceedings; acce<br>to   |
| 1986  | сослр          | Pa., Kaplan v.<br>Alleghany Co. Comm'rs,<br>45 Pa. D. & C.3d 396   | In considering the serious request which was not<br>made lightly, we are guided by the rationals of<br>our Superior Court in Crawford's Estate, 307 P<br>a. 102, 108 (1931), wherein the court stated : "<br>Due consideration should be given by him [judg<br>e 10 the fact that the administration of justice sh<br>ould be beyond the appearance of unfairness.   | Assessing whether any county judge<br>would be able to hear the instant case.   | Judicial proceedii<br>procedure   |
| 1987  | COCAP          | C.A. 9, U.S. v. Kelm,<br>827 F.2d 1319<br>D. Ark., Polson v.   | There is little doubt that Kelm 's conduct hindere<br>d the " efficient administration of justice .<br>Nor does the public service or the administration   | Assessing denial of continuance when<br>pro se party repeatedly missed court<br>and imposed requirements for<br>appointed counsel.<br>Refusing absolute privilege to public | Judicial proceedir<br>procedure   |
| 1986  | COCAP          | D. Ark., Polson v.<br>Davis, 635 F. Supp.<br>1130  | Nor does the public service or the administration<br>of justice require complete immunity for such an<br>action.   |   | Judicial proceedir  |
|       |                | Mo., In re Clinton   |  | Stated as basis of liability under<br>professional conduct rules for fialures<br>to advise client of adverse judgment,  |   |

| 1983   | COCAP                                     | Colo., People v.<br>Whitcomb, 676 P.2d 11   | DR 1 - $102 (A) (5)$ (conduct prejudicial to the admin<br>istration of justice); and DR 6 - $101 (A) (3)$ (neglect of a legal matter).  | Reciting basis of liability resulting in<br>suspension of one year and one day.  | Discipline, Law  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
|  |   | Bankr. W.D. Ark., In re   | It is in the best interests of the estate , the debtor<br>and the creditors to dismits this Chapter 11 case<br>to effectuate a substantial savings in litigation an<br>d administrative expenses which would otherwis<br>e be incurred if it were to remain pending and to<br>further serve the ends of the fair efficient and eff  |  | Judicial proceed   |
| 1986   | COCAP                                     | Westfall, 73 B.R. 186<br>C.A. 8, Banks v. Heun-<br>Norwood, 566 F.2d  | ective administration of justice .<br>To take such action could , in our judgment , esta<br>blish a precedent which would not advance the pr  | offered helow.   | procedure<br>Judicial proceed  |
| 1977   | COCAP                                     | 1073  | oper administration of justice .  | relief sought for first time on appeal.  | procedure  |
| 1977   | COCAP                                     | La., Martin v. South<br>Coast Corp., 356 So. 2d<br>500  | In both instances, the trial julge's knowledge of<br>the condition of the docket, finames not only<br>to both putties but also to other lifegmain in his co-<br>uri, and the note finan an orderly and prompt admi-<br>nistration of justice "provides him with superior<br>hibly to determine the terms of the diminisol. Maller v. Aukkinney, 310 No 24 066, 608 (La<br>App. 14 Cir. 1793 ).<br>Stettori 1703 HIP contains a transmission strength<br>to which makes illegal any address where hy a pri-<br>ne which makes illegal part systems where hy a pri-<br>ne which makes illegal part systems where hy a pri-<br>ne which makes illegal part systems where hy a pri-<br>ne which makes illegal part systems where hy a pri-<br>ne where the origination of the part of the matter origination. Julien  | Describing judges' latitude in<br>dismissals.  | Judicial proceed   |
|  |   | C.A. 6, U.S. v.   | ces, obstructs or impedes, or endeavors to influ<br>ence, obstruct, or impede, the due administrati<br>on of justice, shall be fined not more than \$ 5,00<br>0 or imprisoned not more than five years, or bot  | (Cited in footnote of appeal reversing   | Judicial proceed   |
| 1985   | COCAP                                     | Schneider, 771 F.2d 149<br>N.D. Ind., Naked City,   | h.<br>Prosecutor Ryan corruptly obstructed and impede   | and granting new trial.)   | procedure  |
| 1987   | COCAP                                     | Inc. v. Aregood, 667 F.<br>Supp. 1246   | d the due administration of justice in violation of<br>18 USC 1503 .  | (Appendix stating cause of action<br>from complaint.)  | Lawyer miscond   |
| 1987   | COCAP                                     | Pa., Pa. Labor Relations<br>Bd. v. Am. Federation<br>of State, 526 A.2d<br>769  | Conconitantly, to promote and maintain the effi-<br>cient administration of justice and the enforceabil-<br>ity of their employees ' contracts, the judges of t<br>hie courts of common pleas must have input through<br>gh the courty commissioners. Id., 507 Pa. at 27<br>9, 489 A. 2 dat 1329 - 1330.<br>It comprehends any act which is calculated to or  |  | Judicial conduct   |
| 1985   | COCAP                                     | N.J., State v. Vasky,<br>203 N.J. Super, 91   | ends to embarrass, hinder, impede, frustrate, o<br>r obstruct the court in the administration of Jussic<br>e, or which is calculated to rhots the effect of the<br>snening its authority or its dignity; or which inter<br>feres with or preguidoen partice during the course<br>of fitigation, or which lends otherwise to tring t<br>he authority or administration of the law into disr<br>optice of disregard.  | Finding of contempt  | Judicial proceed<br>powers &<br>prerogatives   |
| 1977   | COCAP                                     | Az., In re Appeal in<br>Pima Cnty, 118 Ariz.<br>127   | In determining whether to give a decision prospe-<br>ctive or retrospective application, the purpose of<br>the decision, reliance on a prior rule of law, and<br>the possible effect upon the administration of jus-<br>tice are factors which must be considered.  | Appeal from court order granting   | )<br>Law enforcemen  |
| 1977   | COCAP                                     | C.A. 3, Commonwealth<br>v. Local Union 542, 552<br>F.2d 498   | That statute provides that a federal court has the<br>power to punish by fine or imprisonment such co-<br>ntempt of its authority as "I misbehavior of any<br>person in its presence or so near thereto as to obs-<br>truct the administration of justice."   | Underlying contempt order (on appeal).   | Judicial proceed<br>powers &<br>prerogatives   |
| 1979   | COCAP                                     | IIL, Peoplle v. Elder, 73<br>IIL App. 3d 192  | This right may not be employed to thwart the ad<br>ministration of justice or to delay prosecution ind<br>efinitely.  | Motion for continuance to employ   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure  |
|  |   | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salsberg, 107 Mise. 2d   | This right may not be employed to thwart the ad<br>ministration of justice or to delay prosecution ind  | Motion for continuunce to employ<br>different attorney in case below<br>implicating right to counsel.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceed  |
| 1980   | COCAP                                     | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salsberg, 107 Mise, 2d<br>276<br>Oh., State v. Conliff, 61   | This right may not be employed to thesar the ab-<br>minimization of justice or to delay protocofficial<br>effailed.<br>Finally, a does not serve the interests of the admi-<br>mizations of justice to deep the making of a noti-<br>en to distinct basis upon the additional time pool<br>of the motion to dismise gass beyond marce<br>enclusionary allegations of lack of proper service<br>in the instant case, the record finits to disoloos the<br>the statement controlled – an imminent threat  | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different attenues in case below<br>implicating right to counsel.<br>Review of denial of motion to diamiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on  | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>powers &  |
| 1980   |   | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salsherg, 107 Mise. 2d<br>276<br>Oh., State v. Conliff, 61<br>Ohio App. 2d 185   | This right may not be employed to thesar the al-<br>minimization of justice or to delay prosecution in<br>diminization of justice or to delay prosecution in<br>diminization of justice to deep the making of a moliton<br>on to diminis when, as here, the afferities in any<br>part of the motion to diminis gone beyond more con-<br>multationary allogations of lack of proper service i-<br>in the instant case, there record lafts to disclose the<br>first statement constrained in an anoment function<br>when administration of justice.   | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different atteness, aciss below<br>implicating right to counsel.<br>Review of denial of motion to diamise.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed  |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982                                 | COCAP                                     | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salsberg, 107 Mise, 2d<br>276<br>Oh., State v. Conliff, 61   | This right may not be employed to thesart the al-<br>minimized of justice or to delay presecution in<br>diminization of justice or to delay presecution in<br>diminization of justice is the the minimized of the<br>one to diminis when, as here, the afferivit in any<br>pot of the motion to diminis gone bayeond more co-<br>onclusionary allogations of fack of proper service<br>-<br>-<br>in the instant case, the record fails to disclose the<br>affect delay delay the dominization of<br>the administration of parkse<br><br>counder was producing to the dominization of<br>the scale dimensional delay the dominization of<br>the scale dimensional delay the dominization of<br>parkse and reflex his unfiness to prepare the s-<br>counder was producing to the dominization of<br>the scale and reflex his unfiness to prepared to s-<br>parks and reflex his unfiness to prepared to s-<br>parks and reflex his unfiness to prepared to see the<br>park of the day of compressional how addressing<br>by 0 the day of compression allows interfaces to parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale marks in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale of the scale of the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale mark in the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale mark in the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale mark in the scale mark in the scale mark in parkses in<br>the scale mark in the scale mark in the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in parkses in the scale mark in th                 | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different atteneys in case below<br>implicating right to connect.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Geiseance Committee's evaluation of<br>attorney's conduct.  | procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>powers &<br>prerogatives<br>Discipline, Lawy   |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982                                 | COCAP                                     | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salaberg, 107 Mise. 2d<br>276<br>Ohi, State v. Conliff, 61<br>Ohio App. 2d 185<br>Colos, People v.<br>K.endly, 648 P.2d 1065<br>C.A. 1, Dd Rio v.<br>Northern Blower Co.,  | This right may not be employed to these it to a limitation of justice or to delay protocotion in<br>clinitation of justice or to delay protocotion in<br>clinitation of justice to day the mixing of a non-<br>timative strain of the strain of the sales of the<br>mixing of a non-to-<br>port of the motion to diminis gaps beyond more<br>conclusionary allogations of facts of proper servers<br>a strain of the strain of the strain of the sales<br>is the statement control of a strain<br>to the statement control of a strain<br>which we are produced to the administration of<br>mixing and relation of partice<br>- conduct was produced to the administration of<br>mixing and relates the strain of the strain<br>- partice of the strain of the strain<br>- partice in approximation of partice<br>- partice in apport. The strain of the strain<br>- partice in apport.<br>The strain context of the strain - but contain<br>- partice in apport.   | Motion for continuous to compley<br>different atteness, a case below<br>implicating right to connect.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Grievance Committee's evaluation of<br>attorney's conduct.   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>powers &  |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982<br>1978                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                            | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salskey, 107 Mice. 2d<br>276<br>Ohio App. 2d 183<br>Colos, People v.<br>Kenelty, 648 JP 2d 1055<br>C.A. 1, Del Rio v<br>Northern Blower Co.,<br>574 F.2d 203<br>Fla, Dadley v. Sate,   | This right may not be employed to thesar the ad-<br>minimized of justice or to delay prosecution indi-<br>efficiency.<br>Finally, - it does not serve the mitrarels of the admi-<br>mization of justice to deep the making of a nodi-<br>on to dismiss when, as here, the adfiver in may<br>pet of the motion to dismiss goes beyond mere co-<br>nclusionary allogations of like (of proper service)<br>in the instance case, the record finith to disclose the<br>the statement concurs that the responsibility of<br>the statement concurs that the responsibility of<br>making and the statement of making and<br>state and relevant that the responsibility of the<br>statement concurs that the responsibility of the<br>statement concurs that the responsibility of<br>making and relevant the statement, above the statement<br>is not and relevant the statement, above the statement<br>by of the day of compensation survers in particu-<br>tion and which is included to the statement, above the<br>relevant a court in the advanced field the statement<br>of relevant a court in the advanced field the statement<br>of the statement concurs, binding<br>, or obstruct a court in the advanced to the statement.  | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different atteness, aciss below<br>implicating right to connect.  | procedure Judicial proceed procedure Judicial proceed provers & prorogatives Unclear Judicial proceed provers & proregatives   |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982<br>1987<br>1987                 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP                   | III. App. 3d 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v.<br>Salaberg, 107 Mice. 2d<br>276<br>Oh, State v. Conliff, 61<br>Ohio App. 2d 183<br>Colos, People v.<br>Kenelly, 64 BP 2d 1055<br>C.A. 1, Dod Rio v<br>Northern Blower Co.,<br>574 F.2d 23<br>Fla., Dadley v. State,<br>511 So. 2d 1032   | This right may not be employed to these it to a<br>minimized of justice or loddy protocotion indi-<br>critically, if does not serve the minerals of the adm<br>minimized of justice to dary the mining of a non-<br>tinear server of the server of the server of the server<br>minimized of the server of the server of the server<br>enclassion of the server of the server of the server<br>occurs on the server of the server of the server<br>is the statement occurs of the server of the server<br>occurs of the server of the server of the server<br>is the statement occurs of partice –<br>server of the server of the server of the server<br>ounder way required in the administration of<br>minimized to the statement occurs of partice –<br>server of the server of the server of the server<br>ounder way required in the administration of<br>justice in appendix process and administration of<br>partice in general.<br>The 1 ad court, retrieves and administration of<br>justice in appendix of the data server of the server<br>of administration of the server of the server of<br>justice in general.<br>The 3 a outmain contempt as a baseding detriced a<br>server of the server parts of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server<br>of the server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the server of<br>the server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the<br>server of the server of the server of the server of the       | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different attensity in case below<br>implicating right to connect.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Grievance Committee's evaluation of<br>attorney's conduct.<br>Lower court's assessment of<br>workmarky compensation scheme.<br>Underlying contempt order (on<br>appeal).<br>Bur official's evaluation of attorney's<br>conduct (on review).  | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>provers &<br>prorogatives<br>Discipline, Law<br>Unclear<br>Judicial proceed<br>powers &<br>prorogatives<br>Unclear<br>Judicial proceed<br>power &<br>prorogatives<br>contempt       |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982<br>1987<br>1987                 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP                   | III. App. 34 192           N.Y., Lipman V.           Saldsey, 107 Mise, 2d           276           Oh., State V. Conliff, 61           Ohio App. 2d 185           Colo., Resple V.,<br>Kendly, 648 P 2d 1065           C.A. 1, Del Rie V.           Northern Blower Co.,<br>574 F 2d 23           Fla., Dadley V. State,<br>511 So. 2d 1052           Fla., Bar V. Hoffer, 412           So. 2d 858           Pa, Commonwealth V.           Willams, 344 Pa.  | This right may not be employed to these it to a<br>minimized of justice or loddy protocotion indi-<br>critication of justice to delay protocotion in<br>critication of justice to delay the mixing of a number<br>instraints of justice to dary the mixing of a number<br>instraints of justice to dary the mixing of a number<br>instraints of justice to dary the mixing of a number<br>port of the number of lack of proper serves<br>conclusionary allegations of lack of proper serves<br>enclusionary allegations of lack of proper serves<br>or any server of lack of proper serves<br>in the instant case, the record finits to disclose the<br>interview production to the administration of<br>mixing and reflex his unfiness to practice law a<br>value affective relation to the mixing and the proper<br>mixing of the server of the server of the server<br>output of the server of the server of the server<br>in addition, if was its institute to practice law a<br>value therefore in the administration of partic-<br>ing and the order process and administration of<br>justice in general.<br>The server of the foreign a constrained between the anti-<br>ory of back is calculated to numbers. Indeed<br>a lagell matter in the administration of partic-<br>ic a which is calculated to numbers is indexing<br>of Dirac and the order particle and the indexing of Dirac<br>and the order part of the data server in probability of<br>Dirac and part of the server of the server of the server<br>of Dirac 2000 (Dirac 2000  | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different attensity in case below<br>implicating right to counsel.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Griesunce Committee's evaluation of<br>attency's conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Underlying contempt order (on<br>appeal).<br>Bar official's evaluation of atterney's<br>conduct (on review).<br>Evaluation of conduct (resisting                        | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>proves &<br>preregatives<br>Discipline, Law<br>Unclear<br>Judicial proceed<br>powers &<br>proregatives<br>contempt  |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982<br>1987<br>1982                 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP                   | III. App. 34 192<br>N.Y., Lipman v. Salakey, 107 Mise, 2d<br>276<br>Oh. State v. Confiff, 61<br>Ohio App. 2d 185<br>Colo., Reeple v. Kendly, 648 V. 2d 1065<br>C.A. 1, Del Ris v. Northern Blower Co.,<br>574 F 2d 23<br>Fla., Dadly v. State,<br>511 So. 2d 1052<br>Fla., Dadly v. State,<br>511 So. 2d 1052<br>Fla., Dat Sine v.<br>Fla., Dat Sin | This right may not be employed to these it to a<br>minimized of justice or to delay prescention in<br>efficiency is a strateging of a most<br>minimized of justice is of organ market and<br>efficiency is a strate, the method of proper service<br>is not densitient when, as here, the afficient in ap-<br>port of the most to doming one biogenetic market and<br>in the instant case, the record finits to disclose the<br>the statement consoling that is proposed in the<br>strateging of proper service<br>is a strateging of the strateging of a most<br>method of the strateging of the strateging of a<br>most strateging of proper service<br>is a strateging of the strateging of the<br>strateging of the strateging of the strateging of<br>market strateging of the strateging of the<br>strateging of the strateging of the strateging of<br>the strateging of the strateging of the strateging<br>as a method of the strateging of the strateging of<br>the strateging of the strateging of the strateging of the<br>strateging fraging strateging biologing of the strateging of the<br>strateging fraging strateging biologing the strateging of the strateging                              | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different attensity in case below<br>implicating right to counsel.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Griesunce Committee's evaluation of<br>attency's conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Lower conduct.<br>Underlying contempt order (on<br>appeal).<br>Bar official's evaluation of atterney's<br>conduct (on review).<br>Evaluation of conduct (resisting                        | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>provers &<br>prorogatives<br>Discipline, Law<br>Unclear<br>Discipline, Law<br>Unclear<br>Discipline, Law<br>Discipline, Law<br>Law enforcement<br>Una generally<br>Judicial proceed |
| 1980<br>1978<br>1982<br>1987<br>1987<br>1987<br>1988 | СОСАР<br>СОСАР<br>СОСАР<br>СОСАР<br>СОСАР | III. App. 34 192 N.Y., Lipman V. Sabkey, 107 Mise. 2d 276 Oh., State V. Conliff, 61 Ohio App. 2d 185 Color, Peeple V. Kendly, 648 P.2d 1055 C.A. 1, Dal Ris V. Northen Blower Co., 574 F. 2d 20 Fla, Dadley V. State, Fla, Dadley V. State, Fla, Bar V. Hoffer, 412 So. 2d 658 Pa, Commonwealth V. Williams, 344 Pa, Super, 108 Mish, Falk V. State Bar   | This right may not be employed ubwarf the all<br>minimized in justice or loader presidential of<br>effailty: a docks not serve the minerals of the admi-<br>minimized of justice to deep the mining of a non-<br>diminization of justice to deep the mining of a non-<br>ling of the minimized of the minimized of the mini-<br>port of the motion to diminis gases beyond more<br>conclusionary allogations of facts of proper serves<br>conclusionary allogations of facts of proper serves<br>or an experimental of the minimized the mini-<br>tant case, the record fails to disclose the<br>in the instant case, the record fails to disclose the<br>in the instant case, the record fails to disclose the<br>value of the obstant of partice -<br>conductive ary equidation to the administration of<br>minimized the statement convolution of partice<br>- where the obstant of the statement of the statement<br>or such the molecular to the statement of the statement<br>- particle minimized on the statement of the statement<br>- or other state courts (rest on the statement of the state<br>- or other state courts in the adminimized not of<br>partice in general.<br>- The Faced Bar Code of Professional Response<br>- 101 (A 13) ; angaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; angaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; angaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in conduct republicital<br>- 101 (A 13) ; and engaged in the statement of the<br>- 101 conduct republic statement of the statement<br>- 101 conduct - 101 conductions of the<br>- 101 conduct - 101 conductions of the<br>- 101 conduct - 101 conductions of the<br>- 101 conduct - 101 conductions of | Motion for continuous to employ<br>different attensity in case below<br>implicating right to connect.<br>Review of denial of motion to dismiss.<br>Underlying contempt finding (on<br>appeal).<br>Grievance Committee's evaluation of<br>attense's conduct.<br>Lower court's assessment of<br>workmark's compensation scheme.<br>Underlying contempt order (on<br>appeal).<br>Bur official's evaluation of attense/'s<br>conduct (on review)<br>Fivaluation of conduct (resisting<br>arest). | Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceed<br>procedure<br>Discipline, Law<br>Unclear<br>Judicial proceed<br>prorgatives<br>prerogatives<br>prerogatives,<br>contempt<br>Discipline, Law  |

|  |                                  |  | A witness violates no duty to claim it , but one w  |   |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
|  |                                  |  | ho bribes , coerces , forces or threatens a witness<br>to claim it , or advises with corrupt motive the w   |   | Judicial proceeding  |
|  |                                  | C.A. 4, U.S. v. Baker,   | itness to take it, can and does himself obstruct or<br>influence the due administration of justice. 329   | Citing upholding of conviction under<br>s. 1503, for inducing witness to use  | powers & prerogatives;   |
| 1979   | COCAP                            | 611 F.2d 964   | F. 2d at 443 .  | Amend, V privilege.   | Tampering  |
|  |                                  |  | Accordingly , we conclude that the evidence esta  |   | Judicial proceeding  |
|  |                                  | IIL, People v. Page, 73  | blished beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant<br>wilfully and knowingly interfered with the admi   | Affirming conviction either for<br>misleading court or causing delat, in  | powers &<br>prerogatives;  |
| 1979   | COCAP                            | III. App. 3d 796   | nistration of justice .<br>Principles of finality, certainty, and the proper a  | either case giving rise to liability.   | Tampering  |
|  |                                  |  | dministration of justice suggest that a decision on<br>ce rendered should stand unless some compelling  | Explaining doctrine back of question  |  |
|  |                                  | S.C., Beall v. Doe, 281  | countervailing consideration necessitates relitiga  | whether a party is precluded from   | Judicial proceeding  |
| 1984   | COCAP                            | S.C. 363   | tion .  | relitigating an issue with a nonparty.  | procedure  |
|  |                                  |  | The Florida Bar in response submits that to grant<br>the petition would not adversely affect the purity   |   |  |
|  |                                  | Fla., Bar v. Ward, 366   | of the court system , hinder the administration of<br>justice , or adversely affect the confidence of the   |   |  |
| 1978   | COCAP                            | Fia., Bar V. Ward, 366<br>So. 2d 405   | public in the legal profession .  | Petition to resign from bar.  | Discipline, lawyer   |
|  |                                  |  | This court imposed a thirty -<br>day suspension, even though we concluded that  |   |  |
|  |                                  | D.C., In re Hutchison,   | the attorney 's conduct had perpetrated a fraud o<br>n the judicial system and compromised the admi   | Describing previous sanction on   |  |
| 1987   | COCAP                            | 534 A.2d 919   | nistration of justice .<br>The administrative office of the courts was give   | awyer.  | Discipline, lawyer   |
|  |                                  |  | n authority to " serve as an agency to apply for an   |   |  |
|  |                                  | C.A. 5, Stegmaier v.   | d receive grants or other assistance and to coordi<br>nate or conduct studies and projects in connectio   |   |  |
| 1979   | COCAP                            | Trammell, 597 F.2d<br>1027   | n with the improvement of the administration of j<br>ustice.  | Describing the duty of court officers.  | Judiciary generally  |
|  | coen                             | 1027   | State v. Gregory , 66 N.J. 510 , 519 ( 1975 ) ( pr  | Describing the duty of court officers.  | Surrently Benerativ  |
|  |                                  |  | ohibiting multiple prosecution for acts arising out   |   |  |
|  |                                  | N.J., State v. Ramseur,  | of same arrest under court 's supervisory power<br>to ensure fairness in the administration of justice  |   | Judicial proceeding  |
| 1987   | COCAP                            | 106 N.J. 123   | , although rejecting constitutional attack );<br>So , it is clear beyond any argument that the Res  | Outlining court's doctrine.   | procedure  |
|  |                                  |  | pondent is guilty of Disciplinary Rule 1 -<br>102 " Misconduct . ( A ) A lawyer shall not : ( 1   |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | ) Violate a Disciplinary Rule ; ( 5 ) Engage in co  |   |  |
|  |                                  | Md., Attorney<br>Grievance Comm'n of   | nduct that is prejudicial to the administration of j<br>ustice ; and (6) Engage in any other conduct tha  |   |  |
| 1027   | COCAP                            | Md. v. Singleton, 532<br>A.2d 157  | t adversely reflects on his fitness to practice law .   | Upholding sanction of attorney in bar<br>proceeding.  | Discipline, lawyer   |
| .70/   | 2.0 Well                         |  | While we are sensitive to the fact that the efficie   |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | nt administration of justice can not be subject to t  |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | he whims and inordinate delays of litigants, and<br>are not convinced that the failure in this case of t  |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | he plaintiff 's new attorney to be prepared for tria<br>I could not have been avoided , there is nothing i  |   |  |
| 1007   | COCAP                            | N.Y., Stock v. Stock,<br>127 A.D.2d 829  | n this record to indicate bad faith on the part of t  | Decoming discology  | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure   |
| 170/   | COCAF                            | 127 76.07.20 827   | he plaintiff in seeking an adjournment .<br>Since defendant Donn persisted in his contempti   | Reversing dismissal.  | procedure  |
|  |                                  |  | ble conduct despite the warnings of the Court , a   |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | nd so misbehaved that in the presence of the Cou  |   |  |
|  |                                  | 1  | rt he , Donn , outrageously obstructed the admini   |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | stration of justice , the Court finds said Donn in c  |   |  |
|  |                                  |  | stration of justice, the Court finds said Donn in c<br>ontempt of Court and he is ordered to be sentenc<br>ed to a term of six months, all as appears conclu  |   | Judicial proceeding  |
|  |                                  | C.D. Cal., U.S. v. Donn,   | stration of justice, the Court finds said Donn in c<br>ontempt of Court and he is ordered to be sentence<br>ed to a term of six months, all as appears conclu<br>sively in the transcript of Evidentiary Hearing, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is hereby incorpo  |   | powers &<br>prerogatives;  |
| 1982   | COCAP                            | C.D. Cal., U.S. v. Donn,<br>584 F. Supp. 525   | stration of justice, the Court finds said Donn in c<br>ontempt of Court and he is ordered to be sentence<br>ed to a term of six months, all as appears conclu<br>sively in the transcript of Evidentiary Hearing, et  | Contempt finding.   | powers &   |
| 1982   | COCAP                            | C.D. Cal., U.S. v. Donn,<br>584 F. Supp. 525   | stration of justice, the Court finds said Domi in c<br>ortempt of Court and he is ordered to be sertence<br>ed to a term of six months, all as appears conclu-<br>sively in the transcript of Evidentiary Hearing, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is horeby incorpo-<br>rated herein and made part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty -   | Contempt finding.   | powers &<br>prerogatives;  |
| 1982   | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525   | Intation of justice, the Court finds and Domin in<br>contempt of Court and he is ordered to be sentence<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears conclu-<br>incyle in the transmittering of Evidenting Hearing, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is hereby incorepo-<br>rated herein and made part hereof. This court imposed a thirty-<br>day supportion, even though we concluded that<br>heatterny's coulds that preparation a fruid o  | Contempt finding.   | powers &<br>prerogatives;  |
|  |                                  | C.D. Cal., U.S. v. Denn,<br>584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchisen,<br>518 A.2d 995   | stration of justice, the Court finds said Dom in or<br>outcompt of Court and be is ordered to be sentence<br>ofto a term of six months, all as appears credul,<br>welve in the transmig of eVidentity Haring, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is hereby incorpo-<br>rated herein and made part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty -<br>day sugension, or worth bough we concluded that   |   | powers & prerogatives;<br>Contempt   |
|  | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,   | stration of justice, the Court finds and Domin in<br>outcompt of Court and ho is ordered to be sentence<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exectly,<br>sively in the transcript of Evidentiany Harring, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is hereby incorpo-<br>grated herein and made part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty -<br>day unquersion, even though we concluded that<br>the attemps 's conduct had perpetented a finad o<br>in the justical system and compresentia the admin-   | Contempt finding,   | powers &<br>prerogatives;  |
|  |                                  | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,   | Intrine or purice, the Court finds will bom in to<br>comput of Court and the is ordered to be sertice<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>onely in the transcript of Evidentity Jillaring, et<br>al. January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorps<br>print and therein and most pair hereor.<br>This court imposed a thirty –<br>day superprint, even though we concluded that<br>the attemp's counted has perpetuted a frand o<br>in the pairlish system and compound a frand-<br>ing the strength of the strength of the attempt<br>instrument of pairs.   |   | powers & prerogatives;<br>Contempt   |
|  |                                  | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,   | Intuition of puticic, the Count finds and Doom in to<br>compared Court and the is ordered to be sentence<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exocut-<br>onely in the transcript of Evidentity Pulsaring, et<br>al., January 25, 1992, which is hereby incomp-<br>paration herein and and and part hereof.<br>"This court imposed a thurty –<br>day suspension, even though we concluded that<br>the attemp's counted has perpetuted a frand o<br>in the platicity system and compension the admini-<br>nitration of partice."<br>Respondent 's discussion of marketing motion pro-<br>norm, raining a failed chain of physical inshibity<br>to stand trait, occasian colling, and pamping bails to<br>standard unchained conther perplaticitation to the ad-<br>sontantianed unchained conther propholical to the ad-   |   | powers & prerogatives;<br>Contempt   |
|  |                                  | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,   | fratiset of public, the Court finds aid Done into<br>comport Court and be in ordered to be mettine<br>of to a term of six months, all an appears execute<br>view) in the manaccipit of Evidentity Planting, et<br>al., January 25, 1982, which is hereby incomp-<br>rated herein and mede part hereof.<br>[This court imposed a thirty-<br>day supersition, even though we concluded that<br>the atterny's conclusion that perpetited as fauld<br>on the particular statement of the attern<br>instantom of justice.<br>Respondent 'A sciencesion of markering mother p<br>errore, mising a false chim of physical intuity  |   | powers & prerogatives;<br>Contempt   |
| 1986   |                                  | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,   | fratise of purice, the Court finds and Domn is be action<br>compared Court and the is indered to be series of<br>40 to strom of six months, all an appears couch<br>well in the runner of the Court purice of the<br>analysis of the Court purice of the Court puri-<br>day suspension, even though we concluded that<br>the attemp's court monghest we concluded that<br>the attemp's court monghest we concluded that<br>an the placetary of the Court purice of the Court<br>material system and couperside that the durin<br>infrintion of place. The Court purice of the Court<br>monstraints of the court is statistical instituty<br>monstraints of the court is statistical instituty<br>of the court is statistical of the court of the court<br>maintening of placets and the court of the court<br>maintening of placets and the court of the court of the<br>maintening of placets and the court of the court of the<br>placets of the court of the court of the court of the<br>maintening of placets and the court of the court of the<br>placets of the court of the court of the court of the court<br>in the court of the court of the court of the court of the<br>placets of the court of the court of the court of the court<br>maintening of placets and the court of the court of the court<br>is placets of the court of the court of the court of the court<br>is placets of the court of the court of the court of the court of the court<br>maintening of the court of the  | Recalling post sanction.  | powers & prerogatives;<br>Contempt   |
| 1986   | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,<br>518 A.2d 995   | furties of putice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be serticated of a strengt of Court and the is indexed to be serticated of a strengt of the Court and Data and Dat   |   | powen & prevogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer  |
| 1986   | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,<br>518 A.2d 995   | further of purice, the Court finds and Doom in compret of Court and the in ordered to be sertices<br>of to a term of six months, all as supease second,<br>welly in the transmission of Evidentity Jiharing, et<br>al. January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>panel herein and anneal part hereof.<br>This court imposed a flurity –<br>day superprises, even though we concluded flurit<br>the attemp's constant and perspectiated a frand o<br>in the photical system and compound the attemp<br>interface of the start of the start of the start<br>interface of the start of the start of the start<br>of the photical system and compound the attemp<br>interface of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>start of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start of the<br>start of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the start of the start of the start of the start<br>of the start of the<br>start of the start of th  | Recalling post sanction.  | powen &<br>percogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding  |
| 1986<br>1986                                 | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hotchinon,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.   | further of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one on the sertice of Evidentity Julianity, et<br>al. January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>panel herein and annet gen bereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty –<br>day supervises, even though we concluded that<br>the atterns' is consulted as perspirated a frand o<br>in the patient and perspirated a frand o<br>in the patient system and compound the attern<br>is sense. The sense of the sense of the sense<br>term of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>france of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>france of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>france of the sense of the sense of the sense of the<br>minimum of paties. In which we do not sense<br>the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense<br>of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense of the<br>sense of the sense of the   | Recalling past satetion.  | powen &<br>percogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powen &<br>percogatives;  |
| 1986<br>1986                                 | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hutchison,<br>518 A.2d 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527   | fratise of puice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertices<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one on the sertice of Evidentity Pularing, et<br>al., January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>panel herein and annet part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty –<br>day suspension, even though we concluded that<br>the attemp's counted and perpetitude a frand o<br>in the platicity of the sertice of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the<br>attemp's counted in program and the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the set<br>setting of the setting of the set the set the set the set the set<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the set<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the set<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the setting<br>setting of the setting of the setting of the setting of the set  | Recalling post sanction.  | power &<br>prerogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>power &   |
| 1986<br>1986                                 | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hotchinon,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.   | further of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice<br>of to a term of six months, all as supease secold,<br>welly in the transmission of Evidentity Jiharing, et<br>al. January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>pand bacteria and annual gen Textor 6.<br>This court imposed a thirty –<br>day superprises, even though we concluded that<br>the atterns's constant day perpendent of transfor-<br>ing the term of the second and perpendent<br>the term of the second and perpendent of the<br>atterns' constant on the operation of the<br>the term of the second of matching and the<br>term of the second of the second and the<br>minimum of paties. In the second the term of the<br>minimum of paties is a second of the second of the<br>minimum of paties is a second of the second of the<br>minimum of paties is a second of the second of the<br>minimum of paties is a second of the second of the<br>minimum of paties is a second of the second of the<br>second of the second of the second of the second<br>of the second of the second of the second of the<br>minimum of paties is a solution of DR 1.<br>Under the second term of the second of the second<br>of constitute is underland or the second of the the<br>second of the second of the second of the second of the<br>inductor of paties of the the second of the second of the second<br>on the second of the second of the second of the second<br>of the second of the sec  | Recalling past satetion.  | powers &<br>percogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>percogatives;  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | furties of purice, the Court finds and Domn in comport of Court and be is ordered to be netratice<br>of the atom of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>oly in the memory of Evidentiary Difference of the<br>atom of the term of the second second second second<br>and particle and and perification. The second second<br>and period networks and another perification of<br>the parallel system of period second second second<br>instantian of pusies. The second second second<br>instantian of pusies of the second second second<br>instantian of the second second second second<br>instantian of pusies. The second second second<br>instantian of pusies of the second second second<br>instantiant methods and the properties of the second<br>instantiant method second second second second<br>instantiant second second second second second second<br>is a second seco   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding,<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP                            | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hotchinon,<br>318 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>Londen, 714 F.24 1558  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertices<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one only in the manacopie of Evidentity Pulsaring, et<br>al. January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>paration between and manager part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thirty –<br>day suspension, even though we concluded in that<br>the attemp's control and perpetitude a frand o<br>in the patient of the series of the attemption<br>of the patient of the series of the attemption of the<br>attemption of patient of the series of the series of the<br>series of the series of the series of the series of the<br>manager of the series of the series of the series of the<br>manager of the series of the series of the series of the<br>manager of the series of the series of the series of the<br>main series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of the<br>series of the series of the series of the series of the<br>main series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the series of the series of the series of the series of<br>the series of the s  | Recalling past satetion.  | powen &<br>percogatives;<br>Contempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powen &<br>percogatives;  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | fratise of public, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertices<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one on the sertice of Evidentity Public Public Public<br>and Public Public Public Public Public Public Public<br>and Public Public Public Public Public Public Public<br>and Public Public Public Public Public Public Public<br>Public Public Public Public Public Public Public Public<br>Public Public Public Public Public Public Public<br>Public Public Publ  | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | fratiset or platice, the Court finds will born in comport C Court and the is indexed to be sentine.<br>all to stemp of the court and the is indexed to be sentine,<br>all to a first order of the short of the court of the sentine<br>of the stemp of the court of the short of the sentine<br>of the stemp of the short of the short of the sentine<br>of the stemp of the short of the short of the short of<br>the stemp of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of the short of the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of<br>the short of the short of<br>the short of the s   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | futtion of purice, the Court finds and Domn in comport of Court and be in ordered to be netratice<br>of no atom of six months, all as appears exceldent of the section of the  | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and his reduced to be sertice<br>of on a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one of the term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>one of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of term of term of the term of the term of the term<br>of term of term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of the term of the term of the term of the term<br>of the term of term of the term of term of term of the term of   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | hratiset of publics, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertices<br>of to a term of six months, all as suppose second-<br>outly in the manacopie of Evidentity. Planting, et<br>al., January 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>panet of beerk and and and performed a frank or<br>the strens's constrained and preserviced a frank or<br>the hereback is supported and the preserviced a frank<br>or the phetical system and compound the atomi-<br>tical system of the strength of the strength incorp-<br>panet, raising a frank of the strength incorp-<br>net, raising a frank of the strength incorporation of the<br>minimum of paties. In the strength incorporation of the<br>minimum of paties is a strength of the strength incorporation<br>of an another the strength of the strength incorporation<br>of the phetical system and compound the atomi<br>initiation of paties is a strength of the strength incorpora-<br>tion of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>in the phetical system is strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>or patient is a strength of the strength of the strength<br>of indigenetic lines, in violation of DR 1 -<br>Ling the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the presenting in strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength or the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength or the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength or the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength or the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of the strength or the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of th   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>Tangering,  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Histchinen,<br>318 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 537<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>Londen, 714 F.24 1558<br>P.s., In re Campolongo,<br>435 A.24 581  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Domn in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice,<br>all to stemp of Court and the is indexed to be sertice,<br>all to stemp of the Court and the indexed to be sertice,<br>all the court of the co   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appeal of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powen &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline; Invyer<br>Discipline; Invyer<br>Autical proceeding<br>powers &<br>precognives;<br>Tampering<br>Discipline; Invyer   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525<br>D.C., In re Hatchison,<br>518 A.24 995<br>N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527<br>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br>London, 714 F.24 1558<br>Pa., In re Campolongo,  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be netratice<br>of no atom of six months, all as spaces result,<br>and a strengt of Evidentiany Dialogy, et al.<br>J. Jammy 25, 1992, which is hereby incorp-<br>ing and herein and analy part hereof.<br>This court imposed a finity-<br>ic and herein and analy part hereof.<br>This court imposed a finity-<br>ic and herein and analy part hereof.<br>This court imposed a finity-<br>tic and herein and analy and the strength incorp-<br>ing and herein and analy main the strength<br>instruction of pusice.<br>This court imposed a finity-<br>tic and the strength in the strength in the strength<br>instruction of pusice.<br>This court is a strength in the strength in the strength<br>instruction of pusice and a purpose has been<br>instruction of pusice of the strength in the strength<br>instruction of pusice is a strength in the strength in-<br>terior to pusice is a strength in the strength in the<br>strength in the strength in the strength in the strength<br>in the strength in the strength in the strength in the<br>strength internet is a strength in the strength in the<br>strength internet is a strength in the strength in the<br>strength in the strength in the strength in the strength in<br>the strength in the strength in the strength in the strength in<br>the strength in the strength in the strength in the strength in<br>the strength in the strength in the strength in the strength in<br>the strength in the stren   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appent of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | powen & precogitive; Centempt Discipline; Invyer   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525           D.C., In re Hatchinen, 518 A.2d 995           N.J., In re Mintz, 101           N.J. S27           C.A. 11, U.S. v.           Londen, 714 F.2d 1538           Pa., In re Campolongo, 435 A.2d 581           Pa., Commonwealth v.   | fratient or justice, the Court finds will born in comport Court and the is indexed to be sentence<br>of no stormed of court and he is indexed to be sentence<br>of no storm of six months, all a supposes results<br>in the memory of the Monting Tharmag, et<br>al and herein and mode part hereof.<br>This court imposed a thefty -<br>in the particle stores of the memory of the<br>indexed herein and mode part hereof.<br>In the particle stores of the memory of the<br>indexed herein and comportantical funds of<br>the memory 's conduct had perpetitude a fraud of<br>the memory is the store of the memory of the memory<br>error, mining a fable chain of physical inability<br>to rand trial cocasis of methodesing south arg<br>error, mining a fable chain of physical inability<br>to rand trial cocasis of the method of R 1 -<br>102 (A) (3) and adversity reflexing on this fit<br>individue of the store of R 1 -<br>102 (A) (3) and adversity reflexing on the fit<br>individue of the store of R 1 -<br>trandom and the store of R 1 -<br>the percenting and thus did not countities of<br>the proceedings and thus did not countities of<br>the proceedings and thus did not countities of<br>the proceedings and thus did not countities of<br>minimization of injustice of the main the store of<br>the store of violation of the individue of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of<br>the store of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of t   | Recalling past sanction.<br>Disciplinary proceeding.<br>Appent of conviction under s. 1503.<br>Reveral of contempt finding.   | power & precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Auficial proceeding<br>proceeding<br>proceeding.   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525           D.C., In re Histchinon, 318 A.24 995           N.J., In re Mintz, 101           N.J. 527           C.A. 11, U.S. v.           Landen, 714 F.2d 1558           Pa., In ro Campolongo, 415 A.2d 581           Pa., Commonwealth v.           Stormson, 393 A.2d 386   | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertice.<br>of to a term of six months, all as appears exoch-<br>only in the transcript of Evidentity Jiharing, et<br>al., January 25, 1922, which is breely incorp-<br>paration of the sertice of the sertice of the sertice<br>of the attemp's constrained appropriate of frant of<br>the attemp's constrained and perpendent<br>of the attemp's constrained and perpendent<br>interimes' constrained and perpendent<br>interimes' constrained and perpendent<br>interimes' constrained and perpendent of the attempt<br>interimes' constrained and perpendent of the attempt<br>interimes' constrained and the attempt of the attempt<br>of multi-attempt of the attempt of the attempt of the attempt<br>interimes' attempt of the attempt of the attempt of the attempt<br>interiment of partice, as welfasting attempt of the attempt<br>interiment of partice and the attempt of the attempt   | Recalling past sanction. Disciplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction under s. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of   | power & precogitive;<br>Centerept<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Daticial preceeding<br>powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Tamporing<br>Discipline, lawyer  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983                         | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D.C., In re Histchison,<br/>318 A.24 995</li> <li>N.J., In re Mintz, 101</li> <li>N.J. 537</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Lenden, 714 F2d 1558.</li> <li>P.s., In re Campolongo,<br/>435 A.24 581</li> <li>P.s., Commonwealth v.<br/>Stevensen, 393 A.24<br/>386</li> <li>C.A. I, Brodzion<br/>Swings Back v. Feat, New Sect.</li> </ul>   | fratiset or platice, the Court finds will born in comport Court and the is ordered to be sentence<br>of no stermed of a months, all as spears, exceld-<br>al and the sentence of the short stermer of the sentence<br>of the stermer of a months, all as spears, exceld-<br>ing and herein and mode part hereof.<br>This court imposed a ladity -<br>our platice of the short stermer of the stermer<br>of platic stermer of the stermer of the short stermer<br>in hardient stermer on the stermer of the short stermer<br>initiation of platice.<br>Respondent 'n indication of marketing another g<br>error, rating a false chain of marketing another g<br>error, rating a false chain of physical inability<br>to that drift occusion of marketing another g<br>error, rating a false chain of physical inability<br>initiation of platice.<br>That of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>102 (A) (5) and adversely reflecting on this fal-<br>ing and the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>102 (A) (5) and adversely reflecting on this<br>of adjuggent given in violation of DR 1 -<br>102 (A) (5) and adversely reflecting on the fal-<br>se of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the the stermed stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the the stermer of the 1 -<br>bolarisation of given of the stermer of the 1 -<br>stermer of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the stermer of the 1 -<br>ther of the stermer of the stermer of the stermer of the stermer<br>of the stermer of the stermer of the stermer of the sterme  | Recalling past sanction. Disciplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction under s. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of   | power & proceptive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983                 | COCAP<br>COCAP                   | 584 F. Supp. 525           D.C., In re Hitchison, 518 A.2d 995           N.J., In re Mintz, 101           N.J. 227           C.A. 11, U.S. v.           London, 714 F.2d 1538           Pa, In re Commonwealth v.           Stormon, 593 A.2d 581           Pa, Commonwealth v.           Stormon, 593 A.2d 386           C.A. 1, Drockton   | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Domn in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice.<br>all to stemp of Court and the is indexed to be sertice,<br>all to stemp of Court and the is indexed to be sertice,<br>all to stemp of the Court and Diagna (et al.<br>and the court and the part here of the court and the temp of the court finds of the temp of the court of the   | Recalling past sanction. Disciplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction under s. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of   | power &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Tampering<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>precogitive;<br>Centempt   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983                 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | 584 F. Supp. 525           D.C., In re Hitchinen,<br>518 A.2d 995           N.J., In re Mintz, 101<br>N.J. 527           C.A. H, U.S. v.<br>Londen, 714 F.2d 1538           Pa., In re Campolongo,<br>435 A.2d 581           Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Stevenen, 593 A.2d<br>366           C.A. I, Brockten<br>Savings Back, F. Fol,<br>Marvisk, Mitshen Fel, M.   | fratise of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice.<br>all on storm of six months, all as spaces could be all the sertices of the sertice of  | Recalling past sanction. Disciplinary proceeding. Disciplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction under s. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of contempt finding. Expounding dectrine.   | powen & proceptive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding<br>proceeding, proceeding, proceedin  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Hotchinon,<br/>318 A.24 995</li> <li>N. J., In re Mintz, 101</li> <li>N. J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Landon, 714 F.2d 1558</li> <li>P.a., In ro Campolongo,<br/>415 A.2d 581</li> <li>P.a., Commonwealth v.<br/>Storemen, 393 A.2d<br/>386</li> <li>C.A. 1, Focklon<br/>Saving Biak, v. Feat,<br/>Marvide, Minthell &amp;<br/>C., 71 F.2d</li> <li>N.H., State v. Patkharet,</li> </ul>   | fratise of puice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice.<br>all on kerner of six months, all as spease result, which is the sertice of the sertice  | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Exposuling arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Exposuling dectrine.  Finding that guilty pleas waive all bat juristicational defects remaining  | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persons &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persongative;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Judicial proceeding  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Histchison,<br/>318 A.24 995</li> <li>N. J., In re Mintz, 101<br/>N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Lenden, 714 F.2d 1558.</li> <li>P.a., In re Campolongo,<br/>435 A.2d 581</li> <li>P.a., Drenmonwealth v.<br/>Stevenson, 393 A.2d<br/>386</li> <li>C.A. I, Brockton<br/>Swings Back, Feat,<br/>Marwick, Mitchell &amp;<br/>Co., 771 F.2d 5</li> <li>N.H. Sate, v. Pathaent,<br/>121 N.H. 621</li> </ul>  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertice of a some of six months, all as spaces could could be an entropy of the domain of the properties of the domain of the domain of the domain of the properties of the domain of the properties of the domain of the domain of the properties of the domain of the domai   | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Assessing arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Expounding dectrine.  Finding that pulty plens waive at bot   | powen & precogitors;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>Discipline, Lowyer<br>precogitors;<br>Contempt<br>Sudicial proceeding<br>precogitors;<br>Contempt  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Histchison,<br/>518 A.24 995</li> <li>N. J., In re Mintz, 101<br/>N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Landen, 714 F.2d 1558</li> <li>Pa., In re Campology,<br/>435 A.2d 581</li> <li>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br/>Stevensen, 393 A.2d<br/>386</li> <li>C.A. 1, Dockton<br/>Swings Back v. Path<br/>Marwisk, Minkell &amp;<br/>Co., 771 F.2d 5</li> <li>N.H., Sate v. Pathlant,<br/>121 N.H. 821</li> <li>La, State v. Walliam,<br/>Paminting a defendant</li> </ul>   | fratise of puice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice.<br>all on kerner of six months, all as spease result, which is the sertice of the sertice  | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Exposuling arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Exposuling dectrine.  Finding that guilty pleas waive all bat juristicational defects remaining  | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persons &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persongative;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Judicial proceeding  |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Hutchison, 518 A.24 995</li> <li>N.J., In re Mintz, 101 N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. H, U.S. V. London, 714 F.2d 1538</li> <li>Pa., In re Campolongo, 435 A.24 581</li> <li>Pa., In re Campolongo, 435 A.24 581</li> <li>C.A. I, Brockten State, 121 N.H. 821</li> <li>La, State V. Williams, Parniting at definitional to proclaim his gialt in gat finition.</li> </ul>  | fratise of puice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sertice.<br>all on kerner of six months, all as spease result, which is the sertice of the sertice  | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Exposuling arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Exposuling dectrine.  Finding that guilty pleas waive all bat juristicational defects remaining  | powen & prevogative;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persona &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persona &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Tampering<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>percogative;<br>Centempt   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983         | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>S84 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Hotchinen,<br/>318 A.24 995</li> <li>N. J., In re Mintz, 101</li> <li>N. J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Lenden, 714 F.2d 1558</li> <li>P.a., In re Campolongo,<br/>425 A.2d 581</li> <li>P.a., In re Campolongo,<br/>435 A.2d 581</li> <li>C.A. 1, Brockton<br/>Swings Back v. Feat,<br/>Marwick, Michell &amp;<br/>C., 771 F.2d 366sdart<br/>121 N.H. Stat v. Williams,<br/>Formitting a defendant<br/>topol cort and still<br/>social activities in Biology.</li> </ul>  | fratise of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertice of a simulation of six months, all as spaces could be also the sertice of a simulation of six months, all as spaces could be also be related to the sertice of the  | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Exposuling arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Exposuling dectrine.  Finding that guilty pleas waive all bat juristicational defects remaining  | powen & prevogative;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persona &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>persona &<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Tampering<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>percogative;<br>Centempt   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | <ul> <li>JS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Histchison, 518 A.24 995</li> <li>N.J., In re Mintz, 101 N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v. Landon, 714 F.2d 1538</li> <li>Pa, Landon, 714 F.2d 1538</li> <li>Pa, L. Commonwealth v. Stevenson, 393 A.2d 581</li> <li>C.A. 1, Diodatin Science, Pathwork, T. 14, Stat. 82, Nat. 71 F.2d 5</li> <li>N.H., Stevenson, 714 F.2d 5</li> <li>N.H., Stevenson, V. Pathaert, 11 N.H. 82 v. Williams, J. 11 N.H. 82 v. Williams, J. 12 N.H. 82 v. Williams, Jong en cent and still.</li> </ul>   | fratiset or platice, the Court fixed scale Doom in comport of Court and the is indexed to be sentine.<br>all no stormet of a monthis, all a separate scench with the interplate of the solution of the sentine of the sentence   | Recalling past sanction. Dissiplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction unders. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of contempt finding. Expounding doctrine. Finding that pathy plens waive all bat jurisdictional defects: remaining defective guilty plen.   | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>proceeding<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>powers &<br>proceeding<br>proceeding<br>powers &<br>proceeding<br>powers |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP          | <ul> <li>PS4 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Histchison, 518 A.24 995</li> <li>N.J., In re Mintz, 101 N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v. Landen, 714 F.24 1538</li> <li>Pa, In re Campolyney, 415 A.24 531</li> <li>Pa, In re Campolyney, 415 A.24 531</li> <li>C.A. 1, Breckler M. 201336</li> <li>C.A. 1, Breckler M. 201336</li> <li>C.A. 1, Breckler M. 201336</li> <li>C.A. 1, Breckler M. 201437</li> <li>Steiner V. Billenk, P. Fal, 1384</li> <li>F. N. H., Ster V. William, 14944</li> <li>Parimiting A defaulter in Big and Ster William and Engen cost and still avoid envicement in Big and Envitement in Big and Envitemen</li></ul> | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be netratice<br>of to a store of six months, all as spaces could<br>all a storem of six months and as spaces could<br>be stored to the store of the store of the store of the<br>distribution of the store of the store of the store of the<br>distribution of the store of the store of the store of the<br>distribution of the store of the store of the store of the<br>distribution of the store of the store of the store of the<br>distribution of purices. The store of the store of the<br>matter of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the<br>matter of the store of the store of the store of the store of the<br>matter of the store of the store of the store of the store of the<br>matter of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the<br>matter of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the store of the store of the store of the store<br>of the store of the st   | Recalling past sanction. Dissiplinary proceeding. Appeal of conviction unders. 1503. Reveral of contempt finding. Assessing arguments on appeal of contempt finding. Expounding doctrine. Finding that pathy plens waive all bat jurisdictional defects: remaining defective guilty plen.   | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Discipline, Insyer<br>Di   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | <ul> <li>S84 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Hitchison, 518 A.24 995</li> <li>N.J., In re Mintz, 101 N.J. 527</li> <li>C.A. H, U.S. V. London, 714 F.24 1558</li> <li>Pa., In re Campolongo, 415 A.24 581</li> <li>Pa., In re Campolongo, 415 A.24 581</li> <li>C.A. I, Drockton Saving Back V. Foll, Marvick, Mitchison, 593 A.24 386</li> <li>C.A. I, Brockton Saving Back V. Foll, Marvick P. 21 N.L. 201 La., State v. Walharet, Paratilag a defindant void convictin in incompulse with the ores of methanismization of pattice.</li> </ul>  | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertice.<br>of to a strong of Court and the is indered to be sertice,<br>all a strong of six months, all a suppose scetch<br>organism of the court and the indered to be sertice,<br>and the strong of the strong of the strong bin-<br>generating of the strong of the strong bin-<br>metry of the strong of the strong bin-<br>ter of the strong of the strong bin-<br>ter of the strong of the strong bin-<br>ter of the strong of the strong bin-<br>metry of the strong of the strong bin-<br>net of the strong bin-<br>ter of the strong bin-<br>strong of the strong of the strong bin-<br>metry of the strong bin-<br>metry of the strong bin-<br>metry of the strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-strong bin-<br>bin-strong bin-<br>bin-strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-strong bin-<br>bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>strong bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bin-<br>bi | Recalling past sanction.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Dissiplinary proceeding.  Appeal of conviction unders. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Exponenting arguments on appeal of contempt finding.  Exponenting dectrine.  Finding that guilty pleas waive all bat juristicational defective guilty plea.  Affenning trial judge's replacement of | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Auficial proceeding<br>proceeding<br>powers &<br>promptive;<br>Tangeting<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer   |
| 1986<br>1986<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983<br>1983 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | <ul> <li>S84 F. Supp. 525</li> <li>D. C., In re Hotchinen,<br/>318 A.24 995</li> <li>N. J., In re Mintz, 101<br/>N.J. 327</li> <li>C.A. 11, U.S. v.<br/>Lenden, 714 F.2d 1558</li> <li>P.a., In re Campolongo,<br/>425 A.2d 581</li> <li>P.a., In re Campolongo,<br/>435 A.2d 581</li> <li>C.A. 1, Brockton<br/>Swings Back v. Feat,<br/>Marwick, Michell &amp;<br/>C., 771 F.2d Schwart, Michell &amp;<br/>C., 771 F.2d Schwart,<br/>2015 Nucl. 821</li> <li>La, State v. Williams,<br/>Permitting a defendent<br/>open conet and still<br/>incompatible with heat<br/>owal advantation in</li> </ul>   | fratiset of purice, the Court finds and Doom in comport of Court and the is indered to be sertice of a some of six months, all a spaces acceld, a same of six months, all a spaces acceld, a six of the sertice of the  | Recalling past sanction.  Disciplinary proceeding.  Disciplinary proceeding.  Appent of conviction under s. 1503.  Reveral of contempt finding.  Expoanding doctrine.  Finding doctrine.  Finding doctrine.  Finding doctrine.  Afferming trial judge's replacement of abeat jury.  | powen & prevogitive;<br>Centempt<br>Centempt<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Auficial proceeding<br>proceeding<br>powers &<br>promptive;<br>Tangeting<br>Discipline, Invyer<br>Discipline, Invyer   |

|            | Pa., In re Anonymous<br>No. 65 D.B. 75,<br>Disciplinary Board of                 | Respondent did not advise [C] that the statute h<br>ad expired, nor what radions could be taken to pr<br>otoch his interest. It is charged that respondent 's<br>action involved a violation of : a. D.R. 1 -<br>102 (A) (5) — Engage in conduct that is preju   |   |  |
|------------|--|--|---|--|
| 1977 COCAP | the Supreme Court of<br>Pennsylvania   | dicial to the administration of justice . b. D.R. 1 -<br>102 (A)(6)  | Board outlining basis of liability.   | Discipline, lawy                               |
| 1987 COCAP | E.D. Mich, Snider v.<br>Lone Star Art Trading<br>Co., Inc., 659 F. Supp.<br>1249 | Although not an entirely impossible mission, suc<br>h a task would make the administration of justice<br>by the Court an extremely arduous task  | Assessing the elaboration of RICO's<br>test beyond its current scope.   | Judicial proceed<br>application of<br>doctrine |
| 1982 COCAP | Barkr. E.D. Mich., In re<br>Rutter, 25 B.R. 244,                                 | Analysis Lifting the Stay for Cause : Administration of Justice 11 U.S.C.; § 36.2 (d) states : One courd of a party interest and after notice and a having, the courd shall grant relative, modifying to the star of the state of  |   | Judicial proceed                               |
|            | lad., In re Moody, 428   | From the foregoing findings we now find that Re-<br>opendem filed the lowsuit when he knew that his<br>action would merey serve to hazas and makiciou<br>nby injure others, engaged in conduct prejudicial<br>to the administration of justice, which adversely<br>reflects on his fitness to practice hav, and, by fil-<br>ing a lowsuit against a judge for conduct occurrin<br>g in the performance of his judicial capacity, and<br>anced a ckinn which is uncommuted under exist.   |   |  |
| 1981 COCAP | N.E.2d 1257  | ng law .   | Assessing complaint against attorney.   | Discipline, lawy                               |
|            |  | Based on the facts outlined above , we agree with<br>the commission of determination than Lanca viol<br>and the following provision of the Lawa Code of<br>Perforsional Responsibility for Lawayers : EC 1 –<br>5 (requiring high standards of peofessional cond<br>nos ). DR 1 –<br>102 ( A ) ( 1 ) (violating disciplinary rate ) ; DR<br>1 –<br>102 ( A ) ( 3 ) (prohibiting conduct involving m<br>craft tarpitade ); DR 1 –<br>102 ( A ) ( 4 ) (embihiting disclosesty , frand , d  |   |  |
|            | Ia., Committee on<br>Professional Ethics v.                                      | eceit or misrepresentation ); DR 1 -<br>102 ( A ) ( 5 ) ( prohibiting conduct prejudicial t  |   |  |
| 1987 COCAP | Lucas, 420 N.W.2d 781  | o the administration of justice ) ;  | Commission's findings (affirmed).   | Discipline, lawy                               |
| 1983 COCAP | C.A. 6, White Motor<br>Corp. v. Citibank, 704<br>F.2d 254                        | of justice within this Circuit requires that the atta<br>ched rule for the administration of the bankruptc<br>yayatem in this Circuit be adopted by the Distric<br>t Courts " Order of the Justicial Council of the<br>Sixth Circuit , December 21, 1982.  | Recalling Judicial Council, C.A. 6<br>determination.  | Judicial council<br>determining rule           |
|            | N.C., State v. Norville,   | Nor is there the slightest reference in his remarks<br>to burdens on the administration of justice, to w<br>asted court resources, or to the necessity of emp  |   | Judicial proceed                               |
| 1987 COCAP | 321 N.C. 92  | anelling another jury in the event of a mistrial .   | Upholding instructions of trial judge.  | procedure                                      |
| 1977 COCAP | C.A. 8, Baker v.<br>Wyrick, 547 F.2d 428   | Such proof might support a reasonable inference<br>that Negroes are excluded from juries for reasons<br>wholly unrelated to the outcome of the particular<br>case on trial and that the peremetry system is be<br>eing used to deny the Negro the same right and o<br>pportanily to participation in the administration of j<br>ustice enjoyed by the white population.  | Expositing rationale of peremptory challenges.  | Judicial proceed                               |
| 1987 COCAP | Ala., Vienna v. Scott<br>Wetzel Services, Inc.,<br>740 P.2d 447                  | and 4 ) the effect on the administration of justice<br>of a retroactive application of the new rule of law   | Discussing retroactivity standard,  | Judicial proceed<br>retroactivity              |
|            | Mich., SL Bar<br>Grievance   |  | Reciting rules that govern professional   |  |
| 1979 COCAP | Administrator v. Del<br>Rio, 407 Mich. 336                                       | (5) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the a<br>dministration of justice .   | conduct in review of determinations<br>thereof.   | Discipline, lawy                               |
|            |  | Out of a concern for the "practical administratio<br>n of justice," we conclude, with the trial judge  |   |  |
| 1981 COCAP | Oh., St. v. Fox, 68 Ohio<br>St. 2d 53  | here, that not enough evidence was introduced t<br>o warrant the requested instruction.  | Affirming jury instructions of trial judge.   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure                  |
|            | S.D.N.Y., In re Lion   | In the letter, the movants renew their application<br>n to withdraw the reference because this will furt<br>here the efficient administration of justice and con-<br>tend that " [ ijndeed, the practical consequence of<br>f the withdrawal of the reference is that it should<br>obvient the need for the prosecution and resolution<br>or appeals from the bankruptcy judge's determ  |   | Kalista -                                      |
| 1985 COCAP | Capital Group, 48 B.R.<br>329  | ination that the proceedings below are core proce<br>edings "  | Finding movants' motion<br>unreasonable, and so denying it.   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure                  |
|            |  | In State v. DeLemba, 117 R.I. 673, 370 A. 2d 1<br>257 (1977), the Rhode Island sepreme court, r<br>dying in part on Column, adopted the requirem<br>of the seprement of the and sepreme court, and<br>the second second second second second second<br>to harmonic and the contrained risk of the recording<br>to harmonic and the contrained risk of the recording<br>recording until althe the criminal risk of the recording<br>recording until althe the criminal risk of the level of a<br>courted plant. The until respect to the level of a<br>courted plant "the until respect to the level of a<br>second second altheory of the level of the level of a<br>second second altheory of the level of the level of a<br>second second altheory of the level of the level of a<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second second<br>second second second<br>second second second second second second second second second second<br>second second |   |  |
|            |  | constitutional deprivation , is nevertheless so rea  |   |  |
| 1980 COCAP | Ala., McCracken v.<br>Corey, 612 P.2d 990  | I and substantial that it calls for action by us on p<br>ublic policy grounds and in furtherance of our res<br>ponsibility to assure a sound and enlightened ad<br>ministration of justice. "Id. at 1275.  | Resolving constitutional question,<br>raised below, of coordination of<br>probation and criminal proceedings. | Judicial proceed<br>procedure                  |
| OCAP       | 54449, 512 F.M 990   | Inquiries would also promote the effective admin   | received one common processings.  | Proceeds                                       |
|            |  |  |   |  |
|            | Nev., Harvey v. State,   | istration of justice by resolving most conflict situ<br>ations at the earliest possible stage of the proceed   | Reversing and remanding for want of   | Judicial proceed                               |
| 1980 COCAP |  | istration of justice by resolving most conflict situ<br>ations at the earliest possible stage of the proceed<br>ings<br>The Respondent objects to the funding that his co-   | Reversing and remanding for want of<br>separate trials below.   | Judicial proceed<br>procedure                  |

ingo ingo ingo the separatement objects to the meaning that has co-nduct in refuning to produce the records was 'py objective that the separatement of particle 'in viola-tion of DR 1 -102 (A) (S) and 'conduct that adversely refle-ests on his fitness to practice law 'in violation of DR 1 - 102 (A) (S). We belowe that the restrictive view is the content with the restrictive view is the the content of the second the second second second second second second second second the second sec

, that it can not , only encourages multiplicity of litigation and waste in the administration of just

ermination below

ild suppoer cases

ting review of disciplinary

ing rule for visitation and

Discipline, lawyers

udicial pro

COCAP

Del., In re Kennedy, 442 A.2d 79

an., Burnworth v. lughes, 234 Kan.

| Image: Second  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
|---|------|-------|-----------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| Image: Second  |      |       |                       | The reneated assertions by Mr. Evans even after       |  |                      |
| Image: Construct Source of Superation of the very nutries with the source of  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| isolation         isolation         isolation         Reserve remeasing discipling         Reserve remeasing discipling           1986         COCAP         F.2 and 30.         Section of the se  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: Second  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image spontaneous solution of the second s   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Instrument         Instrum   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1986         COCAP         Fab Tilds         extablished melles of two, make it apparent that<br>ME. Evens acted originally, and continues to ast<br>originatic in visibilities. In a way that is repredicted to the administration<br>of jardee in visibilities. In a way that is repredicted to the administration<br>of jardee in visibilities. In a way that is repredicted to the administration<br>of jardee in visibilities. In a way that is repredicted to the administration<br>of action of the series of the series of the series of the<br>control, 66 RF. Springer, 1995         Discipline, lawyers           1995         COCAP         E.A. In S. Cornel, U.S. v.<br>Cornel, 05 S. Springer, 1995         Discipline, lawyers         Affering disciplinary findings below. Discipline, lawyers<br>ment attency could serve a the prediction for the administration<br>of the integrably damaged.         Affering disciplinary findings below. Discipline, lawyers<br>ment attency could serve a the prediction for<br>administration of the administration of price serve the<br>original findings of the law and the bas as<br>and can were than bacena visit align to the inter<br>est of the first administration of price serve (mp)<br>with a server the server of the price server that<br>with a server the server of the price server that<br>the visit of the corner with price server that<br>with a server the server of the price server that<br>the visit of the corner with price server that<br>with a server the server of the price server that<br>the visit of the server that server the server of the<br>rest on the server that a server the server of the<br>rest on the server that a server the server of the<br>rest on the server that a server the server of the price server that<br>the visit of the server the server of the price server the<br>set of the server the server the server the server the<br>server that a server the server the server the servere the<br>server the server the servere the server the<br>server the s  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: Problem State         Event and the function of the state inspect that the state inspect that the state inspect to the administration of proceeding of proceedi  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Mc. Exam acted originally, and continues to any<br>origination of products to the administration<br>of protection volution of DR 1 = 102 (A) (5)<br>Such consists or proposition to the administration<br>of protection of the second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second sec   |      |       |                       | ell -   |  |                      |
| Mc. Exam acted originally, and continues to any<br>origination of products to the administration<br>of protection volution of DR 1 = 102 (A) (5)<br>Such consists or proposition to the administration<br>of protection of the second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second second<br>protection of the second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>protection second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second sec   |      |       |                       | established rules of law , make it apparent that      |  |                      |
| C.A. 4, for Plann, 80.         is any that is precluded to the administration<br>of justice in volume of 10 for 10 (1 (1 (2 (1 (5 )<br>preclude)))).         Recounting reasoning or judge in<br>local, in re Carmoly,<br>State conduct is pregulated to the administration<br>of justice and relation of 20 for 1 (2 (1 (5 )<br>preclude)).         Recounting reasoning matcr blow.         Discipline, lawyers           1977         COCAP         S13 N.E.24 649         State conduct is pregulated to the administration<br>of justice and relation of the relation of the state<br>state is a state in the state is a state in the state<br>and state is a state in the state is a state in the state<br>and de interpretation of the entry United State Atta<br>e disqualification or generation.         Audicial proceeding<br>procedure           1985         COCAP         In summary Relation ON Swappers does risk a<br>relation are state attaget of the far advator of the state Attaget<br>and da ares trait became a trait judge in the inte-<br>e of the far advator of the state Attaget Attaget attaget attaget attaget attaget<br>of the far advator of the state attaget attaget attaget attaget attaget<br>attaget attaget att  |      |       |                       | Mr. Evans acted originally, and continues to act      |  |                      |
| 1996         COCAP         F.24 703         of justice in violation of DI 1 = 102 (A) (5.)         disciplina, lawyer         Disciplina, lawyer           9         COCAP         1.8 x 12.0 x 1.0 x 1.  |      |       | C A 4 In re Evany 801 |   | Recognition reasoning of index in      |                      |
| Incl., In rec.remoly,<br>1987 COCAP         Such conduct is pregulated to the administration<br>of junics and reflects adversely on his fitness to<br>practice law.         Affring disciplinary findings below.         Discipline, lawyers           1987 COCAP         51.N.E.24 649         Fredmenory. <i>If the dispublication of ong prov-<br/>ment attemp; yould serve as the products for the<br/>cological fictors of the entry. Unlist stars Atte-<br/>rupt of the stars Attemp, yould serve as the products for the<br/>cological fictors of the entry. Unlist Stars Atte-<br/>rupt of Office, the administration of junic work.<br/>Assessing and rejecting defendant?         Austeing model entry.         Justicial proceeding:<br/>procedure           1985 COCAP         1366         in summary. Richmond Nosopapers does not se-<br/>rate to apport defendant?         Austeing reasoning book of motion<br/>are of the first administration of junic wark<br/>ware processed in the serve in the serve of the<br/>serve to support defendant.         Austeing reasoning book of motion<br/>are of the first administration of junic serve in pro-<br/>reserve administration of junic serve in the<br/>serve to support defendant.         Austeing proceeding:<br/>procedure           1981 COCAP         So 2, VC. 529         It is usual provide first to the administration of junic<br/>are of the first administration of junic serve in the<br/>set of the first abuse of the serve of the serve in the<br/>set of the serve of the serve in the serve in the<br/>set of the serve of the serve in the serve in the<br/>set of the serve in the serve in the serve in the<br/>set of the serve in the serve of the<br/>set of the set of seadministraterin of prints<br/>wire first date of the set of the seadm</i>  | 1086 | COCAR |                       |   |  | Dissipling Immun     |
| Ind., In re-Carmody,<br>1987         of junction and reflects a derively on his filtness to<br>practice law.         Attriming disciplinary findings below.         Discipline, lawyers           1987         COCAP         51 N E.24 669         Full terms v., if the disqualification of one gover<br>ment attorncy could serve an be predicate forth<br>edisquification of the after United States Ata<br>ray v. Office, the admandation of printer word, Assessing and rejecting defindance'<br>disquification regimests.         Junction of the after United<br>States and the advectoring of the after United States Ata<br>ray v. Office, the admandation of printer word. Assessing and rejecting defindance'<br>disquification regimests.         Junction of the after United States Ata<br>ray v. Office, the admandation of printer word. Assessing and rejecting defindance'<br>disquification regimests.         Junction of the after United States Ata<br>ray v. Office, the admandation of printer word. Assessing and rejecting procedure<br>word and a new trial because a trial julg in the inter<br>or the off admandational discustoring block of motion<br>and of a new trial because a trial indivision of printer word.         Junctical proceeding<br>procedure           1981         COCAP         N.C., State v. Bumey,<br>disk and the programme of the opporting block of motion<br>the of 455 (a ) to indice see a contaction of the<br>treat undie 455 (b ) to -indice see a contaction of the<br>treat undie 455 (b ) to -indice see a contaction of the<br>treat undie 455 (b ) to -indice see a contaction of the<br>treat duscient of the distribution of printer.         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1982         COCAP         N.D. True, Chany, W.         The stratafact to be nach indivision of printer ad<br>adminitratinto of printer ad<br>treat duscient distributinterind of pr  | 1980 | COCAF | r.20 703              |   | anscipillary matter below.             | Discipline, lawyers  |
| 1987     COCAP     \$13 X.E.34 649     presente law     Alfraining disciplinary finding below. Disciplina, lawyer       1987     COCAP     \$13 X.E.34 649     interment attency cold serve an lay predicator for the control time of attency cold serve an lay predicator for the control time of time cold serve an lay predicator for the control time of time cold serve an lay predicator for the control time of time cold serve an lay predicator for the control time of time cold serve and lay predicator for the control time of time cold serve and lay predicator for the control time of time control time of time control time of time control tim control time contrel time control tim control time contr  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1985 COCAP         Commuts, v.<br>Curlos, 687 , Supp.         Littlementer, if the disqualification of one gover<br>moment attency could serve as the predicate for the<br>disqualification of the enter United States Atten<br>rays's Office, the administration of junice work.<br>Assessing and rejecting defination?         Judicial proceeding:<br>procedure           1985 COCAP         136         In summary, Richmend Newspaper does not se-<br>rue to support definations: distance that he be an<br>and a new trial because a trial judge in the inter<br>or to support definations: distance that he be an<br>and a new trial because a trial judge in the inter<br>or to support definations: distance that he be an<br>and a new trial because a trial judge in the inter<br>or to support definations: distance that he be an<br>and a new trial because a trial indice in U.S. st n.         Rejecting reasoning back, of motion<br>for reav trial.           1981 COCAP         N.C., State v. Dames,<br>adds and the presents?         Graphysics (L) ad 2 at 922, 1005 C) at 2330.         Rejecting reasoning back, of motion<br>or to the "argonames" of interpresents or distance presents<br>in the first 53 (a ) ho ne to tax any sectual conflicts.         Judicial proceeding<br>procedure           1981 COCAP         CA. 7, U.S. v. Marphy.<br>he truth and ad 55 (a ) ho read force an conclusion<br>that [ 455 (a ) is a concerned with preservitions of<br>the state and the observations of interpresents of the<br>state and the observation of the inter the information of patient<br>readones and bendrights to be most before test an another.         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1985 COCAP         First state and the observations of<br>the state include to be most before test state another.         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1987 C  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Adaessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Assessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Assessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the Inter Units State Atta State Atta         Assessing and Interpretation of Interpretatio   | 1987 | COCAP | 513 N.E.2d 649        | practice law .  | Affirming disciplinary findings below. | Discipline, lawyers  |
| Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Adaessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Assessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the artic Units State Atta         Assessing and rejecting defendant <sup>4</sup> Adaessing procedure           1985         COCAP         1366         Image: Interpretation of the Inter Units State Atta State Atta         Assessing and Interpretation of Interpretatio   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| D. Com., U.S. Y.<br>Cardo, 608 F. Shop         e. disquiffication of the entry United State. Atta<br>Provide State Atta<br>Bell Concer, 608 F. Shop         addicial proceeding<br>procedure           1985 COCAP         1366         In summary, Bitchmond Newspers does not so<br>rare suggest defendant 's demand that he be an<br>end of a wer table scares a trait just in the inter<br>est of the fair administration of justice may impor-<br>ser records limitations upon the access of the p<br>records and the scares a trait just in the inter<br>est of the fair administration of justice scot face<br>procedure         Rejecting reasoning back of motion         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1981 COCAP         RA X. 5, 29         RA X. 1, 20, 30, 30, 51, 30         Rejecting reasoning back of motion         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1981 COCAP         RA X. 5, 29         Rejecting reasoning back of motion<br>est other "apportance" of impropriety issues up<br>estimated a star trait of the access of the p<br>resonance in the administration of puic<br>estimated as traits and the proceeding,<br>procedure         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure           1981 COCAP         Rescar X. 10, 58, 74, 10, 58,   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Curics, 607, Supp.         rms <sup>-1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> VCIICs., the administration of justice wall. Assessing and rejecting defaultant <sup>-1</sup> Massessing defaultant <sup>-1</sup>   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1985         COC.AP         1346         de imparably damaged.         disputification arguments.         procedure           1985         COC.AP         1346         de imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the impact of the imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the impact of partice may impose the impact of the impact  |      |       | D. Conn., U.S. v.     | e disqualification of the entire United States Atto   |  |                      |
| 1985         COC.AP         1346         de imparably damaged.         disputification arguments.         procedure           1985         COC.AP         1346         de imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the impact of the imparably damaged.         in summary. Richmont Novsuppers to kor in the impact of partice may impose the impact of the impact  |      |       | Curico, 608 F. Supp.  | mey's Office , the administration of justice woul     | Assessing and rejecting defendants'    | Judicial proceeding: |
| 198         CA.7 U.S. v.         Ref. and the first administration of partice may import defendure 's default the beam of the first administration of partice may import default the second start partice in the internet of the first administration of partice may import default the second start partice in the second start partice is second start partice in the second start partice is second start partice in the second start partice is second start partite is second start partice is second start partice is second start  | 1985 | COCAP |                       |   |  |                      |
| 198         CCAP         N.C., State v. Barney,<br>and a new trial becarse a trial jobs in the inter-<br>set of the first administration of janics rung impo-<br>erreconside linearies trial becarse a trial jobs in the inter-<br>set of the first administration state of the source attrial jobs.         Rejecting reasoning back of motion         Judicial proceeding.<br>procedure           198         CCAP         N.C., S24e v. Barney,<br>alls and the press to a stringle first barney attributes the source attributes of the<br>erreconside lineary. Judy 20, 100 S (C) 200 S (  | 1500 |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 198         CCAP         N.C., State v. Barney,<br>and a new trial becarse a trial jobs in the inter-<br>set of the first administration of janics rung impo-<br>erreconside linearies trial becarse a trial jobs in the inter-<br>set of the first administration state of the source attrial jobs.         Rejecting reasoning back of motion         Judicial proceeding.<br>procedure           198         CCAP         N.C., S24e v. Barney,<br>alls and the press to a stringle first barney attributes the source attributes of the<br>erreconside lineary. Judy 20, 100 S (C) 200 S (  |      |       |                       | In summary, Richmond Newspapers does not se           |  |                      |
| 1981         COCAP         For several proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the first advances of the proceeding of the state of the st   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Sec. S. State         set of the fair administration of jusice may import<br>remeandle limitations upon the access of the p<br>rescandle limitations upon the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rescandle limitations upon the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rescandle limitations upon the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rescandle limitations upon the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the<br>rest of the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the<br>rest of the access of the p<br>rest of the access of the<br>rest of the rest of the rest of the rest of the<br>rest of the access of the<br>res of the rest of the rest of the<br>rest of the access |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| NC. State V Breney,<br>1981 COCAP         sc reasonable limitations upon the access of the p<br>while and the protein so a criminal rule (U.S. st n. L. R.)<br>(For rev trial.         Refer the state of the state of the state<br>procedure         Judicial proceeding.           1981 COCAP         S02 N.C. 529         It Wavary Powers 03 8.5 N.C. 15.2 at 1992, 1005 N.C. 14 2330.         For rev trial.         procedure           1981 COCAP         S02 N.C. 529         It Wavary Powers 03 8.5 N.C. 15.8 n.C. 14 2330.         For rev trial.         procedure           1981 COCAP         S02 N.C. 529         It Wavary Powers 04 the property issues in<br>the 14 45% (2.4) is concerned with perceptions in<br>the 14 45% (2.4) is concerned with perceptions.         Ite statistical powerships of the property issues in<br>the statistical to be met before itris manning of property indical conflicts.         Judicial proceeding<br>procedure           1985 COCAP         Res, Sentind Star Co. v.<br>merch halvy, therat to the assimistration of just<br>by the presen market on the statistical proceeding procedure in the statistical proceeding<br>procedure         Judicial proceeding<br>procedure           1997 COCAP         Res, Sentind Star Co. v.<br>merch halvy, therat to the assimistration of just<br>by the presen market of the titut in collection of this the property ince with the statistical proceeding procedure in market<br>mercedure distical rook, bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook, bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook, bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook, bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook bodges and there is a non-<br>market of distical rook bodges an  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| N.C., Stare V, Barney,<br>1981 COCCAP         addic and the press to a criminal trial U.S. at an<br>IR Equiciting reasoning block of motion<br>and the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the present of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the the present of the present of the present of the present of the present<br>of the the present of the present of the present of the present of the the the present of the the the present of the the present of the the the present of the the the the the the present of the the the the the the the the present of the  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1981     COCAP     302     X.C. 529     18,651     Ed. 2 at 0.92     100.5     Cut 0.92     precedure       1981     COCAP     302     X.C. 529     18,651     Ed. 2 at 0.92     100.5     Cut 0.92     precedure       1981     COCAP     647     352     100.6     The stance of precession of 0.503 (1 × 10.1000 regimes on or conclusion of 0.503 (1 × 10.1000 regimes on 0.500 regimes on 0.  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 110         Unit water provision of g 523 (2 ), which it applies in the "approximation" of mapping by its insue in the "approximation" of mapping by its insue in the "approximation" of mapping by its insue in the "approximation" of mapping by the second mapping by the third studies of the theorem of the second mapping by the theorem of the second mapping by the   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 198         Co.A. 7, U.S. v. Marph.         So to first "appearance" of impropriety issues in a definition of in rest of using state control or any state control or of the definition of in rest of using state control or or any state contend state contend state contrel or any state of the state contre   | 1981 | COCAP | 302 N.C. 529          |   | for new trial.                         | procedure            |
| 1982         COCAP         Cons. Space 2010         Texa constitution of just particular arrange particular distribution of just particular of just particular distribution of just particular distribution of just particular distribut particular distribut particular distributing particul  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| and the set of the se   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| ex. 7, U.S. v. Murph, be than statular with perceptions m1         Depending doctrine of varier for patential patient of juli genoming doctrine of varier for potential patient coefficies.         Judicial proceeding.           1985 COCAP         768 F.2d 1518         this statuated to be met before tirst mannehines of patient patient coefficies.         potential patient coefficies. <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>der § 455 ( a ) but not to any actual conflict of int</th><th></th><th></th></t<>  |      |       |                       | der § 455 ( a ) but not to any actual conflict of int |  |                      |
| C. A. T. U.S. V. Marphy. her thin actual defects in the administration of jul Exponding doctrine of value's of procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure is the construction of the administration of jul Field and other set of the processing procedure is a simulated to be need before text anaximum of 1 [14]. Somitid Buck Co. merch [Mex], there are not before text anaximum of jul Field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing process and procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing process and processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing processing is a simulated to field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulate of the administration of juli Field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field field of the simulation of julic is and the administration of julic constants and the administration of julic constant is matter processing processing procedure is matter processing and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is a simulated field guidt proceeding procedure is a simulated and procesing set of the administration of julic constant and processing p   |      |       |                       | erest under § 455 ( b ), reinforces our conclusion    |  |                      |
| C. A. T. U.S. V. Marphy. her thin actual defects in the administration of jul Exponding doctrine of value's of procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure procedure is the construction of the administration of jul Field and other set of the processing procedure is a simulated to be need before text anaximum of 1 [14]. Somitid Buck Co. merch [Mex], there are not before text anaximum of jul Field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing process and procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing process and processing procedure is a simulated to field guidt and the processing processing is a simulated to field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulate of the administration of juli Field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field guidt and the processing processing of state electron is a simulated field field of the simulation of julic is and the administration of julic constants and the administration of julic constant is matter processing processing procedure is matter processing and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is administration of julic constant and the electron is a simulated field guidt proceeding procedure is a simulated and procesing set of the administration of julic constant and processing p   |      |       |                       | that § 455 ( a ) is concerned with perceptions rat    |  |                      |
| 1985         COCAP         768 J 24 1518         tice         pocential justicial conflicts.         proceedure           1995         COCAP         768 J 24 1518         This standards to be met before test maniforment 1 reclomes can be adviriged in that the expression by the presentation continue" an intromolifier, and prinding trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was perfined by indice performance on the adviring trial court was performed by the performance on the adviring trial court was performed by the performance on the adviring trial court was performed by the performance of the adviring trial court was performed by advired by advired area regulated of the adviring trial court was adviring trial court or the adviring trial court area and the adviring trial court was advired by advired area regulation of the advired trial court adviring trial court or the adviring trial court area regulated to the adviring trial court area regulated to the adviring trial court area regulated to the adviring trial court or the adviring trial court area regulated to the adviring trial court area regulated to the adviring trial court areadvir performance to regive performance to regive pe   |      |       | C A 7 US v Mumby      |   | Exnounding doctrine of waiver for      | Indicial proceeding: |
| 11         The standard to be net Select Erst annotaniser1           reclones can be adrigide in that the spression by<br>ythe press must constitute " in immediate, not<br>present the spression by the press must constitute" in immediate, not<br>present the spression of just [Finding trial court was perfunctory in<br>desying press access.           1979 COCAP         Rooth, 372 So. 2d 100         ice.           1970 COCAP         Rooth, 372 So. 2d 100         ice.           1970 COCAP         Rooth, 372 So. 2d 100         ice.           1981 COCAP         Test contast molecling the spreyrisis of data contast for state characterization of the state spreyrisis of data contast for state characterization of the state.         Law enforcement/policy           1981 COCAP         Conn., State v.         State intelfective communication on the ad the characterization of policy.         Head description           1981 COCAP         Zoor Root Roo mphasized that experiments a region more.         1.2. Parisfield major administration of policy.         Head description           1981 COCAP         Zoor Root Root Root Root Root Root Root R   | 1085 | COCAP |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: space of the s   | 1500 | ecen  |                       |   | potential juoretai eotititetos         | protestie            |
| Here         y the prese must constitute " m immobile, nnt         diam grant of the present of the  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Ha, Senting Star Co. v. merely likely, direct to the administration of just Pinding trial courts was perfusionly in Justice proceeding: procedure courses of the second  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1979         COCAP         Rooth, 372 So. 2d 100         Soc.         denying prass access.         procedure           1979         COCAP         Rooth, 372 So. 2d 100         Fease counties perform a number of finct color.         procedure  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Texas contains perform a number of functions for<br>the state including the approximation of state electric<br>manufacture of state property laws, the con-<br>ments of state property laws, the con-<br>ments of state property laws, the con-<br>ments of state property laws, the con-<br>state , SH Supp.         Bread description           192 COCAP         220         Cons. State , SH Supp.         Bread description           1981 COCAP         229         State , SH Supp.         Bread functions of patter = The torse Supre<br>met Cont has emphasized that what counties and<br>metantic metantics of patter = The torse Supre<br>Cons. State , SH Supp.         Bread functions of patter = The torse Supre<br>metantic metantics of patter = The torse Supre<br>description         Bread functions of patter = The torse Supre<br>metantic protocols with a state of the administration of patter<br>exercises         Bread functions of patter<br>exercises         Bread<br>functions         Bread<br>funct   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: State State Including the representation of state cleads         Image: State State State Including State State Including State Includi  | 1979 | COCAP | Booth, 372 So. 2d 100 | ice .   | denying press access.                  | procedure            |
| Image: State State Including the representation of state cleads         Image: State State State Including State State Including State Includi  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 992         COCAP         1257         But collusion of state property taxes, the optimal forms, mean interaction of states ready, holdy and to firms, mean forms of mean interaction of states. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of state ready, holdy and state forms, mean interaction of states. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of state ready, holdy and state forms, mean interaction of states. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of state ready in the state forms, mean interaction of states. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of state ready in the state forms of the state. The Collusion of the state. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of the state forms of the state. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of state ready and the state of the state. The Texas Strep         Bit collusion of the state form of the state. The Texas Strep is the state of the state. The Texas Strep is the state of the state. The Texas Strep is the state of the state. The texas Strep is the state of the state. The texas Strep is the state of the state of the state. The texas Strep is the state of texas Strep is the state is the state strep is the state i   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| No. Tex., Came.         metrosition of state reads., brieflys, and ferritis, an         Here           V82 COCAP         State, 344: Supp.         and the administration of plates." The Texnes Supre-<br>in certain capacities they are agained from stats.         Law enforcement/policy.         Bread description           V82 COCAP         Conn., State v.         State, 164: Conn., State v.         State, 164: Conn., State v.         State, 164: Conn., State v.         Bread description           1981 COCAP         299         Conn., State v.         State interfective communication on not ad the<br>defreduit, the state or the administration of plate.         Below.         Law enforcement           1981 COCAP         299         corn., State v.         State instruction of parkies. The traver of the plate.         Identification of plate.  |      |       |                       | r the state including the supervision of state electi |  |                      |
| N.D. Tex., Curan. v.<br>Mark, S.M.F. Skyn, Curan. v.<br>Mark, S.M.F. Skyn, S.M. and Skyn, Skyn   |      |       |                       | ons, the collection of state property taxes, the co   |  |                      |
| N.D. Tex., Curan. v.<br>Mark, S.M.F. Skyn, Curan. v.<br>Mark, S.M.F. Skyn, S.M. and Skyn, Skyn   |      |       |                       | nstruction of state roads , bridges and ferries , an  |  |                      |
| State, 344: Supp.         nuc Courds has emphasized that them counties and<br>in creating approximation days are sufficient to the sufficient terms of the state.         Internet approximation days are sufficient to the sufficient terms of the state.         Hourd description           982 COCAP         200         State v.         State interflective communication can not ad the<br>Genoming. 183 Corem.         Hourd description         Hourd description           1981 COCAP         209         e.e.         Interflective communication can not ad the<br>e.e.         Hourd matching terms of the sufficient or a range<br>ound and the sufficient of the sufficient or a range of the sufficient of the sufficient or a range of the sufficient of thesufficient of the sufficient of the sufficient of the sufficient   |      |       | N.D. Tex., Crane v.   |   |  |                      |
| 1982         DOCAP         1237         in certain approxises they are agents of the state  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Cons., State v.         Stack intellective communication can not aid the<br>Gamming, 18.5 Cons.         Stack intellective communication can not aid the<br>ex.         Delow.         Delow.           1981 COCAP         299         Environment, Els to real administration of justif Ausscript police conduct in matter<br>ex.         Delow.         Delow.         Law enforcement           1981 COCAP         299         CA. 1, Feinnierei         All instruction of administrative arrange<br>administration of justice will be be served by a<br>volding the deplayication of administrative arrange<br>procedure         Judicial proceeding,<br>procedure         Judicial p  | 1092 | COCAR |                       |   | Law onforcement/nolicer                | Broad docarintion    |
| Genning, 183 Com.         def-Gedart, flue static or the administration of justi J. Assessing police conduct in matter<br>jost         Jost Coc/AP         299         ce.           1981 COCAP         299         ee.         Idovesting and the difficult<br>administration of justi J. Assessing police conduct in matter<br>administration of justi cell Most Best Policy         Law enforcement<br>administration of justi cell Most Best Policy         Law enforcement<br>administration particle administration arrange<br>Mass. Gen. Boyo, 643         Most Policy Policy         Justice administration arrange<br>procedure         Justice a  | 1982 | cocar |                       |   | isaw enroreemenoponey.                 | ibroau description   |
| 1981 COCAP         299         ve.         below.         Law enforcement           I Bowever, the instret of comity and the Elistent<br>administration of junitic will be the served by a         Instructure         Law enforcement           CA. 1, Feinteire<br>Barbard         coding the duplication of administrative arrange<br>or p. 282, arrays, in the served by a         Junisdiction and provide the served by a           Statistic Code         ments necessitated by such a requirement. 12. S Junisdiction adjunctive claims,<br>procedure         Judiction procedure<br>procedure           Statistic Code         CA, Cid-American<br>to head and be made without a full and compto-<br>ling comer Property Puer to the duar administration of junitic<br>VU v. Brown         the hearing under the duar administration of junitic<br>classers, it " (Coden v. 1Erbert (1960)<br>Development Corp., 18) 186 CAL app. 2448, ve51 S (Caller, 922) [Clarifying procedural requirements         Judictal proceeding.  |      |       |                       |   | A                                      |                      |
| However, the interest of comply and the difficent           administration of purke will be the served by a<br>G.A. I. Feinstein V.         voiding the duplication of administrative arrange<br>Mass. Gen. Boy., 643           [98] COCAP         F.2d S80, 463         mems necessitated by such a requirement. 12. S. Jurisdictional concerns in hundling<br>seep. S82, suppr. 13.           [98] COCAP         F.2d S80, 463         S63 service at mathematics the appendiments of a neces           Cal, Cal-American<br>Income Property Puer Puer Internet as the appendiments of a neces         Ver should not be made without a full and comple<br>Income Property Puer Puer Internet to a distributer of puer Internet.           VIT v. Brown         c lacktry requires it. " (Colners v. Herbert (1960)<br>Development Corep., 18) 186 Cal. App. 243, 896 [51 Cal. Ref. 922 [Clarifying procedural requirements         Judicial proceeding.  | 1077 | 00010 |                       |   |  |                      |
| Image: Second  | 1981 | COCAP | 299                   |   | below.                                 | Law enforcement      |
| C. A. J. Feinetini, v.         voiding the duplication of administrative arrange<br>Mass. Gen. Boys., 643         Judicial proceeding.           1981         COCA.P         F.2d S80, 463         mems necessitual by such a requirament. 12. S. Jurisdictinal concerns in hundling         Judicial proceeding.           1981         COCA.P         F.2d S80, 463         S80, suppr. 13.         medical malpractice claims.         procedure           Stressour a mildra se Ba appointment of a nece         In advecting the characterization of justic         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made without a full and comple         In the hearing under the due administration of justic         Ver should not be made withearing admini   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Mass. Gen. Borg., 63         ments necressitated by such a requirement. 12: S. Burisdictional concerns in handling procedure.         Judicial proceeding.           1981. COCAP         F.2d 880         egs. 882, users. 1.3.         medical malpractice claims.         procedure.           Cal., Cal-American         ver should not be made without a full and compile laboration of justice.         Ver should not be made without a full and compile laboration of justice.         Judicial proceeding.         Judicial proceeding.           VIL v. Brown         e clarity requires it " (Colarity. 1:2d res. 9:21) (Clarity ing procedural projerements.         Judicial proceeding.         Judicial proceeding.   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| 1981         COC:AP         F.2d S80         eeps. 882, uppr. 13.         medical malpractice claims.         procedure           Sciences an attract as the appointment of a roce<br>Income Property Puer I be the anarigmentizers the appointment of a roce<br>Income Property Puer I be the anarigment of the due administration of justic<br>VTV. Network         the hearing under science State St  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Sol servors a finiter as the appointment of a roce         Ver should not be made without a finit and complexity of the service of the service of the service mode without a finite of the service mode without a service of the service of the service mode without a service of the service of t  |      |       | Mass. Gen. Hosp., 643 | ments necessitated by such a requirement . 12 . S     | Jurisdictional concerns in handling    | Judicial proceeding: |
| So screen a stuffer as the appointment of a roce           Cal, Cal-American         wer should not be made without a fill and comple           Income Property Fund         the hearing unless the due administration of justic           VIL v. Brown         c learny traptices it. * ( Cohen v. Erfort ( 1960)           Development Corp., 18) 186 Cal. App. 2448, 965 [ Cal. Ref. v. 921 (Clarifying procedural requirements         Judicial proceeding.   | 1981 | COCAP | F.2d 880              | eep. 882, supra. 13.                                  | medical malpractice claims.            | procedure            |
| Cal, Cal-Anerican Ver Hould not be made without a full and compte<br>Income Property Puer II the hearing understood for a function of justic<br>VI v. Brown is clearly requires it " (Cohen v. 18rbsrt (1960)<br>Development Corp., 18) 116 Cal. Apr. 2448. 9651 S Cal. Ref. 9221 (Clarifying procedural requirements Judicial proceeding).   |      |       |                       |   | 1                                      |                      |
| Increme Property Fund le hearing unless the due administration of justic<br>VII v. Brown e clearly requires it. ** ( Cohen v. Herbert ( 1960<br>Development Corp., 138) 188 Cal. App. 2. 4488, 498 [8 Cal.Ryter. 922.] [Clarifying procedural requirements Judicial proceeding.   |      |       | Cal., Cal-American    |   |  |                      |
| VII v. Brown e clearly requires it . " { Cohen v. Herbert ( 1960<br>Development Corp., 138 ) 186 Cal. App .2 d 488 , 495 [ 8 Cal. Rpt . 922 ] Clarifying procedural requirements Judicial proceeding;   |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
| Development Corp., 138 ) 186 Cal. App .2 d 488 , 495 [ 8 Cal. Rptr . 922 ] Clarifying procedural requirements Judicial proceeding;  |      |       |                       |   |  |                      |
|   |      |       |                       |   | Clarifiing and and and                 | Individ more from    |
| 1982[CUCAP Cat. App. 30 208 . ) upon lower court. procedure   | 1002 | COCAD |                       | 7 100 Call App .2 0 400 , 495 [ 8 Call Apt . 922 ]    |  |                      |
|   | 1982 | LOCAP | Car. App. 30 268      | -7  | upon tower court.                      | procedure            |

|      |       |   | Despite the unfairness to intigants that sometimes   |   |                       |
|------|-------|---|--|---|-----------------------|
|      |       |   | results, the doctrine of judicial immunity is thou<br>ght to be in the best interests of ' the proper admi |   |                       |
|      |       |   | nistration of justice  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | . [ for it allows ] a judicial officer , in exercising t   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | he authority vested in him [ to ] be free to act up  | 1   |                       |
|      |       | W.D. Pa., Albright v.                   | on his own convictions, without apprehension of  |   |                       |
|      |       | Albright, 463 F. Supp.                  | personal consequences to himself. ' Bradley v.   |   |                       |
| 1979 | COCAP | 1220                                    | Fisher, 13 Wall, at 347.   | Affirming judicial immunity.                                    | Judicial proceeding   |
| 1717 | coera | 1220                                    | 1 he desirability of permitting a defendant ad   | randing judicial initiality.                                    | ruurenii proceediing  |
|      |       |   | ditional time to obtain private counsel of his choi  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | ce must be weighed against the public need for th  |   |                       |
|      |       | Pa., Commonwealth v.                    | e efficient and effective administration of justice  | Announcing balancing considerations                             |                       |
| 1983 | COCAP | McCool, 457 A.2d 1312                   |  | for finding counsel of one's choice.                            | Judicial proceeding   |
|      |       |   |  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | This court reemphasized in People v. Shrum ( 1   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | 957 ) , 12 III. 2d 261 , 265 , the belief that adequ   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | ate opportunity to defend is the first essential of t  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | rial fairness : " Speedy administration of justice i<br>s desirable , but the desire for speed must not be |   |                       |
|      |       | III., People v. Lott, 66                | s desirable, but the desire for speed must not be<br>allowed to impinge upon the constitutional requir     | Finding perfoir correction on dat                               | Judicial proceeding;  |
| 1077 | COCAP | III., People v. Lott, 65<br>III. 2d 290 | allowed to impinge upon the constitutional requir-<br>ement of a fair opportunity to defend . "            | counsel of unnoticed testimony.                                 | ovidentiary issue     |
| 1977 | COCAF | n. 20/270                               | cases of a sair opportunity to detend .  | cosmoci of timotecu testimoly.                                  | evidentiary issue     |
|      |       |   | The exclusion of the occupational groups and of  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | women with young children rests upon a factual f   | 1   |                       |
|      |       |   | inding by this court that jury service by these gro  |   |                       |
|      |       | E.D. Va., U.S. v.                       | ups would entail undue hardship , extreme incon  |   |                       |
|      |       | Computer Sci. Corp.,                    | venience or serious obstruction or delay in the fai  | Appeal based on defects in jury                                 | Judicial proceeding;  |
| 1981 | COCAP | 511 F. Supp. 1125                       | r and impartial administration of justice .  | selection.  | jury                  |
|      |       |   | While dimensioners are in second based based of a  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | This discretionary power is considered basic to t<br>he police power function of governmental entitie      |   |                       |
|      |       |   | s and is recognized as critical to a law enforceme   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | nt officer 's ability to carry out his duties. See A   |   | Referencing           |
|      |       |   | BA Standards for Criminal Justice . Standard 1 -   |   | President's           |
|      |       |   | 4.1 (2d ed . 1980); President 's Commission o  |   | Commission on Law     |
|      |       |   | n Law Enforcement and Administration of Justic   |   | Enforcement and the   |
|      |       | Fla., Everton v. Willard,               | e . The Challense of Crime in a Free Society 103   |   | Administration of     |
| 1985 | COCAP | 468 So. 2d 936                          | - 06 (1967).   | Apprising duties of police officers.                            | Justice               |
|      |       |   |  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | t stake is the honor of the government ^ ] public  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | confidence in the fair administration of justice , a   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | nd the efficient administration of justice   |   |                       |
| 1000 | COCAP | Cal., People v. Sanders,                | . ' [ Citations . ] " ( People v. Mancheno , supra ,   | Barriers of backup also assure                                  | Terry and second sect |
| 1987 | COCAP | 191 Cal. App. 3d 79                     | 32 Cal .3 d at p. 866 . )  | Review of broken plea agreement.                                | Law enforcement       |
|      |       |   | In Greenfield, supra, an attorney was suspended  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | from practice for three years for professional mi  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | sconduct and conduct prejudicial to the administr  | 1   |                       |
|      |       |   | ation of justice . After a judge had denied the att  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | orney 's motion in a pending action , Greenfield ,   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | along with another attorney, Rothstein, wrote t  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | wo letters to the judge accusing him without any   |   |                       |
|      |       |   | basis in fact of misconduct in office . The attorne  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | ys also prepared and circulated letters and affidav  |   |                       |
|      |       |   | its concerning the alleged misconduct to the presi   |   |                       |
|      |       | 0 4 4 h - h - m                         | ding judge of the court , as well as the Governor ,  |   |                       |
| 1007 | COCAP | C.A. 4, In re Evans, 801<br>F.2d 703    | the District Attorney, and the Judicial Conferen   | Collecting precedent to uphold instant<br>disciplinary finding. | Discipline, lawyer    |
| 1980 | LUCAP | r.26 /05                                | ce.<br>In passing the Act, Congress sought to promote  | disciplinary mining.  | Discipline, lawyer    |
|      |       |   | not only the defendant 's right to a speedy trial .  |   |                       |
|      |       | C.A. 11. U.S. v.                        | but also the public 's interest in the efficient adm   | Legislative history of Speedy Trial                             | Judicial proceeding;  |
| 1982 | COCAP | Gonzalez, 671 F.2d 441                  | inistration of justice .   | Act.  | procedure             |
|      |       | Cal., Cooper v. Cnty of                 |  | Rationale for lower court's strict                              |                       |
|      |       |   | The principle is founded upon a need for judicial  | compliance with instructions on                                 | Judicial proceeding:  |
|      |       | Los Angeles, 69 Cal.                    |  |   |                       |
| 1977 | COCAP | Los Angeles, 69 Cal.<br>App. 3d 529     | economy in the administration of justice .   | remand.   | procedure             |

|            |   | In broader terms , the statute 's purposes go beyo  |  |  |
|------------|---|---|--|--|
|            | Mass., Globe<br>Newspaper Co. v.  | nd protection of juvenile privacy to encompass th<br>e Stäte 's interest in sound and orderly administr<br>ation of justice ; ipost important, the statute help<br>s obtain just convictions for the types of crimes f<br>rom which the victims had often suffered at the h   | Expounding policy back of statute  |  |
| 1980 COCAP | Superior Court, 379<br>Mass. 846<br>Cal., In re Marriage of   | ands of the criminal justice system , while their a<br>sssail - ants had often gone free .<br>We also note the immense burden on the adminis  | limiting press access to some trials<br>while reviewing the same.  | Judicial proceedin<br>media access to                          |
| 1981 COCAP | Lee, 124 Cal. App. 3d<br>371  | tration of justice in our civil courts were such reli<br>tigation permitted .   | Rejecting fully retroactive application<br>of new rule.  | Judicial proceedin<br>retroactivity                            |
|            |   | <sup>a</sup> We have given complete retroactive effect to t<br>henow rule, regardless of good-<br>faith reliance by law enforcement authorities or the<br>degree of impact on the administration of juntifica-<br>eq, where the 'major purpose in new constitution<br>and testin is to overcrome an assect of the critini<br>and testin the solutiontially impairs its truth-<br>finding function and so raises sections questions<br>about the accuracy of guilty verdicts in past trials  |  |  |
| 1980 COCAP | Colo., People v. Hardin,<br>607 P.2d 1291   | . Williams v. United States , 401 U.S. 646 , 653 ,<br>91 S.Ct . 1148 , 1152 , 28 L.Ed .2 d 388 ( 1971<br>)  | Explaining doctrine concerning<br>retroactive application.   | Judicial proceedi<br>retroactivity                             |
| 1987 COCAP | Ark., Clark v. State, 291<br>Ark, 405   | The fires which it kindles must constitute an im<br>minent, not merely a likely, threat to the admini<br>stration of justice.   | Assessing when language rises to<br>contempt in review of contempt<br>conviction.  | Judicial proceedi<br>Contempt                                  |
| 1986 COCAP | Ala., Farleigh v.<br>Anchorage, 728 P.2d<br>637   | We have denied broader retroactive application o<br>f a new rule going to defendant 's right to a fair tr<br>ial on grounds of reasonable reliance by law enfor<br>rement officiatio on the old rule and potential im<br>pact on the administration of justice. See Lauder<br>dale. 548 P. 2 dat 383.   | Discussing retroactive application of a new rule.  | Judicial proceedi  |
| 1977 COCAP | N.C., N.C. St. Bar v.<br>Hall, 293 N.C. 539   | Both the court and the prosecuting atterney may<br>well define to accept such plots in cases where the<br>order administration of justice mights be imprope-<br>tly affected. for when the plots is accepted it is and<br>exploit which the law and accounte plotsing appre-<br>values the state of the second plotsing appre-<br>duction of the second plotsing appre-<br>duction of the second plotsing appre-<br>duction vehicles (20 % CC 100, 104, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100,   |  | Judicial proceedi  |
| 1984 COCAP | D.D.C., Laker Airways<br>Ltd. V. Pan Am. World<br>Airways, Inc., 604 F.<br>Supp. 280                    | The basic rationale for the exceptions related to t<br>he administration of justice is that the "unbinder<br>ed and untrammeled functioning of our courts in<br>part of the very foundation of our constitutional d<br>emocracy. "For it is clear that when a court is pre-<br>vented by outside pressure or other interference<br>from adjudicating claims between litigants before<br>it, the rule of law is significantly impaired.  | injunctions to evaluate whether<br>defendants were interfering with<br>administration of justice.                              | Judicial proceedi  |
| 1984 COCAP | Colo., People v. Barron,<br>677 P.2d 1370   | Criminal contempt consists of conduct that obstructs the administration of justice or tends to brin<br>g the court into disrepute.  | Reciting rules in review of erroneous<br>dismissal for supposed lack of<br>jurisdiction over matter brought by<br>information. | Judicial proceedi  |
| 1983 COCAP | Ala., Guidry v. State,<br>671 P.2d 1277   | g use cominante arceptine .<br>For the reasons we have expressed with respect to<br>our conclusion that the conduct involved here di<br>d not fail below an acceptable standard for the fa-<br>in and honeable anaminization of guitties, we co-<br>nedule that the conduct was not shocking and that<br>is placial integrity does not require suppression o<br>f the fruits flowing from it .  |  | Law enforcemen   |
| 1985 COCAP | Az., State c. Hooper,<br>703 P.2d 482   | Finally, we believe retroactive application of the<br>Chapple rule would have an undesirable effect up<br>on the administration of justice<br>Congress nau, nowever, sought to determine an   | Discussing retroactivity   | Judicial proceedi<br>retroactivity                             |
| 1982 COCAP | C.A.D.C., Nat'l Cable<br>Television Ass'n v.<br>Copyright Royalty<br>Tribunal, 223 U.S. App.<br>D.C. 65 | appropriate fee for jukeboxes for nearly 20 years<br>before setting on the figure in the Art. See I Co<br>pyright Law Revision : Hearings on H.F. 2223 B<br>effect the Subcomm . on Courts , Civil Likerities ,<br>and the Administration of Justice of the House<br>Comm . on the Judiciary , 94th Cong. , 1st Sess .<br>380   | Legislative history of copyright<br>provision.   | Referencing Hou<br>Committee on<br>Admininistration<br>Justice |
| 1977 COCAP | C.A. 5, Chapman v.<br>U.S., 547 F.2d 1240   | The Staprame Court 's test for whether a " new r<br>uk " in the area of criminal procedure is to be re-<br>nortively applied calls for the consideration of the<br>orient and and a (b) the central of the reliance be<br>one watandards. (b) the central of the reliance be<br>y law enforcement antiburities on the old standard<br>reliance of e c) the fercient of the reliance be-<br>ries of a c) the ferciencing the reliance be-<br>ready and the reliance be-<br>ready and the reliance be-<br>ready and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>of the reliance bergen and the reliance be-<br>ready and the reliance bergen and the reliance be-<br>ready and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the<br>reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance<br>the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen and the reliance bergen<br>and the reliance bergen and t |  | Judicial proceedi  |
| 1987 COCAR | Cal., Camarena v.<br>Sequios Ins. Co., 190  | As the Supreme Court in Bertero v. National Ge-<br>neral Corp., supra, 13 Cal. 3 dat pages 50 -<br>51, said : "The malicious commonement of a<br>civil proceeding is actionable because it harns the<br>individual against whom the claim is made, and<br>a dato because it threatens the efficient administr<br>itime of lowing.   | Rejecting argument for elimination of liability for malicious prosecution.   |  |
| 1987 COCAP | Cal. App. 3d 1089<br>Fla., In re Certificate,<br>467 So. 2d 286   | ation of justice.<br>These judicial officers are necessary for the prop-<br>er administration of justice, and we recommend<br>they be made permanent and funded by the state<br>relation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of the<br>relation of the properties of   | Recommending creation of new state<br>judges.  | procedure<br>Judicary generall                                 |
| 1984 COCAP | C.A. 4, U.S. v.<br>Carvalho, 742 F.2d 146   | Society wins not only when the guilty are convict<br>ed but when criminal trials are fair; our system o<br>f the administration of justice suffers when any a<br>ccused is treated unfairly.  | Reversing convictions because of<br>government's introduction of dubious<br>evidence.  | Judicial proceedi<br>evidentiary issue                         |
| 1978 COCAP | Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Garrison, 478 Pa. 356<br>C.A. 4, U.S. v.<br>Neiswender, 590 F.2d                | Under this subsection, allegedly contemptuous e<br>onduct will not justify imposition of summary cri<br>ninal contempt except where it causes an obstru-<br>ction of the administration of justice.<br>This "natural consequence," the government co-<br>niends, would have obstructed the due administr  | Announcing rule in overturning<br>contempt conviction.<br>Government's contentions regarding                                   | Judicial proceedi<br>Contempt<br>Judicial proceedi             |
| 1979 COCAP | N.C., Wright v. Am.<br>Gen. Life Ins. Co., 59<br>N.C. App. 591  | ation of justice.,<br>The physican - has did not bar this testimory,<br>and the court was not required as a prerequisite to<br>o its admission to find that disclosure of the infor-<br>mation was "necessary to a proper administration<br>or fustice."  | Rejecting challenges to introduction of<br>evidence.   | Tampering  |
| 1980 COCAP | Ill., People v. Laws, 82<br>Ill. App. 3d 417  | The court weighed the above factors and determined that not only would it penalize law enforcement agents who had acted in accord with the present state of the law, it also would amount to an overwhelming burden on the administration of justifies a lass charged that, by the foregoing acts, the Respondent violated Supreme Judicial Court R   | Recalling denial of retroactive effect<br>for impacts on law enforcement.  | Law enforcemen   |
|            |   | ule 3:17 (2), in that he engaged in misconduct i<br>n office and conduct prejudicial to the administra-<br>tion of justice which brings the judicial office int   | Recalling charge in disciplinary   |  |
| 1978 COCAP | Mass., In re Bonin, 375<br>Mass. 680<br>E.D. Pa., Stevens   | o disrepute .<br>Severance of this action into two actions and tran   | hearing of judge before another court.   | Discipline, judge  |

| 1980 COCAE | Minn., Krug v. Indep.<br>Seh. Dist. No. 16, 293<br>P. N.W.2d 26        | The rules of this court are designed to effectuate<br>the orderly administration of justice and do not c<br>ontrol its jurisdiction, for it retains the constituti<br>onal power to hear and determine, as a matter of<br>discretion, any appeal in the interest of justice  | Allowing appeal where defendant<br>could have raised all issues on appeal<br>of first judgment.  | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure        |
|------------|--|--|--|---|
| 1978 COCAF | C.A. 4, Doleman v.<br>Muncy, 579 F.2d 1258                             | The concurrence argued that aeither history, nor<br>the perpose of the wird fabates course, nor the<br>desired prophylactic utility of the exclusionary re-<br>lass argued or 10 wordt. Amendment claims, ner<br>any sound reason relevant to the administration<br>of patietic putilities of locard cours, concluteral r<br>eview of a state court conviction, to review asso-<br>or of the conductorary their spressively the same<br>names as it would or could have been utilized o<br>a direct review.  | Discussing the contrary view of the consurrence.   | Judicial proceedin                      |
| 1983 COCAE | D. P.R., Schneider v.<br>Colegio De Abogados<br>De Puerto Rico, 565 F. | Law 43, which as we know establishes the integr<br>ated har of Puerto Rico, charges the Cologio wit<br>h the daty of "cooperating ] in the improvement<br>of the Administration of Justice [ and ] to render<br>such reports and give such advice as the Govern<br>ment may require of it"<br>Eddh August and Hogeff were convicted of comp  | Describing the nonjudicial powers of<br>lawyers and the bar.<br>Describing indictments for   | Judicary generally                      |
| 1984 COCAI | C.A. 6, U.S. v. August,<br>745 F.2d 400                                | iring to defraud the United States of the due adm<br>inistration of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §<br>371 (1982) (Count One).  | interference with blind draw system in<br>bankruptcy court and influence clerk<br>of court in duties.  | Judiciary generally                     |
| 1983 COCAF | N.J., Fellerman v.<br>Bradley, 191 N.J.<br>Super, 73                   | This court can not sanction the frustration of its o<br>refer (in this case a content order) by permitting<br>a post-judgment invocation of the attorney -<br>client privilege to unduly interfere with and restr<br>ic the proper administration of justice which it is<br>entrusted to foster.   | Rejecting postjudgment assertion of attorney elient privilege.   | Judicial proceedin,<br>procedure        |
| 1983 COCAF | Mass., in re Alter, 389<br>Mass. 153                                   | 1 Rule 401, § 12 (2), inserted by 365 Mass. 6<br>96 (1974), reach as follows: — The term sterm is using using with a follows: — The term sterm is using the order of a star of the physical star of the star of the physical star of the order of the orde | Citing in footnote the relevant rule<br>supporting revenal of judgment below<br>and two years' suspension, as por the<br>Board's recommendation. | Discipline, lawyer                      |
| 1982 COCAF | Wash., State v. Jones,<br>97 Wash. 2d 159                              | One situation where the proper administration of<br>justice requires the discharge of a jury is where t<br>hat jury is unable to agree on a verdict.   | Reviewing propriety of discharge of<br>jury.   | Judicial proceedin<br>jury              |
| 1985 COCAI | D. Nev., In re Santa   | Courts have inherent power in the interest of the<br>orderly administration of justice and under Rule  | they were improperly charged.  | Judicial proceedin<br>witness tampering |
| 1982 COCAF | Barbara, 94 F.R.D.<br>105  | 41 (b), FRCP, to dismiss for disobedience of it<br>s orders.   | Outlining remedial options.  | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure         |
| 1979 COCAF | Md., St. v. Hicks, 285<br>Md. 310                                      | Postponement of cases from dates scheduled for<br>trial is one of the major factors contributing to de<br>lay in the administration of justice, civil as well<br>as criminal.  | Discussing legislative history   | Judicial proceedin,<br>delay of         |
| 1987 COCAF | N.J., in re Rigolosi, 107<br>N.J. 192                                  | to the administration of justice. "<br>The Eleventh Circuit rejected Silverman's argu-<br>ment stating: " Silverman's proposed instruction<br>in incorrectly explained ' specific intent ' : it plac   | Outlining lawyor's complicity as<br>assessed in brite in trial and Board<br>review below.  | Discipline, lawyer                      |
| 1987 COCAF | C.A. 7, U.S. v. Machi,<br>811 F.2d 991                                 | ed the burden on the government to prove that th<br>e purpose and object of Silverman 's endeavor w<br>as to influence or obstruct due administration of j<br>ustice.  | Rejecting intent as mens rea in<br>obstruction.  | Judicial proceedin<br>witness tampering |
| 1984 COCAF |  | [11] I wholly fails to take into account the enorm<br>ous societal cost of excluding truth in the search<br>for truth in the administration of justice.<br>Just as important as the issue of prejudice is that<br>of the efficient administration of justice. In part<br>cular, we question the traditional assumption that  | Explaining the inevitable discovery<br>doctrine.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure         |
| 1987 COCAF | E.D.N.Y., U.S. v. Gallo<br>668 F. Supp. 736                            | t denial of severance in cases such as this promot<br>es effi ciency .   | Assessing motion for severance.  | Judicial proceedin,<br>procedure        |
|            |  | By reason of the foregoing Paragraph A, (1) yo<br>u have engaged in willful misconduct relating to<br>year official duty and persistent and public cond  |  |   |

ficial duty and persistent and public cond u dicial to the administration of justice th

st for retroactivity can be dealt v ce, as the Court noted in Hampt amount of past reliance will offu nd effect upon the administration

contends that his suspension from office spose a burden on other judges who wil upon to handle the caseload in the Eig I District and would perhaps result in d the administration of justice.

Award of Attorneys "Fees Against the Feder lovernment: Hearings before the Statecommit on Courts, Civil Liberties and Administration Justice of the House Committee on the Judici 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 32 (1980) ( iestimo of Sen. DeConcini )

brings the judicial office into disrepute ,

Ve have weighed the contesting views of the pu es in this matter and conclude that the administ ion of justice will best be served in the circum nees by the court 's exercise of its discretion to ermit defendant to except to the trial judge 's d of ethical rules in prac

f judge to

Discipline, judge

oactivity

Discipline, judge Referring to House enhcommittee on

ubcommittee ourts, Civil iberties and dministration

w by a sitting judge.

Whitaker, 46

of Claims, John M ieg, 224 Ct. Cl. 617

Mich., People v. Ric 101 Mich. App. 1

> .., In re Complain 1 N.W.2d 693

C.A.D.C., Action on Smoking and Health v Civil Acroanutics Bd., 724 F.2d 211

2d 1291

|        |       |   | This general rule , rather than depending upon an  |  |   |
|--------|-------|---|--|--|---|
|        |       | R.L. JWA Realty v. City   | y fundamental principle of the law of evidence , i   |  |   |
| I      |       | of Cranston, 399 A.2d   | s designed to expedite the orderly administration  | Discussing doctrine back of  | Judicial proceedin                                    |
| 1979   | COCAP | 479   | of justice in eminent domain proceedings .   | evidentiary rules.   | procedure   |
| 1517   | coera | 172   | Additionally, in view of the mass of evidence in   | erneening rules.   | processe  |
|        |       |   | the instant case , the efficient administration of j   |  |   |
| I      |       | Mo., State v. Garrette,   |  | Upholding finding that all counts were   | Yesticial measure fin                                 |
| 1000   | COCIN | 699 S.W.2d 468  |  |  |   |
| 1985   | COCAP | 099 S.W.20 468  | nded information at one time<br>At least in the limited context of sentencing, the   | part of a common scheme.   | procedure   |
| I      |       |   |  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | courts can recognize this inherent institutional bi  |  |   |
| I      |       | Mt., State v. Fitzpatrick,  | as and the debilitating effect that it has on the ad   |  | Judicial proceedin                                    |
| 1980   | COCAP | 186 Mont. 187   | ministration of justice .  | sentencing.  | procedure   |
|        |       |   |  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | Respondent was found guilty of violating DR 1 -  |  |   |
|        |       |   | 102 (A) (5), conduct prejudicial to the admin  |  |   |
|        |       |   | istration of justice , although the Committee state  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | d that it felt " considerable empathy for the respo-   |  |   |
| I      |       | Az., In re Riley, 142   | ndent in the circumstances in which these statem   | Basis of liability under conduct rules   |   |
| 1984   | COCAP | Ariz, 604   | ents were made   | for statements to reporters.   | Discipline, lawyer                                    |
| - 1001 | 000.0 |   | ente mere more   | Ter samemento to reportars.  | Deserptine, we ye                                     |
|        | 1     | 1   | Here , substitution was a matter of necessity , w  |  |   |
|        |       | Oh., State v. McKinley.   | here the due administration of justice made it im  | Finding no error in service of   | Judicial proceedin                                    |
| 1082   | COCAP | 7 Ohio App. 3d 255  | perative , and no prejudice resulted .   | substitutte judge.   | procedure   |
| 1984   | COCAF | 7 Onto App. 34 235  | perative, and no prejudice resulted.   | substitute Judge.  | procedure   |
|        |       |   | The Supreme Court stated in Santobello v. New  |  |   |
|        |       |   | York , 404 U.S. 257 , 92 S.Ct . 495 , 30 L.Ed .2   |  |   |
| I      |       |   | d 427 (1971), that "the disposition of criminal  |  |   |
| I      |       |   |  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | charges by agreement between the prosecutor an   |  |   |
|        |       | U.S. Army Ct. Crim.   | d the accused , sometimes loosely called ' plea b  |  |   |
|        |       | Rev., U.S. v. Lay, 10   | argaining , ' is an essential component of the ad  | Laying doctrinal background for  | Judicial proceedin                                    |
| 1981   | COCAP | M.J. 678  | ministration of justice .  | instant analysis of plea bargains.   | procedure   |
|        |       |   |  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | The Court is of the opinion that the question and  |  |   |
| I      |       |   | opinion contained in the Amended Order of Clari  |  |   |
|        |       |   | fication ( a copy of which is attached hereto and i  |  |   |
|        |       |   |  |  |   |
|        |       |   | s incorporated by reference [ see preceding order  |  |   |
|        |       |   | s incorporated by reference [ see preceding order<br>] ) involve issues of statewide application , whic  |  |   |
|        |       | Fla., St. v. Johnson, 8   |  | Court's order setting standards for  |   |
| 1984   | COCAP |   | ] ) involve issues of statewide application , which are of great public importance and will affect the   |  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP | Fla., St. v. Johnson, 8<br>Fla. Supp. 2d 116  | ] ) involve issues of statewide application , whic   | Court's order setting standards for<br>roadside intoxication tests.  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP |   | ] ) involve issues of statewide application , which are of great public importance and will affect the   |  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP |   | <ol> <li>involve issues of statewide application, which<br/>have of great public importance and will affect the<br/>e uniform administration of justice in this state.</li> <li>Neither the insurance companies nor their insure</li> </ol>  |  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP |   | J) involve issues of statewide application, which<br>have of great public importance and will affect the<br>e uniform administration of justice in this state.<br>Neither the insurance companies nor their insure<br>ds, the employers, are officers of the logal syste   |  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP |   | 1) involve issues of statewide application, which are of great public impertance and will affect the uniform administration of justice in this state. Neither the insurance companies nor their insure ds, the employers, are officers of the legal system, nor, unlike lawyers, are they governed by a state.   |  | Law enforcement.                                      |
| 1984   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116   | <ol> <li>involve issues of statewide application, while<br/>h are of great public importance and will affect th<br/>e uniform administration of justice in this state.</li> <li>Neither the insurance companies nor their insure<br/>ds, the employers, are officers of the legal syste<br/>m, nor, unlike lawyers, are they governed by a<br/>code of conduct casting upon them duties with re-</li> </ol>  | roadside intoxication tests.   |   |
|        |       | Fla. Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla., Bammac, Inc. v.  | 1) involve issues of statewide application, while<br>here of grapt upplic importance and will affect the<br>endform administration of juritice in this state.<br>Neither the insurance companies nor their insure<br>ds, the employers, are officers of the legal syste<br>run, or, unike lawyers, are they governed by a<br>code of conduct casting upon them duties with re-<br>port to the administration of justice beyond that  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to   | Judicial proceedin                                    |
|        | COCAP | Fla. Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla., Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274   | 1) involve issues of statework application, while<br>here of group topolic importance and will affect the<br>outflorm administration of justice in this state.<br>Neither the instruction of justice in this state,<br>do, the employers, are officient of the legal syste<br>m, nor, unlike lawyers, are they governed by a<br>code of conduct costing upon them duits with re<br>oppect to the administration of justice beyond that<br>required of the ordinary eitzers.  | roadside intoxication tests.   |   |
|        |       | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship  | 1) involve issues of statework application, while<br>here of grap tupbic imperstance and will affect the<br>e uniform administration of jurities in this state.<br>Neither the immune companies nor their insure<br>do the uniform state of the logal syste<br>order of conduct exiting upon them duties with re-<br>port to the administration of patient beyond that<br>required of the ordinary entities.   | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to   | Judicial proceedin                                    |
|        |       | Fla., Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla., Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.                                    | 1) involve issues of stativide application, white here of part public impertance and will affect the unifferm administration of justice in this state, and the state issues of the state of the states of the states of the states of the st  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure                       |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white are of para public importance and will affect the emiffern administration of junctice in this state. Notifier the insurance companies nor their insurance, the distance of the parameters of the state   | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   |       | Fla., Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla., Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.                                    | 1) involve issues of stativide application, white here of part public importance and will affect the unifferm administration of justice in this state, which is the instance companies nor their instance, do the outployer, are officers of the logal system, now, culdia lawyers, are they governal by a cole of conduct cating upon films duites with respect to the administration of pittice beyond that required of the ordering stitutes. Affair Secondly the false working much have do instruction of model to obstruct the administration.   | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.   | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure                       |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white have of party public importance and will affect the emifferm administration of junctice in this state. Neither the insurance companies run on the junctice is the state of th  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, while<br>net of gost public imperiators and will affect the<br>audiferm abacinistration of justice in this state.<br>Abache fait issues companies and their insure<br>day, the ampliynes, are efficator of the light years<br>or early a state of the state of the state back<br>or early a state of the state back of the<br>register of the ordinary eithern.<br>Add "secondly the line investment must have obt-<br>meted or inside 1 to obstrate the abachination is on<br>the state of the ordinary eithern.<br>Add "secondly the line investment must have obt-<br>meted or inside 1 to obstrate the abachination is on<br>the state of the ordinary eithern of the state of the<br>inside of the obstrate of the administration of<br>plantize It is the obstrate of plantice plant is the<br>state of the obstrate of the administration of<br>plantize It is the appears to the superior event fit<br>is a state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of a state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white are of party public importance and will affect the uniffern administration of juricie in this state. Neither the insurance companies run the logal system, nor, vanika insystem, are the organized and the state of   | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white net of pear public importance and will affect the unifferm administration of justice in this state. This is a state of the state of th  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewide application, white an edge para public impertance and will affect the outflern dashinistration of justice in this state, a bard para public is a state of the state of  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white net of pear public importance and will affect the unifferm administration of justice in this state. This is a state of the state of th  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewide application, white an edge para public impertance and will affect the outflern dashinistration of justice in this state, a bard para public is a state of the state of  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla. Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla. Barnwac, Inv. V.<br>Grady, 500 Sn. 2d 274<br>NJ, Kerr Skenndip<br>Co., Jac. V. John D.<br>Westhoff, R., 304 NJ.<br>Super. 300 | 1) involve issues of statewide application, white have of party public importance and will affect the outflern administration of justice in this state, a bard part public is a state of the part o  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of attorneys to<br>insinuate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of                    | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |
| 1986   | COCAP | Fla, Supp. 2d 116<br>Fla, Bammac, Inc. v.<br>Grady, 500 So. 2d 274<br>N.J., Kerr Steamship<br>Co., Inc. v. John D.<br>Westhoff: He, 204 N.J.            | 1) involve issues of statewise application, white net of pear public importance and will affect the emifferm administration of jurices in this stats. Notifier the insurance companies net their issues, and the employees, and effects of the logal system of the emission of the effects of the logal system of the emission of the emiss  | roadside intoxication tests.<br>Rejecting attempts of atomoys to<br>insignate themselves as parties.<br>Reciting legal standards in review of<br>contempt finding. | Judicial proceedin<br>procedure<br>Judicial proceedin |

| 1981 C         | OCAP | La., Corcoran v. Parish<br>of Jefferson, 405 So. 2d<br>667<br>C.A.D.C., Urban v.        | In the case of Tafaro's Investment Company, In<br>c. v. Division of Hosning Improvement, et al. 7,<br>61 Lu 103, 238-0 24 397 (Lu 1972) the Loui<br>niama Superma Court discussed the difference between<br>the lightitic and guideal fluctations of pub-<br>lic bodies tutting that when a judicial fluctation of<br>two-body, an an adge to guideal fluctation is<br>more and the procedural safegarant developed in the a<br>minimization of guideal guidean and the proceeding<br>SURGe 10 say 1004, in dealing with such a flags<br>and, the court's has on obligation to protect and p | Analysis of judicatory hearings at the<br>Parish level.                          | Judicial proceeding, procedure                           |
|----------------|------|---|--|--|--|
| 1985 C         |      | United Nations, 768<br>F.2d 1497  | reserve the sound and orderly administration of j<br>ustice  | Outlining appropriate response to<br>"prolific pro se litigants."                | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure                        |
| 198 <b>1</b> C | OCAP | Mich., People v. Young,<br>410 Mich. 363  | Retroactive application of the Fountain policy wo<br>uld have an adverse effect on the administration<br>of justice.   | Discussing retroactivity.  | Judicial proceeding;<br>retroactivity                    |
| 1985 C         | OCAP | E.D.N.Y., Latzer v.<br>Abrams, 602 F. Supp.<br>1314                                     | The founds in Richmond Newspapers, Iac. v.<br>Varginia, 448 U.S. 555, 105 S.C. 2344, 65 L.<br>Ed. 2 d 973 (1980), to which the coart maker a<br>reference in Remain, explicitly receptions that at<br>rial joige may, " in the interest of the fair admin<br>stration of putsice, imposer reasonable limitation<br>is on access to a trial "joint a" a government ma-<br>tricitiens upon the use of the streets in the interest<br>rictices upon the use of the streets in the interest<br>rictices as the first flow of ruffle. "   | Discussing limitations on press accoss to trials.                                | Judicial proceeding;<br>media access to                  |
|                |      | C.A. 5, U.S. v. Gaston,   | The indictment charges that Gaston " did wil –<br>fully and hnowingly corrupply endeavor to influe<br>no charty S47, a vinious before the said Crand that<br>Jary, i investigating allegad violations of the fall<br>e claims and files battements lives [] and thereby<br>corrupply endeavor to influence,i not thereby<br>ende the dua administration of justice [] in that<br>Gasten ] urged and advised Jahamy S47 to giver 6<br>abs testimony before said Ganda Jury in relation  |  |  |
| 1979 C         |      | 608 F.2d 607<br>Ill., Timothy Myers v.<br>Bridgeport Machines<br>Div. of Textron, Inc., | to the aforesaid violation. "<br>The roman nor conventess doctrine is equinate r<br>in nature (160 L. Joliavilla & Nashvillo R.R. Co.<br>(1988), 106 III. 2d 133, 146 ; People or rel<br>Achison, Topolak & Santa Fe Sp., Co. v. Clark (1<br>957), 12 III. 2d 515, 520 ) and allows courts t<br>o strike a balance between the convenience of the<br>Illigants and the efficient administration of jusci   | up on appeal.  | Judicial proceeding                                      |
| 1986 C         |      |   | e.<br>After versening the motions the court started (1)<br>that legislative continuence, "in this particular<br>and "world visitar (Reds L, 12). Text<br>Constitution providing that all courts shall be<br>in its lands, goods, represent or repeation, shall<br>have remedy by data course of hux, (2) that<br>that providing frequency expression of the<br>starting providing frequency in the legislators of<br>motions of procession," and (3) the said<br>motions for continuous; instring" with the<br>orderly administration of judice."  | Discussing state of doctrine.<br>Recalling proceedings below in mandamus action. | Judicial proceeding<br>Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure |
| 1983 C         | OCAP | Wyo., Osborn v. State,<br>672 P.2d 777  | When a patient and understanding judge gives ev<br>ery consideration to a defendant 's change of pos-<br>ition the day before 'trial and the defendant atte<br>mpts to mock the administration of justice, there<br>is no abuse of discretion.   | Evaluating procedural decisions<br>below.  | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure                        |

|     |         | Bankr. E.D. Mich., In re                           | apply ; the efficient administration of justice requ<br>ires that the Court and counsel look to one rule fo |  |                                   |
|-----|---------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
|     |         | Bankr. E.D. Mich., In re<br>Miramar, Inc., 70 B.R. | ires that the Court and counsel look to one rule fo<br>r time computation in bankruptcy — Bankruptcy        | Emploining mighting of managed                                   | Judicial proceeding:              |
| 198 | 7 COCAP | 32   | Rule 9006 .   | position.  | procedure                         |
|     |         |  | While the federal courts in the District of Colum   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | bia are called upon to handle a much larger perce   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | ntage of FOIA litigation and are therefore perhap   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | s more overburdened by in camera review in suc<br>h cases than most courts, see Weissman v. Centr           |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | al Intelligence Agency, 565 F. 2d 692, 697 n. 1   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | I ( D.C.Cir . 1977 ) , this Court has recently enc  |  |                                   |
|     |         | D. DeL, Coastal Gas<br>Station Corp. v. Dept. of   | ountered a disturbing increase in requests for in c<br>amera review in nonFOIA litigation which simila      | Discussion estimate for bosches of                               |                                   |
|     |         | Energy, 495 F. Supp.                               |   | government to demonstrate a                                      | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 198 | 0 COCAP | 1172   | ice in this District .  | document's exemption from FOIA.                                  | procedure                         |
|     |         |  | However, when the physical or mental condition  |  |                                   |
|     | 1       |  | of the patient is at issue in such action , suit or p   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | roceeding or when a court in the exercise of soun<br>d discretion, deems such disclosure necessary to       |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | the proper administration of justice , no informat  |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | ion communicated to , or otherwise learned by , s   |  |                                   |
|     |         | Me., State v. Gatcomb,                             | uch physician in connection with such attendance<br>, examination or treatment shall be privileged an       |  | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 197 | 8 COCAP | 389 A.2d 22  | d diselosure may be required .  | Discussing limits of privilege.                                  | procedure                         |
|     |         |  | However, a judge may also, through negligence<br>or ignorance not amounting to bad faith, behave            |  |                                   |
|     |         |  |   | Outlining bases of a judge's liability as                        |                                   |
|     |         | N.C., In re Inquiry,                               | ustice so as to bring the judicial office into disrep   | against canons and ethical                                       |                                   |
| 197 | 8 COCAP | 295 N.C. 291                                       | ute .<br>The waiver rule , as other like rules of procedure   | responsibilities   | Judicial conduct                  |
|     |         |  | , finds its justification upon the interest of a fair ,   |  |                                   |
|     |         | Ill., People v. Friesland,                         | orderly and expeditious administration of justice   |  | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 198 | 5 COCAP | 109 III. 2d 369                                    |   | in waiver of appeal  | procedure                         |
|     |         |  | Like the United States Supreme Court , Californi  |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | a courts use the following criteria to determine w<br>hether a new rule of decisional law in criminal ca    |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | ses should be applied retroactively : (1) the purp  |  |                                   |
|     | 1       |  | ose of the new rule , ( 2 ) the extent of the relianc   |  |                                   |
|     | 1       | Cal. Basela a Carros                               | e by law enforcement authorities on the old rule ,<br>and (3) the effect on the administration of justi     |  | Judicial proceeding:              |
| 197 | 9 COCAP | Cal., People v. Cooper,<br>94 Cal. App. 2d 672     | ce of retrospective application of the new rule .   | Discussing retroactivity.  | retroactivity                     |
|     |         |  | As we have seen , all of the duties pertaining to t   |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | As we have seen, all of the duties pertaining to t<br>he office of superior court clerk , whether essenti   |  |                                   |
|     | 1       |  | al to the office or specifically prescribed by statut   |  |                                   |
|     |         | Cal., Price v. Sup. Ct.<br>Madera Cnty, 186 Cal.   | e, are ministerial functions necessarily subject to<br>the control of the judges of the court so far as es  | Reviewing behavior of court                                      |                                   |
| 198 | 6 COCAP | App. 3d 156  | sential to the proper administration of justice .   | personnel.   | Judiciary generally               |
|     |         |  | The power that a court has over its judgments an  |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | d process notwithstanding, it is equally well esta  |  |                                   |
|     | 1       |  | blished that , in the interests of orderly administr  |  |                                   |
| 1   | 1       |  | ation of justice , Judges as a general rule should  |  |                                   |
|     |         |  | not disturb , vacate , reconsider or modify determ  | 1  |                                   |
|     |         | N.Y., People v. Versla                             | inations of a Judge of concurrent jurisdiction ( 28   | Outlining appropriate bounds of                                  | Indicial proceeding:              |
| 198 | 4 COCAP | N.Y., People v. Varela,<br>124 Misc. 2d 992        | inations of a Judge of concurrent jurisdiction (28<br>NY Jur 2d, Courts and Judges, § 86, p 153).           | Outlining appropriate bounds of<br>discretion in bail remission. | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure |
| 198 | 4 COCAP |  |   |  |                                   |

| mod by Rule 18 of the Federal Rules of Criminal<br>Procedure which states in part : The court shall f<br>ic the place of trial within the district with due re<br>C.A.7, U.S. v.<br>Babitrieri, 778 E20 witnesses and the promyt administration of justic [Reviewing district courts jury ]  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Procedure which states in part : The court shall T<br>is the place of trial whith the district with due re<br>C.A. 7, U.S. v. gapt to the convenience of the defendant and the<br>Bublistierit, 778 = 20 witnesses and the prompt administration of justic [Reviewing district courts jury ]   |                                   |
| ix the place of trial within the district with due re<br>C.A. 7, U.S. v. gard to the convenience of the defendant and the<br>Balistrieri, 778 F.2d withinsess and the prompt administration of justic Reviewing district courts jury J   |                                   |
| C.A. 7, U.S. v.<br>Balistrieri, 778 F.2d witnesses and the prompt administration of justic Reviewing district courts jury J  |                                   |
| Balistrieri, 778 F.2d witnesses and the prompt administration of justic Reviewing district court's jury J  |                                   |
|  |                                   |
|  | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 1985 COCAP 1226 e. selection. j  | jury                              |
|  |                                   |
| Because of this ease by ease approach, we are n  |                                   |
| ot pursuaded that affording Sandstrem retroactivi  |                                   |
|  | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 1983 COCAP Warden, 189 Conn. 374 the administration of justice . I Discussing retroactivity r  | retroactivity                     |
|  |                                   |
| Finding : Referee finds that the conduct of the Re   |                                   |
| spondent as outlined above would evidence cond   |                                   |
| uct 'prejudicial to the administration of justice w  |                                   |
| Minn., In re Complaint hich brings the judicial office into disrepute in vi Bar referee found misconduct   |                                   |
| 1979 COCAP, 296 N.W.24 648 olation of Canons [ Canon ] 3A ( 3 ) and ( 4 ). violative of ethical rules J  | Judicial discipline               |
|  |                                   |
| preserve client funds in an attorney 's special acc  |                                   |
| ount in violation of Code of Professional Respon   |                                   |
| sibility DR 9 -  |                                   |
| 102 ( A ) and 22 NYCRR 603.15 ; failing to pro   |                                   |
| mptly pay funds to which his client was entitled (   |                                   |
| DR 9 -   |                                   |
| 102 [ B ] [ 4 ] ); engaging in conduct involving   |                                   |
| dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation w   |                                   |
| hich adversely reflected on his fitness to practice  |                                   |
| law ( DR 1 -   |                                   |
| 102 [A] [4], [6]); and conduct prejudicial t   |                                   |
| N.Y., In re Baltimore, o the administration of justice in violation of DR  |                                   |
|  | Discipline, lawyer                |
| Wyo., Hoggatt v. State, Citing criterion for nolo contendere plea in   |                                   |
| 1980 COCAP 606 P.2d 718 footnote. Plca U   | Unclear                           |
| Wash., Rhinehart v. Moreover, we are not convinced that the Halkin   |                                   |
|  | Judicial proceeding;              |
| 1982 COCAP Wash. 2d 226 stice . Discussing retroactivity. r  | retroactivity                     |
| D.C., In re Ilutchison, Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the admi Citing in footnote basis for 303-day   |                                   |
|  | Discipline, lawyer                |
| T he guestion whether the conduct complaine  |                                   |
| Gn., Garland v. State, d of interfered with the administration of justice i Exploring factual basis for contempt J   | Judicial proceeding:              |
|  | Contempt                          |
|  |                                   |
| Monsanto has appealed from this order, contend   |                                   |
| ing that the order constituted an impermissible pr   |                                   |
| ior restraint of its right of free speech in that it w   |                                   |
| III., Kemner v. Norfolk as entered without the necessary showing of thre   |                                   |
|  | Judicial proceeding;              |
|  | press access                      |
|  |                                   |
|  |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5   |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5   |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>93 (Oki.Cr. 1980) , hidd that " [d] us to the ne   |                                   |
| This Court in Bower v. State, $606$ P. 2d 529, $5$<br>99 ( $C04$ Cr. 1980) ), $hdd that " (d) us to the noar certain detriments to the disformative shances o$   |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State, 666 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>93 ( Od. Cr. 1980 ), hdd that " [ d ] ne to the ne<br>ar certain detriment to the defendant's chances o<br>If receiving a time detriment and the administration Reciting standard of review for denial  | Judicial proceeding               |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>99 ( Odd Cr. 1980 ) , hold that " { d } ac to the no<br>ar certain detriment to the deformative 'kancase o<br>f receiving a fair defense and to the administration [Reciting standard of review for denial<br>Odda, Gilbreach v. n of justice, the defordant must clearly and uneq (of motion of defense coursel to<br>)   | Judicial proceeding;              |
| This Court in Bowen v. State, 666 P. 2d 589 , 5           93 ( Oki Cr. 1980 ), hdd that " [ d ] ne to the ne ar ar certain detriment to the defondant's chances of Freeeving a Tird detrime and to the administration of freeeving a Tird detrime and to the administration of the observation observation of the observation   | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure |
| This Court in Bower v. State, 606 P. 2d 589, 5           99 ( G&I Cr. 1980 ), held that " { d} are to the not ar certain detriment to the deformation that " schemace of the energy of the ener  |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State., 606 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>92 (CoLC r. 1990) ), hold that "1 d ] are to the ne's<br>ar certain detriminist to the deformative 'kunness'<br>(Okla, Cilbraudh v. )<br>1982 [COCAP State, 651 P.2d 699] with the state of the state o                             |                                   |
| This Court in Bower v. State, 606 P. 2d 589, 5           99 ( Oki Cr. 1980 ), hold that " { d} j to to the no<br>ar certain detriment to the defondent " & dances o<br>Freeevings a fair defines and to the administration [Recting standard of review for denial<br>oklas, Gilbreah v.           1982 COCAP         State, 651 P.2d 699           with a state state in the defondent must be releaved to the state state in the optimized state state in the state state in the optimized state state state in the state in the state in the state state in the state state in the state state in the state in the state state in the state in  |                                   |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>92 ( CGLC 7: 1980 ), hdd bat' [ 4 ] ate to the ne<br>ar certain detriminist the defaultant in Carlony and Lineage for the formation<br>of CGL and CGL 2010 (CGLC 7: 1980 ), hdd bat' [ 4 ] ate to the ne<br>ar certain detriminist the defaultant must character and the demonstration<br>of CGL 2010 (CGLC 7: 2010) (CGLC 7: 2010) (CGLC 7: 2010)<br>1982 (CGCAP (CGLC 7: 2010) (CGLC 7:                       |                                   |
| This Court in Bower v. State, 606 P. 2d 589, 5           99 ( Cold Cr. 1980 ), hold that " { d} are to the no ar a certain detriment to the deformation it & sharesco if receiving a flar defines and to the administration [Recifing standard of review for denial on of jutics, the defordant must clearly and uneq (of motion of defente coursed to a 1)           1982 (COCAP         State, 651 P.2d 699         invocally assert his demand to proceed pro set: " withdraw. If provide the the state state is the state state in the deformation must be related to a state state in the course jutging invocable. The relation is a state state in the state state is the state   |                                   |
| This Court in Bowers v. State, 660 P. 2d 589 ; 5<br>99 ( C64 Cr. 1980 ), hold that " [ d ] are to the ne<br>ar certain detriminent to the defaundant v shunces o<br>Oklas, Gilbreah v.<br>1982 COCAP State, 651 P.2d 699 and the defaundant structure of motion of defense accurate to<br>an of partice, the defaundant must be proved protect " withdraw.<br>Freeeving a first office and the defaundant of protect protect of the structure of<br>sources of the trickida by found party of cargoin<br>g in conduct target protection to the administration of j<br>unite; cargoing in conduct that adversely reflect<br>to the first protection of the structure of the structure of the structure of the structure of<br>the structure of the structure of          | procedure                         |
| This Court in Bowers v. State, 606 P. 2d 589, 5           99 (C64 C7, 1980), Judd that " [d] to to the not ar certain detriment to the deformation tark "schemes of the not ar certain deformation to the deformation tark control and the deformation tark and the detrivant unact quere detrivant on the quere stark of the deformation tark to the  |                                   |
| This Court in Bowers v. State, 660 P. 2d 589 ; 5           99 (C64 C7 - 1980 ), hdd hat " [ 4] ja to the ne ar a certain detriments the deflocation with a "denness" of motion of defense second to a doministration of defense second to a second and the second sec  | procedure                         |
| This Court in Bowen v. State , 606 P. 2d 589 , 5<br>92 (CoLC r. 1990) ), hold that "1 d ] as to the ne is<br>ar certain detriminity the deformant v chances of<br>courter of the detriminity of deformant v chances of<br>courter of the detriminity of deformant v chances of<br>the detriminity of deformant v chances of<br>an excellent detriminity of the deformation of the detriminity of the<br>environment was this cleant for grant value of the detriminity of<br>the detriminity of the deformation of the detriminity of the<br>environment was the schedule for an excellent value of the detriminity<br>of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity<br>of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity<br>of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity of the detriminity<br>of the detriminity of the det | procedure                         |
| This Court in Bowers v. State, 660 P. 2d 589 ; 5           99 (C64 C7 - 1980 ), hidd hat " [ 4] jue to the ne ar a certain detriments the defloating with a shances of freeeving a flair defines and to the administration of defense second to juically assert his demands on the defloating must children of the second provide the  | procedure                         |

|                              |                         |   | or investigation filed by the complainant with the   |  |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|                              |                         |   | Grievance Committee . The respondent 's condu<br>ct in case No. 83A -  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 56 violated C.R.C.P. 241.6 (1) (violation of the Code of Professional Responsibility) and C.R.   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | C.P. 241.6 (7) (failure to respond to a request f<br>rom the committee ), and DR 1 -   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 102 (A)(1) (violation of a disciplinary rule)<br>DR 1 -  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 102 (A) (4) (conduct involving dishonesty),<br>DR 1-   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 102 (A) (5) (conduct prejudicial to the admin<br>istration of justice), DR 1 -   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 102 ( A ) ( 6 ) ( conduct that adversely reflects o<br>n fitness to practice law )*, DR 6 -  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | 101 (A) (3) (neglect of legal matter), and D<br>R 7-   |  |  |
| 1985                         | COCAP                   | Colo., People v. Lloyd,<br>696 P.2d 249   | 101 (A) (2) (failure to carry out employment<br>contract with client).   | Bar Grievance Committee  | Discipline, lawyer   |
| 1985                         | COLAP                   | 0901.20249  | The entire purpose of the finality requirement of  | Dar Orievance Commisse   | Discipline, lawyer   |
|                              |                         | C.A.D.C., U.S. v.   | section 1291 is to " discourage undue litigiousne<br>ss and leaden -   | Concluding full review of evidence's   |  |
| 1983                         | COCAP                   | Richardson, 702 F.2d<br>1079  | footed administration of justice, particularly da<br>masine to the conduct of criminal cases."   | sufficiency would be available after a<br>final verdict.   | Judicial proceeding  |
|                              |                         |   | maging to the conduct of criminal cases . "<br>Professional responsibility does not countenance<br>the use of the attorney -   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | client privilege as a subterfuge and all conspiraci<br>es , either active or passive , which are calculated  |  |  |
| 1986                         | COCAP                   | La., State v. Green, 493<br>So. 2d 1178   | to hinder the administration of justice will vitiate<br>the privilege .  | Precis to evidentiary ruling.  | Judicial proceeding<br>evidentiary issue   |
|                              |                         |   | The proper administration of justice demands that  |  |  |
| 1977                         | COCAP                   | Ga., Wilkarson v.<br>Tolbert, 239 Gu. 702   | t courts have the power to enforce their orders an<br>d decrees by contempt proceedings .  | Upholding contempt order.  | Judicial proceeding<br>Contempt  |
|                              |                         | N.Y., People v. Le  | More important than any inhibiting effect on the<br>right to gather news is the public interest in the f   | Press privilege yields to defendant's  | Judicial proceeding  |
| 1979                         | COCAP                   | Grand, 67 A.D.2d 446  | air administration of justice .<br>Rule 14 requires the trial court to balance the rig   | need for exculpatory evidence.   | press access to  |
|                              |                         | N.D. Ga., U.S. v.   | ht of defendants to a fair trial absent the prejudic<br>e that may result from joint trials, against the pu  |  |  |
| 1984                         | COCAP                   | Caldwell, 594 F. Supp.<br>548   | blic 's interest in efficient and economic administ<br>ration of justice .   | The court severed sua sponte.  | Judicial proceeding<br>procedure   |
|                              |                         | Ala., Commercial<br>Fisherics Entry Comm'n  |  |  |  |
| 1984                         | COCAP                   | v. Byayuk, 684 P.2d<br>114  | the effect on the administration of justice of a ret<br>roactive application of the new rule of law .  | Discussing retroactivity.  | Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity   |
|                              |                         |   | Respondent 's actions as set forth above constitut<br>ed a course of conduct prejudicial to the administ   |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | ration of justice as well as neglect of a legal matt<br>or ontrusted to him in that respondent failed to pr  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | otect his client 's interest by filing an answer to t<br>he defendant 's request for admissions and left th  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | e jurisdiction without notifying his client that he<br>would be unable to appear to represent him at the   |  |  |
|                              |                         | Ind., In re Merritt, 266  | scheduled trial date and failed to direct his client   | Describing predicets conduct<br>justifying liability to sanction as a  |  |
| 1977                         | COCAP                   | Ind. 353<br>S. Ct. Northam  | to course) who cours represent the eitent at such trial .  | matter of law.   | Discipline, lawyer   |
|                              |                         | Pipeline Const. Co. v.<br>Marathong Pipeline Co.,   | The Framers chose to leave to Congress the pree<br>ise role to be played by the lower federal courts i   |  |  |
| 1982                         | COCAP                   | 102 S. Cl. 2858   | n the administration of justice .  | Discussing separation of powers  | Judiciary generally  |
|                              |                         | 1   |  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | As recently as Rose v. Mitchell , supra , the Sup<br>reme Court reaffirmed the longstanding fundame  |  |  |
|                              |                         | C.A. 11, U.S. v. Cross,   | ntal principle that discrimination in the administr<br>ation of justice harms the accused and undermine  | Assessing constitutional significance<br>of discriminatory jury foreman in trial   | Judicial proceeding  |
| 1983                         | COCAP                   | 708 F.2d 631  | s the integrity of the judicial process itself.  | below.   | jury   |
|                              |                         |   | This circuit and others have held that , when the<br>delay is short and the defendant does not show m  |  |  |
| 1000                         | 00010                   | C.A. 5, U.S. v.   | ore than minimal prejudice, reprosecution has lit<br>tle, if any, adverse impact on the administration   | Affirming dismissal without  |  |
| 126/                         | COCAP                   | Melguizo, 824 F.2d 370<br>C.A. 10. U.S. v.  | of justice and the administration of the Act.<br>The trial court must determine whether joint repr<br>esentation will adversely affect the effective and   | prejudice.   | Judicial proceeding<br>Judicial proceeding   |
| 1984                         | COCAP                   | Dressel, 742 F.2d 1256  | fair administration of justice .   | Reciting considerations.   | procedure  |
|                              |                         |   | We hold , under these circumstances , that judge<br>s already assigned and sitting on other cases or ot  |  |  |
|                              |                         |   | herwise engaged in the administration of justice i   |  |  |
|                              |                         | Pa Hamill Estate 3 Pa   |  | Deciding composition of en bane  |  |
| 1977                         | COCAP                   | Pa., Hamill Estate, 3 Pa.<br>D. & C.3d 100  | n this judicial district are not " reasonably availab<br>le " for serving as a court en banc .   | Deciding composition of en banc<br>court.  | Judiciary generally  |
| 1977                         | COCAP                   | Pn., Hamill Estate, 3 Pn.<br>D. & C.3d 100  | le " for serving as a court en banc .<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin  |  | Judiciary generally  |
| 1977                         | COCAP                   | Pa., Hamill Estate, 3 Pa.<br>D. & C.3d 100  | le " for serving as a court en banc .<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin<br>g evidence to persuade the panel and board he ha<br>s the proper understanding of and attitude toward   |  | Judiciary generally  |
|                              |                         | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,   | le "for serving as a court en banc.<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin<br>g evidence to persuade the panel and board he ha<br>s the proper understanding of and attitude toward<br>a the standards imposed on State Bar members a<br>nd can be safely recommended to aid in the admin   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of   |  |
|                              | COCAP                   | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>406 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.  | le " for serving as a court en bane.<br>Petitionen had the burden by clear and convincin<br>gevidence to persuade the parale and board he ha<br>s the proper understanding or and attitude toward<br>is the standards inspeed on State Bar members a<br>nd can be safely recommended to aid in the admi<br>minimization of justice.<br>It is evident that the orderly administration of just   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Grievance Doard.   | Judiciary generally<br>Discipline, lawyer  |
| 1979                         |                         | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>406 Mich. 256  | le " for serving as a court en banc .<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin<br>ge vidence to persuade the panel and how the bas<br>as the preper understanding of and attitude toward<br>a the standards imposed on State Bar members a<br>nd can be safely recommended to aid in the admi-<br>nistration of justice .   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Grievance Doard.   |  |
| 1979                         | COCAP                   | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>406 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.  | In "for everying as a court of hume."<br>Productions that the trade by softer and composition<br>periodices to i presented the small and humer the<br>the preper inductioning of and thitting the term<br>in the tradenth imposed on Sinde Darm members a<br>minimution of justice.<br>It is evident that the orderly administration of justice<br>is requires that a scinnized controveryery. Bits any<br>other highlington, some day computer to an suf-<br>th Recommending the appointment of a Special   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Orievance Board.<br>Denying reargument of validity of  | Discipline, lawyer   |
| 1979                         | COCAP                   | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>406 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.  | In "for everying as a court of hanc."<br>Petitioner had the budget had board board be-<br>entitive to present the period of the board be-<br>ing evidence to present the period of the board be-<br>ing the standards imposed on Sinde Dar members a<br>induction of justice. This is vision that the the final standard<br>interpretent that the orderly administration of just<br>other indigities Some day comparison of a sin-<br>or the average of the standard controversy. But any<br>other indigities some day comes to as moti-<br>har recommending the appointment of a Special<br>Matter, the Magnitude noted that while the Matter<br>or "recommending the infections could, as a technic  | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Orievance Board.<br>Denying reargument of validity of  | Discipline, lawyer   |
| 1979                         | COCAP                   | D. & C.3d 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower  | In "for storing as a court or hanc."<br>Petitioner had the budget hy clear and corrinkin<br>petitioner had the budget hy clear and source the ha<br>result of the storing of the storing of the storing<br>in the storing of the storing of the storing of the<br>interaction of justice.<br>It is a vident that the orderly administration of jus-<br>ice requires that a criminal controvery. But any<br>other lingtime, some day control as an other<br>more than the approximation of a special<br>Matter, the Magnitude rotation which the Matter<br>is recommending the appointment of a Special<br>Matter, the performed by a magnitude, at a clear<br>in a section of the section of the section of the section<br>of provide the theory of the section of the section of provide<br>and the section of provides to the perpenditude of the section<br>of provides to the performance of the section of the section of provides to the method.   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Orievance Board.<br>Denying reargument of validity of  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding  |
| 1979                         | COCAP<br>COCAP          | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>465 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super. 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.  | In "for storing as a court or hanc.<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and corrinatin<br>the proper molectuating of and artitude towards has<br>the proper molectuating of and artitude towards<br>in a storage of the storage of the storage of the<br>intraction of justice. The storage of the storage<br>intraction of justice are storage or an article to<br>intraction of justice are storage or an article to<br>intraction of justice. The storage of the storage<br>of the registers that are orderly administration of justice<br>are commonsching the appointment of a Special<br>Marcine Shafe and the storage that the storage<br>of the storage of the storage of the storage and the<br>storage of the storage of the storage and the<br>storage of the storage of the storage and the<br>storage of the storage of the storage administration of jus-<br>tice of the storage of the storage administration of justice<br>at matter to be performed by a magnitude, at the storage<br>of a magnitude is the two to rever the part of a storage administra-<br>tion of justice in this District to the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to be storage of program administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to be storage of program administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to break the storage administration of justice in the to be storage administration to administration of justice in the to be stor                                       | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Grievance Bond.<br>Denying reargancent of validity of<br>guilty plan.  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>Judicial proceeding<br>appointment of   |
| 1979                         | COCAP                   | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>466 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super. 545<br>S.D.N.V., Park-Tower<br>Development Georg.<br>Inc., v. Goldfeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 96  | In "for storing as a court or hanc."<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and corrinatin<br>it the proper understanding of and artitude towards<br>the standards import on State Dimensions and<br>instandards important of the state of the state<br>instanton of partice.<br>This avoides important of the state of the state<br>instanton of partice.<br>This avoides that the orderly administration of gives<br>increases that a state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of the state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of a constant of the state of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the state<br>of a magnetize the state of the state of the state of the state<br>is particular multi-million dollar layers at the state of the state<br>of the state of the state<br>of the state of the  | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Orievance Board.<br>Denying reargument of validity of  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>appointment of<br>special master  |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980         | COCAP<br>COCAP          | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>465 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super. 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.  | In "for storing as a court or hanc."<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin<br>it the prepare understanding of and artitude lowed<br>the the storader bisomethy and artitude lowed<br>the storader bisomethy and artitude lowed<br>in the storader bisomethy and artitude lowed<br>in the storader bisomethy and articular storage<br>and can be address through a storage and the storage<br>and can be address through a storage and the storage<br>and article of a storage and a storage and a storage<br>and article of a storage and a storage and a storage<br>and article of a storage and a storage and a storage<br>at a videor that the orderly administration of given<br>there, the skigation costs that which the Matter<br>at a videor storage and a storage and a storage and<br>a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a storage<br>at a storage at a sto                                   | court.<br>Denying reinstatement on advice of<br>Bar Grievance Bond.<br>Denying reargancent of validity of<br>guilty plan.  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>appointment of<br>special master  |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980         | COCAP<br>COCAP          | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>406 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.,<br>Edvington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Path-Tower<br>Development Group,<br>Inc., v. Goldfeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 56<br>N.C., Cox. V. Haworth,<br>304 N.C. 571                                       | In "for storing as a court or hanc.)<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and convincin<br>a produces to permate the panel and burde be ha-<br>the proper understanding of and stitude lowed<br>the test conductib inposed on State. Burneshere a<br>and on be safely recommended to all a the dash<br>infinition of paties:<br>It is aviden that the orienty administration of given<br>is avident that the orienty administration of a<br>special control of the state of the state of the<br>state of the state of the state of the state of the<br>states, the state of the state of the state of the<br>states, the states of the state of the state of the<br>states, the states of the states of the states of the<br>states, the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states of the states<br>of the states of the states of the states of the states                      | court. Degying trainstatement on advice of Bit Orientace Board. Deaving reargament of validity of guilty plea. Asseming statictions for default. Discussing retreactivity.   | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judisial proceeding<br>Judicial proceeding<br>appointment of<br>special master<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity               |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP          | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>496 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edington, 317 Pa.<br>Suppr. 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group,<br>Inc., v. Golffeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 56<br>N.C., Cox. V. Haworth,   | In "for serving an a court of hanc."<br>Petitioner had the budget has dear and convincin<br>petitioner had the budget has not all and budget has<br>a spinore to presente the parent and budget has<br>the induction improved on Sixile Dar normbers a<br>interaction of justice. This is a spinore that the induction<br>interaction of justice and the spinore spinore spinore<br>of the induction of the spinore spinore of a Special<br>Matter, the Nagistrate noted that while the Matter<br>and a magnetized spinore spinore of a Special<br>Matter, the performed by a magnitude, it was<br>a constrained in the induction of the spinore and<br>an example of the spinore spinore of a Special<br>Matter, the performed by a magnitude, it was<br>the spinore spinore spinore spinore and the spinore<br>of a magnitude "the to sover the period in the performance<br>of a spinore in the bit Diricit of allocates on the<br>period spinore spinore spinore spinore and the period<br>period spinore spinore spinore spinore spinore spinore<br>the employee spinore spinore spinore spinore spinore spinore<br>magnetized and the spinore spinore spinore spinore spinore<br>spinore spinore spinor                                | court. Degying trainstatement on advice of Bit Orientace Board. Deaving reargament of validity of guilty plea. Asseming statictions for default. Discussing retreactivity.   | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>Judicial proceeding<br>appointment of<br>special master<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity               |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for everying as a court of hume."<br>Petitioner had the budget hy clear and convincin<br>petitioner by another hy model and board be had<br>evidence to presentable the pared and board be had<br>the second second second second second second second<br>interaction of justice. The second second second second<br>of the second second second second second second<br>of the second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>method second second second second second second<br>method second second second second second<br>method second second second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>and an advance of the second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>and second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>method second second second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second second second second second second second<br>second second sec     | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for everying an a court of hanc."<br>Petitioner had the budge hy clear and convincin.<br>Petitioner had the budge hy clear and convincin.<br>The evidence to presente the proof and budge had<br>the conductive hyperbolic or Silke Dar norcheves a<br>interaction of justice.<br>It is avised that the orderly administration of justice<br>like conductive and the converse system of the pro-<br>off infiguration. Norm day converse, like any<br>other lingtion. Norm day converse to an end.<br>In recommending the appointment of a Special<br>Matter, the Vasgistrate toted that which the black<br>the sension by provided to the proper administra-<br>ation of prime to sorver the particular sys-<br>the administration of justice.<br>The absorbing the sorver discussion that reteres<br>the administration of justice.<br>The failing ordered that for concuss mining out of the<br>in accidence the conversidant. In ordered<br>to he like the administration of justice, the trial<br>lingto ordered that have ret discuss for the generation<br>of the induction of the conversidant of the sorver in the proof<br>of the like the administration of pristee, the trial<br>is accidence to convelidated.   | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for storing as a court of hanc."<br>Petitioner had the bundle hay clear and corrinatin<br>petitioner had the bundle has bundle has<br>the investigation happendic the bundle has bundle has<br>the investigation happendic to the burdle has the<br>hard started happendic to the burdle has and<br>investigation of justice.<br>It is avident that the orderly administration of jus-<br>tice avident content of the started happendic to the<br>investigation, so and also content overy. But any<br>other highting is a started to the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic the started<br>the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic to the started<br>happendic the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>happendic to a magnitud the the order of the started happendic to<br>the started happendic to the started happendic the started happendic to the started happendic to<br>happendic to a magnitud the started happendic to the started happendic the started happendic to the start                                   | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for everying an a court of hance."<br>Petitioner had the budden by clear and corrinatin<br>the prepare understanding of and artitude broader<br>that only a set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>interaction of justice.<br>It is a vident that the orderly administration of justice<br>the order that the orderly administration of justice<br>interaction of justice.<br>This a vident that the orderly administration of justice<br>or other additional concretency, the any<br>other highlightm, some day control to an end.<br>In concentration the populations of a Special<br>Matter, the bagestrate noted that which the black<br>is a resonance and the populations of a Special<br>Matter, the bagestrate noted that which the black<br>of a sequentiar by interaction of purposed<br>of a sequentiar by interaction of purposed<br>and a sequentiar by the black is a set of the second<br>of the second program administration of justice<br>and the second program administration of purposed<br>and the second program administration of the second<br>of the population of the second second second second second<br>with a population of the second second second second second<br>the administration of purpose. The second secon   | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for everying an a court of hance."<br>Petitioner had the bundles by clear and corritation<br>the prepare understanding of and statistic broader<br>that the prepare understanding of and statistic broader<br>and on the addyreconcernhold to usil in the addin-<br>tic prepare that the orderly administration of justice.<br>It is a vident that the orderly administration of and<br>the order addyreconcernhold to usil in the addin-<br>tic previses that a sequence of the orderly administration<br>of previses the adding of the orderly administration<br>of previses the orderly administration of a pre-<br>tice order that the orderly administration of a<br>intervention of the previses the orderly a set behind<br>all matter, the bagestrates of a dispected<br>Matter, the bagestrates noted that which the batter<br>of a recommendative functions could, as a technic<br>all matter, the performed by an anguitrate, it would<br>be also rejected distand." is constrained for the order<br>of the administration of patients, and the administration<br>of patients in this District to allocate some<br>with a performable." In order, the administration of patients, the ratio<br>taging ordered that for cause arising out of the<br>is accident to be consolidated.<br>While the dation of a lanyart to disclose facts regard<br>the falses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of relations). Counders and the states is a bar-<br>ner discloses (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections). Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard).<br>The disclose facts factor counder and the counder in the order discloses facts regard<br>discloses of reflections (Counder anguitry discloses facts regard).<br>The disclose fact factoreal travelotin                         | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Pa.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Goldform,<br>F.R.D, 36<br>N.C., Cec, V. Haworth,<br>30 N.C., Srie<br>S.C., Creed v. King, 267              | In "for everying an a court of hanc."<br>Petitioner had the burden by clear and corrination<br>or dispective periodic term of the burder by ha-<br>the prepare understanding of and attitude towards<br>the anomalest housemended to all as the solution<br>instruction of justice.<br>It is avident that the orderly administration of justice<br>interactions of justice.<br>It is avident that the orderly administration of justice<br>interactions of justice.<br>It is avident that the product of a Special<br>Marker, the Magdatom cost of an well-<br>she order that the product of a Special<br>Marker, the Magdatom cost of the well-the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Magdatom of the Special<br>Marker, the Magdatom cost of the well-the the Marker<br>of the order of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the marker of the Magdatom of the Special<br>Marker of the Magdatom of the Marker<br>of a magdatom is then to reare the particle of the<br>order and the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Magdatom of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Magdatom of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>theory of Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker of the Marker<br>of the Marker of the Marker                                 | court. Denying refinitizement on advice of Bar Grievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of guilty plus. Asserting sanctions for default. Discussing retroactivity. Revensing and remanding order for                                      | Discipline, Losyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrum of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                 |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 109<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edington, 317 PA<br>Super, 545<br>S.D. N.Y., Path-Troore<br>Development Georg.<br>Inc., v. Goldfeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 56<br>N.C., Coc. V. Haworth,<br>304 K.C. 571<br>S.C., 205<br>N.H., Echloman's Case, | b) "for evening as a court of hanc." Performer hat the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of | Court. Denying relationsent on advice of Derrying relationsent of validity of guilty plan. Assertsing sametions for default. Discussing relocativity. Revening and remanding order for consolidated trials below. Addressing failure to disclose | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apointnent of<br>apointnent of<br>proceeding<br>automativity<br>Judicial proceeding<br>proceeding             |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 100<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Ps., Commonwealth v.<br>Edrington, 317 Ps.<br>Super, 545<br>S.D.N.Y., Park-Tower<br>Development Group.<br>Inc., v. Gelder, V. Haworth,<br>304 N.C. 571<br>S.C. 205<br>S.C. 205  | b) "for everying as a court of hance."<br>Periodicate that the bundles by clear and court which<br>the every indication of the set of the set of the set<br>of the repert reduction of the set of the set of the set<br>indicated in the set of the set of the set of the set<br>indicated in the set of the set of the set of the set<br>indicated in the set of the set of the set of the set<br>indicated in the set of the set of the set of the set<br>of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the set of the set of the set of the<br>set of the set of the                             | court. Denying reinstatement on advice of Bar Crievance Board. Denying reargament of validity of gailty plea. Assessing sanctions for default. Dacunsing retroservity. Reventing and remanding order for centrolidated trials below.             | Discipline, Lowyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apositrunt of<br>special matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>retroactivity<br>Judicial proceeding                |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 109<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edington, 317 PA<br>Super, 545<br>S.D. N.Y., Path-Troore<br>Development Georg.<br>Inc., v. Goldfeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 56<br>N.C., Coc. V. Haworth,<br>304 K.C. 571<br>S.C., 205<br>N.H., Echloman's Case, | b) "for evening as a court of hanc." Performer hat the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of | Court. Denying relationsent on advice of Derrying relationsent of validity of guilty plan. Assertsing sametions for default. Discussing relocativity. Revening and remanding order for consolidated trials below. Addressing failure to disclose | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding<br>apointnent of<br>apointnent of<br>proceeding<br>automativity<br>Judicial proceeding<br>proceeding             |
| 1979<br>1983<br>1980<br>1981 | COCAP<br>COCAP<br>COCAP | D. & C.34 109<br>Mich., In re Freedman,<br>405 Mich. 256<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Edington, 317 PA<br>Super, 545<br>S.D. N.Y., Path-Troore<br>Development Georg.<br>Inc., v. Goldfeld, 87<br>F.R.D. 56<br>N.C., Coc. V. Haworth,<br>304 K.C. 571<br>S.C., 205<br>N.H., Echloman's Case, | b) "for evening as a court of hanc." Performer hat the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the branch by cherr and composing<br>periodicum that the strength of the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum that the strength of<br>the strength of periodicum the strength of<br>the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength<br>of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of the<br>strength of the strength of the strength of the strength of | Court. Denying relationsent on advice of Derrying relationsent of validity of guilty plan. Assertsing sametions for default. Discussing relocativity. Revening and remanding order for consolidated trials below. Addressing failure to disclose | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceedin<br>Judicial proceedin<br>appointment of<br>repeal matter<br>Judicial proceeding<br>and the proceeding<br>recedure |

| 1978 | COCAP | IIL, People v. Stewart,<br>58 III. App. 3d 630  | To sustain a finding of direct contempt of court,<br>it must be shown that the particular conduct was<br>calculated to embarrass, hinder or obstruct the c<br>ourt in its administration of justice, or to lessen i<br>its authority of diguity, or to bring the administra-<br>tion of law into dispute.  | Reviewing contempt finding.   | Judicial proceeding;<br>Contempt                                |
|------|-------|---|--|---|---|
| 1982 | COCAP | Mich., In re Contempt<br>, 113 Mich. App. 549   | This power is essential to preserve the authority<br>of the courts and to prevent the administration of<br>justice from falling into disrepute .   | Upholding summary contempt.   | Judicial proceeding;<br>Contempt                                |
| 1985 | COCAP | Mich., Moorhouse v.<br>Ambessador Ins. Co.,<br>Inc., 147 Mich. App.<br>412  | The following considerations are pertinent to the<br>issue of whether Ross should be given full retroa<br>etivity, limited retroactivity, or prospectivity onl<br>y; (1) the purpose of the new rule, (2) the gen<br>eral refinance upon the old rule, and (3) the effect<br>t of full retroactive application of the new rule on<br>the administration of justice   | Discussing retroactivity  | Judicial proceeding;<br>retroactivity                           |
| 1981 | COCAP | C.A.D.C., Grace v.<br>Burger, 214 U.S. App.<br>D.C. 375   | The Court made clear, however, that critical to i<br>ts decision was the fact that the statute was draw<br>n narrowly to apply only to picketing with an inle<br>nt to interfere with the administration of justice.   | Reviewing overbreadth of statute used<br>below.                                     | Judicial proceeding   |
|      | COCAP | Ore., In re Bevans, 655<br>P.2d 573<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.<br>Falkenhan, 452 A.2d<br>750                           | Section 18 (b) specifies that the applicant must<br>show that "he or she has good moral character,<br>general fitness to protectice low and that his or her<br>resumption of the practice of law in this state will<br>be be derivened to the administration of justic<br>e or the public interest."<br>Appellant also argues that the evidence was insuf<br>ficient to prove an "actual obstruction " of the ad<br>ministration of justice. | Outlining legal standard back of<br>reinstatement.                                  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding;<br>interforence with |
|      | COCAP | Mass., Berube v.<br>McKesson Wine &<br>Spirits Co., 7 Mass.<br>App. Ct. 426   | Furthermore, the judge who allowed the motion<br>had been involved with several phases of the acti<br>on 's development and undoubtedly was aware th<br>at its restoration to the trial list would not disrupt<br>the administration of justice in the county.   |   | Judicial proceeding   |
| 1977 | COCAP | N.D., Shark Bros. Inc.<br>v. Cass Cnty, 256<br>N.W.2d 701   | If such bifurcated procedures were encouraged or<br>sustained, it would create duplication, and unce<br>riainty, and waste manpower and money, with n<br>o approciable result, and all without improving t<br>he administration of justice.  | Refusing to allow bifurcated<br>procedure in judicial and<br>administrative venues. | Judicial and<br>administrative<br>proceeding                    |
| 1984 | COCAP | Md., St. v. Frazier, 470<br>A.2d 1269   | Castle v. State , 237 Ind. 83 , 143 N.E. 2d 570 , 5<br>72 ( 1957 ) ( trial court failed in its duty to " ensu<br>re efficient administration of justice " )  |   | Judicial proceeding;<br>delay of                                |
| 1979 | COCAP | Cal., în re Jonathan S.,<br>88 Cal. App. 3d 468   | Moreover, unauthorized ex parte contacts of wh<br>atever nature erode public confidence in the fairn<br>eas of the administration of justice, the very cem<br>ent by which the system holds together.  | Assessing liability to sanctions of<br>juvenile court judge.                        | Discipline, judge   |
| 1986 | COCAP | In re-Anonymous Nos.<br>26 D.B. 73 and 32 D.B.<br>73, Disciplinary Board<br>of the Supreme Court of<br>Pennsylvania | What is at issue in this proceeding is whether pet<br>titioner met the burden of demonstrating by clear<br>and convincing evidence that he has the moral que<br>altifications and that the resumption of practice by<br>him will be neither detrimental to the integrity a<br>nd standing of the bar or the administration of ju<br>stice, not subversive to the public interest.  | Considering reinstatement.  | Discipline, lawyer  |
|      |       | D.C., In re Washington,   | In Bar Docket No. 57 -<br>83 , the Hearing Committee found that Respond<br>ent was guilty of neglecting a legal natter entrust<br>of the high state of the second probability of the<br>101 (A) (3), and conduct prejudicial to the ad<br>minintration of guites , in violation of DR 1 -<br>102 (A) (5), and for these violations the Hear<br>ing Committee recommended a suspension of th  |   |   |
|      | COCAP | 489 A.2d 452<br>Tex., Perry v. Ponder,<br>604 S.W.2d 306<br>Pa., Commonwealth v.                                    | ee months.<br>As a matter of sound administration of justice, T<br>exas courts will not intervene in the domentic aff<br>airs of nonresidents, but will leave them to litigat<br>e in their home states.   | Committee.  | Discipline, lawyer<br>Judicial proceeding                       |

|   |           |                          | ed to him , in violation of DR 6 -                    |                                     |                       |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|   |           |                          | 101 (A) (3), and conduct prejudicial to the ad        |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | ministration of justice , in violation of DR 1 -      |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | 102 (A) (5), and for these violations the Hear        |                                     |                       |
|   |           | D.C., In re Washington,  | ing Committee recommended a suspension of thr         | Recommendation of Hearing           |                       |
|   | 1985 COC. | AP 489 A.2d 452          | ee months .   | Committee.                          | Discipline, lawyer    |
|   | 1.00 0000 | 100 1220 102             | As a matter of sound administration of justice, T     |                                     | conselented much se   |
|   |           |                          | exas courts will not intervene in the domestic aff    |                                     |                       |
|   |           | Tex., Perry v. Ponder,   | airs of nonresidents , but will leave them to litigat |                                     |                       |
|   | 1980 COC. |                          |   | 1                                   | testinist second from |
|   | 1980 COC: | Pa., Commonwealth v.     | e in their home states .                              |                                     | Judicial proceeding   |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           | Jackson, 367 Pa. Super.  | And in desperation , he did what he did in order t    |                                     | Judicial proceeding;  |
|   | 1987 COC. | AP 6                     | o delay the administration of justice .               | Recalling transcript below          | contempt              |
|   |           |                          | Implicit in what we said is that the judicial power   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | to punish a lawyer summarily for contempt of co       | 1                                   |                       |
|   |           |                          | urt, essential to facilitate the orderly administrati |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | on of justice ( Gallagher v. Municipal Court ( 19-    |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | 48 ) 31 Cal .2 d 784,788 [ 192 P. 2d 905 ] ), is q    |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | ualified by the cumulative effect of the lawyer 's    |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | right to engage in respectful advocacy on behalf      |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | of his client ( Cooper v. Superior Court ( 1961 )     |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | 55 Cal. 2 d 291, 303 [ 10 Cal.Rptr. 842, 359 P.       |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           | Cal., Bloom v. Sup. Ct.  | 2d 274]), strict compliance with the statutory f      |                                     |                       |
|   |           | of San Diego Cnty, 185   | ramework and the lawyer 's personal right to due      | Recalling previous refusal to find  | Judicial proceeding;  |
|   | 1986 COC. | AP Cal. App. 3d 409      | process   | contempt.                           | contempt              |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | Next, the defendant in Local 542 contended, as        |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | does the respondent , that the fact that the trial ju |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | dge did not bring the contempt charge immediate       |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | ly when the act was committed , but instead dela      |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | yed 24 hours , was proof that respondent 's cond      |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | uct did not obstruct the administration of justice    |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | as required under 18 U.S.C.A. § 401 (1) and th        |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | erefore it was not properly punishable summarily      |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | under Rule 42 ( a ) , Fed.P . Crim.P , , and shoul    |                                     |                       |
|   |           | W.D. Pa., U.S. v.        | d have been prosecuted only after notice and hear     |                                     |                       |
|   |           | Renfroe, 634 F. Supp.    | ing before another judge as required by Fed.R.Cr      |                                     | Judicial proceeding:  |
|   | 1986 COC. |                          | im.P. 42(b).  | Rejecting theory against contempt.  | contempt              |
|   |           |                          |   | subtemp meet a spanne en merde      | - and p               |
|   |           |                          | Although the court in Craig did indicate that the     |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | news articles were " by any standard " unfair , it    |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | nevertheless found that the clear and present dan     |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           | N.Y., Wuinn v. Aetna     | ger test had not been met , stating that the utteran  |                                     |                       |
|   |           | Life & Cas. Ins. Co., 96 | ces " must constitute an imminent , not merely a      |                                     | Judicial proceeding;  |
|   | 1978 COC. | AP Mise. 2d 545          | likely, threat to the administration of justice . "   | Outlining standards for conternot.  | contempt              |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   | 1         |                          | Based upon these facts , the jury found defendant     |                                     |                       |
|   |           | C.A. 11, U.S. v. Brand,  | s committed a corrupt endeavor , tending to impe      |                                     | Judicial proceeding;  |
|   | 1985 COC. | AP 775 F.2d 1460         | de the due administration of justice .                | facts not violative of s. 1503.     | jury                  |
|   |           |                          | ithout further explanation , the court declared that  |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | t the in -  |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | state attorney 's admission to the bar " does not r   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | aise the same concern for the efficient administra    |                                     |                       |
|   |           | C. C. Durland Harbor     | tion of justice that admission of nonresident attor   | 1                                   |                       |
|   |           | S. CL, Frazier v. Heebe, |   |                                     |                       |
|   | 1987 COC. | AP 96 L. Ed. 2d 557      | neys does . "   | Recalling facts below               | Bar generally         |
|   |           |                          |   |                                     |                       |
|   |           |                          | To compel the government to do so " would creat       |                                     |                       |
|   | 1         |                          | e an insuperable obstacle to the administration of    |                                     |                       |
|   | 1         |                          | justice in many cases in which there is no sembl      | Demurring from requiring government |                       |
| 1 |           | Conn., State v. Aillon,  | ance of the type of oppressive practices at which     | to prosecute all counts against the | prosecutorial         |
|   | 1980 COC. |                          | the double - jeopardy prohibition is aimed . "        | same defendant "at one go."         | discretion            |
| - |           |                          | The needless delays engendered by frivolous app       | and a second gen                    |                       |
|   | 1         | Pa., Commonwealth v.     | cals hinder the administration of justice as well a   | Refusing to entertain appeal upon   | Judicial proceeding;  |
| 1 | 1980 COC. |                          |   |                                     |                       |
| 1 | 1380[COC  | AP Brady, 508 A.2d 286   | s the public interest .                               | finding below motion is frivolous.  | procedure             |

| N.D., In re Marngay,<br>N.D., In re Marngay,<br>Strong COCAP         In re Marngay,<br>285 N.W.2d 511         Int a plage is to maintain the honor and digity of<br>the placed results of program doministration of particle<br>state         Policy back of judicial discip<br>state           0970         COCAP         285 N.W.2d 511         and that his resomption of the precise or law in the<br>his state will be neither detrimental to the integrit<br>y and standing of the har or the administration of<br>justice nor nubsersive to the public interest .         Quoting rules en bloc.           1980         COCAP         Wash, In re Zderis, Q.J.<br>102 (A) (Z) (G) (congoing in conduct projudicial<br>to the Administration of justice ).         Board Conclusion           1979         COCAP         Wash, 2d 777         The More frong State Bre Compating. Tribund [   | pline. Discipline, judge<br>Bar generally |
|---|---|
| 1975/COC.AP         285 N.W.2d 541         stice         Policy back of judicial discipation of the practice of law in the state will be neither detrimental to the integration of the practice of law in the state will be neither detrimentation of the integration of law in the state will be neither detrimentatin the neither detrimentatin the neither detrimentation  |   |
| and that his recumption of the practice of Law in t<br>his state will be neither detrimental to the integrit<br>y and standing of the har or the administration of<br>justice nor subservive to the public interest .<br>Development of CPR 3 DR 1<br>Wash., In re Zdrs; 02<br>102 (A) (5) (companying in conductor producting<br>to the administration of justice ).<br>Board Conclusion   |   |
| Mathematical Stress         Mathematical Stress         Mathematical Stress         Question Stres         Question Stres   | Bar generally                             |
| Wash.         In re Complia           1980         COC.4P        , 290 Or. 113           1000 rf (CPR 3) UR 1        , 200 Or. 100           1010 rf (CPR 3) UR 1        , 200 Or. 100           102 rf (C) (CPR 3) UR 1        , 200 Or. 100           1059         COC.4P         Wash. 24 777           1050         the administration of justice ).         Board Conclusion  | Bar generally                             |
| Ores, In recomplaint         y and standing of the bar or the administration of<br>justice on robustive to the public interest.         Quoting rules en bloc.           1980         COC.AP        20 Or. 113         Interest on shown is to the public interest.         Quoting rules en bloc.           1980         COC.AP        20 Or. 113         Interest on shown is to the public interest.         Quoting rules en bloc.           1021         COC.AP        20 Or. 113         Interest on shown is the probability of public interest.           1990         COC.AP         Wash. 2d 777         to the administration of public interest.         Board Cenchnion  | Bar generally                             |
| 1988 COCAP, 200 Or. 113 justice nor subservive to the public interest . Quadrag rules en bloc.<br>The Board modified the conclusion to find a viol<br>ation of (CPR) JDR 1 -<br>Wash., In re Zdrsic, 92. 102 (A) (5) (congading in constant projudicial<br>1979 COCAP Wash. 24 777 to the administration of justice ). Board Conclusion   | Bar generally                             |
| The Board modified the conclusion to find a viol<br>ation of (CPR ) DR 1-<br>Wash., In re 7deris, 92 102 (A) (5) (congring in conduct prejudicial<br>1979 (COCAP Wash, 2d 777 to the administration of justice ). Board Conclusion  |   |
| Wash., In re 7deric, 92         102 (A) (5) (engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).         Board Cenclusion  |   |
| 1979 COCAP Wash. 2d 777 to the administration of justice ). Board Conclusion  |   |
|   |   |
| The Minimizer State Day Complete Tailand C  | Discipline, lawy                          |
|   |   |
| ound the appellant guilty of violating the followin   |   |
| g disciplinary rules : DR 1 -   |   |
| 102. Misconduct (A) A lawyer shall not : (1)  |   |
| Violate a Disciplinary Rule. (3) Engage in illeg  |   |
| al conduct involving moral turpitude . (4) Engag  |   |
| Miss., Clark v. Miss. e in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit  |   |
| Bar Ass'n, 471 So. 2d , or misrepresentation . (5) Engage in conduct t  |   |
| 1985 COCAP 352 hat is prejudicial to the administration of justice. Board Conclusion  | Discipline, lawy                          |
| Similarly, if a crime is quite serious, barring rep   | Law enforcement                           |
| C.A. 11, U.S. v. Godoy, resecution will have a severe impact on the admi Outlining factors to determin  |   |
| 1987 COCAP 821 F.2d 1498 nistration of justice . of reprosecution.  | discretion                                |
| Access or closure issues involving the press requ   |   |
| Fla., State ex rel Harte- ire a showing (a) that the action is necessary to   |   |
| Hanks v. Austin, 2 Fla. prevent a serious and imminent threat to the adm Outlining where press freed  |   |
| 1983 COCAP Supp. 2d 160 inistration of justice , recede before needs of defer   | ndant. press access to                    |
|   |   |
| The same question can not be presented in succe   |   |
| ssive petitions for writs of habeas corpus before t   |   |
| he same court ( Com . ex rel . v. Shovlin , 24 Be   |   |
| aver 94 (1962)), and we fail to see how the pro   |   |
| mpt and orderly administration of justice is to be  |   |
| fostered by presenting a subsequent petition to th  |   |
| Pa., Noyer v. e very court whose purported inaction is being co   |   |
| Commonwealth, 20 Pa. mplained of under a subsisting petition presently Agreeing with magistrate the   |   |
| 1981 COCAP D. & C.3d 659 being considered by our Federal district court . petition lacked merit.  | delay of                                  |
| ance to the proper administration of justice that a   |   |
| C.A. 5, United judicial officer, in exercising the authority veste  |   |
| Steelworkers of Am., d in him, shall be free to act upon his own convi  |   |
| AFL-CIO v. Bishop, ctions, without apprehension of personal conseq Policy back of upholding jud   | dicial                                    |
| 1979 COCAP 598 F.2d 408 uences to himself. immunity.  | Judiciary general                         |
| Zywicki nad consulted with an altorney concerni   | in and in a second second                 |
| ng the legality of his activities and had been infor  |   |
| med that the Superior Court for the District of C   |   |
| olumbia had construed the statute that prohibited   |   |
|   |   |
| leafletting , 40 U. S. C. § 13k , to prohibit only c  |   |
| leafletting, 40 U.S.C. § 13k, to prohibit only c<br>onduct done with the specific intent to influence,  |   |
| leafletting, 40 U. S. C. § 13k, to prohibit only c<br>onduct done with the specific instant to influence ,<br>Sup. Ct., U.S. v. Grace, impede, or obstruct the administration of justice Qualining lawyer's assessme<br>to the specific done with the specific done of the |   |
| <ul> <li>Inselfering, 40 U. S. C. 318, to prohibit only c<br/>onduct done with the specific intent to influence.</li> <li>Sup. Ct., U. S. v. Grace, impede, or obstruct the administration of justice Outlining lawyer's assessme<br/>1983/COCAP. 10.5 X C. 1702</li> </ul>   |   |
| 1960 COCAP         103 8. C. 1702   | tting. Unclear                            |
| 1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1984, to prohibit only o           1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1702           1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1702           The Supermer Court has often considered the relation of justice           CA. 5. Stretton v.         Into Grant Court has often considered the relation of justice   | tting. Unelcar<br>Judicial                |
| 1983         COCAP         IOS 8. C g 138, to prohibit only o onduce disen with aspecific intration influence;           1983         COCAP         IOS 8. C to 1702         impede , or obstruct the administration of justice legality of defendant's kaflet           COCAP         IOS 8. C to 1702         impede , or obstruct the administration of justice legality of defendant's kaflet           COCAP         IOS 8. C to 1702         impede , or obstruct the administration of justice legality of defendant's kaflet           Restrict and Drilling CoA         as a relevant factor in defermining the retroscivity   | tting. Unelcar<br>Judicial<br>proceeding. |
| 1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1984, to prohibit only o           1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1702           1983 COCAP         IOS C. 1702           The Supermer Court has often considered the relation of justice           CA. 5. Stretton v.         Into Grant Court has often considered the relation of justice   | tting. Unelcar<br>Judicial                |
| Interface         Interface <t< td=""><td>tting. Unekar<br/>Judicial<br/>proceeding.</td></t<>  | tting. Unekar<br>Judicial<br>proceeding.  |
| 1983         COCAP         IOS 8. C. G. 128., to prohibit only c.           1983         COCAP         IOS 8. C. 1702         .           as a relevant factor in decomining the relative in the administration of justice         .           Period Duffing CoA         as a relevant factor in decomining the retrowskivi  | tting. Unekar<br>Judicial<br>proceeding.  |
| Interface         Interface <t< td=""><td>tting. Unekar<br/>Judicial<br/>proceeding.</td></t<>  | tting. Unekar<br>Judicial<br>proceeding.  |
| 1983/COCAP         Fig. 40         S. C. § 138, to prohibit only conduct does with the specific intent in filtrance, and the specific intent in filtrance, buffering lawyer's assessme [03.8] COCAP           1983/COCAP         C. S. Sono, C. L. Sono, C. S. Sono, S. Sono, C. S. Sono, S. Sono, C. S. Sono,  | tting. Unekar<br>Judicial<br>proceeding.  |

| 1983)  | COCAP | In re Anonymous No. 4<br>D.B. 76, Disciplinary<br>Board of the Supreme<br>Court of Pennsylvania | Hearing committies [] in its report filed May IVs.<br>1980 recommended but the potition for relatatie<br>mont be denied because petitioner fielde to demo<br>instrate by clear and corvincing evolutions: that he<br>has the mean qualifications required for admissi<br>on to the practice of law in the Commonwealth o<br>Permotylvania and because the admission of Peti-<br>ficant to the resultion of law practice of law wo<br>data but detrimental to 'the administration of justice<br>and subversive to the public interest. | Committee Recommendation   | Discipline, lawyer                             |
|--------|-------|---|---|--|--|
| 1986   | COCAP |   | In leaving the breadth of the jurisdictives of the as-<br>pecials divisions of the division control to the judici-<br>ary, the General Assembly may well have before<br>of that the scienci correst, outject or the supervisi-<br>on of the Supreme Court and certain statutory re-<br>trictions (some of which are metericated in this o-<br>pinion ), can best decide what cause or classes of<br>gas in order to promote the efficient administrati-<br>on of junicie in Missouri.   | Considering whether refusal of jurisdiction was misconduct.                                    | Discipline, judge                              |
| 1987 ( | COCAP | Sup. CL, Griffith v. Ky.,<br>1987 U.S. LEXIS 283  | Justice Powell has pointed out that it " hardly co<br>mports with the ideal of " administration of justic<br>e with an even hand, " " when " one chance bene<br>ficiary — the lucky individual whose case was ch<br>oorn as the occusion for announcing the new pin<br>ciple — enjoys retroactive application , while oth<br>ers similarly situated have their claims adjudicate<br>d under the old octrine .   | Discussing retroactivity   | Judicial proceeding;<br>retroactivity          |
| 1980   | COCAP | E.D. Pa., Wilkinson v.<br>Ellis, 484 F. Supp. 1072  | The destruction of evidence has a uniquely dama<br>ging effect on the administration of justice, for o<br>nee evidence has been destroyed it can not be ret<br>rieved for judicial review.<br>There the plantill argued that the phrase, " cond   |  | Law enforcement;<br>destruction of<br>evidence |
| 1977 ( | COCAP | IIL, People ex rel.<br>Harrod v. III. Courts<br>Comm'n, 69 IIL 2d 445                           | use which is prejudicial to the administration of j<br>ustice or which brings the judicial office into disr<br>epute, " was unconstitutionally vague and overly<br>broad.   | Reciting precedentg in instant<br>consideration of judge's conduct.                            | Discipline, judge                              |
| 1986 ( | COCAP | Fla., Brookings v. State,<br>495 So. 2d 135   | The modern view is that the privilege promotes t<br>he administration of justice by " encouraging clie<br>nts to lay thé facts fully before their coursel.  | Articulating rational for, while<br>refusing to find waiver of, attorney-<br>client privilege. | Judicial proceeding;<br>evidentiary issue      |
| 1980   | COCAP | IIL, Hurletron Whittier,<br>Inc. v. Barda, 82 III.<br>App. 3d 443                               | Finally, requiring defendant to defend this lawsu<br>it in Illinois is neither reasonable nor in keeping<br>with the orderly administration of justice.   | Refusing to require defendant to<br>defend the case in Illinois.                               | Judicial proceeding;<br>procedure              |
| 1981 ( | COCAP | Mo., State v. Gordon,<br>621 S.W.2d 262   | To thus assure of the problem, it is readily appe-<br>rent that compliance with the scenariosyl clear run<br>meetion just noted [Nede 2 (z) under MAI-<br>CR2d 15:00] would contribute more to the orde<br>of this and other appellate courts to approve or di<br>approve of the absorber thereof [the instruction<br>on conventional manslaughter ] in specific cases  | Reversing and remanding on account<br>of failure properly to instruct the jury.                | Judicial proceeding;<br>jury                   |
| 1984 ( |       | N.J., Fitzgibbon v.<br>Fitzgibbon, 197 N.J.<br>Super. 63<br>Miss., Myers v. Miss.               | Their sole warrant is the protection of interests a<br>nd relationships which, rightly or wrongly, are r<br>equeded as of sufficient social importance to justi<br>fy some incidental sacrifice of sources of facts ne<br>oded in the administration of justice.<br>The courts of this state are dedicated to the fair a  | Qualifying spousal privilege.  | Judicial proceeding;<br>evidentiary issue      |
| 1985   | COCAP | St. Bar, 480 So. 2d<br>1080   | nd equal administration of justice and act in accordance with that high principle .   | No error where court was unaware<br>that a party had no representation.                        | Judicial proceeding                            |

|      |       | E.D. Mich., U.S. v.           | He who makes studied inquiries of jurors as to w<br>hat occurred there acts at his peril, lest he be hel |   |                         |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
|      |       | Narciso, 446 F. Supp.         | d as acting in obstruction of the administration of  | Unholding prohibition on post-trial     | Judicial proceeding     |
| 1977 | COCAP | 252                           | justice .  | contact between lawyer and jurors.      | jury                    |
| 1911 | coem  | a./a                          | Thereafter, on August 25, 1983, a criminal co  | contact between lawyer and jurors.      | jury                    |
|      |       |                               | mplaint was filed in the Court of Common Pleas   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | of Dauphin County charging appellant with perju  | Consequence for appellant who had       |                         |
|      |       | Pa., Commonwealth v.          | ry, false swearing, and obstructing the administr  |   |                         |
| 1986 | COCAP | Thomas, 506 A.2d 420          | ation of justice .   | grand jury.                             | Grand Jury              |
|      |       |                               | The First Amendment Interest in Litigation and t   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | he Administration of Justice Defendants correctl   |   |                         |
|      |       | C.A.D.C., In re Halkin,       | y point out that attorneys " have historically been  | Discussing lawyers' qualified retention |                         |
| 1979 | COCAP | 194 U.S. App. D.C. 257        | ' officers of the courts [ , ] ' "   | of First Amendment rights.              | Judicial proceeding     |
|      |       |                               | (1) The purpose of the new rule, (2) general   | -                                       |                         |
|      |       | Mich., People v. Kamin,       | reliance on the old rule and (3) the effect on the   |   | Judicial proceeding     |
| 1979 | COCAP | 405 Mich. 482                 | administration of justice .  | Discussing retroactivity.               | retroactivity           |
|      |       |                               |  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | The court may in its wisdom temper   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | the administration of justice by casing the degree   |   |                         |
|      |       | Toorrow's Son (Robert         | of punishment, but in this case sees no reason for   |   | Judicial decision-      |
| 1977 | COHA  | Hoskins)                      | leniency.  | Judicial decision-making                | making                  |
|      |       |                               |  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | His characterization of the legal profession as  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | being motivated by self-interest does a disservice   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | to the thousands of lawyers who have actively  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | involved themselves in nonpaying charitable  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | activities in their local communities throughout   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | the state. It also fails to take into consideration  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | the active, concerted effort of state and local bar  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | associations to aid in the administration of   | Bar associations upholding the          |                         |
| 1977 | COHA  | NYT Letter to Editor          | justice, which is a social commitment.   | administration of justice               | Bar associations        |
|      |       |                               | Justice Powell said that a judge, when presented   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | with a request to close a hearing, should first  |   |                         |
|      |       | JUSTICES, 5-4, LIMIT          | decide " whether there are alternative means   |   |                         |
|      |       | COURTROOM                     | reasonably available by which the fairness of the  |   |                         |
|      |       | ACCESS BY PRESS               | trial might be preserved without interfering   |   |                         |
|      |       | AND PUBLIC:                   | substantially with the public's interest in prompt   |   |                         |
|      |       | JUDGE'S PRETRIAL              | access to information concerning   | Judge deciding whether to close a       | Judicial decision-      |
| 1979 | COHA  | BAN UPHELD (NYT)              | the administration of justice."  | hearing to acess                        | making                  |
|      | conne | Realities and Illusions       | This court modeled after the Chicago Municipal   | including to include                    | - D                     |
|      |       | (Frances Moley,               | Court was an innovation in the administration of   | Expansion of municipal court to take    |                         |
| 1980 | COHA  | autobiography)                | instice  | civil and criminal jurisdiction.        | Courts generally        |
|      |       |                               | ,  | ····· ······                            | 0                       |
|      |       |                               | My familiarity with Pound's writing came from  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | the writing of my essay on the Cleveland   |   |                         |
|      |       | Realities and Illusions       | Municipal Court, in which I included a   |   |                         |
|      |       | (Frances Moley,               | sprinkling of quotations from Pound's article on   |   |                         |
| 1980 | COHA  | autobiography)                | the administration of justice in the modern city.  | Courts generally                        | Courts generally        |
|      |       |                               | While he had expressed views concerning  |   |                         |
|      |       | Realities and Illusions       | the administration of justice which were rated   |   |                         |
|      |       | (Frances Moley,               | liberal, he was as solidly Republican and as   |   |                         |
| 1980 | COHA  | autobiography)                | conservative as William H. Taft.   | Author's view of Pound                  | Courts generally        |
|      |       |                               | When the survey was about half finished, he  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | proposed to the Committee that there be a  |   |                         |
|      |       | Realities and Illusions       | division of the survey which would deal with the   | -                                       |                         |
| 1000 | 00111 | (Frances Moley,               | influence of the newspapers in   | Press reporting about the               |                         |
| 1980 | COHA  | autobiography)                | the administration of justice.   | administration of justice               | Unclear                 |
|      |       |                               | Neither did the adults who managed the   |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | education system, nor the lawyers and judges in  |   |                         |
|      |       |                               | our courts, nor the Governor, nor those who led  |   |                         |
|      |       | Linema Contor Speaking        | our courts, nor the Governor, nor those who led<br>our Government in Washington and were                 |   |                         |
|      |       |                               |  |   |                         |
|      |       | Out for Human Risks.          | numonaible for the administration of insting in  |   |                         |
| 1082 | COIIA | Out for Human Rights,<br>TIME | responsible for the administration of justice in<br>our great and free nation. I                         | School desegration                      | Government<br>generally |

| 1982 | COHA  | Bennett H. Beach, No<br>Longer Best or<br>Brightest, TIME | * Rose Bird, " said Deukmejian in his campaign,<br>* has done more damage to the California<br>Supreme Court and the administration of justice<br>than any of her predecessors. "  | Campaign for state chief justice | Courts generally                   |
|------|-------|---|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1984 | СОНА  | The New Republic:   | or a concept of " political justice " that does away<br>with a need for any kind of polity or<br>any administration of justice; or a humanism that<br>would like to " extirpate " much of human nature<br>as we know it, including sex, emotion, parental<br>love, even parental identity.   | Describing view of thinker.      | Government                         |
| 1985 | COHA  | Paul Johnson, A History<br>of the English People          | Henry V made a deliberate effort to grasp again<br>althe reins of power, hugely self-confident,<br>industrison, clear in his objectives and<br>determined to have his way in all things, he was<br>a fright-ening and much foured figure among the<br>to supervise directly the administration of justice<br>and framese, while engaged on a war of compact. | Henry Vs reign                   | Executive power<br>law enforcement |
| 1986 | COIIA |   | For example, Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller<br>have consistently sponsored studies and issued<br>reports under their own acgis intended to shape<br>social legislation, foreign policy, public opinion,<br>and the administration of isstice.   | Describing robber barons'        | Unclear                            |

#### **All Citations**

---- F.Supp.3d ----, 2022 WL 16528415

#### Footnotes

- 1 The Court has collected and coded the hits from the databases it queried into a spreadsheet appended as Attachment A.
- 2 The Court identified a few other categories, all of which had only a few hits. These referred to grand juries, bar associations, and two committees (one Congressional and the other Presidential) that have the phrase "administration of justice" in their title. The Court also coded a few entries as "unclear" if the context in the concordance line did not provide enough information to categorize the entry.

**End of Document** 

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.