

JUN 12 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 19-1469

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Eric Hasbrouck, JD,
Petitioner,

v.

State Bar of Nevada
Respondent.

Review of the Supreme Court of Nevada Re: Bar Admission

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Eric Hasbrouck, JD
Pro se
4501 Connecticut Ave. NW
#101
Washington, DC 20008
1-845-214-3273
ebhasbrouck@gmail.com

ORIGINAL

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does Petitioner have the right to judicial review of the practices of the Nevada State Bar, regarding the administering and grading of the bar exam, and the bar admission process, as Petitioner was recently denied admission to the Nevada State Bar, based on an apparent denial of due, or even, a remotely fair, or objective, process, which included probable fraud, and abuse in the administering, grading, and lack of review in the process utilized?

PARTIES

Petitioner

Eric Hasbrouck, JD

4501 Connecticut Ave. NW, #101, Washington, DC 20008, 1-845-214-3273,

ebhasbrouck@gmail.com

v.

Respondent

State Bar of Nevada

Brian Kunzi, Director of Admissions, State Bar of Nevada, Admissions Department,

3100 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, NV 89102, 1-702-382-2200,

briank@nvbar.org.

Richard M. Trachok, II, Chair, Board of Bar Examiners, State Bar of Nevada, 3100

W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, NV 89102, 1-702-383-2200,

rtrachok@mcdonaldcarano.com.

PROCEEDINGS IN OTHER COURTS

Eric Hasbrouck v. State Bar of Nevada, No. 80349, Nevada Supreme Court.

Judgment entered March 23, 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question Presented	i
Parties	ii
Proceedings in Other Courts	iii
Table of Authorities	iv
Jurisdiction	1
Introductory Statement of Facts	2
Issues Presented	3
Argument and Statement of Facts	4
Conclusion	17
Certificate of Compliance	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Jones Const. v. Bovis</i> , 120 Nev. 277 (2004)	6
<i>Barmettler v. Reno Air</i> , 114 Nev. 441 (1998)	6
<i>Awada v. Shuffle Master</i> , 123 Nev. 613 (2007)	6
<i>Brown v. Board of Bar Examiners</i> , 623 F.2d 605 (9th Cir. 1980)	10, 12
<i>In re Hughey</i> , 62 Nev. 498 (1945)	11
<i>In re Myles</i> , 64 Nev. 217 (1947)	11

STATUTORY LAWS

US Constitution	*
Nevada Supreme Court Rule 70	11

Rule 70 - **Applicants not recommended for admission.** The board of bar examiners shall provide notice to an applicant, at the applicant's address given in the application, whenever the board recommends that such applicant be denied admission for failure to pass the examination. The board shall file proof of service of such notice in the supreme court. There shall be no right of appeal or review as to the examination or its results.

Petitioner respectfully requests that a Writ of Certiorari be granted to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nevada for a Petition for Review regarding Bar Admission.

JURISDICTION

The Nevada Supreme Court rendered its decision on March 23, 2020. In doing so, the Nevada Supreme Court violated due process, the US Constitution, relevant controlling jurisprudence, basic principles of judicial legitimacy in democratic societies, duties to monitor and admit attorneys to practice law in a fair and just way in order to uphold the legitimacy of the judiciary, and the laws of the State of Nevada, by denying review of the issues raised in the original Petition for Review.

This US Supreme Court previously reviewed numerous cases regarding the fairness, practices, and procedures involved with admissions to practice law and the exams within the states. The US Supreme has an interest in maintaining judicial legitimacy in how the states admit attorneys to practice law. Nevada is an extreme outlier in the bar admission process among the states, providing little to no transparency in the process. Additionally, there were numerous red flags raised during the process. There seems to be no logical, reasonable, fair, objective process, nor review of the determination of a passing grade on the bar exam. Furthermore, it seems that the entire admission process is being

monopolized and manipulated for reasons other than objectivity, fairness, reasonableness, or judicial legitimacy.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF FACTS

This Writ for Certiorari comes now as a matter of justice, before the US Supreme Court, challenging the findings and practices of the State Bar of Nevada. Petitioner is representing himself in this matter, *Pro se*. Petitioner took the Nevada bar exam in July 2019. Petitioner paid all fees and expenses associated with taking of the Nevada State Bar Exam. Petitioner was given a failing grade on his exam.

After some review of the material provided by the Nevada State Bar, as well as additional inquiry with the Nevada State Bar, it became apparent that material details of the grading procedure and process were not disclosed prior to the exam. It also became apparent, simply based on the face of the information and practices presented by the Nevada State Bar, that there was a high likelihood of fraud in the administering of grades. Furthermore, it was found, based on specific evidence and information, that in Petitioner's case, there appears to be fraud. It is further found that the grading system administered by the Nevada State Bar is highly susceptible to fraudulent practices, lacks any transparency, and is entirely arbitrary and capricious, thus eroding judicial legitimacy.

ISSUES PRESENTED

1. The grading method, criteria, and basic qualifications for determining a passing grade were misleading, misrepresented, and not entirely disclosed, both prior to and after the exam, which amounts to a fraudulently induced contract, pertaining to the contract between Petitioner and the Nevada State Bar, for the bar exam and admission process.

2. The scoring system, review, and entire process regarding the exam, and becoming a licensed attorney in the state of Nevada is designed in a way that is highly susceptible to fraud, and lacks any basic transparency. These practices violate numerous basic foundational elements found within due process, the US Constitution, basic principles of fairness and judicial legitimacy in judiciaries in the United States, basic notions of judicial transparency in democratic societies, and Nevada law.

3. In Petitioner's case, there is specific evidence to support a theory of fraud, and a denial of due process.

4. Based on a comparative scientific analysis of the "best" answers provided, vis-a-vis Petitioner's exam, it appears that Petitioner's answers were generally

more factually accurate, and seemingly better answers, which further supports a theory of fraud, and a violation of due process.

ARGUMENT AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. The grading method, criteria, and basic qualifications for determining a passing grade were misleading, misrepresented, and not entirely disclosed, both prior to and after the exam, which amounts to a fraudulently induced contract, pertaining to the contract between Petitioner and the Nevada State Bar, for the bar exam and admission process.

Prior to the exam, information was available on the Nevada State Bar website. This information indicated that a passing score was one of 140 or higher, and provided no other criteria for attaining a passing score. This information was confirmed through additional research from other sources as well. Petitioner reasonably relied on the information provided by the State Bar as being complete, and accurate, when forming his understanding of the grading and passing criteria, in making his decision to pay the fee and attempt to undergo the process of becoming an admitted attorney in the State of Nevada.

It seemed fairly clear that there were no additional criteria required for obtaining a passing grade on the exam, other than attaining a score of 140 on the exam, provided that the applicant successfully complied with the rules of the exam process and procedures, etc. A grade requirement of 140 for a

passing score indicated; not only the numeric score by which a passing grade would be determined, but also the grading scale that would be used to determine the grade, as well as the fact that no additional scoring requirements would be involved, such as attaining certain or specific minimal scores on particular sections of the exam, so long as the total score was at least a 140.

Sometime after the exam, Petitioner received a letter in the mail from the State Bar of Nevada. This letter depicted some information about the grading formulas and scales used, as well as additional requirements for obtaining a passing score. The criteria depicted in the letter mailed, was materially and fundamentally different from what was represented by the State Bar of Nevada prior to the exam. This included, not only an entirely different scale, from the 140 scale, but a new scale, coupled with a new formula, which required a score of 78 to have a passing score.

In addition to the 78 score, one would have to also receive a score of 75 or higher on more than 3 written essays in order to obtain a passing score, regardless of the total score. There was also an additional formula provided that is supposed to be somehow related to the calculation of the grading scale. None of this information was disclosed prior to the exam by the Nevada State Bar, and the information that was disclosed, depicted an entirely different method and criteria for calculating and determining a passing grade.

Material misrepresentation of the grading method used in determining a grade, the scale to be used; the minimum scores required, the formula for

calculating the grade; requiring minimum scores on 3 essays; and not fully disclosing the criteria for a passing a grade prior to the exam, but rather providing incomplete and distinctly different information that was misleading from the criteria that would be used in the actual grading process, constitutes fraud, deceit, breach of contract, and induces people to pay exorbitant fees, under lessor, and false pretexts, which amounts to a contract based on fraudulent inducement in the State of Nevada. See *Jones Const. v. Bovis*, 120 Nev. 277 (2004); *Barmettler v. Reno Air*, 114 Nev. 441 (1998); *Awada v. Shuffle Master*, 123 Nev. 613 (2007).

Petitioner relied on the information presented by the Nevada State Bar as being accurate, and complete, before he paid any fees or expenses. These material misrepresentations were detrimental and caused injuries to the Petitioner. Petitioner was issued a failing grade on his bar exam, and it was only after failing, and receiving further information from the Nevada State Bar, after the exam, that knowledge of the misrepresentations of the grading criteria occurred. These material misrepresentations, constitute a material breach of the contract between Petitioner and the Nevada State Bar, for the exam, and the associated expenses and preparation for the attorney admission process.

The State Bar of Nevada has a direct, monetary interest in misrepresenting the passing criteria for the exam, as the State Bar receives large fees for each exam. The more people that take, fail, and re-take the exam, increases the revenue of the State Bar. Also, the simpler the grading seems to be, the more

people will be induced to sign up and take the exam: By concealing aspects of the passing criteria, the Nevada State Bar is acting in its own pecuniary interests.

Petitioner is entitled to compensation of any fees and expenses that he incurred as a result of this material breach and fraudulent inducement, including losses associated with time and energy, compiling materials, and preparing for the exam.

These losses include associated losses based on the fact that Petitioner could have spent his time much more valuably, applying to another state that did not use fraud as the modus operandi, or by pursuing other profitable endeavors during the time period that Petitioner was spending on the bar. Petitioner is seeking 25K USD in damages as a result of this fraud, material breach of contract, along with this and other arguments contained within this Petition.

2. The scoring system, review, and entire process regarding the exam, and becoming a licensed attorney in the state of Nevada is designed in a way that is highly susceptible to fraud, and lacks any basic transparency. These practices violate numerous basic foundational elements found within due process, the US Constitution, basic principles of fairness and judicial legitimacy in judiciaries in the United States, basic notions of judicial transparency in democratic societies, and Nevada law.

Petitioner was provided with a letter from the State Bar of Nevada sometime after his exam. This letter indicated no information about the grading rubric used

to determine grades, or any explanation whatsoever for any part of any grade issued to Petitioner. This letter only contained certain numerals, and formulas used in determining the grade, as well as stating some additional, previously undisclosed requirements and criteria for obtaining a passing score.

Petitioner called the State Bar to get more information about the grades, and how to go about determining, why the grading applied seemed to be so different from what was represented prior to the exam. He was given no useful information. Petitioner was told that all he could do, was wait for the model answers to be posted online, and he could submit a form to purchase his essay answers. He was further told that no information would be provided to him on the grading rubric, how the grading took place, or any other information. Petitioner was further told that there was nothing he could do to review the grading process, or regrade the exam to determine if any errors occurred in the grading process or otherwise.

Errors occur all the time, even in the most fool proof systems. The system employed by the State Bar of Nevada allows for no transparency whatsoever, no way to determine if an error occurred, if papers, or numbers got mixed up, if there was a calculation error in determining the grade, or any other type of flaw or error in the grading process. Statistically speaking, occasional errors, simply in terms of human and clerical errors, in things such as transferring scores and numbers, not to mention the various facets and nuances involved with making the grading objective, are scientifically probabilistic realities.

The State Bar may have thrown the exams up in the air and passed all the ones that landed face down. They may have consulted chicken bones, and/or partaken in a ritualistic ceremony to determine the grade. The State Bar does not permit a way to verify what was done, let alone that it was done in a Constitutional, objective, reasonable, or fair way.

Rather, based on the practices employed, it appears that the Nevada State Bar is more interested in concealing any evidence, and eliminating even basic levels of transparency in the process, instead of administering an objective process. It is impossible to have a fair and just judicial system, if those who are permitted to make arguments in that system are not selected in a fair and just way. Nevada does not offer a process that is comparable to the majority of states in admitting members to the bar, as the majority of states offer more information about the grading process, and they offer review procedures to ensure that grades and determinations are not the results of subversion, but are founded on objective principles and fairness, to determine whether the process lacked error, and was reasonable, to further protect their judiciaries from corruption and subversion.

The lack of transparency in the bar admission process, and grading of the exams in Nevada is archaic. The system set up, is a blatant and utter disregard for any norms, standards of fairness, or transparency in any process, or relationship, especially a contractual one, with the gate keepers of the entire state judiciary. This system actually violates the entire US Constitution, because a

judiciary with such a lack of transparency, in such an important element of the judiciary, as admitting licensed attorneys to represent the interests of the people and the US Constitution in courts of law, where fairness and accuracy cannot be verified and vetted in any basic or minimal way, cannot be a judiciary that is upholding any part of the Constitution.

The courts are the only ones who can interpret and enforce the Constitution, and ensure that laws adhere to the Constitution, etc. If private interests are left unhindered to subvert and control the judiciaries, via those who are permitted to represent others, provide legal services, and advice, then these private interests, in effect, hijack the law, the judiciaries, and the US Constitution. In Nevada, the flood gates remain open for private interests to subvert the judiciary in this manner through the practices of the Nevada State Bar.

To my knowledge, the system for selecting attorneys in Nevada is probably more akin to the systems used in cronyistic systems, where certain organized interests control the judiciaries, and lawyers are nothing more than stooges appointed by those interests, such as within dictatorships, and other totalitarian, or nondemocratic systems that lack judicial transparency and judicial legitimacy, where courts are basically rubber stamps for those interests. Such practices are clearly contrary to the totality of the US Constitution, due process, and basic democratic principles. See *Brown v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 623 F.2d 605 (9th Cir. 1980).

Here, Nevada is saying that no one may peak behind the curtain, and they will not open the curtain, people should just trust that what is going on behind the curtain is just, fair, and proper, even despite insurmountable evidence that it is not, at least since the 1940s, based on many similar arguments and cases brought before the Supreme Court of Nevada. See *In re Hughey*, 62 Nev. 498 (1945); *In re Myles*, 64 Nev. 217 (1947).

The Nevada Supreme Court denied any review of the issues raised in Petitioner's, Petition for Review, on the basis that, "[t]here shall be no right of appeal or review as to the examination or its results." Nev. Sup. Ct. Rule 70. Nevada Supreme Court Rule 70 denies any due process or transparency to determine lawfulness, fairness, objectivity, or reasonableness in the bar admission process, and thus is unconstitutional. Such rules and practices, like Rule 70 are inherently unconstitutional and erode the judicial legitimacy of the courts in the State of Nevada, and more broadly in the United States of America as a whole.

Furthermore, the issues raised by Petitioner go well beyond the examination and the results. Therefore, the Nevada Supreme Court improperly denied the Petition for Review on the basis of an unconstitutionally overbroad interpretation of Rule 70. The effect is that Nevada may fail prospective attorneys and not only deny a fair and transparent process, but the practice may foster abuse, and grant themselves an unlawful immunity. Rule 70 is further not applicable as a

basis for dismissal according to Nevada case law, when fraud is raised. See *Brown*, 623 F.2d 605.

3. In Petitioner's case, there is specific evidence to support a theory of fraud, and a denial of due process.

Fraud is a triggering element of the law in both Nevada jurisprudence and US Supreme Court jurisprudence, as applied to cases for bar admission. See *Brown*, 623 F.2d 605. Petitioner had some difficulties in dealing with agents of the Nevada State Bar prior to the exam. Additional documents were requested of Petitioner. Petitioner agreed to provide those documents, but also noted an objection to providing such documents, cited applicable laws, and illustrated the burden of providing such documents.

Petitioner did not initially pass the character and fitness portion of the process, although he was allowed to take the exam with the character and fitness portion pending. The requesting of additional documentation, and not being allowed to pass the character and fitness element of the process, seemed to be contrary to the relevant and established law on the topic. Petitioner conveyed these aspects of the law and the discrepancies therein, expecting to get some sort of explanation as to why he was being given a hard time about the character and fitness element.

At that time, it was made clear to Petitioner, that such decisions are under the sole discretion of one individual at the Nevada State Bar, and this

individual's personal thoughts, feelings, and conclusions are all that matter, rather than law and reason. Petitioner took this to mean that the laws did not matter, only that this one person's opinion mattered. Petitioner was a little confused by this, and had the feeling that this was kind of strange, and improper.

Petitioner ignored this for the time being, and took his exam. After Petitioner discovered that he failed the exam. He was highly suspicious that the reason for the failure had nothing to do with the answers that he provided on the exam, but rather, had to with the apparent exercise of subversive monopolistic control over the process.

Petitioner had a strong suspicion that it was realized that Petitioner's legal arguments regarding the character and fitness were strong and correct, so whatever interests were being represented that were attempting to prevent Petitioner from getting a law license, by improperly not letting him pass the character and fitness portion of the process, then must have made the decision to, instead, issue Petitioner a failing grade on the exam, so as to prevent Petitioner from being admitted to practice law in the state of Nevada, in order to subvert the law, because Petitioner deserved to receive a passing grade on his exam, based on his answers, and there was no lawful reason to prevent Petitioner from being admitted based on his character and fitness record.

Petitioner then called to discuss with relevant agents at the State Bar of Nevada to further gather evidence and confirm these suspicions and apparent

realities. There were numerous insinuations and clues indicating that a fraudulent score was in fact what happened in Petitioner's case. It was not until the smoking gun that these suspicions were virtually confirmed, as much as any such suspicions could possibly be in this case.

The smoking gun here was a long telephone conversation with a relevant agent of the Nevada State Bar. This agent went on contradicting himself sentence after sentence. He went on to further indicate that Petitioner's letters of recommendation would not be retained on file for the proper amount of time as prescribed by statute/policy. When Petitioner raised his suspicions regarding his fraudulent grade in this phone call, he was met with an affirmative answer, and Petitioner was accused of not being candid in his application, even though this accusation was entirely baseless, illogical, and unfounded.

It appears that Petitioner's grade on the exam was fraudulent, and the result of interests against Petitioner and the judiciary. It is further apparent that the system Nevada employs in the bar admission process enables, encourages, entices, and protects such fraud and subversive practices. Administering grades based on such undisclosed criteria, and in a manner that is clearly unlawful and fraudulent is also a violation of due process and the powers entrusted to the State Bar by the Nevada Supreme Court, as well as duties to uphold the US Constitution.

4. Based on a comparative scientific analysis of the "best" answers provided, and Petitioner's exam, it appears that Petitioner's answers were generally more factually accurate, and seemingly better answers, which further supports a theory of fraud, and a violation of due process.

Based on a comparative scientific analysis of Petitioner's exam answers, and the "best" answers provided by the Nevada State Bar, there appears to be no substantive, reasonable, or logical indication, as to why Petitioner was given a grade lower than the model answers provided. Petitioner's answers were consistently superior to the model answers, and it is apparent that he should have received a higher grade than the model answers for every question. These superiorities were pervasive in terms of stating, applying, and analyzing the law in light of the facts and issues in the questions.

Petitioner's answers were frequently word for word recitations of the letter of the law, and the issues were discussed and addressed in a clear and concise manner. Whereas, possibly, not one of the model answers got the law even close to exactly right. Petitioner demonstrated a clear and advanced command of the law, legal analysis, and realistic application, as well as a command of the medium of communication. Whereas the model answers demonstrated some knowledge of the law, but demonstrated difficulty in being specifically accurate, as if the writers were trying to shoot wildly at targets, hoping that something would hit. Meanwhile, Petitioner was hitting the targets accurately with tight groupings. It is almost as if the only logical explanations one

could come to is that the grade was in error, was the result of fraud, and/or it was not the result of any objective measure of the answers provided, and thus a denial of due process.

Additionally, the relevant agents at the Nevada State Bar openly admitted that the grading was subjective, and that it was not an objective process, in a documented communication. Not employing objective grading in the exam erodes judicial legitimacy, and is a violation of the US Constitution and due process. We all deserve objectivity in the grading of exams for bar admission, the courts deserve it, the lawyers, the aspiring lawyers, the academics, the people, our founding fathers, and the entire judicial and governmental system, as well as all the institutions that comprise society. Subjective grading in the admission of attorneys to practice law, subverts all of these professions, interests, institutions, and systems, etc..

It is possible to objectively and scientifically show that the grading of Petitioner's exam was clearly arbitrary and capricious. The arbitrary and capricious findings of the comparative scientific analysis between the two sets of exam answers i.e. the model answers vis-à-vis Petitioner's answers, as applied to the questions, further support a theory of fraud in Petitioner's case. Petitioner will provide his answers, the model answers, and the questions in the Appendix with this Petition. Petitioner would also like to furnish an in-depth and rigorous comparative scientific analysis of the model answers and Petitioner's answers, in

relationship to the questions and legal issues, so that he may objectively and scientifically prove that his answers are better than the "best" answers.

Expert witnesses may also be required, as this Court may not have the necessary expertise to discern between a rigorous objective scientific analysis and a fraudulent subjective one, especially without further evidence regarding this issue, such as expert testimony, or an in-depth and detailed scientific analysis presented by an expert in the field, etc. However, even a cursory analysis should definitively indicate that Petitioner's answers were far superior to the "best" model answers provided by the Nevada State Bar.

Petitioner already reviewed an objective analysis in short-form, as it was necessary for these conclusions to be formulated. Compiling and composing this analysis is another matter, which requires significant effort and time for production. Proper time to compile and submit a scientific comparative analysis enhances the scientific rigor and objectivity of the product, while reducing error.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner asks this court to review the facts, materials, and arguments presented in this petition to address the aforementioned issues. Petitioner asks this court to award damages for the financial injuries sustained from the improper practices applied by the Nevada State Bar in the amount of 25K USD, and/or whatever this Court deems just and reasonable within the law.

If this Petition is found deficient in any part, Petitioner asks for the ability to amend this Petition.

It may be of further interest of this Court to know that there was a significant lack of cooperation by the Nevada Supreme Court Clerk's Office, who denied any relevant information to Petitioner regarding the filing of his initial Petition for Review, including how to pay the fee, but the Clerk finally did tell Petitioner how he may submit payment to process the transaction for the fee related to his original filing. Instructions for paying the fee were finally disclosed to Petitioner, when Petitioner presented the hypothetical context of a fee for a petition of this nature even existing, as Petitioner was incorrectly told that there is no such Petition that he can file, and the Nevada Supreme Court is not the proper place to file such a Petition. Petitioner was refused any other information related to this filing by the Nevada Supreme Court Clerk's Office, under the guise that providing any such information would be considered giving "legal advice".

Petitioner adamantly disagrees with the Nevada Supreme Court Clerk's Office assessment, on what is deemed to be considered legal advice, and what is considered the Clerk's duty to provide basic technical facts, or where to find such facts, when asked about a specific filing. As the Nevada Supreme Court website provides all these aforementioned details for numerous other filings, and such information about other filings were disclosed to Petitioner, such as the filing of a notice of appeal, as well as inaccurate information about what

Petitioner should file, and in which court, etc. The Clerk's Office denied providing that same type of information pertaining to a Petition for Review Re: Bar Exam, under the guise that such information would constitute legal advice.

How is it possible that the same information for other filings is not considered legal advice, but anything pertinent to Petitioner's filing is considered legal advice? Is it that the Nevada Clerk is using the designation and false pretext of "legal advice" to attempt to deny access to the Court whenever they wish, such as when they may have an interest in the case, or when there is an interest in repressing the parties and issues? It is hard to comprehend how these actions do not constitute a violation of due process. Perhaps this is an issue and practice that is pervasive throughout courts in the United States.

Petitioner cannot now name another court in this country that considers providing basic information about a filing, such as the relevant rules, the fee, the basic technical requirements to submit payment and a filing, such as page length, font, word count, format, number of copies, etc. to be considered the giving of legal advice. Therefore, Petitioner thinks that the clerk is intentionally, and improperly calling this legal advice, because the Nevada Supreme Court is acting as an interested party in this case, and this was really just a tactic implemented in order to attempt to prevent Petitioner from gaining timely access to the Nevada Supreme Court, since the issues raised are dealing with the State Bar, and the Supreme Court is the overseer of the State Bar. The Clerk

seemed more than willing to provide all kinds of unrequested, false and misleading legal advice, personal advice, and even detailed information about other types of specific filings, but refused to provide the basic information pertaining to Petitioner's specific filing, and instead provided false and misleading information about this specific filing.

One can only surmise that an explanation for these experiences, is that they were part of a systematic attempt to delay and/or deny access to the courts for this case and the issues being raised. This theory is further supported by the fact that the Nevada Supreme Court directly oversees the activities of the State Bar, and perhaps the Nevada Supreme Court has some type of interest in keeping these issues and arguments from receiving due process of law.

Also, if this Petition is found to be deficient for evidentiary reasons, please allow Petitioner time to supplement and provide relevant evidence. The amount of evidence in this case is fairly large. The basic, necessary information to understand the issues in this Petition were supplied via the Appendix, however, there is substantially more evidence that could be produced, such as transcripts, emails, and other documentary evidence, as well as expert documents and testimony. The evidence should be strong enough to meet Petitioner's burden just on the face of the evidence, and the arguments made, but if evidence is found to be deficient in any regard, Petitioner requests the opportunity to furnish further detailed and supportive evidence, such as communications with relevant individuals, additional documentation, etc.

Petitioner is also requesting some time and opportunity to provide a rigorous scientific comparative analysis of the model answers and his answers in relation to the exam questions. This analysis will address all of the relevant differences between the model answers and Petitioner's answers in relationship to the questions and the relevant law. It is not practically possible for Petitioner to provide this analysis with this filing, as the filing itself has to be compiled and filed in a limited amount of time, and compiling such an analysis is an arduous and time consuming process, which cannot possibly be accomplished within the time period for the submission of this filing, especially when combined with the burden of composing and submitting this filing. Such an analysis may also require expert testimony.

There were extensive communications between Petitioner and Respondent. If this Court deems the review of such communications necessary for it to make a proper determination in this case, Petitioner is ready willing and able to provide such evidence. It would greatly reduce the burden of production, and burden of review on this Court, if those communications, and additional evidence to be provided were narrowly and specifically requested by this Court, as they may pertain to the specific facts and issues in this case, which this Court may deem require further evidentiary review and clarification, etc.

Additionally, Petitioner is not looking to throw anyone under the bus here, as many of these issues seem to be more systematic in nature. However, if this

Court requires specific evidence of communications with specific individuals, and specific communications, that evidence may be furnished, but Petitioner is leaving it up to this Court to make that determination, before supplying such evidence, as supplying such evidence could be damaging to individuals, and Petitioner would like to respect those individuals, and their roles, by only supplying such information, if this Court deems such information necessary to make a favorable determination for Petitioner. Petitioner further requests leave and time from this Court, to provide further evidence, of any nature that this Court deems suitable and/or necessary in making its determinations.

There are significant and widespread social ramifications to what appears to be happening in the judiciary within the State of Nevada. I believe that it was both Machiavelli and Aristotle who posited that a role for the judiciary is to help stave off outbreaks of violence within a society. They posited that a legitimate judiciary, acts to give the citizenry a forum to sort out grievances, aside from taking up arms. Perhaps, when the legitimacy of that system is eroded, a contrapositive effect occurs, and this may shed some light on contemporary society. Perhaps, now, more than ever, courts should be focused on fulfilling their proper roles in legitimate ways, so as to further promote the protections posited by Machiavelli and Aristotle.