

No. 20-1249

---

In the  
Supreme Court of the United States

\_\_\_\_\_  
♦  
GARY VICTOR DUBIN,

*Petitioner,*

v.

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,

*Respondent.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
♦  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMICUS  
BRIEF ON BEHALF OF HUNDREDS OF  
PETITIONER'S CLIENTS HAVING BOTH  
INDEPENDENT STANDING AND ADDITIONAL  
REASONS SUPPORTING GRANTING REVIEW  
\_\_\_\_\_  
♦

GARY VICTOR DUBIN  
*Counsel of Record*

DUBIN LAW OFFICES  
55 Merchant Street, Suite 3100  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  
Telephone: (808) 537-2300  
Facsimile: (808) 523-7733  
Cellular: (808) 392-9191  
E-Mail: gdubin@dubinlaw.net  
*Attorney for Client Amici*

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMICUS  
BRIEF ON BEHALF OF HUNDREDS OF  
PETITIONER'S CLIENTS HAVING BOTH  
INDEPENDENT STANDING AND ADDITIONAL  
REASONS SUPPORTING GRANTING REVIEW**

Hundreds of Petitioner's Clients ("Clients"), many named in Exhibit 1 attached to this Motion, too numerous a class to include in the caption of this matter, respectfully move this Court, pursuant to Rule 37.2(a), for leave to file an Amicus Brief which is also attached in support of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari docketed in Case No. 20-1249.

This Motion is timely filed on March 22, 2021 as the Petition was filed on February 25, 2021. Petitioner consents to the filing, but Respondent, receiving timely notice, has not approved.

If this Motion is granted, Clients will bring to the Court's attention the following *additional* matters of great independent urgency beyond what is presented in the Petition, deserving to be high on Your Agenda, more fully described in the attached Amicus Brief:

1. *The Protection Of Petitioner's Clients Requires Granting Appellate Review.* Clients are real parties in interest having separate, independent standing, entitling them to support the Petition, heretofore ignored, unable to defend their constitutional rights, not named as parties, while cavalierly denied formal notice and any participation in the underlying disbarment proceedings, being victims nevertheless, highly prejudiced by the disbarment, having had their cases thereby disrupted and their investment in Petitioner's legal services lost, left foundering.

2. *The Protection Of The Public's Constitutional Rights Requires Granting Appellate Review.* There is strong public interest in having this Court grant review, not only on Client's behalf, but also on behalf of hundreds of thousands of homeowners, similarly situated annually, whose foreclosure defense attorneys continue to be unfairly disbarred nationally, state by state, by an autocratic state attorney disbarment system exactly as described in the Petition in Hawaii, otherwise thus far immune, evading any meaningful appellate, error correction or oversight enforcement of constitutional rights.

3. *The Protection Of Access To Justice For Millions Of Homeowners Requires Granting Appellate Review.* The general public and their families, in even more growing numbers as an aftermath of the current pandemic, continue to face foreclosure and eviction, unable to find representation, denied "Access to Justice," clogging our courts with *pro se* litigants, since such unfair disbarments, presently effectively unreviewable, are discouraging attorneys from representing homeowners especially on a *pro bono* basis as Petitioner had been doing, otherwise risking arbitrary loss of their law licenses, not being allowed any appellate oversight except in this usually non-error-correcting Court, while other professionals such as physicians are allowed full review unequally.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Gary Victor Dubin*

---

Honolulu, Hawaii  
March 22, 2021

GARY VICTOR DUBIN  
*Counsel of Record*  
*Attorney for Client Amici*