

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<i>In re: Jordan</i> (10th Cir. Jan. 3, 2023) (Disbarment Order).....	Supp. App. 1
<i>In re: Jordan</i> (10th Cir. Jan. 20, 2023) (Denying Mot. to Reconsider and Vacate)	Supp. App. 6
<i>In re: Jordan</i> (10th Cir. Jan. 25, 2023) (Denying Mot. for Reasoned Opinion)	Supp. App. 7
<i>In re: Jordan</i> (10th Cir. Feb. 6, 2023) (Denying Mot. re: Pet. for Rehearing en Banc)	Supp. App. 8
<i>In re: Jordan</i> (10th Cir. Feb. 6, 2023) (NEF re: Pet. for Rehearing en Banc rec'd, but not filed).....	Supp. App. 9

Supp. App. 1

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

In re: JACK JORDAN | No. 22-808

ORDER

(Filed Jan. 3, 2023)

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **KELLY**, and **PHIL-
LIPS**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before us to consider whether attorney Jack Jordan should be reciprocally disciplined in this court as a result of his disbarment by the Kansas Supreme Court. On November 21, 2022, after receiving the Kansas Supreme Court’s order, this court issued an order to Mr. Jordan to show cause why he should not be similarly disbarred in this court.

Mr. Jordan has filed four pleadings in response to the show cause order: (1) a “Memorandum Showing Denial of Due Process of Law Regarding Proof Under the U.S. Constitution”; (2) a “Memorandum of Violations of Due Process of Law Regarding Opportunities to be Heard and Failures to Bear Burden of Proof”; (3) a “Memorandum Regarding Black-Collar Crime”; and (4) a sworn declaration. He has also attached portions of the record from the state disciplinary

Supp. App. 2

proceeding. Mr. Jordan argues that the Kansas disbarment violates the First Amendment and his due process rights. He also argues he was disbarred without proof of misconduct. For these reasons, he also asserts it would be a grave injustice for this court to impose reciprocal discipline.

In a reciprocal discipline proceeding, this court does not exercise appellate review over a state court's disciplinary decision. *See Selling v. Radford*, 243 U.S. 46, 50 (1917) (explaining that federal courts lack authority to re-examine or reverse a state supreme court's disciplinary action against a member of its bar). This court will generally impose discipline similar to that imposed by the state court unless an intrinsic review of the record from the state disciplinary proceeding reveals (1) a lack of procedural due process because the attorney was denied notice and a fair opportunity to be heard; (2) insufficient proof of misconduct, or (3) some other "grave reason" which would render reciprocal discipline unjust. *See id.* at 51. It is the attorney's duty to provide the state record for this court's review. *See In re Harper*, 725 F.3d 1253, 1257 (10th Cir. 2013).

According to the portions of the record provided by Mr. Jordan, he received notice of his alleged violations of the Kansas Rules of Professional Conduct, filed a written answer in response, and appeared at hearings before the Kansas disciplinary panel and the Kansas Supreme Court. The Kansas Supreme Court set forth the evidence of Mr. Jordan's misconduct in its disbarment order. To the extent Mr. Jordan asks us to

Supp. App. 3

reexamine or reverse the Kansas Supreme Court's decision, we cannot.

In short, our review of the record has not revealed a lack of procedural due process, insufficient proof of misconduct, or other grave reason under *Selling* for this court to refuse to give reciprocal effect to the disbarment decision of the Kansas Supreme Court. Mr. Jordan's arguments to the contrary are largely frivolous and conclusory. Accordingly, Mr. Jordan's request for an evidentiary hearing is denied, *see* Tenth Circuit Rules, Addendum III, Plan for Attorney Disciplinary Enforcement, Section 8.1., and Mr. Jordan is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Mr. Jordan's name shall be stricken from this court's attorney admission roster. Readmission to practice in this court is conditioned upon the filing of an application that (1) demonstrates good cause why Mr. Jordan should be readmitted, (2) includes evidence showing that Mr. Jordan has been returned to good standing within the Kansas state court system, and (3) otherwise complies with the applicable provisions of this court's Plan for Attorney Disciplinary Enforcement.

Entered for the Court

/s/ Christopher M. Wolpert
CHRISTOPHER M. WOLPERT,
Clerk

Supp. App. 4

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK**

Byron White United States Courthouse
1823 Stout Street
Denver, Colorado 80257
(303) 844-3157

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

Jane K. Castro
Chief Deputy Clerk

January 3, 2023

Re: 22-808, *In re: Jordan*

A COPY OF THE ATTACHED ORDER HAS BEEN
PLACED IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL THIS
DATE, ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS:

Jack Jordan
3102 Howell Street
North Kansas City, MO
64116

Skyler B. O'Hara, Clerk
U.S. District Court for
the District of Kansas
500 State Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66101

Office of the Disciplinary
Administrator
Kansas Supreme Court
701 SW Jackson Street,
1st Floor
Topeka, KS 66603

US Supreme Court
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe,
Clerk
US Court of Appeals
for the 2nd Circuit
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007

Lyle W. Cayce, Clerk
US Court of Appeals
for the 5th Circuit
600 Camp Street
New Orleans, LA 70130

Supp. App. 5

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk US Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit 95 7th Street San Francisco, CA 9410	Mark Langer, Clerk US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit 333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
Paige Wymore-Wynn, Clerk US District Court for the District of Western Missouri 400 East 9th Street Kansas City, MO 64106	Lisa LeCours, Clerk New York State Court of Appeals 20 Eagle Street Albany, NY 12207
Brenna B. Mahoney, Clerk US District Court for the District of Eastern New York 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201	Ruby J. Krajick, Clerk US District Court for the District of Southern New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk US District Court for the District of Southern Texas 515 Rusk Avenue Houston, TX 77002	

by: R. Stephens
Deputy Clerk

Supp. App. 6

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

In re: JACK JORDAN | No. 22-808

ORDER

(Filed Jan. 20, 2023)

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **KELLY**, and **PHIL-
LIPS**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before us on *Respondent's Motion to Reconsider and Vacate Disbarment Order*, which we construe as a petition for rehearing pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 40. After careful consideration, and as construed, the petition is denied.

Entered for the Court

/s/ Christopher M. Wolpert
CHRISTOPHER M. WOLPERT,
Clerk

Supp. App. 7

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

In re: JACK JORDAN | No. 22-808

ORDER

(Filed Jan. 25, 2023)

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **KELLY**, and **PHIL-
LIPS**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before us on *Respondent's Motion for Published Reasoned Opinion*. To the extent Respondent takes issue with the reasoning in this court's disbarment order, the motion is not permitted. *See* 10th Cir. R. 40.3 (prohibiting successive petitions for rehearing). To the extent Respondent asks the court to publish the disbarment order, the request is denied. No further filings will be accepted in this matter.

Entered for the Court

/s/ Christopher M. Wolpert
CHRISTOPHER M. WOLPERT,
Clerk

Supp. App. 8

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

In re: JACK JORDAN | No. 22-808

ORDER

(Filed Feb. 6, 2023)

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **KELLY**, and **PHIL-
LIPS**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before us on *Respondent's Motion to
Allowing Filing of Petition for Rehearing en Banc*. The
motion is denied.

Entered for the Court
/s/ Christopher M. Wolpert

CHRISTOPHER M. WOLPERT,
Clerk

Supp. App. 9

Subject **22-808 In re: Jordan “Document received, not filed”**
From <ca10_cmecf_notify@ca10.uscourts.gov>
To <jack.jordan@emobilawyer.com>
Date 2023-02-06 16:16

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case(including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.**

Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was entered on 02/06/2023 at 3:16:08 PM Mountain Standard Time and filed on 01/30/2023

Case Name: In re: Jordan

Case Number: 22-808

Document(s): Document(s)

Docket Text:

[10974949] Petition for Rehearing En Banc received from Jack Jordan but not filed per this court's order dated 02/06/2023. Served on 01/30/2023. Manner of Service: email. [22-808]

Supp. App. 10

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Jack Jordan: jack.jordan@emobilawyer.com

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Main Document

Original Filename: 22-808_Petition for Rehearing
En Banc.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1104938855 [Date=01/30/2023]
[FileNumber=10974949-0][ab8000fea95108a8f0799dfe
8941dc7e2e70334e7f7b4cecd8222b63a916a256f77739f
991bd2e4c9d60e50de22e11b307a13ef6764862e006b5a
837de15bd7c]]
