

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|--------|
| <i>In re: Jack Jordan</i> , No. 23-8505 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 14, 2023) (disbarment order) | App. 1 |
| <i>In re: Jack Jordan</i> , No. 23-8505 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 22, 2023) (denying oral argument) | App. 3 |
| <i>In re: Jack Jordan</i> , No. 23-8505 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 24, 2023) (discharging show cause order; denying hearing; treating review of state court order as a federal appeal) | App. 4 |
| <i>In re: Jack Jordan</i> , No. 23-8505 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 10, 2023) (order to show cause re: reciprocal disbarment based on state court order) | App. 7 |
| <i>In re: Jack Jordan</i> , No. 23-8505 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 3, 2024) (denying rehearing en banc) | App. 9 |

App. 1

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 23-8505

September Term, 2022

Filed On: November 14, 2023

In re: Jack Jordan,
Respondent

BEFORE: Rao and Walker, Circuit Judges,
and Randolph, Senior Circuit Judge

ORDER OF DISBARMENT

Upon consideration of this Court's order filed February 10, 2023, directing respondent to show cause as to why he should not be disbarred based on his disbarment by the Kansas Supreme Court, and the brief filed by respondent, it is

ORDERED that respondent Jack Jordan be disbarred from the practice of law before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Respondent has not carried his burden to demonstrate that there was a lack of due process or an infirmity of proof in the Kansas Supreme Court's proceeding; that disbarment is gravely unjust; or that his misconduct warrants substantially different discipline. *See In re Zdravkovich*, 634 F.3d 574, 577–78 (D.C. Cir. 2011); D.C. Cir. Rules, App. II, Rule IV(c). It is

App. 2

FURTHER ORDERED that respondent Jack Jordan be prohibited from holding himself out to be an attorney at law licensed to practice before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's motion to postpone oral argument and his motion to vacate the oral argument order are denied as moot, in light of this Court's order filed August 22, 2023, deciding to dispose of this matter without oral argument. Respondent invoked his right to be heard before facing disbarment. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 46(b)(3). But the Court previously declined to hold an evidentiary hearing in its order filed April 24, 2023, and respondent waived oral argument by requesting to vacate the argument Order. *Cf. In re Williams*, 398 F.3d 116, 120 (1st Cir. 2005).

The Court has accorded the issues full consideration and has determined that they do not warrant a published opinion. *See* D.C. Cir. R. 36(d).

Per Curiam

App. 3

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 23-8505

September Term, 2022

No. 124,956

**Filed On: August 22, 2023
[2013624]**

In re: Jack Jordan,
Respondent

BEFORE: Rao and Walker, Circuit Judges; and
Randolph, Senior Circuit Judge

ORDER

The court concludes, on its own motion, that oral argument will not assist the court in this case. Accordingly, the court will dispose of the appeal without oral argument on the basis of the record and the presentations in the briefs. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j).

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Michael C. McGrail

Deputy Clerk

App. 4

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 23-8505

September Term, 2022

No. 124,956

Filed On: April 24, 2023

In re: Jack Jordan,

Respondent

BEFORE: Millett, Wilkins, and Katsas, Circuit
Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of this court's order to show cause filed February 10, 2023, the lodged response thereto, the motion to exceed the word limit for the response, and the motion for a hearing, it is

ORDERED that the order to show cause be discharged. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to exceed the word limit be denied. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that this case be scheduled for oral argument before a merits panel. To the extent respondent requests an evidentiary hearing, that request is denied. Oral argument will be confined to the issue of whether identical discipline is warranted under Rule IV of the court's Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement. See D.C. Cir. Rules, App. II, Rule IV(c). It is

App. 5

FURTHER ORDERED that the following briefing schedule will apply in this case:

Respondent's Brief June 20, 2023
(not to exceed 13,000 words)

Appendix June 20, 2023

The court will not accept any additional filings or supplements, absent extraordinary circumstances. Respondent's brief may not exceed 13,000 words. See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(e).

Respondent will be informed later of the date of oral argument and the composition of the merits panel.

To enhance the clarity of his brief, respondent is urged to limit the use of abbreviations, including acronyms. While acronyms may be used for entities and statutes with widely recognized initials, the brief should not contain acronyms that are not widely known. See D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures 43 (2021); Notice Regarding Use of Acronyms (D.C. Cir. Jan. 26, 2010).

Respondent is strongly encouraged to hand deliver the paper copies of his brief to the Clerk's office on the date due. Filing by mail may delay the processing of the brief. Additionally, respondent is reminded that if filing by mail, he must use a class of mail that is at least as expeditious as first-class mail. See Fed. R. App. P. 25(a). The brief and appendix must contain the date

App. 6

that the case is scheduled for oral argument at the top of the cover. See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(8).

Per Curiam

App. 7

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 23-8505

September Term, 2022

No. 124,956

**Filed On: February 10, 2023
[1985419]**

In re: Jack Jordan,
Respondent

ORDER

Upon consideration of the order issued by the Kansas Supreme Court on October 21, 2022, which states that Jack R. T. Jordan was disbarred from the practice of law by the Kansas Supreme Court, and it appearing that Jack R. T. Jordan is respondent, Jack Jordan, who was admitted to the bar of this court on December 16, 2019, under number 62144, it is

ORDERED, on the court's own motion, that respondent show cause by March 13, 2023, why the imposition of identical discipline by this court would be unwarranted. *See* Rule IV (a) & (c) of the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The response to the order to show cause may not exceed the length limitations established by Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2) (5,200 words if produced using a computer; 20 pages if handwritten or typewritten).

App. 8

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this order to respondent, along with a copy of the order from the Kansas Supreme Court, by certified mail, return receipt requested, and by first class mail.

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Selena R. Gancasz

Deputy Clerk

Attachment:

A copy of the order from the Kansas Supreme Court is attached.

App. 9

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 23-8505

September Term, 2022

No. 124,956

Filed On: January 3, 2024

In re: Jack Jordan,

Respondent

BEFORE: Srinivasan, Chief Judge; Henderson,
Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Katsas, Rao,
Walker, Childs, Pan, and Garcia, Cir-
cuit Judges; and Randolph, Senior
Circuit Judge

ORDER

Upon consideration of respondent's petition for re-
hearing en banc, and the absence of a request by any
member of the court for a vote, it is

ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk
