

APPENDIX

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	<i>Page</i>
Appendix A — Opinion, State ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Ass'n v. Barlean, 2026 OK 30, SCBD No. 7652 (cons. w/ 7779) (Okla. Apr. 28, 2026)	1a
Appendix B — Order of Immediate Interim Suspension, 2024 OK 36 (Okla. May 20, 2024)....	20a
Appendix C — Order Denying Request to Lift Immediate Interim Suspension and Directing Hearing (Okla. July 15, 2024)	23a
Appendix D — Order of the Professional Responsibility Tribunal (Nov. 18, 2024).....	26a
Appendix E — Report of the Trial Panel (Apr. 25, 2025)	30a
Appendix F — Order Denying Rehearing (Okla. June 23, 2026)	56a
Appendix G — Pertinent rule provisions (RGDP; ORPC).....	58a
Appendix H — Exhibit C to Respondent's verified response to show-cause order (CBI Service Termination Report) (filed May 31, 2024)	67a
Appendix I — Plea and deferred-sentence documents, Case Nos. CF-2021-3557 and CM-2022-4468 (excerpt).....	71a

Table of Appendices

	<i>Page</i>
Appendix J — Special Appearance and Objection (Aug. 28, 2024) (excerpt)	90a
Appendix K — In re the Disbarment of Kelly John Barlean, Misc. No. 7 (W.D. Okla. July 9, 2024)	96a

1a

**Appendix A — Opinion, State ex rel. Oklahoma Bar
Ass'n v. Barlean, 2026 OK 30, SCBD No. 7652 (cons. w/
7779) (Okla. Apr. 28, 2026)**

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

2026 OK 30

STATE OF OKLAHOMA *EX REL.* OKLAHOMA
BAR ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

SCBD No. 7652 (Consolidated w/ SCBD No. 7779)
FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

Opinion

**ORIGINAL PROCEEDING FOR ATTORNEY
DISCIPLINE**

¶10 Complainant, the State of Oklahoma *ex rel.* Oklahoma Bar Association (OBA), brought disciplinary proceedings against Respondent based on (a) convictions in two criminal cases; (b) a judicial grievance; (c) two counts of other professional misconduct filed by the OBA. We find

Appendix A

clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's conduct requires disbarment. We order Respondent to pay costs of \$2,532.10 within ninety days from the date of this Opinion.

**RESPONDENT DISBARRED; APPLICATION FOR
COSTS GRANTED.**

KUEHN, V.C.J.:

¶1 This matter is before the Court for imposition of final discipline under combined Rules 6 and 7.2, Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings (RGDP), 5 O.S. Ch. 1, App. 1--A. Respondent is licensed to practice law in Oklahoma.¹ Beginning in 2021 Respondent engaged in behavior, in Oklahoma and in Illinois, constituting professional misconduct with consequences including criminal convictions and civil protective orders.

¶2 Rule 7 proceedings (SCBD 7652) against Respondent began on April 26, 2024. On May 20, 2024, this Court issued an Order of Immediate Interim Suspension pursuant to Rule 7.3 of the RGDP. 5 O.S. Ch. 1, app. 1--A. Respondent filed an Answer and moved to set that Order aside. This Court denied that motion and referred the matter to the Professional Responsibility Tribunal (PRT) for a hearing and recommendation of final discipline. The hearing was set for October 2-3, 2024. In the interim, Respondent (a) sought to depose persons not connected with his state

1. Throughout pleadings and documents admitted during the disciplinary proceedings Respondent refers to himself as a retired lawyer.

Appendix A

criminal charges, (b) asked to postpone the hearing so he might conduct discovery in his Rule 7 proceedings; and (c) moved to continue the hearing after the State sought to accelerate his deferred sentences. The Rule 6 complaint against him (SCBD 7779) was filed on September 27, 2024. Respondent filed an Answer to that complaint. The PRT struck the October hearing dates and reset the Rule 7 matter for a November status conference.

¶13 On October 18, 2024, this Court consolidated the matters and directed that both cases be resolved with a joint hearing, a single record, and a single trial panel report. On October 30, 2024, Respondent moved to stay the proceedings after a fire destroyed his home. On November 28, 2024, the PRT denied Respondent's motion for depositions, and set deadlines for discovery and exchange of witness lists and exhibits. The hearing was rescheduled for March 26, 2025. Respondent had participated in the pretrial proceedings by filing answers, responses, and motions. Respondent had notice of the March 26 hearing. However, Respondent did not appear and failed to participate in the hearing. The Report of the Trial Panel was filed with this Court on April 25, 2025, and the OBA's brief was filed on May 19, 2025. Respondent did not file a brief.

¶14 The Trial Panel recommended a minimum imposition of discipline of suspension of two years and one day, while noting harsher discipline was warranted. We agree and disbar Respondent.

*Appendix A***STANDARD OF REVIEW**

¶15 This Court has exclusive original jurisdiction over bar disciplinary proceedings. *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 4, 540 P.3d 458, 462. We review the disciplinary proceedings *de novo*, to independently determine whether the OBA has shown clear and convincing evidence of misconduct; we consider the PRT report but are not bound by its conclusions and recommendations. *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Conrady*, 2025 OK 74, ¶ 4, 578 P.3d 174, 179. Our primary responsibility in these proceedings is not punishment. We focus on protection of the public, preservation of the integrity of the courts and the legal profession, and deterring similar misconduct. *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Silvernail*, 2022 OK 68, ¶ 21, 522 P.3d 464, 470.

RULE 7 PROCEEDINGS

Rule 7.1: A lawyer who has been convicted or has tendered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere pursuant to a deferred sentence plea agreement in any jurisdiction of a crime which demonstrates such lawyer's unfitness to practice law, regardless of whether the conviction resulted from a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or from a verdict after trial, shall be subject to discipline as herein provided, regardless of the pendency of an appeal.

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings, 5 O.S. ch. 1 app. 1-A.

Appendix A

¶7 Rule 7 applies where a lawyer has been convicted of a crime. Certified copies of the conviction, including guilty pleas, are conclusive evidence of commission of the crime and provide a sufficient basis for discipline. Rule 7.2, Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings, 5 O.S. ch. 1 app. 1-A. Not every conviction results in discipline. *Silvernail*, 2022 OK 68, ¶ 5, 522 P.3d at 467. In keeping with this Court's primary concerns, we must consider whether the conviction demonstrates the lawyer's unfitness to practice, and if so what discipline should be imposed. *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Dyer*, 2024 OK 72, ¶ 4, 558 P.3d 22, 24. Unfitness to practice reflects on a lawyer's "honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects. . . ." Rule 8.4(b), (c), Rules of Professional Conduct, 5 O.S. ch. 1, app. 3-A. These offenses may involve "violence, dishonesty or breach of trust, or serious interference with the administration of justice." *Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 6, 540 P.3d at 463 (*quoting State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Armstrong*, 1990 OK 9, ¶ 8, 791 P.2d 815, 818); Comment to Rule 8.4, Rules of Professional Conduct, 5 O.S. ch. 1, app. 3-A. "Criminal acts may warrant discipline even if they were not directly related to the practice of law." *Silvernail*, 2022 OK 68, ¶ 5, 522 P.3d at 467.

¶8 On January 5, 2023, Respondent pled guilty to two misdemeanor charges of Domestic Assault and Battery in each of Oklahoma County Case Nos. CF-2021-3557 and CM-2022-4468.² Both charges stemmed from violent

2. Respondent had been charged in CF-2021-3557 with felony Domestic Assault and Battery by Strangulation. This charge was reduced to misdemeanor Domestic Assault and Battery as part of Respondent's plea agreement.

Appendix A

incidents involving Respondent and a woman with whom he had a romantic relationship. On August 16, 2021, during an argument, Respondent strangled or choked the woman until she gave him her car keys. He was arrested, charged with a felony and bound over for trial. While out on bond, on December 2, 2022, during another fight Respondent pushed the woman down a flight of stairs, injuring her arm. He was arrested again and charged with a misdemeanor.

¶19 Under Respondent's plea agreement, the felony charge was reduced to a misdemeanor and Respondent pled guilty to both charges. He agreed to supervised probation with requirements including restitution, community service, completion of an intervention program, anger management classes; an alcohol and drug assessment and any recommended treatment. Respondent failed to complete these requirements. The State moved to accelerate his deferred sentence on September 30, 2024; on November 22, 2024 Respondent pled no contest to the motion to accelerate. Both counts were reduced to convictions and he was fined. The Oklahoma County Court Clerk did not report Respondent's convictions to the OBA, but they were discovered during the OBA investigation of the Bondurant grievance, discussed below.

Discussion

¶10 This Court's May 20, 2024 order of interim suspension directed Respondent to show cause why a final order of discipline should not be imposed. In his Answer, Respondent claimed that a June 2021 arrest, search of his

Appendix A

house, and incarceration-unrelated to the charges at issue here-was illegal and led him down a “dark, self-destructive path” which culminated in his arrest for domestic violence by strangulation, the basis for the charge in CF-2021-3557. He attached a copy of a civil rights complaint he had filed in federal court as a result of the allegedly illegal search and incarceration. In that complaint, Respondent blamed the victim in both criminal cases for his troubles. Respondent also claimed in his Answer that he had barely practiced law in Oklahoma and retired from legal practice in the 2010s. He appeared to argue that there would be no point in imposing a suspension from practice, or any form of discipline, since he did not practice law or represent clients.

¶11 This Court has held that domestic violence is itself a “serious breach of a lawyer’s ethical duty and will not be tolerated.” *State ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Ass’n v. Lockard*, 2023 OK 110, ¶ 17, 538 P.3d 871, 874-75 (*quoting State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass’n v. Zannotti*, 2014 OK 25, ¶ 24, 330 P.3d 11, 17). Respondent pled guilty to two crimes of violence against a person with whom he had an intimate relationship. In each instance he resorted to violence while quarrelling with the victim. The crimes were separated by several months, and the second occurred while he was out on bond after having been charged with the first crime. Although his deferred sentence offered him the opportunity to avoid those convictions, he admitted that he failed to complete the requirements he himself had agreed to. These convictions and the circumstances surrounding them reflect, at best, extremely poor judgment and a propensity to violence.

Appendix A

¶12 The OBA has shown by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's conduct adversely reflects on his judgment and thus his fitness to practice law. *Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 14, 540 P.3d at 464; *Silvernail*, 2022 OK 68, ¶ 12, 522 P.3d at 468; *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Conrady*, 2012 OK 29, ¶ 10, 275 P.3d 133, 137. We find that Respondent's criminal convictions amount to professional misconduct.

Rule 6 Proceedings

¶13 "Rule 6 sets forth the process by which the OBA processes grievances against attorneys, conducts investigation, and presents the results and recommendations to this Court for disciplinary action." *Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 15, 540 P.3d at 464. According to the Rules Governing Professional Conduct, attorneys may not act contrary to prescribed standards of conduct which would discredit the legal profession, either in their professional capacity or in their personal lives. Rule 1.3 (RGPC). Once an attorney is notified that a grievance is filed against him, he shall make a full written response within specific time limitations, and failure to do so is in itself grounds for discipline. Rule 5.2 (RGPC). Turning to the official rules of professional conduct, an attorney shall not seek to influence a judge or other official by means prohibited by law, communicate *ex parte* during proceedings without authorization by law or court order, or engage in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal. Rules 3.5(a), (b), (d) (ORPC). A lawyer shall not knowingly make a statement about a judge's qualifications or integrity that is false, or with reckless disregard as to its truth. Rule

Appendix A

8.2 (ORPC). Misconduct includes a violation or attempted violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Rule 8.4 (ORPC).

¶14 Respondent is charged in three specific grievances with violating provisions of the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct (ORPC), Title 5, Chapter 1, Appendix. 3-A, and Rules 1.3 and 5.2 of the RGDP.

Count I, the Bondurant Grievance

¶15 In 2024, Respondent's ex-wife and son sought protective orders against him. They claimed he had fits of rage, sent them threatening text messages, and would not leave them alone despite being told to stop contacting them. On March 27, 2024, Judge Bondurant presided over a combined hearing in both cases. Testimony showed that Respondent repeatedly left packages and gifts on the petitioners' porch. The Judge later testified that both petitioners' fear of Respondent during the hearing was "palpable" and "visible". Initially Judge Bondurant believed that Respondent simply might not understand that his actions were making the petitioners afraid. She was inclined to set the case six months out to give Respondent the chance to "stop doing what he was doing" and resolve the problem without a protective order. So she asked Respondent if he intended to stop. Judge Bondurant testified that Respondent had up to that point represented himself professionally and politely. However, she said, with that question his entire demeanor changed and he responded, "No, I don't intend to stop. They don't know what they need. I know what they need." At that

Appendix A

point Judge Bondurant found there was a clear need for a protective order.

¶16 After the hearing the Judge issued protective orders in both cases, in effect until March 27, 2026. The orders prohibited Respondent from any contact with his ex-wife and son, unless authorized by the court; from harassing, stalking or interfering with them; from any conduct that would place them in reasonable fear of bodily injury to themselves or relatives. He was ordered to remain at least one hundred yards away at all times. The day after the Orders were issued, at approximately 9:00 p.m., Respondent left two voicemail messages for Judge Bondurant. The first warned that he planned to lodge a judicial complaint against her. In the second he mentioned being jailed after a disagreement with a different judge, stated he had been a military unarmed combat instructor, and then said, "I don't appreciate incompetent judges, and I take care of them." Judge Bondurant testified that Respondent's personality in the messages was starkly different from what she'd seen in her courtroom. Given Respondent's history of violent behavior, Judge Bondurant notified courthouse security. After that, she filed this grievance. She stated this was because of the "unstable nature" of the phone messages, plus Respondent's change, within 24 hours, from presenting with decorum and control to expressing such anger and rage.

¶17 Respondent twice failed to respond to notice of the grievance sent him by the OBA. In July 2024, two months after the OBA's second letter, Respondent emailed the OBA stating he had just read it and asking about

Appendix A

the status of the complaint. In August 2024 Respondent again asked about the status of the grievance, and told the OBA he planned to file a judicial complaint against Judge Bondurant. The OBA referred Respondent to its previous letters for information about the grievance requirements. Respondent has never responded to the grievance. OBA alleges this violates Rule 3.5(a), 3.5(b), and 3.5(d), as well as Rule 8.2(a) and Rule 8.4(a) of the ORPC, and Rules 1.3 and 5.2 of the RGDP.

¶18 OBA charges that these actions reflect adversely on the legal profession and Respondent's fitness to practice, in violation of Rules 3.5(a), 3.5(b) and (d), Rule 8.2, Rule 8.4(a), ORPC, and Rule 1.3 and Rule 5.2, RGDP.

¶19 This involves members of the W family and their counsel in Illinois. Respondent met the Ws socially several years ago, when they were in Oklahoma. The Ws eventually moved to Illinois; husband J.W. is a law school graduate but does not practice law. At some point Respondent and J.W.'s wife, L.W., had a sexual relationship, which continued after the family moved to Illinois. The record indicates that L.W. ended the relationship after she became concerned about Respondent's aggressive behavior. Thereafter Respondent engaged in a sustained campaign, conducted primarily through social media, text messaging, and email, to, as he threatened, ruin or destroy the W family and J.W.'s career.

¶20 Starting in Fall 2023, Respondent contacted several people in connection with this campaign. He contacted J.W.'s mother, M.D.W., through a Facebook message. The two were not Facebook friends and she had

Appendix A

neither heard of nor met Respondent. The messages were sexually suggestive and sexually explicit, referring both to Respondent's relationship with L.W. and to potential sexual activity with M.D.W. herself. M.D.W. applied for a protective order; in response Respondent sent her disparaging messages about her appearance. At the same time Respondent sent a series of harassing messages to J.W.'s workplace. They included sexually suggestive and explicit photographs of L.W. After receiving these, J.W. explained the situation to the office human resources department, which encouraged him to file for a protective order for himself and his children. And during the same time period, Respondent sent numerous texts to L.W. He stated he would destroy the family and J.W.'s career, that he would crush J.W. "like a bug", and use his legal skills to file several lawsuits against them in order to cause them pain and take them down. Respondent threatened that the W children would be "collateral damage". He stated that he had been to Illinois and knew where both M.D.W. and the Ws lived. He repeatedly stated that the W family deserved this for their actions against him. L.W. also applied for a protective order. L.W., M.D.W., and J.W. and the children were granted protective orders in April 2024.

¶21 Illinois attorney Brad Tengler represented M.D.W. and J.W. in their applications for protective orders. After Tengler was hired, Respondent sent harassing messages to his office. They included sexually suggestive and explicit photographs of L.W., and emails threatening to send more explicit videos which would be admitted in the legal proceedings, and to include information in the public filings and testimony which would destroy J.W.'s business.

Appendix A

One message warned Tengler not to provoke Respondent "in litigation or in life", because he was trained to deal with adversaries and had not failed. Tengler took this as a threat of physical violence against him personally.

¶22 OBA charges that these actions reflect adversely on the legal profession and Respondent's fitness to practice, in violation of Rule 1.3, RGDP.

Count III, Conduct in Response to SCBD No. 7552

¶23 Respondent sent the OBA more than twenty emails after the Rule 7 Notice of Judgment and Sentence was filed. He claimed the criminal charges would be dismissed (as discussed above, they were not). He called this Court incompetent, a joke, redneck and lazy, invited the OBA to "bring it on bitch", and stated he was overqualified for Oklahoma. Along with a certificate of completion of his required anger management program, he wrote, "I don't strangle. I crush or pull out voice boxes. Ask my Airborne instructors." He suggested the female OBA attorney was embarrassed to be "schooled by a Man", and threatened to drag the State through a federal Section 1983 civil rights claim. He invited an OBA paralegal trying to help him with subpoenas to "come after me so I can show you what the United States trained me to do to Communists."

¶24 OBA charges that these actions reflect adversely on the legal profession and Respondent's fitness to practice, in violation of Rule 1.3, RGDP.

*Appendix A***Discussion**

¶25 Respondent filed an Answer to this complaint. Regarding Count I, Respondent claimed that Judge Bondurant lied and made a frivolous grievance against him. He claimed she had winked at him during the proceedings, suggesting that he didn't have to pay costs, and then improperly found him indigent; he argued this violated the Canons of Judicial Conduct. He claimed any criticism of the judge was merely an exercise of his First Amendment rights. He referred to the two voicemails to Judge Bondurant as "instructional" and, regarding the charge that he had left them, asked, "so what?" As to the Illinois protective orders in Count II, Respondent blamed J.W. for the entire thing. Respondent did admit that he is not "a choirboy", with a "colorful youth and felonious peccadillos." Respondent suggested that his parole officer was aware of the Illinois events and untroubled by them.

¶26 "Fitness to practice law entails more than the ability to handle cases but involves the continuing qualification of good moral character and respect for the law." *State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Littlefield*, 2023 OK 53, ¶ 7, 529 P.3d 185, 188. Respondent's conduct across all three counts, and including his responses filed with this Court, exhibit serious defects of moral character.

¶27 Angry with Judge Bondurant for issuing protective orders against him, Respondent made two *ex parte* calls and left her threatening voicemail messages. Responding to the threats, the judge alerted courthouse security. That is, Respondent communicated *ex parte* in order to illegally

Appendix A

influence a judge, and his intentional conduct disrupted a tribunal, all in violation of Rules 3.5(a), (b), (d) (ORPC). The messages themselves included false statements about the judge's qualifications or integrity in violation of Rule 8.2 (ORPC). This conduct discredits the legal profession in violation of Rule 1.3 (RGDP) Respondent also failed to timely respond to the OBA's notifications, once the grievance investigation had begun, in violation of Rule 5.2 (RGDP). And all these violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct are contrary to Rule 8.4 (ORPC).

¶28 During the course of events outlined in Count II, Respondent repeatedly sent lewd, sexually suggestive and explicit messages to members of the W family and J.W.'s employer, as well as attorney Tengler. He threatened the W children. Although he claimed to be retired, Respondent gleefully threatened to use his legal skills to ruin the W family, cause them embarrassment, and destroy J.W.'s career. He used improper and threatening tactics to fight all three family members' attempts to get protective orders against him, including improper messages and threats to their attorney. Respondent throughout consistently blamed the W family, particularly J.W., for Respondent's own actions. This entire course of conduct brought not only discredit, but disgrace upon the legal profession in violation of Rule 1.3 (RGPC).

¶29 In his Answer Respondent did not address the frequency or content of his emails to the OBA which form the basis for Count III. Those began a day after the Rule 7 complaint (SBCD No 7652) was filed. They included threats against OBA personnel (including the prosecuting

Appendix A

attorney), as well as language disparaging this Court's fitness and competence and inappropriate comments. At the very least, they show astonishingly poor judgment for any lawyer, much less one in Respondent's position. These messages brought discredit on the legal profession and violated Rule 1.3 (RGPC).

DISCIPLINE

¶30 We turn to the question of appropriate discipline. Respondent engaged in persistent professional misconduct over several years and in two states. He claims he has retired from the practice of law. However, he represented himself in the Oklahoma protective order hearings that formed the basis for the Rule 6 Bondurant grievance, in the Illinois protective order hearings, in the federal lawsuit he refers to in his pleadings, and in these disciplinary proceedings. Even assuming he was acting *pro se*, every party was aware that Respondent was a lawyer licensed to practice in Oklahoma, and he made frequent reference to his superior legal skills.

¶31 This Court's goal in disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public and preserve the integrity of the judicial system. *Lockard*, 2023 OK 110, ¶ 8, 538 P.3d at 873. We consider prior decisions which involve similar misconduct in determining appropriate discipline. *Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 39, 540 P.3d at 470. We may review four factors, including: (a) the duty violated; (b) the lawyer's mental state; (c) the potential or actual injury caused by the lawyer's misconduct; and (d) the existence of aggravating or mitigating factors; we will look at the whole record. *Id.*

Appendix A

¶32 The common threads in Respondent's conduct are violence or the threat of violence and harm. First, Respondent was twice convicted of domestic violence; in both instances the victim was injured (Rule 7). Furthermore, the protective order charges forming the basis of the Bondurant grievance (Rule 6, Count I) stemmed from Respondent's actions putting his ex-wife and son in fear, and his stated intention to continue that conduct. Respondent made violent threats to Judge Bondurant and the OBA (Rule 6, Counts I and III). His communications to the W family and Tengler, in addition to lewd and suggestive comments, contained threats to "destroy" and "ruin" the family, and to make the W children "collateral damage". M.D.W., J.W., Tengler, and Judge Bondurant all testified that these threats made them afraid of Respondent and what he might do. Because Respondent did not participate in the PRT hearing, the only mitigating evidence in the record are Respondent's claims (raised in pleadings) that he is in ill health, was injured while in jail in 2021, began drinking heavily, and became aggressive.

¶33 We have consistently imposed discipline where violence is involved. We recently imposed a six-month suspension for a single domestic violence incident with significant mitigating circumstances and a clear treatment plan. *Lockard*, 2023 OK 110, ¶ 18, 538 P.3d at 875. Those mitigating factors are not present here. More severe domestic violence attacks have resulted in two-year suspensions. *See, e.g., State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Faulk*, 2021 OK 46, ¶ 29, 496 P.3d 612, 618 (repeated pattern of domestic violence, shoved and choked victim to

Appendix A

unconsciousness); *Zannotti*, 2014 OK 25, ¶ 25, 330 P.3d at 17 (battery, strangulation, injury to property). Domestic violence coupled with other professional misconduct has resulted in a suspension of two years and a day. *See, e.g., State ex rel. Okla. Bar Ass'n v. Givens*, 2014 OK 103, ¶ 22, 343 P.3d 214, 219 (two separate violent physical attacks on teenage son); *Conrady*, 2012 OK 29, ¶ 19, 275 P.3d at 140 (broke into victim's empty home and fired several gunshots, with significant mitigating evidence). And a consistent pattern of violent or threatening conduct, coupled with other professional misconduct, will warrant disbarment. *Lance*, 2023 OK 98, ¶ 47, 540 P.3d at 472-73 (substance abuse and protective order violations coupled with failure to represent clients and violent conduct towards the public); *Silvernail*, 2022 OK 68, ¶ 31, 522 P.3d at 472 (shot victim after an altercation, practiced law from jail).

¶34 This Court does not condone violent conduct by attorneys. Nor do we condone harassment, threats, or inappropriate or suggestive comments and communications. Judge Bondurant asked Respondent directly if he would stop the actions that put his ex-wife and son in fear, and he said he would not; then he threatened the judge and attacked her competence. Respondent initiated and carried out a campaign of harassment and threats against the W family and attorney Tengler over a period of several months. He failed to respond to the Bondurant grievance, and made threatening and inappropriate communications to the OBA. And, of course, he admitted to two counts of domestic violence.

Appendix A

CONCLUSION

¶35 Respondent's conduct reveals a consistent pattern of violence and poor judgment compelling our conclusion that Respondent is unfit to practice law. He is disbarred. The OBA filed an application to assess costs of \$2,352.10, pursuant to Rules 6.13 and 6.16, (RGDP). We find the payment of costs appropriate. Respondent is ordered to pay costs in the amount of \$2,352.10 within ninety days from the date of this Opinion.

**RESPONDENT IS DISBARRED AND ORDERED
TO PAY COSTS OF \$2,352.10**

ALL JUSTICES CONCUR.

20a

**Appendix B — Order of Immediate Interim
Suspension, 2024 OK 36 (Okla. May 20, 2024)**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

2024 OK 36

**STATE OF OKLAHOMA EX REL. OKLAHOMA
BAR ASSOCIATION,**

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

ORDER OF IMMEDIATE INTERIM SUSPENSION

¶1 The Oklahoma Bar Association (OBA), in compliance with Rules 7.1 and 7.2 of the Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings (RGDP), has forwarded to this Court certified copies of the Information, Probable Cause Affidavit, and Judgment and Sentence in the following matters in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma: State of Oklahoma v. Kelly John Barlean, case no. CF-2021-3557, and State of Oklahoma v. Kelly Barlean, case no. CM-2022-4468. Pursuant to a plea agreement, the charge of felony Domestic Assault and Battery by Strangulation in case no. CF-2021-3557 was reduced to misdemeanor Domestic Assault and Battery. Following pleas of guilty

Appendix B

to misdemeanor domestic assault and battery in the combined cases, the court deferred sentencing for 3 years until January 4, 2026.¹

¶2 Rule 7.3 of the RGDP provides: "Upon receipt of the certified copies of Judgment and Sentence on a plea of guilty, order deferring judgment and sentence, indictment or information and the judgment and sentence, the Supreme Court may by order immediately suspend the lawyer from the practice of law until further order of the Court." Having received certified copies of these papers and orders, this Court orders that Kelly John Barlean is immediately suspended from the practice of law. Kelly John Barlean is directed to show cause, if any, no later than **June 4, 2024**, why this order of interim suspension should be set aside. *See* RGDP Rule 7.3. The OBA has until **June 18, 2024**, to respond.

¶3 Rule 7.2 of the RGDP provides that a certified copy of a plea of guilty, an order deferring judgment and sentence, or information and judgment and sentence of conviction "shall constitute the charge and be conclusive evidence of the commission of the crime upon which the judgment and sentence is based and shall suffice as the basis for discipline in accordance with these rules." Pursuant to Rule 7.4 of the RGDP, Kelly John Barlean

1. Since entering the pleas in these cases, two protective orders (PO-2024-44 and PO-2024-45) have been entered against Respondent in Oklahoma County following testimony from his son and ex-wife regarding Respondent's conduct involving stalking and harassment. The protective orders are in effect until March 27, 2026.

Appendix B

has until **July 3, 2024**, to show cause in writing why a final order of discipline should not be made. The written return of the lawyer shall be verified and expressly state whether a hearing is desired. The lawyer may in the interest of explaining his conduct or by way of mitigating the discipline to be imposed upon him, submit a brief and/or any evidence tending to mitigate the severity of discipline. The OBA has until **July 18, 2024** to respond by submission of a brief and/or any evidence supporting the recommendation of discipline.

¶4 DONE BY ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT
in conference on May 20, 2024.

/s/ _____
CHIEF JUSTICE

Kane, C.J., Winchester, Edmondson, Combs, Gurich,
Darby and Kuehn, JJ. Concur; Rowe, V.C.J. and
Kauger, J., dissent.

23a

**Appendix C — Order Denying Request to Lift
Immediate Interim Suspension and Directing Hearing
(Okla. July 15, 2024)**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

SCBD No. 7652
Rule 7

STATE OF OKLAHOMA *EX REL.*
OKLAHOMA BAR ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

Filed July 15, 2024

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO LIFT
IMMEDIATE INTERIM SUSPENSION AND
DIRECTING HEARING**

This Court notes Respondent Kelly John Barlean's response to this Court's Order of Immediate Interim Suspension directing Respondent to show cause why the order should be set aside pursuant to Rule 7.3, RGDP, and the Complainant Oklahoma Bar Association's reply. Rule 7.3 provides that, "Upon good cause shown, the Court may

Appendix C

decline to enter an order of immediate interim suspension when it appears to be in the interest of justice to do so, due regard being had to maintaining the integrity of and confidence in the profession." Upon review of Respondent's response, this Court finds that good cause has not been shown, and it appears to be in the interest of justice for this Court to keep the interim suspension in effect. Accordingly, this Court denies Respondent's request to lift the immediate interim suspension.

Under Rule 7.4, RGDP, this Court "may order the lawyer . . . to show cause in writing why a final order of discipline should not be made. The written return of the lawyer shall be verified and expressly state whether a hearing is desired. The lawyer may in the interest of explaining his conduct or by way of mitigating the discipline to be imposed upon him, submit a brief and/or any evidence tending to mitigate the severity of discipline." Respondent's response to the show cause order sets forth argument and exhibits to explain the reasons for the criminal conviction, including his argument that he was unlawfully arrested and that his civil rights were violated, resulting in Respondent filing an Amended Complaint in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma in Case No. CIV-23-00488-JD against multiple defendants concerning his arrest and subsequent detainment in the Oklahoma County Jail. In this regard, Respondent has raised material facts which are in dispute and should be weighed by the Professional Responsibility Tribunal and a recommendation made to this Court. Moreover, Respondent also alleges mitigating factors and urges this Court to set aside the Interim

25a

Appendix C

Suspension, and argues that a Final Order of Discipline should not be entered. However, mitigation and the severity of discipline are more appropriate in a final order of discipline. Therefore, this matter is accordingly referred to the Professional Responsibility Tribunal to hold a hearing to make a recommendation on whether final discipline should be imposed under Rule 7, and if so, a recommendation of the final discipline to be imposed. The trial panel shall submit its findings and recommendation to this Court within thirty days after the hearing.

DONE BY ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT
ON JULY 15, 2024.

/s/
CHIEF JUSTICE

**Appendix D — Order of the Professional
Responsibility Tribunal (Nov. 18, 2024)**

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
BEFORE THE PROFESSIONAL
RESPONSIBILITY TRIBUNAL

Case No. 7652 (cons. w/7779)

STATE OF OKLAHOMA *EX REL.* OKLAHOMA BAR
ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

**ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S MOTION
TO STAY IN PART, SETTING HEARING,
DENYING RESPONDENT'S APPLICATION FOR
DEPOSITIONS OF TWO POLICE OFFICERS,
STAYING DISCOVERY FOR LIMITED TIME, AND
SETTING DEADLINE FOR WITNESS LIST AND
EXHIBIT EXCHANGE**

A Telephonic status conference was conducted November 12, 2024, at 1:30 p.m. for the purpose of scheduling future proceedings in the case, particularly a scheduling conference, a ruling on the Objection and

Appendix D

Application of Respondent related to depositions of two police officers, and the hearing.

Assistant General Counsel Jana Harris and Investigator Krystal Willis appear for the Oklahoma Bar Association. Respondent Kelly John Barlean does not appear and no appearance is made on his behalf. OBA Assistant General Counsel advised that Respondent emailed the OBA paralegal on Sunday, November 8, 2024, at 3:02 p.m. indicating "I will not be available." Respondent followed up with three additional emails on the same date related to other issues.

The link to the Zoom telephone conference was sent by the OBA paralegal to Respondent the morning of November 12, 2024, some hours before the telephonic status conference at 1:30 pm.

It is hereby ORDERD:

1. Respondent's Motion to Stay Proceedings is granted in part without objection of the OBA.
2. The disciplinary hearing of the consolidated cases is set for March 26 and 27, 2025, commencing at 9:00 a.m. and, continuing on Friday March 28, 2025, commencing at 1:00 p.m.
3. Respondent's Application related to depositions of the two police officers is denied.

Appendix D

4. Discovery is stayed as to OBA and Respondent for thirty days (December 16, 2024).
5. OBA and Respondent are not stayed from responding to any filings of the other party.
6. OBA and Respondent are to exchange witness lists and exhibits by February 26, 2025; the OBA has five days from receipt of Respondent's witness list to file notice of any rebuttal witnesses.
7. Respondent is ordered to provide only file stamped copies of pleadings to the Complainant and the PRT.

Respectfully submitted this 18th day of November, 2024.

/s/ Martha Rupp Carter
Martha Rupp Carter
PRT Presiding Master

*Appendix D***CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

The undersigned certifies that on the 18th day of November 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was mailed electronically to:

Martha Rupp Carter 312 E 29 th Place Tulsa, OK 74114 mruppcarter@yahoo.com TRIAL PANEL PRESIDING MASTER	Malinda Matlock 1001 NW 63 rd Street, Suite 280 Oklahoma City, OK 73116 mmatlock@rhodesokla. com TRIAL PANEL LAWYER MEMBER
Jeff Park 11434 E Tecumseh Street Bixby, OK 74116 jpark@americancrating. net TRIAL PANEL NON- LAWYER MEMBER	Jana J. Harris Assistant General Counsel 1901 N. Lincoln Blvd. P.O. Box 53036 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73152 janah@okbar.org ATTORNEY FOR COMPLAINANT

And via first class mail, postage prepaid to:

Kelly John Barlean
3101 NW 20th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73107-3001
RESPONDENT

/s/ Jaycee Moseley
Jaycee Moseley

**Appendix E — Report of the Trial Panel
(Apr. 25, 2025)**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF
OKLAHOMA BEFORE THE PROFESSIONAL
RESPONSIBILITY TRIBUNAL**

Case No. 7652 (cons. w/ 7779)

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *EX REL.*,
OKLAHOMA BAR ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

Filed April 25, 2025

REPORT OF THE TRIAL PANEL

The Trial Panel respectfully submits its report in accordance with Rule 6.13 of the Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings (“RGDP”) for the Oklahoma Supreme Court’s consideration. The full Trial Panel conducted the March 26, 2025, hearing on the record. Assistant General Counsel Jana Harris appeared for Complainant Oklahoma Bar Association (OBA). Respondent Kelly John Barlean (“Respondent”) did not appear.

Appendix E

The OBA called five witnesses and provided evidence through the witnesses' testimony and exhibits offered and admitted in the consolidated proceedings under Rules 6 and 7, RGDP. All OBA exhibits were admitted.

Findings of Fact

The OBA proved the following facts by clear and convincing evidence.

1. The Respondent pled guilty to the misdemeanor Domestic Assault and Battery, amended from the felony Domestic Assault and Battery by Strangulation, on January 5, 2023.
2. The Respondent pled guilty to another Domestic Assault and Battery misdemeanor on January 5, 2023.
3. The Respondent failed to respond to a grievance filed against him by Judge Sara Bondurant after multiple notifications by the OBA.
4. The Respondent left inappropriate and threatening voice messages for Judge Bondurant after the Judge entered protective orders against Respondent for his ex-wife and son to intimidate the Judge and interfere with her orders against him.
5. Respondent's voice messages created fear and concern for Judge Bondurant and her court staff

Appendix E

for their safety and security and necessitated efforts to secure wellbeing within the courthouse workplace.

6. Respondent in his answer to the OBA's Rule 6 complaint misrepresented Judge Bondurant's courtroom conduct to him.
7. Respondent behaved in an abusive, threatening, profane, derogatory, and demeaning manner to harass members of a family and the attorney family members were forced to retain in their no contact proceedings against Respondent in Illinois.
8. Respondent caused this family fear, anxiety, and stress due to his anger, lack of decency, and the rank malice he displayed against them.
9. Respondent, in the course of these proceedings, belittled, ridiculed, and demeaned the Oklahoma Supreme Court, OBA staff and its counsel, and the Trial Panel.
10. The Respondent exhibited willful disrespect and disregard for the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Responsibility and the disciplinary process for Oklahoma attorneys.
11. Respondent's conduct generated disrespect for the legal profession.

*Appendix E***Portions of Record forming Basis for Finding of Facts
Rule 7**

Respondent was charged with the felony crime of Domestic Assault and Battery By Strangulation in CF-2021-3557 in Oklahoma County for squeezing his female victim by the throat and preventing her from breathing on August 25, 2021. OBA Exhibit 1, page 14. Respondent was bound over for trial following preliminary hearing on April 6, 2022, with jury trial set January 9, 2023. OBA Exhibit 1, pages 32, 39. While awaiting trial in the felony case, Respondent was charged with misdemeanor crime of Domestic Assault and Battery in CM-2022-4468 in Oklahoma County for shoving the same female victim down some stairs on December 22, 2022. OBA Exhibit 2, page 15.

On January 5, 2023, Judgment and Sentence in CF-2021-3557 and CM-2022-4468 was entered against Respondent upon his plea of guilty in both cases based on the plea agreement: felony charge was reduced to misdemeanor; three-year deferred sentence to January 4, 2026; costs, fees, and restitution; anger management class; Batterers' Intervention Program; drug and alcohol assessment and following all recommendations. OBA Exhibit 2, page 28-31.

The State filed an Application to Accelerate Deferred Sentence on June 16, 2023, for violating terms of the deferred sentence. OBA Exhibit 1, page 98. In its 1st Amended Application to Accelerate Deferred Sentence, the State alleged Respondent violated the terms of the

Appendix E

deferred sentence by failing to follow up on the drug/alcohol assessment, failing to submit to random drug/alcohol testing and not completing specified classes. OBA Exhibit 1, page 116. Respondent entered no contest plea to the State's Application to Accelerate on November 22, 2024, and pursuant to plea agreement was accelerated to \$100 fine in each case. OBA Exhibit 1, page 122-124.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 1

Respondent failed to respond to a grievance filed against him by Oklahoma County Special Judge Sara Bondurant, received by the OBA on April 3, 2024. OBA Exhibit 3, page 1-7. Testimony of Krystal Willis, OBA Legal Investigator at page 39, lines 6-13; page 40, lines 11-25; pages 41-48 of the Transcript of Proceedings; OBA Exhibit 3, pages 9-26.

Judge Bondurant's grievance against Respondent resulted from Respondent's conduct following entry of protective orders against Respondent for his ex-wife and son in Oklahoma County, PO-2024-44 and PO-2024-45, filed January 5, 2024. Following service on Respondent and the denial of Respondent's Motion to Dismiss filed in both cases, the Emergency Protective Orders against Respondent were heard before Judge Bondurant on March 27, 2024. Trial Transcript, page 19, line 15 to page 22, line 23. Respondent identified himself as a lawyer and advised he represented himself. Trial Transcript, page 22, line 24 to page 23, line 7.

Appendix E

Judge Bondurant testified about Respondent's trial conduct:

"As I recall, during his testimony, he was very professional, very polite, conducted himself well, and the whole protective order issue was really about him going and leaving gifts on the porch of the ex-wife where the adult son lived, and throughout the testimony in the hearing, it was – I could see where the petitioners were afraid, and it was visible, it was palpable, and after 13,000 of these, you start to notice things like that, and so leaving gifts on someone's porch doesn't in and of itself seem too concerning. So, at the end, he explained it in a way that he had items that belonged to them, wanted to keep giving them gifts, and so my intention was to set this out another six months to give him the opportunity to stop doing what he was doing because he was putting them in fear and maybe he wasn't aware of that. Sometimes people just aren't self aware of boundaries. So it was really the last question that I asked of Mr. Barlean that concerned me most. I asked if he intended to stop, and he looked at me and it was a very different shift in personality, and he said, 'No, I don't intend to stop. They don't know what they need. I know what they need.' So with that, things changed, and I issued a final order. . . . Because when people tell me what they're going to do, I believe them, and he said he was not going to stop, which indicates a clear need for a protective order." Trial Transcript, page 23, line 23 continuing to page 25, line 3.

Judge Bondurant testified she was concerned for the safety of the Respondent's ex-wife and son based on

Appendix E

video evidence taken a year or so before the petitions for protective orders and presented at the hearing. The video evidence showed Respondent cussing, raging and punching walls as the ex-wife and other children were leaving the house, with one child pleading not to be left. Respondent's son was visibly shaking in the courtroom during the protective order proceedings. Trial Transcript at page 25, line 8 to Page 26, line 14.

Final Orders of Protection were entered on behalf of Respondent's ex-wife and son and served on Respondent at the conclusion of the hearing on March 27, 2024. OBA Exhibit 4, pages 59-66; OBA Exhibit 4A, pages 55-62. Respondent left two voice mail messages on a telephone assigned to Judge Bondarant's court staff on March 28, 2024, the first around 9:00 p.m. The messages were accessed by court staff and reported to Judge Bondarant on March 29, 2024. Trial Transcript, page 26, lines 15 -25 to page 29, line 3.

Respondent's first voice mail to Judge Bondarant provided: "Hi, my name is Kelly Barlean, OBA bar number 31286. Just wanted to let the judge know that I will be filing an appeal for what happened in my case today. And, additionally, I will be filing a complaint with the Judicial Commission for incompetence, so just to let you know it's coming. Bye."

Respondent's second voice mail provided: "Oh, I forgot to mention, you need to look at the complaint I filed on special Judge McCray. Yeah, yeah, he has no business getting promoted up the judge food train. All he did was

Appendix E

rubber stamp, you know, probable cause affidavits by the police. That's – that's why I'm going to – well, that's why I'm suing the police. I know judicial immunity, I can't go after him, but it's – I mean, most people know that there was no probable cause. That's why they let me go after eight days. Yeah, eight days. I did eight days in gangland. Somebody said I was an unaffiliated gang member they put me down there, and I was like 60 years old, 20, 30, 40 years older than everybody else while wearing my United States Air Force Academy gold ring. I was getting in fucking fights every day. If I wasn't an unarmed combat instructor in the 101st Airborne Division, I would have been raped or dead. I'm just glad it all came back to me at the old ripe age of 60. **So yeah, I don't appreciate incompetent judges, and I take care of them.**" OBA Exhibit No. 3, transcriptions of Respondent's voice mail messages to Judge Bondarant attached to the OBA grievance at pages 4-5. Judge Bondurant's testimony at page 27, line 5 through page 28 and to page 29, line 3, Trial Transcript.

The messages were distinctly different in tone and emotion, with the second displaying profanity and spoken in an angry and harsh voice, unlike the first one in a normal voice and tone. OBA Exhibits 3B and 3C.

The immediate concern experienced by Judge Bondarant for her court staff's and her safety upon hearing Respondent's messages was expressed through her testimony that "it was such a stark differenced in personality than I saw in the courtroom." Testimony of Judge Bondarant, page 29, lines 5-20, Trial Transcript.

Appendix E

Her first reaction was to contact Judge McCray to let him know about the reference to him in the voice mail. Her next reaction was to inform the sheriff's office which is tasked with courthouse security. Judge Bondarant also arranged for Respondent's photograph to be obtained and circulated among her court staff so they would know Respondent if he confronted the judge or her staff in the courthouse. Page 24, Line 21 to Page 30, Line 11, Trial Transcript.

Judge Bondarant did not file the bar grievance against Respondent because of his threat of a judicial complaint. She filed the grievance because of the "unstable nature" of the phone call and the "difference in personality" of the person she saw in the courtroom within a 24-hour period ending with Respondent's display of anger, rage, and delusional thinking. Trial Transcript, page 30, line 16 to Page 31, line 13.

A judicial perspective of the impact of Respondent's conduct on the legal profession was afforded by Judge Bondarant: "I think that attorneys have their own issues, and so the conduct with his ex-wife and son trying to give someone the benefit of the doubt in their home life and personal life as an attorney, they shouldn't be punished for something going awry in their home life, but the lack of responsibility which he took none from what he did, I think that reflects poorly as an attorney. The messages, I think at best, that's an improper ex parte communication. At worst, it was a threat and I think it's somewhere in between but still it's improper what he did." Trial Transcript, page 35, lines 1-16.

Appendix E

In Respondent's answer to the OBA's Rule 6 Complaint, he asserts and expresses offense that Judge Bondurant found him indigent by waiving court costs in the protective order proceedings and by "winking" at him in this context during the hearing. The evidence provided to the Trial Panel is that Judge Bondurant did not wink at Respondent. She believes the protective order docket is the most violent in the courtroom and accordingly keeps proceedings professional and under tight rein. She does not automatically impose court costs in these proceedings for a variety of reasons. The reason she did not impose costs against Respondent was because she perceived he had some sort of mental health challenge. Her perception was based on Respondent's testimony that he would not stop "gifting" his ex-wife and son. Trial Transcript, page 33, line 13 to page 34, line 25.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 2

Respondent's conduct toward the "W" family and the no contact petitions sought by three family members occurred while Respondent was on criminal probation in Oklahoma County between October and November 2023. Trial Transcript, page 63, lines 18-25 and page 67, lines 1-7. Bradley Tengler, Illinois attorney, represented JW and his mother, MW, in their actions for orders of protection against Respondent filed in two Illinois counties. Respondent harassed and abused JW and MW, JW's mother, following a sexual relationship Respondent had with LW, JW's wife and MW's daughter-in-law. Trial Transcript, page 83, lines 17-25 and page 84, lines 1-5.

Appendix E

In the course of Mr. Tengler's representation of JW and MW, he/his paralegal received inappropriate, profane, and harassing emails with pornographic photographs from Respondent. These communications included: photograph of two naked women in a sexual position one of whom is believed to be LW; photograph of two naked women, one of whom is believed to be LW, in sexual positions on a bed; email stating in part: "I am prepared to run everything up the flagpole and let the world know how dysfunctional and untruthful the "Ws" are and encourage them to not entrust their money to them or do business with them in any capacity"; email stating: "I look forward to objecting to sealing the record. I want prospective employers to know "Ws" like fucking in bathrooms. And no lawyer can keep it sealed.; email stating: "Have you read crazy Dee's IMBD website? I will make the jury laugh at her and her claims. The tired, old bitch can't pass for being under 40. Lol; and, email stating: "I look forward to producing cell phone videos of LW. JW will love it Lol Let's make this fun. You make money from losers as I laugh." Respondent sent an email with three images to Mr. Tengler while he was waiting for the case to be called in a virtual courtroom on February 16, 2024, at 12:09 p.m. The first image was previously sent on January 29, 2024, and contains two naked women on a bed. The second image appears to be LW masturbating. The third image is a picture of a woman receiving oral sex from an apparently rotting corpse with flayed legs bearing the caption "If your Halloween party ain't this lit, don't bother inviting me. OBA Exhibit 6, pages 79-80. Trial Transcript, page 85, line 8 through page 89, line 12; page 91, lines 6 to 25. Mr. Tengler testified that he believed Respondent's intent

Appendix E

was to expose sexual videos of JW's wife, which would be public because produced in a public order of protection/no stalking order proceeding, to embarrass JW. Trial Transcript, page 87, line 24 to page 88, line 7.

On February 21, Respondent emailed Mr. Tengler, threatening what Mr. Tengler believed was physical violence if he or his client continued with the litigation: "You read the report. Please don't provoke me in litigation or life. Ask the hardened gangbangers who thought they could strip the old man of a United States Air Force Academy 18k Gold ring in Maximum Security Gang Pod. I do what I do - I was trained and provoked to deal with America's adversaries. So far, I have not failed." OBA Exhibit 6, Pages 80, paragraph 10.a at subparagraph ix. Trial Transcript, page 89, line 24 to page 90, line 21.

MW filed her Petition for Stalking No Contact Order in Cook County, Illinois against Respondent for stalking/cyber stalking due to vulgar messages he sent her containing intimate detail of a relationship Respondent had with LW, MW's daughter-in-law, profanity and lewd suggestion of wanting a sexual encounter with her (let's meet up babe, give it a whirl) on October 17, 2023, one at 12:59 a.m. the other 3:02 a.m. OBA Exhibit 5, page 8-9; pages 68-69. MW did not know who Respondent was when he messaged her; it concerned her that he knew about her family. Trial Transcript, page 97, lines 4-16 and page 99, lines 14-21. Respondent sought out MW on Facebook messenger. OBA Exhibit 5, page 38. Trial Transcript, page 99, lines 22-25, The messages confused MW and she first contacted her son. She then printed out the messages and

Appendix E

took them to the police who assisted her in completing the paperwork for her court filing. Trial Transcript. Page 100, lines 12 to 23. Following MW's filing in the Illinois court, Respondent sent an additional message to her on LinkedIn on December 27, 2023, demeaning her for her age and appearance. OBA Exhibit 5, pages 49-51. Respondent then began attacking her in the court filing, by "throwing all his legal knowledge" at her, requiring her to hire an attorney for help. She and her son, JW, obtained attorney Tengler's assistance. Trial Transcript at page 101, lines 6-18.

MW was concerned for her personal safety when Respondent contacted her. She knew he came to the area where she lived and that he had a history of violence. She was aware of this from looking on the Oklahoma Supreme Court Network. Trial Transcript, page 101, lines 19 to 25 and page 102, lines 1 to 7. She testified that she was frightened and asked a friend to stay with her for a while. Lines 4-7. When asked what the Respondent was doing directly to her, Ms. W testified: "That was so sick. He was saying he had been with my daughter-in-law, and then he wants to be – and he's attacking my son by acting this way, and then he wants to be with his mother. I couldn't believe it. I was appalled." Trial Transcript, page 103, lines 5 to 19. MW was aware Respondent was contemporaneously attacking her son on his workplace email in an effort to get her son fired. "I couldn't believe anybody would be so mean." Trial Transcript page 103 lines 20-25 and page 104, lines 1-2. Although MW had never had contact with Respondent on LinkedIn, he reached out to her in that forum on December 27, 2023. Trial Transcript, page 102, lines 625 and page 105, lines 1-2. Respondent was served

Appendix E

with notice of MW's petition on November 28, 2023. OBA Exhibit 5, page 19. Following the inappropriate requests to see MW and after Respondent was served with notice of her petition, he then "got really mean about my appearance and he looked up my website and was making fun of it. So he was attacking me on all different levels." Trial Transcript at page 105, lines 7-17.

MW testified that after Respondent filed a motion to dismiss her request for protection, she had to hire an attorney because she "didn't understand most of the legal jargon" and that she had to pay legal fees of approximately \$10,000 and that her son JW had to pay a similar amount. Trial Transcript page 105, line 18-25 and page 106, lines 1-13. MW's assessment is that Respondent used his position as an attorney to threaten her, describing the matter as "confusing and bizarre." Trial Transcript page 106, lines 7-13. She plans to contact Mr. Tengler to have a permanent no contact order regarding Respondent and expressed her shock that he remains an attorney. Trial Transcript page 107, lines 8 to 25, Page 108, lines 1-6. MW particularly wanted the Trial Panel to know about the stress Respondent's conduct placed on her family, including her grandchildren who felt the tension and asked what was happening; "... children know things, and really hurt me the worst." Trial Transcript, page 109, lines 13-23. She worries for the safety of her grandchildren due to Respondent's reference to the children as "collateral." Trial Transcript, page 109, lines 13-25 and page 110, lines 1-10. Further, as to Respondent, MW stated: "I can't believe he's still an attorney. That blows my mind. He has a horrible background. He's a criminal."

Appendix E

Respondent contemporaneously communicated with JW, son of MW. Respondent sent a message to JW at his employment stating it had been fun having sexual encounters for the last couple of years with JW's wife and that he had been to JW's home. The obscene language in the message, as well as a previous message sent in April of the same year which was accompanied by photograph of LW, JW's wife, caused it to be flagged by JW's supervisor and resulted in work meetings about the messages and direction to JW to obtain a protective order to prevent future similar messages coming to the workplace. Trial Transcript at page 119, lines 7-21; OBA Exhibit 6, page 23-24. This was the second email Respondent sent to Mr. W, the first being sent on April 15, 2022, referring to JW in demeaning and derogatory fashion and categorizing himself, Respondent, as a "King Trojan man" and transmitting a picture of LW with Respondent's bodily fluid in her mouth. OBA Exhibit 6, page 2. JW, for himself and his two children, filed a Petition for Stalking No Contact Order in Illinois against Respondent on November 2, 2023. OBA Exhibit 6, page 5-7 and pages 23-24. Respondent was served with Stalking No Contact Order on November 8, 2023. OBA, Exhibit 6, page 16. The order prohibited Respondent from threatening to commit or committing stalking personally or through a third party and from contacting JW or other protected persons in any way, directly or indirectly or through third parties. OBA Exhibit 6, page 13. Respondent continued to send text messages to LW threatening to destroy JW's career and family after he was served. OBA Exhibit 6, page 50.

Appendix E

JW's concern for his and his family's safety, including the safety of his then seven and eleven year old daughters, caused his filing of the petition for no contact order. Trial Transcript, page 116, lines 15-25, page 117, lines 1-11. He testified: "I was scared. I mean, it got so weird, you know, we turned off the lights in the house at night. We were worried he'd drive up here and shoot or do whatever. I mean, there's no telling with this guy." Trial Transcript, page 121, lines 17-25; page 122, line 1. JW was forced to retain an attorney after Respondent filed a motion to dismiss JW's case. Trial Transcript 117, lines 12-21. In the affidavit accompanying his motion, Respondent asserts he was merely exercising his First Amendment right to free speech and that the October 18, 2023, email was to inform JW that he would no longer be seeing his wife and that it was "the first and only time I have communicated or had any contact with him since he moved to Illinois a year and a half ago." OBA Exhibit 6, page 44, paragraph 8. The statement is untrue in disregard to Respondent's April email to JW.

Respondent's on-going texts to LW, JW's wife, between November 8 and November 26, 2023, resulted in her obtaining an emergency order of protection against Respondent in Winnebago County, Illinois, on November 27, 2023. OBA Exhibit 5, page 45. The text highlights include Respondent's threat to "eviscerate" JW and squish him like a bug; threats that JW and his daughters will see and live the outcome of his poor choice; threatening a "beat down" of JW and that "Life as he knew it will soon be irrevocably over." Respondent's texts stated that: "I'm only focusing on trashing JW professionally like he

Appendix E

deserves"; that "I will smile as I punish him "; that he "will never get a promotion after I publicly and professionally humiliate him in Court. Just what you deserve."; and further threatening "you and the girls will be collateral damage because of JW." OBA Exhibit 6, page 115 and pages 123-127.

The Ws' three protective order cases concluded with Agreed Civil No Contact Orders in which Respondent agreed to be restrained and enjoined until April 10, 2026, as to JW and MW, and, until further order of the court as to LW, from harassing, stalking or interfering with the Ws; contacting the Ws via email, social media, telephone, text message, letter or any other form of communication; from posting about the Ws directly or by reference, discussing, referring to or otherwise identifying the Ws on all social platforms; from posting about, discussing or otherwise disseminating information regarding the protective order litigation; and Respondent remaining at least 300 feet away from the Ws, the W residences and the Ws' family. OBA Exhibit 5, page 119; OBA Exhibit 6, page 131-132; OBA Exhibit 6A, page 191-192.

Respondent has contacted LW since agreeing to her no contact order. Trial Testimony, page 122, lines 18-25; page 123, lines 1-6.

JW's fear for his family's safety made him very reluctant to testify before the Trial Panel. Trial Transcript page 122, lines 14-17. JW fears Respondent will resume contact. Trial Transcript, page 125, lines 2-23. JW testified: "I just want this all to go away. I don't want to

Appendix E

be a part of this anymore with Mr. Barlean, but because of the way that he has behaved and because of the way it holds all attorneys and professionals to a bad light, it's shameful. I mean, this guy is like an empire (sic). He's like a cancer in our life. I felt like I had to, after being asked, I, in good conscience, had to do this, yes. Trial Transcript, page 125, lines 5-13,

He further testified: "Well, I mean, I'm very reluctant and fearful and nervous to be here. I haven't done anything to him at all. I've never threatened him. I've never, you know, reached out in any aggravated way to him at all, you know, but he just keeps using the legal system to terrorize me and my family. I mean, my 75-year-old mother, for example, had nothing to do with him, and yet he attacked her, and he's come after my job and he's forced my mother and I to spend a great deal of money to defend ourselves against him and hire counsel, and the misery and fear my family has had to endure because of his behavior has been traumatizing. I mean, he, like I said, literally has behaved like a vampire, sucking money and time and resources away from my family and I. Anyway, I just honestly want this all to end." Trial Transcript, page 126, lines 3-18.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 3

Respondent's taunting, demeaning, and threatening emails to OBA's counsel commencing May 1 and 4, 2024, refer to the Oklahoma Supreme Court as "lazy," and "redneck"; he indicates he is eager to "appear in front of the Court that pissed a way a prodigious talent." OBA Exhibit 7, pages 1, 6. His demeaning communications

Appendix E

to counsel ("obviously you are not a litigator" and "who trained you") are interlaced with profanity: "Bring it on bitch." OBA Exhibit 7, pages 4-6.

Respondent indicates in a May 5, 2024 email that "rules are moronic" and further: "And to say the rule is APC are dispositive on my license, we have a whole new federal lawsuit. I'm retired. Let's Rock and roll." OBA Exhibit 7, page 9.

His June 29, 2024, email with the subject line "I look forward to embarrassing the Oklahoma Supreme Court again like I did in 1994" states in its first line: "I did not respect the competence of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, That's why I went to Washington where the justices were not mouth-breathers." The next to last line states: "I was and am too qualified for the land the US Government deemed a shithole and sent the Indians." OBA Exhibit 7, page 13.

The subject line of the June 29, 2024, empty email sent at 1:08 p.m. to OBA counsel states: "What a joke. I don't strangle. I crush or pull out voice boxes. Ask my Airborne instructors." His August 30, 2024, email states: "I ALWAYS did preemptive strikes that could be classified as felonies." OBA Exhibit 7, page 24.

Respondent's empty email to OBA counsel of November 7, 2024, at 3:57 p.m. contains the subject line: "The Oklahoma Supreme Court is a Joke. I made them the butt of jokes in Washington in 1995. Just like i shall do again here in Oklahoma after I drag the state through

Appendix E

a federal court 1983 claim. i am good at civil rights now. i master shit quick." OBA Exhibit 7, page 182. His November 8, 2024, 1:17 a.m. email states: "Please, on my way to hot tub with girls half my age. Boo hoo. Make me feel bad. lol You have no idea hot to make a woman scream all night." OBA Exhibit 7, page 188. At 1:21 a.m. of the same day, his email contains the subject line "What did your sorry ass do for America?" and states in the body of the email: "Oklahoma got what it deserved. I will keep punking out and humiliating the Supreme Court for losing a generational talent. I swear I will do my best to keep oklahoma citizens fat, and full of meth."

Respondent emailed the OBA paralegal on November 8, 2024, at 2:42 a.m. urging her to: "Please have the balls to come after me so I can show you what the United States trained me to do to Communists!" OBA Exhibit 7, page 191. His empty email of December 19, 2024, contains the subject line: "Please tell the Supreme Court to end this charade before the Legislature next convenes." OBA Exhibit 7, page 212.

Respondent's Communications to Trial Panel

When the Presiding Master of the Trial Panel replied to Respondent's email to inform of the schedule of proceedings and a forthcoming order on November 12, 2024, Respondent replied with three emails in the early morning of November 13, 2024. Portions of his emails provide as follows:

Appendix E

At 12:16 a.m.: "I'm tired of this bs. Time for me to put on my politician hat and let people know exactly who exactly is profiting and for how much via ORA.

At 2:11 a.m.: "You people have no soul. I will treat you all the same way."

At 2:29 a.m.: "Please convict me in absentia. I shall not waste my time or Oklahoma taxpayer dollars any more. I dare you to hammer me because I need the money. How the fuck did I become the only fresman in a ste with term limits get on approps and one year become vice chair, **My skills as a Cold War spook are fully intact. Please don't make me do what I know how to do. Good night. I have plans for tomorrow.**" PRT Exhibit 1.

Respondent also replied twice to an email sent in error by another member of the Trial Panel on March 4, 2025, at 1:10 p.m. and 1:19 a.m., asserting the proceedings were a charade and a waste and that the "OBA has too much money and needs to be gutted." OBA Exhibit 7, Supp. # 1 and Supp. #2.:

Conclusions of Law

Rule 7 Notice of Judgment and Sentence

1. The Respondent committed misdemeanor crimes of Domestic Assault and Battery and the same is conclusively established by the filing of the Judgment and Sentence entered in CF-2021-3557 and CM-224468 in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma under Rule 7.2, RGDP.

Appendix E

2. The Judgment and Sentence is “conclusive evidence” of Respondent’s commission of the crime of Domestic Assault and Battery, a crime that is a serious breach of a lawyer’s ethical duty. Stat ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association v. Faulk, 2021 OK 46, 493 P.3d 216; State ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association v. Zanotti, 2014 OK25, 330 P.3d 11.

3. Respondent’s violent offenses of Domestic Assault and Battery establish a connection to his fitness to practice law. Rule 8.4(b), RGDP and Comment 2 of Rule 8.4(b), RGDP.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 1

1. Respondent’s voice messages to Judge Bondurant sought to influence her through intimidation and threat; constituted *ex parte* communications; and constituted conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal in violation of Rule 3.5(a), 3.5(b) and Rule 3.5(d), RGDP.

2. Respondent’s messages to Judge Bondurant violated the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct (ORPC) and constituted conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice. Rule 8.4(a), and (d), ORPC.

3. Respondent’s false assertion of the Judge “winking” at him and making findings of indigency violated Rule 8.2, ORPC, because the statements were false or made in reckless disregard of the truth or falsity concerning the Judge’s integrity.

Appendix E

4. Respondent's professional misconduct as to Judge Bondurant was conduct contrary to prescribed standards of conduct and brought discredit upon the legal profession, and is thus basis for disciplinary action. Rule 1.3, RGDP.
5. Respondent violated Rule 5.2, RGDP, when he failed to respond to the grievance Judge Bondurant submitted against him within the required twenty days and this is grounds for discipline.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 2

Respondent's crude, profane, malicious attacks, communications, and threats made via email directly and indirectly against MW, JW, and LW and the attorney retained by JW and MW are professional misconduct in violation of Rule 1.3, RGDP, in that they were acts that could reasonably be found to bring discredit upon the legal profession.

Rule 6 Complaint – Count 3

Respondent's crude, profane, malicious attacks, communications, and threats made via email against OBA staff and counsel, the Oklahoma Supreme Court and the Trial Panel are professional misconduct in violation of Rule 1.3, RGDP, in that they were acts that could reasonably be found to bring discredit upon the legal profession and the Oklahoma attorney disciplinary process.

*Appendix E***Recommendations as to Discipline and Costs**

The Trial Panel noted Respondent's statements regarding his ill health in the record and hopes for his restoration to health and wellbeing.

Respondent's reprehensible, inappropriate, and unprofessional conduct brings discredit to the legal profession. Respondent should not be allowed to continue weaponizing his licensed Oklahoma attorney status even if this is done in his self-representation rather than for private clients. Respondent's assertions that he does not practice law are negated by his repeatedly holding himself out as an Oklahoma attorney in good standing in his self-representations in the Oklahoma and Illinois protective order proceedings.

The Trial Panel unanimously recommends a minimum discipline of two-years and one day suspension be imposed on Respondent as requested by the OBA. The Trial Panel is unanimous in its view that the evidence warrants harsher discipline if the Oklahoma Supreme Court deems appropriate.

The Trial Panel further recommends that the costs of the investigation, record, and proceedings be imposed on Respondent.

The Trial Panel respectfully urges the Court to consider sealing portions of the record that are available to the public and identify the "W" family. The Trial Panel believes the family has suffered enough due to

54a

Appendix E

Respondent's harassment and should not sustain on-going lack of privacy resulting from this disciplinary process. The Trial Panel as well is concerned that confidential medical information of Respondent submitted by Respondent in the record should likewise be sealed.

Respectfully submitted,

Trial Panel

/s/ Martha Rupp Carter
Martha Rupp Carter, Presiding Master

/s/ Melinda Matlock
Melinda Matlock, Lawyer Member

/s/ Jeff Parker
Jeff Parker, Non-Lawyer Member

55a

Appendix E

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on the 25th day of April 2025, service of a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was made by first-class mail, postage prepaid to:

Kelly John Barlean
3625 N.W. 53rd Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73112
RESPONDENT

/s/ Jaycee Moseley
Jaycee Moseley

**Appendix F — Order Denying Rehearing
(Okla. June 23, 2026)**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

SCBD No. 7652 (cons. w/ SCBD No. 7779)

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *EX REL.*,
OKLAHOMA BAR ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

v.

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

Filed June 23, 2026

Respondent Kelly John Barlean's Verified Petition for Rehearing is denied. Respondent's Motion to Seal Petition for Rehearing is denied. Respondent's Motion for Disclosure of Ex Parte Communications and for Judicial Notice is denied. Respondent's Motion to Vacate Cost Assessment is denied. Respondent's Motion to Stay Enforcement of Disbarment Pending Rehearing is denied.

Complainant Oklahoma Bar Association's Motion to Strike is granted. The exhibits attached to Respondent's Verified Petition for Rehearing are hereby stricken.

57a

Appendix F

DONE BY ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT
IN CONFERENCE THIS 23rd DAY OF JUNE, 2026.

/s/
CHIEF JUSTICE

ALL JUSTICES CONCUR

**Appendix G — Pertinent rule provisions
(RGDP; ORPC)**

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A

* * *

**Rule 1.3. Discipline for Acts Contrary to Prescribed
Standards of Conduct.**

The commission by any lawyer of any act contrary to prescribed standards of conduct, whether in the course of his professional capacity, or otherwise, which act would reasonably be found to bring discredit upon the legal profession, shall be grounds for disciplinary action, whether or not the act is a felony or misdemeanor, or a crime at all. Conviction in a criminal proceeding is not a condition precedent to the imposition of discipline.

* * *

*Appendix G***Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings****5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A**

* * *

Rule 5.2. Investigations.

After making such preliminary investigation as the General Counsel may deem appropriate, the General Counsel shall either (1) notify the person filing the grievance and the lawyer that the allegations of the grievance are inadequate, incomplete, or insufficient to warrant the further attention of the Commission, provided that such action shall be reported to the Commission at its next meeting, or (2) file and serve a copy of the grievance (or, in the case of an investigation instituted on the part of the General Counsel or the Commission without the filing of a signed grievance, a recital of the relevant facts or allegations) upon the lawyer, who shall thereafter make a written response which contains a full and fair disclosure of all the facts and circumstances pertaining to the respondent lawyer's alleged misconduct unless the respondent's refusal to do so is predicated upon expressed constitutional grounds. Deliberate misrepresentation in such response shall itself be grounds for discipline. The failure of a lawyer to answer within twenty (20) days after service of the grievance (or recital of facts or allegations), or such further time as may be granted by the General Counsel, shall be grounds for discipline. The General Counsel shall make such further investigation of the grievance and response as the General Counsel may deem appropriate before taking any action.

* * *

60a

Appendix G

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A

Rule 6.12. Evidence, Procedure and Standard of Proof.

* * *

(c) To warrant a finding against the respondent in a contested case, the charge or charges must be established by clear and convincing evidence, and at least two of the members of the Trial Panel must concur in the findings.

* * *

61a

Appendix G

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A

* * *

Rule 7.1. Criminal Conviction of Lawyer.

A lawyer who has been convicted or has tendered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere pursuant to a deferred sentence plea agreement in any jurisdiction of a crime which demonstrates such lawyer's unfitness to practice law, regardless of whether the conviction resulted from a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or from a verdict after trial, shall be subject to discipline as herein provided, regardless of the pendency of an appeal.

* * *

J

Appendix G

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A

* * *

Rule 7.2. Transmittal of Record Relating to Conviction.

The clerk of any court within this State in which a lawyer is convicted or as to whom proceedings are deferred shall transmit certified copies of the Judgment and Sentence on a plea of guilty, order deferring judgment and sentence, indictment or information and judgment and sentence of conviction to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and to the General Counsel of the Oklahoma Bar Association within five (5) days after said conviction. The documents shall also be furnished to the Chief Justice by the General Counsel within five (5) days of receiving such documents. Such documents, whether from this jurisdiction or any other jurisdiction shall constitute the charge and be conclusive evidence of the commission of the crime upon which the judgment and sentence is based and shall suffice as the basis for discipline in accordance with these rules.

* * *

Appendix G

Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 1-A

* * *

Rule 7.4. Conviction Becoming Final Without Appeal.

If the conviction becomes final without appeal, the General Counsel of the Oklahoma Bar Association shall inform the Chief Justice and the Court may order the lawyer, within such time as the Court shall fix in the order, to show cause in writing why a final order of discipline should not be made. The written return of the lawyer shall be verified and expressly state whether a hearing is desired. The lawyer may in the interest of explaining his conduct or by way of mitigating the discipline to be imposed upon him, submit a brief and/or any evidence tending to mitigate the severity of discipline. The General Counsel may respond by submission of a brief and/or any evidence supporting the recommendation of discipline.

* * *

64a

Appendix G

Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 3-A

* * *

Rule 3.5. Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal

A lawyer shall not:

- (a) seek to influence a judge, juror, prospective juror or other official by means prohibited by law;
- (b) communicate ex parte with such a person during the proceeding unless authorized to do so by law or court order;

* * *

- (d) engage in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal.

* * *

65a

Appendix G

Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 3-A

* * *

Rule 8.2. Judicial and Legal Officials

(a) A lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, adjudicatory officer or public legal officer, or of a candidate for election or appointment to judicial or legal office.

* * *

66a

Appendix G

Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct

5 O.S., ch. 1, app. 3-A

* * *

Rule 8.4. Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

* * *

(d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the
administration of justice;

* * *

67a

**Appendix H — Exhibit C to Respondent's verified
response to show-cause order (CBI Service
Termination Report) (filed May 31, 2024)**

COURT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

CBI SERVICE TERMINATION REPORT

NAME: Barlean, Kelly

CID#: 30335

Case Number: CF-2021-3557 & CF-2022-4468

DOB: [REDACTED]

Date Services Ended: February 19, 2024

Date Enrolled: January 26, 2023

Required to Complete 52 sessions of Batterer's Intervention
Program

Reason For Termination: (Select Reason and Provide
Brief Details)

☐ **Rejection**

☐ Psychiatric History

☐ Criminal Record of violent crimes

☐ Chemical dependency requiring completion of an
inpatient or residential treatment program

68a

Appendix H

- ☐ Inability to function in a group due to limited mental cognitive abilities
- ☐ Failure to obtain initial assessment
- ☐ Failure to enroll in program

Comments: _____

☐ **Involuntary Termination**

- ☐ Recurrence of violence
- ☐ Absences from program sessions/activities
- ☐ Attending session under the influence
- ☐ Arrest
- ☐ Failure to actively participate
- ☐ Violation of any rules of the program or the client-contract

Comments: _____

☒ **Completion**

- ☒ Completed all program requirements. **“Completion of batterer’s intervention does not indicate that the client will not re-offend. This is a report that the person has satisfactory completed the necessary**

Appendix H

requirements of the certified program without any other known or reported re-offending during the time of enrollment in the program.”

Comments: Mr. Barlean attended 52 BIP classes. He was attentive, engaged and provided feedback in class discussions.

Summary of Lethality Risk Indicators: Mr. Barlean took the DVI both at admission to and upon discharge from our Batterers Intervention Program. His score on the Domestic Violence Scale of the DVI remained at the 68th percentile (Moderate Risk Range) both at admission and upon discharge. Individuals who score in this range are not violence oriented but can be provoked. His score on the Stress Coping Scale of the DVI decreased from the 45th percentile at admission to the 33rd percentile at discharge. He scored in the Low Risk Range on the Truthfulness Scale, the Control Scale, the Alcohol Scale, and the Drugs Scale of the DVI both at admission and upon discharge.

Did Client participate in planning for exit from the program? ☒ Yes ☐ No If No, why not?

Concerns for the safety of Victims, Children or Others:
There are no immediate concerns.

70a

Appendix H

/s/ _____ /s/ February 19, 2024
STAFF SIGNATURE DATE

I have read, received and understand the conditions of my Termination Report from CAP's Batterers Intervention Program.

/s/ _____ /s/ February 19, 2024
CLIENT SIGNATURE DATE

If unable to obtain client's signature, explain why:

600 N. Dewey, Suite 100 Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Phone: (405) 290-7322 Fax: (405) 290-7325

[REDACTED]
Defendant's Social Security Number

1. Is the name *(Defendant*
just read to you initials yes or no)
your true name? YES KB or NO
2. Is your age 61 years; and
is your date of birth
[REDACTED]-1961? YES KB or NO
3. Is Don Jackson your lawyer? CA YES KB or NO
4. Are you taking any kind of
medication? YES or NO KB

Appendix I

- a. If yes, what kind and when did you take it?
- b. If yes, does this medication affect your judgment now? YES ____ or NO ____
5. Have you been prescribed any medication that you should be taking, but that you are not taking? YES ____ or NO KB
- a. If yes, what kind and when should you have taken it? _____
- b. If yes, does not taking this medication affect your judgment now? YES ____ or NO ____
6. Have you ever been seen by a doctor or confined in a hospital for mental illness? YES ____ or NO KB
- If yes, explain: _____
7. Counselor, do you have any reason to believe your client is not mentally competent to appreciate and understand the nature, purpose and consequences of this proceeding and to assist you in presenting any defense that may exist to any charge? (*Lawyer* initials) YES ____ or NO DJ

Appendix I

8. Counselor, do you have any reason to believe your client was not mentally competent to appreciate and understand the nature, purpose and consequences of his or her acts at the time they were committed and out of which the charges in the Information arose? YES ☐ or NO DJ
9. Do you understand you are charged with: (for more than six charges use Plea of Guilty, Addendum 1)
- a. CF-21-3557-Amended to Domestic Assault & Battery - 9 Misdemeanor
- b. CM-22-4468 Domestic Assault & Battery - 9 Misdemeanor
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____
- f. _____
- and have you and your lawyer had a copy of the charge(s)? (*Defendant* initials) YES KB or NO ☐
10. Do you understand that the range of punishment provided for the above crime(s) (is)(are) as follows:
- a. Minimum of 0 to a maximum of 1 yr (and)(or) a fine of \$ 5,000. YES KB or NO ☐
- b. Minimum of 0 to a maximum of 1 yr (and)(or) a fine of \$ 5,000. YES KB or NO ☐

Appendix I

- c. Minimum of ___ to a maximum of ___ (and)(or) a fine of \$ _____. YES ___ or NO ___
- d. Minimum of ___ to a maximum of ___ (and)(or) a fine of \$ _____. YES ___ or NO ___
- e. Minimum of ___ to a maximum of ___ (and)(or) a fine of \$ _____. YES ___ or NO ___
- f. Minimum of ___ to a maximum of ___ (and)(or) a fine of \$ _____. YES ___ or NO ___
11. Do you understand that if you plead guilty, you can be sentenced to a term of imprisonment within the total of the above range(s) of punishment? YES KB or NO ___
12. Do you understand that in addition to that punishment, a Victim Compensation Assessment will be imposed for each charge? YES KB or NO ___
13. Do you understand that you are entitled to a speedy jury trial on the charge(s), to confront all witnesses who will testify against you at the trial(s), to remain silent, and to have your witnesses ordered to Court even at the expense of the State? YES KB or NO ___
14. Do you understand that the law presumes you are not guilty of the crime(s) charged in the Information, or of any lesser-included offense(s)? YES KB or NO ___

Appendix I

15. Do you understand that a plea of not guilty requires the State to prove each and every material allegation of the Information beyond a reasonable doubt to a jury, or to the Court if a jury is waived, and if the State can not do this, you will not be convicted? YES KB or NO ____
16. Do you understand that you have the right to keep a plea of not guilty, and in doing so you keep all these rights? YES KB or NO ____
17. Do you understand that by entering a plea of guilty you give up all these rights? YES KB or NO ____
18. Have you talked over the charge(s) with your lawyer, do you understand your rights, and have you had your lawyer's advice in this matter? YES KB or NO ____
19. Has your lawyer served you well? YES KB or NO ____
20. Do you want a jury trial? YES ____ or NO KB
21. You stand now on a plea of not guilty. Should you change your plea to guilty, do you understand there has been a plea agreement? YES KB or NO ____

22. Do you want to enter you plea(s) now and be sentenced (now)(at a later date)? YES KB or NO

23. What (is)(are) your plea(s) to the charge(s), (and to each of them)? (handwriting of *Defendant* only) GUILTY

24. Do you plead guilty because you did the acts charged? YES KB or NO

25. Do you plead guilty of your own free will and without any coercion or compulsion of any kind? YES KB or NO

26. Have you been forced, abused, mistreated, threatened, or promised anything. by anyone to have you enter your plea(s)? YES or NO KB

27. Do you or your lawyer have anything more to say or do you know of any legal reason why you should not be sentenced now? (*Defendant* initials) YES or NO KB
(*Lawyer* initials) YES or NO DJ

*Appendix I***28. THE COURT FINDS:**

- A. The Defendant is mentally competent to understand the nature, purpose and consequences of this proceeding, and further, the Defendant was mentally competent to appreciate and understand the acts he or she committed on or about the date alleged in the Information, and to realize the nature, purpose and consequences of those acts at the time they were committed.
- B. The plea agreement is fair and just to the parties and should be concurred in by the Court.
- C. The plea(s) of guilty (is)(are) knowingly and voluntarily entered.

DEFERRED SENTENCING**29. THE COURT ORDERS:**

- A. The plea(s) of guilty (is)(are) accepted by the Court.
- B. The sentencing date is deferred until Jan 4, 2026
at 9:00 a.m.
- C. You are to pay the following to the Oklahoma County Court Clerk:
 - 1. A Judicial Assmnt in the amount of \$ 100 on or before instanter.
 - 2. The court costs in the approximate amount of \$ 473 on or before instanter.
 - 3. The Victim Compensation Assessment in the sum of \$ 100 on or before instanter.

Appendix I

4. The court-appointed attorney fee amount of \$_____ on or before _____.
5. A laboratory fee for the benefit of the _____ in the amount of \$_____ on or before _____.
- D. You are to pay restitution according to the restitution schedule.
- E. You are to pay \$_____ to the Department of Mental Heath on or before _____.

* * *

AFFIDAVIT

ON THE 16 [and the 2nd] DAY OF Aug [Dec 2022], 2021,
In OKLAHOMA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, I committed
the following act (s): _____

I struck C.M. with whom I was in a dating relationship
/s/ Kelly Barlean [January 5, 2023]

***THE ABOVE STATEMENT OF THE CRIME IS IN
MY OWN HANDWRITING OR WRITTEN BY MY
ATTORNEY AND APPROVED BY ME. Initials KB***

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

*30) To appeal from a conviction on your plea of guilty
you must file a written Application to Withdraw
Plea of Guilty within ten (10) days from today.
You must set forth in detail the grounds for
your withdrawal and request an evidentiary
hearing in the trial court. The trial court must
hold a hearing and rule upon your application*

Appendix I

within thirty (30) days from the date it is filed. If the trial court denies your Application you have ninety (90) days from the date of denial to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals to appeal the trial court's decision. If you are indigent, these appeals can be prosecuted at public expense, and you can have an attorney appointed to represent you.

Do you understand your right to appeal?

YES KB NO

31) Have you fully understood the questions that have been asked?

YES KB NO

32) Were your answers freely and voluntarily given?

YES KB NO

DONE IN OPEN COURT this 5 day of Jan,
2023. This document is to be filed in the case.

/s/
Assistant District Attorney

/s/ Don Jackson
Attorney for the Defendant

/s/
Judge of the District Court

WAIVED
Court Reporter Present

/s/
Deputy Court Clerk

80a

Appendix I

Having been previously sworn, I the Defendant whose signature appears below, make the following statements under oath: 1) My Attorney and I have read this Judgment and Sentence and Summary of Facts on the Plea of Guilty. 2) It is a true statement of the questions asked and of my answers to them. 3) I approve this document and I do not desire to change it or add anything to it. 4) I understand that I may be prosecuted for perjury if I have made false statements to this Court.

/s/ Kelly Barlean

Defendant

81a

Appendix I

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA
COUNTY – STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

Case No. CF-2021-3557
CM-2022-4468

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

vs.

KELLY BARLEAN

SUPPLEMENTAL COURT ORDER: COMMUNITY
SERVICE – RESTITUTION – COURT COST
SENTENCE: ☒ Deferred 3 Mos [Yrs]
☐ Suspended _____ Mos Yrs ☐ Time to Serve _____

☐ Supervised by [OPS]. ☐ Unsupervised ☐ Supervised
until all conditions of Court ordered Probation are fulfilled.

☐ Supervised by DOC/Community Sentencing ☐
Supervised by DOC/Probation and Parole. DOC may
recommend to the assigned District Court Judge that the
Defendant be transferred DOC/Community Sentencing.
The Defendant must agree to the transfer before the
application to transfer is submitted to the judge.

COMMUNITY SERVICE: ☐ READMIT

You are ordered to complete 20 hours (Min 10 hours per
Month) of community service on or before the 1 day of
May 2023.

Appendix I

RESTITUTION: Case No. CF-2021-3557

The Defendant is ordered to make Restitution payments in accordance with the terms set out before and imposed by the Court:

☒ Pay full restitution in the amount of \$ 550 on or before the 1 day of Feb 2023.

OR

☐ Pay restitution installment payments of \$ _____ per month, beginning with the first day of _____ 20____, and a similar payment of \$ _____, on or before the first day of each month thereafter, until the full amount of \$ _____ is paid.

The following is a schedule of Recipients(s) owed restitution by the defendant and the amounts due each person:

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE NO.	AMOUNT
C.M.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	\$ 550

NOTICE: RESTITUTION PAYMENTS ARE MADE TO:

☐ DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, ATTN: RESTITUTION,
P O BOX 11400, OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73136.

☒ OKLAHOMA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S
OFFICE, 320 ROBERT S. KERR, STE 505,
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102.

*DEFENDANT MUST ADD ONE DOLLAR (\$1.00) TO
EACH PAYMENT AS REQUIRED BY LAW.

83a

Appendix I

COURT COSTS:

THE ENTIRE AMOUNT IS DUE TODAY!

YOU ARE ORDERED TO IMMEDIATELY REPORT TO THE COST ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE LOCATED AT ROOM 407 OKLAHOMA COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING, 320 ROBERT S. KERR, OKLAHOMA CITY OKLAHOMA 73102. YOU MUST REPORT WITHIN FIVE (5) BUSINESS DAYS AFTER YOUR RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN A BENCH WARRANT BEING ISSUED FOR YOUR ARREST.

Dated this 5 day of Jan 2023.

/s/
Assistant District Attorney

/s/ Don Jackson
Attorney for the Defendant

/s/ Kelly Barlean
Defendant

/s/
District Judge

/s/
Deputy Court Clerk

84a

Appendix I

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY,
STATE OF OKLAHOMA SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER
OF THE COURT

CASE NO: CF-2021-3557

CASE NO: CM-2022-4468

DEFENDANT: Kelly Barlean

DATE OF SENTENCE: 1-5-23

TYPE/LENGTH OF SENTENCE: 3 yrs Deferred

**RULES AND CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISED
PROBATION THROUGH OKLAHOMA
PROBATION SERVICES, LLC (OPS)**

1. I will report in person to Oklahoma Probation Services, LLC, 600 N. Dewey, Suite 200, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102, within 3 business days, phone 405-602-8734.
2. I will not violate any city, state, federal and tribal jurisdiction law; and I will advise my probation officer within 72 hours of arrest or contact by any law enforcement agency.
3. I will not possess or use marijuana or any illegal narcotic drug or controlled dangerous substance or take any prescription drugs not specifically prescribed to me. While I am on probation, I understand that I cannot obtain or use marijuana

Appendix I

with a medical marijuana prescription, without the courts permission.

4. I will not associate with convicted felons.
5. I will report as directed by Oklahoma Probation Services, LLC.
6. I will not change my address and/or phone number without notifying Oklahoma Probation Services, LLC.
7. I will notify my OPS Probation Officer if I will be traveling out of state and obtain a travel permit for the trip from my Probation Officer.
8. I understand that I will be supervised unless released, in writing, by Oklahoma Probation Services, LLC or by order of the court.
9. I will maintain legal and gainful employment and supply written verification. I will notify my probation officer within 72 hours, if I change my employment. If retired or disabled, I will provide documentation of income to my Probation Officer. If unemployed, I will submit documentation of job/employment applications weekly. The number of applications per week will be determined by my OPS Probation Officer. Full time students will be exempt from employment requirements.
10. I understand that violations may result in the imposition of additional sanctions and/or acceleration or revocation of my sentence.

Appendix I

11. I agree to submit proof of completion of all requirements and payment of all costs, fines and fees to my probation officer 60 days prior to the end of my probation.
12. I agree to pay all court costs, fines, miscellaneous costs, and any other seeming costs in this case.
13. I agree to pay a monthly probation fee of \$40.00. **CASH, MONEY ORDER, CASHIER'S CHECK, or CREDIT CARD ARE THE ACCEPTED FORMS OF PAYMENT. Please make MONEY ORDER or CASHIER'S CHECK payable to Oklahoma Probation Services, LLC (OPS).**
14. I agree to pay a monthly prosecution fee of \$40.00 to the Oklahoma County District Attorney's office per the 991 Form.
15. In the event a probation acceleration/ revocation is filed and pending, I understand these rules and conditions shall apply if requested by the prosecution.

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
(CHECK ANY THAT APPLY)**

- ☒ A PAY RESTITUTION PER SEPARATE SCHEDULE. AMT OWED 550 MONTHLY PAYMENT [in full by 2-1-23] TO BEGIN _____
- ☒ B COMPLETE COMMUNITY SERVICE PER SEPARATE SCHEDULE. COMPLETE 20 HOURS BY 5-1-23

Appendix I

- ☐ C I WILL ATTEND LITERACY, ABE OR GED CLASSES/GED TEST AS DIRECTED BY MY PROBATION OFFICER.
- ☐ D ATTEND MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING AS DIRECTED AND PROVIDE WRITTEN PROOF.
- ☒ E COMPLETE 52 WEEK BIP DOMESTIC ABUSE PROGRAM WITHIN 60 WEEKS. (MUST SUPPLY OPS PROBATION OFFICER WITH A COPY OF OFFICER'S AFFIDAVIT, PROBABLE CAUSE OR POLICE REPORT REGARDING THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CHARGE AND BE ENROLLED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF SENTENCING). ATTEND ALL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REVIEW COURT DATES.
- ☐ F COMPLETE VIP/MADD PROGRAM WITHIN 90 DAYS.
- ☒ G BE ASSESSED FOR ALCOHOL/DRUG TREATMENT WITHIN 60 DAYS AND THEN COMPLETE ANY TREATMENT AS RECOMMENDED OR DIRECTED BY OKLAHOMA PROBATION SERVICES, LLC; AND PROVIDE WRITTEN PROOF 90 DAYS PRIOR TO END OF PROBATION OR WITHIN 1 YEAR, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST.
- ☐ H I WILL OBTAIN A MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT WITHIN 60 DAYS, COMPLETE

Appendix I

ANY TREATMENT AS RECOMMENDED
AND PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION TO OPS
PROBATION OFFICER.

- ☐ I INSTALL IGNITION INTERLOCK ON ANY VEHICLE DRIVEN BY DEFENDANT PRIOR TO DRIVING OR WITHIN 1 DAY AFTER RECEIVING A VALID DRIVERS LICENSE FOR A PERIOD OF _____ MONTHS. IF I CANNOT ABIDE BY THESE TERMS, I SHALL NOT DRIVE UNTIL I CAN COMPLY.
- ☐ J I WILL NOT POSSESS OR CONSUME ALCOHOL OR ILLEGAL NARCOTICS NOR VISIT PLACES WHERE THEY ARE DISPENSED, USED OR SOLD. I WILL NOT GO TO ESTABLISHMENTS WHERE THE MAIN ITEM FOR SALE OR USE IS ALCOHOL OR ILLEGAL DRUGS/ NARCOTICS.
- ☐ K COURT ORDERED RANDOM DRUG/ALCOHOL TESTING; TYPE OF TEST WILL BE DETERMINED BY OKLAHOMA PROBATION SERVICES AT THE DEFENDANT'S EXPENSE. _____ (circle) WEEKLY / MONTHLY FOR A PERIOD OF _____ (circle) WEEKS / MONTHS/ YEARS. OPS PROBATION OFFICER MAY INCREASE FREQUENCY FOR MISSED, POSITIVE OR DILUTED TEST.
- ☐ L I WILL NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARMS.

Appendix I

- ☐ M IF UNEMPLOYED/UNDER-EMPLOYED, I
WILL COMPLETE A JOB SKILLS TRAINING/
EMPLOYMENT WORKSHOP AS DETERMINED
BY MY OPS PROBATION OFFICER.
- ☐ N COMPLETE PARENTING CLASSES BY _____.
- ☐ O OBTAIN BUCCAL SWAB WITHIN 30 DAYS.
- ☐ P ATTEND PPREP CLASS ON DATE _____.
- ☐ Q ATTEND AA/NA MEETING _____ WEEK
FOR _____ MONTHS/YEARS.
- ☒ R OTHER: Complete Anger Mgmt Classes

5th day of Jan., 2023
(Month) (Year)

/s/ Kelly Barlean
Signature of Defendant

/s/ Don Jackson
Signature of Attorney for the Defendant

/s/ _____
Signature of Assistant District Attorney

/s/ _____
Signature of Judge of the District Court

**Appendix J — Special Appearance and Objection
(Aug. 28, 2024) (excerpt)**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF
OKLAHOMA BEFORE THE PROFESSIONAL
RESPONSIBILITY TRIBUNAL**

Rule 7, RGDP
OBAD # 2475 SCDB # 7652

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *ex rel.*,
OKLAHOMA BAR ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

KELLY JOHN BARLEAN,

Respondent.

Filed August 28, 2024

**SPECIAL APPEARANCE AND OBJECTION TO
RESPONDENT BARLEAN'S APPLICATION
FOR DEPOSITION SUBPOENAS OF SERGEANT
BRANDON LEE AND OFFICER TAYLOR RAY**

The undersigned counsel, Stacey Haws Felkner, appears specially on behalf of Sgt. Brandon Lee and Officer Taylor Ray (nee Garcia) in the above styled case and requests that this Tribunal deny Respondent Barlean's application for deposition subpoenas. See, Respondent's Application for a Deposition Subpoenas [sic], attached as Exhibit 1. In support of this request, counsel states:

Appendix J

1. On June 5, 2023, Kelly Barlean filed a federal civil rights suit in the Western District of Oklahoma, *Barlean v. Oklahoma County Criminal Justice Authority et al.*, Western District of Oklahoma Case. No. CIV-23-00488-JD. Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray are two of six OCPD officers named in the lawsuit. See, First Amended Complaint, attached as Exhibit 2.

2. The undersigned counsel represents Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray in the federal civil rights case. See, July 12, 2023 Entry of Appearance, attached as Exhibit 3.

3. On May 20, 2024, the Supreme Court suspended Respondent Barlean from the practice of law. See, Order of Immediate Interim Suspension, attached as Exhibit 4. The basis for the suspension was Barlean's criminal convictions in *State of Oklahoma v. Barlean*, CF-20213557 and *State of Oklahoma v. Barlean*, CM-2022-4468. See, Ex. 4, p. 1.

4. The interim suspension order gave Barlean an opportunity to show cause why the order of interim suspension should be set aside. See, Ex. 4, p. 2.

5. On May 31, 2024, Barlean filed his response to the show cause order. See, Respondent's Answer to Order to Show Cause Why Order of Interim Suspension Should be Set Aside and Final Order of Discipline Should not be Made, attached as Exhibit 5.¹

1. Exhibit A to the Response (and Exhibit 2 to this Pleading) is the First Amended Complaint from the federal lawsuit. In the interests of judicial economy, Counsel has not attached the other exhibits from the response.

Appendix J

In this response, Barlean discussed his pending federal lawsuit. See, Ex. 5, pp. 4-6.

6. The claims made against Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray in the federal case arise out of an incident which occurred on June 6, 2021. See, Ex. 5, p. 2. Although it is not apparent from Barlean's response to the show cause order, the June 2021 incident is not related to the convictions which resulted in Barlean's interim suspension. Those convictions were based on two other incidents of domestic violence, which occurred on August 16, 2021 and December 2, 2022. See, Amended Notice of Judgment and Sentence, attached as Exhibit 6. Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray were not involved in the arrests which resulted in either of those convictions.²

7. On August 22, 2024, Respondent Barlean filed "Respondent's Application for a Deposition Subpoenas [sic]" seeking deposition subpoenas for Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray.

8. Respondent Barlean is prohibited from seeking discovery at this time from Defendants Lee and Ray (or any other defendants) in the federal civil rights suit. See, February 5, 2024 Order, attached as Exhibit 7 (citing Rule 26.3 of the Local Rules for the Western District of

2. The Information, List of Witnesses and Probable Cause Affidavit in CF-2021-3557 are attached as Exhibit 1 to the Amended Notice and Judgment of Sentence. The Information, List of Witnesses and Affidavit of Probable Cause in CM-2022-4468 are attached as Exhibit 2 to the Amended Notice. Neither Sgt. Lee nor Officer Ray was listed as a witness in either case.

Appendix J

Oklahoma). Under Rule 26.3, if a motion has been made by any party pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "no party may seek discovery from any source before that motion has been decided." The discovery bar imposed by Rule 26.3 is in effect because the motions to dismiss filed by Defendant Oklahoma County Criminal Justice Authority, Defendant Turn Key Health Clinics, LLC and Defendant Mark Winchester have not been decided. Additionally, the federal court has specifically prohibited the parties from submitting any further filings without prior leave of court until the court rules on the pending motions. See, Ex. 7, p. 2.

9. The anticipated testimony has no connection to the criminal convictions at issue in the disciplinary proceedings. Instead, the testimony Barlean expects to elicit from Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray, if the requested deposition subpoenas are issued, relates solely to the allegations made against Lee, Ray (nee Garcia), and the other defendant officers in Barlean's federal civil rights action. Compare, Ex. 1, pp. 1-2, with Ex. 2, Paragraphs 19-43 and 94-193. In other words, Respondent Barlean is attempting to use the subpoena power of this Tribunal to improperly conduct discovery in his civil rights case before discovery is permitted under the federal rules.

10. While Sgt. Lee and Officer Ray do not dispute that this Tribunal has the authority to issue subpoenas under Rule 6.11(a) of the Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings and/or to take depositions, the Tribunal should not allow Barlean to misuse that subpoena authority as a means to circumvent the federal discovery process.

Appendix J

Therefore, Sergeant Brandon Lee and Officer Taylor Ray (nee Garcia), through the undersigned counsel, ask this Tribunal to deny Respondent Kelly Barlean's Application for Deposition Subpoenas.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stacey Haws Felkner

Stacey Haws Felkner, OBA No. 14737
COLLINS, ZORN & WAGNER, PLLC
429 N.E. 50th Street, 2nd Floor
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-1815
Telephone: (405) 524-2070
E-mail: shf@czwlaw.com
*Attorney for Sgt. Brandon Lee and
Officer Taylor Ray*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on the 28th day of August, 2024, service of a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Special Appearance and Objection to Respondent Barlean's Application for Deposition Subpoenas of Sergeant Brandon Lee and Officer Taylor Ray** was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, on:

Kelly John Barlean
3101 N.W. 20th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73107-3001
RESPONDENT

95a

Appendix J

Jana J. Harris
Assistant General Counsel
1901 N. Lincoln Blvd.
P.O. Box 53036
Oklahoma City, OK 73152
ATTORNEY FOR COMPLAINANT

Martha Rupp Carter
312 E. 29th Place
Tulsa, OK 74114
TRIAL PANEL PRESIDING MATER

Malinda Matlock
1001 N.W. 63rd Street, Suite 280
Oklahoma City, OK 73116
TRIAL PANEL LAWYER MEMBER

Jeff Park
11434 E. Tecumseh Street
Bixby, OK 74116
TRIAL PANEL NON-LAWYER MEMBER

/s/ Stacey Haws Felkner
Stacey Haws Felkner

**Appendix K — In re the Disbarment of Kelly John
Barlean, Misc. No. 7 (W.D. Okla. July 9, 2024)**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

Misc. No. 7

**IN RE THE DISBARMENT OF
KELLY JOHN BARLEAN**

Filed July 9, 2024

ORDER

This Court, having received a copy of an order filed May 20, 2024 by the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma immediately suspending Kelly John Barlean from the Oklahoma Bar Association,

HEREBY ORDERS, ADJUDGES AND DECREES, in accordance with Local Civil Rule 83.6(a), that Kelly John Barlean be disbarred from the practice of law before this Court.

Dated this 9th day of July, 2024.

/s/ Timothy D. DeGiusti
Timothy D. DeGiusti
Chief United States District Judge

/s/ Scott L. Palk
Scott L. Palk
United States District Judge

97a

Appendix K

/s/ Charles B. Goodwin

Charles B. Goodwin
United States District Judge

/s/ Patrick R. Wyrick

Patrick R. Wyrick
United States District Judge

/s/ Jodi W. Dishman

Jodi W. Dishman
United States District Judge

/s/ Bernard M. Jones

Bernard M. Jones
United States District Judge