

1 Plaintiff  
2 Martin Lynch, No Bar Number Pro Se  
3 v.  
4 Defendants  
5 Barry Brody, Bar No. 005227 Pro Se  
6 Annette Burns, Bar No. 009871 Pro Se  
7 Aris Gallios, Bar No. 010619 Pro Se  
8 Helen R. Davis, Bar No. 018309 Pro Se  
9 Keith Berkshire, Bar No. 024107 Pro Se

8 **IN THE SUPREME COURT**  
9 **STATE OF ARIZONA**

10 PETITION TO STRIKE, DISREGARD  
11 OR AMEND COMMENTS MADE BY  
12 DEFENDANTS JULY 5, 2016

Supreme Court No. R-16-0037

13 COMPLAINT TO AZ STATE BAR

**COMMENTS TO PETITION TO  
AMEND ARIZ. R. FAM. L. P. 72  
SUBMITTED JULY 5, 2016**

14 FEDERAL YOUNGER NOTICE  
15 SHOULD STATE REMEDIES FAIL

**FAILURE TO DISCLOSE  
CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

16 ¶1 Plaintiff asserts that the above named defendants have violated Arizona  
17 State Bar Rules of Professional Conduct as follows.

18  
19 ER 6.4. Law Reform Activities Affecting Client Interests

20 A lawyer may serve as a director, officer or member of an organization involved in  
21 reform of the law or its administration notwithstanding that *the reform may affect*  
22 *the interests of a client* of the lawyer. When the lawyer knows that the interests of  
23 a client may be *materially benefited* by a decision in which the lawyer participates,  
24 *the lawyer shall disclose that fact* but need not identify the client.

25 ¶2 The comments regarding changes to Rule 72 which lack the required  
disclosure of conflict of interest may be found on the Court website.

1 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
2 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
3 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
4 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
5 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
6 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
7 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
8 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
9 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
10 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
11 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
12 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
13 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
14 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
15 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
16 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
17 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
18 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
19 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
20 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
21 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
22 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
23 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
24 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>  
25 <http://www.azcourts.gov/DesktopModules/ActiveForums/viewer.aspx?portalid=0>

&moduleid=23621&attachmentid=3496. A word search of this document for the word “*interest*” yields four instances of Defendants concern for the “best interests of the child”. The term “conflict of *interest*” is not found anywhere in this document.

¶3 Plaintiff asserts that these comments of July 5, 2016 to the AZ Supreme Court requires disclosure required by ER 6.4 noted above. Perhaps something simple and accurate such as “*Disclosure of Conflict of Interest: If our proposals are adopted we stand to benefit financially from people who are forced to pay for our services against their will.*” Black’s Law Dictionary defines taking money illegally as stealing. If the Court orders the money to be taken from people against their will, then the stealing is legal and therefore, it is not stealing. As a lay person and member of the public served by the Judiciary, Plaintiff regards legal stealing to be synonymous with what the rest of us know as stealing.

¶4 Plaintiff asserts two separate violations of ER 6.4 exist. The first sentence refers to a “client” or victim who may be affected by the attorney’s desired ability to extract money from a client who does not wish to be a client of the attorney.

¶5 The second violation of ER 6.4 involves the next sentence which describes a different client, that being themselves, attorneys who stand to “*materially benefit*” financially from their comments on this Supreme Court Rules forum.

1 ¶6 Defendants freely admit that they are attorneys and list their Bar Numbers.  
2 They must therefore be bound by the “Rules of Professional Conduct” requiring  
3 disclosure of “conflict of interest”. If the Defendants were represented by other  
4 attorneys in this matter, those attorneys would clearly be required to disclose this  
5 conflict of interest. Defendants do not indicate that they are represented, thus it is  
6 reasonable to conclude that they are representing themselves in their professional  
7 capacity as stated in their own petition.  
8  
9

10 ¶7 Defendants seem to presume that they are not bound by ER 6.4 and that  
11 they are only concerned about the best “interests of the child” when the truth is  
12 that this Rule change Petition may *force people against their will to pay money to*  
13 *these Defendants*. Plaintiff asserts this is the primary motive of their intentionally  
14 deceptive misconduct, failure to disclose conflict of interest, fraud by omission.  
15

16 ¶8 Plaintiff asserts that the Defendants must conform to ER 6.4 and may carry  
17 on with their freedom of speech after they have properly disclosed their “conflict  
18 of interest”. The responsible regulatory agency, *the State Bar* has the duty to  
19 enforce its own code of conduct such that the confidence of the People in the  
20 integrity of the entire Judicial branch of Government is not undermined by  
21 lawyers claiming to help people while concealing their ulterior motives.  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 ¶9 **FEDERAL YOUNGER EXCLUSION DOCTRINE ALERT:** Plaintiff

2 has first-hand experience with these people and their methods. Not all are the  
3 same. Some are more ethical than others. All seem to be free to contrive conflict  
4 and churn billable hours without fear of discipline. Conflict is harmful to people  
5 and especially children, whom Defendants claim to be acting “*in the best*  
6 *interests*” of. All of this harm is done to clients by churning the conflict and  
7  
8 billable hours at enormous hourly rates such that average people must hand over  
9  
10 their life savings under the color of law.

11 ¶10 American Bar.org preaches informed consent as follows.

12 [http://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_home/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_index/conflictsofinterest.html](http://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp_solo_magazine_home/gp_solo_magazine_index/conflictsofinterest.html). Since so much money is involved  
13  
14 other conflicts of interest may also exist. The AZ State Bar is lawyers disciplining  
15 lawyers, or perhaps not disciplining their friends when they should be disciplined.  
16  
17 The AZ Supreme Court has forced poverty and harmful conflict upon families  
18  
19 formerly under Rule 74 “Parenting Coordinators” and now Rule 72 “Special  
20 Masters”. All Court Rules exist in the form specified by the Supreme Court under  
21  
22 Art 6 Sect 3 of the Arizona State Constitution.

23 ¶11 All of the above listed parties are hereby noticed that should they fail to  
24 correct their misconduct and follow the *Rule of Law* they will find themselves  
25 vulnerable to civil action under (but not limited to) 42 USC§ 1983 Denial of

1 Rights and 1985 Conspiracy to Deny Rights for committing the crimes described  
2 by 18 USC§1341 Swindles and Frauds, 18 USC §1951 Extortion, 18 USC§  
3 Chapter 96 Extortion via a racketeering enterprise (RICO), et al; as established in  
4 the minds of the jury by the standard of “*preponderance of the evidence*”.

5 ¶12 To these ends should the State Supreme Court find it necessary to remove  
6 cases from Family Court Judges and force a conflicted third party upon litigants  
7 against their will by means of Rule 72, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the  
8 decision include *findings of fact and conclusions of law*.  
9

10  
11 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016.

12  
13 By /s/ Martin Lynch  
14 Martin Lynch#+  
15 We the People Court Services LLC  
16 PO Box 25784  
17 Tempe, Arizona 85285  
18 602-550-6304  
19 [mlcontact@wethepeoplecourtservicesaz.org](mailto:mlcontact@wethepeoplecourtservicesaz.org)

20 Electronic copy filed with the Clerk  
21 of the Supreme Court of Arizona this  
22 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016.

23  
24 By: /s/ MARTIN LYNCH

25 \*Signed with electronic authorization.  
#President of the Arizona Chapter of Family Civil Liberties Union  
#General Manager of We the People Court Services LLC  
#Fifty Eight Years an Honest Citizen of the State of Arizona.