

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD
OF THE
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION
AND
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)	
)	
EDWARD ANDREW WEINHAUS,)	
)	Commission No. 2025PR00026
Attorney-Respondent,)	
)	
No. 6333901.)	

NOTICE OF FILING

To: Tammy L. Evans (tevans@iardc.org) (ardceservice@iardc.org)
Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission
130 East Randolph Drive, #1500
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6219

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **June 13, 2025**, we filed with the Clerk of the Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission: **ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND AFFIRMATIVE MATTERS**, a copy of which is served upon you herewith.

Adrian Vuckovich (av@cb-law.com)
Kathryne Hayes (khayes@cb-law.com)
COLLINS BARGIONE & VUCKOVICH
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Telephone: 312-372-7813

By: /s/ Adrian Vuckovich
Counsel for Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure [735 ILCS 5/1-109], the undersigned certifies that they served the foregoing document(s) by causing copies to be delivered to the above stated SERVICE LIST by **email** on **June 13, 2025**.

By: /s/ Monica Nunez

FILED
6/13/2025 3:27 PM
ARDC Clerk

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD
OF THE
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION
AND
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION**

In the Matter of:)	
)	
EDWARD ANDREW WEINHAUS,)	
)	Commission No. 2025PR00026
Attorney-Respondent,)	
)	
No. 6333901.)	

ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS, AND AFFIRMATIVE MATTERS

COMES the Attorney-Respondent, Edward Andrew Weinhaus, licensed to practice law in Illinois in September 2020 , by his attorneys, Adrian Vuckovich and Kathrynne Hayes, denying any prefatory allegations, and for his Answer, including certain affirmative matters, states as follows:

COUNT I

(Knowingly Making False Statements with Reckless Disregard as to Their Truth or Falsity Concerning the Qualifications or Integrity of Judges Thaddens Wilson and Regina Scannicchio)

1. Respondent has created and is the registered agent for several limited liability corporations in Missouri, including, but not limited to, LegalSolved, LLC, Control New MLSS, Inc., and Judiciocracy, LLC. Judiciocracy, LLC is a legal news media company, and consists of various news publications, including, but not limited to, ALAB news, which describes itself as “an independent news organization that covers attorney misconduct, in all its forms, to improve the practice of law.” At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent served as the Chief Executive Officer of Judiciocracy, LLC, and reviewed all content before the content was published to the ALAB news website.

ANSWER: The First Sentence is admitted and admitted that Respondent is the CEO.

Denied Respondent reviews all content.

FILED
6/13/2025 3:27 PM
ARDC Clerk

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 1:

- a) Respondent is an attorney who represents the organizations in question herein.
- b) Respondent owes certain duties to the organizations in question herein as an officer and an attorney.

2. Between October 7, 2015, and September 23, 2022, the Hon. Judge Regina Scannicchio was assigned to the Domestic Relations Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County and presided over a domestic relations matter between Respondent and his former spouse. On September 23, 2022, after Judge Scannicchio was named the Acting Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division, she no longer heard cases on the calendar to which Respondent's matter was assigned, and she no longer had any direct involvement in that case. On May 22, 2024, Judge Scannicchio was named the Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division.

ANSWER: Admitted that Judge Regina Scannicchio was assigned to Respondent's case but denied as to the dates alleged. Admitted Judge Scannicchio was named Chief Judge of the Domestic Relations Division at some point. Respondent lacks knowledge regarding the specific reasons that Judge Scannicchio became uninvolved in Respondent's case. Admitted that Plaintiff had no case before the Judge on or after September 23, 2022 and did not appear before the Judge as a lawyer or litigant after September 23, 2022.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 2:

- a) Respondent's litigation in front of Judge Scannicchio ended prior to her being named as Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division.

3. Prior to April 18, 2023, Respondent was a plaintiff in a lawsuit involving a corporate dispute that was filed in the Chancery Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County. That case settled on or before April 18, 2023, with a judgment in the amount of \$6,000,000 being entered against the defendants. The case was assigned to the Hon. Thaddeus L. Wilson, a Circuit Judge in the Chancery

Division, and on April 18, 2023, Respondent's counsel caused an agreed settlement order to be filed in the case and presented to Judge Wilson for signature and entry.

ANSWER: Admitted other than the date as to when counsel for Respondent submitted an order.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 3:

a) Respondent's company, Control NEW MLSS LLC ("CNML") was represented by Ryan M. Cleys and Zachary Ziliak of Ziliak Law for derivative purposes under Delaware law in an Illinois court case – Cook # 2016CH07155. Respondent also represented CNML in various capacities.

b) The Derivative settlement was first presented to Judge Wilson on or about April 3, 2023 by Ryan M. Cleys which included the Conditional Direct Settlement as an exhibit – which was conditioned on Judge Wilson reviewing the Derivative settlement (including the Conditional Direct Settlement) under Delaware Chancery Court Rule 23.1(d).

c) The Derivative Settlement was next presented to Judge Wilson on or about April 11, 2023 with the Conditional Direct Settlement executed, pursuant to Rule 23.1(d).

4. Respondent later used those settlement proceeds to create Children of the Court, a nonprofit organization that advocates for judicial reform in family law cases. The organization advocates that judges who have either never been parents or who are not actively a part of the foster care system, should not be assigned to or make decisions regarding parental issues in family law cases.

ANSWER: Denied as to the first sentence. Admitted that one of the organization's advocacy missions is alleged accurately.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 4:

a) Respondent did not directly receive any settlement proceeds approved by court orders unless directly stated in the orders.

b) Delaware Chancery Court Rule 23.1(d) governs how a derivative shareholder, like a class action lead class representative, may receive an award that may be at the expense of other shareholders. Any derivative settlement requires judicial review and approval for an individual shareholder reward at the expense of other shareholders.

c) Judge Wilson approved settlement orders and in doing so approved what Respondent received (and did not receive) as a result of the derivative settlement under Del. Ch. Ct. R. 23.1(d).

d) Court orders have the effect of law.

5. On or after April 18, 2023, Respondent caused a website to be created for Children of the Court, which included a webpage titled “Team,” that listed individuals associated with the organization and described their backgrounds and responsibilities.

ANSWER: Denied. The basis for the creation of the website was a court order entered by Judge Wilson.

6. On or after April 18, 2023, Respondent caused a picture of Judge Wilson to be uploaded to and included on the “Team” section of the Children of the Court webpage with the words “Nationwide Enforcer” below Judge Wilson’s name, and a short biography. The biography included the following statements:

“Although he sits on a bench in Cook County, Illinois, his order has created a national organization, advocating in every state. Judge Wilson is responsible for enforcing the funding of Children of the Court pursuant to his April 18, 2023 order in Cook County.”

ANSWER: Denied except that the quoted language appeared on the website at some point.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 6:

a) Children of the Court operates throughout the United States, without regard to any individual state.

b) Judge Wilson entered an order approving the settlement in 2016CH07155 as an approved Delaware derivative settlement under Del. Ch. Ct. R. 23.1(d) which required the creation and financing of Children of the Court.

c) The order states the Court retained jurisdiction to enforce the settlement agreement.

d) The settlement agreement provided for the funding of Children of the Court for 10 years.

e) Judge Wilson recused himself from further overseeing the settlement agreement in Case # 2016CH07155 after the Administrator's Complaint was filed against Respondent in this action.

7. Respondent's statements described in paragraph six, above, were false because they falsely stated that Judge Wilson was a member of the Children of the Court "Team" and that he had responsibility for overseeing the organization's activities and funding.

ANSWER: Denied that the quotes contain the statements alleged and therefore the allegations are denied.

8. Respondent knew that his statements concerning Judge Wilson were false, or he made the statements with reckless disregard for their truth or falsity because he knew that Judge Wilson's order did not create Children of the Court, that Judge Wilson was not a member of the organization's "Team," and that Judge Wilson had no ongoing responsibility over the organization's funding or operation. Respondent also knew or should have known that the statements concerned Judge Wilson's impartiality and therefore his qualifications or integrity.

ANSWER: Denied.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 8:

a) Children of the Court listed accurate information about Judge Wilson on its website.

b) Children of the Court listed truthful information about Judge Wilson on a page entitled "Judges."

c) Children of the Court listed truthful information about Judge Wilson on a letter sent to Marcia Meis, several judges, and state courts around the country. The letter was not questioned and disputed.

d) Children of the Court listed truthful information about Judge Wilson on a page entitled “Team.”

e) Children of the Court nor any of its agents, attorneys, officers, or directors used the words that Judge Wilson was “on the team.”

f) When Respondent was informed by counsel for ARDC that Judge Wilson disliked the statements on the website, the content was removed. There was no complaint about it thereafter.

9. On December 12, 2023, Respondent caused an article to be posted on the ALAB news website titled “Breaking: Dastardly Chicago Divorce Attorneys Hurst Robin Kay & Allen Have Own Client Thrown in Jail According to Legal News Journal.” The article, while not related to Respondent's own divorce proceedings, involved allegations of misconduct against one of his ex-spouse's attorneys. The article included the following statement: “In an unprecedented ‘slam’ on a fellow judge, another Cook County judge and leader the Hon. Thaddeus L. Wilson immediately ordered an organization be started to keep judges like [Judge Regina] Scannicchio away from cases involving children.”

ANSWER: Denied as to the first sentence. Admitted that the article was not related to any litigation involving Respondent. The remaining allegations require no answer in that the language in the article speaks for itself. In further answer, the article is accurate and was properly published by Judiocracy.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 9:

a) The full article needs to be included to understand the context and who the speaker is. Particularly, the article states explicitly: “[Respondent] refused comment.”

b) Attorneys in Illinois are protected from liability for assisting their clients make legal speech.

c) The Administrator is not discriminating between the Respondent and Judiciocracy LLC or Children of the Court in its allegation.

d) The Administrator does not allege that Judiciocracy LLC or Children of the Court acted in violation of any law or regulation.

10. Respondent's statement described in paragraph nine, above, was false because Judge Wilson did not "immediately order an organization be started" to take any action involving Judge Scannicchio regarding her involvement in any cases involving children or otherwise, because Judge Wilson did not start the organization and did not have any involvement in directing the organization to take any action concerning Judge Scannicchio or any other judges. Judge Wilson had no part in the creation of Children of the Court, was not involved in its operations, did not direct it to take any action involving Judge Scannicchio, was not involved in a "slam" against her, and had no responsibility to affect her judicial assignments since, as a Circuit Judge in the Chancery Division, he had no authority over what cases were assigned to Judge Scannicchio, who was the Acting Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County at the time the article was published.

ANSWER: Denied that the statement referenced in the allegations was Respondent's statement. Admit that Judge Scannicchio was the Acting Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division. The remaining allegations are argumentative and should be stricken. In the alternative, denied as alleged.

AFFIRMATIVE ALLEGATIONS 10:

a) The article disclosed Respondent's journalistic duties to Judiciocracy LLC's audience and further stated that "[Respondent] refused comment.]"

b) Judge Wilson reviewed the settlement and entered an order which lead to the creation of the entity Children of the Court pursuant to Delaware Chancery Rule 23.1(d) and *Marek v. Lane*, 571 U.S. 1003, 1006 (2013) (Roberts, CJ, in statement respecting denial of *certiorari*).

c) Public records demonstrate that Judge Wilson made statements regarding Judge Scannicchio.

d) Judge Wilson was made aware on the same docket as the settlement order (by a party not controlled by the Respondent) of allegations of mismanagement of Judge Scannicchio by her supervisors.

e) Judge Wilson commented about the issues related to the above subparagraph in open court.

f) Respondent directly and through other counsel attempted to obtain clarification regarding the alleged falsity of the statements prior to the filing of the Complaint by the Administrator but was unable to obtain such clarification.

g) Judiciocracy LLC's policy is to correct false information.

h) Judiciocracy's controlling owner has submitted a request via federal court filing in an Affidavit for Administrator's review to learn what was false about the statement.

i) Judiciocracy has never been asked by Judge Wilson, Judge Scannicchio or any other party to correct anything in the statement.

j) A failure to take steps to correct any false information is a prima facie admission that the information is not a false statement of fact to which the rules apply to speech and cannot be determined a false statement of fact of that type.

11. Respondent made the statement described in paragraph nine, above, knowing it was false or made it with reckless disregard to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of Judge Wilson and Judge Scannicchio because Judge Wilson had no part in the creation of Children

of the Court, was not involved in its operations, did not direct it to take any action involving Judge Scannicchio, was not involved in a “slam” against her, and had no responsibility to affect her judicial assignments since, as a Circuit Judge in the Chancery Division, he had no authority over what cases were assigned to Judge Scannicchio, who was the Acting Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County at the time the article was published. Respondent also knew or should have known that the statements concerned Judge Wilson’s impartiality and therefore his qualifications or integrity and concerned the qualifications or integrity of Judge Scannicchio.

ANSWER: Denied

12. By reason of the conduct outlined above, Respondent has engaged in the following misconduct:

- a. knowingly making a false statement or making a statement with reckless disregard to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, by conduct including causing a picture of Judge Thaddeus L. Wilson to be uploaded to and included on the “Team” webpage of the website for Children of the Court, which falsely implied that Judge Wilson was a member of that organization’s “team” and/or was affiliated with the organization; and causing the December 12, 2023 article to be posted to the ALAB news website that falsely stated that Judge Wilson ordered the Children of the Court organization to be started to keep Judge Regina Scannicchio away from cases involving children, in violation of Rule 8.2(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- b. engaging in dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including making the false statements described in paragraphs six and nine, above, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Denied.

AFFIRMATIVE MATTERS

Table of Contents

<i>I. JUDICIAL AND OTHER ESTOPPEL.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>II. FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS PURPORTED RESPONDENT SPEECH</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>III. RESPONDENT’S PURPORTED SPEECH IS ESPECIALLY PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT</i>	<i>12</i>

IV. RESPONDENT'S PURPORTED SPEECH IS ESPECIALLY PROTECTED BY THE ILLINOIS RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT.....	13
V. THE PURPORTED SPEECH IS TRUTHFUL.....	15
VI. EVEN WERE THERE FACTIAL ISSUES WITH THE PURPORTED SPEECH NONE OF IT IS RECKLESSLY FALSE.....	16
VII. EVEN IF PORTIONS OF THE PURPORTED SPEECH DEEMED NOT FALSIFIABLY TRUE, THEY ARE MATTERS OF OPINION AND/OR FAIR PUBLIC COMMENTARY AND NOT SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINE.....	17
VIII. RESPONDENT RELIED ON OPINIONS OF ATTORNEYS AND OTHERS IN ASSISTING THE ENTITY SPEECH.....	19
IX. ADMINISTRATOR IGNORES SIMILAR STATEMENTS IN SIMILAR CONTEXTS NOT RELATED TO JUDGES OR JUDICIAL REFORM WHICH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIEWPOINT DISCRIMINATION	20
X. THE SPEECH IN QUESTION IS THAT OF CHILDREN OF THE COURT AND JUDICIOCRACY LLC	21
XI. ADMINISTRATOR IS INTERFERING WITH ENTITY SPEECH THROUGH ATTACKING RESPONDENT AS AN OVERREACH OF AUTHORITY	21
XII. ADMINISTRATOR IS SELECTIVELY ENFORCING DIFFERENT RULES TO CREATE A HOBSON'S CHOICE FOR ATTORNEYS WHO FULFILL THEIR DUTIES AND AS SUCH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY	22
XIII. ADMINISTRATOR IS SEEKING TO INTERFERE WITH ENTITIES' RIGHTS TO ASSOCIATE WITH ATTORNEYS AS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY	23
XIV. ADMINISTRATOR'S ACTIONS HEREIN ARE IGNORING THE REAL DISCIPLINARY ISSUES IN THE NEWS ARTICLE TO ASSIST ONE OR MORE SITTING JUDGES FROM CRITICISM AGAINST THEIR MISSION AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST	23
XV. ADMINISTRATOR SEEKS TO LIMIT CRITICISM OF JUDGES ON BEHALF OF A PRIVATE BUSINESS LEAGUE OF JUDGES.....	24

I. JUDICIAL AND OTHER ESTOPPEL

1) Attorney-Respondent restates and re-alleges all above Answers and Affirmative Allegations.

2) Administrator, Administrator's executive, and Administrator's counsel ("Administrator Defendants") are (or were) defendants in a federal case filed prior to the charges herein related to the Attorney-Respondent's work for the Plaintiffs in that matter, styled as *Children of the Court and Judiciocracy LLC v. ARDC, Lea S. Gutierrez, and Tammy Evans* in the Northern District of Illinois. Case # 1:25-cv-03387 ("Entity Speech Litigation").

3) Administrator Defendants have relied on various arguments to seek redress in the Entity Speech Litigation, including but not limited to rights of the Plaintiffs in the Entity Speech Litigation, Rights of the Attorney-Respondent in this litigation, and other legal claims.

4) To the extent the Administrator Defendants are entitled to relief in the Entity Speech Litigation, the Administrator is judicially estopped from arguing otherwise in this matter.

5) Additionally, the Administrator Defendants' positions before the federal court could lead to other estoppel arguments and as such, Attorney-Respondent should be granted leave to estop Administrator from inconsistent positions for equitable reasons as against the public interest.

II. FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS PURPORTED RESPONDENT SPEECH

6) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

7) For the speech purportedly made by Respondent, Respondent was not speaking in the course of any pending litigation, Respondent was not conducting attorney advertising.

8) Respondent attorney is not subject to any criminal accusation for the allegations in the Complaint.

9) Respondent attorney is not subject to any tortious allegations in a civil court for the allegations in the Complaint.

10) Administrator has not claimed otherwise in their Complaint.

11) Attorneys do not lose their First Amendment rights outside of a very limited basis pursuant to the Supreme Court of the United States.

12) Administrator's Complaint seeks to exceed the authority to infringe on the free speech rights of an attorney outside of the circumstances listed above – no pending litigation, no attorney advertising, no criminal conduct, and no tortious acts.

13) As such, the charges in the Complaint should be denied.

III. RESPONDENT'S PURPORTED SPEECH IS ESPECIALLY PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT

14) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

15) The purported speech of Respondent is in the nature of Judicial Reform.

16) Respondent's purported speech discussed how judicial reform was enabled, and financed, and the types and quality of judicial experience.

17) Case Assignment related to judicial experience is a valid critique of judges, judicial administration, and serves the improvement of the judicial system.

18) Discussing experienced and inexperienced judges for case assignments seeks to improve the Judiciary.

19) Further, courts themselves seek to hold themselves accountable for how they assign cases. See *Children of the Court and Conor Paris v. Chief Judge Timothy Evans, et al*, Second Amended Complaint, Case # 1:24-cv-08785, Northern District of Illinois, ("Experience-based judicial assignments can be a hallmark of a thoughtful judiciary. See, for e.g.: <https://www.iand.uscourts.gov/content/how-are-federal-judges-assigned-cases> (last visited 5/14/2025).")

20) But not all case assignment systems are thoughtful.

21) Reforming case assignments based on appropriate experience is a matter of serious public import.

22) Respondent has been called “America’s Most Aggressive Judicial Reformer.”

23) Respondent has been called the “Patron Saint of [Judicial] Clerks.”

24) Respondent dedicates much of his professional pro bono work to judicial reform.

25) Respondent performs pro bono work in suing judges and markets that he sues judges.

26) Respondent has a long history of protecting judges physical well-being.

27) Respondent sacrifices personal gain to improve the functioning of the judiciary.

28) Respondent has published the tagline for work in the area of Judicial Reform:

“The one area of practice a lawyer is paid not to do.”

29) The First Amendment protects speech designed to hold public officials, such as judges, accountable.

30) The United States Supreme Court has in fact noted that the holding public officials accountable is among the most protected speech under the First Amendment.

31) Additionally, the speech in question is published on a news site and a judicial reform site, both deserving of the same heightened protection under the First Amendment.

32) Therefore, Respondent’s purported speech deserves the highest form of protection.

33) The Complaint should be denied for encroaching on heightened protection of public accountability speech.

IV. RESPONDENT’S PURPORTED SPEECH IS ESPECIALLY PROTECTED BY THE ILLINOIS RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

34) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters’ Allegations.

35) The Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct include specific rules for criticizing public officials, including judges, such as:

Rule 6.4 states:

RULE 6.4: LAW REFORM ACTIVITIES AFFECTING CLIENT INTERESTS

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

36) Respondent serves as director and officer of organizations involved in judicial reform including Children of the Court and Judiciocracy LLC (literally, it's in their names!).

37) Rule 6.4 explicitly authorizes Respondent's work for Children of the Court and Judiciocracy as a director and officer.

38) The public interest also allows Respondent to serve as an attorney for Children of the Court and Judiciocracy.

39) Nothing in Rule 6.4 or any of the Illinois Professional Rules of Conduct allows or authorizes the Respondent to work against the interests of Children of the Court and Judiciocracy once he establishes duties to them.

40) The purported Respondent's speech was in the interests of Children of the Court and Judiciocracy.

41) Respondent had made similar speech on his own accord prior to Judge Wilson's order on April 18, 2023, establishing his duty to help the entities speak similarly. See <https://coachforged.com/coach-outside-of-class-israeli-judicial-reform/> at about 10:10 (published March 17, 2023).

42) As such, Administrator cannot both allow and complain about Respondent's assistance of judicial reform speech.

43) Additionally, Rule 8.2(a) Comment 1 encourages Respondent to speak honestly about elected officials, such as judicial officers.

44) It states: “Assessments by lawyers are relied on in evaluating the professional or personal fitness of persons being considered for election...Expressing honest and candid opinions on such matters contributes to improving the administration of justice...”

45) As such, the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct encourage discussion of the administrative of justice such as the judicial reform speech purportedly made by Respondent.

46) Therefore, the charges in the Complaint should be denied.

V. THE PURPORTED SPEECH IS TRUTHFUL

47) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters’ Allegations.

48) Administrator spent several hours questioning client on the truthfulness of his speech on June 13, 2024.

49) The record of the Sworn Statement demonstrates that the purported speech of Respondent was truthful.

50) Administrator noted only that the ‘context’ of the speech could be misunderstood.

51) Administrator acknowledged that although the speech was fit for attorneys as truthful, not all of the audience would be lawyers.

52) Inasmuch as there are falsifiable statements of fact, each of the statements attributed to Respondent are truthful or are otherwise matters of opinion.

53) For example, Administrator makes claims about the words “on the team” – but no such words appear.

54) Even were they to appear, Administrator has failed to define what makes someone “on the team” and whether or not that is true or false.

55) Prior to the Complaint, Judge Wilson was faced with a motion to modify the settlement he entered, including the way the funds were disbursed.

56) Rather than strike the motion calling for his enforcement of the funding, Judge Wilson recused himself from then enforcing the funding after learning he would be a fact witness in this proceeding.

57) Prior to his recusal, Judge Wilson, and only Judge Wilson, had the judicial power to enforce the settlement that guaranteed the funding of Children of the Court.

58) Administrator cannot produce a proper definition of the words “on the team” for them to be considered “false.”

59) As the purported speech of Respondent is truthful for factual matters, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

VI. EVEN WERE THERE FACTIAL ISSUES WITH THE PURPORTED SPEECH NONE OF IT IS RECKLESSLY FALSE

60) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters’ Allegations.

61) Respondent had a good faith belief in the truth of each of the matters that were published.

62) For example, Respondent has been told by many attorneys who work in what is now her divisions that Judge Regina A. Scannicchio’s lack of parental experience affects her ability to be a fit judge.

63) Respondent has published her inability on occasion to rule properly for that reason.

64) Further, Respondent has sought that Judge Scannicchio receive proper training to address her inexperience and weaknesses in the past.

65) Further, Respondent has sought that the issue of the lack of supervision of Judge Scannicchio’s alleged blindspots be brought before her supervisors.

66) Further, parties other than those affiliated with Respondent brought the precise issue of the lack of supervision of Judge Scannicchio before Judge Wilson in the Case #2016CH07155.

67) Judge Wilson commented publicly on the matter being brought before him in open court.

68) Public allegations of Judge Wilson (“Judge Thaddeus”) criticizing Judge Scannicchio are a matter of public record.

69) Respondent nonetheless, who has some knowledge of Judge Scannicchio’s strengths and weaknesses, helped shape Children of the Court to allow “judges like Judge Scannicchio” to incentivize improving their experience, even if childless, by promoting fostering.

70) Children of the Court’s mission, nonetheless, would keep “judges like Judge Scannicchio” who has never been a parent (absent becoming a foster parent) away from custody cases, according to Respondent’s good faith belief.

71) Likewise, Respondent believed Judge Wilson understood the meaning of Delaware Chancery Court Rule 23.1(d) and was aware of his docket.

72) As such, the purported speech of Respondent could not be recklessly false.

73) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

VII. EVEN IF PORTIONS OF THE PURPORTED SPEECH DEEMED NOT FALSIFIABLY TRUE, THEY ARE MATTERS OF OPINION AND/OR FAIR PUBLIC COMMENTARY AND NOT SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINE

74) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters’ Allegations.

75) For any matters that are not falsifiable as matters of pure fact (eg “Judge X killed person Y”), including but not limited to “judges like” another judge, or how a judge participates “on the team” or a “slam,” these cannot be considered anything other than opinion of fair public commentary.

76) Further, under the prevailing understanding of a judge's role in creating an organization as a result of a class settlement, the matter is clearly a matter of opinion or fair public commentary.

77) Judge Wilson may disagree with his purpose, but Respondent's interpretation of Judge Wilson's review of a settlement and entry of an order cannot be recklessly false when no comment was ever made about Judge Wilson's purposeful intent, but rather the organization's intent and the effect of Judge Wilson's order.

78) Chief Justice Roberts' pronouncement in *Marek v. Lane* discusses a perfectly analogous situation to a shareholder derivative settlement with a *cy pres* award in lieu of a shareholder reward to comply with Del. Ch. Ct. R. 23.1(d):

“Marek’s challenge is focused on the particular features of the specific *cy pres* settlement at issue. Granting review of this case might not have afforded the Court an opportunity to address more fundamental concerns surrounding the use of such remedies in class action litigation, including when, if ever, such relief should be considered; how to assess its fairness as a general matter; whether new entities may be established as part of such relief; if not, how existing entities should be selected; what the respective roles of the judge and parties are in shaping a *cy pres* remedy; how closely the goals of any enlisted organization must correspond to the interests of the class; and so on. This Court has not previously addressed any of these issues. *Cy pres* remedies, however, are a growing feature of class action settlements. See Redish, Julian, & Zyontz, *Cy Pres Relief and the Pathologies of the Modern Class Action: A Normative and Empirical Analysis*, 62 Fla. L. Rev. 617, 653-656 (2010). In a suitable case, this Court may need to clarify the limits on the use of such remedies.”

Marek v. Lane, 571 U.S. 1003, 1006 (2013) (Roberts, CJ, in statement respecting denial of *certiorari*) (emphasis added).

79) If Chief Justice Robert doesn't know the precise role of a judge in creating an organization, then Respondent could not know that the information purportedly his speech was “false.”

80) And neither does Administrator.

81) If Administrator knows the effect of a Del. Ch. Ct. Rule 23.1(d) order as is in question here, Administrator should be required to produce an expert to prove the statements creating the order are falsifiable, false, and that Respondent was recklessly so.

82) They can't so they won't.

83) The purported speech of Respondent was opinion or otherwise fair commentary and is protected speech that cannot be recklessly false.

84) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

VIII. RESPONDENT RELIED ON OPINIONS OF ATTORNEYS AND OTHERS IN ASSISTING THE ENTITY SPEECH

85) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

86) Respondent showed the court order in question and the language referring to Judge Wilson to several attorneys prior to January 2024 when the original complaint from Judge Scannicchio was received.

87) Respondent (for the entities' benefit) had a right to rely on attorneys' review of the statements to determine their truth or falsity.

88) Attorneys from Polsinelli, Steptoe and Johnson, and others, did not advise that they found that the speech "false."

89) These attorneys acted on the speech in Judge Wilson's orders as interpreted in the same manner as on the Children of the Court website which include the excerpts of the settlement and the enforcement order as well as a link to the full settlement.

90) One attorney repeated similar language in an application to the IRS.

91) Respondent therefore should not be held accountable for *intentional* or *reckless* wrongdoing when the speech was public for so long, with so much attorney review, with attorneys

repeating or relying on the consequence of Judge Wilson's actions similar to Respondent's purported speech.

92) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

IX. ADMINISTRATOR IGNORES SIMILAR STATEMENTS IN SIMILAR CONTEXTS NOT RELATED TO JUDGES OR JUDICIAL REFORM WHICH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIEWPOINT DISCRIMINATION

93) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

94) One or more other websites construe Judge Wilson's actions similarly to how Administrator's purported speech does.

95) One or more of those websites do not discuss judicial reform.

96) One or more of those websites includes a Director who is a partner from Steptoe and Johnson who did not oppose the exact same language about Judge Wilson's involvement.

97) Respondent's purported speech on Children of the Court constituted nothing more than the other site's speech being copied over and adjusted in a non-material way.

98) In fact, the only real difference between the two Judge Wilson descriptions are the topic.

99) On Children of the Court, the topic is Judicial Reform. On the other site, it's not.

100) The Steptoe and Johnson partner has never authorized the removal of Judge Wilson's bio from the other site's "Team" page, where it remains (albeit clarified to avoid any confusion).

101) Attacking the speech in question of Children of the Court is unconstitutional viewpoint discrimination.

102) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

X. THE SPEECH IN QUESTION IS THAT OF CHILDREN OF THE COURT AND JUDICIOCRACY LLC

103) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

104) The speech in question is on the websites of the entities Children of the Court and Judiciocracy LLC.

105) The entities have a right to speak on their own.

106) The entities are entitled to officers, directors, and attorneys to assist them in speaking.

107) Officers, directors, and attorneys owe the entities a duty.

108) The entities can enforce the duties of the officers, directors, and attorneys.

109) Respondent was officer, director, and attorney to the entities.

110) The entities made their officer, director, and attorney help them speak.

111) As such, the speech wasn't "caused" by Respondent, but caused by Respondent's duty to help the entities speak.

112) Respondent is not liable for the speech he was duty-bound to help the entities make.

113) Administrator is confusing this case with the cases like Palmisano and Lowery where the attorney was conducting Personal speech, such as, potentially, Respondent's speech listed above on March 17, 2023 CoachForged.com video.

114) In this case, Respondent was required to help the entities speak and did so.

115) The speech was not his speech, but the entities' speech.

116) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

XI. ADMINISTRATOR IS INTERFERING WITH ENTITY SPEECH THROUGH PROSECUTING RESPONDENT AS AN OVERREACH OF AUTHORITY

117) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

118) The Administrator pressured Respondent to stop helping the entities comment on sitting judges (elected officials) and to help create news stories in the Sworn Statement on June 13, 2024.

119) Administrator is attempting to stop an officer, director, and attorney to fulfill his duties to the entities herein.

120) Punishing the entities' attorney for their speech limits their speech.

121) By way of example, the charges in the Complaint would prevent the entities from access to an attorney to help them speak.

122) Such action by Administrator is an overreach of authority and a violation of the Constitutional protection of free speech.

123) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

XII. ADMINISTRATOR IS SELECTIVELY ENFORCING DIFFERENT RULES TO CREATE A HOBSON'S CHOICE FOR ATTORNEYS WHO FULFILL THEIR DUTIES AND AS SUCH IS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY

124) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

125) Respondent has duties to the entities in question.

126) If Respondent did not fulfill his duties to the entities, he would also be subject to discipline by the Administrator for other rules violations.

127) As such, Administrator has created a Hobson's Choice for Respondent.

128) Putting Respondent into a Hobson's Choice is an unconstitutional exercise of their authority.

129) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

XIII. ADMINISTRATOR IS SEEKING TO INTERFERE WITH ENTITIES' RIGHTS TO ASSOCIATE WITH ATTORNEYS AS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY

130) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

131) Administrator's actions serve to prevent any attorney to assist judicial reform statements even absent any tortious speech, crime, existing litigation, or attorney advertising.

132) Please again see the chart with the red "X's" above for a demonstration.

133) Administrator's actions are an unconstitutional over-reach to limit the associational rights of entities.

134) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

XIV. ADMINISTRATOR'S ACTIONS HEREIN ARE IGNORING THE REAL DISCIPLINARY ISSUES IN THE NEWS ARTICLE TO ASSIST ONE OR MORE SITTING JUDGES FROM CRITICISM AGAINST THEIR MISSION AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

135) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

136) The news story in question covered the case of *Paris v. Paris* (Cook #2016D004685) and the issue of attorney fees sending a father of seven to jail over the holiday period.

137) The story noted a potential Rule 1.9 violation.

138) The Administrator has ignored the potential Rule 1.9 violation throughout the entirety of this process through March 1, 2025 at least.

139) That is, even though the Administrator has investigated Respondent for uncovering violations and the way Respondent has purportedly done it, the Administrator completely ignored the actions of Brian Jason Hurst.

140) Brian Jason Hurst not only had his own client thrown in jail for fee payment issues (according to the coverage of the entity), but also violated Rule 1.9 by representing an adverse party to his former client in the very same litigation.

141) Administrator, intent on stifling the criticism of fees in the domestic relations division, ignored a clear example of a Rule 1.9 violation which should be prosecuted.

142) Further, the party who violated Rule 1.9 also either disagrees with the Administrator's decision to bring these charges here, or is in further violation of the rules by failing to report them as would be required pursuant to *Himmel* and *Skolnick*.

143) Administrator failed to investigate the violations of the attorney, after the purported speech of Respondent disclosed it, based on, as they say, "the feelings" of judges.

144) Administrator's position should not prioritize "the feelings" of judges over material violations in the rules in plain sight.

145) Administrator's bringing of these charges is the public interest.

146) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

XV. ADMINISTRATOR SEEKS TO LIMIT CRITICISM OF JUDGES ON BEHALF OF A PRIVATE BUSINESS LEAGUE OF JUDGES

147) Respondent re-states and re-alleges all prior Answers, Affirmative Allegations, and Affirmative Matters' Allegations.

148) The original complaint by Judge Scannicchio was sent to Respondent on or about January 10, 2024.

149) Respondent's counsel, Attorney Ryan M. Cleys, responded, which raised many of the issues above and included factual information to debunk false claims by Judge Scannicchio.

150) Additionally, Mr. Cleys noted that Judge Scannicchio was a member of a *private* organization that sought to stifle criticism of judges and that her complaint was intended to stifle rightful criticism by a private group of judges.

- 151) Administrator sent a request to Judge Scannicchio to respond Mr. Cleys' rebuttal.
- 152) Administrator sent the following request to Judge Scannicchio with Mr. Cleys' rebuttal:
- “If you believe the response is inaccurate or if you wish to provide additional information or documents for our consideration, you may submit your written response to klowry@iadc.org.”
- 153) Judge Scannicchio did not believe the response was inaccurate.
- 154) Judge Scannicchio did not wish to provide additional information or documents for the Administrator's consideration.
- 155) Judge Scannicchio did not submit a written response to the Administrator.
- 156) However, Judge Scannicchio is a director of the Illinois Judges Association.
- 157) Five of the seven members of the Illinois Supreme Court are members of the Illinois Judges Association or list it as part of their official biographies.
- 158) The Illinois Judges Association is a business league of judges organized under IRS Code § 501(c)(6). (“Business League”).
- 159) The Business League seeks to stifle criticism of judges.
- 160) The Illinois Supreme Court has a conflict of interest for matters related to the Business League.
- 161) On or about February 7, 2024, Respondent fulfilled his duty to organization Children of the Court by sending letters to judges and judicial administrators around the country.
- 162) On or about March 20, 2024, Marcia Meis, who reports to the Illinois Supreme Court, like Administrator, wrote an email to Administrator that the letter sent by the entity was “not a legitimate letter.”
- 163) The letter is legitimate and publishes similar statements to that identified in the charges in the Complaint.

164) The Administrator is seeking to stifle criticism of judges for the improper purpose of assisting the Business League in its private efforts to stifle criticism of judges.

165) For these reasons, the charges in the Complaint should be dismissed.

WHEREFORE, Attorney-Respondent requests the Hearing Board dismiss the Complaint and preserve all Attorney-Respondent rights under the rules.

June 13, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Adrian Vuckovich

Adrian Vuckovich (av@cb-law.com)
Kathryne Hayes (khayes@cb-law.com)
COLLINS BARGIONE & VUCKOVICH
1 North LaSalle Street, Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 372-7813