

*The following is a real-time transcript taken as closed captioning during the oral argument proceedings, and as such, may contain errors. This service is provided solely for the purpose of assisting those with disabilities and should be used for no other purpose. These are not legal documents, and may not be used as legal authority. This transcript is not an official document of the Florida Supreme Court.*

**The Florida Bar v. Alan S. Glueck**

**SC06-1101 | SC07-1**

THE FINAL CASE ON OUR CALENDAR  
THIS MORNING IS FLORIDA BAR v.  
GLUECK.

>> I'M SORRY.

>> NO, NO, NO, WHEN YOU'RE  
READY.

>> I'M JUAN CARLOS ARIAS AND I  
REPRESENT THE FLORIDA BAR IN  
THIS CASE.

THE CASES BEFORE YOU ARE TWO  
COMBINED SUPREME COURT CASES,  
WHICH INCLUDE EIGHT COMPLAINTS.  
AND THEY'RE ABOUT FOUR PATTERNS  
OF MISCONDUCT.

THE FIRST ONE IS MISCONDUCT  
RELATING TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT  
RELATIONSHIP DEALING WITH  
NEGLECT, LACK OF DILIGENCE, AND  
COMMUNICATION.

THE SECOND PATTERN IS A  
BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP OR  
PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE  
ATTORNEY AND NONATTORNEY IN THE

--

>> I'D LIKE FOR YOU TO EXPLORE  
THAT A LITTLE BIT WITH US.

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

>> WHAT ARE THE NECESSARY  
ELEMENTS?

DOES IT HAVE TO BE A  
PARTNERSHIP?

CAN IT BE JUST A BUSINESS  
RELATIONSHIP?

EXPLAIN TO US WHAT YOU SEE THE  
FACTS TO BE AND WHAT THE  
FLORIDA LAW IS IN THIS  
PARTICULAR AREA ON THIS COURT  
BECAUSE THIS SEEMS TO BE  
ONE OF THE MOST SUBSTANTIAL  
PARTS.

THE OTHERS ARE MORE  
STRAIGHTFORWARD I THINK THAN  
THIS ONE MAY BE.

>> CHIEF JUSTICE LEWIS, THE,  
THE REFERRING THE REPORT FOUND

BOTH A BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP OR  
A PARTNERSHIP.

SHE WAS VERY CAREFUL IN  
DRAFTING IT THAT WAY.

THAT IS BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE  
PROOF THAT THERE WERE CONTRACTS  
AND THAT THINGS WERE DONE IN A  
PARTICULAR WAY BUT IN PRACTICE,  
IN PRACTICE WHAT MR.^GLUECK HAD  
AT THE LOCATION OF MILLENIA IN  
AVENTURA WAS A STOREFRONT THAT  
HE WOULD VISIT ONCE OR TRICE A  
-- TWICE A MONTH.

THAT WAS RAN, OPERATED BY THIS  
NONLAWYER, SHE WAS THE ONE  
DRAFTING DOCUMENTS.

SHE WAS THE ONE USING HER STAFF  
OF THE MILLENIA BUSINESS TO DO  
ALL ATTORNEY-CLIENT RELATED  
RESPONSIBILITIES FOR  
MR.^GLUECK.

THEY WERE ANSWERING THE PHONE.  
THEY WERE USING PHOTOCOPIERS.  
THEY, THEY COMBINED, THEY  
BLENDED THIS LAW FIRM THAT  
REALLY DIDN'T EXIST IN THE  
OPERATION OF A CONSULTING FIRM.  
THAT WAS RUN BY THIS NONLAWYER,  
MS.^BECHTINGER SO IN PRACTICE  
YOU COULD NOT SEPARATE WHAT WAS  
GOING ON, THERE AND THAT'S WHY  
THE REFEREE FOUND THAT WE HAD  
INDEED A, A, AN IMPROPER  
RELATIONSHIP.

WE DON'T KNOW WHO WAS PAYING  
FOR THE UTILITIES.

>> WAS THERE ANYTHING WRONG  
WITH HIM AGREEING AS A LAWYER  
TO PROVIDE LIMITED LEGAL WORK  
FOR PEOPLE THAT CAME INTO THE  
OFFICE WITH IMMIGRATION ISSUES,  
IN OTHER WORDS, JUST AS A  
STARTING POINT, PEOPLE CAME TO  
THIS OFFICE WITH WOULD THERE  
ORDINARILY BEING ANYTHING WRONG  
WITH HIM PROVIDING THE LEGAL  
SIDE OF IT TO CLINIC WHO CAME  
FOR HELP WITH IMMIGRATION  
ISSUES TO THAT OFFICE?

?

>> THE PROBLEM, JUSTICE  
ANSTEAD, IS THAT HE DID NOT IN  
ANY OF THE PROCESS FROM THE  
BEGINNING OR THE ARRIVAL OF THE

CLIENT TO THE FILLING OUT OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT HE RUBBER STAMPED ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH. SO WHEN THESE CLIENTS CAME IN, THESE VULNERABLE CLIENTS, IMMIGRANTS, WENT IN, THEY ONLY MET THE ONE PARALEGAL THAT SPOKE PORTUGUESE.

THEIR QUESTIONS WERE BEING ANSWERED, AND THAT'S IN THE RECORD.

WE HAD MR.^RAMOS, WE HAVE MS.^NAKAD.

THEY NEVER MET GLUECK.

ALL THEIR QUESTIONS, LEGAL QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED BY THIS PARALEGAL.

THEY THOUGHT THAT THEY WERE HIRING AN ATTORNEY FROM THE MOMENT OF THE STEP ONE ON IMMIGRATION, WHICH WAS THE LABOR APPLICATION ONTO THE CONCLUSION OF THEIR LEGALITY IN THE COUNTRY, SO THEY'VE BEEN UNDERSTANDING -- THEY DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT O, YEAH MS.^BET BECHTINGER CAN DO A PORTION OF TSHE CAN DO THE LABOR CERTIFICATION FOR YOU.

THEY DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT. THEY HIRED WHETHER GLUECK BECAUSE WE LEARNED AS YOU KNOW HE DENIED BEING AN ATTORNEY AT THAT LOCATION.

HE ACTUALLY SAID HE WAS A SUBCONTRACTOR OF MILLENIA.

>> IS THERE EVIDENCE THAT MR.^GLUECK WAS SHARING IN THE PROFITS OF THIS CORPORATION.

>> WE HAVE CONTRACTS AND WE HAVE CHECKED THAT WE'LL INTRODUCED THAT SHOWED THAT HE WAS THE ATTORNEY THAT WAS HIRED FROM THE BEGINNING FROM THE LABOR CERTIFICATION POINT AND THAT HE RECEIVED THE CHECK MADE TO HIS LAW FIRM.

WE HAVE LEARNED.

>> WELL THAT GOES TO HIS PARTICIPATION A LAWYER.

I AM SAYING OUR REFEREE FOUND AND YOU ARGUED THAT THERE WAS A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN HIM AND NONLAWYERS SO WHAT EVIDENCE WAS

THERE OF A, A FORMAL PARTNERSHIP THAT HE OWNED STOCK IN THIS CORPORATION, DID HE RECEIVE PART OF THE PROFITS OF THIS CORPORATION?

THOSE KINDS OF THINGS THAT WOULD EVIDENCE THAT THERE WAS A PARTNERSHIP AS OPPOSED TO SOME OTHER INAPPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIP?

>> JUSTICE CANTERO, WE ASK MR. ^GLUECK TO PROVIDE DOCUMENTS FROM THIS STATEMENT I OBTAINED FROM HIM WAY BACK IN 2006, SHOW US THAT YOU WERE PAYING FOR, FOR THE RUNNING OF THIS OPERATION IN MILLENIA BECAUSE AT THAT TIME HE WAS CLAIMING THAT HE DID NOT HAVE A, A LAW FIRM THERE.

YOU SEE, --

>> WELL, LET'S JUST STOP RIGHT THERE FOR A MINUTE.

IF I'M A LAWYER, I AM PRACTICING AND I GO TO MILLENNIUM AND NOT PAYING ANY RENT OR ANYTHING BUT I GO THERE TO GIVE LEGAL ADVICE TO CLIENTS WHEN THEY COME IN, IS THAT -- AND I THINK WE ARE GOING TO HEAR, HE IS ASKING ABOUT DOES THAT MAKE A BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP JUST BECAUSE I GO THERE?

IF THE CHECK IS MADE PAYABLE TO ME?

>> WELL, THE PROBLEM IS THAT THE, THAT CHECK WAS BEING PROCESSED THROUGH TWO WAYS. THESE CHECKS WERE BEING PROCESSED TWO WAYS. THEY COULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO MILLENIA.

WE SAW A PATTERN WE SAW CONTRACTS MADE TO MILLENIA AND WE ALSO SAW IN THE SAME LOCATION CONTRACTS MADE WITH MR. ^GLUECK SO WE HAVE THESE CONTRACTS AND CHECKS BEING MADE TO MILLENIA OR TO HIS LAW FIRM.

>> PLEASE FINISH YOUR ANSWER WITH JUSTICE CANTERO. I DIDN'T MEAN TO INTERRUPT.

>> THANK YOU, AND, AND SO, WE HAVE THIS OPERATION WAS RAN VERY LOOSELY BY THIS PARALEGAL.

AND, AND --

>> WERE THERE ANY CHECKS FROM MILLENIA TO GLUECK?

>> NO, BUT WE HAVE STATEMENTS, BILLING STATEMENTS ON CONTRACTS BETWEEN GLUECK AND THE CLIENTS AND THE BILLING STATEMENTS FROM MILLENIA.

THAT IS IN THE RECORD.

HOW CAN THAT BE?

IF THEY HIRE MR.^GLUECK AND THEY HAVE A CONTRACT WITH MR.^GLUECK WHY IS MILLENIA RECEIVING PAYMENTS ON THE MONTH BECAUSE THESE PEOPLE WERE PAYING MONTHLY FEES TOWARDS THEIR LEGAL SERVICES SO WE HAVE A COMPLETE BLENDING OF THIS OPERATION.

WE DON'T KNOW WHO WAS PAYING FOR THE ELECTRICITY.

WE DON'T KNOW WHO WAS PAYING FOR THE WATER.

WE DON'T KNOW THAT.

IT'S JUST BOTH OPERATIONS WERE FEEDING FROM EACH OTHER, AND THE REALITY IS BASED ON THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE IS MR.^GLUECK WAS NOWHERE AROUND.

>> WAS THERE ALSO A CLAIM THAT HE ABANDONED SOME OF THESE CLIENTS?

>> ABSOLUTELY.

>> WOULD YOU ELABORATE THAT?

>> ABSOLUTELY.

THIS OPERATION IN MILLENIA CLOSED WHEN MS.^BECHTINGER DECIDED TO GO BACK TO BRAZIL SO ALL THE HUNDREDS OF CASES WE ONLY HAVE EIGHT, THAT WENT THROUGH THAT OFFICE WERE LEFT IN LIMBO.

>> WHAT WAS THE STATUS OF MILLENIA AT THAT POINT?

>> SHE CLOSED THE DOORS, JUSTICE QUINCE.

>> WELL I THOUGHT MILLENIA WAS NOW OWNED BY SOME FRIENDS OF HERS, SO IF THERE WERE OTHER

PEOPLE, WHAT HAPPENS SO WHEN SHE WENT BACK TO BRAZIL, THE WHOLE OPERATION FELL APART. >> SHE WAS THE OPERATION SHE SAID AT THE UPL TRANSCRIPT THAT IS PART OF THE RECORD AS YOU KNOW THERE IS HISTORY HERE.

MR.^GLUECK WAS ACTUALLY THE ATTORNEY FROM BECHTINGER IN A UPL CASE WHERE SHE ENGAGED -- AGREED TO AN INJUNCTION FROM THIS COURT NOT TO ENGAGE IN HELPING PEOPLE IN IMMIGRATION AND HE WAS THE ATTORNEY OF RECORD.

AT THAT UPL HEARING AND THAT'S IN THE RECORD.

MR.^GLUECK DID NOT KNOW THAT MR.^BECHTINGER IN 1997 OPENED A LAW FIRM OF GLUECK IN ORLANDO A MEMBER OF THE UPL COMMITTEE WENT OUTSIDE AND CALLED THE NUMBER AND THERE WAS AN ANSWERING MACHINE SAYING THE LAW OFFICES OF ATTORNEY GLUECK AND HE HAD TO GO ON THE RECORD IN THE UPL HEARING IN 97 TO EXPLAIN HE HAD NOT GIVEN HER PERMISSION TO DO THAT.

MR.^GLUECK HAD A RELATIONSHIP WITH HIS NONATTORNEY FOR A LONG TIME. AND HE STILL CHOSE TO OPEN A BUSINESS WITH HER IN 2000 WIN -- 2001 SO THAT'S WHY WE COME HERE AND FEEL VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THIS CASE.

>> I ASK YOU ABOUT WHETHER THERE WAS PROOF THAT PARTICULAR CLIENTS WERE ABANDONED OR HARMED.

>> ABSOLUTELY I WILL GIVE YOU TWO EXAMPLES.

>> WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS US ABOUT THAT.

>> JUSTICE ANSTEAD THERE ARE TWO ANSWERS.

IN THE RAMOS CASE THIS GENTLEMAN PAID DOCUMENTS WERE SUBMITTED, BUT THEN THE LABOR DEPARTMENT ASKED FOR A FOLLOW-UP, FOR A CLARIFICATION.

THERE WAS AN ISSUE WITH AN

EMPLOYER.

THAT LETTER CAME BACK TO  
MILLENIA BECAUSE GLUECK PUT THE  
MILLENIA OFFICE ADDRESS IN ALL  
THE FILINGS HE DID.

HE DIDN'T USE HIS LAW FIRM IN  
HOLLYWOOD SO WHEN THAT OFFICE  
CLOSED, GUESS WHAT HAPPENS TO  
ALL THE FOLLOW-UPS?

REMEMBER, IN 2001, APRIL, THERE  
WAS A CHANGE IN THE IMMIGRATION  
LAW.

SO EVERYBODY WAS GETTING IN  
THEIR LABOR CERTIFICATIONS.  
THERE WERE SUCH A BACKLOG START  
SENDING DOCUMENTATION TO THE  
ATTORNEY OF RECORD PLEASE COULD  
YOU FIX THIS, MILLENIA WAS  
CLOSED.

HE TOOK NO STEPS, NO STEPS TO  
MAKE SURE THAT THAT  
CORRESPONDENCE GOT TO HIM  
BECAUSE HE WAS THE ATTORNEY  
THAT SIGNED THOSE DOCUMENTS.

>> WELL, HOW DID MR.^KIMMEL --  
HOW DID MR.^KIMMEL PLAY INTO  
THIS.

I THOUGHT HE HAD GIVEN THESE  
FILES TO ANOTHER ATTORNEY WHO  
WAS --

>> SOME OF THEM.

JUST SOME OF THESE FILES WERE  
TRANSFERRED.

WE THOUGHT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE  
ACTUAL CLIENTS, BY THE WAY,  
MANY OF THEM DIDN'T KNOW.  
IN THE RAMOS CASE HE DIDN'T  
KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE  
TRANSFER OF HIS HEIL.

HE -- FILE.

HE LEARNS THAT THE DEPARTMENT  
OF LABOR HAD CANCELED THE  
APPLICATION BECAUSE THERE WAS  
NO RESPONSE.

HE GOES ONLINE IN 2005, I  
BELIEVE, AND HE LEARNS THAT AND  
HE STARTS LOOKING FOR  
MR.^GLUECK.

HE COULDN'T FIND MR.^GLUECK.  
WHEN HE ACTUALLY FILES A  
COMPLAINT, MR.^GLAUCREAPPEARS  
AND MEETS WITH MR.^RAMOS AND  
GUESS WHAT HE TELLS  
MR.^RAMOS?

YOU CONTRACTED WITH MILLENIA.  
THEY HAVE YOUR MONEY NOT ME.  
BUT HE WAS.  
MR.^RAMOS SOLD MR.^GLUECK'S LAW  
OFFICE SIGN AT THE DOOR SO WHEN  
THE FLORIDA BAR WAS GETTING ALL  
THIS INFO, MR.^RAMOS ALSO HAD A  
BUSINESS CARD THAT SAID  
BECHTINGER PARALEGAL GLUECK  
OFFICE IN AVENTURA.

MR.^GLUECK MISLEAD THE FLORIDA  
BAR FOR OVER TWO YEARS TELDING  
UNIN RESPONSES THAT HE --  
TELLING US IN RESPONSES THAT  
ALLEGEDLY MILLENIA HAD A  
CONTRACT.

HE WAS DISTANCING HIMSELF FROM  
ALL THESE CONTRACTS FOR OVER  
TWO YEARS.

HE TOOK A SWORN STATEMENT I  
TOOK OF HIM IN 2006 AND HE  
STILL KEPT SAYING THAT.

>> OKAY.

WHAT OTHER, WHAT OTHER, WAS IT  
JUST RAMOS OR WAS --

>> NO, WE ALSO HAVE MS.^NAKAD  
WHO SPENT SEVEN, EIGHT MONTHS  
IN CRONE.

WHY?

BECAUSE SHE MISS ADHEARING.

>> WAIT A MINUTE NOW.

DOESN'T THE RECORD REFLECT AS  
FAR AS SHE IS CONCERNED THAT HE  
WAS NOT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
RECORD FOR HER AND THAT A COPY  
OF THE DOCUMENT THAT REQUIRED  
HER TO COME TO COURT WAS NEVER  
SENT TO HIM.

>> WHAT HAPPS IS SHE WENT --  
SHE FIRST HIRED GLUECK IN 99, I  
BELIEVE, FOR A REPLACEMENT OF  
AOF A CARD, ENTRY CARD, AND SHE  
WENT BACK TO HIS LAW OFFICE IN  
MILLENIA IN 2001.

SHE NEVER MET GLUECK SO WHEN  
YOU HEAR GLUECK MAKINGING  
EXPLANATIONS ABOUT WHAT'S  
HAPPENING IN HIS LAW FIRM AT  
AVENTURA HE WASN'T THERE.  
BUT YOU KNEW HERE FROM THE  
CLIENTS WHO WERE HERE WHO SPOKE  
TO BECHTINGER TELLING YOU AND  
TELLING AUS, I HIRED HIM FOR  
THAT SECOND PORSCHE PORTION OF

IMMIGRATION ISSUES IN 2001 SO  
HE IS GETTING EXPLANATIONS FOR  
EVERYTHING BUT HE WASN'T THERE.

THE COMPLAINTANTS WERE THERE.  
THE COMPLAINANTS ARE THE ONES  
THAT WERE CREDIBLE AND THAT'S  
WHAT THE REFEREE FOUND.

HE -- THE REFEREE COMPLETELY  
DISMISSED HIS EXPLANATIONS  
BECAUSE HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT  
WAS GOING ON AT THAT OPERATION  
BECAUSE HE WASN'T.

THERE SO I UNDERSTAND GLUECK  
HAS EXPLANATIONS FOR EVERYTHING  
BUT WE HAVE TO KNOW WHAT THE  
COMPLAINANTS HAVE TO SAY  
BECAUSE THEY WERE THERE.

>> BEFORE YOU SIT DOWN, JUSTICE  
ANSTEAD IS INTERESTED IN THE  
NUMBERS.

ARE THERE MORE THAN THE TWO AS  
REFLECTED THAT WERE HARMED THAT  
ACTUALLY WERE SUPPOSED TO BE  
REPRESENTED THAT WERE ABANDON?

>> THERE ARE -- MS. OLIVIERA,  
TESTIFIED FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

>> HOW MANY?

>> WELL, THEY ALL WERE  
ABANDONED.

THAT'S WHY THEY WERE  
COMPLAINING --

>> HOW MANY?

>> THEY NEVER BECAME LEGAL.  
THEIR PROCESS WAS NEVER  
COMPLETED --

>> HOW MANY WERE AT THE  
HEARING?

HOW MANY CLIENTS WERE  
IDENTIFIED AT THE HEARING --

>> ALL OF THEM, THEIR PROCESS  
OF IMMIGRATION FROM ACTUALLY  
BECOMING LEGAL WAS NEVER  
CONCLUDED.

>> I UNDERSTAND BUT HE IS  
ASKING NUMBERS.

HOW MANY --

>> EIGHT CASES, EIGHT CLIENTS.

AND THAT'S WHY --

>> THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG.

THERE MAY BE MANY MORE, BUT HE  
JUST STOPPED THIS --

>> HE ACKNOWLEDGED, MR. ^GLUECK  
ACKNOWLEDGED THAT WAS A  
CRAZY TIME THAT THOSE MONTHS  
BEFORE APRIL OF 2001 WERE CRAZY  
I MEAN HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE WENT  
THROUGH THAT OFFICE.

>> YOU ARE ABOUT TO USE UP YOUR  
TIME SO YOU WANT TO SAVE SOME  
TIME.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
I APPRECIATE IT.

>> GOOD MORNING.

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT.  
MY NAME IS KEVIN TYNAN PURSUANT  
TO THE COURT'S ORDER MY CLIENT  
ALAN GLUECK IS HERE.

IF YOU WANT HE MAY RISE.  
IF NOT, I WILL TAKE CARE OF  
WHAT I CAN.

THE RESPONDENT STARTED HIS  
BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP WITH  
MS. ^BECHTINGER WITH THE BEST OF  
INTENTIONS.

HE THOUGHT HE UNDERSTOOD THE  
RELATIONSHIP.

HE GAVE HER GUIDANCE.

HE KNEW GUIDANCE NEEDED TO BE  
GIVEN.

HE TRUSTED HER.

>> DID HIS RELATIONSHIP PRECEDE  
THE UPL MATTER INVOLVING HER OR  
WAS THAT THE BEGINNING OF IT OR  
TELL US, IN TERMS OF THE RECORD  
HERE WHEN HIS RELATIONSHIP  
BEGAN WITH HUR FOR ANYTHING.

>> THE BEST EVIDENCE THERE,  
JUDGE, OR JUSTICE, IS AS YOU  
LOOK AT THE UPL TRANSCRIPT,  
THERE'S TESTIMONY ABOUT THE  
BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP FINALLY  
STARTING AT THAT POINT.  
IT HAPPENS TOGETHER.

>> AND THIS HAD TO DO WITH HER  
ACCESS TO THE BRAZILIAN  
IMMIGRANT COMMUNITY.

>> CORRECT, AND MY CLIENT, WHO  
HAD A SUCCESSFUL PRACTICE IN  
HOLLYWOOD AND MAINTAINED THAT  
PRACTICE THROUGH THE WHOLE TIME  
FRAME WANTED TO BRANCH OUT.

>> AN IMMIGRATION PRACTICE?

>> IMMIGRATION AS WELL AS  
CRIMINAL LAW.

AND WANTED TO BRANCH OUT IN THE

NEW GROWING COMMUNITY IN SOUTH FLORIDA.

>> WAS THERE A SIGN AT AVENTURA.

>> YES.

>> THAT IT WAS A LAW OFFICE IN THIS SAME PLACE AS MILLENNIUM.

>> YES.

>> SMALLER,.

>> SO LET ME ASK YOU THAT IN AND OF ITSELF IS NOT A VIOLATION.

>> NO.

>> SO IF THE LAWYER OCCUPIES THAT SPACE WITHOUT PAYING FOR ANYTHING AND GIVES ADVICE TO PEOPLE WHO COME IN THERE, IS THAT A VIOLATION OF ANYTHING?

>> NO.

>> AND IF, IF THE PEOPLE COME IN, THEY RECEIVE ADVICE, EVEN ON ONE OCCASION, AND MILLENNIUM THE ONE WHO BILLS FOR THAT AND MILLENNIUM PAYS THE LAWYER S THAT A VIOLATION?

>> UNDER EXISTING CASE LAW, MORE THAN LIKELY.

>> OKAY IN THIS CASE WE AT LEAST HAVE THAT, RIGHT.

>> CORRECT AND I AM GOING TO CONCEDE AS I DID IN THE BRIEF WE HAVE A FLAWED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP HERE.

>> WELL, A BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP.

>> DOESN'T MATTER AND WHAT HAPPENS IS THEY STARTED WITH THE BEST OF INTENTIONS BUT AS MY COLLEAGUE NOTED IT GOT CRAZY WHEN BUSINESS PICKED UP BECAUSE OF THE CHANGE IN THE LAW.

>> WHEN YOU SAY THAT STARTED WITH THE BEST OF INTENTIONESS, THE REFEREE ISSUES -- INTENTIONS, THE REFEREE ISSUED AN 85-PAGE ORDER.

>> OH, YEAH.

>> ARE YOU QUOTING FROM THE REVERIE'S FUNDINGS -- REFEREE'S FINDINGS THAT THIS STARTED AS A LEGITIMATE RELATIONSHIP OR IS THAT YOUR CHARACTERIZATION, YOUR POINT OF VIEW.

>> CLEARLY MY CHARACTERIZATION

AND MY CHARACTERIZATION OF WHAT THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE TRIAL.

THERE IS NOTHING IN EVIDENCE THAT SAYS ANYTHING OTHER THAN MY CLIENT'S TESTIMONY AND MS.^BECHTINGER'S TESTIMONY VIA THAT TRANSCRIPT ABOUT HOW THE BUSINESS STARTED.

>> THE REFEREE WAS FREE TO BELIEVE OR DISBELIEVE EITHER OR BOTH.

>> CERTAINLY, AND I DON'T RECALL AND I KNOW I HAVE REREAD THIS A BUNCH OF TIMES BUT MY MEMORY AS I GET OLDSER NOT AS ALWAYS AS CLEAR AS IT SHOULD BE.

>> IT'S A LONG ORDER.

>> I BELIEVE THERE WAS ANY DISCUSSION OR REPORT ABOUT ANYBODY'S INTENTIONS IN THE BEGINNING.

I THINK SHE JUST TALKED ABOUT THERE WAS THIS BUSINESS AND HERE IS WHAT HAPPENED TO IT.

>> WELL CERTAINLY --

>> WELL, LET'S EXPLORE THIS BEST OF INTENTIONS.

>> OKAY.

>> BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT YOUR CLIENT REPRESENTED THIS LADY AT A UPL.

HEARING.

>> YES.

>> AND THAT THERE WAS A PERMANENT INJUNCTION ISSUED WHICH SAID THAT SHE WAS NOT SUPPOSED TO BE DOING THESE FORMS AND GIVING OUT ADVICE, CORRECT?

>> CORRECTS, NOT SUPPOSED TO BE, BE GIVING ADVICE BECAUSE THAT WOULD BE THE PRACTICE OF LAW, BUT IF THE FORMS WERE BEING DONE UNDER HIS SUPERVISION --

>> WELL, SHE IS NOT TO SELECT THE FORMS.

>> CORRECT.

>> SHE IS NOT TO SELECT THE FORMS THAT HAVE TO BE DONE IN ORDER TO GET THIS STUFF DONE.

>> CORRECT.

>> THAT IS CORRECT.

>> OKAY, SO HE, OPENS UP OR,  
OR, AN OFFICE, IN THE SAME  
SPACE WITH HER.

CALLING HER A PARALEGAL.

LET -- LEAVES HER THERE.

TO MAKE ALL THE CONTACT WITH  
THE CLIENTS TO GIVE THEM THE  
FORMS AND MAKE THAT  
DETERMINATION ABOUT FORMS THAT  
NEEDED TO BE FILLED OUT AND  
THEN HE JUST SIGNS THEM AND  
GOES TO HEARINGS IF ITS  
NECESSARY.

THAT'S GOOD INTENTIONS?

>> JUSTICE, THE WAY YOU  
QUESTIONED IT, NO, BUT THE  
TESTIMONY IN FRONT OF THE  
REFEREE, AND AGAIN, THE ONLY  
TESTIMONY IN FRONT OF THE  
REFEREE AS TO THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN HOW THE BUSINESS WORKED  
INTERNALLY WAS MY CLIENT, AND  
HE TOLD US IN THAT TESTIMONY  
REPEATEDLY IS THAT THE, HE MADE  
THE ULTIMATE DECISIONS.

HE HAD GIVEN GUIDANCE ON WHAT  
NEEDED TO BE DONE ON THE  
INTAKE.

THOSE WERE HIS FORMS THAT WERE  
CREATED AND USED BY  
MS.^BECHTINGER.

>> WELL HOW DO YOU MAKE THE  
ULTIMATE DECISION, IT SEEMS TO  
ME, IT'S A PROBLEM WITH MAKING  
THE ULTIMATE DECISION, IF YOU  
ARE NOT THERE TO EVEN TALK TO  
THE PEOPLE?

>> WELL, THERE IS TESTIMONY,  
AND, AND, THE BULK OF THESE  
CASES AND I DO WANT TO SPEND A  
FEW MOMENTS ON LABOR SERTS  
VERSUS IMMIGRATION BECAUSE I  
THINK THAT'S A WONDERFUL POLICY  
CONSIDERATION YOU HAVE IN FRONT  
OF YOU BUT WHAT YOU SAW  
TESTIMONY FROM EVEN FROM MY  
CLIENT AS TO AT LEAST ONE  
WITNESS THAT THE MORE  
COMPLICATED ISSUES WHERE IT  
NEEDED THE LAWYER THERE WAS A  
MEETING.

MR.^GEOVANI I BELIEVE WAS THE  
CORRECT INDIVIDUAL -- HE

ACTUALLY CAME AND IN SAID I MET WITH MR. ^GLUECK RIGHT FROM THE BEGINNING.

THE DIFFICULTY WAS THE BULK OF THE CASES, THE CLIENTS CAME IN KNOWING THEY WANT ADLABOR CERTIFICATION.

THEY KNEW THEY NEEDED THAT STEP IN THE PROCESS TO BE LEGITIMATE AND THAT WAS EASY.

IF YOU LOOK AT, AND I BELIEVE ONE OF THE FORMS IS ACTUALLY IN EVIDENCE, AND IT'S A SIMPLE FORM.

GIVE ME YOUR NAME, GIVE YOU YOUR ADDRESS GIVE ME WHAT YOU DO FOR A LIVING.

>> LET'S GO BEYOND THAT THOUGH IN TERMS OF THE LAWYER-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP.

>> ALL RIGHT.

>> DID YOUR CLIENT HERE, HAVE A RETAINER AGREEMENT OR WHAT DID, IN OTHER WORDS, WITH THE, THE, THE PEOPLE THAT CAME IN THAT NEEDED LEGAL SERVICES.

>> RIGHT.

>>> RIGHT.

>> WAS HE CHARGING THEM ON AN HOURLY BASIS?

DID HE HAVE A RETAINER AGREEMENT WITH THEM SO THAT THEY UNDERSTOOD WHAT SERVICES HE WAS GOING TO PROVIDE?

WHAT THEY WERE GOING TO COST? AND WHAT OBLIGATIONS HE HAD AS SEPARATED FROM HIS PARALEGAL OR THIS MILLENIA OUTFIT.

>> RIGHT.

>> IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT DID HE DO TO CARRY OUT HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AS A LAWYER REPRESENTING THESE CLIENTS.

>> THIS IS WHERE I GIVE YOU THE LEGAL ANSWER, DEPENDS BECAUSE IN SOME CASE THERE WAS A RETAINER WITH MY CLIENT DONE RIGHT, OTHER CASE THERE WAS A RETAINER WITH MILLENIA.

IT WAS A MISH MOSH OF FACTS, AND, YOU'LL SEE THAT ALL OVER THE RECORD, THERE WAS NO RHYME OR REASON.

AND THAT'S WHY THIS BUSINESS

RELATIONSHIP IS FLAWED, AND AGAIN, THERE WERE THINGS THAT COULD'VE GIN DONE BETTER THAT WERE NOT.

>> SO WERE CLIENTS HARMED AS A RESULT OF THIS.

>> THERE WERE TWO BROUGHT TO THE BAR'S ATTENTION FROM MY COLLEAGUE HERE AND I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE TRANSITION OF THE CLIENTS BECAUSE THERE WAS A GREAT SYSTEMIC QUESTION ABOUT ABANDONMENT.

WHEN MY CLIENT REALIZED MS.^BECHTINGER WAS DOING SOMETHING BAD THAT DAY HE TERMINATED THAT RELATIONSHIP, TOLD HER WE ARE NOT GOING TO WORK TOGETHER ANYMORE.

>> WHAT DO YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY SHE WAS DOING SOMETHING BAD.

>> HE DISCOVERED SHE HAD WRITTEN A LETTER ON HIS STATIONARY NOT AUTHORIZED BY HIM.

>> IS THAT IT, THOUGH?

>> NO, THAT WAS ENOUGH. THAT WAS ENOUGH FOR HIM.

>> WHAT ABOUT THE, THE REST OF IT IN TERMS OF PEOPLE COMING IN EXPECTING THAT THEY WERE GOING TO RECEIVE LEGAL SERVICES BY A LEGAL PROFESSIONAL?

>> WELL, AGAIN, HE THOUGHT HE HAD IT SET UP RIGHT AND HE THOUGHT IT WAS RUNNING SMOOTHLY IT WAS A BIT CRAZY.

WHEN HE SAW THAT, HE STOPPED BECAUSE HE KNEW THAT WAS WRONG AND WHAT HE DID IS HE HELPED TRANSITION EACH CLIENT THAT WANTED TO GO THERE TO MR.^KIM ALBRAND NEW LAWYER AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE MAJORITY OF COMPLAINTS, NEGLECT, LACK OF COMMUNICATION, THEY ARE DONE AT A TIME WHEN MY CLIENT NO LONGER REPRESENTED --

>> SO WHY WAS THIS SET AUP AS MILLENIA.

WHY NOT SET UP HIS BRANCH OFFICE AS HIS LAW OFFICE AND WHEN PEOPLE COME IN SO

EVERYBODY KNOWS THIS IS A LAW  
OFFICE I CAN CONTROL I HAVE  
PARALEGAL AND OTHER ATTORNEYS

--

>> THAT IS THE QUESTION,  
JUSTICE BELL, BECAUSE I THINK  
THERE WAS PROBABLY A VERY  
LEGITIMATE WAY TO SET THIS UP  
WITH BETTER CONTROLS, BETTER  
CHECKS AND BALANCES THAT DO NOT  
EXIST IN THIS CASE.

WHAT FINDINGS WERE MADE BY THE  
REFEREE THAT YOU FEEL WAS NOT  
EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT AT THE  
HEARING?

>> THERE ARE A COUPLE POINTED  
OUT IN THE BRIEF, BUT I WANT TO  
TALK ABOUT WHAT THE BAR COUNCIL  
TALKED ABOUT AND YOU WILL SEE  
MR.^RAMOS HE DID A LABOR  
CERTIFICATION, IT FAILED  
BECAUSE HIS EMPLOYER NO LONGER  
WANTED TO EMPLOY HIM.

IT TOOK TOO LONG.

AND THERE ARE DOCUMENTS IN  
EVIDENCE, CORRESPONDENTS THAT  
MR.^RAMOS HAD THAT SAID WE  
NEED TO GO FIND ANOTHER  
EMPLOYER.

THAT IS JUST IN EVIDENCE.

>> BUT THIS IS NOT THE SAME  
CASE THERE WAS A MASSACHUSETTS --

>> NO, --

>> A FLORIDA EMPLOYER INSTEAD  
OF A MASSACHUSETTS EMPLOYER.

>> RIGHT.

THAT'S NOT THAT ONE, AND THAT  
HAPPENED MUCH LATER IN THE  
PROCESS.

BUT THE ONE THAT, RAMOS I  
BELIEVE THAT MR.^HARRIS WAS  
TALKING ABOUT WAS THE ONE I AM  
REFERRING TO.

THE OTHER ONE WHICH IS PROBABLY  
THE ONE THAT OUGHT TO TROUBLE  
THE COURT THE MOST BECAUSE IT'S  
THE MOST EGREGIOUS IS NAKAD BUT  
IF YOU'LL LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE  
IN NAKAD AND BACK TO MY INITIAL  
THOUGHT ABOUT WHAT DO YOU DO AS  
A LAWYER IN IMMIGRATION?

YOU FILE WHAT'S CALL ADG-28,  
THAT IS YOUR NOTICE OF  
APPEARANCE.

WHEN YOU FILE THAT YOU GET A  
COPY OF EVERYTHING THAT  
HAPPENS.  
THAT DID NOT OCCUR.  
MY CLIENT NEVER REPRESENTED HER  
ON HER FAILED MARRIAGE  
AMICATION AND THAT'S WHAT  
TRIGGERED THE NOTES -- CASE.  
>> DID HE REPRESENT HER AT ALL?

>> TWO AREAS, ONE, TO, TO GET A  
REPLACEMENT CARD WHEN SHE CAME  
INTO THE COUNTRY, FINISHES  
DONE, OFF TO THE SIDE.  
NO MORE REPRESENTATION.

>> NEVER CAME BACK TO THE  
OFFICE AFTER THAT.

>> NEVER CAME BACK TO  
MR.^GLUECK.

>> DID SHE AND COME BACK TO THE  
MILLENNIA LOCATION?

>> HER TESTIMONY WAS HARD TO  
DECIPHER.

HE DIDN'T HAVE ANY CHECKS OR --  
HE DID DO SOMETHING LATER FOR  
HER, WHICH WAS ANOTHER  
ATTEMPTED LABOR CERTIFICATION  
THAT WAS CONCLUDED BECAUSE SHE  
GOT REMEDIATED.

>> WELL, WHERE IS THERE SOME  
EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD THAT SHE  
WAS PUT ON CLEAR NOTICE THAT I  
AM REPRESENTING YOU STRICTLY ON  
THIS ASPECT OF YOUR IMMIGRATION  
ISSUES.

THAT'S DONE AND TERMINATED.  
NOW YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT  
SOMEPLACE ELSE, WHERE IS THERE  
ANYTHING IN THIS RECORD TO  
DEMONSTRATE --

>> I CAN SHOAL YOU -- SHOW YOU  
THE TRAIL.

>> AND THIS IS THE ONE THAT WAS  
DETAINED FOR SEVEN --

>> CLEARLY, CLEARLY AWFUL THING  
HAPPENED.

>> SO WHERE IS THERE SOMETHING  
WHERE AFTER REPRESENTING HER  
SHE WAS PUT ON NOTICE THAT NO,  
YOU CAN NO LONGER LOOK TO ME  
THAT YOU'RE ON YOUR OWN.

>> IT'S LIKE ANY CASE, JUSTICE  
IF YOU COME IN TO GET SOMETHING  
AND YOU GET IT, CASE OVER AND,

THAT WAS --

>> WELL, I'M HAVING DIFFICULTY WITH -- THE ASPECT OF IT THERE THAT IS LIKE ANY CASE THAT YOU COME IN YOU GET SOMETHING AND IT'S OVER.

I ASSUME THAT MOST OF HIS IMMIGRATION CLIENTS WERE PEOPLE THEY STATED WITH THEM UNTIL THEY WORKED THEIR WAY THROUGH.

>> CORRECT.

>> WHATEVER THE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM DEMANDED SO IT'S NOT LIKE ANY CLIENT YOU COME AND IN YOU GET THAT LITTLE SERVICE AND YOU'RE DONE.

>> -- GONE.

>> WELL THE DIFFICULTY HERE, JUSTICE, WAS THE DIFFICULTY HE HAD WAS SIMPLY TO SECURE A REPLACEMENT CARD.

DID IT.

COMPLETED.

FINISH.

>> AND WHAT KIND OF FEE DID HE GET FOR THAT.

>> I DON'T RECALL IF THAT'S IN EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR.

>> I MEAN, DID HE GET A FEE THAT HE CHARGED.

>> I BELIEVE SO I BELIEVE SO.

>> THAT HE CHARGED HER.

>> I BELIEVE SO.

>> OR THAT SHE PAID MILLENIA.

>> PROBABLY CLEANER, PROBABLY DIRECTLY BUT IT'S PROBABLY NOT A DEFINITIVE ANSWER ON THE RECORD, YOUR HONOR BUT THAT CASE FINISHES WE KNOW THAT THE MARRIAGE, THE FIRST FAILED MARRIAGE APPLICATION WHERE MY CLIENT DIDN'T APPEAR STARTS. SOMEWHERE THEREAFTER.

AND THE NEXT TIME MY CLIENT GETS INVOLVED IS MUCH LATER FOR THE LABOR CERTIFICATION FOR MR.^KIMMEL.

>> WHO FILLED OUT THE MARRIAGE APPLICATION.

>> NOT MY CLIENT.

NOT MY EVIDENCE BUT IT'S NOT MY CLIENT.

HE NEVER APPEARED TO REPRESENT HER IN THAT?

>>> DOES SHOW IT CAME TO THE  
SAME OFFICE.  
IF YOU LOOK AT THE ADDRESSES,  
NOTHING WENT BACK TO MILLENNIUM  
WITH REGARD TO THAT --

>> NOTHING GOING TO MILLENNIA.  
MORE LIKELY IT'S OUR SPIN ON  
THE FACTS.

IN ESSENCE IT NEVER REALLY SAID  
MS.^NAKAD WAS DOING THAT  
HERSELF AND SAID OTHERWISE BUT  
THAT'S ALL WHERE HE CAN SAY IS  
INTERPRET.

THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THINGS  
THAT PROBABLY NEED TO BE  
ADDRESSED.

>> I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU  
ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF SANCTIONS  
HERE.

>> THAT'S EXACTLY WHERE I WAS  
GOING.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I HAVE A MOMENT AND A HALF I  
WANT TO GET HERE.

>> THE BAR SEEKS DISBARMENT AND  
WHAT DO YOU CROSS APPEAL ON?  
ARE YOU SAYING ARE YOU SAYING  
LESS.

>> TWO THOUGHTS.

TWO THOUGHTS: IF YOU DO NOT  
OVERTURN ANY OF THE FACTS,  
REGRETFULLY, WE FIND THE  
THREE-YEAR SUSPENSION IS  
APPROPRIATE UNDER EXISTING CASE  
LAW.

IF, HOWEVER, YOU BELIEVE YOU  
BELIEVE ONE MORE CAVIATE, BUT  
IF YOU BELIEVE SOME OF THESE  
FACTS ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY THE  
RECORD WE BELIEVE A LESSER  
SUSPENSION IS IMPORTANT.

I WANT TO FINISH BY TALKING A  
LITTLE BIT ABOUT --

>> IT SEEMS TO ME THOUGH THAT  
IF IT'S THE BAR THAT HAS  
APPEALED AND THEY ARE SEEKING  
DISBARMENT THAT YOU JUST MAY  
WANT TO -- REALIZING THIS TIME  
IS SHORT, BUT IF WE FIND ALL  
THE FACTS TO BE TRUE, RIGHT.

>> WHY ISN'T DISBARMENT -- IF  
YOU LOOK AT THE TWO PRIMARY  
CASES, THEY'RE BOTH BRIEFED  
FULLY, BEACH AND ABRAMS AND

THEY ARE DIFFERENT ON THE FACTS  
A LITTLE BIT BUT ONE WAS A,  
ABRAMS WAS A YEAR SUSPENSION,  
AND IN THAT CASE, THE ATTORNEY  
HAD NO CONNECTION TO ANY OF THE  
CASE -- DID NO WORK BUT RUBBER  
STAMP AND I CONTRADICT MY  
COLLEAGUE HERE THAT THE  
EVIDENCE SHOWS MY CLIENT DID  
MORE THAN RUBBER STAMP AND THE  
BEACH CASE, WE ARE TALKING  
ABOUT THE CONDUIT AND THE  
LAWYER GOT 90 DAYS LOTS LESS.  
AND THE ABRAMS CASE WAS JUST AS  
SYSTEMIC, JUST AS PERVASIVE  
BECAUSE IT'S THE RELATIONSHIP.

>> YOU KNOW WHAT TROUBLES ME  
ABOUT THAT IS THIS CASE WAS A  
CASE INVOLVING A LAWYER WHO HAD  
REPRESENTED THIS PERSON AT AN  
UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF LAW  
SITUATION AND IT SEEMS TO ME  
THAT HE HAS NOW PUT HER IN THE  
SAME POSITION TO BE ABLE TO  
HAVE THE UNLICENSES PRACTICE OF  
LAW.

>> IN THE END RESULT IT DID.  
HE DIDN'T MEAN TO DIE -- THAT  
DOESN'T MEAN HE DIDN'T MEAN TO  
DO IT THE RIGHT WAY.  
THE STANDARD FOR DISBARMENT IS  
HIGH.

YOU WANT TO FIND THIS IS A  
LAWYER WHO CANNOT BE  
REHABILITATED SHOULD NEVER HAVE  
BEEN A MEMBER OF THE BAR AND IF  
YOU LOOK AT THE MITIGATION  
PRESENT IN THIS CASE, THE  
RESUME MY CLIENT PRESENTS THAT  
HE IS A GOOD LAWYER.

HAD A BAD RELATIONSHIP THAT  
ENCOMPASSED ONLY PART OF HIS  
PRACTICE.

THANK YOU.

>> IN ONE MINUTE I WILL ADDRESS  
THE CASES FOR DISBARMENT.

>> OKAY BECAUSE WE, WE REALLY  
HERE, YOU KNOW, WE, IF THERE,  
IF IT HAS A REASONABLE BASIS IN  
THE CASE LAW, TO UPHOLD THE  
REFEREE'S SANCTION OF THREE  
YEARS.

>> YES, I BELIEVE THAT THE  
87-PAGE LONG REPORT OF REFEREE

IT GIVES COMPETENT, INCLUDES  
COMPETENT AND SUBSTANTIAL  
EVIDENCE.

THERE'S NO DOUBT ABOUT IT.  
IF YOU LOOK AT THAT REPORT, IT  
WAS BROKEN DOWN IN 28 COUNTS.  
IT'S SOLID.

>> BUT WE TAKE IT THAT IT'S ALL  
TRUE.

>> YES.

>> NO WHY DON'T WE UPHOLD THE  
THREE YEARS.

>> BECAUSE THE START POINT FOR  
THIS ANALYSIS COMES ON THE L  
SIR CASE.

THE L CERT CASE THIS COURT  
FOUND A THREE-YEAR SUSPENSION  
WAS APPROPRIATE FOR ONLY ONE  
TYPE OF MISCONDUCT.

WE HAVE FOUR DIFFERENT  
GROUPINGS OF MISCONDUCT.  
THAT'S WHAT I WAS SAYING AT THE  
BEGINNING.

WE HAVE QUICKLY, WE HAVE THE  
ISSUE OF THE VIOLATION OF  
INJUNCTION.

WE HAVE THE ISSUE OF HIS  
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CLIENTS.

WE HAVE THE ISSUE OF HIS  
BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP.  
AND THIS ONE CASE ONLY DEALT  
WITH ONE AREA.

WHICH WAS THE, THE  
COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE  
ATTORNEY AND THE CLIENT IN  
IMMIGRATION MATTERS.

YOU HAVE TO MULTIPLY THAT BY  
FOUR DIFFERENT OTHER AREAS OF  
MISCONDUCT IN THIS CASE SO THE  
L. SERT GIVES THUS BOTTOM LINE  
FOR ONE TIME OF FOUR TYPES OF  
MISCONDUCT WE HAVE HERE.

>> THEY ALL -- DOES IT ALL  
ARISE BECAUSE OF THE  
RELATIONSHIP, IN OTHER WORDS,  
DID HE INDEPENDENTLY AS A  
LAWYER SAY THAT THIS WAS AN  
ANOTHER LAWYER THAT WAS IN  
PARTNERSHIP?

DID HE -- WAS THERE GROSS ACTS  
OF MISCONDUCT INDEPENDENTLY  
FROM THE RELATIONSHIP.

>> ABSOLUTELY MR. ^GLUECK LIED

TO THE BAR DURING THE INVESTIGATION.

HE TRIED TO MISREPRESENT HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH MS.^BECHTINGER.

NEVER MENTIONED HER NAME IN ANY OF THE RESPONSES NEVER MEMBERSED HE HAD A LAW FIRM IN THAT LOCATION BUT WHEN THE BAR STARTED ASKING THEM THE CLIENTS WERE TELLING THEY WENT TO YOUR LAW FIRM EVERYTHING STARTS UNFOLDING.

AFTER THE SWORN STATEMENT I TOOK FROM GLUECK WHERE HE DENIED HAVING BECHTINGER WORK FOR HIS LAW FIRM, I SHOWED HIM AT THE END THE CARD WITH HER NAME AS PARALEGAL.

I, AND THEN THROUGH HIS COUNCIL HE COMES AND SAYS, 0, I DID HAVE A SATELLITE OFFICE AT MILLENIA.

2 1/2 YEARS AFTER HE'S STARTING DENYING HE HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH MILLENIA'S IMPROPER HANDLING OF THE CASES.

>> MAYBE YOU DIDN'T UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION.

MY QUESTION IS REALLY THAT IF SHE HAD BEEN A LAWYER BECAUSE YOU TALK ABOUT THE CLIENT, THE SEVEN MONTHS, DID HE COMMITMENT VIOLATION SEPARATE VIOLATIONS INCOMPETENTLY REPRESENTING PEOPLE AND ABANDONING THEM? WERE THOSE SEPARATELY CHARGED OR DOES IT ALL ARISE BECAUSE OF THE RELATIONSHIP --

>> IF SHE WERE AN ATTORNEY, HE WOULD'VE HAD A PROBLEM WITH ALL THE LETTERS THAT WERE COMING BACK ASKING FOR FOLLOW-UPS AND THE APPLICATIONS.

AND NOBODY RESPONDED TO THOSE.

NOTHING WAS DONE WITH THOSE BECAUSE THEY WERE THE MILLENIA CLOSE LOCATION.

THEY STILL ABANDONED THE CLIENTS BECAUSE THINGS WERE NOT BEING RESPONDED TO SO THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT HE ABANDONED THOSE CLIENTS, AND I WANT TO

SAY SOMETHING ELSE ON THE INJUNCTION BECAUSE WE HAVE FOCUSED ON THE FORMS. THE INJUNCTION ACTUALLY SAYS IN LETTER G, TAKING INQUIRIES OR ANSWERING QUESTIONS FROM PERSONS WHICH PARTICULAR INS FORMS AND APPLICATIONERIZE SUITED SO SHE WAS THE PERSON ANSWERING ALL THOSE QUESTIONS BECAUSE THAT IS THE EVIDENCE FROM THE COMPLAINANT. SO IT'S NOT ABOUT THE FORM HE GAVE HER. SHE WAS THE FRONT OF THE OPERATION. IT'S PROVEN THROUGH THE TESTIMONY, AND IT'S CONSISTENT FROM ALL THESE PEOPLE THAT WERE HURT. THESE IMGRANTS THAT SOME OF THEM WE GREAT FROM BRAZIL. SOME OF THEM WERE IN OTHER STATES. HE REALLY AFFECTED THESE PEOPLE'S LIVES AND THEIR DREAMS TO BECOME IMMIGRANTS. HE'S WRONG. HE TARGETED PEOPLE THAT WERE DESPERATE AND VULNERABLE. >> WAS THERE ANY ATTEMPT TO PUNISH HER BY THE BAR WHEN SHE CAME BACK TO THE COUNTRY. >> SHE LEFT BRAZIL. WE DON'T KNOW HER STATS AND I WILL ASK THE COURT -- >> SHE DIDN'T TESTIFY AT THE HEARING. >> NO, NOT AT THIS HEARING. WE DON'T KNOW WHERE SHE IS. PLEASE THE COURT LOOK AT THE MITCHELL CASE, WHICH LOOKS AT THE FREQUENCY AND TOTALITY OF THE CLIENTS. LOOK AT WILLIAMS WHICH DEALS MORE HARSHLY WITH CUMULATIVE DISBARMENT. WHAT GLUECK DID IS UNACCEPTABLE. HE HAS BEEN IN PRACTICE FOR 31 YEARSF. YOU DON'T DO THIS TO CLIENTS. HE MUST BE DISBARRED. IT'S THE ONLY FAIR CONCLUSION

IN THIS CASE.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WE WILL TAKE THE CASE UNDER  
ADVISEMENT.

>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

HAVE A GREAT.

>> PLEASE RISE.