

## Appendix D

# Oregon Oaths

## of Office and the Violations of Civil Rights.

### Introduction to Appendix D:

Simply put, Appendix D offers commentary on our concerns that the 5 attorneys named in this investigation (plus Thompson) committed violations against the Constitutions of Oregon and the United States in each of their respective roles in the matter of Bice. There are citations, definitions, arguments, opinions, and requests.

**The Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Law of the United States of America. The Constitution of Oregon is the Supreme Law of Oregon.**

If statute or rule in Oregon are in conflict with the U.S. or Oregon Constitution, the dictates of the Constitution must be abided over statute or rule.

If a person claims a right by a permissive rule or law and exercise of such right is prohibited by the U.S. or Oregon Constitution or by one or more of the Articles or Clauses of those Constitutions, the right is void and not supported by rightful law.

### **Oath for Admission to the Oregon State Bar**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, swear (or affirm):  
(Print Name)

That I will faithfully and honestly conduct myself in the office of an attorney in the courts of the State of Oregon; that I will observe and abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct approved by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon; and that I will support the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of Oregon.

### **Oaths for Elected & Appointed Oregon Office Holders (OR Const., Art. XV, § 3)**

Oaths of office. Every person elected or appointed to any office under this Constitution, shall, before entering on the duties thereof, take an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution of the United States, and of this State, and also an oath of office.—

### **Quote by Chief Justice John Marshall**

*“The powers of the legislature are defined, and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction, between a government with limited and unlimited powers, is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed, are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act.” - Chief Justice John Marshall, **Marbury v. Madison** 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803)*

---

**We believe that Berry, Foote, Alexander, Joyce & Rosenblum have violated the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions and thereby their Oaths of Office & their Oaths to the Oregon State Bar which regulates their license to practice law in Oregon. This, even if they were practicing in a manner allowed by law.**

We believe that each of the named attorneys knew or should have known the meaning of their oaths and that these oaths were not to be neglected. As well, we believe that each of these named attorneys know or should know presently, the meaning of their oaths and that their oaths are not to be neglected.

We believe that each of the named attorneys know, should know, knew, & should have known to refrain from any activity, though permitted by law or rule, which is prohibited by the U.S. or Oregon Constitution.

In violation or in abidance of applicable laws, rules, and codes of conduct, we believe that there have been violations of the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions, in the Bice matter, by the five attorneys named in our request for investigation and that given the persistence of the violations, the known harm done to Dr. Bice, and the alternatives that were available to these attorneys in their respective roles, that their offenses rise to the level of moral turpitude.

### **Due Process of Law**

To keep it simple “due process of law” means a lawful process which is “fundamentally fair.” In context of the Due Process Clause in the 5th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, it is a “fundamentally fair process designed to determine whether a person can lawfully be deprived of life, liberty, or property.” In the context of the Bice matter, we regard life, liberty, and property as related to Dr. Bice’s career.

### **The Due Process Clause from the U.S. Constitution**

From the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution:

No person shall ... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law ... U.S. Const. amend. V

Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

[N]or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law ... U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1

**Due Process of Law (Due Process) Absent in the Matter of Dr. David T. Bice**

The Administrative Law process surrounding OBPE's challenge to Dr. David Bice's license and person was fundamentally unfair and the price Dr. Bice has paid for this unfairness has been high. Dr. Bice's experience however is not unique. As a person having his license challenged by an Oregon healthcare regulatory board his experience is actually quite typical at its core. We describe the typical process which surrounds a healthcare board's challenge to a license holders license.

Dr. Bice is a psychologist who had his license challenged by the Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners (OBPE), but the following, as well could accurately describe the OMB or OBLPCT.

**Paraphrased, these are general powers of "the board." The board:**

- 1) Makes the charge against the licensees (or can)
- 2) Investigates the charge against the licensee, characteristically adding extra charges capriciously as they go. The tendency keeping investigations open and "on-going"
- 3) Writes the rules which govern investigative and disciplinary processes, and determine the nature of the licensee's rights & responsibilities (see Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 858, Division 20). Typically, the rights are limited in a manner which place the licensee at substantial disadvantage at outset, and the responsibilities are such that they overwhelm the licensee.

**The board then:**

- 4) Prosecutes the licensee
- 5) Makes the final judgement on the case. In a contested case, there is a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). The judge makes a decision. If the board doesn't agree with the ALJ's decision, the board may reject it in favor of their own decision. The board may make the decision as to whether they met their own burden of proof. The board may decide who had the "preponderance of evidence" (which, unlike the

OSB's "clear and convincing" standard is the evidentiary standard in healthcare board administrative hearings).

- 6) Imposes the disciplinary action of their choice.
- 7) Reports the disciplinary action against the licensee to one or more National Data Bases, effectively blacklisting the licensee. Discipline is typically effective immediately. Stays until the outcome of Appeals are nearly never granted. Bice was an exception.
- 8) Appoints an AAG from the DOJ's Appellate Division to represent the board in the Oregon Court of Appeals.
- 9) Re-decides the case and reimposes discipline when the licensee "wins" a Reverse & Remand.

Because there are believed to be no instances on record in which the board has voted against their own prosecutorial arguments, those who fight the injustice they've just experienced must take their case to appeals in hopes of justice. The process of appeals typically takes 4 years and in that time, a licensee's career begins to deteriorate. They are frequently driven into poverty a lose their ability to retain an attorney. Appeals are sometimes abandoned and sometimes laboriously carried through pro se.

Some licensees are tricked by the board into signing ill-defined "stipulated agreements." The board generally fails to inform the licensee that a "stipulated agreement" is still regarded a "disciplinary action" and will be reported to National Data Bases substantially and permanently crippling or ending their career (no matter how minor the allegation).

Because they are classed as confidential, we know nothing of the cases the board dismisses. We reject any suggestion that the fact that the board dismisses cases (no matter the number or percentage) attests to any type of fairness on their part nor offset for unfairness in prosecuted cases.

### **Rightful Behavior of the 5 named attorneys**

Rightful behavior on the part of the 5 named attorneys would be to have simply refrained from participation in unconstitutional behavior so as to not violate their solemn oaths to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land.

These 5 attorneys did not do this though. Simple as that. It matters not that some of their behavior was likely allowed by state law. It matters not that others may be committing the same offenses as we speak. It matters not that it may be a systemic problem. It matters not that they may have seen themselves as "just doing their jobs." It doesn't even matter if the licensees they abused were guilty.

The details are elsewhere in the set of materials we've provided, but these five attorneys, in participating, condoning, furthering, or turning a blind eye to the work of Berry and Foote have been complicit in depriving Dr. David T. Bice of his Constitutionally guaranteed right to due process of the law.

We have recently been putting money values on the life, liberty and property deprived each similarly treated licensee. We are beginning to see a trend in estimates with means, medians, and modes of \$1.5M per licensee.

Dr. Bice could have been different. Nearly 5 years ago, ALJ Rick Barber found *completely* in Dr. Bice's favor. This would have resulted, for Dr. Bice, in a very rare outcome. No blacklisting. No lasting scars from a gruesome board attack. The right thing for the board to have done would have been to let ALJ Barber's *independent* determination stand. If the board wanted to win, they should have had a better case or at least presented it better *before* the judgement. Instead, the board lied, substantially changed material historical fact in writing (Foote), drew Carolyn Alexander into the falsity, and then, when caught by the judges of the Oregon Court of Appeals, continued to lie about having substantially altered the material historical facts of Barber which had exonerated Bice.

We believe that the preventable damage done to Dr. Bice alone rises well into the realm of moral turpitude.

We believe that many others have been harmed by these 5 attorneys in similar and at times in greater ways.

We believe if they are not stopped they will continue this behavior, bringing harm to many more people. We believe that these 5 attorneys are morally unfit to practice law in Oregon.

### **The Importance of Oaths**

Every lawful and ordered society relies on the goodness of oaths. Witnesses and other parties on court proceeding can be afforded trust because they take an oath the breaking of which carries penalty.

So it is with government and with public officials. The public at large relies on the goodness of oaths of those in government and public office in order that they may trust government and public office

### **Equal Protection under the Law**

Simply put, "equal protection under the law" in Oregon means:

NO State (as in none, zero, zip) may deny ANY citizen or CLASS of citizens the EQUAL protection of the Supreme Law of the Land and NO (as in none, zero, zip) law

shall be passed granting ANY citizen or CLASS of citizens, privileges OR IMMUNITIES which on the same terms, shall not belong to ALL citizens.

### **Equal Protection Clause from the U.S. Constitution**

Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

[N]or shall any state ... deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1

From the Oregon Constitution, Article 1, Section 20:

Equality of privileges and immunities of citizens. No law shall be passed granting to any citizen or class of citizens privileges, or immunities, which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens. — OR Const. article I § 20

### **We reject as clearly fallacious, the following absurd interpretations of Equal Protection:**

- 1) That in matters of law, treating all, or most, members *within* a given class of persons equally means that the criteria for equal protection has been met.

#### **Examples:**

The systematic deprivation, or risk of deprivation, of the protection of due process for all doctors in disciplinary matters is not “equal protection” for the doctors.

Being deprived of civil rights under the guise of Administrative Law when many classes of citizens are also deprived of civil rights under the guise of Administrative law is not “equal protection” under the Constitution.

- 2) That the phrase “upon the same terms” from OR Const. article I § 20 may be interpreted ridiculously.

#### **Example:**

That someone could credibly assert:

“I am immune to civil suits. If you were an immune person, you’d be immune as well. You are not an immune person and therefore are not immune. You are not, so you’re not and if you were you would be. You see, upon the same terms, there is equal protection.” This is not equal protection under the law. It is classism.

- 3) Only certain persons or classes of persons may decide which persons or classes of persons can decide when it is in the best interest of the people to suspend equal

protection laws for a given class of persons and that they could do so without due process of law.

- 4) There are laws written which allow (literal) lawlessness. Therefore, lawlessness is legal.

### **Oregon Statutes, Oregon Practices, & Violation of Equal Protection Mandates**

Healthcare professionals are a class of citizens.

Healthcare professionals are treated differently than other licensed professionals in Oregon with regard to “legal” privileges and immunities.

Some sub-classes of healthcare professionals are treated differently than other sub-classes of healthcare professionals in Oregon with regard to “legal” privileges and immunities.

Some individual healthcare professionals are treated differently than other individual healthcare professionals in Oregon with regard to “legal” privileges and immunities.

Boards and agencies (generally) in Oregon are allowed to provide due process (ALJ makes final order) *or not* (board makes final order) *as they please*. An agency may make a rule about this facilitating regular procedure within the agency either way, or they may decide on a case by case basis, in contested disciplinary matters, whether they will let an ALJ’s decision stand.

**In the Bice matter**, all 5 of the named attorneys exploited these liberties. They chose to overturn ALJ Rick Barber’s decision to totally exonerate David T. Bice, and in this, deliberately and willfully violated the Oaths to abide the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions. They caused substantial harm to Dr. Bice by depriving Dr. Bice of his constitutionally guaranteed rights to due process and equal protection under the law. These oaths are so important as to be *requisite* to the holding of each of the named 5’s respective offices, and as well, their licenses to practice law.

#### **How these “liberties” are established and sustained:**

Oregon Attorney General Model Rules  
Division 3  
Model Rules of Procedure for Contested Cases

#### **OAR 137-003-0000**

Applicability of Rules in OAR 137, Division 3

(2) When an administrative law judge assigned from the Office of Administrative Hearings conducts a contested case hearing for the agency, the proceedings **shall** be conducted pursuant to OAR 137-003-0501 to 137-003-0700, **unless**:

- (a) The case is not subject to the procedural requirements for contested cases; or
- (b) The Attorney General, by order, has exempted the agency or a category of the agency's cases from the application of such rules in whole or in part. These rules need not be adopted by the agency to be effective.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 183.341

Stats. Implemented: ORS 183.341 & OL 1999, Ch. 849

Hist: DOJ 10-1999, f. 12-23-99, cert. ef. 1-1-00; DOJ 19-2003, f. 12-12-03, cert. ef. 1-1-04

## **From the Attorney General's Website:**

### **Notice of Contested Case Rights and Procedures**

#### **(OAH Hearings)**

[http://www.doj.state.or.us/help/pdf/notice\\_of\\_contested\\_case\\_rights\\_and\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.doj.state.or.us/help/pdf/notice_of_contested_case_rights_and_procedures.pdf)

**5. Administrative Law Judge.** The person presiding at the hearing is known as the administrative law judge (ALJ). The ALJ will rule on all matters that arise at the hearing, subject to agency consideration of matters transmitted for agency decision under OAR 137-003-0635 or matters subject to agency review under OAR 137-003-0640 or OAR 137-003-0570. The ALJ will be assigned by the Chief ALJ from the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). The OAH consists of employees of, and independent contractors with, the Chief ALJ. The ALJ [has/does not have] the authority to make the final decision in the case. [If the ALJ does not have final decision-making authority add: The final determination will be made by board/commission or title/position of agency decision-maker.]

**14. Proposed Order and Exceptions.** (If the ALJ issues a final order, skip directly to "Final Order.>"). The ALJ will issue a proposed order in the form of findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommended agency action. You will be provided with a copy and you will be given an opportunity to make written objections, called "exceptions," to the ALJ's recommendations. You will be notified when exceptions to the

**15. Final Order.** (Choose one of the following options. Alternative A is for cases where an ALJ issues a proposed order and the agency issues the final order. Alternative B is for cases where an ALJ issues a final order.)

Alternative A: The agency will render the final order in this case. The agency may modify the proposed order issued by the ALJ. If the agency modifies the proposed order in any substantial manner, the agency in its order will identify the modification and

explain why the agency made the modification. The agency may modify a proposed finding of “historical” fact only if the proposed finding is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the record.

Alternative B: The ALJ will render the final order in this case. Because the ALJ will issue the final order there will be no opportunity for you to object to the order or to present additional arguments prior to issuance of the order.

Note: Some agencies have adopted rules that require a party to ask for reconsideration before seeking judicial review. Agencies that impose this additional requirement should explain the requirement and the procedure for seeking reconsideration, and cite the applicable agency rule.

**ORS 183.341 Model rules of procedure; establishment; compilation; publication; agencies required to adopt procedural rules.** (1) The Attorney General shall prepare model rules of procedure appropriate for use by as many agencies as possible. Except as provided in ORS 183.630, any agency may adopt all or part of the model rules by reference without complying with the rulemaking procedures under ORS 183.335. Notice of such adoption shall be filed with the Secretary of State in the manner provided by ORS 183.355 for the filing of rules. The model rules may be amended from time to time by an adopting agency or the Attorney General after notice and opportunity for hearing as required by rulemaking procedures under this chapter.

(2) Except as provided in ORS 183.630, all agencies shall adopt rules of procedure to be utilized in the adoption of rules and conduct of proceedings in contested cases or, if exempt from the contested case provisions of this chapter, for the conduct of proceedings.

(3) The Secretary of State shall publish in the Oregon Administrative Rules:

(a) The Attorney General’s model rules adopted under subsection (1) of this section;

(b) The procedural rules of all agencies that have not adopted the Attorney General’s model rules; and

(c) The notice procedures required by ORS 183.335 (1).

(4) Agencies shall adopt rules of procedure which will provide a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to be notified of the agency’s intention to adopt, amend or repeal a rule.

(5) No rule adopted after September 13, 1975, is valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the rules adopted pursuant to subsection (4) of this section. [1975 c. 759 §6 (enacted in lieu of 183.340); 1979 c.593 §12; 1997 c.837 §1; 1999 c.849 §§24,25; 2003 c.75 §28]

**ORS 183.411 Delegation of final order authority.** Unless otherwise provided by law, an agency may delegate authority to enter a final order in a proceeding or class of proceedings to an officer or employee of the agency, or to a class of officers or employees of the agency. A delegation of authority under this section must be made in writing before the issuance of any order pursuant to the delegation and must be retained in the agency’s records. [2007 c.116 §2]

**ORS 183.630 Model rules of procedure; exemptions; depositions.** (1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, all contested case hearings conducted by administrative law judges assigned from the Office of Administrative Hearings must be conducted pursuant to the model rules of procedure prepared by the Attorney General under ORS 183.341 if the hearing is subject to the procedural requirements for contested case proceedings.

(2) The Attorney General, after consulting with the chief administrative law judge, may exempt an agency or a category of cases from the requirements of subsection (1) of this section. The exemption may be from all or part of the model rules adopted by the Attorney General. Any exemption granted under this subsection must be made in writing.

(3) The Attorney General shall consult with an advisory group when adopting model rules of procedure for the purpose of contested case hearings conducted by administrative law judges assigned from the Office of Administrative Hearings. The advisory group shall consist of:

- (a) The chief administrative law judge;
- (b) An officer or employee of a state agency, appointed by the Governor;
- (c) An attorney who practices administrative law, appointed by the Oregon State Bar;
- (d) A deputy or assistant attorney general appointed by the Attorney General; and
- (e) A public member, appointed by the Governor, who is not an attorney or an officer or employee of a state agency.

(4) Except as may be expressly granted by the agency to an administrative law judge assigned from the office, or as may be expressly provided for by law, an administrative law judge conducting a hearing for an agency under ORS 183.605 to 183.690 may not authorize a party to take a deposition that is to be paid for by the agency. [1999 c.849 §8; 2003 c.75 §7; 2009 c.866 §6]

**ORS 183.635 Agencies required to use administrative law judges from Office of Administrative Hearings; exceptions.** (1) Except as provided in this section, all agencies must use administrative law judges assigned from the Office of Administrative Hearings established under ORS 183.605 to conduct contested case hearings, without regard to whether those hearings are subject to the procedural requirements for contested case hearings.

(2) The following agencies need not use administrative law judges assigned from the office:

- (a) Attorney General.
- (b) Boards of stewards appointed by the Oregon Racing Commission.
- (c) Bureau of Labor and Industries and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries.
- (d) Department of Corrections.
- (e) Department of Education, State Board of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- (f) Department of Human Services for vocational rehabilitation services cases under 29 U.S.C. 722(c) and disability determination cases under 42 U.S.C. 405.

- (g) Department of Revenue.
  - (h) Department of State Police.
  - (i) Employment Appeals Board.
  - (j) Employment Relations Board.
  - (k) Energy Facility Siting Council.
  - (L) Fair Dismissal Appeals Board.
  - (m) Governor.
  - (n) Land Conservation and Development Commission.
  - (o) Land Use Board of Appeals.
  - (p) Local government boundary commissions created pursuant to ORS 199.430.
  - (q) Public universities listed in ORS 352.002.
  - (r) Oregon Youth Authority.
  - (s) Psychiatric Security Review Board.
  - (t) The Oregon Health Authority for hearings conducted under ORS 161.315 to 161.351.
  - (u) Public Utility Commission.
  - (v) State Accident Insurance Fund Corporation.
  - (w) State Apprenticeship and Training Council.
  - (x) State Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision.
  - (y) State Land Board.
  - (z) State Treasurer.
- (3) The Workers' Compensation Board is exempt from using administrative law judges assigned from the office for any hearing conducted by the board under ORS chapters 147, 654 and 656. Except as specifically provided in this subsection, the Department of Consumer and Business Services must use administrative law judges assigned from the office only for contested cases arising out of the department's powers and duties under:
- (a) ORS 86A.095 to 86A.198, 86A.990 and 86A.992 and ORS chapter 59;
  - (b) ORS chapter 455;
  - (c) ORS chapter 674;
  - (d) ORS chapters 706 to 716;
  - (e) ORS chapter 717;
  - (f) ORS chapters 723, 725 and 726; and
  - (g) ORS chapters 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 737, 742, 743, 743A, 743B, 744, 746, 748 and 750.
- (4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any proceeding in which an agency is required to use an administrative law judge assigned from the office, an officer or employee of the agency may not conduct the hearing on behalf of the agency.
- (5) Notwithstanding any other provision of ORS 183.605 to 183.690, an agency is not required to use an administrative law judge assigned from the office if:
- (a) Federal law requires that a different administrative law judge or hearing officer be used; or
  - (b) Use of an administrative law judge from the office could result in a loss of federal funds.
- (6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Department of Environmental Quality must use administrative law judges assigned from the office only for contested

case hearings conducted under the provisions of ORS 183.413 to 183.470. [1999 c.849 §9; 2001 c.900 §46; 2003 c.75 §8; 2005 c.22 §131; 2005 c.26 §18; 2007 c.239 §9; 2009 c.541 §6; 2009 c.762 §46; 2009 c.830 §147; 2009 c.866 §10; 2011 c.637 §64; 2011 c.708 §25; 2013 c.296 §19; 2015 c.767 §53]

---

**The above set of OARs, Attorney General Opinions, and ORSs are not “legal law” nor based in “legal law.” The permissions they provide offer the 5 attorneys named in the Bice matter NO SAFE HARBOR, from their obligations and oaths to faithfully abide the Supreme Mandates of the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions. If, upon investigation any or all of the 5 named attorneys (or AAG Thompson) are found to have violated the constitution during the course of their involvement or association with the Bice matter, not withstanding *any* exceptions, we want them appropriately held to account. Even if in no other matter, the named 5 (plus Thompson) have ever violated the Constitutions in the course of their professional roles before, we nevertheless want them held to account for such violations in the Bice matter alone.**

---

## **This is But a Truncated List of Possible Constitutional Violations of the 5 Attorneys Named in this Request for Investigation**

We find that violations committed by the named five attorneys regarding their violations of the 5th and 14th amendments of the U.S constitution and Article 1, Section 20 of the Oregon Constitution to be the most egregious among their violations of Civil and Human Rights **in the matter of David T. Bice**, and generally.

Were time to allow, we would address other matters such as the matter of **Secret Courts (OR Const. article I § 10)**.

Furthermore, we, the undersigned, intend to pursue the matter generally so as to avoid addressing the violations of the named 5 attorneys in a manner differently than we would hold other citizens and office holders accountable for the same offenses.

Regardless of the necessary present truncation of our efforts, we are nevertheless wishing to hold the named 5 accountable for their personal violations of Civil and Human Rights as described in the U.S. and Oregon Constitution. The Department of Justice and the various boards and agencies of Oregon both write and enforce their own rules, and the fact that they may state statutory authority to do so, it is no Safe Harbor by which they are permitted to, in violation of the constitutions, to deprive citizens of Life, Liberty, or Property, or to (actual) Due Process and Equal Protection

under the law. It is the very heart of the constitutions which is at the very heart of Lawfulness , that there be NO provisions for violation of these 2 Basic tenets of Basic Civil and Human rights.

**We wish to have the OSB further investigate these matters and as is appropriate, prosecute the 5 named attorneys against their licenses.**

We believe that the behaviors of these 5 attorneys, outside of any possible violations of statute, administrative rule, or RPC, the 5 named attorneys violated the constitution knowingly, by design, and with malice afore thought in order to privilege themselves with the opportunities to behave in arbitrary and capricious ways other than by a rule of law which applies to them equally. They have written and acted upon rules which have maximized their privileges and immunities and minimized the same in those they would deign to discipline, such that they have destroyed any **effective** means of redress which does not destroy targeted individuals in the course of it. The 5 know or should know what they are doing. They know, or should know what they've done, and all the reasons it is contemptible and prejudicial to the administration of justice. 4 of the named 5 are prominent attorneys with the Oregon Department of Justice. **Their behavior rises to the level of moral turpitude.**