



Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

Appeal of Rutherford SBOT #202601781 Ref: SBOT Padis 202601091, Parker 202601226,, and Scholer 202601233.

1 message

Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

Sat, Apr 11, 2026 at 6:23 PM

To: Board of Disciplinary Appeals <appeal@txboda.org>

Brian Carr
1201 Brady Drive
Irving TX 75061
518-227-0129
carrbp@gmail.com

Board of Disciplinary Appeals (BODA)
P.O.Box 12426
Austin, TX 78711
phone 512-427-1578
appeals@txboda.org

Dear Sir / Madam:

Attached is a file with scanned images of the signed appeal form for the Rutherford and SBOT #202601781.

I believe that I correctly authorized future correspondence via email. Can you please let me know if anything further is required?

There are three other appeals which were submitted previously. I would like to suggest that all four appeals be heard in the same hearing as there are clear indications of illegal collusion between the attorneys listed and this context can only be considered when the other attorneys are included.

Further, I am concerned that Texas Bar Association (TBA) Chief Disciplinary Counsel (CDC) is endeavoring to conceal the specific violations. Can you please provide me with the entire record provided to your board by the CDC for each appeal?

Further, it is apparent the CDC is not relying on the publicly available articles and statutes such as:

- [Texas Constitution Article V, Section 1-a C](#). Clearly gives the State Commission on Judicial Conduct (SCJC) jurisdiction over Texas state judges and not federal judges
- [TITLE 2.B.33. STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT](#) (8) clarifies that only state judges are under the jurisdiction of SCJC, and
- [Sec. 33.0213](#) indicates that the jurisdiction of SJC is supplemental to other remedies for judicial discipline and that parallel proceedings are considered and supported by the legislature (so that implicitly CDC is expected to follow the legislatures intention that all attorneys be held to the ethical standards).
- [Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct](#) (TDRPC) Rule 6.08 similarly supports parallel disciplinary proceedings and supports the legislative intent that all attorneys be held to the published ethical standards.

It is plausible that BODA and CDC have other statutes or case law that they rely on, but CDC never cited any such sources. Can you please identify any such statutes or case law which BODA and CDC rely on in providing apparent absolute immunity to federal attorneys and judges?

Specifically, each of the complaints contained specific references to [TDRPC Rule 4.01](#) Truthfulness and each element was supported by affirmed statements (client, knowingly, false, material, third person) so I would like a copy of anything in the record which refutes these statements or provides exceptions not listed in the rule itself.

Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Brian

On Mon, Mar 30, 2026 at 4:21 PM Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com> wrote:

Brian Carr
1201 Brady Drive
Irving TX 75061
518-227-0129
carrbp@gmail.com

Board of Disciplinary Appeals
P.O.Box 12426
Austin, TX 78711
phone 512-427-1578
appeals@txboda.org

Dear Sir / Madam:

Attached are three files with scanned images of the signed appeals form for the named attorney and SBOT #.

BodaPadis202601091.pdf
BodaParker202601226.pdf
BodaScholer202601233.pdf

I believe that I correctly authorized future correspondence via email. Can you please let me know if anything further is required? Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Brian



Virus-free. www.avast.com



BODA202601781Rutherford.pdf
292K