

FILED

MAR 11 2015

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE  
SAN FRANCISCO

1 LAW OFFICE OF MARTIN REINER  
By: Martin Reiner SBN - 144024  
2 9025 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90211  
3 (310)871-0063  
Pro Se Respondent MARTIN REINER  
4

5  
6  
7  
8 STATE BAR COURT

9 HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

10 In the Matter of: ) CASE NO.: 14-N-06382  
11 MARTIN BARNETT REINER, )  
No. 144024, ) RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO THE  
12 A Member of the State Bar. ) NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES  
13 ) REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL  
14 ) MOTION FOR ABATEMENT

15 TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE BAR COURT AND THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL OFFICE:

16 The Respondent Pro Se herein, attorney Martin Reiner ("REINER"), hereby responds  
17 to the Notice of Disciplinary Charges ("NDC") in this case, as follows:

18 REINER generally denies the allegations of the NDC.

19 REINER further asserts as defenses to Count One of the subject NDC in this matter, which is  
20 the sole count of the subject NDC in this matter, that REINER was not duty bound to obey Rule  
21 9.20, nor any of that Rule's subsections, because the suspension order issued by the California  
22 Supreme Court in its case number S218700 is legally invalid ab initio, as being null and void ab  
23 initio on the following grounds, as on each numbered ground alone by itself, or as on any of the  
24 grounds combined with one or more of the other grounds, or as on all of the grounds combined  
25 together:

26 (1) REINER actually prevailed at the State Bar Court's trial underlying California Supreme  
27 Court case number S218700, as there was no evidence of culpability adduced at the trial of the  
28 subject State Bar Court case, as REINER was fully exonerated as to each of the two Counts

1 constituting the NDC in that State Bar Court case, but the "Decision" of the State Bar Court trial  
2 judge in that State Bar Court case, Patrice McElroy, as well as the "Opinion" of the involved  
3 State Bar Court Review Department judges in that State Bar Court case, Joan Remke, Judith  
4 Epstein, and Catherine Purcell, and the suspension order issued by the involved justices of the  
5 California Supreme Court, including Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Carol Corrigan, Marvin Baxter,  
6 Kathryn Werdeger, Ming Chin, and Goodwin Liu, in its case number S218700, were each issued  
7 adverse to REINER, in wrongful defiance of the exonerating evidence adduced at trial, with that  
8 wrongful defiance being imposed to thwart justice, as obstructions of justice, as violations of  
9 California Penal Code Section 96.5, as a criminal conspiracy in violation of California Penal  
10 Code Section 182, as well as in violation of 18 U. S. C. 241 and 18 U. S. C. 242, which utterly  
11 deprived REINER of a fair hearing before the State Bar Court trial judge, as well as depriving  
12 REINER of a fair hearing before the involved State Bar Court Review Department judges, as  
13 well as depriving REINER of a fair hearing before the involved justices of the California  
14 Supreme Court, and/or

15 (2)the NDC underlying the State Bar Court case underlying the California Supreme Court's  
16 case number S218700 alleged knowingly false factual allegations and/or arrived at knowingly  
17 false factual conclusions, which were, in wrongful defiance of the evidence adduced at trial,  
18 wrongfully adopted in the "Decision" of the State Bar Court trial judge, as well as the "Opinion"  
19 of the involved State Bar Court Review Department judges, and in the subject suspension order  
20 of the involved justices of the California Supreme Court, which thereby deprived REINER of a  
21 fair hearing before the State Bar Court trial judge, the involved State Bar Court Review  
22 Department judges, and the involved California Supreme Court justices, as such wrongful  
23 misconduct constituted a willful violation of REINER's constitutional right of procedural due  
24 process, and/or

25 (3)the NDC underlying the State Bar Court case underlying the California Supreme Court's  
26 case number S218700 alleged knowingly false legal allegations and/or arrived at knowingly false  
27 legal conclusions, which were wrongfully adopted in the "Decision" rendered by the State Bar  
28 Court trial judge, as well as the "Opinion" rendered by involved State Bar Court Review

1 Department judges, and in the subject suspension order of the involved justices of the California  
2 Supreme Court, which thereby wrongfully deprived REINER of REINER's constitutional right  
3 of procedural due process, and/or

4 (4)each of the four orders which had issued by the California Workers' Compensation  
5 Appeals Board ("WCAB") which constituted the two Counts of the NDC in the State Bar Court  
6 case underlying the California Supreme Court case in California Supreme Court case number  
7 S218700, were each legally invalid ab initio, and the three of those four WCAB orders which  
8 arose in relation to the WCAB matter involving Rosa Palafox, each of those three WCAB orders  
9 also were issued by the WCAB as a crime - aiding and abetting insurance fraud - as a violation of  
10 California Penal Code Section 550 and California Insurance Code Section 1871.4, and as an  
11 obstruction of justice, in violation of California Penal Code Section 96.5, and/or

12 (5)each of the four orders which had issued by the California Workers' Compensation  
13 Appeals Board ("WCAB") which constituted the two Counts of the NDC in the State Bar Court  
14 case underlying the California Supreme Court case in California Supreme Court case number  
15 S218700, were, and presently remain, not final, not binding orders because their constitutional  
16 validity was, and remains, being actively challenged by REINER in litigation pending before the  
17 federal judiciary pursuant to the legal authority of CANATELLA vs. STOVITZ (N.D. Cal. 2005)  
18 365 F. Supp. 2d 1064 and IN THE MATTER OF KLEIN (Rev. Dept. 1994) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct.  
19 Rptr. 1, and/or

20 (6)with regard to the WCAB order underlying Count One of the NDC in the State Bar Court  
21 case underlying the California Supreme Court case in California Supreme Court case number  
22 S218700, as well as the WCAB order underlying Count Two of that NDC for the alleged  
23 impugning of the integrity of WCAB judges, REINER had raised in the Answer to that NDC, as  
24 to each of those two Counts of that NDC, the defense of the case of UNITED STATES  
25 DISTRICT COURT FOR CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA vs. YAGMAN (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
26 1995) 55 F. 3d 1430, which thereby imposed a burden of proof upon the State Bar Court and its  
27 attorneys to prove REINER's subject statements as to Count One, as well as to Count Two, as  
28 being false, and that prosecution's burden of proof was never met. As to the three WCAB orders

1 underlying Count Two of that same NDC, the trial transcript reflects that the evidence adduced at  
2 the subject trial of that case proved REINER's Answer's contention that those three WCAB  
3 orders were issued as criminal wrongdoing by the WCAB to cover-up, as well as aid and abet,  
4 the involvement of former WCAB judge Thomas Redmond in the commission of insurance  
5 fraud, and/or

6 (7)as a matter of equity.

7 Based upon the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Count One of the NDC  
8 underlying this matter, State Bar Court case number 14-N-06382, be dismissed forthwith and  
9 with prejudice. Alternatively, it is hereby respectfully requested that this matter be abated until  
10 the legal exhaustion of REINER's active challenge of the constitutional validity of the four  
11 subject underlying WCAB orders, which is before the federal judiciary, becomes final.

12 Dated: March 9, 2015

  
13 MARTIN REINER  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## PROOF OF SERVICE

Regarding State Bar Court Case Number 14-N-06382

I am employed in the City of Beverly Hills, Los Angeles County, California. My business address is 9025 Wilshire Boulevard, #301, Beverly Hills, California 90211. I am over the age of 18 years and I am not a party to the foregoing action

On March 9, 2015, I served the Respondent's Answer to the Notice of Dicipinary Charges, Request for Dismissal, and Motion for Abatement on -

California State Bar Court  
Attn: Office of Chief Trial Counsel  
845 S. Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2515

by mail, by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope, addressed as set forth above with postage prepaid in the United States mail in Los Angeles, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California , that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is being executed on March 9, 2015 in Beverly Hills, California.

  
HABTNESH EZRA