

Dear Dispatch Editor:(submission for Letter to the Editor from Carole Squire 461-1390)

This letter is to respond to the Tuesday, July 10, 2007 Dispatch article by James Nash captioned **Ex-judge should be allowed to practice law, justices told**. Mr. Nash writes: As a Franklin County family-law judge, Carole Squire (was) reportedly scolding lawyers in court, conducting her own "investigations" from the bench and putting off decisions that were supposed to be made in a day.

I did not conduct any "investigation" which the law prohibits a judge from performing. The so-called "investigations", in two cases, involved the procedural matter of having FCCS confirm an abuse referral. Secondly, in regard to two cases, I did not fail to make a decision required by law to be made in a day. There could be no such failure due to the fact the law does not require a same day decision as alleged concerning the at issue two cases. Furthermore, monthly statistics gathered and maintained by the Ohio Supreme Court, evidence the diligence and timeliness with which I conscientiously discharged my responsibilities as a jurist. The record of appeals from my cases and the remands from the court of appeals evidence the regularity with which I properly applied the law.

During my nearly ten years of service as a jurist, it was not my habit, no more than any other judge, to scold lawyers. I conservatively estimate I handled more than 30,000 cases during my nearly ten years on the bench. There is not a judge who has served on the bench for a few years who has not had three assigned cases that could generate allegations such as those I'm facing.

It's disturbing to me that Ms. Lori Brown, from the office of the disciplinary counsel, has stated more than once, as she did at the July 10th hearing, that a recusal entry I signed, involving Attorney Richard Innis, contained a misrepresentation. Truth is the recusal entry contained information which I believed at the time and continue to believe to date honestly reflects what Mr. Innis communicated to me in regard to Judge Preisse making a referral to the disciplinary counsel involving me. Judge Preisse acknowledged during her testimony before the panel, during my disciplinary proceedings, that she made said referral even though she knew of no ethical violation committed by me. It is unethical for either the Dispatch or Ms. Brown to assist in creating the false impression that I was dishonest in regard to the entry. The Dispatch becomes a willing accomplice to attempts to suppress truth, which I've observed during this disciplinary process, when Dispatch reporters fail to investigate and fail to present all involved parties' perspectives.

Mr. Nash concludes his article citing three incidents that the disciplinary counsel cites as evidence of my misconduct. Not a single one of the allegations has merit and the allegations distort truth beyond recognition. In regard to the quote in Mr. Nash's article by a nonobserver to my conduct, that a reasonable observer would be "appalled" by my conduct, it totally ignores the fact that reasonable observers who were eyewitnesses to the at issue conduct testified credibly and adamantly at my disciplinary proceedings that it was not my conduct, but rather several attorneys' conduct which was appalling. Truth pressed down will rise. I trust God to vindicate me.

*Submitted via E-mail
7-12-2007*