

In a 28 page, 112 paragraph Opinion, **Slip Opinion No. 2007-OHIO-5588, Disciplinary Counsel v. Squire**, the Supreme Court of Ohio unethically suspended former Judge Carole Squire from the practice of law for two years, with one year stayed. Set forth in forty- three of the 112 paragraphs in the Opinion are substantive findings upon which the Justices of the Ohio Supreme Court reportedly based their decision to suspend Carole Squire.

THIS IS TO CORRECT THE RECORD AS TO THE FOLLOWING: 1) MISCHARACTERIZATIONS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE SQUIRE GRIEVANCE HEARINGS BEFORE A THREE MEMBER PANEL; A CHEF, AN ATTORNEY AND A JUDGE, 2) INACCURATE CITATIONS OF THE LAW AND/OR 3) UNTRUTHFUL INFORMATION SET FORTH IN 29 OF THE 43 PARAGRAPHS OF SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS IN THE OPINION; SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS RIDDLED WITH INACCURACIES AND DISTORTIONS OF TRUTH UPON WHICH THE OHIO SUPREME COURT RELIED IN UPHOLDING THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE'S DECISION TO SUSPEND CAROLE SQUIRE FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW FOR TWO YEARS WITH ONE YEAR STAYED.

Following is “my say” concerning the 29 above referenced paragraphs. Each number below corresponds to an identical paragraph number set forth in **Slip Opinion No. 2007-2007-OHIO-5588, Disciplinary Counsel v. Squire** . The 29 paragraph numbers which I’m responding to have attached exhibits to prove my case. The attached exhibits are also identified by the paragraph number in the **Slip Opinion**. The paragraph numbers are as follows: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 50, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 71, 72, 73, 74 and paragraph 76.

(I wasn’t permitted to see the Board of Commissioners’ report forwarded to the Supreme Court)