

**Byers, Dave**

**From:** Byers, Dave  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 4:51 PM  
**To:** England, Joel  
**Subject:** FW: Legis

does this work?

**From:** Byers, Dave  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 4:46 PM  
**To:** Garcia, Liana <[liagarcia@courts.az.gov](mailto:liagarcia@courts.az.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Legis

**From:** Garcia, Liana <[liagarcia@courts.az.gov](mailto:liagarcia@courts.az.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 2:47 PM  
**To:** Byers, Dave <[DByers@courts.az.gov](mailto:DByers@courts.az.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Legis

OK how about this:

The Supreme Court shall adopt a rule requiring that any complaint or charge against a licensed attorney be dismissed unless the complainant alleges direct and specific knowledge of a violation of the Rules of Arizona Supreme Court, including the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Does this still allow for the situations Maret laid out?

Liana Garcia  
Director of Government Affairs  
Arizona Supreme Court  
C (602)513-3398

On Feb 14, 2024, at 1:01 PM, Byers, Dave <[DByers@courts.az.gov](mailto:DByers@courts.az.gov)> wrote:

I think we need more specify language that "nexus" and would like the ability for the bar itself to bring a charge. I suspect Kern might not like that, but on occasion, the bar bring a complaint they learn from the news etc.....They can't wait for a complaint on a serious matter.

From: Garcia, Liana <[liagarcia@courts.az.gov](mailto:liagarcia@courts.az.gov)>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 12:36 PM  
To: Byers, Dave <[DByers@courts.az.gov](mailto:DByers@courts.az.gov)>  
Subject: Re: Legis

On Kern's SB1471 on bar complainants requiring a nexus to the case, do we want wording similar to Petersen's CLE bill? Attached -  
Liana Garcia  
<[image001.jpg](#)>  
Director of Government Affairs  
Arizona Supreme Court  
C (602)513-3398

On Feb 14, 2024, at 10:46 AM, Byers, Dave <[DByers@courts.az.gov](mailto:DByers@courts.az.gov)> wrote:

We officially oppose Kerns SCR 1044  
On the SB 1471....Can you see if he is willing to allow some refinement on the wording as if he will, we might support.  
SB 1586 we oppose....In reading the actual wording, while you indicated this would prevent hiring contract lobbyist.

I need to double back with him on the Gowen Retention SCR.