

IMPLEMENTATION OF MISSOURI COURT PLAN IN ALASKA

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Theresa Nangle Obermeyer, Ph.D.

October 15, 2004

Per Andrew Halcro's "Opinion," "Hey, hands off state judiciary branch," Anchorage Daily News 10/10/04 F-2, total misunderstanding of Alaska State Judiciary is shown. My husband and I have been mailing 60 copies of our treatment by Alaska Bench and Bar to Alaska Legislature for 12 years so Mr. Halcro received that correspondence 1998-2002. How can he opine:"Alaska's judiciary is one of the finest in the country" after he and the entire Alaska Bench and Bar have watched and participated in my husband's and my treatment for over a 20 1/2 year period? Tom is not licensed to practice law in Alaska today. It is time for ethics and decency to prevail in this 45 year old state that is the only one without a law school or any elected attorney. Alaska has not had a Blue Book for a decade.

I gave about 700 pages of documents to Senator Ralph Seekins and Representative Lesil McGuire September 30 when Alaska Senate and Alaska House of Representatives Judiciary Committees met about Alaska Judicial Council (AJC) and the judicial selection process. Included in the documents were Tom's and my six rejections from U.S. Supreme Court and the transcript United States of America vs. Theresa Nangle Obermeyer A94-0074 CR September 26-28, 1994, a fabricated non-jury, federal criminal trial, at which now past Chief Judge James K. Singleton, U.S. District Court, and now past Chief Justice Dana Fabe, Alaska Supreme Court, both testified against me prostituting their oaths of office in order to be promoted to higher judgeships. Judge William B. Enright, U.S. District Court, San Diego, flew up here to preside over this trial and the testimony of Ms. Teri Carns, 30 year employee and current Senior Staff Associate, AJC, was used to convict me. On September 30 Ms. Carns at the behest of Mr. Larry Cohn, Executive Director, AJC, addressed Alaska Senate and House Judiciary Committees briefly.

Mr. Halcro's "Opinion" stated:"The reason for its (Alaska Judiciary) success is the 'Missouri (Court) Plan' that shapes our judicial selection process." It is apparent that Mr. Halcro does not understand the manipulation of the "Missouri Court Plan" under which my father, Judge James F. Nangle (deceased), State of Missouri Circuit Court, St. Louis, was on the bench there for 45 years. Missouri Constitution Article V 25(c)(1) states:"Tenure of judges . . . Each judge appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 25 (a)-(g) shall hold office for a term ending December thirty-first following the next general election after the expiration of twelve months in office." In other words, in Missouri a judge must stand for retention in the next election after twelve months in office. By contrast, the rule in Alaska reads that judges must stand for retention:" . . .at the first general election held more than three years (two for District Court) after appointment." Alaska's rule allows probably double the time prior to retention as compared to "Missouri Court Plan." The result is that Alaska Supreme Court justices, Alaska Court of Appeals judges, and Alaska Superior Court judges stand for retention about four years after appointment. After the first retention Alaska Supreme Court justices stand for retention every ten years, Alaska Court of Appeals every eight years, and Alaska Superior Court every six years. Is this "public service" or "self service?" Talk about "golden parachute" retirements. Such a deal! It is no wonder that Alaska attorneys are applying in droves for Alaska Bench.

Alaska Bar Association Board of Governors should ask Mr. Van Goor for a complete accounting of his lack of ethics in filing a complaint against my husband at Missouri Bar Association over <http://www.tobermeyer.info> "American Case Law Precedent" file "30 Complaints against Alaska Attorneys" that I spent a decade filing 1993-2003 without any assistance. Tom and I have always

shown respect for Mr. Van Goor and the result has been Mr. Van Goor's malicious trumped up Missouri Bar complaint against my husband. Mr. Van Goor should be questioned about why he did nothing about my 30 Alaska Bar complaints beginning with my 100 page complaint December 20, 1993 against Howard Trickey, Jermain, Dunnagan & Owens, who was my counsel as Anchorage School Board member 1990-94. Why has Mr. Van Goor presided over the very unfair, demented treatment that my husband and I have received including jailing me on January 15, 1999 while Board of Governors was at court? I am trying to forgive Mr. Van Goor but he is being paid to set ethical standards for Alaska Bar Association.

Alaska Bar Association Board of Governors meets October 28-29, 2004. We expect Mr. Stephen Van Goor whose name has been published since April 18, 1986 on Page 1201 [In The Matter of the Application of Thomas S. Obermeyer](#), 717 Pacific Reporter 2d 382, 57 American Law Reports 4th 1195 in connection with an annotation entitled [Failed Applicant's Right of Access to Bar Examination Questions and Answers](#), 57 ALR 4th 1212 to show leadership by advocating that Thomas Obermeyer, Attorney, licensed by similar Missouri Bar Examination in 1990, a state that has reciprocity with Alaska, be licensed to practice law in Alaska by majority vote. Mr. Van Goor must face the fact that ethical people do not take a person's money once without a thought of helping the individual. Alaska Bar Association has taken Tom's money 28 times without a positive result and/or options which are allowed in every other state in the Union. Tom should have been admitted here by reciprocity 14 years ago when he was licensed in Missouri. Tom has in good faith studied for months for, taken a three day essay test for 84 days of his life, and then waited for more months to find out time after time that he cannot have a reasonable livelihood as we have raised four children. Alaska Bar Examination is a test of minimal competence and Tom has been singled out mercilessly. Who else has been ridiculed and "flunked" for 20 1/2 years the way Tom has?

Mr. Halcro must not understand that American courts of law are supposed to be about ethics, good example, and basic fairness.