

1 Farimah Brown, City Attorney, SBN 201227  
2 Lynne S. Bourgault, Deputy City Attorney, SBN 180416  
3 BERKELEY CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
4 2180 Milvia Street, Fourth Floor  
5 Berkeley, CA 94704  
6 Telephone: (510) 981-6998  
7 Facsimile: (510) 981-6960  
8 Email: LBourgault@cityofberkeley.info

Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF BERKELEY

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 KIARA ROBLES,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY, WE  
15 REFUSE TO ACCEPT A FASCIST  
16 AMERICA (a.k.a. ANTIFA), CITY OF  
17 BERKELEY, ET AL.,

Defendants.

No. 4:17-cv-04864 CW

**DEFENDANT CITY OF BERKELEY'S  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO  
REVOKE PRO HAC VICE ADMISSION  
OF LARRY KLAYMAN**

Date: November 14, 2017  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Crtrm: TBD

18 **INTRODUCTION**

19 In his Opposition to the City of Berkeley's Motion to Revoke Pro Hac Vice Admission,  
20 Mr. Klayman concedes numerous documented instances in which federal courts have  
21 sanctioned and criticized him for his unprofessional behavior. He also concedes that he has been  
22 banned for life from practicing in two federal district courts, and has been the subject of  
23 disciplinary proceedings and public reprimands based on multiple violations of rules of  
24 professional conduct. Mr. Klayman appears to argue that his long history of unprofessional and  
25 inappropriate behavior is warranted and excused by his "zealous" advocacy and "litigation  
26 style" in "highly charged politically motivated cases." Opp. at 1:14; 1:21-24. Mr. Klayman's  
27 position makes no sense, as the rules and guidelines for professional conduct contain no  
28

1 exception for political cases or alleged “zealous” advocacy.

2 Mr. Klayman makes an underhanded accusation against the objectivity of the Court,  
3 claiming illogically that the Court will be biased in favor the City of Berkeley’s position  
4 because she attended and taught at UC Berkeley. Opp. at 3-7. He promises to “fully” obey “all  
5 court orders” and to treat the court and “all parties with dignity and respect,” however, he has  
6 already flouted the rules in this case by filing an opposition to the City’s motion to dismiss five  
7 days late, leaving the City only one business day in which to file its reply brief.

8 Mr. Klayman argues that his client has a Sixth Amendment right to her counsel of  
9 choice, ignoring the fact that this is a civil case, not a criminal case. The Court should grant the  
10 City’s motion and revoke Mr. Klayman’s *pro hac vice* admission.

11 **ARGUMENT**

12 **I. Plaintiff has no Sixth Amendment right to counsel of her choice**

13 Mr. Klayman argues that plaintiff Kiara Robles has a guaranteed Sixth Amendment right to  
14 counsel of her choice. Opp. at 2:21-23. However, the authorities Mr. Klayman relies upon do  
15 not support his claim that plaintiff has a right to the counsel of her choice in this civil case. For  
16 instance, *U.S. v. Ries*, a case regarding the right to counsel in the criminal context, states “the  
17 Sixth Amendment right to chosen counsel is not absolute; it can be abrogated to serve a  
18 ‘compelling purpose.’ Ensuring the ethical and orderly administration of justice is one such  
19 purpose.” 100 F.3d 1469, 1471 (9th Cir. 1996). None of the cases cited by Mr. Klayman  
20 extend a right to counsel of one’s choice to civil cases. Instead, the cases discuss the manner in  
21 which judicial concerns, such as conflicts of interest, will abrogate a civil litigant’s right to  
22 choice of counsel. See *City and County of San Francisco v. Cobra Solutions, Inc.*, 38 Cal.4th  
23 839, 846 (Cal. 2006) (“Ultimately, disqualification motions involve a conflict between the  
24 clients’ right to counsel of their choice and the need to maintain ethical standards of  
25 professional responsibility.”); see also *Khani v. Ford Motor Co.*, 215 Cal.App.4th 916, 920  
26 (Cal.App.2d Dist. 2013) (noting “a disqualification motion juxtaposes a client’s right to  
27  
28

1 represented by his or her counsel of choice with the attorney’s duty to maintain the confidences  
2 of his or her former client.”) Therefore, Mr. Klayman provides no authority supporting his view  
3 that plaintiff’s alleged “right to counsel” supersedes this Court’s authority to revoke his *pro hac*  
4 *vice* admission.

5 **II. Mr. Klayman concedes there are numerous incidents of improper conduct**  
6 **warranting revocation of *pro hac vice* admission**

7 Mr. Klayman does not dispute the eleven documented instances of improper conduct  
8 cited by the City in its motion. See Def’s MPA at 6-7. Nor can Mr. Klayman dispute the  
9 specific criticisms by two separate Texas district courts, where “[t]he record reflect[ed] Mr.  
10 Klayman’s predilection for filing frivolous, nonsensical, and vituperative documents.” See  
11 *Klayman v. Obama*, 3:16-CV-02010-L (N.D. Texas); *Zamarripa v. Farrakhan*, 3:16-cv-03109-  
12 N (N.D. Texas). Finally, Mr. Klayman does not dispute his filing, dismissing, refiling, and  
13 dismissing again of lawsuits against, among others, President Obama, which he dismissed based  
14 on his view that the federal judge would be biased against him. *Klayman v. ACLU*, No. 2:17-  
15 cv-01703-JAK-JEM, ECF 1, ¶¶ 37-38; *Klayman v. Obama*, No. 2:17-cv-00836-JAK-JEM, ECF  
16 1; *Klayman v. ACLU*, 2:17-cv-01703-JAK-JEM, ECF 1.

17 Thus, the record warrants revocation of Mr. Klayman’s *pro hac vice* admission because  
18 it shows his conduct will likely interfere with “the orderly administration of justice” and he will  
19 likely “not abide by the court’s rules and practices.” *In re Bundy*, 840 F.3d 1034, 1042 (9th  
20 Cir. 2016). Although he claims he will “fully” obey all court rules and respect the parties, Mr.  
21 Klayman has already flouted the rules by filing an opposition brief five days late, leaving the  
22 City only one business day to file its reply brief. See ECF # 22 (Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion  
23 to Dismiss Complaint).

24 **III. *In re Bundy* supports the City’s request to revoke Mr. Klayman’s *pro hac vice***  
25 **status**

26 Mr. Klayman relies on the dissenting opinion in *In re Bundy* to argue that the Court  
27 should not revoke his *pro hac vice* status. Mr. Klayman argues his application was “improperly,  
28 arbitrarily, and capriciously denied” while ignoring the *Bundy* Court’s findings. See Pltf’s Opp.

1 at 3-4; see *Bundy*, 840 F.3d at 1045 (holding district court did not abuse its discretion by  
 2 considering Mr. Klayman’s “‘pending disciplinary proceedings,’ a failure to state in his *pro hac*  
 3 *vice* application that the attorney was subject to pending disciplinary proceedings and . . . his  
 4 failure to directly address those proceedings when so requested.”)

5 While Mr. Klayman may disagree with the *In Re Bundy* Court’s holding, he provides no  
 6 legitimate reason why this Court should not consider it in deciding this motion.

7 **IV. Mr. Klayman misrepresents the District of Columbia Bar proceedings**  
 8 **against him**

9 Mr. Klayman misrepresents the ethics proceeding against him before the District  
 10 of Columbia Bar. He claims “this matter is still pending and Mr. Klayman has never  
 11 actually been found to have acted unethically in this matter.”<sup>1</sup> *Bundy*, 840 F.3d at 1049;  
 12 Pltf’s Opp. at 4 (emphasis in original). However, Mr. Klayman omits the fact that a three  
 13 member hearing committee for the D.C. Bar found “by clear and convincing evidence”  
 14 that Mr. Klayman violated Florida Rule of Professional Conduct 4-1.9(a), and D.C. Rules  
 15 of Professional Conduct 1.9 and 8.4(d). Bourgault Dec. Exh. A at p. 43. Therefore, the  
 16 D.C. Bar proceedings are relevant to this motion to revoke Mr. Klayman’s *pro hac vice*  
 17 admission.

18 **V. Mr. Klayman’s Florida Bar Public Reprimand shows Mr. Klayman’s**  
 19 **predilection for interference with the fair administration of justice**

20 Mr. Klayman erroneously argues this court should not consider his Florida Bar  
 21 Public Reprimand because it “was entirely unrelated to his conduct in any courtroom”  
 22 and “he settled the matter to just move past the dispute.” Pltf’s Opp. at 5. However, this  
 23 court has discretion to consider any evidence towards “promoting the orderly  
 24 administration of justice” including whether an out-of-state attorney “will not ‘abide by  
 25 the court’s rules and practices” when ruling on *pro hac vice* admission. *In re Bundy*, 840

26 <sup>1</sup> Mr. Klayman also references an “Affidavit of Negotiated Discipline” that Defendant did not  
 27 cite in its motion. However, Mr. Klayman’s claim that he withdrew the document was found to  
 28 be a clear misrepresentation in *In re Bundy*, where the district court found Mr. Klayman  
 “provided false information to this court by stating that he withdrew his affidavit when, in fact,  
 the Hearing Committee rejected it.” *Bundy*, 840 F.3d at 1044 (emphasis added).

