



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE

CARTER PAGE, an individual,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	C.A. No. S20C-07-030 CAK
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
OATH INC., a corporation,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

RULE TO SHOW CAUSE

Pursuant to Delaware Superior Court Civil Rule 90.1, the Court *sua sponte* is issuing this Rule to Show Cause why the permission to practice in this case issued to L. Lin Wood, Jr., Esquire should not be revoked. The following appears to the Court:

1) In this case alleging Defendant defamed Plaintiff, the Court gave Mr. Wood permission pursuant to Delaware Superior Court Civil Rule 90.1 to appear as attorney for Plaintiff, *pro hac vice* by order dated August 18, 2020. The order granted Mr. Wood’s motion, which contained the typical agreement to abide by all State and local rules, the Delaware Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct¹ and the Principles of Professionalism for Delaware Lawyers.²

2) It appears to the Court that, since the granting of Mr. Wood’s motion he, has engaged in conduct in other jurisdictions, which, had it occurred in Delaware, would violate the Delaware Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct (“DRPC”).

¹Prof. Cond. R. (Jan. 1, 2019).
²Prim. Prof. (Nov. 1, 2003).

*Feehan and Derrick Van Orden v. Wisconsin Elections Commission, et al.*³ In that case it appears:

- a. The suit was filed on behalf of a person who had not authorized it.
- b. The Complaint and related papers had multiple deficiencies as

outlined in an order dated December 20, 2020 issued by The Honorable Pamela Pepper:

- (i) The Order indicated the filings had been forwarded to defense counsel "...at the following address..." with no addresses listed.
- (ii) Documents were allegedly filed under seal, but were not.
- (iii) The Complaint requesting a temporary restraining order was not verified or supported by an appropriate affidavit, as required by Court Rules.
- (iv) The Complaint contained no certification of efforts to notify the adverse parties, as required by Court Rules.
- (v) Apparently, a motion for declaratory relief was filed in draft form.
- (vi) The papers filed in Wisconsin asked for various injunctive remedies, but did not ask for a hearing.
- (vii) While the pleadings, including a proposed order, asks for emergency relief and an "expedited" injunction, nothing indicates whether the plaintiffs were asking the Court to act more quickly than normal, or why.

c. In a response to defendants' Motion to Dismiss, which was not signed by Mr. Wood, but which was filed while he was one of the counsel of record, a citation for a case, including a quotation was found by the Court to be fictitious. The citation was to a point of law critical to the case.

³2020 WL 7250219 (U.S. Dist. Ct., E.D. Wisc. (Dec. 9, 2020).

3) The Georgia Litigation

a. Mr. Wood is Plaintiff in the case of *L. Lin Wood, Jr. v. Brad Rattensperger, et al.*, 2020 WL 6817513 (U.S. Dist. Ct., N. D. Georgia, Atlanta Division Nov. 20, 2020). In that case, Mr. Wood sought, *inter alia*, to prevent Georgia's certification of the votes in the general election for President of the United States. In its opinion denying the relief sought by Plaintiff, the Court said:

Viewed in comparison to the lack of any demonstrable harm to Wood, this Court finds no basis in fact or law to grant him the relief he seeks. (Emphasis supplied).

b. Mr. Wood's conduct in filing this suit which the Court found had no basis in "fact or law" may violate DRPC Rule 3.1:

"A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so..."

c. The False Affidavit

Mr. Wood filed or caused to be filed the affidavit of Russell James Ramsland, Jr. in the Georgia litigation which contained materially false information, misidentifying the counties as to which claimed fraudulent voting information occurred.

d. Mr. Wood's conduct in filing this false affidavit violates DRPC 1.1 (Competence), 3.1 (Meritorious Claims and Contentions), 3.3 (Candor to the Tribunal), 4.1(a) (Truthfulness in Statements/False Statement of Material Fact), and Misconduct (Dishonesty and Deceit).

4) The Wisconsin Litigation

Mr. Wood is one of several counsel for plaintiffs in the case of *William*

d. The foregoing conduct in the Wisconsin case appears to violate DRPC 1.1 (Competence), 3.1 (Meritorious Claims and Contentions), 3.3 (Candor to the Tribunal), 4.1(a) (Truthfulness), and 8.4(c) (Misconduct).

5) All of the foregoing gives the Court concerns as to the appropriateness of continuing the order granting Mr. Wood authorization to appear in this Court *pro hac vice*.

6) Mr. Wood and local counsel shall have until January 6, 2021 to respond to this Rule to Show Cause. If defendant has a position on the Rule, defendant shall file it in writing by the same date.

7) Currently in this case oral argument on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is scheduled for Wednesday, January 13, 2021 at 9:30 a.m. The Court will hear counsel on that date in response to this Rule to Show Cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


Craig A. Karsnitz

cc: Prothonotary
All Counsel of Record

FILED PROTHONOTARY
SUSSEX COUNTY
2020 DEC 18 P 3:03

ED PROTHONOTARY
SUSSEX COUNTY
0 DEC 18 P 2:20