PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY RECORD

Board Intake, Preservation, and Rule 10(c) Referral Request Concerning Associate Justice Rick E. Lawrence

Filed August 18, 2026 at 12:54 a.m. ET | Public-safe summary | Confidential source packet withheld from public posting

RECORD STATUS	TRANSMISSION	SOURCE PACKET
Complaint and routing request filed. No finding, adjudication, or referral decision is represented.	**Sent August 18, 2026 at 12:54 a.m.** To the Overseers Clerk, with the Board, Bar Counsel service, opposing counsel, and the opposing party copied.	**30-page confidential packet.** Completed form, verified supplemental statement, and Exhibits A-F. The raw packet is not included in the public site.

1. What the submission expressly acknowledges

The filing does **not** ask the Board of Overseers to reverse, modify, or enforce any ruling. It also does not ask the Board to create direct disciplinary jurisdiction over an incumbent justice. The filing states that Maine Bar Rule 10(c) places incumbent justices and judges outside the Board's direct disciplinary jurisdiction and asks for a written jurisdictional disposition, preservation, and correct routing or coordination with the Committee on Judicial Conduct.

The filing identifies Maine Bar Rule 10(b) as a preservation and coordination reason for maintaining the dated record. It identifies M.R. Prof. Conduct 8.4(d) only as a potential later lawyer-discipline issue if and when Rule 10 permits Board jurisdiction.

The filing also acknowledges that the June 23 order was signed “For the Court” and may reflect a collective decision. It asks for investigation of Associate Justice Lawrence's responsibility in authenticating and issuing it; it does not claim without investigation that he acted alone or authored every word.

FILED COMPLAINT / REQUEST FOR REFERRAL — NOT AN ADJUDICATED FINDING

2. Core concern preserved for review

The submission asks whether institutional authority was used in a manner prejudicial to the administration of justice when repeated implementation filings were characterized as wasting institutional resources while the enforcement pathway previously identified by the Law Court had not produced prompt, practical action.

The preserved sequence is: an acknowledged trial-court jurisdictional blockage; a May 12 direction to proceed in the “usual course”; continuing absence of an action-capable implementation process; new and ongoing child-impact events; and a June 23 order labeling the resulting filings repetitive or frivolous while authorizing future documents to be docketed without judicial presentment.

3. The “UNdue course” feedback loop alleged in the filing

The complaint describes the record volume as a consequence of unresolved process rather than the cause of the underlying problem.

1	**Unresolved implementation issue** Contact, therapy, transport, medical or school access, scheduling, or records.
2	**Email or provider inquiry** A written request is sent to create a usable adult coordination record.
3	**Motion or notice** When the issue remains unresolved, a filing is used to request action or preserve the event.
4	**Rejection, correction, service, and relation-back work** The filing path produces technical notices, corrected packets, proposed orders, exhibits, and deadlines.
5	**More preservation work** Unclear docket treatment, nonpresentment, or continuing events generate another source packet or oversight submission.
6	**The multiplied volume is cited against the filer** The complaint asks whether the institution then uses the record volume created by nonresolution to justify further nonaction.

“Usual course” becomes UNdue course when the process is structurally unable or unwilling to deliver a timely, action-capable hearing.

4. Requested action

1. Accept the completed form as an intake and preservation submission and issue a written disposition expressly applying Maine Bar Rule 10(c).

2. Preserve the complaint and exhibits for possible Rule 10(b) relevance and for any Board-Committee coordination record.

3. Transmit or formally refer the submission to the Committee on Judicial Conduct, or identify the exact procedure for lodging the same complete packet without loss of the present dated record.

4. Preserve or provide the complete appellate and trial-court record identified in the filing, including the May 12 and June 23 orders and the implementation posture after May 12.

5. Request that the proper authority examine the basis for labeling the filings frivolous and wasteful and for authorizing nonpresentment while the May 12 enforcement pathway had not produced prompt practical implementation.

6. Provide a written disposition identifying jurisdiction, transmission or referral status, preservation, and the scope of any coordination.

5. Source packet filed with the confidential submission

EX.	DOCUMENT	PUBLIC-SAFE PURPOSE
A	May 12, 2026 Law Court Order on Motion to Permit Trial Court Action	Preserves the order recognizing a trial-court enforcement path and directing usual-course action.
B	June 23, 2026 Law Court Order on Pending Motions	Preserves the “waste the Court’s time and resources” language, blanket denial, and future nonpresentment direction.
C	February 16, 2026 implementation and compliance email chain	Preserves early requests for contact, therapy, transport, school, medical, insurance, and records logistics.
D	Motion for Interim Order Implementing and Clarifying Logistics	Preserves narrow requested protocols intended to reduce conflict and repeated filings.
E	August 17, 2026 Open Letter to Rick E. Lawrence	Preserves the public, non-ex parte accountability demand and the continuing implementation record.
F	August 17, 2026 sent-email record	Preserves simultaneous distribution through the Executive Clerk and to the parties, counsel, judicial administration, the Attorney General, media, and public-accountability recipients.

6. Transmission proof

The Gmail sent-message record shows transmission on **Tuesday, August 18, 2026 at 12:54 a.m.** to the Overseers Clerk, with the Board, Bar Counsel service address, Patrick S. Bedard, and Amanda Morse copied. The subject was “Board Intake, Preservation, and Rule 10(c) Referral Request Concerning Associate Justice Rick E. Lawrence.” The message requested confirmation of receipt and an assigned complaint, referral, or intake number.

The transmitting email states that the submission seeks a written jurisdictional disposition, preservation of the full complaint and exhibits, and transmission or referral to the proper judicial-conduct authority rather than another administrative dead end.

A redacted public copy of that one-page sent-message record is provided separately. Email addresses and the Gmail account URL are removed; the confidential 30-page attachment itself is not published.

7. Public-release boundary

The source packet contains private contact information, date-of-birth information, child-identifying information, and confidential disciplinary-submission material. It remains preserved as the controlling confidential source. This public summary does not reproduce those details.

The existence of a complaint, intake, or referral request proves that concerns were submitted. It does not prove that the Board or Committee accepted jurisdiction, opened an investigation, found misconduct, or agreed with any allegation.

Controlling sources: the confidential filed packet; the native sent email; signed court orders; official dockets; native implementation communications; provider and school records; and electronic-filing notices.