

GCF 26-240: COMPLAINT VS. DISMISSAL

Side-by-Side Record Comparison

Purpose: identify material differences between the May 25, 2026 submission and the July 21, 2026 dismissal. This exhibit does not decide intent or misconduct. It identifies record questions requiring independent review.

Central record conflict: The May 25 submission repeatedly and expressly disclaimed any request that the Board decide custody, parenting time, appellate merits, or underlying court issues. The July 21 dismissal nevertheless characterized the submission as asking the Board to re-litigate those matters.

Issue	May 25 complaint / submitted record	July 21 dismissal	Question for independent review
Scope of grievance	"I am not asking the Board to decide custody, parenting time, child support, the pending appeals, or any merits issue reserved to a court." Full Packet p. 2.	"Here, you asked the Board ... to re-litigate Protection from Abuse and Family Matter cases currently before the courts." Dismissal p. 1.	How did the expressly stated scope become a request to re-litigate the underlying cases?
Attorney conduct vs. client conduct	The complaint identified Bedard-specific theories: counsel-level ratification of gatekeeping; record-shaping; disputed factual framing; procedural burden; implementation conduct; candor and fairness concerns. Full Packet pp. 2, 4, 6-8.	"You blame Attorney Bedard for the actions taken by his client and attempt to impute her conduct to him." Dismissal pp. 1-2.	Which attorney-specific allegations were addressed separately from allegations concerning the client?
Facts and governing rules	The packet expressly invoked candor, fairness, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice and incorporated the May 15 complaint's professional-conduct theories and evidence map. Full Packet pp. 2-4, 6-14.	"In your filing ... you have alleged no facts or law that equate to MRPC violations by Attorney Bedard." Dismissal p. 1.	Was there a rule-by-rule or allegation-by-allegation review? What documents support the conclusion?
Requested action	Requested a substantial professional-conduct investigation, review of native source records, and consideration of interviews with Glenn Anderson, Esq. and Daniel Pierce, LCSW. Full Packet pp. 2-5, 13-14.	The dismissal treated the requested action as re-litigation or an appeal from the underlying courts. Dismissal pp. 1-2.	Why was a disciplinary investigation request treated as a request for custody or appellate adjudication?
Evidence and support	The packet incorporated a 39-page submission, a master timeline, source categories, court filings, service emails, provider/school records, and named witnesses; it offered native materials by the Board's preferred method. Full Packet pp. 2-5, 13-39.	The dismissal stated that no support had been provided for allegations about Bedard's client and did not identify which attachments or pages were reviewed. Dismissal pp. 1-2.	Which attachments and pages were opened? Were the incorporated source maps and named witnesses considered?
Actual investigation requested	The transmittal and addendum repeatedly demanded a substantial investigation, review of native source records, and consideration of named witnesses and documentary audit trails. Transmittal; Full Packet pp. 2-5, 13-14.	The dismissal states that information was reviewed and that the grievance investigation did not establish a violation, but it identifies no witness contact, source request, document-access history, response from counsel, or other investigative step. Dismissal pp. 1-2.	Was an actual investigation conducted, or was the matter resolved through paper review and characterization alone?
Acknowledged review window	The complaint was submitted May 25. On July 8, Bar Counsel asked that no additional information be submitted while the grievance filing was reviewed. Email record; July 8 letter.	The dismissal was issued July 21 and stated that the May 25 complaint had been reviewed. Dismissal p. 1.	What review steps occurred, and what was the complete record before the respondent on July 21?

Visual Comparison 1 - Express Scope Limitation vs. Re-litigation Characterization

The complaint expressly limits the requested review to professional conduct. The dismissal acknowledges the written limitation, then states that re-litigation is nevertheless the action sought.

May 25 complaint - Full Packet p. 2	July 21 dismissal - p. 1
Part D: Information about your grievance complaint This complaint concerns Attorney Patrick S. Bedard's conduct as counsel for the opposing party in long-running child-impact family litigation. I am not asking the Board to decide custody, parenting time, child support, the pending appeals, or any merits issue reserved to a court. I ask the Board to investigate whether the conduct described in my attached complaint, this required form, the Supplemental Investigation Addendum, and the FULL Master Timeline violates the Maine Rules of Professional Conduct, including duties relating to candor, fairness, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice. This is not a one-event complaint. I allege a course of business and litigation practice spanning approximately 15.5 years that has repeatedly converted court orders, shared parental rights, records access, contact implementation, counseling/reunification, school access, medical/insurance access, and appellate record access into delay, friction, nonresponse, and record-shaping. The foreseeable result has been generational harm to my family: degradation of the parent-child relationship, continued conflict, procedural exhaustion, economic impairment, and child-impacting instability that cannot be repaired by later paper rulings. The attached May 15, 2026 complaint is incorporated as the principal narrative. The attached Supplemental Investigation Addendum and the FULL Master Timeline are incorporated as the investigation map. The Board should not treat this as a set of disconnected emails or isolated court filings. The timeline shows notice, recurrence, repeated attempts to obtain logistics and compliance, and continuing consequences. Key chronology summarized: prior grievance GCF-25-524 raised material misrepresentations/unsupported assertions, procedural gamesmanship, implementation friction, and record-shaping; the Feb. 11, 2026 District Court order preserved shared parental rights/records access and provided daily electronic contact, continued reunification therapy, and in-person-contact progression; Feb. 14-20 written implementation requests sought contact, therapy attendance/logistics, transport, school/medical/insurance records, and authorizations; Feb. 18 forward I filed/served expedited, audio/record, clarification, and interim logistics motions; Apr. 20-25 a provider-confirmed counseling/contact appointment was displaced and contact was framed as the child's practical veto; Apr. 27-28 school attendance and eFiling barriers continued; May 1-15 additional counseling, school-access, attendance, Law Court record, Tyler/eFileMaine, and implementation issues were documented and served; on May 14 Daniel Pierce, LCSW stated that a scheduled provider meeting had been moved after he had 'worked this out with Amanda,' while Respondent was copied; on May 15 another school tardy issue was documented to Respondent and Ms. Morse. Requested review: open and conduct a substantial investigation into Respondent's professional conduct, including review of the full timeline and source records; native emails; court filings and service emails; Law Court/trial-court docket activity; eScribers/Office of 26-240 Patrick S. Bedard - page 2	Please understand that an attorney's primary duty is to his client, and most of an attorney's ethical obligations under the MRPC inure to the client's benefit, not to opposing parties (such as yourself). There are also provisions under the MRPC that are designed to guarantee the honesty and integrity of attorneys, and to ensure that they comply with their obligations as officers of the court. While there are provisions of the MRPC that relate to an attorney's ethical obligations to opposing counsel and unrepresented people, those rules correspond primarily to the attorney's obligations of truthfulness and the fair administration of justice. The information reviewed in this disciplinary investigation failed to establish that Attorney Bedard acted in a way that violated those provisions of the MRPC. Here, you asked the Board of Overseers of the Bar's Bar Counsel's office to re-litigate Protection from Abuse and Family Matter cases currently before the courts. While you write you do not request the Board decide those issues, it is the action you seek. In your filing, however, you have alleged no facts or law that equate to MRPC violations by Attorney Bedard. For example, you blame Attorney Bedard for his client's conduct, saying his client (also your former spouse) violated communication and other orders of the courts and rules

Source documents are reproduced in full elsewhere in this packet. The dismissal photographs will be replaced when a cleaner scan is supplied.

Visual Comparison 2 - Professional-Conduct Investigation vs. Client-Conduct Framing

The complaint identifies counsel-level conduct and requests investigation of the full record. The dismissal largely analyzes client conduct, lawful client instructions, and the issuing court's jurisdiction.

May 25 supplemental addendum - Full Packet p. 4

July 21 dismissal - p. 2

SUPPLEMENTAL INVESTIGATION ADDENDUM

26-240 Patrick S. Bedard - Maine Board of Overseers of the Bar

Justin A. Tahai - May 25, 2026 - /s/ Justin A. Tahai

This addendum is incorporated into the required Grievance Complaint Form and the May 15, 2026 complaint concerning Attorney Patrick S. Bedard. It is intended to remove any reasonable excuse for treating the matter as a narrow personality dispute, an isolated litigation complaint, or a request that the Board decide custody. It is a request for a substantial professional-conduct investigation.

I allege that Attorney Bedard's course of professional conduct has materially contributed to generational harm to my family over approximately 15.5 years. The conduct pattern includes use of procedural leverage, nonresponse, record-shaping, filtered logistics, and implementation friction in a child-impact case where delay itself changes the facts on the ground. Time lost in a parent-child relationship is not neutral and cannot be restored by a later finding that someone should have acted sooner.

The FULL Master Timeline is incorporated as the Board's investigation map. It is not rhetorical background. It is a date-indexed, source-oriented roadmap showing the long arc of access-control, records-access, school/medical/counseling, eFiling, transcript/audio, appellate, trial-court, and implementation issues. The May 14, 2026 v12M no-loss supplement is likewise incorporated because it preserves the most recent implementation burden, Rule 3(d), FM-218, Tyler/eFileMaine, and Law Court/trial-court sequence.

The prior GCF-25-524 review did not, in my view, substantially investigate the complete pattern. I am therefore submitting the official form, the complaint, the full master timeline, and this addendum so the Board can no longer reasonably say the record was unclear, fragmented, or unsupported. A professional-conduct review that looks only at isolated fragments will miss the harm mechanism.

The core issue is not that I lost rulings or disagree with counsel advocacy. The core issue is whether a lawyer may, as a course of business, repeatedly benefit from ambiguity, delay, nonresponse, disputed factual framing, child-gatekeeping interpretations, and procedural exhaustion while the practical effect is to erode a court-ordered parent-child relationship and shared parental rights.

I request that Bar Counsel substantially investigate, at minimum, the following: (1) the complete GCF-25-524 history and current 26-240 submission; (2) the full master timeline and native source records; (3) the February 11, 2026 order and counsel's post-order implementation posture; (4) the Feb. 14-20, 2026 implementation-request emails; (5) the Feb. 18, 2026 expedited/audio/clarification/interim-logistics filings; (6) the March/April transcript-audio and record-completion issues; (7) the April 20-25 provider-confirmed appointment displacement and child-gatekeeper framing; (8) the April-May school, attendance, medical, and records-access issues; (9) the May 8 counseling late/early-departure problem; (10) the May 14 scheduling/billing/control email chain with Daniel Pierce; and (11) Respondent's full file and communications

Justin A. Tahai
July 21, 2026
Page 2

applicable to her.¹ You then assert that the conduct of Attorney Bedard's client is imputable to Attorney Bedard. However, in the first instance you have provided no support that your allegations about Attorney Bedard's client are true. Even if you had provided evidence that the allegations about Attorney Bedard's client are valid, a violation of court orders is under the jurisdiction of the court that issued them, or on appeal to the authority above it (such as the Maine Supreme Judicial Court). The Board of Overseers of the Bar, however, has no jurisdiction to hear appeals from Maine courts or to serve as a panel for re-litigating issues before them.

Despite your objections to Attorney Bedard's methods, he was ethically required to follow his client's lawful instructions. Attorney Bedard, further, is not responsible for his client's behavior unless it approaches limits that were not demonstrated by the information reviewed in the grievance investigation. The information reviewed in the grievance investigation did not show that Attorney Bedard failed to in his duties to his client. Further, Attorney Bedard's professional representation of his client does not violate ethical rules. Since the information reviewed in this grievance investigation does not support that Attorney Bedard's conduct violated the ethics rules, I must close this complaint.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Maine Bar Rules, I am dismissing this complaint. As a consequence of that dismissal, the matter will be kept confidential by the Board of Overseers of the Bar and Bar Counsel. See also the attached "Dismissal Guidelines."

Please note that the Maine Bar Rules permit you to have a public (non-attorney) member review this dismissal. Your **written request must be made within 21 days of receipt of this dismissal letter**. You can send your request via email to the Board Clerk at Clerk@mebaroverseers.org or by U.S. Mail to the address listed on this letterhead. Any such review will be conducted by a public member of the Grievance Commission or the Board of Overseers of the Bar. By letter, the Clerk of the Board will subsequently notify you and Attorney

Source documents are reproduced in full elsewhere in this packet. The dismissal photographs will be replaced when a cleaner scan is supplied.

Focused Review Questions

1. What actual investigative steps occurred beyond reading or summarizing the submitted papers?
2. Did the respondent open and review all 39 pages of the May 25 full packet before signing the dismissal?
3. Did the respondent review the May 15 complaint, the incorporated supplemental addendum, and the embedded timelines?
4. What internal summary, template, or characterization was used to reduce the complaint to client conduct and re-litigation?
5. Why did the dismissal not address the express scope limitation or the listed attorney-specific professional-conduct theories?
6. Was Attorney Bedard asked to respond? If so, was his response provided to the complainant before dismissal as required by any applicable procedure?
7. What facts and reasons supported the conclusion that the submission alleged no facts or law equating to an MRPC violation?
8. Were the identified witnesses or native source materials considered or requested?

No conclusion about intent should be drawn without the native grievance file, access records, internal communications, drafts, and the respondent's explanation. The document conflict itself, however, is visible from the face of the submitted packet and dismissal.