

GCF 26-240: Complaint vs. July 21, 2026 Dismissal

Public record comparison. This exhibit identifies facial conflicts and review questions; it does not determine intent or misconduct.

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	Expressly disclaimed asking the Board to decide custody, parenting time, child support, appeals, or court merits.	Said the complainant asked the Board to re-litigate PFA and family matters.	How did the express scope limitation become a re-litigation request?
Attorney vs. client conduct	Identified counsel-level theories: alleged ratification, record-shaping, factual framing, procedural burden, implementation conduct, candor, and fairness.	Primarily described blame for the client's conduct and an attempt to impute client conduct to counsel.	Which attorney-specific allegations were separately addressed?
Facts and rules	Invoked candor, fairness, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice; incorporated an evidence map and newer complaint.	Said no facts or law equated to MRPC violations by Bedard.	Was there an allegation-by-allegation or rule-by-rule analysis?
Evidence	39-page packet, timelines, source categories, filings, service records, and named witnesses; native sources offered.	Did not identify which attachments, pages, witnesses, or source requests were reviewed.	Which documents and pages were opened, and were witnesses or native records considered?
Investigation	Requested substantial investigation, native-source review, and witness consideration.	Referred to a grievance investigation but identified no witness contact, document request, respondent response, audit trail, or other step.	What actual investigative work occurred beyond paper review?

Focused questions for public-member or independent review

1. What investigative steps occurred beyond reading or summarizing the submitted papers?
2. Were all 39 pages of the May 25 packet opened and reviewed?
3. Were the May 15 complaint, May 25 addendum, timelines, and embedded source maps considered?
4. What internal summary, template, or characterization produced the re-litigation framing?
5. Why did the dismissal not address the express scope limitation and attorney-specific conduct theories?
6. Was Patrick S. Bedard asked to respond? If so, what procedure governed access to that response?
7. What factual and legal analysis supported the conclusion that no alleged facts or law equated to an MRPC violation?
8. Were Glenn Anderson, Daniel Pierce, or any native source materials contacted, requested, or reviewed?

No conclusion about intent should be drawn without the native grievance file, access records, internal communications, drafts, and the decision-maker's explanation. The document conflict, however, can be evaluated from the face of the submitted packet and dismissal.