WHY HAVE NEARLY ALL UTAH JUSTICES SINCE 1960 DELIBERATELY VIOLATED THEIR SWORN OATH OF OFFICE SINCE 1960 BY DEPRIVING ALL UTAH BAR MEMBERS OF THEIR U.S. CONST. DUE PROCESS?

UTAH SUPREME COURT JUSTICES TAKE OATH TO UPHOLD U.S. CONSTITUTION AS SUPREME LAW, AND FLOOR BENEATH WHICH RIGHTS CANNOT GO. ***STATE V BRIGGS*** 2008 UT 83¶26. Ut. Con. Art. IV sec. 10
"¶ 26 Nevertheless, the protections in the federal Constitution provide a *constitutional floor, which, if Utah's Constitution or laws provide a lesser level of protection, renders interpretation of Utah's Constitution unnecessary.* In other words, if the challenged state action violates the federal Constitution, we need not reach the question of….[WE] resolve the case with reference only to the federal Constitution." [emphasis added]
Justices blame prosecuted lawyers for inadequate arguments, for Justices' knowing U.S. law violations.

1968 U.S. SUPREME COURT-DEFINED U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL-DUE PROCESS FOR LAWYERS. ***In the Matter of John Ruffalo, Jr*. 390 U.S. 544, 550, 551, 88 S.Ct. 1222, 20 L.Ed.2d 117 (1968)(" Disbarment, designed to protect the public, is a punishment or penalty imposed on the lawyer." …."These are adversary proceedings of a quasi-criminal nature."**

1960 TIL NOW UTAH"JUSTICES" SUPREME COURT DUE PROCESS STANDARDS FOR ALL PAST AND PRESENT UTAH BAR MEMBERS. **Rule 14-501 (c)** "*Formal disciplinary and disability proceedings are civil in nature."*

Justices Durham, Durrant, Lee, Oaks, Pearce, etc ALL knowingly willfully do nothing to apply U.S. Supreme court standards to lawyer licenses.

1960 Utah Justice Wade in a dissent tells how all Utah justices knowingly eviscerated all Utah State Bar members U.S. Constitutional Due Process protections in their licenses.

In re MacFarlane, 350 P.2d 631, 636-37, 10 Utah 2d 217 (Utah, 1960)(J Wade dissent)

[mere preponderance of evidence displaces "quasi criminal" "clear and convincing" evidence]

"To disbar an attorney is a very serious matter indeed. It not only may deprive him of gaining a livelihood for himself and a dependent family, but it may, and usually does, result in preventing him from making available all antecedent preparation, although that may cover practically the period of a lifetime. In no other calling are such far-reaching consequences visited upon a delinquent who has not been found guilty of some felonious act. The rule, therefore, that the evidence should be clear and convincing is based upon a most solid foundation. * * *.' (Emphasis ours.) 48 Utah 163, 167, 158 P. 778, 779. [48 Utah 163, 158 P. 779]

[court presumption is one of lawyer guilt, eliminates Prosecutor burden, instead of quasi criminal presumed lawyer innocence]

If the presumption [of guilt] shifts the burden of proof in a disciplinary proceeding the same as in a civil action, then neither clear and convincing proof, nor a preponderance of the evidence or even substantial evidence is required to disbar an attorney where such a presumption is involved. This is entirely contrary to and inconsistent with the requirement of clear and convincing proof and allows an attorney to be disbarred without substantial proof that he has not always acted strictly in accordance with legal ethics. Such would seem to be a very harsh and tragic result as clearly pointed out in In re Hanson as quoted above. So a different rule should apply in a disciplinary proceeding than in a civil action which merely determines property rights.

[national norms are disregarded]

Accordingly it is generally recognized that there is a presumption of innocence in a disciplinary proceeding involving a license to practice law. In such cases this court recognizes that clear and convincing evidence is required and it is universally recognized that at least something more than a preponderance of the evidence is required to disbar or suspend a license to practice law."

In 1993 the Utah Justices "root" Utah law into Mormon church history, ***Society of Separationists, Inc. v. Whitehead***, 870 P.2d 916, 921 (Utah, 1993) de facto displacing Ut. Terr. Sup. Ct. common law of u.s. constitution and law as a U.S. territory specifically rejecting church priesthood authority and law. *See Utah territorial supreme court in Moroni v. Green.*