

Re: Fw: case #26-13570 -Follow up on Conflicts of Interest and New and independent Bar complaint on attorney Scott Davis

From: Chris Hanson (christophhanson77@gmail.com)

To: cwackes@floridabar.org; acap@floridabar.org; morr@orcook.com; paige@greenleelawtampa.com; rsb@searcylaw.com; jdoyle@floridabar.org; josh@jpfirm.com

Cc: scott@hunterlawgroup.com; jkelley@floridabar.org; cahanson77@yahoo.com; truthoverchaos@outlook.com

Date: Thursday, July 23, 2026 at 10:56 AM EDT

July 23, 2026

Sent by email

Dear Mr. Wackes, Mr. Kelley, and Bar leadership:

I will be direct. The Bar's own policies command a review, an explanation, and communication. Across three files, I have received none of the three. The files are: RFA No. 25-6861, my sworn February 18, 2025 complaint against Scott Davis, opposing counsel in my dissolution case; RFA No. 26-13570, my sworn May 24, 2026 resubmission of that complaint; and File No. 2026-10,395(13F), Judge Kelly Ayers's November 24, 2025 complaint against me. I regret that this email has to be so long. However, the relevant events will continue to expand at an increasing rate given the Bar's current course of action and my commitment to obtaining some remedy for my family. I continue to pursue efficiency in these matters and hope you all will consider the same.

1. My review request was timely, and your policy is mandatory. Bar Counsel closed RFA No. 26-13570 by a June 16, 2026 letter. I requested review in writing on July 4, 2026 (day 18) and again on July 11 (day 25). I have heard nothing from the Bar in response. Standing Board Policy 15.75(e) provides that the chief branch discipline counsel or ACAP/Intake Department director "will review bar counsel's decision to close an inquiry or discipline case at staff level only on the written request of the complainant made within 30 days." Both requests fell inside the window. Policy 15.75(c) adds: "At each level of review, bar counsel will inform the complaining witness and respondent or respondent's counsel of actions taken or decisions made." Your own complaint form makes the same promise to every Floridian: "If the inquiry/complaint is closed by bar counsel, the complainant may request a review of the closure in accordance with the policy," and "you will receive a written explanation of the reasons for the closure." What is the Bar's position on compliance? No review window should be deemed waived while the Bar declines to answer.

2. I seek only what the Rules require of the Bar. Rule 3-7.4(i) provides that a complaining witness has no right to appeal, and I know what *Cole v. Owens*, 766 So. 2d 287 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000), holds. This letter does not ask a court to compel discipline. It asks the Bar to operate the review process its Board of Governors created and its complaint form promises. Standing Board Policy 15.91 reinforces that process with "the reasons the file was closed" and "a status update every 90 days." Your office has already shown me what compliance looks like. On May 6, 2025, Bar Counsel answered my identical request on RFA 25-6861 in six days, attached the governing policy, identified the reviewer, and stated a timeline: "Each of these reviews may take as long as 60 days to complete." The review then ran. The Director of Intake issued a written decision. The Chair of Grievance Committee 13A wrote that "the Bar's policy requires that I review the file" and confirmed that "an additional review of this matter has taken place." Even the Bar's final answer, that review had ended, came in writing with rules cited. In 2026 the identical request has produced nothing. That is a choice, and it conflicts with the Bar's core duty.

3. The closure you refuse to explain cites no rule and made no finding. Rules 3-7.3(a) and (d) require bar counsel to give the complaining witness the reasons an inquiry is closed. The June 16 letter cites no Rule Regulating The Florida Bar and finds no allegation untrue. It rests entirely on the proposition that my allegations "involve a dispute over which a court has jurisdiction." That sentence describes every rule of candor, discovery fairness, and meritorious claims in Chapter 4. Those rules can only be violated in a dispute before a court. The resubmitted complaint was sworn. Rule 3-7.3(b) says bar counsel "must investigate the allegations contained in any written complaint that is signed under oath." The Bar closed it in twenty-three days. Nothing in the file disputes the facts as alleged.

The closure is worse on the present facts. The misconduct is continuing before the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, and the Bar has formal notice of it. My May 24, 2026 complaint quoted Judge Ayers's own words from the bench: "I'm not the Florida Bar. I don't discipline lawyers." (Apr. 22, 2025 Tr. 35; complaint Ex. G.) It documented that her successor, Judge Matthew Felix, deferred scheduling to Mr. Davis. Pressed to address the misconduct and make findings, he answered: "I can make the ruling without findings of facts, and if the Second DCA says I need to find facts, then I'll do so." (Complaint Ex. H at 181.) It named the result. The Bar deferred to the court. The court deferred to the Bar. The conduct continued and escalated. The court says discipline is the Bar's job. The Bar says the dispute belongs to the court. Mr. Davis passes through the gap, all while my family suffers from the obvious and continuing ethical violations.

The first complaint was closed in six days in February 2025. In May 2026 your counsel told a court that "the Bar did not act on [the February 2025] complaint and so did not share it with or request a response from Mr. Davis." In the interim, the Bar represented significant review, investigation, and

oversight efforts related to that same complaint. On May 6, 2025, Bar Counsel wrote that the file would be reviewed under the board's policy by the director of ACAP, with each review taking "as long as 60 days to complete." On July 16, 2025, the Director of Intake issued a written decision affirming the closure after, in her words, "reviewing the transcripts of the hearings which are in the case docket and having carefully considered all of the information contained within the file." On September 23, 2025, the Chair of Grievance Committee 13A wrote that she had "reviewed the file" and that "an additional review of this matter has taken place."

On September 24, 2025, the Director of Intake summarized the whole course: "The review of your allegations against Mr. Davis included investigation by a Senior Staff Attorney, review of the closure by the undersigned as Director of Intake, and a review by the Chair of Grievance Committee 13A." An investigation by a Senior Staff Attorney, confirmed through two further levels of review, cannot be reconciled with "did not act."

Obviously, the Bar's representations over those several months directly conflicts with the Bar's current story. The Bar seems to tell the story that fits its intentions at any given time, whatever is consistent with their objective. In this case, it is disposing of Davis's misconduct without applying the Rules.

4. You know what your silence is costing. The Bar has been on notice for seventeen months of what is happening in this litigation. While the Bar declined to examine Mr. Davis's conduct, that conduct continued. My sworn May 24 complaint documents it rule by rule. It now reaches my children. On June 25, 2026, after nearly three years of separate homes, 50/50 custody, with by all accounts, healthy, thriving children, the Court decides to force a guardian ad litem into our lives. The order contains no finding of parental unfitness. It was entered over my documented objection and is now the subject of a pending motion for reconsideration. My core financial discovery, requested May 16, 2024, remains unresolved after more than two years. Mr. Davis's motions have moved. The facts are clear the Judge Felix is simply retaliating against me for exposing attorney and judicial misconduct.

I have practiced law in this state for nineteen years without a blemish. My correspondence has also told you plainly what this period has cost me, including the toll on my health. The Bar has not responded even to that. The Bar tells the public it exists to "protect the public by prosecuting unethical attorneys." It is an official arm of the Supreme Court, exercising that court's exclusive disciplinary jurisdiction under article V, section 15 of the Florida Constitution. A regulator that knows what its inaction enables cannot call silence neutrality. The facts of this case are clearly inconvenient for the Bar and its representatives, but they are not reasonably in dispute or even difficult to find.

5. Mr. Kelley: the file against me shows the same disregard, in the opposite direction. Judge Ayers's complaint against me, File No. 2026-10,395(13F), has now been open 241 days. On March 20, 2026, you announced I would be subpoenaed for a sworn statement expected to take three to four hours. No subpoena was ever served or scheduled. I have offered in writing, most recently on July 10, 2026, to give that statement and answer the Bar's questions under oath. I have asked in writing more than a dozen times for the Bar to identify a single statement of mine it contends is false. No answer has come to any of it. No one has explained Attorney Joshua Sheridan's assignment to the file. When I contacted him, he disclaimed any knowledge of the complaint.

That silence puts me in an impossible position. I cannot defend myself against an allegation of misconduct that no one can actually describe. For 241 days the Bar has held an open complaint over my head. It will not identify a false statement, produce any evidence, or take the sworn testimony I have offered. An accusation that is never specified can never be answered. It simply hangs there, during the most difficult period of my family's life, doing its work by existing.

I note what Standing Board Policy 15.91 provides: the Bar keeps the complainant informed, expressly including "judicial officers in judicial referrals," with "a status update every 90 days." The accused is promised nothing, and nothing is what I have received. Set this file beside my complaints against Mr. Davis and the pattern completes itself. The lawyer I reported, with sworn, rule-by-rule specificity: closed in six days, then twenty-three for the subsequent complaint, with no investigation and no stated reason. The lawyer a judge reported, with no specified false statement: kept open 241 days and counting. That is a two-tiered system in miniature. Who the parties are has mattered more than what the record shows each attorney did. So I ask directly: has the complaining judicial officer been receiving her 90-day status updates on the file against me while I receive silence? Two update cycles have passed. Identify the false statement, or close the file.

6. When accountability reached the Bar itself, the Bar moved to quash. I subpoenaed four of the Bar's officials, Mr. Courtemanche, Ms. Schuyler, Mr. Kelley, and Mr. Sheridan, to testify in the family case about the handling of these files. They did not appear and answer under oath. Greenberg Traurig appeared for them and moved to quash on May 22, 2026. That motion is the same filing that told the court the Bar "did not act" on my complaint. The other quash motions in that period were resolved within days. The Bar officials' motion alone was carried nearly seven weeks, until July 7, 2026, when it was granted without findings of fact. (Tr. 29:20-31:5.) The testimony was never heard. The evidence it would have supplied stayed out of the record through the June 25 guardian ad litem decision. Among the four was the Director of Intake whose September 24, 2025 representations are quoted above. She never explained them under oath. The Bar spent member resources to keep it that way. An institution confident in its own conduct does not litigate this hard to avoid describing that conduct.

The certified transcript of the July 7 hearing has now been prepared. I direct Bar leadership to four passages.

First, your counsel described the Bar's approach as policy. The Bar "did not engage in back and forth with that counsel because their policy is when that counsel is already in a proceeding, where a Court has primary authority over the parties and the counsel, discipline can happen there, if it's appropriate." (Tr. 6:23-7:3.) He continued: the closure language "refers to not a violation of the rules warranting the imposition of discipline. That doesn't mean there's not a violation of the rules, that means it's not arising to the level where the -- The Bar is going to independently take action, especially in the case where there's an ongoing Trial Judge to monitor the proceedings." (Tr. 7:12-20.) Set those words beside Judge Ayers's from the bench, quoted above: "I'm not the Florida Bar. I don't discipline lawyers." Each oversight body, in its own words, assigns the duty to the other. My sworn complaint documented that gap. Your counsel confirmed it on the record.

Second, your counsel gave the court this account of my first complaint: "It went up a few levels of review as documented in the motion, and they all concurred in the closure." (Tr. 24:8-11.) A complaint that "went up a few levels of review" is not a complaint the Bar "did not act" on. Both statements are the Bar's. I put the contradiction to the court directly. The court answered: "I heard that. I heard that, Mr. Hanson." (Tr. 28:5-6.) The motion was then granted on a single procedural basis, with no findings: "procedurally I don't think it's appropriate to have -- to have those individuals subpoenaed for testimony in the family law case." (Tr. 31:1-3.)

Third, I asked the court whether the finger-pointing would simply continue: "the parallel failures -- and oversight where The Bar is pointing at the Thirteenth Circuit, and the Thirteenth Circuit is pointing at The Bar, that's just going to continue?" The court answered: "I'm not going to answer that question." (Tr. 31:6-18.) The Bar is the one institution that can end it. I ask whether it will.

Fourth, I ask leadership to read what its counsel said while arguing that the Bar's own officials should not testify. Counsel volunteered, of me, "I got a very strong spidey-sense, and I'm not a doctor, but I think there are -- is some emotional mental difficulties happening there." (Tr. 25:8-11.) And: "I hope he takes that opportunity to recalculate and maybe devote better family time than litigation." (Tr. 25:19-21.) The question before the court was whether the Bar's representations about my files could be tested under oath. Mr. Londot is well aware of these problems and the parallel failures I describe. As he's able to avoid answering for his own and the Bar's conduct, he distracts with personal insults and gaslighting.

Counsel retained with member resources baselessly speculated about my mental state and advising me on how to spend time with my children. I ask leadership to state whether those comments reflect the Bar's standards for counsel appearing in its name. I find those comments from a fellow Bar member incredibly inappropriate. As the Bar proceeds in this manner, intent on burying Davis's misconduct, further misconduct will inevitably occur in pursuit of that end. However, given the Bar's status as a litigant, it leaves me helpless against the misconduct that continues to cause significant and unfair harm to my family.

The passages above appear at transcript pages 6-7, 24-25, 28, and 31. The full certified transcript is available on request.

7. What these files are doing to the system you steward. Confidence in Florida's justice system rests on a simple premise: the rules apply to everyone, and the institutions that enforce them answer for how they do it. Measure these files against that premise. A nineteen-year lawyer with an unblemished record brought sworn, specific complaints. They were closed in days, without investigation and without a stated rule. The review your own policy promises has been met with silence. The same lawyer stands accused in a file no one will particularize, held open for 241 days.

If the Bar will do this to one of its own members, with an impeccable reputation, the public is entitled to ask what happens to complainants without legal training. The lesson these files teach Florida lawyers is worse than futility. Reporting misconduct exposes the complainant to retaliation. The Bar has not hidden its refusal to investigate or discipline Mr. Davis, whatever the severity of the documented conduct.

The record shows excusal after excusal and a studied refusal to engage with facts no one has disputed. And the member who kept telling the truth is ignored on and retaliated against for his sworn complaints. The one file the Bar keeps open is the accusation against him, unparticularized at 241 days. It is maintained by the regulator he pays dues to and whose mission his complaints serve. That is the legacy these files are writing. I do not believe it is the legacy the Bar's leadership wants. It is not one the Bar's charter permits: "to inculcate in its members the principles of duty and service to the public, to improve the administration of justice." The correction is simple and entirely within your power: follow your own policies, in writing, now.

8. The record will be complete. Under Rules 3-7.1(a)(4) and 3-7.3(g), closed disciplinary files are public records. Nothing in your rules prohibits a complainant from disclosing this correspondence. Your June 16 letter states that the file of RFA No. 26-13570 "will be disposed of one year from the date of closure." The records of RFA No. 25-6861 were apparently already disposed of while litigation over them was pending. The Bar's Deputy General Counsel confirmed that disposal in writing on June 5, 2026. I again remind you of my preservation requests for all of the Bar's materials and information relating to these cases.

9. What I'm Requesting.

- a. a written statement of whether the Policy 15.75(e) review triggered by my timely July 4 request is underway, who is conducting it, and when it will conclude;

- b. if the Bar's position is that no review will occur, that position in writing, with the authority that displaces Policies 15.75(e) and 15.75(c);
- c. the written explanation of the reasons for the June 16, 2026 closure that Rule 3-7.3 and your complaint form promise, including the rule applied to close a sworn complaint without investigation;
- d. confirmation that no review or reconsideration window is deemed waived while the Bar declines to answer;
- e. confirmation that the complete file of RFA No. 26-13570 will be preserved and not disposed of while related litigation is pending, consistent with my prior preservation demands and with what happened to the records of RFA No. 25-6861;
- f. from Mr. Kelley: a written status of File No. 2026-10,395(13F), the identification of any statement of mine the Bar contends is false, or the closure of that file; and
- g. from Mr. Kelley: a statement of whether status updates on File No. 2026-10,395(13F) have been provided to the complaining judicial officer under Standing Board Policy 15.91 while none were provided to me.

This letter is made for the record.

Respectfully,

Christopher A. Hanson

Florida Bar No. 44094, self-represented

727-409-5738

Dear President Orr, President-elect Greenlee, Past President Baker-Barnes, Executive Director Doyle, and members of the Board of Governors:

President Orr — on June 19, 2026, the day you were sworn in, you pledged: "I pledge to the Florida Supreme Court, to the district, circuit, and county courts, and to our more than 115,000 members, we will work hard to do anything we can to improve our system of justice this year." That same evening, my June 19 email — in the chain below, addressed to you by name — placed before you a documented, sustained failure of the Bar's core function, and asked for nothing more than a conversation. I followed it with a nine-point objection on July 4 (also below). From all of Bar leadership: not one word in response.

Before the history, one thing in fairness to each of you. I want every recipient of this email to have a clean path into this problem, not an excuse out of it. Several of the officer addresses on my June 11, 2026 email proved incorrect and bounced — so some of you may be learning this history for the first time today, and if so, none of what follows is laid at your door. If my June 19 and July 4 emails were filtered, triaged by staff, or lost in the transition between administrations, I accept that explanation too; this email cures it. But what cannot survive today is the position that no one knew. As of this message, every person named above has actual notice, at a verified address, of everything set out below and in the attached record. What happens after today is a decision each of you makes with that record in hand.

I write now to a wider circle of the Bar's leadership because one question — whether any good-faith basis exists for the Bar's refusal to act on documented misconduct — is in its seventeenth month without an answer, and no one at the Bar has yet even attempted one. That is not because the question is hard. Here is the course of events, each step documented in the forwarded chain and its attachments:

FEBRUARY 18, 2025. I have been a member of The Florida Bar since September 2007 — now in my nineteenth year, AV-rated as a trial attorney, with no Bar complaint filed by me or against me in my first seventeen-plus years of high-volume practice. That changed when I filed my first: a 25-page complaint (Bar File No. 25-6861) against attorney Scott Davis, opposing counsel in my own dissolution-of-marriage case in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit in Tampa, documenting element by element an intentional strategy of delaying and obstructing discovery. The core violation was not my characterization. The court had already adjudicated it — granting my motion to compel and finding entitlement to fees on November 20, 2024 — and that order sat in the very docket the Bar reviewed.

FEBRUARY 24, 2025. Six days later, the Bar closed the file at screening. The entire stated basis: the allegations "present questions of law and involve a dispute over which a court has jurisdiction." I replied that this sentence "describes every case in litigation ever." The rules my complaint invoked — candor toward the tribunal (4-3.3), fairness to the opposing party in discovery (4-3.4), meritorious claims (4-3.1) — can only be violated in a dispute before a court. If the existence of litigation places conduct beyond the grievance system, those rules can never be enforced against anyone, and the Bar's discipline program is a brochure. And under the Bar's own Rule 3-7.3(a), a complaint may be closed at screening only upon a determination that the facts, taken as proven, would not warrant discipline. So the six-day closure has a precise legal meaning: the Bar determined that everything I alleged — including a discovery violation a court had already adjudicated — warranted no discipline even if every word of it was true. It reached that determination in less time than its own published process gives the accused lawyer merely to respond, and without that response-and-rebuttal cycle ever beginning. The Bar's own letters would later tell me that a mere review of a closure "may take as long as 60 days." The merits decision itself got six days. In the sixteen months since, no one at the Bar has attempted to answer any of this. There is no answer.

APRIL THROUGH OCTOBER 2025. I followed up in good faith twenty times. I asked the Bar to identify any evidence — on any factor a disciplinary system recognizes: clarity of the violation, intent, degree of harm, pattern of misconduct, protection of the public, or any factor of the Bar's own choosing — supporting the conclusion that no action was warranted (October 10, 2025). Silence. I sent a photograph of my children, so the people reviewing the file would see the family the misconduct was reaching. Silence. Instead, the Bar's September 24, 2025 letter assured me my allegations had been investigated and reviewed at multiple levels — and informed me that further correspondence "will be placed in the file without response."

THE CONDUCT CONTINUED EXACTLY AS COMPLAINED. The delay-and-obstruct strategy ran on unchecked — a Third Request for Production has now gone entirely unanswered, without objection or response of any kind, for over fifteen months. The presiding judge, Judge Ayers, declined to address Davis's conduct herself, telling me on the record on April 22, 2025: "I'm going to call the Florida Bar and report him because that's what the Florida Bar does. I don't do that." Judge Ayers was later disqualified from the case. Then, on November 24, 2025, Judge Ayers filed a Bar complaint against me — which the Bar proceeded to open in its own name: the file is styled "Complaint by The Florida Bar against Christopher Alan Hanson," File No. 2026-10,395(13F). That file — the only one in this entire history the Bar has kept open — is in its eighth month, though the Bar has never identified, despite more than a dozen written requests, a single statement of mine it contends is false, and never scheduled the sworn statement its own counsel promised in writing on March 20, 2026. I have offered, unconditionally and repeatedly, to testify under oath. The offer has never been taken up. The regulator that cannot find time to hear sworn testimony it asked for has found time to keep the file open.

AND LOOK AT HOW THAT COMPLAINT WAS STAFFED. On December 3, 2025, Bar Counsel Jason Kelley's letter certified that the matter "has been forwarded to your committee for further investigation and disposition" — the grievance committee chaired by Joshua Sheridan, a prominent Tampa family-law practitioner whose practice runs through the same Tampa family courts where Judge Ayers presided, as I objected in writing within five days. Assigning a complaint originated by a sitting family-law judge to a reviewer whose livelihood runs through that judge's courts is not a screening oversight; it is the conflict of interest converted into machinery. And it was a choice among alternatives: multiple grievance committees serve the Thirteenth Circuit, and the Bar routinely assigns matters to committees and staff counsel in other circuits where local conflicts exist. Of every option available, this complaint was routed to the reviewer most exposed to the complaining judge. I directed my inquiries to that committee as the Bar's letter instructed — five of them during the 104 days the certification stood, every one ignored. Then, on March 17, 2026, Mr. Sheridan himself answered: "I'm not assigned to this case. I have no knowledge." To his credit, that looks like the point where the assignment met a professional unwilling to play a part in it. To this day, no one at the Bar has explained how a matter officially certified to a committee "for further investigation and disposition" could be unknown to that committee's chair 104 days later — or who actually held the file in the interim, and what they were doing with it. The complaint survived that episode anyway. It is still open now.

MAY–JUNE 2026. I resubmitted the Davis complaint — sworn, keyed rule by rule to the docket, the exhibits, and the hearing transcripts (Bar File No. 26-13570) — together with a conflict-of-interest notice, because the Bar itself and personnel from the first complaint's review are adverse parties to me in my pending public-records lawsuit over the records of that complaint's handling (Leon County Case No. 2025-CA-002469, now First District Court of Appeal Case No. 1D2026-0728). The Bar closed the resubmission in twenty-three days, naming no rule, engaging no ground, and never addressing the conflicts. Rule 3-7.3(b) states that bar counsel "must investigate the allegations contained in any written complaint that is signed under oath." The resubmission was sworn. I ask the Bar to state, in writing, which provision of its own rule it applied in closing a sworn complaint in twenty-three days without investigation. Its own closure letter invites resubmission "if the court makes a finding or enters an order which supports your allegations" — a condition the November 20, 2024 compel-and-fees order, Exhibit A to the complaint, had already satisfied; the letter does not mention that order. And the ground the letter does give is the same circular one: the grievance system "is not the correct forum," and resolution "must be left to the court of competent jurisdiction" — while the judge deferred discipline to the Bar on the record, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission, dismissing my separate complaint concerning the judge, pointed back to "the normal court process." Every forum points to another forum. That circle is not an accident of jurisdiction; it is how accountability is made to disappear while the conduct continues.

JULY 7, 2026. Then, days before this email, the court to which the Bar's letters defer granted the Bar personnel's motion to quash my subpoenas in the underlying dissolution case — stating no finding of fact and no ground at the hearing, and without the court or the Bar's counsel ever addressing either of the two separate tracks of relevance those subpoenas served: the Bar's handling of the Davis complaints, and the complaint against me that the Bar has kept open for eight months. The forum the Bar says has jurisdiction has now closed its doors on the same records the Bar says it disposed of.

THE RECORDS. The Bar's Deputy General Counsel has confirmed in writing (June 5, 2026) that records of the first complaint "have been disposed of pursuant to judicial branch and bar records retention schedule" — the same records the Bar's outside counsel represented to the court in my records case did not exist; concerning the same file the Bar's Director of Intake described as receiving "investigation by a Senior Staff Attorney," review by the Director of Intake, and "review by the Chair of Grievance Committee 13A"; about which the Bar's counsel told a court: "Mr. Hanson simply refuses to believe that the Bar did not act on his complaint." Those statements cannot all be true. They are the Bar's own words, made at different times to different audiences, and they are irreconcilable. And the June 16, 2026 closure letter now schedules the second file for the same fate: it "will be disposed of one year from the date of closure" — destruction calendared while litigation over the destruction of the first file is pending. An oversight body does not dispose of the file on its own conduct, in the middle of litigation about that file, by accident. And at that same July 7 hearing, the Bar's outside counsel offered me his thoughts on what I should be doing as a father.

President-elect Greenlee, you told the Bar News in March: "The Board of Governors has been told by the Supreme Court, and takes very seriously, the role that we play in the discipline process," and "We're a self-regulating profession ... we do a very good job of it, and I want to make sure that stays in our hands." Here is what those hands have done with this file: a court-corroborated complaint closed in six days; a sworn resubmission closed in twenty-three days without engaging one ground; the records destroyed while litigation over them is pending, and the second file's destruction already calendared; a retaliatory complaint routed to a conflicted committee until its own chair disclaimed it; and the only file kept open, the one aimed at the complainant. That is not self-regulation. It is self-protection, executed in writing, on Bar letterhead.

The Bar's own Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions state: "The primary purpose of lawyer discipline is to protect the public." Its own website promises Floridians it will "protect the public by prosecuting unethical attorneys." So I put the question to each of you by name: identify a good-faith basis — any evidence, on any factor of the Bar's choosing — for the position that Mr. Davis's documented, court-corroborated, and unrefuted misconduct requires no action. If that basis exists, produce it, and I will stand corrected and say so publicly. If it does not — and the Bar's silence, now in its seventeenth month, says it does not — then what has happened here is not oversight. It is the burial of a documented complaint, and every official who receives notice of it and does nothing ratifies it.

You collectively oversee the licenses of more than 115,000 lawyers whose conduct touches Floridians at the most vulnerable moments of their lives. The Bar asks those Floridians to trust that lawyers can police lawyers. This file is that promise put to the test — and it is failing, in the Bar's own writing. If a member in his nineteenth year, whose disciplinary record is spotless, presenting adjudicated violations with transcripts, cannot get the Bar to name a rule, answer a letter, or return a phone call — what exactly is the public supposed to expect?

I therefore request, from the Bar's leadership directly:

1. INDEPENDENT REVIEW — reassignment of both Davis complaints (Bar File Nos. 25-6861 and 26-13570), and review of the Bar's own 2025–2026 handling of them, to a non-conflicted grievance committee and staff counsel outside the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit;
2. WRITTEN ANSWERS to the nine points in my July 4, 2026 objection (below), including the records-disposal and litigation-hold questions — and an explanation of the December 3, 2025 assignment: who selected that committee, what less-conflicted committees or circuits were available and passed over, who actually held the file for 104 days, and why the certification was never corrected;
3. DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT AGAINST ME (File No. 2026-10,395(13F)) or identification in writing of the false statement it rests on. And if the Bar will do neither, let it finally put to Judge Ayers herself the question I have asked since December: identify the false statement, or withdraw the complaint; and
4. A CONFERENCE — Zoom or telephone — with any person authorized to speak for the Bar on these matters.

Please respond by JULY 24, 2026. This correspondence, and any response or non-response, will become part of the record in the pending litigation, and I will continue to document these matters publicly, as I have throughout. I would genuinely prefer the ordinary outcome — the Bar quietly doing its job — and today's email is an open door to exactly that. I remain, as I have been from the first email in this chain, ready to sit for a sworn statement, to answer any question, and to be proven wrong about any fact I have stated. No one has tried.

Respectfully,

Christopher A. Hanson, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 44094
727-409-5738

On Sat, Jul 04, 2026 06:16 PM, Chris Hanson <christophhanson77@gmail.com> wrote:

RFA No. 26-13570 — Objection to June 16, 2026 Closure and Requests for additional review including through the executive committee and all formal and informal options for reconsideration and action:

Dear Mr. Wackes and Bar leadership:

I acknowledge receipt of Bar Counsel's letter dated June 16, 2026, stating that "this file has been closed effective June 16, 2026." I object for the record and request that the Bar proceed with all additional review and oversight options relating to my complaint. I further ask that you and other bar representatives who may oversee this process, consider all of the following in conjunction with my nearly nineteen years of successful and unblemished practice in Florida.

1. The conflict notice is unaddressed. My May 24, 2026 transmittal requested "written confirmation that it has a concrete plan to account for these conflicts before proceeding." The letter does not acknowledge that request. Nor does it acknowledge my June 5, 2026 email to ten Florida Bar addresses — including Bar officers and the Executive Director, with the complaints and the Bar's own closure correspondence attached — which set out the mishandling of the February 2025 complaint, the grounds of the resubmitted complaint, and the structural conflicts of interest; copied Mr. Davis in the interest of complete transparency so that he could offer any explanation; and formally requested the Bar's position. That email received no written response of any kind. The only communication that followed was the June 16 closure, by mail, acknowledging none of it. And concerning, the Bar is treating this matter precisely as the Bar representatives whose own conduct and conflicts are at issue require. Continuing to ignore these obvious violations serves only those whose misconduct goes unexamined — to the great detriment of me and my family. Disposing of the complaint in this manner is antithetical to the Bar's sacred duties.

2. No finding; no rule. Your letter does not state that any allegation was found untrue or unfounded. It declines the forum: the allegations "involve a dispute over which a court has jurisdiction," and "The Florida Bar's grievance system is not the correct forum in which to have your allegations adjudicated, and resolution of those issues must be left to the court of competent jurisdiction." My sworn May 24, 2026 complaint proceeded ground by ground, keyed to specific rules — Rules 4-3.1, 4-3.2, 4-3.3, 4-3.4(a), (c), and (d), 4-4.4(a), and 4-8.4(c) and (d) — with citations to the docket, the exhibits, and the hearing transcripts. Your letter names no rule and addresses no actual ground. And the stated basis proves too much: the rules my complaint invokes — candor toward the tribunal (Rule 4-3.3), fairness to the opposing party in discovery (Rule 4-3.4), meritorious claims (Rule 4-3.1) — can only be violated in a dispute before a court. If the existence of such a dispute placed the conduct beyond the grievance system, those rules could never be enforced against anyone.

3. The letter's one factual response answers an allegation I did not make. It states that "the appeal was disposed of prior to the hearing mentioned in your complaint." I'm not even certain what that refers to, but it's completely irrelevant to the many unrefuted ethical violations described. My complaint alleged: "On August 1, 2025 the Court entered an unconditional Order Granting Motion for Stay Pending Appeal (docket #225); the Second District approved it on September 8, 2025 (docket #234). No order lifting the stay was ever entered." The disposition date of the appeal is not the allegation. The unrefuted ethical violations remain unaddressed.

4. On this record the referral is circular. The letter itself records that I "brought such matters before the Court before, but that the Court declined to take any action in the matter thus far." As of today: my October 3, 2025 filing seeking sanctions against Mr. Davis and his client (Docket 239) and my

October 12, 2025 verified motion for sanctions (Docket 245) remain unruled; Mr. Davis's own April 20, 2026 hearing notice re-lists them only "if time permits." The court's November 20, 2024 order — finding me entitled to attorney's fees, amount reserved — has never been liquidated. And on October 28, 2025 the Judicial Qualifications Commission dismissed my complaint concerning the presiding judge (Docket No. 25-762), stating that the concerns "may be matters for review through the normal court process." My complaint described this posture: "the Bar deferred to the court, and the court deferred to the Bar, while the conduct continued and escalated."

5. The letter's resubmission condition is already met. It invites resubmission "if the court makes a finding or enters an order which supports your allegations." The November 20, 2024 order — Exhibit A to the complaint — granted my motion to compel and found me entitled to attorney's fees, amount reserved. The letter does not mention it.

6. The file the Bar keeps open is the one against me. Judge Ayers's complaint against me — File No. 2026-10,395(13F), filed November 24, 2025 — remains open in its eighth month. On March 20, 2026, the Bar's Lawyer Regulation counsel wrote that he would send me "a subpoena to appear in person for a sworn statement" expected to take three to four hours; none was ever served or scheduled. I have offered in writing, repeatedly and as recently as June 19, 2026, to give that sworn statement, to sit for a deposition, and to answer the Bar's questions under oath. In the same period the Bar has not, despite my repeated written requests, identified any statement of mine it contends is false. My first complaint against Mr. Davis was closed in six days; this one in twenty-three days; the complaint against me remains open. If, now into the eighth month, the Bar cannot identify a single false statement, that complaint should be dismissed; I ask that it be dismissed or that the false statement be identified in writing.

7. Channels. The Bar's May 26, 2026 acknowledgment of this complaint stated that the Bar would communicate with me by mail. Every substantive response in this file and in RFA No. 25-6861 has been a U.S.-mail letter offering no email address; the September 24, 2025 letter stated that further correspondence "will be placed in the file without response." On June 10, 2026 — six days before the closure — I asked in writing why this complaint, unlike the Bar's matters in which I am the respondent, was being communicated by mail: "Has this one already been pre-judged or why is it different?" On June 11, 2026, I asked whom I could contact because "I would like to speak to someone with the Bar." Neither email received a response. Nothing acknowledges my written offers — most recently June 19, 2026 — "to sit for a deposition, to answer the Bar's questions under oath," or my request for "a brief Zoom meeting or telephone conference with Bar leadership." In the same period, the Bar's public-records office answered my June 3, 2026 request by email within two days. I renew the June 19 requests.

8. Member resources. The Bar has retained outside counsel — Greenberg Traurig, P.A., an international law firm — to defend the Bar and three of its officials in litigation over public access to the records of the February 2025 complaint (Second Judicial Circuit, Leon County, Case No. 2025-CA-002469, now First District Court of Appeal Case No. 1D2026-0728); the same firm appeared in Case No. 24-DR-001150 on May 22, 2026 to quash subpoenas for those records; and the Bar's records office has priced production of that firm's billing records at \$254.67 (Request No. W016061-022526). The Bar has committed resources to resisting disclosure of how my complaint was handled — a complaint it closed without any finding, whose records it then disposed of, and whose resubmission it has now closed without engaging a single ground. I am a dues-paying member of The Florida Bar. As a member, I object to that allocation of the Bar's resources, and I ask the Bar's leadership to account for it.

9. Preservation. The letter states that "the computer record and file of this matter will be disposed of one year from the date of closure." On June 5, 2026, the Bar's Deputy General Counsel wrote that records of RFA No. 25-6861 "have been disposed of pursuant to judicial branch and bar records retention schedule and are no longer available." I renew the June 19, 2026 litigation-hold demand and ask that the Bar confirm in writing that the complete file of RFA No. 26-13570 will be preserved and that no disposal will occur while related litigation is pending.

This objection is made for the record. I continue my requests that the Bar engage with the facts here to protect my family and the public from these continuing ethical violations causing so much harm to litigants in Florida.

Respectfully,

Christopher A. Hanson

Florida Bar No. 44094

727-409-5738

----- Forwarded message -----

From: cahanson77@yahoo.com <cahanson77@yahoo.com>

Date: Fri, Jun 19, 2026 at 5:40 PM

Subject: Fw: case #26-13570 -Follow up on Conflicts of Interest and New and independent Bar complaint on attorney Scott Davis

To: morr@orcook.com <morr@orcook.com>, paige@greenleelawtampa.com <paige@greenleelawtampa.com>, RSB@searcylaw.com <RSB@searcylaw.com>, jdoyle@floridabar.org <jdoyle@floridabar.org>, josh@jpfirm.com <josh@jpfirm.com>

Cc: Scott Davis <scott@hunterlawgroup.com>, jkelley@floridabar.org <jkelley@floridabar.org>, Christopher A Hanson <truthoverchaos@outlook.com>, chris hanson <christophhanson77@gmail.com>

Dear President Orr, President-elect Greenlee, Past President Baker-Barnes, and Executive Director Doyle:

I write to place before the Bar's leadership the request set out in my email below. I congratulate those of you installed this month. I raise these concerning issues now because this is a genuine opportunity to address a clear, well-documented matter in good faith.

There are ongoing parallel failures in oversight (at the Bar and in the 13th Circuit) that have allowed severe, intentional and harmful misconduct to go unchecked. Even with consistently raising the issues with the appropriate Judges and officials throughout this timeframe, there's still no effort to follow through with the necessary investigations and disciplinary proceedings. This is a matter of great public importance due to the willful nature of both the underlying misconduct and the refusals to enforce the rules from an expanding list of Judges and officials starting with attorney Davis.

I again offer to sit for a deposition, to answer the Bar's questions under oath, and to present further evidence to the bar — promptly and at the Bar's convenience. The facts are perfectly consistent over the course of more than 2 years showing this misconduct and the Court's and the Bar's intentional neglect of it. It is only getting worse with time, for all involved, and I wish to put an end to that as soon as possible. I abhor sending these emails and dealing with the stress of this conflict on my family and on our financial situation.

I welcome a direct conversation and respectfully request a brief Zoom meeting or telephone conference with Bar leadership to learn how the Bar is handling these conflicts of interest and explore any possible resolution. I copy Bar Counsel Jason Kelley directly and renew to him the same offer as to the deposition previously raised in this matter. I waive any attorney-client privilege as to these matters. I have no concern with full transparency and will not hide behind privilege.

I regret that, for some of you, this letter is our introduction; I would have preferred to meet under better circumstances. By way of that introduction: I was admitted to The Florida Bar in September 2007, and for more than eighteen years I practiced as an AV-rated trial lawyer in a high-volume workers' compensation practice, with a reputation for diligence, fairness, and skill as a litigator.

I ask you to weigh these facts as presented to the bar the past year and a half against my record as an AV rated trial lawyer with no disciplinary history going back to grade school. I remain unaccused of any wrongdoing in this litigation despite the difficult circumstances I've faced. There is no way around dealing with these failures, and I continue to plead for timeliness in doing so.

What has occurred here is clear, documented, and unrefuted, and it is not going to change. There is no honest way past it other than facing the difficult reality that certain individuals acted in bad faith. The likelihood that anything I have set out is untrue is, frankly, nonexistent. I've consistently given those I've accused as you'll see below, the opportunity to correct any misunderstanding in my statements. And it's obvious, that there is none.

For your convenience, the record across multiple Circuit Courts and beyond is laid out here:

- Open Letter to Sixth Judicial Circuit Leadership (June 8, 2026): <https://tinyurl.com/hanson-open-letter-6th-cir>
- Initial Brief on the Merits, First DCA No. 1D26-0728 (the Bar-accountability appeal): <https://tinyurl.com/hanson-1d26-0728-initial-brief>
- "Foxes Guarding the Courthouse" (article): <https://tinyurl.com/hanson-foxes-article>

My June 11, 2026 email to the Bar follows below. I respectfully ask that it be routed to whoever is now responsible, and that I be given a prompt, good-faith answer on the conflicts of interest, the status of the Davis Complaint, and an opportunity to be heard.

Spoliation Concerns

While I certainly hope to avoid costs associated with inspection of electronic devices, I must raise a serious and time-sensitive concern. On June 5, 2026, the Bar's Deputy General Counsel, Rick Courtemanche, responded to my public-records request (No. W016446-060426) concerning RFA No. 25-6861 — and stated that some of the responsive records "have been disposed of pursuant to judicial branch and bar records retention schedule and are no longer available." That course of action is difficult to reconcile with the ongoing litigation seeking file materials and the Bar's purported multi-level review of that very complaint. It raises obvious questions. I respectfully seek clarification on what was disposed of and ask the Bar to identify when, by whom, and under what specific authority those records were disposed of.

Accordingly, and to avoid any question of spoliation, I respectfully request that the Bar immediately implement a litigation hold and preserve — and direct all relevant personnel and custodians to preserve — all potentially relevant electronically stored information (ESI),

together with the devices and accounts on which it may reside: computers, servers, mobile phones, tablets, email accounts, text/SMS and other messaging applications, cloud storage, backups, and archives, including all associated metadata. I further ask that any automatic deletion, retention-schedule purging, overwriting, or device reset bearing on RFA No. 25-6861 or the related matters be suspended immediately. Even where a "record" has been administratively disposed of, the underlying emails, text messages, and other data — and their metadata — are frequently recoverable from devices, servers, and backups; preserving them now is essential both to a good-faith resolution and to the integrity of these proceedings.

Thank you for your time and your service to the profession.

Respectfully,
Christopher A. Hanson
Florida Bar No. 44094
727-409-5738

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: cahanson77@yahoo.com <cahanson77@yahoo.com>

To: ACAP@floridabar.org <acap@floridabar.org>; mrobertson@floridabar.org <mrobertson@floridabar.org>; morr@floridabar.org <morr@floridabar.org>; jdoyle@floridabar.org <jdoyle@floridabar.org>; acapintake@floridabar.org <acapintake@floridabar.org>; jkrelldavis@floridabar.org <jkrelldavis@floridabar.org>; communications@floridabar.org <communications@floridabar.org>; jkramer@floridabar.org <jkramer@floridabar.org>; rbaker-barnes@floridabar.org <rbaker-barnes@floridabar.org>; jchilson@floridabar.org <jchilson@floridabar.org>; Scott Davis <scott@hunterlawgroup.com>

Cc: Christopher A Hanson <truthoverchaos@outlook.com>; londonj@gtlaw.com <londonj@gtlaw.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 at 08:23:25 AM EDT

Subject: Re: case #26-13570 -Follow up on Conflicts of Interest and New and independent Bar complaint on attorney Scott Davis

Good morning. Please let me know whom I may contact about this situation. I've heard nothing and obviously, I'm concerned about the handling of this complaint.

I'm a nearly twenty-year AV-rated Florida attorney. I had never made a Bar complaint or had a Bar complaint against me in the first seventeen plus years of practice, litigating thousands of cases. My first complaint ever was against Mr. Davis. The professional rule violations were clearly documented element by element with supporting documentation in the 25-page complaint from February of 2025. The bar has taken inconsistent positions regarding its handling of that complaint. Its current position is that it just ignored it without any suggestion that the violations did not happen, just as I had described.

Now in relation to this most recent complaint, the Bar suggests it will communicate by mail. There has been no response to my concerns about conflicts of interest given my current litigation against the Florida Bar. It's difficult to see any logical basis for the bar's handling of Mr. Davis' ethical violations other than that the rules don't apply to him.

Mr. Davis's misconduct continued yesterday, including insinuations about child molestation and abuse. His actions in this case are intentional, unconscionable, and a hazard to litigants in the Tampa area. I would like to speak to someone with the Bar regarding these concerns to ensure that these violations are treated with the seriousness and impartiality they require.

Please provide contact information for someone I may address these concerns with. Thank you for your cooperation.

Chris Hanson
727-409-5738

On Wednesday, June 10, 2026 at 06:58:47 AM EDT, cahanson77@yahoo.com <cahanson77@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good morning. The end of this week will make three weeks since I submitted the recent bar complaint against Attorney Scott Davis. Obviously there are concerns with how the previous complaint was handled. I have heard nothing about the Florida Bar's plan to ensure that the complaint is considered without bias, which requires action to account for the obvious conflicts of interest.

My family continues to experience significant harm in the forms of financial distress and physical and mental health problems. The acknowledgement of my complaint received on May 26, 2026 referenced that the Bar would communicate with me by mail. I have

received nothing.

What is the reason for communicating about this bar complaint by mail? The one on Hodz and Ayers' complaint against me all resulted in email communications. Has this one already been pre-judged or why is it different?

There is a hearing at 1130 today and I require some information from the bar in order to present arguments to the Court. Please let me know the status before then. Thank you for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

Christopher A. Hanson, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 44094
727-409-5738

On Friday, June 5, 2026 at 11:46:18 AM EDT, cahanson77@yahoo.com <cahanson77@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good morning. I am following up on my Bar complaint, included below. This matter requires leadership's attention: the history raises serious questions about impartiality and the good-faith execution of the Bar's oversight duties, and there is a clear pattern of unrefuted facts spanning from the Bar across multiple Circuit Courts that will continue to erode public confidence in the judiciary until the relevant individuals follow through with their duties and the consequences the law requires.

In the interest of complete transparency, I am copying the Respondent, Mr. Davis, on this email. For a year and a half, he has not had to account — in any forum — for the clear ethical violations documented in the attached complaints. I encourage him, as I always have, to offer any explanation for the conduct described in the attachments. Finally, to the extent the Bar intends to rely on any findings or actions of the judges in the underlying litigation, I respectfully request the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence of my own before any such reliance is treated as resolving anything — particularly where those rulings are themselves the subject of pending disqualification and mandamus litigation.

1. Mishandling of the February 2025 complaint against Mr. Davis.

The Florida Bar exercises the disciplinary authority delegated by the Supreme Court under Chapter 1 of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar — what its own rules describe as a critical self-regulatory responsibility, existing to protect the public and the administration of justice. Yet my February 2025 complaint against Mr. Davis (RFA 25-6861) — attached together with the Bar's closure correspondence (Attachment 2) — was closed within six days. That closure remained despite the clear and unrefuted nature of the allegations, multiple requests for additional review and appeal, and a complainant who is a nearly 20-year Bar member, AV-rated, with no history of any Bar complaint made by or against him.

This was not a matter of competing characterizations. By the time the Bar closed the file — six days after it was submitted — the trial court had already adjudicated the core violation: on November 20, 2024, the court granted my motion to compel, found the failure "to timely comply with Mandatory Disclosure," and awarded fees. That finding sat in the very docket the Bar reviewed. Rule 3-7.3 contemplates investigation unless a complaint is clearly unfounded — and a complaint resting on an adjudicated discovery violation is its opposite.

The Bar varied from its own prescribed process, with no authority and no explanation, ever. And the misconduct escalated severely after that initial "delay" phase of his clear and intentional strategy of concealing evidence of marital assets at all costs. No one has disputed my detailed allegations regarding misconduct in pushing two of my attorneys off the case, colluding to rush my second attorney's withdrawal, and filing clearly retaliatory motions, weaponizing the children, precisely at the time of withdrawal. What explanation is there, other than that someone "fixed" the case for Mr. Davis? I am formally asking the Bar for its public position on that question.

2. The resubmitted complaint meets the elements on its face.

The new/resubmitted complaint (Attachment 1) is just as concrete. One example among many: after the Bar's closure, Mr. Davis escalated a psychological-examination demand constructed from my own candid disclosure that I was undergoing medical treatment —

and at the April 17, 2026 hearing he conceded the pretext in his own words: "He has offered to produce those [records] to me. That is true. But I'm not the guardian ad litem." Further, he has refused my many offers to attend the psychological and vocational evaluations, showing disinterest in anything other than the lawfare of it. Wielding an opposing party's disclosed health treatment as litigation leverage, while admitting the offered records went unexamined, squarely meets the elements of Rules 4-4.4(a) and 4-8.4(d): the intent is established by his own statements, and the harm runs through my children.

That is one instance. The resubmission documents at least ten others that clearly map onto the elements the same way — the specific rule, the deliberate conduct, and the resulting harm — including a Third Request for Production (No. 140) that has gone entirely unanswered, without objection or response of any kind, for fifteen months.

These are not disagreements about the law. They are documented violations whose level of intent and degree of harm — the very criteria the Bar's own framework treats as decisive — sit unmistakably on the side of investigation and discipline.

3. Structural conflicts of interest (in addition to the ongoing direct conflict in the 13th Circuit).

The individuals involved in closing the 2025 Davis complaint, and in advancing Judge Ayers' retaliatory November 2025 complaint against me, have a vested interest in preventing any honest review of what happened in 2025. Those conflicts are not hypothetical; they arise from the same facts, the same files, and in several instances the same individuals.

The Bar has still not identified a single measure it is taking to ensure a good-faith, conflict-free process. I therefore ask formally: (a) what is the Bar's concrete plan to account for these conflicts and ensure an impartial investigation; and (b) is the Bar investigating its own handling of the February 2025 complaint and the layers of review that followed?

If it is not, this email constitutes my formal request that it do so on both (a) and (b). Please state the Bar's position on both questions in writing.

The asymmetry in the Bar's two postures tells the story by itself. The same Bar that closed a documented complaint (supported by an order for fees and costs on a discovery issue) against Mr. Davis within six days has kept Judge Ayers' retaliatory complaint against me (File No. 2026-10,395(13F)) alive for more than six months — without ever identifying a single statement of mine as false, despite my repeated written requests that it simply name one.

My May 13, 2026 follow-up (Attachment 5), the latest in a months-long series that remains substantively unanswered, asked that question yet again. A complaint that self-evidently fails to allege any false statement should never have advanced at all; yet it remains pending — hanging over the head of a complainant who is actively litigating against the Bar — while the Davis complaint could not survive a week. This is the structural conflict in operation: the Bar using its power to protect insiders and attack those who insist on accountability.

What is the justification for the Ayers complaint remaining before the Bar — alleging no false statement, and therefore no violation — for more than six months, when my detailed, court-corroborated complaint lasted six days?

4. The Bar's false and misleading statements.

For over a year, Bar representatives told me the complaint had been investigated and given layered, good-faith review. On September 24, 2025, Director of Intake Shanel Schuyler wrote on the Bar's behalf (Attachment 3): "The review of your allegations against Mr. Davis included investigation by a Senior Staff Attorney, review of the closure by the undersigned as Director of Intake, and a review by the Chair of Grievance Committee 13A."

Yet the Bar's Greenberg Traurig counsel has now represented to a court, in a filed motion (Attachment 4, ¶ 5): "the Bar did not act on his complaint and so did not share it with or request a response from Mr. Davis."

An investigation by a Senior Staff Attorney, confirmed through two further levels of review, cannot be reconciled with "did not act."

One of those statements is not true, and the complainant — and now a court — are owed the answer to a simple question: why did the Bar describe a three-level investigative review confirming closure if it "didn't act" at all?

5. Continuing concealment of the Bar's communications with Mr. Davis.

I see no way to reconcile the Bar's shifting positions except this: the Bar has decided that concealing its communications with Mr. Davis about the first complaint is a better option than producing them. That concealment is already at issue before the First District Court of

Appeal, and the public-records litigation surrounding it will continue to illuminate what the Bar will not voluntarily disclose.

Meanwhile, Mr. Davis was emboldened by the dismissal. He filed the Bar's closure correspondence in the trial court to suggest he had been cleared of wrongdoing — the same correspondence included within Attachment 2, which he docketed below as Docket 200. Davis did this while concealing the underlying communications about the complaint from the complainant.

So I will ask the questions directly, and I ask for direct answers. First: will the Bar produce its communications with Mr. Davis concerning RFA 25-6861 — yes or no? If the answer is no, identify the specific legal basis for withholding each communication, as I have requested repeatedly for over a year. Second: what do those communications show?

If they support the Bar's account of its own inaction, there is no rational reason to conceal them — production would end this dispute in the Bar's favor. There is no excuse for the oversight authority and the respondent attorney to jointly conceal their communications about a complaint from the person who filed it — however the Bar now chooses to tell the story of its inaction. And the trial judge has expressly deferred the disciplinary issues to the Florida Bar, which makes the Bar's good-faith engagement the only avenue of accountability that currently exists.

6. Demand for retraction.

In a recent motion, the Bar's counsel, Mr. John Londot, accused me of "harassing" the Bar and denigrated my character throughout the filing. Mr. Londot and the Bar know there is no good-faith support for those statements: the record reflects a complainant who used the Bar's own processes, asked the Bar's own questions, and waited over a year for answers that never came. I request the immediate written retraction or substantiation of those statements.

I recognize that statements made in litigation carry privilege. But that privilege exists to protect candid advocacy — not baseless character attacks — and I reserve every available remedy, in the litigation and before the appropriate regulatory bodies, if the statements are neither withdrawn nor supported. There has been no allegation of any improper conduct from me. And even a cursory review of my correspondence with the Florida Bar and all other interested parties will reveal my straightforward intent for a fair and efficient result. As unlikely as it may seem given everything described above, I would still prefer to resolve all of this professionally and quietly.

Conclusion and formal requests.

I did not ask for any of this. I am a nearly 20-year, AV-rated attorney with no history of a Bar complaint submitted by or made against me — until I encountered Mr. Davis, whose ethical violations have torn my family apart and cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars. I followed up with the Bar in good faith for over a year. My goal is a fair result for everyone involved, and I do not like making my personal business public — but it appears to be the only remaining path to fairness.

Given everything set out above, one structural conclusion is unavoidable: screening and processing these matters through the ordinary channels — the same channels, and in several instances the same individuals, whose conduct is at issue — cannot produce a result anyone should trust. I therefore formally request that the Bar disqualify the conflicted personnel and circuit from any role in these matters and administratively reassign both the resubmitted complaint and the Ayers complaint to an independent, non-conflicted grievance committee and staff counsel in another judicial circuit — a reassignment squarely within the Bar's administrative authority and its Standing Board Policies governing lawyer regulation, and one the Bar makes routinely where local conflicts exist. If the Bar contends it lacks the authority to do this, I ask that it say so in writing.

To be specific, I request the Bar's formal written response on eight points: **(1)** its position on whether the February 2025 complaint was "fixed"; **(2)** an explanation of the direct inconsistency between Ms. Schuyler's September 24, 2025 letter and its counsel's "did not act" representation; **(3)** its concrete plan for handling the identified conflicts of interest; **(4)** whether it is investigating its own 2025 handling — and if not, this email is my formal request that it do so; **(5)** retraction of the harassment accusation; **(6)** identification of any statement of mine that the Ayers complaint alleges to be false — or, if after six months none can be identified, dismissal of that complaint; **(7)** disqualification of the conflicted personnel and administrative reassignment of both pending matters to an independent grievance committee and non-conflicted staff in another circuit; and **(8)** production of the Bar's communications with Mr. Davis concerning RFA 25-6861, or a written statement of the specific legal basis for withholding each one. If the Bar would prefer to handle this in a less public way, I remain open to that — but I need to see concrete action assuring me that the events of the past 18 months will not continue.

Respectfully,

Christopher A. Hanson, Esq.

