

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Frank D. Wuterich,) WRIT APPEAL PETITION FOR REVIEW
Staff Sergeant (E-6),) OF NAVY-MARINE CORPS COURT OF
United States Marine Corps,) CRIMINAL APPEALS' DECISION ON
Appellant,) APPLICATION FOR EXTRAORDINARY
) RELIEF
)
v.)
)
David M. Jones,) Crim.App. Misc. Dkt. No.
Lieutenant Colonel,) 200800183
United States Marine Corps,)
In his official capacity as) USCA Misc. Dkt. No. _____
Military Judge, and)
)
The United States,)
)
Appellees.)

Dwight H. Sullivan, Colonel, USMCR
CAAF Bar No. 26867
Appellate Defense Division
112 Luke Avenue, Suite 343
Bolling AFB, DC 20032-8000
(202) 767-8885

Kirk Sripinyo, Major, USMC
CAAF Bar No. 34753
S. Babu Kaza, Major, USMCR
CAAF Bar No. 33773
1254 Charles Morris Street, S.E.
Bldg. 58, Suite 100
Washington, DC 20374

Neal Puckett
CAAF Bar No. 26121
email: Neal@puckettfaraj.com

Haytham Faraj
CAAF Bar No. 35170
email: Haytham@puckettfaraj.com
Puckett & Faraj, PC
1800 Diagonal Road
Suite 210
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel 888-970-0005
Fax 202-280-1039

Counsel for Appellant

INDEX

Table of Authorities	iii
Preamble.....	1
History of the Case.....	3
Relief Sought.....	6
Jurisdictional Basis for Relief Sought.....	7
Issue Presented.....	8
Statement of Facts.....	8
Reasons Why this Writ Appeal Should Be Granted.....	19
A. Summary of Argument.....	19
B. Introduction.....	22
C. The military judge correctly concluded that the severance of Appellant's attorney-client relationship with LtCol Vokey upon LtCol Vokey's commencement of terminal leave was erroneous.....	24
D. Appellant was harmed by a break in representation upon LtCol Vokey's commencement of terminal leave....	27
E. Appellant is prejudiced by the loss of LtCol Vokey's representation.....	33
F. Appellee Judge Jones erred when he severed Appellant's attorney-client relationship a second time based on his erroneous determination that an "irreconcilable" conflict prevents LtCol Vokey from ever representing Appellant.....	38
G. Erroneous interference with an attorney-client relationship is uniquely appropriate for redress via a writ.....	48
H. Appellant did not invite the erroneous deprivation Of his attorney-client relationship with LtCol Vokey.	50
I. Appellant's right to counsel must not be made contingent on actions by third parties over whom Appellant has no control.....	51

Conclusion.....	52
Appellees' Addresses, Telephone and Facsimile Numbers.....	52
Certificate of Compliance with Rule 27(d)	55
Appendix	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Clinton v. Goldsmith</i> , 526 U.S. 529 (1999)	7
<i>FTC v. Dean Foods Co.</i> , 384 U.S. 597 (1966)	7
<i>In re Tennant</i> , 359 F.3d 523 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	7
<i>Lovett v. United States</i> , 64 M.J. 232 (C.A.A.F. 2006) (summary disposition)	49
<i>United States v. Catt</i> , 1 M.J. 41 (C.M.A. 1975)	28
<i>United States v. Eason</i> , 21 C.M.A. 335, 45 C.M.R. 109 (1971)	35, 44
<i>United States v. Hohman</i> , 70 M.J. 98 (C.A.A.F. 2011) (per curiam)	27
<i>United States v. Hutchins</i> , 69 M.J. 282 (C.A.A.F. 2011) ... <i>passim</i>	
<i>United States v. Iverson</i> , 5 M.J. 440 (C.M.A. 1978) ...	28, 37, 38
<i>United States v. Miller</i> , 66 M.J. 306 (C.A.A.F. 2008)	24
<i>United States v. Murray</i> , 20 C.M.A. 61, 42 C.M.R. 253 (1970) ..	28
<i>United States v. Nguyen</i> , 56 M.J. 252 (C.A.A.F. 2001) (summary disposition)	48
<i>United States v. Schmidt</i> , 60 M.J. 1 (C.A.A.F. 2004) (per curiam)	49
<i>United States v. Shadwell</i> , 58 M.J. 142 (C.A.A.F. 2003) (summary disposition)	48
<i>United States v. Spriggs</i> , 52 M.J. 235 (C.A.A.F. 2000)	44
<i>United States v. Tellier</i> , 13 C.M.A. 323, 32 C.M.R. 323 (1962) ..	28
<i>United States v. Wiechmann</i> , 67 M.J. 456 (C.A.A.F. 2009)	28
<i>United States v. Wilson</i> , 54 M.J. 450 (C.A.A.F. 2001) (summary disposition)	48

Statutes

10 U.S.C. § 688 (2006)	42
Uniform Code of Military Justice Article 67, 10 U.S.C. § 867 (2006)	7
Uniform Code of Military Justice Article 92, 10 U.S.C. § 892 (2006)	41
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)	7
38 U.S.C. § 4311 (2006)	42

Regulations

Department of Defense Directive 1352.1 (July 16, 2005)	43, 44
Dep't of the Navy, Judge Advocate General Instr. 5803.1C, Para. 16e(2) (Nov. 9, 2004)	27
Dep't of the Navy, Judge Advocate General Instr. 5803.1C, (Nov. 9, 2004)	39, 40, 41
MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL, UNITED STATES, Pt. I, ¶ 3 (2008 ed.) .	45, 46

Miscellaneous

ABA Comm. on Professional Ethics and Grievances, Formal Op. 343 (1977)	40
ABA Comm. on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, Informal Op. 1235 (1972)	40
ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.10.	37
Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 8.05 Comment 3	39