

INDEX

Table of Authoritiesiii

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