BEFORE THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS

APPOINTED BY

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

JUN 2 0 2024
Board of Disciplinary
Appeals

IN THE MATTER OF

§.

WILLIAM TOPP MAXWELL

§ CAUSE NO. 56591

STATE BAR CARD NO. 24028775

§

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE

AND

MOTION TO FILE PAPER MOTIONS (RULE 1.05(a)(4)(iii))

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD:

COMES NOW, William Topp Maxwell ("Maxwell"), and files this Motion for Continuance and for just cause would show unto the Board as follows:

On July 26, 2024, at 9:00 AM, this matter is set for trial on the merits of the Motion for Entry of judgment of Disbarment.

This matter is still pending on the Supreme Court's docket.

The deadline for filing is ten (10) days prior to the hearing (on information and belief, as Maxwell does not have access to State of Texas Rules--Civil Procedure); July 16, 2024.

Maxwell would request a ninety (90) day extension.

This is the first request for extension.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 1) On July 17, 2023, the Third Court of Appeals Affirmed Maxwell's 2015 conviction in Cause No. 1:11-CR-00740(03). See Cause No. 15-2925.
- 2) On September 15, 2023, the Third Circuit denied Maxwell's timely filed Sur Petition for Rehearing. See Exhibit 1 attached hereto.

- 3) On November 3, 2023, Justice Alito <u>Granted Maxwell</u> an extension "to and including February 12, 2024 to file his petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court." See Exhibit 2, attached hereto.
- 4) On May 7, 2024, the Supreme Court docketed Maxwell's February 9, 2024, Petition for Certiorari, Doc. No. 23-7404. See Exhibit 3, attached hereto.
- 5) On May 14, 2024, the Solicitor General waived its right to file a response. See Exhibit 4, attached hereto.
- 6) On May 28, 2024, the Supreme Court notified the Solicitor General that "[a]lthough your office has waived the right to file a response to the petition for a writ of certiorari in the above case, the Court nevertheless in has directed this office to request that a response be filed..." The Solicitor General's response is due on or before June 27, 2024. See Exhibit 5, attached hereto.
- 7) Maxwell raised two (2) questions in his Petition for Certiorari.

 First, because several cases had been issued in Maxwell's favor by the Supreme Court, post-Third Circuit Panel decision in July 2022, Maxwell sought whether G.V.R. or full certiorari was appropriate. See Ciminelli v.

 United States, 598 U.S. ____ (2023); and related cases Dubin v. United States, 216 L.Ed. 2d 136, 157 (2023); Percoco v. United States, 598 U.S. ____, ___ (2023).

Second, Maxwell noted structural error, because the Government had tendered to the jury two hundred and seventy-six (276) exhibits that were never offered for admission into evidence by the Government, and were never admitted into evidence by the trial court. The two hundred and seventy-six (276) exhibits were material exhibits and prejudiced the case. Maxwell

notified the Supreme Court of the Government's concession of these facts. See Exhibit 6, attached hereto on May 23, 2024.

MOTION FOR EXTENSION

- 8) The rules of compulsory discipline, Rule 6.01(c) require, during the period of interlocutory suspension, that prior to Maxwell filing a Motion to Terminate, he must obtain "certified copies" of the decision and mandate of the reversing court and attach those to his Motion.
- 9) Because the Solicitor General's response is not due to the Supreme Court until June 27, 2024, and will not be delivered to Maxwell (snail mail) for some days thereafter, and because Maxwell's reply, if any, will delay the Supreme Court's ruling either granting certiorari, denying certiorari, or ordering full briefing, or issuing a G.V.R., Maxwell requests a ninety (90) day extension to obtain notice from the Supreme Court regarding the standing of his case, and so advise the State Bar.
- anyone regarding the delay. Because the Supreme Court's reversal will necessarily increase costs on appeal, should the hearing move forward, Maxwell requests the extension to obtain the necessary certified documents to attach to his Motion for Termination, and/or file his objection to the disbarment proceeding.
- 11) Because Maxwell is incarcerated, he is unable to contact Ms. Amanda M. Kates, esq., with the State Bar of Texas, to determine whether she is opposed to the extension requested.

RELIEF UNDER RULE 1.05(a)(4)(iii)

12) Maxwell seeks permission to file this paper copy pursuant to Rule 1.05(a)(4)(iii) for good cause shown. Maxwell does not have access to the

internet or computers for electronic filing.

12) Maxwell will immediately notify the State Bar and Ms. Amanda Kates, esq., of any decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

PRAYER

For these reasons, Maxwell requests an extension of ninety (90) days for the hearing on the merits of the Motion for Entry of Judgment of Disbarment, currently scheduled for July 26, 2024, at 9:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

William Maxwell

Reg. No. 71944-279

FCI-Beaumont-Low

P.O. Box 26020

Beaumont, TX 77720

pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Date

VERIFICATION

I hereby certify that the material facts stated herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I make this verification under penalties of perjury and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746. I further verify that the exhibits attached hereto are true and correct copies of the originals.

Date

William Maxwell

William Maxwell

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 15-2925

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

٧.

WILLIAM MAXWELL, a/k/a BILL,

William Maxwell,

Appellant

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (D.C. Nos. 1-11-cr-0740-003) District Judge: Honorable Robert B. Kugler

SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING

Present: JORDAN, HARDIMAN, RESTREPO, BIBAS, PORTER, MATEY, PHIPPS, FREEMAN, MONTGOMERY-REEVES, CHUNG and AMBRO*, Circuit Judges

The petition for rehearing filed by appellant William Maxwell in the aboveentitled case having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court and to all the other available circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service, and no judge who concurred in the decision having asked for rehearing, and a majority of the judges of the circuit in regular service not having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing by the panel and the Court en banc, is DENIED.

BY THE COURT

s/ Kent A. Jordan
Circuit Judge

DATE: September 15, 2023

^{*} Judge Ambro's vote is limited to panel rehearing only.

Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk Washington, DC 20543-0001

November 3, 2023

Scott S. Harris Clerk of the Court (202) 479-3011

Mr. William Maxwell Prisoner ID 71944-279 FCI Beaumont P.O. Box 26020 Beaumont, TX 77720

Re: William Maxwell v. United States

Application No. 23A399

Dear Mr. Maxwell:

The application for an extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case has been presented to Justice Alito, who on November 3, 2023, extended the time to and including February 12, 2024.

This letter has been sent to those designated on the attached notification list.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

Lisa Nesbitt Case Analyst

Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris Clerk of the Court (202) 479-3011

May 7, 2024

Mr. William Maxwell Prisoner ID 71944-279 FCI Beaumont P.O. Box 26020 Beaumont, TX 77720

Re: William Maxwell v. United States

No. 23-7404

Dear Mr. Maxwell:

The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed on February 9, 2024 and placed on the docket May 7, 2024 as No. 23-7404.

A form is enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.

Sincerely,

Scott, S. Harris, Clerk

Lisa Nesbitt Case Analyst

Enclosures

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MAXWELL, WILLIAM Petitioner

VS.

No: <u>23-7404</u>

USA

WAIVER

The Government hereby waives its right to file a response to the petition in this case, unless requested to do so by the Court.

ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

May 14, 2024

cc:

WILLIAM MAXWELL PRISONER ID: 71944-279 FCI BEAUMONT P.O BOX 26020 BEAUMONT, TX 77720

Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris Clerk of the Court (202) 479-3011

May 28, 2024

Mrs. Elizabeth B. Prelogar Solicitor General United States Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

> Re: William Maxwell v. United States No. 23-7404

Dear Mrs. Prelogar:

Although your office has waived the right to file a response to the petition for a writ of certiorari in the above case, the Court nevertheless has directed this office to request that a response be filed.

Ten typewritten or otherwise reproduced copies of your response, together with proof of service thereof, should be filed on or before June 27, 2024.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris

Sut S. Hans

Clerk

cc: William Maxwell

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

WILLIAM MAXWELL

Petitioner/Appellant/Defendant,

VS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Respondent/Appellee/Plaintiff.

On Petition for Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, Camden Vicinage, Honorable Robert Kugler, presiding.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

Respectfully submitted,

William Maxwell
Reg. No. 71944-279
FCI Beaumont Low
Post Office Box 26020
Beaumont, Texas 77720
Pro se'

TO THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT:

COMES NOW, William Maxwell ("Maxwell"), petitioner herein, and files this Supplemental Brief, noting the United States' admission of the factual underpinnings of Maxwell's structural error argument, and for just cause would show unto the Court as follows:

- Maxwell; his brother, John Maxwell; Nick Scarfo; and Salvatore Pelullo were convicted after trial in this matter. The trial was eight (8) months long.
- 2) Maxwell asserted in his Opening Brief that, as a result of this
 "Monster Trial," which was objected to by the defendants (multiple times)
 throughout, structural error occurred. The Federal Rules of Evidence were
 abrogated. In this case, two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits
 that were never offered for admission into evidence, never admitted into evidence,
 were nevertheless given to the jury by the United States, considered by the
 Trial Court in its denials of Rule 29 and Rule 33 motions, and were considered
 by the Appellate Court in its affirmance of the case. Maxwell argued that
 giving two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits to the jury that were
 never offered for admission by the Government (thereby triggering the defense
 duty to object), nor admitted by the Trial Court into evidence, was a break
 down of the adversarial process and constituted the type of error this Court
 has called structural.
- 3) Scarfo, who is now proceeding in the Trial Court on a §2255 case, raised the inadmitted exhibit issue. In its Response, found at Cause No. 1:23-cv-22432-RBK, Doc. No. 7, Page 101 the United States confesses:

- "...To be sure, the cases discussed above did not involve anywhere near the number of unadmitted exhibits at issue here. Nor does the Government dispute that, had the unadmitted exhibits been excluded from evidence, the overall strength of the Government's case against [the defendants] would have been eroded."
- 4) The Government has confessed that the two hundred seventy-six (276) exhibits were material; that they were not offered for admission into evidence; that they were not admitted into evidence, ever, and that they affected the outcome of the case.
- 5) The Government took other positions in the Brief in regards to Scarfo that are not material to Maxwell's assertions in his Opening Brief.
- 6) The Government confesses that it has known about this structural (Maxwell alleges that it is structural) error since at least 2019. The exhibits (276) that were highlighted for the Court in Maxwell's Appendix show a District Court filing in 2019. Despite this knowledge of structural error, the Government did not alert the Appellate Court that two hundred seventy-six (276) exhibits that it included in the joint appendix were not properly before the Appellate Court.
- 7) The Government makes other arguments that are perhaps better raised by the Government.
- 8) The filing did not become available to Maxwell until today, May 23, 2024. Maxwell files this Supplement to clarify that there is no dispute that:

- (1) two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits were never offered into evidence by the United States;
- (2) two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits were never admitted into evidence by the Court;
- (3) two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits that were never offered into evidence or admitted into evidence were prejudicial to Maxwell (defendants);
- (4) two hundred seventy-six (276) material exhibits that were not offered into evidence nor admitted into evidence were nevertheless given to the jury and considered by the Trial Court and Appellate Court (and reasonable inferences therefrom) in reaching its decisions (Rule 29, Rule 33, Direct Appeal, Jury Deliberations) in this case.
- 9) Maxwell urges that, under these undisputed facts, structural error occurred. Alternatively, full briefing may be appropriate under GVR to the Court below.

Respectfully submitted,

William Maxwell

Reg. No. 71944-279

FCI-Beaumont-Low

P.O. Box 26020

Beaumont, TX 77720

VERIFICATION

I hereby verify that the material factual statements contained herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I make this verification under 28 U.S.C. §1746 and penalties of perjury.

7/23/282

Date

William Maxwell