

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Grievance Against Jane Doe,
Board of Commissioners, Idaho State Bar.

JOHN DOE (2025-18),	)
Petitioner,	)
	) Supreme Court Docket No. 53006-2025
v.	) Idaho State Bar File No. 25-208
JANE DOE,	)
Respondent.	)

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF EVIDENCE AND ONGOING OBSTRUCTION

**NOTICE OF CONTRADICTORY COMMUNICATIONS FROM IDAHO STATE BAR
CLERK AND FURTHER EVIDENCE OF IRREPARABLE CONFLICT**

Now comes the Petitioner, JOHN DOE (2025-18), pro se, and respectfully files this Supplemental Notice to bring new, material evidence to the Court’s attention. In support thereof, Petitioner states as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

This Supplement is filed to document a communication received September 25, 2025, from Idaho State Bar Clerk Karen Carlisle, which directly contradicts her prior communication of September 23, 2025. This contradiction confirms the profound procedural confusion and bias previously alleged, demonstrating that Ms. Carlisle is an unreliable and conflicted conduit for Court-ordered proceedings.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. On September 23, 2025, Ms. Carlisle emailed Petitioner, unilaterally requesting availability for a “review hearing” on October 14 or 15, 2024. Petitioner immediately objected, noting this was a void act as the matter was under this Court’s jurisdiction and a Hearing Committee had been supplanted by the Court’s appointment of Senior Judge Kerrick.
2. On September 25, 2025, Ms. Carlisle sent a follow-up email (attached as Exhibit A), stating: “Judge Kerrick has asked that I communicate the following to you. Under her previous direction, I requested your availability for the October dates... She was unaware of your previously expressed unavailability at that time.”

III. ARGUMENT

This latest communication creates an irreconcilable contradiction that undermines the integrity of the process:

1. Contradictory Representations: Ms. Carlisle’s September 23 email gave no indication the request was from Judge Kerrick, presenting it as a standard PCB scheduling action. Her September 25 email retroactively attributes the request to the Judge. This discrepancy makes it impossible to determine the true origin of the scheduling attempt and demonstrates a lack of procedural clarity and candor.
2. Deepening the Conflict: As a material witness to the underlying ethics complaints, Ms. Carlisle’s role in transmitting—and potentially misrepresenting—communications between the Court and the Petitioner is untenable. Her involvement injects confusion and doubt into every step of the process.
3. Evidence of Systemic Breakdown: This incident is a microcosm of the broader failure. Whether the error was in the initial request or the subsequent explanation, it confirms that the Idaho State Bar, through its conflicted agent, cannot reliably facilitate the very proceedings this Court sought to oversee directly.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner JOHN DOE (2025-18) respectfully requests this Court:

1. TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE of the September 25, 2025, communication from Karen Carlisle (Exhibit A).
2. ISSUE AN ORDER formally directing that all future communications from the Court or Senior Judge Kerrick to the Petitioner be conducted directly through the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, bypassing the conflicted administration of the Idaho State Bar.
3. CONSIDER THIS SUPPLEMENT as further evidence of the necessity for the Court's continued and vigilant supervisory role in this matter.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of September, 2025.

JOHN DOE (2025-18),

Petitioner

Pro Se

Exhibit:

Exhibit A: Email from Karen Carlisle, dated September 25, 2025