

Richard Louis
3057 Chandler
Lincoln Park, Michigan 48146

March 24, 2006

Hon. Ronald M. George, Chief Justice
Hon. Associate Justices
Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Charles Benninghoff v. Superior Court
Real Party In Interest: The California Bar

Appellate Number: G035923
Supreme Court Number: S141459

Dear Chief Justice George and Honorable Associates Justices;

This letter is being submitted to urge the Supreme Court to accept review of Mr. Benninghoff's plea, as he is being maliciously attacked despite the protection he is assured under California Statute.

My interest in this case is that I am a citizen hoping that Your Honors will honor your Oaths' Of Office in Mr. Benninghoff's (and in all) case(s), and not create a judicial crime after the fact, which opens the door of personal liability because of operations "beyond the scope" of your call to public duty, an (otherwise) protected position.

Based upon the Law, As Written, I believe, that Mr. Benninghoff was representing people before Californian agencies, after having received Legislative Counsel Opinion #18108 *that specifically states* he can do so, stipulated as follows:

Legislative Counsel Opinion #18108 specifically states:

"In our view, where a statute or regulation allows representation at an administrative hearing by an "authorized representative" who is not an attorney, and does not make a distinction between a non-attorney and a resigned attorney, a resigned attorney may provide representation in an administrative hearing on the same basis as any other non-attorney".

Pretty clear, wouldn't you say?


An "Appeal" is based on the "facts IN EVIDENCE", based upon the actual "record" of the Lower Court, isn't it?

Should this travesty to go forward, isn't this what you need to rule on? In your experience, what would you say is the net result on an Appellate Justices' career of being "reversed on appeal"? It is really nothing when compared to the effect of sustaining an *ex post facto* finding allowing a conviction when Opinion #18108 is so clear.

The writing of law rests with the Legislature, not the courts. Therefore, if Mr. Benninghoff is not to be allowed to do agency work as a resigned attorney, and as the Legislative Counsel so wrote, then it is up to the Legislature to write the laws accordingly.

This issue is of great public interest, because if the courts continue to rewrite law, then our State Constitution is moot and we become a state of men and not of law.

Sincerely,



Richard Louis
Citizen of the State of Michigan

PROOF OF SERVICE

In Orange County

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I, Nancy L. Benninghoff, declare:

I am a citizen of the United States, a resident of Orange County, and am over 18 years of age. I am not a party to the within entitled action. My business/residence address is:

Street: P. O. Box 1355
City, State, ZIP: San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693

On March 27, 2006 I served a copy of the attached:

Letter of Richard Louis and Dated March 24, 2006

by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Mission Viejo, California , addressed as follows to:

Party or Attorney At Law

JAMES S. LINK
Attorney at Law
215 N Marengo 3rd Fl
Pasadena, CA 91101

ORANGE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
Presiding Judge
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

RICHARD J. ZANASSI
State Bar Of California / OGC
180 Howard St
San Francisco, CA 94105-1639

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATE: March 27, 2006


Nancy L. Benninghoff