To: Del Ciampo, Joseph **Subject:** RE: Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

From: PSHauser pshauser@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 11:34 AM

To: Del Ciampo, Joseph < Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov>

Subject: Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. DelCiampo,

I wish to express my **strong opposition** to adoption of Proposed Rule 8.4(7). I am in full agreement with, and endorse, the November 2, 2020 comment letter of the Christian Legal Society and believe the proposed rule threatens the First Amendment rights of Connecticut lawyers. Existing Rule 8.4(4) and its Commentary already adequately address any issues of bias and prejudice that should result in discipline.

I respectfully request that the Rules Committee of the Superior Court reject Proposed Rule 8.4(7).

Thank you.

Peter Hauser

O'Donnell, Shanna

From: Rules Committee

To: PSHauser

Subject: RE: Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

From: PSHauser pshauser@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 6, 2020 3:21 PM

To: Rules Committee < Rules Committee@jud.ct.gov >

Subject: Fwd: Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Resending. Thank you.

----Original Message-----

From: PSHauser pshauser@aol.com

To: Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov <Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov>

Sent: Tue, Nov 3, 2020 11:33 am Subject: Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

Dear Mr. DelCiampo,

I wish to express my **strong opposition** to adoption of Proposed Rule 8.4(7). I am in full agreement with, and endorse, the November 2, 2020 comment letter of the Christian Legal Society and believe the proposed rule threatens the First Amendment rights of Connecticut lawyers. Existing Rule 8.4(4) and its Commentary already adequately address any issues of bias and prejudice that should result in discipline.

I respectfully request that the Rules Committee of the Superior Court reject Proposed Rule 8.4(7).

Thank you.

Peter Hauser