

CASES DETERMINED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF ARKANSAS

IN RE: Oscar STILLEY

06-067

269 S.W.3d 792

Supreme Court of Arkansas
Opinion delivered December 13, 2007

1. ATTORNEY & CLIENT — SUBPOENAS QUASHED. — Where the supreme court had been apprised that Mr. Oscar Stilley had requested that subpoenas be issued to compel certain named justices of the court to appear at a public meeting before the Supreme Court Committee on Professional Conduct, and where Mr. Stilley had previously made the same request of named supreme court justices to appear for depositions in the same proceeding against Mr. Stilley and those subpoenas were quashed by letter opinion of the supreme court, the supreme court quashed the subpoenas issued in the instant proceeding for the same reasons given in the prior letter opinion.
2. COURTS — ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT — SUPERINTENDING CONTROL. — The supreme court had superintending control over the practice and conduct of all attorneys pursuant to Amendment 28 of the Arkansas Constitution, and it reserved the right to continue to examine the matter, including the issue of sanctions, were sanctions deemed appropriate.

PER CURIAM. [1] We have been apprised that Mr. Oscar Stilley has requested that subpoenas be issued to compel certain named justices of this court to appear at a public meeting before the Supreme Court Committee on Professional Conduct scheduled for December 14, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. Previously, Mr.

Stilley made the same request of named supreme court justices to appear for depositions in the same proceeding against Mr. Stilley pending before the Professional Conduct Committee. By letter opinion dated February 14, 2003, this court quashed the subpoenas, setting out the reasons for the ruling therein. That opinion was signed by all justices.

Here, Mr. Stilley is again seeking to compel the justices to be present at a hearing, rather than at a deposition. For the same reasons given in this court's February 14, 2003, opinion, we herewith quash the subpoena issued in this proceeding.

[2] This court has superintending control over the practice and conduct of all attorneys, *see* Ark. Const. amend. 28, and we reserve the right to continue to examine this matter, including the issue of sanctions, should such be deemed appropriate.
