

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

**IN RE: EDWARD MOSES, JR.**

No. 2024-B-00295

-----  
IN RE: Disciplinary Counsel - Applicant Other; Notice of Discipline in Another  
Jurisdiction Pursuant to Rule XIX, Section 21 and Motion to Initiate Reciprocal  
Discipline Proceedings;  
-----

**May 29, 2024**

Reciprocal discipline imposed. See per curiam.

JLW

SJC

JTG

WJC

JBM

PDG

Hughes, J., dissents in part.

Supreme Court of Louisiana

May 29, 2024



\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Deputy Clerk of Court  
For the Court

## SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 2024-B-0295

IN RE: EDWARD MOSES, JR.

## ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDING

## PER CURIAM

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 21, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) filed a petition seeking the imposition of reciprocal discipline against respondent, Edward Moses, Jr., an attorney licensed to practice law in Louisiana, based upon discipline imposed by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana.

**UNDERLYING FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Respondent was suspended by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana for a period of one year based on conduct involving the filing of frivolous litigation as well as attempts to co-opt his clients’ cases to assert his own personal agenda. After receiving notice of the federal court order of discipline, the ODC filed a motion to initiate reciprocal discipline proceedings in Louisiana, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 21. A copy of the order issued by the Middle District of Louisiana was attached to the petition. On March 7, 2024, we rendered an order giving respondent and the ODC thirty days to demonstrate why the imposition of identical discipline would be unwarranted.

Respondent filed a timely response in which he asserted that reciprocal discipline is unwarranted. He asserted that although he is an attorney, he did not appear in these proceedings in his individual capacity, but rather solely in the

capacity of “the Christian Emperor d’Orleans Trust protector of the Atakapa Indian ‘Tribe of [symbols] Moses’ (Foreign) Express Spendthrift Trust.”

## DISCUSSION

The standard for imposition of discipline on a reciprocal basis is set forth in Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 21(D). That rule provides:

Discipline to be Imposed. Upon the expiration of thirty days from service of the notice pursuant to the provisions of paragraph B, this court shall impose the identical discipline ... unless disciplinary counsel or the lawyer demonstrates, or this court finds that it clearly appears upon the face of the record from which the discipline is predicated, that:

- (1) The procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process; or
- (2) Based on the record created by the jurisdiction that imposed the discipline, there was such infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that the court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion on that subject; or
- (3) The imposition of the same discipline by the court would result in grave injustice or be offensive to the public policy of the jurisdiction; or
- (4) The misconduct established warrants substantially different discipline in this state; ...

If this court determines that any of those elements exists, this court shall enter such other order as it deems appropriate. The burden is on the party seeking different discipline in this jurisdiction to demonstrate that the imposition of the same discipline is not appropriate.

Our review of the record demonstrates respondent was afforded full due process rights in the federal court and there is no infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct. The discipline imposed by the federal court is not offensive to the public policy of this state and is not substantially different from the discipline we would impose under similar circumstances.

Nonetheless, we would be remiss if we did not comment on the nature of respondent's filings both in federal court and this court, which may be charitably characterized as bizarre. These filings and respondent's actions in federal court raise serious questions as to whether respondent is competent to practice law without endangering his clients or the public.

In light of these concerns, we will mandate that after serving his one-year suspension, respondent shall not be eligible to seek reinstatement to the practice of law in Louisiana pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(K), unless and until he submits to a comprehensive mental health evaluation through the Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program and files a copy of the evaluation report in this court and with the ODC. We will further reserve the right of the ODC to object to respondent's reinstatement under Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(K) or seek any other relief.

### **DECREE**

For the reasons assigned, it is ordered that respondent, Edward Moses, Jr., Louisiana Bar Roll number 30646, be and he hereby is suspended from the practice of law on a reciprocal basis for a period of one year. It is further ordered that respondent shall not be eligible to apply for reinstatement to the practice of law in Louisiana pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(K) unless and until he submits to a comprehensive mental health evaluation through the Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program and files a copy of the evaluation report in this court and with the ODC. The right of the ODC to object to respondent's reinstatement under Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(K) or seek any other relief is reserved. Nothing in our order should be read as precluding the reinstatement of respondent in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana if otherwise permitted under the rules of that court; however, under no circumstances shall respondent be

reinstated to the practice of law in Louisiana without an express order from this court.