

**ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION  
AND  
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION**

In Re:  JOANNE MARIE DENISON  Attorney-Respondent  Reg. No. 6192441	Commission No. 2013 PR 0001
---	-----------------------------

**Motion to Reconsider Motion to Dismiss**

Now comes JoAnne Denison, owner of the probate corruption blog, [www.marygsykes.com](http://www.marygsykes.com) and moves for this Panel to reconsider her Motion to Dismiss these Disciplinary proceedings for the following reasons:

1. That on February 28, 2013 the Virginia Supreme Court rendered a decision in the case of **Horace Hunter v. Virginia State Bar**. A copy of this case is found on my website along with evidence and other material that unequivocally prove that the "judicial officials" referred to in the disciplinary complaint were appointed by a Court lacking jurisdiction. Respondent respectfully requests to supplement the record with the *Hunter Case*.
2. That this case is consistent with prior United States Supreme Court cases that have been previously cited protecting the right of content based non-commercial

speech. The Blog that is the subject of this Disciplinary Action does not meet any criterion for Commercial Speech and therefore is totally protected content speech. Content based speech is given the highest level of protection, according to the United States Supreme Court ("SCOTUS"). As content based speech, SCOTUS has repeatedly pointed out government cannot regulate.

3. That the Illinois ARDC has not been granted jurisdiction by the Illinois Supreme Court to exercise Jurisdiction of subject matter that the United States Supreme Court has decreed to be protected speech and therefore as all of the allegations made against Ms Denison involve protected speech this matter must be dismissed.
4. My blog at [www.MaryGSykes.com](http://www.MaryGSykes.com) does not represent my cases, nor does it advertise my law firm for any services. While I am happy to help clients that write me asking further questions, my main business is patents, trademarks and copyrights, and my [www.DenisonLaw.com](http://www.DenisonLaw.com) website does that. This website is completely separate from [www.MaryGSykes.com](http://www.MaryGSykes.com). Whenever I believe that a post contains a complicated matter best suited for a lawyer, I always advise my readers to hire "a lawyer" and I do not direct them to my website or to contact myself or my staff or advise them to hire me. I want this blog to be clearly independent and non-biased so that it attains the highest credibility for what is posted thereupon. It is obvious from reading any grouping of posts, that the purpose of

this blog is to bring to light corruption. It is NOT to hire myself or my staff for any particular legal matter.

5. Posts on my blog come from many, many sources, but primarily probate victims. These probate victims are not necessarily from Illinois but are often from the entire nation, it appears that Probate corruption is at national epidemic levels.
6. When the posters state that assets are uninventoried, that there was no proper service of a summons and complaint, no *Sodini notices* properly served, my response is that a complete and thorough investigation should immediately be undertaken by the appropriate authorities. My response is NOT to hire me because most people on the blog don't have the kind of money that is needed to hire a lawyer, most cases have active GAL's and I expect the GAL's to handle instances of uninventoried assets, lack of jurisdiction, lack of summons and complaint as a matter of course and *what they were hired to do*. Why should a probate victim hire a lawyer when the GAL should be doing that work and the estate pays for the GAL? Why aren't those GAL's doing their job in the first place?
7. Why are the families being terrorized with huge probate legal bills, demands to isolate the ward, humiliate the ward with loss of control over property, placement in nursing homes against the will of the ward and often family members that want to take care of the ward in their own home, as it should be. Sometimes wards are forced to take injections of Halodol, Risperdol, or they might be told

they MUST take strong psychotropic drugs which are contraindicated for the elderly such a Seroquel, Librium (new variants of Thorazine). Why do they need me to enforce basic laws on the books of all states? Sorry, but I don't think for these very basic and obvious rights, you need a lawyer to cause a stink. I think you need a lawyer for a patent or trademark because those are truly complex, I don't think you need a lawyer to stand in court and tell the judge that strong psychotropic drugs are just horse tranquilizers that are contraindicated for grandma on every package. And it's evil to use them on her so she won't speak up that she is in fact competent and tries to escape because she's smart enough to and resourceful enough to do so without strong tranquilizers.

8. So no, my speech is clearly NOT commercial. It's basic human rights. I speak out for making sure that due process is done in each and every probate case--summons and complaint, properly served, assets properly inventoried, the ward treated with respect and not isolated. These are not complicated legal issues--at their very core they are obvious and natural human rights and civil rights.

Wherefore, the undersigned attorney-Respondent respectfully moves that the record be supplemented with the Hunter case and for the immediate dismissal of these Disciplinary proceedings inasmuch as Hunter makes it clear my speech is non-commercial, the Hunter court would not even allow the names of criminal defendants to

be kept confidential, and what I have posted on my blog is clearly content based speech which should be afforded the highest First Amendment protections according to SCOTUS.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "JoAnne Denison". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first name "JoAnne" and last name "Denison" clearly distinguishable.

JoAnne Denison

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney-Respondent, appearing in this case Pro Se for the purpose of handling matters until she can find new counsel of record, states that she served the following individuals by the methods shown below:

Attys Jerome Larkin, Sharon Opryszek and Jessica Haspel

Attn: ARDC, One Prudential Plaza, 130 E. Randolph St, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Chicago, IL 60601 via email March 1, 2013

and by snail mail in a couple of days when I get around to it.

I will send the required number of copies, I think is an original and 3 copies to the Clerk of the ARDC

I'll let you know.

*Jo Ann Demison*

NOTE: PLEASE SAVE TREES BY ACCEPTING EFILING. PIXELS NEVER DIE AND THEY DON'T CLEAN THE AIR.