

Date: August 1, 2017

RE: Russwurm vs. Figaro Taney County Missouri Case #: 15AF-CC00559

From: Barbara Figaro

1368 Clevenger Cove Road, Hollister, MO 65672

(417) 337-3717

BarbFigaro@yahoo.com

To: Mark A. Flanegin, Staff Counsel

**Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel**  
**3327 American Avenue**  
**Jefferson City, MO 65109**  
**573-635-7400 573-635-2240 (Fax)**

In response to your correspondence to me dated April 21, 2017:

I would like to advise you that I have also filed complaints against Brandi Smith, my Lawyer Dan Brogand of Springfield MO, and Judge Eighmy, with the appropriate disciplinary entities. I believe there was collusion between the judge and the attorneys. This would become evident if an investigation beyond incorrect docket entries were done. I request you review all four complaints, supporting documentation, related correspondence from the disciplinary counsel, and the recordings from all hearings and the trial, including the post trial hearings. All four complaints are intertwined. A review of complaints filed, documents, statements, post trial proceedings and court recordings would give an accurate overview of what has happened. Some docket entries are just plain incorrect so it is extremely unfair in an investigation that you base your decisions on them.

Most lawyers I have contacted regarding legal mal-practice find it very distasteful and I have not yet been able to secure an appropriate lawyer to proceed. I am not giving up and will continue to contact lawyers hoping to secure representation. So, yes, I am still attempting to resolve my issues legally.

You asked what I have done to correct this situation: Through my second attorney, we made numerous attempts through the court system to either get a new trial, or to get the court to accept new or corrected information. The judge allowed post trial hearings and accepted corrected documents and testimony from me, however, even after accepting the documentation into evidence, he refused to accept them in his decisions regarding his previous decisions. His actions are being investigated at this time. The reason I changed my values on December 18, 2015 was... the document submitted to the court by Rudy Arambulo was a false document and did not have any of the figures I had supplied to my attorney. I testified numerous times in court that these were not my figures. Rudy Arambulo stated a leased apartment in NJ was real estate I owned, however it was a lease not real-estate. He could not

produce a deed because one did not exist. He listed on Form 9 thousands of dollars worth of items were inherited. They were not. He supplied no documentation to court. Judge accepted this even though I testified they were not. He and my husband changed valuations on items numerous times. You had copies of some of those documents in original complaint. Judge stated I changed values in docket entry, but made no mention of how many times figures were changed by Rudy Arambulo.

Docket entries often did not reflect what happened in court hearings or trial. I request you review the recordings. There was no hearing regarding my being ordered out of my home or out of the state. Rudy Arambulo, my husbands' attorney and Dan Brogand, my attorney, and Judge Eighmy met privately in chambers, and between the 3 of them decided to remove me from my home and the state. That would have become evident to you if you would have reviewed the recordings. This is one statement filed by Dan Brogand to the Chief Disciplinary Counsel in response to my complaints against him:

**"Consistent with fairly common practice in the area, the trial judge asked the attorneys to discuss the case with him in chambers prior to any hearing. We discussed our respective positions, and the judge told us how he would rule. Therefore, no hearing was held. "**

Was this information taken into consideration in your decision to investigate my complaint? Does this sound like the legal way to remove someone from their home. Where was "due process"? Do you not see collusion and conspiracy between the lawyers and the judge. A true investigation would have revealed this. You did not even send my complaint to Rudy Arambulo to get his responses to my complaints. There were numerous allegations regarding ethics and legal violations.

Judge Eighmy asked my husband during a hearing, when was the last time he was with me in the apartment in NJ. We were together (ON VACATION) in the apartment until June 2014, which was what my husband responded. We both returned to our Missouri home June 2014. Technically we lived together until judge ordered me out of my home in September 2015. However Rudy Arambulo and Brandi Smith lied and submitted false documents to the court, and Judge Eighmy decided we were separated Since 2012, even though he asked my husband and had his response on record.

I respectfully request that you review not only my original supporting documentation and complaint against Rudy Arambulo, but all four complaints I have filed, and the recordings from the hearings and trial. I can send recordings and copies of all 4 complaints if you request them. I do believe that reviewing docket entries is just not sufficient to be called an investigation of my complaints. I believe a full investigation into the way our court system is operating and the way some Missouri lawyers are operating should require a full and complete investigation into the system

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Figaro

Said real estate more fully described as:

**All of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 22, 23, and 24 of Block 26, ARCADIA LANDING SUBDIVISION, per the recorded plat thereof, Plat Book 2, page 30A of the Taney County Recorder's Office.**

The Respondent owns real estate located at 44 D Columbus Boulevard, Whiting, Ocean County, New Jersey. The Court finds that the current appraised value of said real estate is \$28,000.00 and is not subject to any indebtedness. The Court awards said real estate to the Respondent. Petitioner is ordered to transfer his interest in said real estate to Respondent by executing a Quit Claim Deed.

Said real estate more fully described as: *NOT REAL ESTATE  
1 SHARE OF STOCK*

**Manchester Township Block 75 Lot 70 Crestwood Village Co-op III**

The parties jointly own boat slip rights identified by the Army Corps of Engineers as No. 7399 further identified as Dock #5 located on Table Rock Lake. The Court finds the boat slip has a current market value of \$12,000.00 and is not subject to any indebtedness. The Court awards said described boat slip to the Respondent. Petitioner is ordered to transfer his interest in said boat slip to Respondent by executing the appropriate Army Corps of Engineers form or document.

The parties jointly own boat slip rights identified by the Army Corps of Engineers as No. 7399 further identified as Dock #4 located on Table Rock Lake. The Court finds the boat slip has a current market value of \$10,000.00 and is not subject to any indebtedness. The Court awards said described boat to the Petitioner. Respondent is ordered to transfer her interest in said boat slip to Respondent by executing the appropriate Army Corps of Engineers form or document.

The parties do not own any other real estate.

