

HAMMONS & MILLS  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
115 W. 8th AVE., SUITE 280  
EUGENE, OREGON 97401

Box 062

**FILED**  
AT.....O'CLOCK.....M  
OCT 10 2002  
Court Administrator  
Circuit Court for Lane County Oregon  
DEPUTY

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LANE

OREGON STATE BAR, a public corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICHARD NORLAND and NETWORK  
OREGON, INC., dba SOS DOCUMENTS,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-01-13524

JUDGMENT ENJOINING  
DEFENDANTS

**THIS MATTER** having come on for trial on June 26, 2002 and the Court having entered Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,

**IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED** that defendants, and each of them, be and hereby are enjoined from practicing law without a license.

**IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED** that plaintiff shall be awarded attorney fees and costs by supplemental judgment as provided under ORCP 68.

DATED this 10 day of October, 2002.

*/s/ Karsten H. Rasmussen*

**KARSTEN H. RASMUSSEN**  
CIRCUIT JUDGE

PRESENTED BY:

  
David B. Mills, OSB #77281  
HAMMONS & MILLS  
115 W. 8th Ave., Suite 280  
Eugene, Oregon 97401  
(541) 484-1216

AT 11 O'CLOCK A M

OCT 02 2002

Circuit Courts  
For Lane County, Oregon  
BY \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR LANE COUNTY

OREGON STATE BAR, a public corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICHARD NORLAND and NETWORK  
OREGON, INC., dba SOS DOCUMENTS

Defendants.

Case No. 16-01-13524

FINDINGS OF FACT AND  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The above entitled matter came before the court on June 26, 2002. The Plaintiff appeared through his attorney, David B. Mills and Defendant Richard Norland appeared in person. An Order of Default was previously entered against defendant Network Oregon, Inc. Testimony was taken and the record was left open for written submissions by the parties. Mr. Mills submitted written argument and proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Thereafter, the court ruled based upon the incorrect belief that Mr. Norland had not filed written submissions. Upon learning of its mistake, the court set aside its Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law (77) and considered Mr. Norland's written arguments and proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

NOW, THEREFORE:

Having considered the evidence, written arguments and proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law from Plaintiff and Defendants, the court hereby makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

FINDINGS OF FACTS


1. Defendant Network Oregon, Inc. is in default and an Order of Default has been entered against it.
2. Defendant Network Oregon, Inc. is an Oregon corporation.
3. Defendant Norland is not now nor ever has been licensed to practice law as an attorney in the

- state of Oregon.
4. Defendant authored and distributed the pamphlet as set forth in Exhibit 9.
  5. On or after November 26, 2001 and before December 12, 2001, defendant Norland was aware of the entry of the Order set forth in Exhibit 1 and its provisions.
  6. On or after December 12, 2001 defendant Norland appeared on behalf of and represented defendant Network Oregon, Inc., in this proceeding and in the United States District Court.
  7. The Notice of Removal dated December 14, 2001 and filed herein was prepared and filed by defendant Norland on behalf of himself and defendant Network Oregon, Inc.
  8. The Motion set forth in Exhibit 5 was prepared and filed herein by defendant Norland on behalf of himself and defendant Network Oregon, Inc.
  9. The Certifications and Motion set forth in Exhibit 6 were prepared and filed herein by defendant Norland on behalf of himself and defendant Network Oregon, Inc.
  10. The Motion set forth in Exhibit 7 was prepared and filed herein by defendant Norland on behalf of himself and defendant Network Oregon, Inc.
  11. The Motion set forth in Exhibit 8 was prepared and filed herein by defendant Norland on behalf of himself and defendant Network Oregon, Inc.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The distribution by defendant Norland of Exhibit 9 constituted the practice of law in violation of ORS 9.160.
2. The filing of the document represented by Exhibit 5 constituted the practice of law in violation of ORS 9.160.
3. The filing of the document represented by Exhibit 6 constituted the practice of law in violation of ORS 9.160.
4. The filing of the document represented by Exhibit 7 constituted the practice of law in violation of ORS 9.160.
5. The filing of the document represented by Exhibit 8 constituted the practice of law in violation of ORS 9.160.
6. Plaintiff is entitled to entry of a Judgment enjoining defendants from practicing law without a license.

Dated: October 2, 2002



Karsten H. Rasmussen, Circuit Court Judge

Prepared by Eric Kiley