

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

VAKHTANG BAKHUTASHVILI,	)	Arizona Supreme Court
	)	No. CV-26-0151-SA
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	FILED 06/23/2026
STATE BAR OF ARIZONA; ROBERT J.	)	
DILK & ASSOCIATES, PLLC; AZ	)	
CIGAR, INC.	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	
	)	

O R D E R

I. Background

On June 8, 2026, this Court entered an en banc order in this proceeding declining special action jurisdiction, identifying a pattern of escalating harassment, and providing notice pursuant to *Madison v. Groseth*, 230 Ariz. 8, 14 ¶¶ 17-18 (App. 2012), that further escalation would result in the consideration of designating Petitioner Vakhtang Bakhutashvili ("Petitioner") a vexatious litigant. Any such designation could require pre-filing approval, payment of all deferred fees, and other appropriate relief. *Bakhutashvili v. State Bar of Arizona*, CV-26-0151-SA, order at 8-9 (Ariz. June 8, 2026) ("June 8 Order"). The June 8 Order noted, "Chief Bar Counsel expressly informed Petitioner that the underlying matter is a civil dispute and that Petitioner is free to initiate civil litigation if he deems it appropriate. Petitioner has not established that the State Bar failed

to adequately investigate his complaint, and the relief requested is far outside what this Court will consider in reviewing the State Bar's investigation." (*Id.*, at 10). It also denied the Motion to Recuse Duty Justice King and to Vacate the June 1, 2026 Order. (*Id.*, at 12).

The June 8 Order generally explained that Petitioner's underlying dispute with AZ Cigar, Inc. (the "Company") arose from a transaction involving a cigar shipment. A representative of the Company proposed a \$10,000 settlement; Petitioner revised his demands and asserted an aggregate claim of \$12,000,000. Attorney Robert Dilk (the "Attorney") sent Petitioner a message stating that he had been retained to represent the Company, and, after a series of communications, Petitioner filed a complaint with the State Bar of Arizona against the Attorney's law firm. The State Bar notified Petitioner that no further inquiry was warranted. Petitioner appealed, and Chief Bar Counsel denied the appeal. Petitioner then filed the special action.

In separate proceedings, Petitioner filed a separate Emergency Petition for Special Action, *Bakhutashvili v. Clerk of the Arizona Supreme Court*, CV-26-0165-SA, ("Clerk Special Action") alleging that the Clerk had violated "Petitioner's constitutional rights to Due Process and Equal Protection," and demanding the Clerk "immediately correct the public docket to accurately reflect the original, unadulterated case caption." The Court noted that Petitioner's claim was that the court docket was impermissibly altered, but observed that there was no allegation that the Clerk altered any document that

Petitioner filed, and the Court declined special action jurisdiction in the Clerk Special Action on June 1, 2026.

Rather than respond to the substance of the June 8 Order or address why a vexatious litigant designation should not be entered, Petitioner filed a series of additional motions, gratuitous documents, demands, and requests for clarification that continue the patterns identified in the June 8 Order. Exhibit "A" lists the filings in this case.

Having afforded Petitioner notice and an opportunity to be heard, the Court proceeds to make the findings required by A.R.S. § 12-3201 and *Madison v. Groseth*.

II. The Pending Motions

Following entry of the June 8 Order, Petitioner filed the following three motions, (collectively, the "Pending Motions"):

(1) An (eight page) motion filed June 10, 2026, captioned "Petitioner's Motion for Immediate Judicial Intervention and Expedited Adjudication Due to Ongoing Administrative Misconduct, Procedural Manipulation, Bad-Faith Falsification of Judicial Records, and Conduct Misleading This Honorable Court by the Clerk's Office and Related Agents," (the "Motion");

(2) A (twenty-three page) second motion filed June 10, 2026, bearing the identical caption, (the "Second Motion"); and

(3) An (eleven page) motion filed June 14-15, 2026, captioned "Petitioner's Emergency Motion for Reconsideration, Vacatur of Orders,

and Request for Direct Oversight by the Chief Justice" (the "Third Motion").

III. Authority

A. Statutory and Inherent Authority

Arizona Revised Statutes § 12-3201(A) authorizes the presiding judge of superior court, on its own motion, to designate a pro se litigant a vexatious litigant in a noncriminal case. Upon designation, the litigant may not file any new pleading, motion, or other document without prior leave of court. A.R.S. § 12-3201(B). Independent of this statute, Arizona courts possess inherent authority to curtail a vexatious litigant's ability to initiate judicial proceedings. *Madison*, 230 Ariz. at 14 ¶¶ 17-18; *Acker v. CSO Chevira*, 188 Ariz. 252, 254 (App. 1997). The vexatious litigant statute informs this Court's consideration of Petitioner's filings in this matter.

That statute includes a non-exhaustive list of "vexatious conduct": (a) repeated filing of court actions solely or primarily for the purpose of harassment; (b) unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings; (c) court actions brought or defended without substantial justification; (e) a pattern of making unreasonable, repetitive and excessive requests for information; and (f) repeated filing of documents or requests for relief that have been the subject of previous rulings by the court in the same litigation. A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1). As set forth below, the Pending Motions provide specific examples falling under multiple subsections of the statute.

B. Due Process.

The *Madison* framework requires (1) notice and opportunity to be heard, (2) an adequate record for review, (3) substantive findings as to frivolous or harassing nature of the litigant's actions, and (4) an order narrowly tailored to closely fit the specific vice encountered. *Madison*, 230 Ariz. at 14 ¶ 18. Petitioner received notice through the June 8 Order, has had the opportunity to respond, and has responded by filing additional motions that themselves demonstrate the conduct warranting designation.

IV. Findings of Fact

A. Assertions in the Petition and Motion to Recuse

On May 6, 2026, Petitioner filed the Petition in this Court naming nineteen respondents including the State Bar of Arizona, its Board of Governors, its Senior Leadership, the Attorney/Law Firm, the Company, and the Company's representatives. Petitioner demanded that the Court, within 14 days, produce documents concerning the Bar's investigation; explain why documents were not available; direct the State Bar to "[r]estore the original Complaint" and name the Law Firm and not the Attorney; require written confirmation that his \$12,000,000 claim had been disclosed to insurance carriers; and require written confirmation that the \$72,000,000 claim against the State Bar had been disclosed to insurance carriers, threatening "[f]ailure to notify insurance carriers of known or reasonably

anticipated claims constitutes a violation of A.R.S. § 20-443.01 (Class 5 Felony)." (Pet. at 21-22; June 8 Order at 4).

The order also recounted threats and assertions reflecting a pattern of escalating demands and filings that demonstrate this matter is predominately for purposes of harassment, rather than for any legitimate purpose:

The firm's repeated refusal of proposed pre-litigation settlement and its silence in response to proffered evidence have resulted in substantial escalation of the conflict and heightened legal risks. Furthermore, the firm is accused of failing to disclose existing claims to its insurers during professional license renewals, which constitutes active participation in a conspiracy to conceal criminal activity.

. . . .

Thereby, the State Bar became an accomplice in concealing criminal activity, effectively blocking mandatory disclosures to relevant federal agencies

. . . .

[Chief Bar Counsel] used electronic communications to legitimize a fictitious civil dispute, actively concealing systemic fraud and shielding [the Law Firm] from federal oversight by the USPTO, USPS, and tax authorities, while suppressing disclosure of multi-million-dollar insurance liabilities. Violations:

- § 18 U.S.C. § 1341 – Mail fraud: concealment of material facts through official correspondence
- § 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – Tampering with an official proceeding / obstruction of a federal investigation
- § 18 U.S.C. § 1519 – Falsification or concealment of records in a federal investigation
- § 18 U.S.C. § 371 – Conspiracy to defraud the United States."

. . . .

Any assertion that this File does not exist in the Bar's electronic systems would constitute a violation of A.R.S. §13-2407 — Tampering with a Public Record — and 18 U.S.C. §1519 — Falsification or Concealment of Records in connection with a matter within federal jurisdiction.

.

On March 17, 2026, the Petitioner served the State Bar of Arizona, its Board of Governors, and its Senior Leadership with a formal civil notice of claim in the amount of \$72,000,000. By failing to disclose this material liability to its insurance carriers and the ADOA Risk Management department, as mandated by A.R.S. § 41-621, the State Bar engaged in a systemic concealment of financial risk.

.

Failure to notify insurance carriers of known or reasonably anticipated claims constitutes a violation of A.R.S. § 20-443.01 (Class 5 Felony).

(June 8 Order at 7-8; Pet. at 8-9, 12, 15-17, 21). As the June 8 Order observed, the Petition itself closes with an explicit conditional offer: "The petitioner also notifies the court of its willingness to settle this dispute out of court, provided that the respondents negotiate in good faith to resolve Case No. 26-0182 through appropriate administrative measures prior to filing this case in United States federal court." (June 8 Order at 8; Pet. at 23).

Petitioner's June 2, "Motion to Recuse" further alleged that Duty Justice King and the Clerk have in their possession documentary evidence confirming "the facts of the participation of the STATE BAR OF ARIZONA in a conspiracy with" the Law Firm "to conceal multi-million dollar insurance obligations, commit fraudulent acts against the United States Postal Service (USPS) and UPS Postal Service, engage in repeated perjury and misrepresentation of a Non-Resident of

the United States of America by official officials of the Bar Association, as well as multiple falsifications of Court records by the Clerk of the Supreme Court in Case No. CV-26-0151-SA, *Bakhutashvili V. State Bar of Arizona et al.*" (Mot. to Recuse at 5).

B. Examples of continuing vexatious conduct in the Pending Motions

The Pending Motions each reflect, on their face, a continued effort to harass the named respondents, expand the pool of targets, imply nefarious intent through innuendo and public information, and to reopen issues already decided, rather than to pursue any legitimate judicial remedy. The Pending Motions include examples of repeated filing of court actions that are vexatious.

The Motion renews the same allegations previously presented to and rejected by the Court. The Motion accuses the Clerk's Office of "ongoing administrative misconduct," "procedural manipulation," and "bad-faith falsification of judicial records." (Motion at 1). It includes claims of "institutional corruption" and a conspiracy by the respondents "to conceal \$96,000,000 from insurance companies," and "execution of wire fraud and mail fraud." (Motion at 1). It again challenges Duty Justice King's June 1 ruling striking the certificate of service and requiring service under court rules as constituting "nothing less than an intentional act of obstruction designed to insulate her associates from federal liability and judicial scrutiny." (Motion at 3). It alleges that the Clerk's Office has "weaponized" administrative procedures "in bad faith to delay" the

proceedings. (*Id.*). It accuses the Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions (DIFI) and the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) of participating in "a conspiracy" to conceal "multiple fraudulent acts" and "falsification of tax and customs documentation." (*Id.*).

The Motion asserts:

These coordinated and deliberate administrative actions, undertaken pursuant to a conspiracy among officials of the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA), the Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions (DIFI), and the Office of the Arizona Supreme Court, for the benefit of the Respondents with whom they maintain longstanding professional and financial relationships, directly violate the Petitioner's constitutional rights to due process of law and equal access to the courts.

(*Id.* at 5). The Motion also includes a continuing and more expansive barrage of unsupported wrongdoings and new demands exceeding the scope of the Petition, such as, demands for public oversight and ongoing demands to consider, "recusal or disqualification where warranted." (*Id.* at 8). It alleges, "[t]he conduct described in this Petition implicates matters falling within federal jurisdiction, including, but not limited to: Conspiracy to Defraud the United States (18 U.S.C. § 371); Misprision of Felony (18 U.S.C. § 4); Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud and Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1349); and Fraud Upon the Court." (*Id.* at 6).

The day after filing the Motion, Petitioner filed the **Second Motion**, including the same description on the first page, repeating these accusations at greater length across twenty-three pages. The

Second Motion characterizes the Court's factual description of the underlying cigar-shipment dispute as "false," "misleading," and part of a "conspiracy among public officials," (Second Motion at 2), and accuses Duty Justice Lopez of "exhibiting deliberate blindness in favor of the Respondents." (Second Motion at 7). It reiterates Petitioner's "\$12,000,000 compensation demand" against respondents, (*Id.* at 9), and peppers the Court with questions. (*Id.* at 12).

Although the Bar and the Court have explained that Petitioner may pursue legitimate civil remedies and that his complaints exceed the scope of his challenge against the State Bar, Petitioner repeatedly "requests clarification" about the Respondents' duties and obligations. (See eleven clarification requests in the Second Motion).

The **Third Motion** was filed in this case but captioned with case number CV-26-0165-SA – the companion case in which this Court had already declined jurisdiction on June 1, 2026.

The Third Motion expands Petitioner's targets to include the Clerk of Court, Presiding Disciplinary Judge and Director, Administrative Office of the Courts by name as having "access" to the "circumstances," but failing to "conduct a full legal assessment of the criminal aspects . . . to competent authorities." (Third Motion at 9). It labels the Court's prior orders "unfounded and factually unsupported" (*Id.*) and asserts that the Duty Justices who signed those orders did so in service of respondents with whom they maintain

"longstanding professional, personal, and financial ties." (*Id.*). It contends the Duty Justices have "willfully disregarded the submitted evidence." (*Id.* at 10). It demands that the Chief Justice personally assume "direct oversight" of all proceedings in both case numbers, vacate the orders of two Duty Justices, conduct a full investigation into the conduct of the Members of the Arizona Supreme Court and the Clerk's Office, and "notify the appropriate federal institutional authorities" of Petitioner's claims. (*Id.* at 9).

The Third Motion also includes assertions that Duty Justice Lopez is "participating in the willful disregard of documented fraudulent conduct involving:" "Mail fraud," "Concealment of aggregate insurance obligations totaling \$96,000,000," "Fraudulent misrepresentation," "Customs fraud," and "Falsification of Tax Records." (*Id.* at 10).

C. Vexatious Conduct under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1)(a).

Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1)(a), vexatious conduct includes, "[r]epeated filing of court actions solely or primarily for the purpose of harassment." As shown above, the special action challenged the State Bar's dismissal of Petitioner's bar complaint. With the Petition and successive filings, Petitioner concocts unsubstantiated wrongdoings, implicating not only the original respondents but also Court officers in federal crimes and ethical violations. The repeated invocation of the names of respondents, the expansion of allegations to include Court officials and agencies not

parties to the proceeding, recitation of criminal statutes and the fantastical multiple million dollar claims establish that Petitioner has no sincere intention to challenge the State Bar investigation or pursue any claim properly presented in this Court in the first instance. Petitioner's filings serve only to burden and harass the Company, the Attorney, State Bar Counsel, Chief Counsel, the Clerk, and Duty Justices and to burden Court staff. This pattern is consistent with the use of court filings as instruments of pressure and harassment rather than as vehicles for the adjudication of genuine legal claims.

D. Vexatious Conduct under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E) (1) (b) .

Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E) (1) (b), vexatious conduct includes unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings. Each of the Pending Motions expands and prolongs this proceeding beyond its proper scope by seeking unwarranted "emergency" relief, seeking relief outside the scope of this proceeding, and relitigating matters resolved by prior orders.

Petitioner invoked "emergency" designation in multiple successive filings, including an "Emergency Motion for Special Action and Request for Immediate Relief" on May 24, 2026, an "Emergency Petition for Special Action" on May 27, 2026, and successive "Motion[s] for Immediate Judicial Intervention" (Motion and Second Motion) and "Petitioner's Emergency Motion for Reconsideration, Vacatur of Orders, and Request for Direct oversight by the Chief

Justice.” (Third Motion). None of these presented a genuine emergency; each sought to accelerate consideration of claims already pending and to pressure the Court and respondents into immediate action. This constitutes unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings within the meaning of A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1)(b).

Also, the Motion and Second Motion both reassert, at length, the same allegations of docket “falsification” that formed the basis of the Petition in Case No. CV-26-0165-SA – a matter the Court had already concluded on June 1, 2026, and that the June 8 Order addressed again in declining to accept jurisdiction. The Pending Motions present no new evidence and no legal basis that was not or could not have been raised before entry of the June 8 Order. They simply regurgitate the same emails and same grievances.

The Third Motion explicitly acknowledges the prior orders declining jurisdiction and seeks to relitigate them – not by identifying a material error of law, but by making baseless assertions that the Duty Justices acted in bad faith.

Taken together, the Pending Motions, filed in a span of four days, represent an unreasonable expansion of a proceeding that this Court had concluded, piling new accusations on top of resolved issues in purported “emergencies” in a manner that burdens the Court and the named respondents without advancing any cognizable claim.

E. Filings Without Substantial Justification

Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1)(c), vexatious conduct includes actions brought without substantial justification. "Without substantial justification" incorporates A.R.S. § 12-349. Under that statute, conduct is "without substantial justification" when it is groundless and not made in good faith. See A.R.S. § 12-349(F). A claim is groundless if the proponent can present no rational argument based upon the evidence or law in support of that claim. "Whether a claim is groundless is viewed through an objective lens, without regard to the attorney's or party's subjective beliefs." *Arizona Republican Party v. Richer*, 257 Ariz. 237, 243 ¶ 15 (2024) (internal citations omitted).

The Motion demands that the Court set aside personal service requirements and allow Petitioner to force his pool of respondents into litigation without the inconvenience of requiring Petitioner to effect personal service. In so doing, Petitioner maintains that the June 1 Duty Justice Order adhering to Rule 7(d) service requirements results from a "clear manifestation of bias," "based upon" the Duty Justice's "deep-seated personal, financial, and professional ties to respondents." (Motion at 2-3). Other examples are listed above, including allegations on pages 3, 5 and 6 of the Motion and pages 9 and 10 of the Third Motion. There is no factual or legal support offered for the oft-repeated allegations of bias except for supposition springing from publicly available information. See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 81, Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. The Court is well-

within its authority in requiring service as mandated under Rule 7(d). The challenge to that ruling based on "bias" is objectively groundless and without substantial justification.

D. Pattern of Unreasonable, Repetitive, and Excessive Requests for Information

Under § 12-3201(E)(1)(e), vexatious conduct includes a pattern of making unreasonable, repetitive, and excessive requests for information. This begins with the Petition's requests for information "within 14 days" and demands for confirmation.

The Pending Motions continue a pattern described in the June 8 Order, beginning with a demand for a State Bar docket sheet "within 24 hours." The Second Motion asks the Court to "clarify" whether raising questions about shipping records, customs-related issues, and inventory discrepancies constitutes harassment. (Second Motion at 12-13). It includes ongoing requests for "clarification" as to the Court's rulings. (*Id.* at 17).

Petitioner has engaged in a pattern of unreasonable, repetitive, and excessive questions and requests for information. The Court concludes that these requests for "clarification" and questions establish a pattern of making unreasonable, repetitive, and excessive requests for information and constitute vexatious conduct.

F. Repeated Filing of Documents Presenting Issues Already Ruled Upon

Under § 12-3201(E)(1)(f), vexatious conduct includes a repeated filing of documents or requests for relief that have been the subject

of previous rulings by the court in the same litigation. The Court finds this factor satisfied.

The June 8 Order specifically addressed and denied: (1) Petitioner's recusal motion as to Duty Justice King; (2) the claim that the Court should vacate the June 1 order; (3) the claim that the docket had been falsified; (4) the claim that the Court should accept jurisdiction over the State Bar complaint; and (5) the claim that the underlying commercial dispute presented federal issues warranting this Court's intervention. The Pending Motions again raise these issues, seeking vacatur of both the June 1 and June 8 orders, removal of the Duty Justices who signed them, and direct supervision by the Chief Justice.

Petitioner also repeatedly files pleadings and documents that are already filed, increasing the burden of his filings on Court Staff. These are listed on Exhibit "A." Other factors not specifically listed in the statute that support this ruling include misuse of "emergency" filings lacking any actual emergency and motions to recuse or disqualify judges lacking any statutory basis or grounds under Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 81.

IV. Conclusions of Law

Courts have a "responsibility to see that [litigants] conform to an acceptable, minimal level of competency and performance" and "[w]e owe this responsibility to the judiciary, the bar and, more importantly, to [all] litigants and the people as a whole." *Ramos v.*

Nichols, 252 Ariz. 519, 522 ¶ 8 (App. 2022) (quoting *Evans v. Arthur*, 139 Ariz. 362, 364-65 (1984)). In this regard, "Courts hold unrepresented litigants in Arizona to the same standards as attorneys and do not afford them special leniency." (*Id.*). The Court is also well-within its authority in ending frivolous proceedings. *Acker*, 188 Ariz. at 256.

The Court finds, upon the record as a whole, that Petitioner has engaged in vexatious conduct within the meaning of A.R.S. § 12-3201. The filings in this proceeding – from the original Petition through the Pending Motions – are not calculated to achieve any result reasonably available through the judicial process, but rather to intimidate, burden, and harass the named respondents and court personnel through the multiplication of parties, accusations of criminal and ethical violations, and repeated references to ever-escalating millions of dollars in claims. The Court further finds that Petitioner has been afforded notice, consistent with *Madison*, 230 Ariz. at 14 ¶¶ 17, 18, and an opportunity to respond.

As noted by other courts, lawsuits lacking a reasonable basis are not within the scope of First Amendment protection. A pre-filing requirement applied to a vexatious litigant "does not violate the first amendment." *Potter v. Arizona House of Representatives*, 1 CA-CV 23-0213, 2024 WL 368095, at *9 ¶ 56 (App. Feb. 1, 2024), review denied (June 25, 2024) (mem. decision) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Courts have the recognized power and the obligation to

protect the public and the efficient administration of justice from litigious propensities. *In re Martin-Trigona*, 737 F.2d 1254, 1262 (2d Cir. 1984).

The Pending Motions demonstrate that Petitioner has no intention of curtailing this conduct voluntarily.

V. Pre-Filing Restriction

Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(B), a pro se litigant designated a vexatious litigant may not file a new pleading, motion, or other document without prior leave of the court. Arizona courts possess inherent authority to implement pre-filing restrictions that are narrowly tailored to the specific vice encountered. *Madison*, 230 Ariz. at 14 ¶ 18. The restrictions imposed herein are tailored to the pattern identified in the record.

Petitioner's vexatious conduct consists specifically of (1) filing court proceedings in this Court that are primarily designed to harass the same constellation of respondents arising out of a private commercial dispute, (2) repeatedly seeking relief from this Court that is outside its jurisdiction or that duplicates issues already decided, and (3) targeting court personnel and members of this Court with accusations of criminal conspiracy as a mechanism to force continued engagement with claims already resolved. A restriction requiring prior approval of filings in this Court is therefore narrowly tailored to address that pattern without foreclosing access to other forums or to claims of a materially different nature.

VI. Deferred Fees

Under A.R.S. § 12-302(M), if a party who has been granted a fee deferral is found to be a vexatious litigant during the pendency of the action, the court shall order the applicant to pay the deferred or waived fees and costs. Petitioner was granted a fee deferral at the outset of both proceedings. Having found Petitioner to be a vexatious litigant, the Court will require payment of those deferred fees and costs.

VII. Ruling

Therefore, upon consideration en banc,

IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner Vakhtang Bakhutashvili is hereby designated a Vexatious Litigant in accordance with the Court's inherent authority and pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-3201.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner Vakhtang Bakhutashvili shall pay all filing fees and costs deferred in connection with Case No. CV-26-0151-SA and CV-26-0165-SA pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-302(M) in the amount of **\$660.00**. Petitioner must make such payment within thirty (30) days of this order. Petitioner may not file any new pleading, motion, or other document in this Court unless or until payment of all deferred fees are paid. The Clerk shall not accept for filing any document submitted by Petitioner unless the Clerk has received payment of the deferred fees in full.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner Vakhtang Bakhutashvili may not file any new pleading, motion, or other document in this Court

arising out of or relating to the subject matter of Case Nos. CV-26-0151-SA or CV-26-0165-SA, or relating to any dispute among the same parties arising out of the same set of operative facts described in those proceedings, without first obtaining prior leave of the Court. This prohibition includes any person or entity named in any of the filings in Case Nos. CV-26-0151-SA or in CV-26-0165-SA.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED any request for leave to file must be submitted to the Clerk of the Court and must include:

1. An application that is no longer than three pages titled, "Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File."
2. The Application must include a certification that the claims or issues presented have not previously been raised and rejected in these proceedings and a concise statement of the legal basis for the proposed filing.
3. The Application must include as exhibits both a copy of the proposed filing and a copy of this order as exhibits.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, the Clerk shall not accept for filing any document submitted by Petitioner in either the CV-26-0151-SA or CV-26-0165-SA cases or in relation to these matters until such leave has been granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall refer any proposed filing by Petitioner that relates to the above-described subject matter to a Justice designated by the Chief Justice for review prior to filing. The reviewing Justice shall grant leave to file only upon a

determination that the proposed filing presents a cognizable legal claim or argument that has not previously been ruled upon and is not frivolous.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any request for fee waiver or deferral may only be granted by a Justice of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall note Petitioner's vexatious litigant designation in the dockets of Case No. CV-26-0151-SA and CV-26-0165-SA and in the Court's administrative records, consistent with A.R.S. § 12-3201 and applicable court policies.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying the Pending Motions and any other pending motions.

DATED this 23rd day of June, 2026.

 /s/
JOHN R. LOPEZ IV
Duty Justice

TO:
Vakhtang Bakhutashvili
Maret Vessella
Jessica Fotinos
Amy K Rehm
Robert J Dilk
John Scott Hiland
AZ Cigar Inc.
State Bar of Arizona

Exhibit A
List of Filings
CV-26-0151-SA — Bakhutashvili v. State Bar of Arizona,

Entry	Date	Type	Filing / Description	Attributed To
1	6-May-2026	FILED	Petition for Special Action; Certificate of Compliance; Cover Sheet; Exhibits A–K	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
2	6-May-2026	FILED	Exhibit H; Exhibit H; Exhibit I; Exhibit K	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
3	6-May-2026	FILED	Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees and Consent to Entry of Judgment; (Proposed) Blank Order; Proof 1; Proof 2	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
4	11-May-2026	ORDER	Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees — Deferral granted; no payments due until further notice	Aaron C. Nash, Clerk
5	14-May-2026	SENT	Letter to Petitioner Re Certificate of Service	Court → Petitioner
6	15-May-2026	FILED	Certificate of Compliance; Certificate of Service; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees; (Duplicate) Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees and Consent to Entry of Judgment	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
7	19-May-2026	FILED	Motion to Amend Case Caption to Conform to the Electronic Filing Record Generated by AZ Turbocourt at Inception; Certificate of Service; (Duplicate) Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
8	19-May-2026	SENT	Letter to Petitioner Re Motion	Court → Petitioner
9	19-May-2026	FILED	(Amended Per Letter Sent 5/19/26) Motion to Amend Case Caption to Conform to the Electronic Filing Record; Certificate of Service; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees; (Duplicate) Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
10	23-May-2026	FILED	Petitioner's Formal Notice of Documented Pattern of Judicial Record Falsification, Fraud Upon the Court, and Demand for Written Administrative Justification; Certificate of Service; Exhibit A (Unauthorized Docket Alteration May 11); Exhibit B (Unauthorized Docket Alteration May 15)	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
11	24-May-2026	FILED	Petitioner's Emergency Motion for Special Action and Request for Immediate Relief; Certificate of Service; (Duplicate) Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
12	28-May-2026	FILED	Notice of Service; [STRICKEN per 6/1/26 Order] Certificate of Service; Petition for Special Action; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
13	1-Jun-	ORDER	Denied, without prejudice, the May 24 "Emergency Motion for Special Action and	Hon. Kathryn H. King

Entry	Date	Type	Filing / Description	Attributed To
	2026		Request for Immediate Relief; Petition for Special Action to be considered in due course	
14	1-Jun-2026	ORDER	Granted the Motion to Amend Caption (three respondents); directed service under Ariz. R. Civ. P. 4, 4.1, 4.2 and a certificate of service; set 20-day response/reply deadlines; struck the May 28 Certificate of Service as noncompliant	Hon. Kathryn H. King
15	2-Jun-2026	FILED	Motion to Recuse Duty Justice Kathryn H. King, Vacate the June 1, 2026 Order, and Authorize Alternative Service; Certificate of Service; (Duplicate) Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
16	8-Jun-2026	ORDER	(En banc) Declined special action jurisdiction over the May 6 Petition; provided notice under <i>Madison v. Groseth</i> that further escalation may result in vexatious-litigant designation; denied the Motion to Recuse and to Vacate the June 1 Order	Hon. John R. Lopez IV
17	10-Jun-2026	FILED	Petitioner's Motion for Immediate Judicial Intervention and Expedited Adjudication Due to Ongoing Administrative Misconduct, Procedural Manipulation, Bad-Faith Falsification of Judicial Records, and Conduct Misleading This Honorable Court by the Clerk's Office and Related Agents; Certificate of Service; DIFI_PRR2026-008_Closure_and_Block_April20_2026.pdf; Message blocked	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
18	10-Jun-2026	FILED	EXHIBIT_Evidence_of_Record_Manipulation_and_Docket_Discrepancies.pdf; Certificate of Service; Application for Deferral/Waiver of Fees; Order Re Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
19	11-Jun-2026	FILED	Petitioner's Motion for Immediate Judicial Intervention and Expedited Adjudication Due to Ongoing Administrative Misconduct, Procedural Manipulation, Bad-Faith Falsification of Judicial Records, and Conduct Misleading This Honorable Court by the Clerk's Office and Related Agents; Certificate of Service; EXHIBIT 11 (Intentional Withholding of Commercial Invoice from International Buyer); EXHIBIT_A_1-2	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
20	11-Jun-2026	FILED	MARET_VESSELLA_CHIEF_BAR_COUNSEL_SEES_NO_VIOLATIONS_IN_RESPONDENTS_CONDUCT.pdf; Certificate of Service; EXHIBIT_C_Admission_of_Liability_and_Bad_Faith_Settlement_Offer.pdf; EXHIBIT_C_1-2	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
21	11-Jun-2026	FILED	AscOrder (Judicial Misrepresentation Favoring Respondents); Certificate of Service; EXHIBIT_F_2_Evidence_Received_by_State_Bar_Leadership.pdf; EXHIBIT_D_J	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
22	11-Jun-2026	FILED	EXHIBIT_B_Logistics_Violation_Customs_Evasion_and_Inventory_Manipulation.pdf; Certificate of Service; Order Re Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; Application for Deferral/Waiver of Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
23	14-Jun-2026	FILED	Petitioner's Emergency Motion for Reconsideration, Vacatur of Orders, and Request for Direct Oversight by the Chief Justice; Certificate of Service; Order Re Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; Application for Deferral/Waiver of Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se

Entry	Date	Type	Filing / Description	Attributed To
24	17-Jun-2026	FILED	Request for Special Consideration of Documentary Evidence Demonstrating Material Misapprehension and Mischaracterization of the Record; Certificate of Service; EXHIBIT_DOCUMENTARY_EVIDENCE_REFUTING_VESSELLA_MISREPRESENTATIONS.pdf; Exhibit_Vessella_Mischaracterization_of_Facts_CV-26-0151-SA.pdf	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
25	17-Jun-2026	FILED	Uncontested_Claims_State_Bar_Dilk.pdf; Certificate of Service; Application for Deferral/Waiver of Fees; Order Re Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se

CV-26-0165-SA — Bakhutashvili v. Clerk of the Arizona Supreme Court

Entry	Date	Type	Filing / Description	Attributed To
1	27-May-2026	FILED	Emergency Petition for Special Action; Certificate of Compliance; Cover Sheet; Summary Sheet	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
2	27-May-2026	FILED	Petition- CV-26-0151-SA - Falsification of Court Records May 6; Certificate of Service; Petition – CV-26-0151-SA - Falsification of Court Records May 15; Petition – CV-26-0151-SA - Falsification of Court Records May 19	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
3	27-May-2026	FILED	Appellate Application for Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees and Consent to Entry of Judgment; (Proposed) Appellate Order Regarding Deferral or Waiver of Court Fees; Displaced Person Documents 1; Displaced Person Documents 2	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
4	28-May-2026	FILED	Notice of Service; Certificate of Service; Emergency Petition for Special Action; (Copy of) Order Re Court Fees (CV-25-0151)	Petitioner Bakhutashvili, Pro Se
5	1-Jun-2026	ORDER	(En Banc) Declined special action jurisdiction	Hon. Kathryn H. King

