

For immediate release: 11 am PT-2 pm ET
December 17, 2020

Contact: Caroline Beckmann
CBeckmann@tridentdmg.com
(202) 440-1783

**Bradford Lund, Grandson of Walt Disney, and Step-Mother Sherry Lund Call On
Judicial Commission to Remove Superior Court Judge David J. Cowan from Bench
for Alleged “Multiple” Violations of Judicial Canons of Ethics**

*Leading attorneys sign letter asking for removal of Judge Cowan, citing Judge Cowan’s
evident bias favoring “hostile trustees” who have “conspired” against Mr. Lund and his
step-mother, Sherry Lund, ignoring court decisions in Mr. Lund’s favor in Arizona and
California*

Representatives of #FreeBritney movement express support for Mr. Lund’s cause

Los Angeles, CA, December 17, 2020 – At a national telephonic press conference this morning, attorneys for Bradford D. Lund, grandson of the late Walt Disney, and Mrs. Sherry Lund, his step-mother, announced the filing of two letters on behalf of each of Mr. Lund and his step-mother, to the California Commission on Judicial Performance, asking for the permanent removal of Los Angeles Superior Court Judge David Cowan from the bench for multiple violations of the California Canons of Judicial Ethics.

The letter on behalf of Mr. Lund also asserted that Judge Cowan’s bias was to protect the violations of their duties by “hostile trustees” who used “every tactic possible to attack both Mr. Lund and his entire family. The letter pointed out that this bias resulted in Judge Cowan protecting at his expense the “hostile Trustees [who] conspired with estranged family members to initiate Arizona guardianship/conservatorship proceedings against Mr. Lund, which lasted over seven years, he was vindicated and found competent by the Arizona court.”

Mr. Lund has also stated that he loves and is grateful to his step-mother, Sherry Lund, and objects to the improper and personal attacks against her by Judge Cowan, aided and abetted by multiple false statements by the hostile trustees and their attorneys also attacking her – facilitated and encouraged by Judge Cowan in violation of the Judicial Canons requirement that he remain fair and neutral. A separate letter defending Mrs. Lund’s love and good faith regarding her step-son was also submitted, signed by a separate attorney long experienced in the probate court system.

Representatives of the #FreeBritney movement, as well as other probate reform groups in California and elsewhere, also indicated their support for Brad Lund’s cause of for freedom and justice.

The letters by attorneys representing Mr. Lund and his step-mother, Sherry Lund, include more than 30 improper statements contained in Judge Cowan’s November 12, 2020 judicial order (“Order”), which challenged Mr. Lund’s attorney’s right to continue to represent her client after

more than 10 years. The Order critically referred to Mr. Lund's federal civil rights lawsuit last March naming Judge Cowan as a defendant, while announcing at the same time that he was removing himself from the case going forward.

According to the two letters, the specific statements by Judge Cowan in the November order were 1) knowingly false, 2) showed disqualifying personal animus, and 3) impermissibly "embroiled himself as an adversary" by ignoring the appearance if not the reality of retaliation and conflict of interest.

The two letters were signed by all of the attorneys representing Mr. Lund, including, lead counsel, [Sandra Slaton of Horne Slaton](#) in Scottsdale, AZ, [Dario Frommer](#) of Akin Gump's Los Angeles office, former majority leader of the California State Assembly; [Lanny J. Davis](#) of DC's Davis Goldberg Galper and former special counsel to President Clinton; [Joseph P. Busch](#) of the Petit Firm, and, representing Mr. Lund's step-mother, Sherry Lund, writing a separate letter is [Lauriann Wright](#), a founding partner of the Los Angeles firm of Wright Kim Douglas, the attorney for Sherry Lund and a highly respected veteran of the probate court system for more than 20 year

The full text of both letters can be found [here](#) and [here](#). The full list of more than 30 specific statements in Judge Cowan's November Order cited by the attorneys in both letters as violations of the Judicial Canons and justifying his removal can be found [here](#).

"One of the most basic protections our country has in preserving our democracy, is our confidence in the integrity of the judicial branch," wrote Mr. Lund's attorneys, Messrs. Frommer, Davis and the three others. "Indeed, there is nothing more important than preserving the integrity of the court system."

"The Judicial Cannons require that a judge must preside over cases with neutrality and fairness....The standard for removal of a judge must be exceedingly high. It must be more than mere disagreement with the judge's views of the facts and the evidence. There must be a substantial offense to the standards of integrity required of a judge. That high standard has been met here."

Lauriann Wright, in a separate letter to the Commission on behalf of Sherry Lund, Mr. Lund's step-mother, also cited many of these same specific disqualifying and prejudicial statements made by Judge Cowan about her client, Mrs. Lund, Bradford Lund's step-mother. Then Ms. Wright added a powerful personal statement at the end of her letter justifying her request for the removal of Judge Cowan from the bench also citing evidence of gender bias by Judge Cowan:

"Until this case, I have never felt that my advocacy for my clients was not fairly considered because of my gender as their attorney.... It is not lost on me that my client Sherry Lund is a stepmother and that stepmothers are a female stereotype that are much-maligned in popular culture. Match that up with a judicial officer that calls argument by female attorneys on the case "emotional" and "coy" and then makes detrimental, negative findings about my client who is a stepmother, without ever holding an evidentiary hearing, and one has to question whether justice has been served."

Another example of Judge Cowan’s willingness to make personal attacks without evidence in his court – in this case a knowingly false statement about Mr. Lund mental condition – occurred in open court, on June 25, 2019. In attempting to justify his denial of Mr. Cowan’s his right to join in the global settlement agreement to which all parties had agreed, Judge Cowan stated:

“Do I want to give 200 million dollars effectively to someone who may suffer from Down Syndrome? The answer is no.”

Mr. Lund’s lead attorney, Sandra Slaton, *immediately* asked the judge to withdraw the statement which he *knew* was false because, in the public record in his own court, was a DNA test from a respected genetic laboratory in Wisconsin that precluded even the possibility that Mr. Lund has Down Syndrome. Despite his being reminded of the DNA test and hearing the request to withdraw the false accusation from the public record, Judge Cowan responded with one word: “Denied.”

Mr. Lund’s hostile trustees and their attorneys, rather than honoring their fiduciary obligations to correct the record from this false statement by Judge Cowan, contrary to the DNA evidence, remained silent and to date have never made any effort to correct the record and challenge Judge Cowan’s multiple examples of bias and improper personal attacks against his attorney, Ms. Slaton, and his step-mother.

Ms. Wright challenged Judge Cowan’s repeated personal attacks on the motives of Mr. Lund’s step-mother, Sherry Lund, in her own letter to the Judicial Commission:

“These statements, along with other statements demonstrating hostility and bias detailed below, were made in a matter where Judge Cowan has *never held an evidentiary hearing* and where Mrs. Lund *has never testified*. There is nothing in the record to support Judge Cowan’s personal and biased statements against Mrs. Lund. In fact, Judge Cowan...specifically ignored that the overwhelming majority of the unverified, unsworn, and wholly unauthenticated exhibits and statements in the hostile Trustees’ Memorandum of Facts were presented and rejected by both the California court in the 2013 trial, and the Arizona court in the 2016 trial.” (Emph. added).

Mrs. Lund’s response to Judge Cowan’s attacks is: “If this probate court had done its job 11 years ago, these trustees and their attorneys would have been removed and surcharged [assessed appropriate financial penalties] then. I am fighting to get justice for my son and my family.”

###