

# LAWRENCE VANDYKE ON QUALIFICATIONS

## Highlights

- Lawrence VanDyke was a self-serving, unqualified, and lazy practitioner of the law.
  - A comprehensive review of his law practice by the American Bar Association in which they interviewed VanDyke's peers found him unqualified to serve on the federal bench.
  - According to this review, VanDyke was an “arrogant, lazy, an ideologue, and lacking in knowledge of the day-to-day practice,” with an “entitlement” temperament.
  - The American Bar Association found that VanDyke lacked preparation or care for “cases in which he did not have a particular personal or political interest.”

## VanDyke Was A Self-Serving, Unqualified, And Lazy Lawyer

### THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION FOUND THAT VANDYKE WAS UNQUALIFIED TO SERVE ON THE FEDERAL BENCH

**The American Bar Association Found That VanDyke Was Unqualified To Serve On The Federal Bench.** According to a letter from the American Bar Association, “The American Bar Association’s Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has received a full report on Lawrence J.C. VanDyke and a supplemental review by a former chair of the Committee. The Committee’s work is based solely on a review of integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament. Based on these criteria, a substantial majority of the Committee has determined that Mr. VanDyke is ‘Not Qualified,’ and a minority determined that he is ‘Qualified’ to serve on the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit. The majority rating represents the Standing Committee’s official rating.” [American Bar Association Letter, [10/29/19](#)]

### The American Bar Association Found That VanDyke Was Lazy, Self-Serving, And Arrogant In His Law Practice

**American Bar Association Interviews Revealed That VanDyke Was “Arrogant, Lazy, An Ideologue, And Lacking In Knowledge Of The Day-Today Practice,” With An “Entitlement” Temperament.** According to a letter from the American Bar Association, “Mr. VanDyke’s accomplishments are offset by the assessments of interviewees that Mr. VanDyke is arrogant, lazy, an ideologue, and lacking in knowledge of the day-to-day practice including procedural rules. There was a theme that the nominee lacks humility, has an ‘entitlement’ temperament, does not have an open mind, and does not always have a commitment to being candid and truthful.” [American Bar Association Letter, [10/29/19](#)]

**The American Bar Association Found That VanDyke Lacked Preparation Or Care For “Cases In Which He Did Not Have A Particular Personal Or Political Interest.”** According to a letter from the American Bar Association, “Even though Mr. VanDyke is clearly smart, comments were made that in some oral arguments he missed issues fundamental to the analysis of the case. There were reports that his preparation and performance were lacking in some cases in which he did not have a particular personal or political interest.” [American Bar Association Letter, [10/29/19](#)]