

GRAPH C: Network of Influence

KEY POINT: This diagram shows a connected network of relationships—not isolated contacts. These influence pathways were not fully disclosed.

INFLUENCE + FINANCIAL PATHWAYS

FROM	TO	CONNECTION TYPE	FINANCIAL ELEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE
Ashby	Collins	Personal + Professional	Historical / indirect	Foundational relationship
Ashby	Case	Arbitrator role	💰 ~\$130K fees	Incentive to remain engaged
Collins	Staubus	Case alignment	💰 Expert compensation	Network benefit
Ashby	Staubus	Professional	💰 Paid expert	Reinforces interconnectedness
Collins	Besly	Business	Structural	Ongoing network link
Ashby	Besly	Business overlap	Indirect	Active connection during arbitration

INFLUENCE PATHWAYS

- Ashby ■ Collins: Divorce attorney, employer, financial relationship
- Collins ■ Staubus: Case alignment / expert involvement
- Ashby ■ Staubus: Prior professional relationship
- Collins ■ Besly: Firm / business connections
- Ashby ■ Besly: Ongoing business/legal overlap
- Ashby ■ Besly: Ongoing business/legal overlap

GRAPH F: Network Map - Visual Connection Diagram

KEY POINT: This diagram shows each connection to Ashby and the stakeholders had in this arbitration proceeding. It shows to what extent the stakeholders were disclosed on her limited disclosures, many of whom were disclosed 8 months after her appointment as arbitrator. This revealed her intentional concealment of key player in the arbitration, with her as the ultimate decision maker as the arbitrator.

PERSON	ROLE IN ARBITRATION	RELATIONSHIP TO ANNE ASHBY	TYPE OF CONNECTION	DISCLOSURE STATUS	FINANCIAL COMPONENT	WHY IT MATTERS
Anne Ashby	Arbitrator	Central decision-maker	—	—	💰 ~\$130,000 in arbitrator fees (est.)	-Decides outcome -Has financial incentive to remain on case
Michael Collins	Central figure / connected to dispute	- Divorce attorney - Former employer - 35+ year relationship	● Personal ● Professional ● Financial	✗ Minimally disclosed (late & incomplete)	Indirect (network alignment)	Core relationship raising bias concerns
Keith Staubus	Expert witness	- Former colleague - Known professionally	● Professional 💰 Financial	✗ Downplayed as “known”	💰 ~\$53,100 expert payment	Financial benefit to connected participant
Steven Besly	Business/legal connection	- Shared registered agent - Linked to Collins firm	● Business ● Ongoing	✗ Not disclosed	Indirect	Active overlapping business ties

GRAPH G: Spotlight on Michael Collins Relationship

KEY POINT: This diagram shows the most important conflict Michael Collins. Collins represented Robin Allison and was opposing counsel on the underlying case.

Ashby concealed her deep, longstanding dependent relationship with Michael Collins and his firm, with whom she was associated before, during and after the arbitration proceeding, with ties to Keith Staubus and Steven Besly.

What Ashby Disclosed	What She Omitted	Why It Matters
"Collins handled my divorce"	✗ High-profile, deeply personal divorce involving criminal context	Shows personal trust + vulnerability
"Worked with Collins ~2 years"	✗ She was hired by Collins immediately after leaving bench (April 2009)	Shows career dependency
"I have known him"	✗ 35–40 year continuous relationship	Misrepresents depth + continuity
✗ Nothing about financial context	✗ Filed Chapter 7 bankruptcy wiping ~\$700k debt; did not report Collins firm income	Shows financial reliance + possible indebtedness

GRAPH H - Analysis - Highlights Disconnect Between Issues Presented and the Final Award

Purpose - This chart highlights the **disconnect between the issues presented and the Final Award**, showing where material disputes were **raised vs. not analyzed**

ISSUE PRESENTED (BEFORE)	WHAT THE FINAL AWARD DOES (AFTER)	CONTRADICTION / OMISSION
Assets already existed prior to representation	No analysis of asset origin	No determination of whether any “recovery” was created
No fee owed on pre-existing assets	Full fee imposed on total value	Fee applied without addressing pre-existing nature of assets
Lack of disclosure / informed consent	No findings on disclosure	No evaluation of whether consent was informed
Fiduciary duty governs fee agreements	No fiduciary analysis	No application of heightened attorney standards
Fees applied to non-created value are improper	Fees awarded in full	No distinction between created vs. existing value
Damages model disputed	Exact damages adopted	No independent calculation or validation
Causation disputed	No causation analysis	No link established between work and fee entitlement
Defenses raised against enforcement	Defenses denied without explanation	No reasoning for rejection
Competing narratives presented	One narrative adopted	No weighing of both sides
Request for exoneration from fee claim	Full liability imposed	No analysis of exoneration argument

👉 **The Final Award closely tracks the lawyers’ requested relief in both structure and substance, with minimal independent modification.**

GRAPH I: Side by Side Comparison: What the Lawyers Asked for & What They Got

JOE LITTLE (LAWYERS' POSITION)	ANNE ASHBY (FINAL AWARD)
Lawyers are "good and honest" and earned their fee	Award grants full recovery to Lawyers
Lawyers created ~\$10,000,000 recovery for Clients	Award adopts recovery-based fee entitlement
Clients owe 35% contingency fee	Award enforces fee recovery based on Lawyers' claims
Richard owes \$1,416,915.68	Award calculates interest on \$1,416,915.68
Caroline owes \$1,352,149.80	Award calculates interest on \$1,352,149.80
Requests pre- and post-judgment interest	Awards 8.5% prejudgment + post-judgment interest
Requests attorneys' fees, arbitration costs, expenses	Awards attorneys' fees, expert fees, and AAA costs
Relies on legal theories (contract, estoppel, quantum meruit, unjust enrichment)	Award expressly adopts same legal theory framework
Requests full denial of Clients' claims/defenses	Award denies all Clients' claims and defenses
Frames Clients' arguments as false narrative	Award provides no analysis of Clients' arguments
Requests relief based on Joseph Little affidavit	Award explicitly relies on Joseph Little affidavit
Requests liquidation of trust assets to satisfy award	✗ Not included in final award
Requests continuation of Schwab/Minaki account freeze	✗ Not included in final award