

1 ERIC BRAKEBILL JONES

2 5634 Noel Drive

3 Temple City, CA 91780

4 (626) 348-3019

5 Objector In Pro Per

6  
7  
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY**

10 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA 93940

11 Estate of JUDY BRAKEBILL JONES, ) Case No.: 25PR000590

12 Decedent. ) **MOTION TO DISQUALIFY**

13 ) **COUNSEL UNDER RULE 3.7**

14 ) **(Lawyer as Witness)**

15 ) Dept: 13

16 ) Hearing Date: March 4, 2026

17 ) Time: 9:00 AM

---

18  
19 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

20  
21 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Objector ERIC BRAKEBILL JONES hereby moves  
22 to disqualify ALBERT J. NICORA, ESQ. and NICORA LAW OFFICES, LLP  
23 from representing Petitioner HEIDI MARICHEN JONES BLANCHARD in this  
24 matter pursuant to California Rule of Professional Conduct 3.7.

25  
26 // (Continued on Page 2)

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2  
3 **I. INTRODUCTION**

4  
5 On June 27, 2025, Albert J. Nicora, Esq. authored a letter to Objector that  
6 contains a dispositive admission regarding the possession and control  
7 of \$10,650.00 in Trust assets. This written admission makes  
8 Mr. Nicora a necessary witness on a contested factual issue, requiring  
9 his disqualification under Rule 3.7 of the California Rules of  
10 Professional Conduct.

11  
12 **II. THE WRITTEN ADMISSION**

13  
14 The June 27, 2025 letter from Nicora Law Offices, LLP states that  
15 Petitioner 'sold tangible personal property including a vehicle'  
16 and proposes to distribute \$10,650.00 in proceeds. This letter,  
17 authored by Mr. Nicora, constitutes an admission by a party-opponent  
18 under Evidence Code Section 1220.

19  
20 // (Continued on Page 3)

1       III. LEGAL AUTHORITY

2  
3       A. California Rule of Professional Conduct 3.7

4  
5       Rule 3.7(a) provides: 'A lawyer shall not act as an advocate at a  
6       trial in which the lawyer is likely to be a witness unless:

7       (1) the testimony relates to an uncontested issue;

8       (2) the testimony relates to the nature and value of legal services  
9       rendered in the case; or

10       (3) disqualification would work substantial hardship on the client.'

11  
12       B. Kennedy v. Eldridge (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 1197

13  
14       The Court of Appeal held that disqualification is required where the  
15       attorney's credibility is a contested issue. In Kennedy, the court  
16       disqualified an attorney whose personal knowledge of disputed facts  
17       made him a necessary witness. The court stated that when an attorney's  
18       own statements create the factual dispute, the attorney cannot also  
19       serve as the advocate.

20  
21       // (Continued on Page 4)

1 IV. APPLICATION TO THIS CASE

2  
3 Here, Mr. Nicora's written admission directly contradicts the verified  
4 allegations in Petitioner's Petition for Probate. The Petition claims  
5 the identity of the Executor is 'unknown,' yet Mr. Nicora's letter  
6 demonstrates his client possessed and controlled Trust assets and  
7 acknowledged ongoing communication with the successor trustee.

8  
9 The disputed amount of \$10,985.00 (comprising \$10,650.00 from the  
10 vehicle sale plus \$335.00 from garage sales) is a central contested  
11 issue. Mr. Nicora, as the author of the admission letter, is the only  
12 witness who can explain the circumstances of its drafting.

13  
14 V. CONCLUSION

15  
16 For the foregoing reasons, Objector respectfully requests that the  
17 Court disqualify Albert J. Nicora, Esq. from representing Petitioner  
18 in this matter. Rule 3.7(b) permits other attorneys from the firm to  
19 continue representation if the individual attorney is disqualified.

20  
21 DATED: December 30, 2025

22  
23 

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 ERIC BRAKEBILL JONES

26 Objector In Pro Per  
27  
28