


In the Indiana Supreme Court

In the Matter of: Michael A. Blickman,
Respondent

Supreme Court Case No.
18S-DI-553



Order

This matter comes before the Court on (1) a limited petition for rehearing filed by Respondent on January 8, 2021, to which the Commission has responded, and (2) Respondent's motion for leave to file a reply, to which the Commission also has responded.

The Court GRANTS Respondent's motion for leave to file a reply and directs the Clerk to file the reply as of the date of tender.

The Court GRANTS IN PART Respondent's limited petition for rehearing and modifies the following portion of the Court's original opinion, issued December 9, 2020, as follows:

Miller denied that Park Tudor was in possession of the materials Father had provided and claimed not to know where the materials were. ~~Respondent initially told police he did not know where the materials were but they were not at the school.~~ During about an hour of questioning, Respondent repeatedly concealed from authorities that he possessed the material sought. At some point after Respondent conferred privately with Miller though, Respondent informed police he had copies of the materials at his office, but he asserted those materials were privileged.

Slip op. at 5. The Court, *sua sponte*, further modifies the opinion to reflect that the Honorable Robert B. Mrzlack is currently the Commission's Interim Executive Director. Id. at 19.

Contemporaneous with the entry of this Order, the Court is filing its Opinion on Rehearing reflecting these changes.

Done at Indianapolis, Indiana, on 3/12/2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Loretta H. Rush".

Loretta H. Rush
Chief Justice of Indiana

Rush, C.J., and David, Massa, and Goff, JJ., concur.
Slaughter, J., concurs with separate opinion.

Slaughter, J., concurring.

I agree with the Court that rehearing is warranted to correct a factual misstatement in our initial opinion. I write separately to explain my understanding of our revision. It is true that Michael Blickman was not forthcoming with the deputy prosecutor in that he did not tell the “whole” truth. It is also true that Blickman was not under oath and had no duty to answer unasked questions. No such duty should be inferred from our revision.