

Katherine Diamond Ragland
2105 Kleinert Avenue
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806
225-421-4740
katrag@live.com

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
Louisiana Attorney Disciplinary Board
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd., Suite 607
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70816

May 18, 2026

RE: Formal Complaint Against Ebony Cavalier

To Disciplinary Counsel:

Please accept the enclosed formal disciplinary complaint against attorney Ebony Cavalier arising from her conduct in the matter of *Ragland v. Ragland*, Family Court for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Docket No. F-209,479.

This complaint concerns repeated official court representations that Ms. Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in connection with continuances and repeated temporary restraining order proceedings, while later representations asserted that IRIS “was not involved in your case in any way.”

The conduct described in the enclosed complaint created a materially misleading appearance of independent domestic violence agency involvement and institutional support in proceedings requiring repeated findings of “good cause” under Louisiana law. Those representations became embedded in the official trial court and appellate record and caused severe prejudice to me and my relationship with my children.

I respectfully request a full disciplinary investigation into this matter and the imposition of appropriate sanctions supported by the evidence.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Diamond Ragland

Complaint regarding Ebony Cavalier by Katherine Diamond

Submitted May 2026

Page 1 of 13

OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD

4000 S. SHERWOOD FOREST BLVD., SUITE 607 – BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70816 – (225) 293-3900 – 1-800-326-8022-FAX (225) 293-3300

ETHICAL CONDUCT COMPLAINT

1. FULL NAME: Katherine Diamond
2. HOME ADDRESS: 2105 Kleinert Avenue
City: Baton Rouge State: Louisiana Zip: 70806
Telephone Number: 225-421-4740
Email: katrag@live.com
3. EMPLOYER: Self Employed
WORK ADDRESS: Same as Home Address

INFORMATION ABOUT ATTORNEY

1. NAME OF ATTORNEY: Ebony Cavalier
2. ADDRESS: 5255 Florida Blvd
CITY: Baton Rouge STATE: Louisiana ZIP: 70806

I. OVERVIEW OF MISCONDUCT

This complaint concerns attorney Ebony Cavalier's repeated appearances in temporary restraining order proceedings while expressly identified in the official court record as appearing "on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc." in the matter of Ragland v. Ragland, Family Court for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Docket No. F-209,479. The conduct at issue involves repeated requests for continuances in domestic abuse proceedings, repeated continuation and reissuance of temporary restraining orders ("TROs"), and the creation of a materially misleading appearance that IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center had substantively reviewed, evaluated, supported, or participated in the matter. It further involves the use of IRIS's institutional credibility and domestic-violence expertise to lend legitimacy to repeated TRO continuances requiring "good cause" under Louisiana law, conduct which materially affected both the official trial court record and later appellate proceedings.

The official minute entries repeatedly state that "Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc." appeared and requested continuances resulting in renewed TROs remaining "in full force and effect." The Louisiana First Circuit Court of Appeal later repeated this representation in its procedural history of the case. However, a later written explanation from Sara Downing associated with the IRIS audit review process stated that "the agency was not involved in your case in any way," and that Ebony Cavalier's participation was merely a "courtesy to the court" for docket-management purposes.

This contradiction is extraordinarily serious. IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center is not an ordinary private entity. It is a specialized domestic violence organization carrying institutional credibility, implied expertise, victim advocacy authority, and perceived professional evaluation regarding allegations of abuse. Accordingly, repeated official representations that an attorney was appearing "on behalf of IRIS" in domestic abuse TRO proceedings naturally conveyed to the Court, opposing parties, appellate courts, and the public that an independent domestic violence organization had some substantive basis for participating in, supporting, or legitimizing continuation of the TRO proceedings.

Under Louisiana law, continuances extending TRO proceedings require "good cause." The repeated use of IRIS's name and institutional status in connection with continuances and TRO renewals created the appearance that an independent domestic violence organization had reviewed the matter and supported continuation of emergency abuse-related restrictions, when later representations asserted IRIS was not actually involved in the case in any substantive capacity. This conduct materially prejudiced me, contributed to the prolonged continuation of TRO restrictions, reinforced abuse allegations through institutional appearance rather than competent evidence, and contaminated both the trial court and appellate record with the false appearance of independent domestic violence agency involvement.

II. SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF MISCONDUCT

The misconduct is reflected in multiple official court records. On May 20, 2020, the minute entry states that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” and requested that the matter be passed and reassigned to June 17, 2020. The same entry states that a new temporary restraining order was issued keeping all prior orders in full force and effect.

On June 17, 2020, the minute entry again states that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” and requested that the matter be passed to August 26, 2020. Again, a new temporary restraining order was issued keeping all prior orders in full force and effect.

On January 27, 2021, the minute entry again states that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” and requested that the matter be reassigned to April 21, 2021. Again, a new temporary restraining order was issued keeping all prior orders in full force and effect.

On April 21, 2021, the minute entry again states that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” and requested that the matter be reassigned to July 28, 2021. Again, a new temporary restraining order was issued keeping all prior orders in full force and effect.

These were not harmless scheduling notations. Each appearance occurred in a domestic abuse protective-order proceeding under La. R.S. 46:2131, et seq., and each appearance resulted in continuation of a TRO. The First Circuit later repeated this representation, stating that Ebony Cavalier, “the attorney on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.,” was present at the May 20, 2020 rule to show cause hearing and requested that the matter be passed and reassigned.

The problem is that a later written explanation stated that IRIS “was not involved in your case in any way,” that IRIS was not paid for any TROs filed against me, and that Ms. Cavalier’s participation was merely a “courtesy to the court.” If IRIS was not involved in my case, then Ms. Cavalier’s repeated appearances “on behalf of IRIS” created a false and misleading appearance in the official record. That appearance gave the TRO continuances credibility they otherwise would not have had.

III. OFFICIAL MINUTE ENTRIES AND APPELLATE RECORD

The official court record repeatedly represented that Ebony Cavalier was appearing “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in connection with continuances and repeated temporary restraining order (“TRO”) extensions in the matter of Ragland v. Ragland.

The minute entry for May 20, 2020 states:

“Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.”

The entry further states:

“Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be passed and reassigned to June 17, 2020. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court.”

The minute entry for June 17, 2020 again states:

“Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.”

The entry further states:

“Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be passed to August 26, 2020. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court.”

The minute entry for January 27, 2021 again states:

“Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.”

The entry further states:

“Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be reassigned to April 21, 2021. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court.”

The minute entry for April 21, 2021 again states:

“Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.”

The entry further states:

“Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be reassigned to July 28, 2021. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court.”

These repeated appearances and requests for continuances became part of the permanent appellate record. In the subsequent appeal, the Louisiana First Circuit Court of Appeal specifically referenced the May 20, 2020 minute entry and stated:

“The minute entry for the May 20, 2020 rule to show cause hearing on the Protective Order states that Ebony Cavalier, the attorney on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc., was present and requested that the matter be passed and reassigned to June 17, 2020.”

The appellate opinion further noted:

“The rule to show cause hearing was continued and reassigned numerous times. Each time Mr. Ragland would file a request for a Temporary Restraining Order seeking the same relief as in the initial Temporary Restraining Order.”

Accordingly, the repeated representation that Ebony Cavalier was appearing “on behalf of IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” was not an isolated clerical issue. It became embedded in the official procedural history of the case and was later repeated and reinforced by the appellate court itself.

IV. LATER REPRESENTATIONS THAT IRIS WAS NOT INVOLVED

After years of official court records repeatedly representing that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in connection with continuances and TRO extensions, I later received written correspondence directly contradicting those representations.

On October 6, 2022, Sara Downing wrote to me regarding concerns I had raised during the audit process involving IRIS Domestic Violence Center. In that email, Ms. Downing stated:
“the agency was not involved in your case in any way”

She further stated that:

“the court does ask her to go on the record regarding some continuances just to move the dockets along”

and:

“These matters were processed by that attorney as a courtesy to the court.”

These statements raise serious concerns regarding coordination between the Court and Ms. Cavalier in creating official records that repeatedly represented IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center as participating in proceedings where IRIS was later said to have had no substantive involvement. The official record did not describe these appearances as mere scheduling accommodations or ministerial procedural acts. Instead, the repeated minute entries represented Ms. Cavalier as appearing “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in domestic abuse TRO proceedings.

These representations are irreconcilable with the repeated official minute entries and appellate references identifying Ebony Cavalier as appearing “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in domestic abuse TRO proceedings.

If IRIS was “not involved in [the] case in any way,” then the repeated appearance in official court records that an IRIS attorney was participating in the proceedings materially misrepresented the true nature of IRIS’s involvement.

This distinction is critically important because IRIS is not an ordinary private entity. It is a specialized domestic violence organization carrying institutional credibility, implied expertise, victim advocacy authority, and perceived professional evaluation regarding allegations of abuse. A reasonable judge, appellate court, litigant, or member of the public would naturally interpret repeated appearances “on behalf of IRIS” in a domestic abuse proceeding as conveying that an independent domestic violence organization had some substantive basis for supporting, participating in, or legitimizing continuation of the TRO proceedings.

Under Louisiana law, continuances extending TRO proceedings require “good cause.” The repeated use of IRIS’s institutional identity in connection with continuances and renewed TROs created the appearance that an independent domestic violence organization considered continuation of the TRO process appropriate and necessary. According to the later explanation provided by Ms. Downing, however, IRIS had no substantive involvement in the case at all.

The repeated official representations that an attorney appeared “on behalf of IRIS” also created the appearance that recognized domestic violence response protocols, investigation procedures, victim assessments, or professional review processes had occurred. A reasonable judge, litigant, or appellate court could naturally infer from the repeated IRIS appearances that the allegations had been reviewed or supported through some form of legitimate domestic violence intervention process.

However, to my knowledge, no independent domestic violence investigation, forensic evaluation, child forensic interview, or post-forensic assessment supporting these repeated continuances and TRO extensions was ever conducted through IRIS or any comparable independent domestic violence agency. Nevertheless, the repeated use of IRIS’s name and institutional identity conveyed the appearance that such professional involvement and review had occurred.

As a result, the official court record conveyed a materially misleading appearance of independent domestic violence agency involvement and support, which substantially increased the perceived legitimacy and credibility of repeated TRO continuances and caused severe prejudice to me and my relationship with my children.

V. CONFLICT AND APPEARANCE ISSUES

The appearance issues surrounding these proceedings are deeply concerning. During the same period in which Ebony Cavalier repeatedly appeared in court “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in connection with continuances and repeated TRO extensions, Judge Pamela J. Baker was publicly identified as serving as Treasurer of the Board of Directors of IRIS Domestic Violence Center. Specifically, a published LSU Law Family Law Conference biography for Judge Baker states:

“Judge Baker also currently serves as Treasurer of the Board of Directors of the Iris Domestic Violence Center.”

At the same time, the official court record repeatedly reflected that an attorney identified as appearing “on behalf of IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” was requesting continuances that resulted in renewed TROs remaining “in full force and effect.”

Later representations asserted that IRIS “was not involved in [the] case in any way” and that the appearances were merely a “courtesy to the court.” These circumstances create serious appearance and integrity concerns.

A reasonable litigant or observer could naturally conclude from the official court record that:

- IRIS had substantively reviewed the allegations;
- IRIS supported continuation of the TRO proceedings;
- or IRIS had some independent victim-advocacy basis for participating in the matter.

That appearance carried enhanced credibility because:

- IRIS is a specialized domestic violence organization;
- the proceedings involved abuse allegations under La. R.S. 46:2131 et seq.;
- and the presiding judge simultaneously held a leadership role within IRIS itself.

The use of IRIS’s institutional identity in repeated continuance proceedings requiring “good cause” under Louisiana law created the appearance of independent organizational validation and support for continued TRO restrictions when later representations asserted IRIS was not actually involved in the case substantively.

These circumstances substantially undermined confidence in the fairness, neutrality, and integrity of the proceedings.

VI. PREJUDICE CAUSED BY THIS CONDUCT

The conduct described above was not harmless, technical, or merely administrative. The repeated appearance of Ebony Cavalier “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” gave institutional credibility to allegations of domestic abuse and child endangerment in a matter where IRIS was later described as not being involved in any substantive way. Because IRIS is a specialized domestic violence organization, its apparent involvement carried the weight of expertise, assessment, and independent concern. That appearance made the allegations against me seem more credible than they otherwise would have appeared and created the impression that a domestic violence organization had reviewed or supported the continuation of the TRO proceedings.

This conduct caused serious prejudice. The TRO remained in effect through repeated continuances, restricted my relationship with my children, and reinforced a false narrative that I was dangerous or abusive. The prejudice did not remain limited to the trial court. The appellate court later repeated the minute-entry representation that Ebony Cavalier appeared on behalf of IRIS, meaning the misleading appearance of IRIS involvement followed me into the appellate record as well. This damaged my credibility, harmed my ability to defend myself fairly, and gave continued legitimacy to orders that profoundly affected my parental rights, my reputation, and my relationship with my children.\

VII. RULES IMPLICATED

I respectfully request investigation into whether Ebony Cavalier violated the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct, including but not limited to:

- Rule 3.3 — Candor Toward the Tribunal;
- Rule 4.1 — Truthfulness in Statements to Others;
- Rule 4.4 — Respect for Rights of Third Persons;
- Rule 8.4(c) — Conduct Involving Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit, or Misrepresentation;
- Rule 8.4(d) — Conduct Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice.

The repeated representation in official court records and later appellate proceedings that Ebony Cavalier appeared “on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.” in connection with repeated TRO continuances and extensions created a materially misleading appearance that IRIS had substantively reviewed, supported, or participated in the matter.

Later representations stating that IRIS “was not involved in your case in any way” and that these appearances were merely a “courtesy to the court” raise serious questions regarding the accuracy and propriety of those prior representations to the Court and in the official record.

Because Louisiana law requires “good cause” for continuances extending TRO proceedings, the use of IRIS’s institutional identity and credibility in connection with repeated continuances materially affected the legitimacy and perceived evidentiary support for the ongoing TRO process.

VIII. REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

I respectfully request a full disciplinary investigation into Ebony Cavalier's conduct in connection with the repeated continuances and extensions of temporary restraining orders in *Ragland v. Ragland*, Family Court for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Docket No. F-209,479.

The conduct described herein was not harmless administrative conduct. It created a materially misleading appearance that IRIS Domestic Violence Intervention Center had substantively reviewed, supported, investigated, or participated in allegations of domestic abuse and child endangerment when later representations asserted that IRIS "was not involved in your case in any way." This contradiction is extraordinarily serious.

By appearing in the official court record "on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.," Ms. Cavalier used the institutional authority, credibility, and implied expertise of a domestic violence organization to support the continuation of TRO proceedings. IRIS's apparent involvement carried the natural implication that proper domestic violence protocols had been followed, that the allegations had been reviewed by an independent agency with specialized expertise, and that there was some legitimate professional basis for continuing emergency restrictions against me.

In reality, to my knowledge, no independent IRIS investigation occurred, no child forensic interview occurred, no forensic or post-forensic examination occurred, no domestic violence assessment was performed by IRIS, and no proper independent investigative process supported these repeated continuances and TRO extensions. Nevertheless, the record repeatedly conveyed the appearance that IRIS was involved, thereby giving the allegations and continuances credibility they otherwise would not have had.

This is especially serious because Louisiana law requires "good cause" for continuances extending TRO proceedings. The repeated use of IRIS's institutional identity created the appearance of good cause by implying independent domestic violence agency involvement where none apparently existed. That misleading appearance became embedded in the official trial court record and was later repeated by the appellate court itself.

The prejudice to me was grave. I was kept under prolonged TRO restrictions, separated from my children, and forced to defend myself against allegations that were made to appear more credible through the false implication of IRIS involvement. The damage extended beyond the trial court because the appellate record also repeated the appearance that Ebony Cavalier appeared on behalf of IRIS.

The suffering caused by this conduct has been profound. This was not a technical mistake or harmless courtroom shortcut. Ms. Cavalier's failure to adhere to basic professional standards of candor, authority, accuracy, and fairness helped create a false record that prolonged emergency restrictions, damaged my parental relationship, harmed my children,

Complaint regarding Ebony Cavalier by Katherine Diamond

Submitted May 2026

Page **12** of **13**

destroyed my credibility, severely damaged my emotional wellbeing, and inflicted lasting personal, reputational, financial, and familial harm. The resulting trauma and destruction to my family unit have been catastrophic.

I believe this conduct constituted fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice. I further believe Ms. Cavalier used her status as an attorney and her association with IRIS to create a false perception of legitimacy, expertise, and procedural propriety in proceedings that profoundly damaged my relationship with my children, my reputation, and my ability to receive a fair hearing.

I respectfully request that the Office of Disciplinary Counsel impose the most severe disciplinary sanction warranted by the evidence, including permanent disbarment if supported by the investigation. Attorneys should not be permitted to lend the credibility of a domestic violence organization to court proceedings when that organization has not actually investigated, reviewed, or participated in the matter. The integrity of protective-order proceedings depends upon candor, accuracy, and public trust. Ms. Cavalier's conduct violated that trust and caused catastrophic harm.

I have supporting documentation for the facts stated in this complaint, including minute entries, appellate excerpts, correspondence regarding IRIS's lack of involvement, and documentation regarding Judge Baker's role with IRIS. I will provide these materials upon request.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Diamond Ragland
2105 Kleinert Avenue
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806
225-421-4740

Judge: BAKER, PAMELA J Session: 4/21/2021

F-209479
A
04/21/2021

DVC:

This matter came on for hearing under the provision of LSA R.S. 46:2131, et seq. Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.

Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be reassigned to July 28, 2021. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court .

Judge: BAKER, PAMELA J Session: 1/27/2021

F-209479
A
01/27/2021

DVC:

This matter came on for hearing under the provision of LSA R.S. 46:2131, et seq. Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc..

Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be reassigned to April 21, 2021. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court .

Judge: BAKER, PAMELA J Session: 6/17/2020

F-209479
A
06/17/2020

DVC:

Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.

Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be passed to August 26, 2020. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court .

Judge: BAKER, PAMELA J Session: 5/20/2020

F-209479
A
05/20/2020

DVC:

This matter came on for hearing under the provision of LSA R.S. 46:2131, et seq. Present in court were Ebony Cavalier, the attorney, on behalf of Iris Domestic Violence Intervention Center, Inc.

Ms. Cavalier requested that this matter be passed and reassigned to June 17, 2020. A new temporary restraining order was issued keeping in full force and effect all prior orders of the Court .

Re: IRIS

From Sara M Downing <Sara@TWRU.com>
Date Thu 10/6/2022 8:13 PM
To Katherine Ragland <katrag@live.com>

Katherine

We did expand our audit procedures to include testing regarding the concerns you brought to my attention.

While I cannot discuss specifics about the audit with you I assure you that we took them seriously and did investigate the matter. What I can tell you is that the attorney on record did not represent your ex husband and the agency was not paid for any TROs filed on your behalf - the IRIS attorney is in court a couple times a week representing various cases on behalf of IRIS clients and the court does ask her to go on the record regarding some continuances just to move the dockets along. These matters were processed by that attorney as a courtesy to the court.

I am not familiar with family court but apparently whenever there is a continuance the TRO needs to get renewed in the court record. For these issues Either either your attorney or Ms Downs let the court know that they would not be there that day asked for a continuance and so the judge asks one of the attorneys in court on that day to present the matter for continuance w so the court reporter can record it on the record - because this attorney was in court that day representing Iris the court reporter listed her as such but in fact she was not representing Iris in these matters.

IRIS was able to prove what we felt was sufficient audit evidence that they have never been paid for any TROs filed against you from any grant or any agency.

I hope this answers your questions. Best of luck with your case

Sara Downing

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 6, 2022, at 7:49 PM, Katherine Ragland <katrag@live.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Sara,

I spoke to you recently. I am very concerned about the matters I spoke to you about.
When are you available to talk?

Sincerely,
Katherine Diamond

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)