DISCIPLINARY HANDBOOK: VOLUME XV

[CASES FROM 2021; CURRENT THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2021]

OHIO BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Links within this document lead either to publications on the Supreme Court of Ohio's website or to other pages within this document. Links in the Table of Cases will direct the user to the corresponding Case Summary; links within the Case Summaries will direct the user to the Index. Links within the Index will direct the user back to the Case Summaries. This document is also fully searchable (hit Ctrl+F, type in the exact term or phrase, and then hit Enter).

The case summaries were prepared by Board staff and may not reflect all aspects of a case in their entirety. The summaries are meant to assist the reader by providing a brief overview of the misconduct committed by the attorney, the rules violated, and the sanction imposed. The summaries should be a beginning point that ends with reading the actual court opinion.

Ohio Board of Professional Conduct
65 South Front Street, 5th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3431
614.387.9370
www.bpc.ohio.gov

© 2022 Ohio Board of Professional Conduct

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Link is to the beginning of the section]

I. TABLE OF CASES

II. CASE SUMMARIES

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z

III. INDEX

AGGRAVATING & MITIGATING FACTORS

CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT VIOLATIONS

CRIMINAL CONDUCT (Felony, Misdemeanor, Treatment in Lieu of Conviction)

DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURAL ISSUES (Aggravation/ Mitigation, Cause remanded by Court, Consent-to-Discipline, Default, Sanction Increase/ Decrease, Other)

DISCIPLINARY RULE VIOLATIONS

VIOLATIONS OF THE RULES FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE BAR

PRIOR DISCIPLINARY RECORD (Attorney Registration, Board Discipline, Other)

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE MISCONDUCT (Judge/ Magistrate/ Clerk, Public Official)

RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT VIOLATIONS

SANCTION (Disbarment, Dismissal, Indefinite Suspension, Public Reprimand, Term Suspension)

TABLE OF CASES

FOR CASE SUMMARY- Click the Case Name; **FOR FULL DECISION**- Click the citation in the Case Summary

Alexander, Warren Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-1508. Decided 2/16/2021.

Baker, Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2021-0437. Decided 6/8/2021.

Barbera, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2209. Decided 7/12/2021.

Berry, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-3864. Decided 11/3/2021.

Berta, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-1264.Decided 4/15/2021.

Brand, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2122. Decided 6/29/2021.

Bruner, Ohio State Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-4048. Decided 11/17/2021.

Bryant, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2020-1510. Decided 2/16/2021.

Burchinal, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-774. Decided 3/17/2021.

Burgess, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-1511. Decided 2/16/2021.

Burgess, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2187. Decided 6/30/2021.

Chambers, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-1515. Decided 2/16/2021.

Cosgrove, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2188. Decided 6/30/2021.

Devanney, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2021-0209. Decided 4/13/2021.

Dougherty, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-1240. Decided 4/14/2021.

Elter, Warren Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-1518. Decided 2/16/2021.

Family, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-4054. Decided 11/17/2021.

Ford, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-3661. Decided 10/20/2021.

Grendel, Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2021-0436. Decided 6/8/2021.

Heller, Cleveland Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2211. Decided 7/1/2021.

Jones, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-4070. Decided 11/18/2021.

Kathman, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2189. Decided 6/30/2021.

Kelley, Stark Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-770. Decided 3/16/2021.

Lewis, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-805. Decided 3/18/2021.

Lindon, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-804. Decided 3/18/2021.

Long, Toledo Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-3967. Decided 11/10/2021.

Ludwig, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-3971. Decided 11/10/2021.

Morton, Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-4095. Decided 11/23/2021.

Okuley, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-3225. Decided 9/21/2021.

Petracci, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-249. Decided 2/3/2021.

Petree, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2021-0765. Decided 8/3/2021.

Polizzi, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-1136. Decided 4/7/2021.

Polly-Murphy, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-3302. Decided 9/22/2021.

Porter, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-4352. Decided 12/15/2021.

Repp, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-3923. Decided 11/9/2021.

Robinson, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-2123. Decided 6/29/2021.

Sabol, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-2059. Decided 6/22/2021.

Simpson, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2021-0439. Decided 6/8/2021.

Spoljaric, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2020-1517. Decided 2/16/2021.

Strauss, Cleveland Metro.Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-1263. Decided 4/15/2021.

Talley, Akron Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2021-1230. Decided 11/23/2021.

Vagotis, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2021-Ohio-806. Decided 3/18/2021.

Valenti, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-1373. Decided 4/21/2021.

Weatherly, Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2021-1228. Decided 11/23/2021.

Weber, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-3907. Decided 11/4/2021.

Wilcoxson, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-3964. Decided 11/10/2021.

Winters, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion 2021-Ohio-2753. Decided 8/17/2021.

***Alexander**, Warren Cty. Bar Assn. v.*
2020-1508. Decided 2/16/2021

Case Summary

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4, 1.15
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline, (2)(no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Flessa (2019); Goldberger (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for misconduct related to his neglect of a client matter, failure to reasonably keep a client informed about the status of a matter, comply with reasonable requests for information, and failure to deposit a client's retainer in an IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a client in a domestic relations matter related to the modification of an existing spousal support order. Contrary to the terms of the engagement agreement, Respondent did not deposit the client's retainer in his IOLTA. The client and a relative attempted to contact Respondent eight times during a five-month period. During the same period, Respondent communicated with the client three times regarding a new office receptionist, acknowledging a court hearing scheduling request, and to inform the client he had returned to town and would provide an update. The client terminated the client-lawyer relationship.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement, publicly reprimanded Respondent, and ordered Respondent to complete a minimum of two hours of CLE on proper use and maintenance of an IOLTA.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.5(a)(5), 3.5(a)(6), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for his conduct during a trial in which he was found in contempt of court.

PROCEDURE: The Board voted to accept the consent-to-discipline agreement entered into by the parties and recommended a public reprimand

FINDINGS: Respondent represented a client on charges of felonious assault and domestic violence. Respondent later filed a notice related to his client's intent to rely on a claim of self-defense in relation to the criminal charges. The state filed a motion *in limine* pertaining to the use of evidence in the self-defense claim. At trial the judge denied Respondent's request for a self-defense jury instruction. Respondent reacted to the judge's ruling by repeatedly attempting to stop the trial and threatening to sit in the back of the courtroom. While the judge was instructing the jury, Respondent left the defense table and stood behind a television stand to show that he was not participating. The judge stopped instructing the jury and dismissed it for a lunch break. The trial resumed and guilty verdicts were returned by the jury. The judge documented the events relating to Respondent on the record, held him in contempt, ordered him to pay a $500 fine, and ordered him to handwrite sections of the Rules of Professional Conduct 25 times.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	Eighteen-month suspension, twelve months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.16(d), 3.1, 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (4) (multiple offenses),(5) (lack of cooperation), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Roseman (2019); Engel (2018); Walden (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for eighteen months with six months stayed for neglecting a client's matter and failing to cooperate in the disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation of a partially stayed suspension and added restitution to the client as an additional requirement.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a client in a pending child-support and custody proceeding. An amended hearing notice set an initial hearing for July 20, 2017. However, Respondent took six weeks to file a notice of appearance and consequently neither Respondent nor his client appeared at the hearing. Five days later, a capias was issued for the client's arrest. In an attempt to resolve the matter, Respondent took his client to the courthouse where she was taken into custody. At a later date, Respondent's motion to modify child support was dismissed for failure to appear and prosecute the motion. Respondent filed an objection and a hearing was set for August 1, 2018. Because he had a hearing in another county, Respondent did not arrive at the courthouse until after the hearing had ended. The client represented herself at the hearing and the objection was overruled. Respondent later appealed the judgment, but failed to file an appellate brief. The appeal was later dismissed, but Respondent never informed the client. The client testified that she attempted to communicate with Respondent on numerous occasions, but did not receive any calls or text messages. When the client went to the courthouse, she learned that the appeal had been dismissed two months earlier. Before the appeal, the trial court had found the client in contempt for failing to timely pay her child-support obligation. Neither Respondent nor the client appeared at a later contempt hearing. When the client retained new counsel she asked Respondent to provide a copy of the file which he did not provide. Respondent failed to respond to two letters of inquiry from relator.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board of an eighteen-month suspension with twelve months stayed on conditions that Respondent make restitution of $900.00 to his client and engage in no further misconduct.

Sanction	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	Jud.Cond.R. 1.2
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, fully stayed for sending inappropriate Facebook messages and videos to a court employee.

PROCEDURE: The parties stipulated to the charged misconduct and the panel recommended to the Board that Respondent be publicly reprimanded. The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct, but recommended the imposition of a conditionally stayed six-month suspension. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent sent a Facebook friend request to a new court reporter, Jane Doe. Doe was not assigned to his courtroom, but accepted the request. Respondent and Doe began to exchange messages and Respondent invited her to meet in person in his chambers. Additional messages were exchanged concerning various topics including their respective divorces. Respondent then asked for Doe's cellphone number and suggested that they talk over the weekend. The parties stipulated that if Doe had testified she would have stated that she gave her phone number because she felt like she could not refuse, considering Respondent's status as judge. Respondent called Doe and she stated that he sounded intoxicated and used profanity. He also asked her out to lunch but she declined. He later sent her a message that he had an "offer you can't refuse" and would have offered her tickets to an event for her and her children. He later sent Doe a message asking her out for lunch or drinks. Doe did not reply to his message. Out of 72 subsequent messages she replied to only 15. The majority of the messages were partisan and vulgar and some contained videos of offensive or sexually suggestive content. Doe brought the messages to the attention of her supervisor and a colleague, who both informed court administration.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board of a six-month, stayed suspension on conditions that he complete a minimum of eight hours of continuing judicial education on the subject of sexual harassment within 90 days of the disciplinary order and refrain from committing further misconduct.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.5(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline, (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Mezher & Espohl (2012); Goldberger (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for failing to adequately communicate the basis or rate of his hourly fee.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report recommending Respondent be publicly reprimanded and ordered to make restitution. A joint waiver of objections was filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client seeking to terminate her marriage. He did not present the client with a written fee agreement and wrote "$2,500 flat" on his business card. The client paid $200 for the initial consultation and another $1,500 a month later. Respondent filed a complaint for divorce and the client paid the balance of the quoted fee plus a $280 filing fee. Over a 13-month period, Respondent's employer sent the client monthly billing statements itemizing the time that Respondent and his secretary had spent on the case. The statements provided that the case was a flat fee dissolution plus court costs and showed that no balance was due. As part of the pending divorce, the proceeds of the sale of the marital residence were deposited in the law firm trust account. The court awarded the client a portion of the proceeds and the client inquired as to the distribution of the funds. The distribution statement deducted $7,730 from the client's share for additional attorney fees. The client replied with an e-mail raising several errors or issues with the distribution. The panel heard conflicting testimony about whether Respondent had informed the client that he would charge a different fee if her case proceeded as a divorce rather than a dissolution. Respondent admitted at the hearing that he never informed the client in writing that he would charge an hourly fee if the case proceeded as a divorce.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a public reprimand and ordered Respondent to make restitution of $850 to Respondent within 90 days of the date of the order.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	GBR V(23)(C), GBR V(23)(D), GBR V(23)(F)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline, (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Gaba (2003); Willis (2002); Dugan (2007)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for failing to register an employment relationship with a suspended lawyer and for failing to notify clients that a disqualified lawyer would work on their cases.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report recommending Respondent be publicly reprimanded. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented his two daughters and son-in-law in various personal-injury and medical-malpractice cases. To assist him in the case, he entered into an informal arrangement with Rodger Moore, a suspended lawyer. Although Respondent knew about Moore's suspension, he did not review the Rules for the Government of the Bar, register his relationship with Moore on the prescribed form with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, or receive written acknowledgment from the Office of Disciplinary Counsel that the relationship could commence, nor informed the clients by written notice that a disqualified or suspended lawyer would be providing services on their cases. Respondent directly supervised Moore's work and activities and eventually paid him $150.00 per hour for a total of $138,000 and $2,800 in expenses. Respondent continued his working relationship with Moore for an additional six months after he was informed by Relator of his obligations under Gov.Bar R.V(23). Respondent never billed his clients for any of the legal services he provided or the cost of Moore's services.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a public reprimand.

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.4(c),1.5(b), 1.15(a)(2), 8.4(c), 8.4(h), 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim), (9) (no restitution); **M-** (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years for failing to create or maintain an IOLTA, failing to communicate with clients about the scope of representation and the basis for fees, engaging in conduct that adversely reflects upon the lawyer's fitness to practice law, failing to disclose a lack of malpractice insurance, and failing to disclose material facts during the disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The panel found Respondent had engaged in the stipulated misconduct and committed two violations of 8.4(c), even though the relator sought to withdraw the charges. The Board adopted the panel's findings and recommended sanction.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented a client in a criminal matter. Six months later, the client filed a grievance against Respondent alleging that Respondent was disrespectful and threatened to make his life miserable if he filed a grievance. Bruner initially denied making the threat, but when presented with a recording of the conversation, acknowledged that it was his voice on the recording. In another matter, Respondent was retained by a client's parents to investigate post-conviction remedies for their son. The clients filed a grievance alleging that Respondent had not provided the legal services for which he had been paid. Respondent admitted that he had not adequately explained the services he would perform and failed to create IOLTA records for the advanced fee. In another matter, Respondent was retained to file a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, but did not check the docket before filing and was unaware that the client's prior counsel had filed a similar motion that was denied. Respondent's motion and memorandum in support failed to cite any legal authority. Respondent was also retained to file a motion for judicial release for a client that was eventually denied because, by statue, the client's sentence was mandatory and he was therefore ineligible for judicial release. During the investigation of a grievance filed by a client related to Respondent's court-appointed representation, Respondent admitted he made inconsistent statements and failed to disclose material facts.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a two year suspension, and ordered Respondent to provide proof to relator within 90 days that he made restitution to two clients.

DISSENTING: Justice Brunner in an opinion joined by Justice DeWine.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.3(a)(1)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; M- (1) (no prior discipline, (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Moore (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for misconduct related to backdating a signature declaration form in a bankruptcy court case, signing a client's name to the form, and attesting to the client's signature.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent filed a bankruptcy petition for a client. The court later issued a show cause order indicating that the required signature declaration form had not been filed. The Respondent later signed his client's name to the form, attested to the client's signature by signing his own name, and backdating the form. Respondent later filed a motion to withdraw as counsel that was granted by the bankruptcy court. Respondent's client was later indicted for several crimes, including concealment of assets and fraud. The client was also charged with providing false information in the bankruptcy filings and falsely attesting to their accuracy. Respondent testified at his client's criminal trial that he had signed his client's name to the signature declaration form. Respondent self-reported his misconduct.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Table of Cases Index

Sanction	Disbarment
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.8(a), 1.15(c),1.16(d), 3.3(a)(1), 5.5(a), 8.1(a), 8.1(b), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), 8.4(h), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (4) (cooperative attitude), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Fletcher (2013)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was permanently disbarred for misappropriating client funds, misconduct arising from a felony-theft conviction, neglect, and practicing law while under suspension.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation.

FINDINGS: Respondent was court-appointed to represent a client in a criminal matter. Respondent filed a motion for a psychiatric evaluation of his client that was granted. The client was declared incompetent to stand trial. Once the client was released from jail, he asked the client to borrow $8,000 without informing him of the terms of the loan or advising him to seek independent counsel. Additional funds were borrowed from the client. The client was eventually placed back in jail and he asked Respondent to assist him in paying bills by giving him several blank checks. Respondent used the checks for his own benefit. Over a period of time, Respondent misappropriated $22,100 in addition to a total of $19,200 he had previously borrowed from the client. After the client's competency was restored, he discovered the misappropriated funds. Respondent was indicted for his theft from the client and pleaded guilty to a fourth-degree-felony count of theft. In three other counts, Respondent failed to act with reasonable diligence in his representation of clients. He often failed to return calls or respond to messages seeking information about the status of their cases. When he did respond to the inquiries, he repeatedly lied. In one matter he accepted a filing fee but made excuses over several weeks as to why he had not filed the complaint. In another matter, he claimed that the probate court had wrongly rejected filings that contained errors that he had committed. He failed to timely file a notice of appeal in another client matter that was eventually dismissed because he never filed an appellate brief. In as separate matter, Respondent falsely informed the court that he had filed his paperwork and fees for reinstatement from his suspension, but that the Supreme Court had not timely processed the documents or reinstated him.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of permanent disbarment.

Burgess, *Columbus Bar Assn.*
2020-1511. Decided 2/16/2021.

Case Summary

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.6(a)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Holmes & Kerr (2018)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for revealing confidential client-lawyer communications in a motion to a court.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent agreed to represent a client in a domestic relations matter at no cost with the understanding that the client would prepare and draft all pretrial documents. The client was a paralegal in Respondent's law firm. Respondent gave the client tasks that needed to be completed according to a timetable. Respondent left the law firm and the relationship between the client and Respondent deteriorated. The client subsequently filed a pro se motion to continue an upcoming hearing and included an affidavit that averred Respondent had been unresponsive. The hearing was continued. Respondent later filed a motion to withdraw as counsel and included confidential client-lawyer communications, including statements contrary to the client's interests. The motion to withdraw was granted.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	One-year suspension, stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.16(d), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses),(5) (lack of cooperation), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character),
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Pfundstein (2010); Mariotti (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year, fully stayed for misconduct related to failing to provide competent representation, adequately communicate with a client, engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, and failing to properly withdraw from another client matter.

PROCEDURE: Respondent failed to answer the complaint and an interim default suspension was imposed. He responded to a show cause order and the Court remanded the matter for consideration of mitigation evidence only. Neither party objected to the Board's report and recommendation.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented a client in a divorce case and filed the complaint and a motion for temporary orders regarding custody and support of the client's minor children. But he failed to comply with a local rule regarding service of the motion. The court requested that Respondent set an expedited oral hearing on the temporary orders, but he failed to schedule the hearing, failed to notify his client, and did not raise the issue about the temporary orders at three scheduling conferences. He later failed to appear for a subsequent status conference and the scheduled trial date. His client terminated his services and new counsel requested the client file, which Respondent failed to provide. He also falsely represented to the client that his new lawyer had the file, even though it was not delivered until the disciplinary investigation commenced. In a separate count Respondent agreed to provide limited-scope representation of a client in the drafting and negotiation of a separation agreement and the drafting of a closing argument. Respondent entered a notice of appearance, completed only some of the agreed-upon work, and failed to withdraw as required by local court rule. Respondent did not return the client's file until after a grievance was filed.

SANCTION: The Court terminated Respondent's interim default suspension but required upon his reinstatement, that he demonstrate that he complied with a November 22, 2019 suspension order, submit proof he has undergone an OLAP evaluation, followed recommended treatment or counseling, and paid the costs of the proceedings. Upon reinstatement, the Court ordered that Respondent be suspended for one year, fully stayed on conditions that he complete one-year of monitored probation focused on law-office management, client communication, case management, and compliance with treatment or counseling recommendations, complete at least six hours of CLE in the areas of office management, client communications, and case management in addition to other requirements, and refrain from further misconduct.

Sanction	One-year suspension, stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(c), 1.15(a), 8.1(b), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses), (5) (lack of cooperation), (9) (no restitution); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Brueggeman (2010); Peters (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year, fully stayed for misconduct related to failing to provide competent representation, adequately communicate with a client, failing to provide the client with notice that he did not maintain professional liability insurance, and failing to deposit fees and costs in his IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a client in a personal injury matter. After the matter was settled, Respondent was retained to file a bankruptcy petition on the client and her husband's behalf. Respondent retained $1,810 from the personal injury settlement to cover his fee and the fee for filing the bankruptcy petition. Respondent never filed the bankruptcy petition and failed to communicate the status of the matter with his clients. The retained fee was not placed in his IOLTA and no monies had been refunded to the clients as of the date of the consent-to-discipline agreement.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement, suspended Respondent for one year, all stayed, and imposed conditions of proof of restitution to the affected client in the amount of $1,810, completion of six hours of CLE in law office and IOLTA management, six hours on the subject of professional ethics, in addition to the biennial CLE requirements, and one-year of monitored probation focused on law office management, client communications, and IOLTA requirements, and refrains from further misconduct.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive),(8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character), (7) (mental illness), (8) (other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Schwarz (2020); Goldblatt (2008)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for misconduct related to his felony conviction for attempted unlawful sexual contact with a minor.

PROCEDURE: The parties stipulated to two rule violations and the agreed sanction of an indefinite suspension. The Board adopted the findings of fact and recommendation of the panel. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent entered into an online chatroom and began a sexual discussion and solicited a person he believed to be a minor to engage in sexual activity. He made arrangements to meet with the person and was arrested for attempted unlawful sexual conduct with a minor, importuning, and possession of criminal tools. He later pleaded guilty to attempted unlawful sexual contact with a minor, was found to be a Tier II sex offender, and was sentenced to a two-year term of community control. He was ordered to continue and successfully complete sex-offender counseling.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board and indefinitely suspended Respondent with no credit for time served under the interim felony suspension.

Sanction	One-year suspension, stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.16(e), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim), (9) (no restitution); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Farris (2019); Mariotti (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year suspension, stayed for failing to diligently pursue her client's claim, failing to communicate with the clients about the status of their matter and respond to requests for information, failing to refund the retainer paid after her withdrawal from representation, and falsely claiming a refund had been issued.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent clients in a property dispute. The clients paid Respondent a $1,000 retainer and agreed to pay a $200 hourly rate. Respondent told the clients that she would send letters to the township and their neighbors in an effort to resolve the dispute. Respondent never replied to text or telephone messages from the clients asking for the status of the letters. The client eventually sent Respondent a letter via certified mail terminating the representation. After Respondent failed to respond to a final text message, the clients filed a grievance and filed a complaint in small claims court which resulted in a judgment against Respondent in the amount of $1,000 plus interest and costs. The clients subsequently filed a theft report with the sheriff's office. Later, Respondent sent the clients a package that included a letter indicating the package contained their documents and the $1,000 retainer. No check was included in the package. Respondent later admitted during deposition that she knew the check was not contained in the package.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement, suspended Respondent for one year, all stayed, and imposed conditions that Respondent submit to an OLAP evaluation and complies with any treatment or counseling recommendations resulting from the evaluation, completes a one-year term of monitored probation with a focus on law practice management, and refrains from further misconduct.

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.16(c), 1.16(d), 3.4(c), 8.4(d), 8.1(b), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (4) (multiple offenses),(5) (lack of cooperation); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years for multiple violations arising from his abandonment of two clients' legal matters and failure to cooperate in the ensuing disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation. No objections were filed by either party.

.

FINDINGS: Respondent entered an appearance in a criminal case pending in the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas after several continuances had been granted. When Respondent made his first appearance, the court informed counsel that no further continuances would be granted. Respondent later moved to New Mexico without notifying the court or filing a motion to withdraw as required by the local rules. Other counsel appeared for the client at the next hearing date, but the client fled from the courthouse. The judge attempted to contact Respondent, denied a motion for a continuance, and issued a warrant for the client's arrest. The judge unsuccessfully attempted to contact Respondent by e-mail. In a second count, Respondent was retained to represent a client in a custody case and was paid a $500 retainer. After a continuance was granted, Respondent failed to appear at hearing and did not inform the client he could not continue the representation. He did not timely respond to the client's request for a refund of the retainer.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the recommended sanction of the Board and suspended Respondent for two years commencing on April 13, 2020 on conditions that that he complete 12 hours of CLE on law-office management and serve a two-year period of monitored probation upon reinstatement with a focus on law-office management. The conditions were in addition to the conditions set forth in the Court's October 30, 2019 suspension order in Case No. 2018-1766.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4, 1.15(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Ernst (2018); Harsey (2015); Flessa (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his clients, failing to communicate effectively with the clients, and failing to properly deposit advance fees in his IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a couple to represent them in reclaiming rental property held in trust. Respondent received a retainer of $750.00 and failed to deposit the amount in his IOLTA. Respondent's initial efforts to assist his clients failed and he recommended they file a foreclosure action. An additional fee of $2,750 was received and deposited in Respondent's personal account. Respondent prepared documents to proceed with the foreclosure action. The clients later notified Respondent that they had secured a buyer for the property, instructed him not to file the foreclosure action, and advised him that they no longer needed his services. The sale fell through, and Respondent located a prospective buyer who made an offer that was accepted. The clients received no details about the transaction until the morning of the closing. Respondent prepared a billing statement that reflected his time for only the closing. The clients did not receive any bill for services that indicated how the two retainers were used, inquired about the funds, and indicated they expected a refund. Respondent left the closing, and the closing did not proceed. The clients went to his office, and he refused to return their documents.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	Eighteen-month suspension, twelve months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.5(a), 1.15(a), 1.5(d)(3)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct)**; M-** (3)(restitution or rectified consequences),(5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Nelson (2017); Watson (2015)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for eighteen months with 12 months stayed for failing to properly use and maintain her IOLTA, charging an excessive fee, failing to act with reasonable diligence, and failing to keep a client informed about the status of a legal matter.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct and recommended sanction. The parties filed a joint waiver of objections.

FINDINGS: The Office of Disciplinary Counsel received notice that Respondent had overdrawn her IOLTA. Respondent claimed that she was going inactive, closing her law practice, and accidentally overpaid a refund to one client. In another count, Respondent was retained to represent a client in a domestic-relations matter. In a written fee agreement, the client agreed to pay a $1,500 retainer and $500 per month for the life of the case. All payments were earned upon receipt, but Respondent failed to advise the client in writing that she may be entitled to a refund. In addition to the agreed upon rate, Respondent invoiced the client for additional charges based on $350 an hour and $150 an hour for paralegal work. Another invoice noted that all of Respondents' clients were "being transitioned to hourly" even though the client did not consent to a modification of the terms of the fee agreement. In another client matter, Respondent was retained to assist in a domestic-relations matter. Respondent assigned another lawyer to appear at a hearing, but indicated that the lawyer would prepare at "no cost" to the client. However, the client was billed for a meeting with the lawyer. After Respondent received discovery requests in the case, the client objected to providing any personal identifying information, and Respondent promised to remove the information, but produced draft responses with the information and made no objections. Later, a motion to compel was filed, and opposing counsel moved for sanctions against the client.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board and suspended Respondent for eighteen months, twelve months stayed. The reinstatement was conditioned upon proof of completion of two three-hour CLE courses on law-office management and submission to an evaluation by OLAP and compliance with any treatment or counseling recommendations resulting from the evaluation. Respondent was also required upon reinstatement to work with a monitoring attorney for a two-year period focused on the practice of law, use of an IOLTA, and fee agreements. The Court noted that due to her inactive status, the sanction has no effect unless and until she restores her license to active status.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.15(c), 1.16(a)(1), 1.16(d), 1.16(e), 5.5(a), 8.1(b), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (5) (lack of cooperation), (9) (no restitution)**; M-** (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Sarver (2020); Freeman (2010)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for continuing to practice law under a prior indefinite suspension and committing multiple violations.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation of an indefinite suspension to run consecutively to the prior suspension.

FINDINGS: In one count, Respondent was retained to file an emergency custody action. Respondent did not maintain an IOLTA and therefore did not deposit any portion of the client's advanced fee into a trust account. The client sent multiple messages to the client, some of which were unanswered, concerning the status of her case. Because of Respondent's failure to communicate, the client sent a letter to her requesting a refund. Respondent never filed anything on her client's behalf and failed to appear for a deposition in the disciplinary matter. A second client retained Respondent to assist him in reinstating parenting time. Respondent filed a motion to reinstate the client's parenting time, but failed to otherwise prosecute the motion. Respondent was suspended before the hearing, but she failed to notify the court or withdraw. She suggested the client attend the hearing on his own and suggested that he blame her by indicating she was out of state due to a family emergency. The magistrate continued the hearing. In a final count, Respondent was retained to represent a client in a divorce proceeding but did not deposit any portion of an advanced fee into an IOLTA. Respondent and the client agreed to hold off on filing the divorce complaint. Later, Respondent did not respond to text messages requesting that she file the divorce complaint. The client learned about Respondent's suspension and pending disciplinary matter and requested a refund and a return of his paperwork. Respondent did not respond to the client, refund the client's money, or return his documents.

SANCTION: The Court imposed an indefinite suspension to run concurrently with the prior indefinite suspension imposed in March, 2020. The Court conditioned Respondent's reinstatement on submission of proof that she has made restitution, undergone an OLAP evaluation, and obtained a written opinion from a qualified healthcare professional that she is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Chief Justice O'Connor and Justice Fischer. Chief Justice O'Connor would have imposed a permanent disbarment.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none**; M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive) ,(4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Thompson (2011); Gottesman (2007)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was publicly reprimanded for falsely notarizing a backdated automobile title.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent witnessed and notarized a contract for the sale of a vehicle from an estate. At the same time, Respondent falsely notarized and backdated the title to the vehicle to enable its transfer without the involvement of probate court.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	One-year suspension, six months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(b), 1.5(d)(3), 1.15(a), 1.15(a)(2), 3.3(a)(1), 5.3(b), 5.3(c)(2), 5.4(a)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses) (8) (harm to vulnerable victim)**;** **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Miller (2012); Schuman (2017); Simonelli (2007)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year suspension with six months stayed for committing multiple ethical violations related to his handling of a client's bankruptcy matter and his supervision of a nonlawyer in his law office.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of one year with six months stayed, but modified some conditions of the stay.

FINDINGS: Respondent hired a nonlawyer to assist him in his office. The assistant met with clients, prepared bankruptcy petitions under supervision, and accepted client payments. The assistant rented a room in Respondent's home. In December 2016, Respondent discovered that the assistant was collecting cash payments from clients, but not keeping records or remitting all funds to Respondent. After a period of time and an internal investigation, Respondent estimated that the assistant stole $19,000 from the firm. The assistant admitted to local police that he stole some funds. No charges were brought against the assistant. In another count, Respondent was hired to represent a client in a Chapter 7 bankruptcy. Respondent filed the petition without giving the client an opportunity to review it. A subsequent property schedule listed the client's vehicle at less than the full market value she had paid and did not list the seller as a secured creditor. The client's signature on the inventory was purportedly forged. Before a meeting of creditors, Respondent learned that a sum of $3,000 was used as a down payment on a vehicle. Respondent became angry and suggested they skip the creditor's meeting and allow the court to dismiss her case. After Respondent failed to attend a third creditor's meeting, the court dismissed the case for failure to pay the filing fee. Respondent offered to refile the petition, but indicated the client would need to pay the outstanding filing fee plus a new filing fee. The client later requested a refund which Respondent paid. At hearing, an expert testified that Respondent's bankruptcy filings contained numerous deficiencies and errors.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a one-year suspension with six months stayed on conditions that he complete six hours of CLE in law-office and client-trust-account management, in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, submit to a drug-and-alcohol assessment, pay the outstanding bankruptcy filing fee, and commit no further misconduct.

Sanction	Six-months stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(c), 8.4(h), 8.1(a)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character), (8) (other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Wexler (2014); DeLoach (2011)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, stayed for making a false statement in a disciplinary investigation, engaging in deceitful conduct, and engaging in conduct that adversely reflects on his fitness to practice law.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a six-month, stayed suspension. The parties jointly waived objections.

FINDINGS: Respondent claimed that Sean McKee, who had begun dating his estranged wife, left him a threatening voicemail. McKee was employed in the men's-clothing business and used the brand names "The Haberdasher Club" and "Alphasuit." Respondent, without notifying McKee, incorporated two businesses with the same brand names. Upon discovering the filings, McKee filed a grievance. In response to the grievance, Respondent falsely stated that he had filed the articles of incorporation to protect McKee's business from "trademark bullying" and that one filing was to form a debt purchasing company to purchase charged off automobile loans from banks. Respondent later dissolved the two companies and admitted he had incorporated the entities to retaliate against McKee for dating his wife. After Respondent learned of McKee's grievance, he sent his then ex-wife hostile text messages about the grievance and his financial support of her. One of the messages threatened retaliation against McKee. Another text message stated that his law licenses supported her and their children and that McKee's false allegations threatened the family's security.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a six-month, stayed suspension on conditions that he comply with his OLAP contract for a period of two years or longer if recommended by OLAP, complete one-year term of monitored probation focused on ethics, and refrain from any further misconduct.

CONCURRING IN PART, DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Kennedy joined by Justice DeWine

NOT PARTICIPATING: Justice Brunner

Sanction	One-year suspension, six months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.8(e), 1.15(a), 1.15(a)(3), 1.15(a)(4), 1.15(a)(5), 1.15(b), 5.3(a), 5.3(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Podor (2009)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year with six months stayed for failing to supervise a nonlawyer employee, improper financial assistance to clients, and misconduct related to his IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: A panel adopted the parties' stipulated rule violations, granted relator's motion to amend the complaint to conform to the stipulations, dismissed nine alleged rule violations, and recommended the dismissal of an additional violation based on the insufficiency of the evidence. The board adopted the panel's findings, conclusions, and recommended sanction. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent discovered that his paralegal had issued a check payable to herself and terminated her employment. The paralegal pleaded guilty to one count of theft and one count of forgery. Prior to termination, the paralegal had witnessed an accident and recommended an injured party retain Respondent. Respondent stipulated that the paralegal invited the client to her house, discussed settlement, and later forged the Respondent's signature to the back of the settlement check. In an unrelated count, Respondent had provided improper financial assistance to clients on five occasions ranging from $200 to $4,500 and reimbursed himself from settlement proceeds. Related to the IOLTA violations, Respondent did not create a separate record for each account indicating the date, amount, and client for each debit and credit, kept more than a minimal amount of his personal funds in his IOLTA, including a three-month period when he kept at least $150,00 of his own funds in the account, provided checks to payees from his IOLTA and allowing them to cash and secure funds from the IOLTA before his bank had received payment on deposits, failed to create a ledger for some transactions, and had inadvertently allowed third parties access to his IOLTA from his PayPal account when he permitted a client to pay him through the PayPal account.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a one-year suspension with six months stayed on conditions that he engage in no further misconduct and pay the cost of the proceedings. The Court ordered as a condition to reinstatement that Respondent complete a minimum of 24 hours of CLE on the topics of professional ethics and law-office management. Upon reinstatement Respondent was ordered to serve one year of monitored probation.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.6(c), 1.15(a),1.16(b)(1), 1.16(c), 1.16(d)(3)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (8) (other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Allerding (2009); Bulson (2020)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years with one year stayed for failing to act with reasonable diligence in representing a client and improperly withdrawing from representation.

PROCEDURE: A panel adopted the parties' stipulated sanction of a two-year conditionally stayed suspension. The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation.

FINDINGS: Respondent was transported twice during a 24-hour period by emergency medical personnel for a psychiatric evaluation. The second time he was placed in an inpatient mental-health-and-chemical-dependency facility after acknowledging he had taken several substances including cocaine and Adderall. After he was admitted to rehabilitation, the Respondent had his girlfriend place a message on his voice-mail indicating he was no longer taking cases and reassigning current cases to new lawyers. At the time, Respondent had 15 clients in domestic-relations and criminal matters. He missed at least one hearing, made no arrangements to communicate with clients, to continue representation, or withdraw as counsel. Respondent's client files were transferred to local counsel who agreed to represent the affected clients pro bono. After a relapse, Respondent was hospitalized a second time. Respondent's girlfriend discovered, and later delivered to relator's counsel, approximately 20 client files he had left in the trunk of her car that he abandoned at a gas station.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a two-year suspension, all stayed on conditions that he remain in compliance with his OLAP contract, enters into an additional two-year contract upon the issuance of the final order, completes three hours of continuing legal education focused on law-office management, in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, serves a two-year period of monitored probation focused on law-office management and compliance with his OLAP contract, and engages in no further misconduct.

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Haynes (2020); Engel (2018); Braun (2012)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension for failing to communicate and diligently represent a client.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a client in a marriage-dissolution proceeding. After the dissolution was granted, Respondent was required to prepare and submit QDROs in order to divide the parties' retirement assets. Respondent never prepared the QDROs and had no further communication with the client. The client was forced to retain new counsel to complete the necessary QDROs. Respondent made restitution to the client in the amount of $2,490 which covered the costs to hire new counsel and an outside company to prepare the QDROs.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court suspended Respondent for two years, retroactive to May 30, 2020 with additional conditions for reinstatement of obtaining an OLAP assessment and complying with any recommendation, and completing six hours of CLE in law-office management, in addition to the other requirements of Gov.Bar R. X. Upon reinstatement, Respondent was required to complete a one-year period of monitored probation focusing on his compliance with any recommendations made by OLAP.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), 8.4(h), GBR V(20)(A)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (5) (lack of cooperation), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (5) (good character), (6) (other penalties/sanctions), (8) (other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	McElroy (2014)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for misconduct stemming from his convictions on felony counts of theft, drug possession, and tampering with evidence. In addition, he gave false testimony about the status of his license in another jurisdiction.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation.

FINDINGS: Respondent was observed while working as a pharmacist at Cleveland Clinic stealing prescription medication.He was found guilty of theft, drug possession, and tampering with evidence. He was ordered to serve two years of community control and pay a fine of $750. As a result of his convictions, his pharmacist license was permanently revoked. While the matter was pending before the Supreme Court, Relator discovered evidence that Respondent had been suspended on an interim basis and ultimately disbarred in Michigan as a result of his felony convictions. Relator filed an emergency motion seeking a stay in the case and a remand to the Board for further proceedings. On remand, the panel determined that Respondent had been aware of his Michigan interim suspension and disbarment order and a pending USPTO proceeding before a deposition was taken in August 2018. During the deposition he testified that his Michigan law license was "just no longer active" and denied the existence of any other disciplinary proceedings in his capacity as a lawyer.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court indefinitely suspended Respondent from the practice of law and with additional conditions for reinstatement of remaining drug-alcohol free, entering a two-year contract with OLAP, submitting to random drug screens, participating in mental health/substance-abuse counseling with a qualified chemical-dependency professional, notifying OLAP of all prescription drugs, submitting proof of successful completion of a substance-abuse-treatment-program, submitting a prognosis that he can return to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law, and committing no further misconduct.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h) GBRV20A
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (6) (other penalties/sanctions), (8) (other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Connors (2020); Maryniuk (2017); Grossman (2015)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for misconduct arising from his conviction on multiple felony counts of pandering sexually oriented matter and illegal use of a minor in nudity-oriented material or performance.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the findings and recommendation of the panel. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was indicted on five second-degree felony counts of pandering sexually oriented matter involving a minor and one fifth-degree felony count of possessing criminal tools. He was additionally indicted on eight counts of pandering sexually oriented matter involving a minor and two counts of illegal use of a minor in nudity-oriented material or performance, all second-degree felonies. He entered no-contest pleas and was found guilty of all charges. He was sentenced to an aggregate ten-year prison term and designated a Tier II sex offender.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served.

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4, 1.4(a), 1.4(c), 1.8(c), 1.15(a), 1.15(d), 1.16, 1.16(a)(1), 1.16(a)(2), 5.5(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years for failing to reasonably communicate with clients, personally accepting retainers after clients signed a fee agreement with her law firm, failing to place prepaid fees in an IOLTA, and failing to deliver clients' papers and property upon termination of representation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation that Respondent be suspended for two years with credit for time served under her ongoing attorney-registration suspension.

FINDINGS: Respondent accepted a retainer fee from a client, endorsed, and cashed the check without notifying the firm. She did not attend a hearing with the client, instructing him to attend the hearing alone. Respondent left her firm and began to practice as a sole practitioner. She did not carry malpractice insurance, failed to provide her client with notice of that fact, failed to maintain an IOLTA, and failed to hold her client's retainer in the IOLTA. She later asked her client to help her pay her electric bill and buy school supplies for her children. After her attorney-registration suspension she informed her client that she would withdraw from the case, but failed to file a withdrawal or substitution of counsel with the court. She failed to return the client's file until several months later and owed the client restitution. In a second count, Respondent joined a new law firm and signed a fee agreement with a client. She failed to deposit the client's retainer in an IOLTA. The fee and agreement were either lost or stolen. After a month, the client contacted the firm to inquire about the status of her matter. The firm notified the client that Respondent had left the firm and the firm had no record of the client. The file was not returned to the client because Respondent had lost it. In a third matter in juvenile court, Respondent seldom returned the client's phone calls and informed her that she was free to obtain another lawyer. Respondent told the client that she, her child, and fiancé needed to fly to Cincinnati for a hearing. Respondent was 30 minutes late for the hearing. The client would have testified that Respondent was not prepared for the hearing, did not initiate or participate in settlement discussions, nor was prepared to negotiate a settlement on her behalf.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court suspended Respondent for two years, with credit for time served under her attorney-registration suspension, and ordered her to pay $316.50 in restitution for one client. The Court required her to petition the court for reinstatement to the practice of law, submit documentation from a qualified healthcare professional opining that she is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

Sanction	One-year suspension, six months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	3.5(a)(6), 8.2(a), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (5) (lack of cooperation), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year with six months stayed for making improper statements that impugned the integrity of judicial officers in a document filed with the Supreme Court.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation that Respondent be suspended from the practice of law for one year, fully stayed. Objections were filed by both parties.

FINDINGS: Respondent appealed a Board of Tax Appeals decision on behalf of a client to the Eighth District Court of Appeals. Because Respondent failed to present a current value of the subject property's value, the court of appeals held that the BTA's decision was reasonable and lawful. Respondent next sought a discretionary review of the court of appeals' decision. He argued in his memorandum in support of jurisdiction that the Supreme Court's prior decision in *Moskowitz v. Cuyahoga Cty. Bd. of Revision* was wrongly decided, had applied its own burden of proof, and that the Court should have supported its decision with "solid case law." He also stated that the Court intentionally misstated the holdings of cases cited and criticized the Court for accusing him of "being disingenuous in his view" of the BTA's citation to a case. Additionally, he accused the Supreme Court of seeking to achieve its own political agenda in a prior BTA decision. Respondent also criticized two justices for favoring the government at the expense of the taxpayers and Constitution. He stated that the decision in *Moskowitz* was delayed to permit the retirement of certain justices.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law and suspended Respondent for one year, with six months stayed on the condition that he commit no further misconduct.

CONCURRING: Chief Justice O'Connor in an opinion joined by Justices Fischer, Donnelly, Brunner and Stewart.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Stewart would adopt the recommended sanction of the Board.

DISSENTING: Justice Kennedy and Justice DeWine in separate opinions.

Sanction	Disbarment
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.7(a)(1), 1.7(a)(2), 1.7(b), 1.7(c)(2), 1.8(a), 1.13(a), 1.13(e), 5.5(a), 7.1, 8.4(c), 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses),(5) (lack of cooperation), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** none
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Cicirella (2012); Fletcher (2013); Shabazz (1995)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was permanently disbarred for representing multiple clients with conflicting interests, practicing while under suspension, and failing to cooperate with the disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommended a sanction of disbarment.

FINDINGS: Respondent was a member of the law firm Mueller, Smith & Okuley. The firm occupied a building owned by two corporations, one of which was owned by Respondent and his wife. Lawyer Mueller left the firm and later filed a lawsuit against Smith, Respondent, the corporations, and other entities. During the litigation, Respondent appeared as legal counsel for the two corporations, himself, and another entity. The litigation was settled, but disputes arose regarding the enforcement of the agreement. Prior to the settlement, Respondent was authorized to serve as one of the corporation's chief operating officers and permitted to use funds to perform necessary repairs and maintenance on the law building. At the same time, the Okuley Smith law firm was behind on rent payments. Respondent then prepared, executed, and recorded a $354,000 mortgage on behalf of the corporations while he represented both in the underlying litigation with Mueller. He later arranged for the corporation to borrow funds to satisfy money owned in the settlement from a company owned by his wife, sister, and sister-in-law. A professor of law testified that Respondent represented multiple clients on opposite sides of the mortgage transaction and when he had an ownership interest in at least party to the transaction. During the Mueller litigation, Respondent recognized that there could be conflicting interests and sent a letter to several addressees to waive conflicts that was never signed.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law and permanently disbarred Respondent.

Sanction	Eighteen-month suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-**(3) (pattern of misconduct); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Garfield (2006); Atway (2020); Plesich (2019); Petroff (1999)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for eighteen months, with credit for time served, for misconduct stemming from 20 felony counts related to the improper use of a doctor's Drug Addiction Treatment Act (DATA) number.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the panel's recommendation to accept the consent-to-discipline agreement with an eighteen-month suspension, with credit for time served under an interim felony suspension.

FINDINGS: Respondent was employed as a director of operations at an alcohol and drug rehabilitation facility in Whitehall, Ohio. A doctor at the facility had a DATA number and a waiver that allowed him to prescribe controlled substances to treat narcotic dependence. After the doctor resigned, Respondent failed to notify the DEA that the doctor was no longer the waiver physician for the Whitehall facility and failed to register another waiver physician. Throughout the spring and summer of 2017, Respondent continued to use the former doctor's DATA number to make 22 purchases of controlled substances in violation of federal law. In 2019, Respondent and five others were indicted on multiple felony charges of health care fraud, distribution of controlled substances, and money laundering. Respondent was specifically charged with one count of conspiracy to commit health care fraud and 22 counts related to improper usage of the DATA number. Respondent entered a guilty plea to the 22 counts related to the use of the DATA number. The conspiracy to commit health care fraud charge was dismissed. Respondent was sentenced to a one-year term of probation for each of the 22 counts, to be served concurrently, and ordered her to pay a special assessment of $2,200. Respondent completed probation and paid the special assessment. She self-reported her misconduct to Relator on February 26, 2020.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline and suspended Respondent for eighteen months with credit for time served under the March 2020 interim felony suspension.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.5(c)(1), 1.5(c)(2), 1.15(a), 1.16(e), 3.1, 8.1(a), 8.1(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (5) (lack of cooperation), (9) (no restitution); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Austin (2019); Delay (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for neglecting several client matters failing to communicate with and deceiving clients, misappropriating funds, failing to cooperate with the disciplinary investigation, and concealing her misconduct.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of an indefinite suspension.

FINDINGS: In one count, Respondent represented a client who had been previously represented by a firm that asserted a charging lien on a settlement with an insurer. Upon negotiating the final settlement, Respondent deposited the settlement funds in her empty IOLTA and later withdrew and deposited the entire amount in her personal checking account. In a letter to a client, she erroneously stated the client's share of the settlement and did not include a check. She began to misappropriate the funds. She cancelled two meetings with the client to arrange for distribution of the proceeds. After a grievance was filed, Respondent wrote checks to the client, but one check was returned for insufficient funds. In a second count, Respondent represented a client to recover the cost of a faulty repair and was paid a flat fee of $75 to send a demand letter. After receiving a check for a full refund, she falsely stated to her client that the bank would hold the funds for ten days and later misappropriated more than $2,800 of the refund. In another count, Respondent accepted retainers from separate clients in a divorce and child support matter. She deposited both retainers in her overdrawn personal checking account and misappropriated the funds. She eventually ceased communicating with both clients without performing any significant work and failed to refund the unearned retainers. In a final count, Respondent was retained in a civil matter stemming from an assault. Respondent falsely informed the client that she had filed a complaint on her behalf. Two years later, after Respondent filed a complaint, the complaint was dismissed as time barred. At a later hearing on defendant's motion for attorney fees, Respondent was found to have engaged in frivolous conduct and she and her client were ordered to jointly pay attorney fees.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court indefinitely suspended Respondent from the practice of law and required her to demonstrate as additional conditions on reinstatement that she has committed no further misconduct, made restitution to several parties and clients and/or satisfied a judgment, submitted to an OLAP assessment and complied with all recommendations, and received a prognosis from a qualified healthcare professional or chemical-dependency professional that she is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

Sanction	Disbarment
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Lisner (1981); Sturgeon (2006); Ostheimer (1995)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was permanently disbarred for misconduct that occurred prior to becoming a lawyer.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of permanent disbarment.

FINDINGS: Respondent was employed as a high school history teacher from 2006 to 2010 when he was terminated after someone reported seeing him arrive at the school with a student. He was confronted by the school superintendent and admitted he had met with one student but was not honest about his sexual relationships with his students. He was indicted in 2017 with several counts involving gross sexual imposition and sexual battery. He later pleaded guilty to one count of gross sexual imposition and three counts of sexual battery with respect to each of the two victims, was sentenced to 33 years in prison, and was designated a Tier III sex offender. On appeal, he was resentenced to 29 years, 10 months in prison. The underlying conduct occurred before Respondent was admitted to the Ohio bar in 2013. Although he admitted his termination on his bar application, he did not disclose that he had engaged in sexual conduct with his students. Respondent testified at the disciplinary hearing that he had communicated with the victims, in one case several years later, after he was terminated from the school.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of permanent disbarment.

DISSENTING: Justices Donnelly, DeWine, and Stewart.

Sanction	One-year, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.8, 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) dishonest or selfish motive, (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year suspension, fully stayed for misconduct arising from her representation of two clients in which she acquired an ownership interest.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a one-year, fully stayed suspension.

FINDINGS: Respondent was an associate with a law firm and provided legal assistance to a friend in connection with the creation of a company that was developing transdermal patches. Respondent was an officer of the company, Advanced Health Brands (AHB) and had a one percent ownership interest in the company. She then represented a second company, Nutriband, in its acquisition of AHB. She also acquired an ownership interest in Nutriband. Respondent did not inform the firm that she was performing legal services for the companies or follow the firm's standard practices for establishing new clients. Before Nutriband's acquisition of AHB, the CEO asked Respondent to furnish a legal opinion in response to an inquiry from the SEC. Her opinion incorrectly stated that AHB's transdermal patches did not require approval from or were regulated by the FDA. After the acquisition was complete, the SEC contacted Respondent and issued a subpoena directing her to produce certain documents. Later, a lawyer representing Nutriband issued a litigation hold letter to Respondent in anticipation of a malpractice suit based on Respondent's legal opinion. The SEC later issued a cease-and-desist order finding that Nutriband had made misleading statements regarding the FDA's jurisdiction over its products and imposed fines of $25,000 against Nutriband's CEO and CFO. Respondent's law firm entered into a confidential agreement with Respondent to settle all their respective claims arising from the legal work that she had performed for the two companies.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a one-year stayed suspension on conditions that she engage in no further misconduct.

DISSENTING: Justice Fischer and Chief Justice O'Connor would have imposed a conditionally stayed eighteen-month suspension.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, one year stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.8(j), 3.3(a)(1), 8.1(a)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses),(5) (lack of cooperation), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension, with one year stayed for engaging in improper sexual relationships with two clients, making a false statement to a tribunal, and making false statements of material fact during the disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a two-year suspension, with one year stayed.

FINDINGS: Respondent began to exchange inappropriate and sexually suggestive text messages with a divorce client. He filed a motion for contempt against the client's spouse and included an affidavit that he notarized that was purportedly signed by the client. Respondent began a sexual relationship with the client when she flew to Ohio to attend postdecree hearings. The Respondent broke off the relationship and the client informed his law firm of the improper conduct. The firm instructed Respondent to withdraw from the case, reimburse the client, and self-report his violations to Relator. In a second count, Respondent was retained to represent a spouse charged with domestic violence. After a favorable ruling in her case, she invited Respondent to dinner and later engaged in sex. When Respondent reported his relationship with another client to his employer, he failed to disclose conduct with another client. After the relationship ended, the client filed a grievance. In response, he falsely and repeatedly stated that the relationship did not begin until his employer removed him from the case. He later admitted his response was a fabrication.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a two-year suspension with one year stayed on conditions that he contact OLAP within 60 days of the disciplinary order, comply with Gov.Bar R. V(23)(A) during the suspension, and commit no further misconduct. In addition to the conditions for reinstatement in Gov.Bar R. V(24), the Court ordered Respondent to show compliance with OLAP recommendations, provided an opinion from an qualified healthcare professional that he is able to return to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law, provide proof that he has completed six hours of CLE addressing ethical boundaries in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar X, and cooperate with a monitoring attorney for two years after reinstatement who will preapprove all professional relationships with female clients.

Sanction	One-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	Jud.Cond.R. 1.2, 2.2, 2.8(B), Prof.Cond.R. 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (multiple offenses), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year suspension for engaging in undignified, improper, and discourteous demeanor, ordering a courtroom observer to submit to a drug test, and finding the observer in contempt for refusing the drug test.

PROCEDURE: The panel recommended a one-year suspension with six months stayed. The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact and - conclusions of law, but recommended a one year suspension and immediate suspension from judicial office without pay.

FINDINGS: A woman, A.O., entered Respondent's courtroom to observe the hearing of her daughters' father, T.D. He had been arrested the day before for violating his probation and failing to appear in a county drug-court program. The judge noticed A.O. in the courtroom and after a defendant said he did not believe in using drugs, stated "That's good. I wish all of us could say that. Right, A.O.?" Before Respondent called the next case, he stated that he felt A.O. was under the influence and wanted her tested. A bailiff directed her to follow him to the probation department to have a drug test administered. She asked for a lawyer, but was denied because she was not under arrest. A.O. declined the drug test and Respondent held her in contempt for ten days. At jail she was forced to take a pregnancy test and undergo two-full-body scans with male officers present. Respondent sentenced T.D. to a 180-day jail term, and a 30-day jail term in two cases. A 150-day jail term was ordered for T.D.s probation violations to be served consecutively with the 180-day term. A.O.'s defense counsel filed a motion to stay her sentence pending appeal. The prosecutor filed a motion to vacate Respondent's contempt finding on the grounds that it was not supported by law and violated the Ohio and United States Constitutions. After the hearing, A.O. was released from jail. The appeals court reversed Respondent, finding the record to be "devoid of any specific observations or findings by [Respondent] of [A.O.'s] conduct in the courtroom ****" and that his actions were an invalid exercise of contempt power.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a one-year suspension.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, one year stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.5(a), 3.3(a)(1), 4.1(a), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) dishonest or selfish motive, (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Stahlbush (2010); Swift (2014)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years, with one year stayed for misconduct related to an underlying theft conviction that involved overbilling for work she performed as a court-appointed lawyer.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a two-year suspension with one year stayed. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent pleaded guilty to a fifth-degree felony count of theft that arose from her overbilling the Ohio Public Defender's Office and Lorain County for court-appointed work performed from 2016-2018. She was sentenced to three years of community control and ordered to make restitution of $29,319 to Lorain County within one year and abstain from seeking court-appointed work for two years. Respondent admitted that she made false statements to nonjudicial personnel and the exhibits established her false billing statements were received and certified by the county auditor.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a two-year suspension with one year stayed with no credit for time served under the interim felony suspension. She was ordered to comply with all orders of the underlying criminal case, pay $50,000 in restitution to Lorain County in addition to the $29,319 ordered in the criminal case, and engage in no further misconduct. She was additionally ordered for one year following her reinstatement to furnish Relator with copies of all her court appointed work.

Sanction	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	DR 9-102(E)(1), DR 9-102(B)(3), 1.15(a), 1.15(a)(2), 1.15(a)(3), 1.15(a)(4), 1.15(a)(5)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Fletcher (2009)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, stayed for failing to follow conduct rules related to her IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a six-month stayed suspension. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Between 1983 and 2019, Respondent failed to comply with conduct rules regulating the safekeeping of her client funds and client trust accounts. She routinely deposited and held client retainers in her operating account and paid personal expenses from the account, sometimes before fees were earned. Despite her failing to properly deposit funds in her IOLTA, she did maintain an accounting of her operating account with running balances and services rendered against each client's retainer. Consequently, she was able to refund clients any unused retainers.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a six-month stayed suspension on conditions that she complete a one-year term of monitored probation focused on law-office management and compliance with client-trust-account regulations, complete three hours of CLE on law-office management and compliance with client-trust-account regulations in addition to the other requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and refrain from any further misconduct.

NOT PARTICIPATING: Justice Brunner

Sanction	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.6(a), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Holmes & Kerr (2018)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, stayed for disclosing client confidential information to his nonlawyer spouse.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was employed by one law firm before he resigned and accepted a new position at a different law firm. After he left the firm, a former client contacted the firm to obtain a copy of his case file. A partner accessed Respondent's e-mail account to locate client communications between and among the client, Respondent, and opposing counsel. The partner found several e-mail communications between Respondent and his wife who is not a lawyer and was never employed by the firm. The partner determined that Respondent shared his e-mail account and calendar with his wife. The wife accessed the e-mail account to review messages, client correspondence, and the calendar and had possession of the account username, password, and domain information. She was also able to access files located on the law firm's server. A review of e-mails between Respondent and his wife revealed they discussed confidential client information. The wife also used her access to perform substantive work on Respondent's legal matters, including completing a dissolution form, editing client correspondence, and reviewing other work product. In one instance, a client was billed for work performed by Respondent's wife. Respondent's wife kept law firm documents on her work and personal computers, including information concerning law firm salaries, income, bonuses, and performance evaluations. Respondent acknowledged in an e-mail to his wife the impropriety of providing his wife access to the law firm e-mail and server accounts. Respondent continued to provide his wife access to his e-mail and calendar at his new law firm.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and suspended Respondent for six months, stayed.

Sanction	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.8(j)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, stayed for engaging in a sexual relationship with a client.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and recommended adoption by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client in August 2019 to represent her in a personal property dispute involving her former fiancé. After the client-lawyer relationship commenced, Respondent and his client became involved in a social and sexual relationship that continued until December 2019 or January 2020. In January 2020, the client contacted Respondent's co-counsel and advised him that she was involved in a sexual relationship with Respondent and that problems had developed between the two. Respondent withdrew from representation on the advice of his co-counsel. Co-counsel continued the representation which resulted in mediation of the pending lawsuit.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and suspended Respondent for six months, stayed.

Sanction	One-year, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none**; M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (6) (other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year, all stayed for misconduct arising from a vehicular accident and subsequent convictions for OVI, resisting arrest, and leaving the scene of an accident.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a one-year suspension, all stayed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was driving in snowy conditions when he rear-ended a police cruiser parked on the side of the road near the scene of another accident. While the impact caused substantial damage to Respondent's car and the cruiser, he left the scene without stopping, later crashed into a median, abandoned his vehicle and fled on foot. He was arrested, administered field sobriety tests, and had a blood-alcohol content of .148. He pleaded no contest to two counts of operating a vehicle without reasonable control, a single count of resisting arrest, leaving the scene of an accident, unsafe operation of a vehicle in the vicinity of an emergency vehicle, and OVI. He was sentenced to 90 days in jail with 87 days suspended and three days credit for successful completion of a driver-intervention program. His driver's license was suspended for two years from the date of the accident. He was placed on 12 months of active probation followed by 24 months of inactive probation. After his term of active probation, he was required to attend two Alcoholics Anonymous meetings per week, wear a continuous remote alcohol-monitoring device, and pay a fine and court costs.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction of a one-year stayed suspension on conditions that he engage in no further misconduct and abide by the terms of the probation imposed by the municipal court.

Sanction	One-year, six months stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.3, 1.4(b), 1.5(c), 1.5(c)(2), 1.15(a), 1.15(a)(2), 1.15(c), 8.1(b), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation)**; M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Roseman (2016); Maney (2017); Smith (2017); Hadeed (2019); Engel (2018); Pheils (2011)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year with six months stayed for misconduct arising from his representation of a client in an employment discrimination matter.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation to accept the consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by four employees to represent them in an employment discrimination matter on a contingency fee basis. Respondent did not place advance fees for the payment of costs and expenses that he received from one client in his IOLTA. During litigation Respondent did not engage in written discovery on behalf of his client, Dennis Bogard. When asked for copies of the discovery requests by Relator, Respondent provided documents that the accompanying metadata showed were created several months after the deadline for completion of discovery. Bogard signed a confidential settlement and release and sent it electronically to Respondent. Prior to signing the document, the only communications between Respondent and the client were through text messages or via one of the other plaintiffs in the case. Upon receipt of the settlement check, Respondent did not provide Bogard with a closing statement nor inform him that his portion of the settlement would be reduced by tax withholding and garnishments.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement, suspended Respondent for one year with six months stayed, ordered Respondent to complete six hours of CLE on law office and IOLTA management in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and upon reinstatement work for one year with a monitoring attorney appointed by Relator focusing on law practice management and operation.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.5(d)(3), 1.4(c), 1.15(a), 1.15(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Ernst (2018); Smith (2016); Harsey (2015): Rucker (2012)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for failing to advise a client that the client may be entitled to a refund, failing to disclose the lawyer's failure to carry professional-liability insurance, failing to hold client's property in an IOLTA, and hold legal fees paid in advance in an IOLTA.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings, conclusions, and recommended sanction of a public reprimand.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to probate a client's late father's estate and accepted an initial payment of $500 on a proposed flat fee of $2,500. The engagement letter did not inform the client that the fee was earned upon receipt and that the client may be entitled to a full or partial refund if she did not complete the work. Respondent never negotiated the check for the initial payment but deposited later payments in her operating account. Respondent also did not inform the client that her liability-insurance had lapsed during the representation. She communicated with the client and performed some work on the estate. While she prepared rough drafts of the probate forms, she never filed the documents with the court. Respondent claimed that she wrote the client to inform her that she was waiting for a waiver from the client's sister and would terminate the representation if the document was not received by a date certain. At hearing, the client testified that she never received the letter.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanctio	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.3, 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct),(4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character), (6) (other penalties)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Schnittke (2017); LaFayette (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months, stayed for failing to competently and diligently represent three clients in matters in which she had been appointed to serve as counsel.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a six-month, stayed suspension. Neither party filed objections.

FINDINGS: In one client matter Respondent was appointed as appellate counsel. She was granted three extensions to file an appellate brief but failed to timely do so. A show cause order was issued by the court and Respondent eventually filed the brief. She did not file a reply to the state's merit brief. At oral argument she informed the panel that the parties intended to waive oral argument and stand on their briefs. One judge expressed concerns that her brief was "52 pages of the most difficult reading I've ever probably done in 12 years." The oral argument was rescheduled, and Respondent was given two weeks to file a reply brief. She sought an extension of time but failed to submit the brief by the deadline. The court of appeals removed her as counsel and noted that her merit brief was "inadequate, incoherent and unintelligible" and that she was unprepared for oral argument. In a second matter, Respondent failed to file a timely notice of appeal, instead filed a motion for a delayed appeal, and was *sua sponte* removed as appellate counsel. In a third client matter, a hearing was scheduled for the same day as a deposition by the Relator investigating an unrelated grievance. She failed to appear at the hearing and failed to notify her client or the court that she had a conflict. A new lawyer was appointed.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a six-month, stayed suspension. The Court ordered Respondent to complete six hours of continuing legal education in law-office management, including calendar-management and law-office-technology training, six hours of training in criminal appellate law prior to accepting any new appointments in appellate matters, and refrain from further misconduct.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(4)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Perry (2019); Goldberger (2019)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for neglecting a client's matter and failing to comply with reasonable requests for information from the client.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation to accept the consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client to file a claim regarding currency that was seized by the U.S. Government at an airport. Respondent filed the claim with the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol. The U.S. Attorney later filed a forfeiture complaint in U.S. District Court and a copy of the complaint was sent to Respondent via certified mail and signed for by an employee of his office. Respondent failed to file a verified claim to the currency, answer the forfeiture complaint, or respond to a forfeiture motion filed by the U.S. Attorney. The motion was granted and the case was closed. Respondent's client is now barred from asserting any claim to the currency. Respondent did not notify his client that he had failed to answer the complaint, that the currency had been forfeited, and that the case had been closed. Upon discovering the case was closed, the client sent Respondent an email and text regarding the matter. Respondent responded by email and blamed the client for failing to notify his office of the forfeiture complaint and denied receiving the complaint. Respondent continued to blame his client after the grievance was filed. Respondent refunded the client's fee. The client was pursuing a malpractice action against Respondent.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and issued a public reprimand.

Sanction	One-year, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.15(a), 1.15(a)(5), 1.15(b), 1.15(d), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct),(4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Adelstein (2020); Gorby (2015)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for one year, stayed for failing to hold funds in a client trust account and engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a one-year, stayed suspension. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented three individuals in personal-injury cases. He received medical-payments-coverage checks payable to each client which he placed in an IOLTA. None of the clients were aware the checks had been issued. Two checks were signed with client signatures by either Respondent or his employee. When Respondent left his firm, his clients remained, but he did not transfer his client's med-pay payments to the firm's client trust account. One month after opening his IOLTA, Respondent deposited $35,000 of his personal funds into the account to act as a buffer so that he could promptly issue settlement checks to his clients. On one occasion he failed to withdraw earned fees after distributing settlement proceeds and failed to conduct monthly reconciliations for two years. Respondent also delayed distribution of settlement proceeds to his client. In one matter client funds were not distributed until three years after the settlement funds were initially received. In another matter, a check to a client was returned when Respondent's IOLTA balance contained insufficient funds. At one point, Respondent's account balance was $286.01 when it should have held over $20,000.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a one-year, stayed suspension. The Court ordered Respondent to complete six hours of continuing legal education focused on client-trust-account and client-fund-management, to not engage in further misconduct, and to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, eighteen months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1) (prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Bancsi (2014); Engel (2018); Karp (2018)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years, with 18 months stayed for neglecting a client matter, failing to reasonably communicate with the client, failing to return the client's file, and failing to cooperate in the disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a two-year suspension, 18 months stayed. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by the parents of a client in his appeal of his criminal conviction. They agreed to pay a flat fee of $5,000, $3,300 of which they paid up front. Respondent filed a notice of appeal but did not timely file a brief or move for an extension of the deadline. The court issued a show-cause order requiring the filing of the brief or to show cause why the case should not be dismissed. Respondent did not inform his client or his client's parents of the court's order, took no action, and the court dismissed the appeal. Respondent did not inform the client or parents about the dismissal, nor reply to the mother's initial attempts to contact him. He informed her that he had experienced some medical difficulties and admitted that he had not filed a timely brief. He agreed to file a motion to reopen the appeal and complete the representation. While he prepared an undated motion and appellate brief, he never filed the documents. When asked about the status of the appeal, he falsely stated that the motion was sent by a runner to the court. Days later he wrote in response to an email inquiry that he was awaiting acceptance by the clerk of courts. Respondent did not respond to additional inquiries from the client. After the mother hired new counsel, she learned that Respondent had never filed a motion to reopen her son's appeal or an appellate brief. Respondent refunded the parents the total amount that they had paid him.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a two-year suspension, with 18 months stayed on conditions that he commit no further misconduct. The Court further ordered that Respondent submit proof that he is in compliance with his OLAP contract, and serve a one-year period of monitored probation on reinstatement focused on his law-office management and client communications.

Sanction	Six-month, stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	JCR 1.2, 2.2, 2.9(A), 2.9(B), 2.11(A)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3) (pattern of misconduct),(4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5) (good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent, a common pleas judge, was given a stayed, six-month suspension for engaging in *ex parte* communications with an individual regarding multiple cases before him.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a six-month, stayed suspension. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent issued a civil stalking protection order that required Keith Blumensaadt to stay away from his brother and nephew. Blumensaadt was indicted on 12 felony counts. Respondent had previously served as Blumensaadt's probation officer and both the prosecutor and defense counsel waived any disqualification. A plea agreement was approved and Blumensaadt was released from custody. Within 30 days of his release, Blumensaadt and the judge became Facebook friends and began to regularly communicate via Facebook Messenger in which they discussed both personal and professional matters including multiple cases over which Respondent presided. In one case, Blumensaadt recommended that Respondent give a defendant a "bond he can [not] make" because the defendant had sold his daughter heroin. In Blumensaadt's divorce case from his wife he sent the judge a Facebook message concerning a transfer of custody of their son. In relation to a motion to change parenting time, more questions were asked, with Respondent occasionally replying. Blumensaadt continued to send Respondent messages about his wife and the divorce. Respondent made a change without a hearing to the CSPO to allow him to attend his mother's funeral after he and Blumensaadt spoke for 30 minutes through Facebook Messenger about potential modifications to the CSPO. After a personal injury accident, Blumensaadt exchanged messages with Respondent about the defendant, the recommendation being made by the prosecutor for the defendant to attend a pretrial diversion program, and his injuries. At no time during any exchange with Blumensaadt did Respondent reveal the *ex parte* communications to parties or disqualify himself.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a six-month, stayed suspension on conditions that he complete a minimum of three hours of continuing judicial education on the subject of *ex parte* communication or appropriate use of social media by judicial officers in addition to the requirements of Gov.Jud.R. IV, refrain from future misconduct, and pay the costs of the proceedings.

INDEX
Aggravating & Mitigating Factors
(Gov. Bar R. V, Section 13(B)(C)
Effective January 1, 2015)

Aggravation (Gov. Bar R. V, Section 13(B))

(1) (prior discipline)

Barbera (7/12/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (2/17/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

(2) (dishonest or selfish motive)

Berry (11/3/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

(3) (pattern of misconduct)

Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(4) (multiple offenses)

Alexander (2/16/2021)
Barbera (7/12/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(5) (lack of cooperation)

Barbera (7/12/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)

Okuley (9/21/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

(6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

(7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

(8) (harm to vulnerable victim)
Barbera (7/12/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)

(9) (no restitution)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

Mitigation (Gov. Bar R. V, Section 13(C))

(1) (no prior discipline)
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Berry (11/3/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(2) (no dishonest or selfish motive)
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Barbera (7/12/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(3) (restitution or rectified consequences)
Berry (11/3/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)

Sabol (6/22/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

(4) (full and free disclosure)
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Berry (11/3/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(5) (good character)
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Barbera (7/12/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

(6) (other penalties / sanctions)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)

(7) (chemical/ mental illness)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)

(8) (other rehabilitation)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)

Return to Table of Contents

Code of Judicial Conduct Violations

Jud.Cond.R. 1.1 (compliance with the law)

Jud.Cond.R. 1.2 (promoting confidence in the judiciary)
Berry (11/3/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 1.3 (avoiding abuse of the prestige of judicial office)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.1 (giving precedence to the duties of judicial office)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.2 (impartiality and fairness)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.3 (bias, prejudice, and harassment)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.4 (external influences on judicial conduct)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.4(B) (shall not permit family, social, political, financial, or other interests or relationships to influence the judge's judicial conduct or judgment)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.5 (competence, diligence, and cooperation)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.5(A) (perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.6 (ensuring the right to be heard)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.6(A) (shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.6(B) (encourage parties to a proceeding and their lawyers to settle matters in dispute but shall not act in a manner that coerces any party into settlement)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.7 (responsibility to decide)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.8 (decorum, demeanor, and communication with jurors)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.8(B) (patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others)
Repp (11/9/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.8(C) (prohibiting a judge from commending or criticizing jurors for their verdict)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.9(A) (ex parte contacts and communications with others)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.9(B) (notification to parties of receipt of ex parte communication and opportunity to respond)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.10 (judicial statements on pending and impending cases)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.11 (disqualification)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.11(A) (disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.12 (supervisory duties)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.13 (administrative appointments)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.14 (disability and impairment)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.15 (responding to judicial and lawyer misconduct)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.16 (cooperation with disciplinary authorities)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.1 (extrajudicial activities in general)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.1(C) (participate in activities that would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.1(D) (conduct that would appear to a reasonable person to be coercive)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.2 (appearances before governmental bodies and consultation with government officials)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.3 (testifying as a character witness)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.4 (appointments to governmental positions)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.5 (use of nonpublic information)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.6 (affiliation with discriminatory organizations)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.7 (participation in educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic

organizations and activities)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.8 (appointments to fiduciary positions)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.9 (service as an arbitrator or mediator)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.10 (practice law)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.11 (financial, business, or remunerative activities)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.11(C)(3) (judge shall not engage in financial activities that involve the judge in frequent transactions or continuing business relationships with lawyers)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.12 (compensation for extrajudicial activities)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.13 (acceptance and reporting of gifts, loans, bequests, benefits, or other things of value)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.14 (reimbursement of expenses and waivers of fess or charges)

Jud.Cond.R. 3.15 (reporting requirements)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.1 (political and campaign activities of judges and judicial candidates)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.2 (political and campaign activities of judicial candidates)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.2(A)(1) (a judicial candidate shall be responsible for acting at all times in a manner consistent with the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.3 (campaign standards and communications)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.3(A) (post, publish, broadcast, transmit, circulate, or distribute information knowingly to be false or with a reckless disregard concerning the judicial candidate
Jud.Cond.R. 4.4 (campaign solicitations and contributions)

Jud.Cond.R. 4.5 (activities of a judge who becomes a candidate for nonjudicial office)

Return to Table of Contents

Rules of Professional Conduct Violations

Rule 1.0(g) (terminology: knowingly, known, or knows)

Rule 1.0(i) (terminology: reasonable or reasonably)

Rule 1.1 (providing competent representation)
- Bruner (11/17/2021)
- Burgess (6/30/2021)
- Heller (7/1/2021)
- Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
- Talley (11/23/2021)
- Valenti (4/21/2021)

Rule 1.2 (scope of representation and allocation of authority between client and lawyer)

Rule 1.2(a) (abiding by client's decisions concerning representation; consulting with clients as to means by which they are to be pursued)

Rule 1.2(c) (limiting scope of representation)

Rule 1.2(d) (counseling a client to engage, or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is illegal or fraudulent)

Rule 1.2(e) (not present, participate in presenting, or threaten to present criminal charges or professional misconduct allegations solely to obtain an advantage in a civil matter)

Rule 1.3 (acting with reasonable diligence and promptness)
- Alexander (2/16/2021)
- Barbera (7/1/2021)
- Burchinal (3/17/2021)
- Burgess (6/30/2021)
- Chambers (2/16/2021)
- Devanney (4/13/2021)
- Dougherty (4/14/2021)
- Devanney (4/13/2021)
- Elter (2/16/2021)
- Family (11/17/2021)
- Ford (10/20/2021)
- Heller (7/1/2021)
- Kelley (6/16/2021)
- Lewis (3/18/2021)
- Ludwig (11/10/2021)
- Petracci (2/3/2021)
- Talley (11/23/2021)

Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.4 (communication)
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.4(a)(communication)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.4(a)(1) (promptly informing the client of any circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent is required)

Rule 1.4(a)(2) (reasonably consulting with client about means to accomplish objectives)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)

Rule 1.4(a)(3) (keeping client reasonably informed about status of matter)
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.4(a)(4) (complying as soon as practicable with client's reasonable requests for information)
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.4(a)(5) (consulting with client about limitations when client expects unlawful assistance)

Rule 1.4(b) (explaining matters for clients to make informed decisions)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Rule 1.4(c) (informing clients if professional-liability insurance is terminated)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)

Rule 1.4(c)(1) (maintain a copy of the notice signed by the client for five years after termination of the representation.)

Rule 1.5(a) (charging or collecting an illegal or clearly excessive fee)
Family (11/17/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)

Rule 1.5(b) (communicating to the client the nature and scope of representation and the basis or rate of the fee and expenses)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)

Rule 1.5(c) (contingent fee agreement)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Rule 1.5(c)(1) (contingent fee agreement in writing signed by the client)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

Rule 1.5(c)(2) (preparing closing statement in contingent fee matter)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Rule 1.5(d)(3) ("Earned upon Receipt" or "non-refundable" fee)
Family (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)

Rule 1.5(e) (fee division with lawyers not in the same firm)

Rule 1.5(e)(2) (written consent after full disclosure of the identity of each lawyer)

Rule 1.5(f) (dispute between lawyers, fees shall be divided in accordance with the mediation or arbitration provided by a local bar association)

Rule 1.6(a) (revealing information relating to the representation of a client)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)

Rule 1.6(c) reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of or unauthorized access to information related to the

representation of a client.)
Kelley (6/16/2021)

Rule 1.7(a) (conflict of interest- current clients)

Rule 1.7(a)(1) (prohibiting a lawyer from accepting continuing employment if the representation of the client will be directly adverse to another current client)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.7(a)(2) (conflict of interest arising from lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client, a third person, or lawyer's own personal interests)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.7(b) (accepting/ continuing representation if conflict of interest created, unless conditions met)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.7(c)(1) (even if each affected client consents, the lawyer shall not accept or continue the representation)

Rule 1.7(c)(2) (prohibits a lawyer from asserting a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same proceeding)
Rule 1.8 (conflict of interest, current clients)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.8(a) (entering a business transaction with a client)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Rule 1.8(a)(1) (transaction and terms fair and reasonable and fully disclosed to client in writing)

Rule 1.8(a)(2) (advising client in writing of the desirability of seeking and giving reasonable opportunity to seek independent legal counsel)

Rule 1.8(a)(3) (informed consent to the essential terms of a transaction with lawyer)

Rule 1.8(c) (a lawyer shall not prepare an instrument giving the lawyer or a person related to the lawyer a gift)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Rule 1.8(e) (provide financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation)
Kathman (6/30/2021)

Rule 1.8(f) (accepting compensation for representing a client from someone other than the client)

Rule 1.8(h) (making an agreement prospectively limiting the lawyer's liability)

Rule 1.8(h)(1) (making agreement prospectively to limit liability for malpractice or requiring arbitration of a claim)

Rule 1.8(h)(2) (settling a potential claim for professional liability without advising client in writing to seek counsel or obtaining client's informed consent)

Rule 1.8(j) (soliciting or engaging in sexual activity with a client when no previous consensual sexual relationship existed)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)

Rule 1.9 (duties to former clients)

Rule 1.9(a) (obtain informed consent of a client before representing another in the same or a substantially related matter adversely affecting the client)

Rule 1.9(c)(1)(revealing information relating to the representation to the disadvantage of the former client)

Rule 1.9(c)(2) (revealing information relating to the representation of a former client)

Rule 1.13(a) (a lawyer employed or retained by an organization represents the organization acting through its constituents and owes allegiance to the organization and not to its constituents)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.13(e) (a lawyer representing an organization may also represent any of its directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders, or other constituents, subject to the consent to any conflict given by an appropriate official of the organization)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 1.15 (safekeeping funds and property)
Alexander (2/16/2021)

Rule 1.15(a) (property of clients in an interest-bearing client trust account)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)

Kathman (6/30/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)

Rule 1.15(a)(1) (holding property of clients or third persons separate from lawyer's own property; safekeeping funds in separate interest-bearing trust account)

Rule 1.15(a)(2) (maintaining a record for each client)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Rule 1.15(a)(3) (maintaining a record for each bank account)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)

Rule 1.15(a)(4) (maintaining bank statements, deposit slips, and cancelled checks)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)

Rule 1.15(a)(5) (performing and maintaining a monthly reconciliation)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)

Rule 1.15(b) (depositing own funds in client trust account for bank service charges)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)

Rule 1.15(c) (depositing unearned/ advanced fees into a trust account)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)

Rule 1.15(d) (promptly delivering funds or property to client or third party)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)

Rule 1.15(e) (improperly holding funds in dispute)

Rule 1.16 (declining or terminating representation)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.16(a) (a lawyer shall not represent a client or where representation has commenced, shall withdraw from the representation of a client)

Rule 1.16(a)(1) (accepting, or failing to withdraw from, representation that will violate the Rules or other law)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.16(a)(2) (withdrawing from representation when the lawyer's physical and mental condition materially impairs the lawyer's ability to represent the client)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

Rule 1.16(a)(3) (requiring a lawyer not to represent a client after the lawyer has been discharged)

Rule 1.16(b)(1) (permitting a lawyer to withdraw from representation if the withdrawal can be accomplished without material adverse effect on the interests of the client)
Kelley (6/16/2021)

Rule 1.16(c) (withdrawing from representation in a proceeding without leave of court if required)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)

Rule 1.16(d) (taking steps to protect a client's interest as part of termination of representation)
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)

Rule 1.16(d)(3)
Kelley (6/16/2021)

Rule 1.16(e) (promptly refunding fee paid in advance that is not earned)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

Rule 1.18 (using or revealing information learned during discussions with a prospective client)

Rule 1.18(c) (prohibiting a lawyer from representing a client with interests materially adverse to those of a prospective client in the same matter if the lawyer had received information from the prospective client that could be significantly harmful to that person, unless the lawyer obtains informed consent)

Rule 2.1 (in representing a client, a lawyer shall exercise independent professional judgment and render candid advice)

Rule 3.1 (not bringing or defending a proceeding, or asserting or controverting an issue in a proceeding, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous)
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

Rule 3.3(a)(knowingly make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal)

Rule 3.3(a)(1) (knowingly make or fail to correct a false statement of fact to a tribunal)
Bryant (2/16/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)

Rule 3.3(a)(3) (knowingly offering false evidence)

Rule 3.3(d) (ex parte proceeding- requiring lawyer to inform tribunal of all material facts)

Rule 3.4(a) (destroying or concealing a document with evidentiary value)

Rule 3.4(b) (falsify evidence)

Rule 3.4(c) (knowingly disobey the rules of a tribunal)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)

Rule 3.4(d) (intentionally or habitually failing to make reasonably diligent effort to comply with a legally proper discovery request by opposing party)

Rule 3.5(a)(1) (prohibiting a lawyer from seeking to influence a judicial officer, juror, prospective juror, or other official by means prohibited by law)

Rule 3.5(a)(3) (prohibiting a lawyer from communicating ex parte with a judicial officer as to the merits of the case during the proceeding)

Rule 3.5(a)(3)(i) (prohibiting a lawyer from communicating ex parte with a judicial officer or other official as to the merits of the case during the proceeding unless authorized to do so by law or court order)

Rule 3.5(a)(5) (engage in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal)
Baker (6/8/2021)

Rule 3.5(a)(6) (undignified or discourteous conduct that is degrading to a tribunal)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)

Rule 4.1 (truthfulness in statements to others)

Rule 4.1(a) (making false statement to third person during representation)
Robinson (6/29/2021)

Rule 4.2 (prohibiting a lawyer from communicating about the subject of his representation of a client with a person known to be represented by another lawyer in the matter)

Rule 4.3 (prohibiting a lawyer from giving legal advice to an unrepresented person)

Rule 4.4(a) (lawyer shall not embarrass, harass, delay, burden, or violate the legal rights of such a person)

Rule 5.1(c)(managing lawyer is responsible for another's violation if managing lawyer orders or ratifies the conduct)

Rule 5.3 (responsibilities regarding nonlawyer assistants)

Rule 5.3(a) (managing lawyer must have measures in effect to assure non-lawyer's conduct is compatible with professional obligations)
Kathman (6/30/2021)

Rule 5.3(b) (supervisory lawyer must make reasonable efforts to ensure conduct is compatible with professional obligations)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)

Rule 5.3(c) (lawyer with direct supervisory responsibility for professional conduct rule violation of nonlawyer)

Rule 5.3(c)(2) (lawyer has managerial authority and knows of the conduct at the time and fails to take reasonable remedial action)
Heller (7/1/2021)

Rule 5.4(a) (prohibiting lawyer from sharing legal fees with a nonlawyer)
Heller (7/1/2021)

Rule 5.4(c) (prohibiting a lawyer from permitting a person pays the lawyer to direct or regulate the

lawyers' professional judgment)

Rule 5.5 (unauthorized practice of law; multijurisdictional practice of law)

Rule 5.5(a) (prohibiting a lawyer from practicing law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 5.5(b)(2) (prohibiting a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction from holding himself out as admitted to practice)

Rule 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services)
Okuley (9/21/2021)

Rule 7.2(b) (giving anything of value to a person for recommendation of the lawyer's services)

Rule 7.2(b)(3) (the usual charges for a nonprofit or lawyer referral service that complies with Gov. Bar R. XVI)

Rule 7.3(a) (in-person solicitation of professional employment for pecuniary gain)

Rule 7.3(c)(1) (disclose the manner in which the lawyer became aware of the identity and legal need of addressee)

Rule 7.3(c)(3) ("ADVERTISING MATERIAL" OR "ADVERTISEMENT ONLY")

Rule 7.3(d) (verification that party has been served with notice of the action filed against the party)

Rule 7.5(a) (practicing under a trade name or a misleading name)

Rule 7.5(c) (name of lawyer in public office in name of a law firm)

Rule 7.5(d) (stating or implying practice in partnership or other organization)

Rule 8.1 (bar admission and disciplinary matters)

Rule 8.1(a) (knowingly making a false statement of material fact in connection with a disciplinary matter)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)

Rule 8.1(b) (failing to disclose fact or failing to respond to demand for information from a disciplinary authority)
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Rule 8.2 (judicial officials)

Rule 8.2(a) (false or reckless statements concerning the integrity of a judicial officer)
Morton (11/23/2021)

Rule 8.3(a) (requiring an attorney to report to disciplinary authority violations of the Rules)

Rule 8.4(a) (violating, attempting to violate, knowingly assisting or inducing another to violate the Rules)

Rule 8.4(b) (committing illegal act that reflects adversely on honesty or trustworthiness)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)

Rule 8.4(c) (conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)

Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Rule 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Rule 8.4(h) (conduct adversely reflecting on lawyer's fitness to practice)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)

Rule 8.5(a) (a lawyer admitted to practice in Ohio is subject to the disciplinary authority of Ohio, regardless of where the conduct occurs)

Rule 8.5(b)(2) (the rules of the jurisdiction in which the lawyer's conduct occurred, or, if the predominant effect of the conduct is in a different jurisdiction, the rules of that jurisdiction shall be applied)

Return to Table of Contents

Violations of the Rules of the Government of the Bar

Gov. Bar R. I(8)(A) (oath of office)

Gov. Bar R. V(8)(A)(1) (confidentiality of proceedings before probable cause)

Gov. Bar R. V(8)(G)(2) (failure to register a suspended attorney with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel)

Gov. Bar R. V(8)(E) (requiring a suspended lawyer to notify all clients being represented in pending matters of his suspension and consequent disqualification to act as an attorney)

Gov. Bar R. V(9)(G) (failure to cooperate with disciplinary investigation)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)

Gov. Bar R. V(10)(C)(1)(prohibiting a lawyer from practicing law while under an attorney-registration suspension).

Gov. Bar R. V(11)(E) (proceedings and documents relating to review and investigation of grievances be private)

Gov. Bar R. V(20)(A) (requiring an attorney admitted to the practice of law in Ohio to provide written notification of a disciplinary order issued in another jurisdiction to disciplinary counsel and the clerk of this court within 30 days of its issuance)
Lindon (3/18/2021)

Gov. Bar R. V(23)(A)

Gov. Bar R. V(23)(C)
Brand (6/29/2021)

Gov. Bar R. V(23)(D)
Brand (6/29/2021)

Gov. Bar R. V(23)(F) (notification to client that a suspended attorney is performing work or providing services in connection with client's matter)
Brand (6/29/2021)

Gov. Bar R. VI (requiring an attorney to register with the Supreme Court on or before the first day of September in each odd-numbered year)

Gov. Bar R. VI(1)(D) (an attorney shall keep the Office of Attorney Services apprised of the attorney's current address and phone number)

Gov. Bar R. VI(4)(B) (an attorney shall keep the Office of Attorney Services apprised of the attorney's current address and phone number)

Gov. Bar R. VI(4)(D) (failing to provide IOLTA information on certificate of registration when maintaining an IOLTA)

Gov. Bar R. VI (5)(C)(prohibiting an attorney who has been suspended for a registration violation from practicing law or holding out as authorized to practice law)

Gov. Bar R. VII(2)(A)(3(d) (unauthorized practice of law if providing legal services while suspended for failure to satisfy CLE requirements)

Gov. Bar R. VII(2)(A)(4) (holding out to the public as authorized to practice law in Ohio)

Return to Table of Contents

Prior Disciplinary Record

Attorney Registration
Ludwig (11/10/2021)

CLE Suspension
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)

Board Discipline
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)

Other

Return to Table of Contents

Public Employee Discipline

Judges/ Former Judges/ Magistrates
Berry (11/3/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Return to Table of Contents

Public Officials/ Former Public Officials

Criminal Conduct

Felony Conduct
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)

Misdemeanor Conduct
Strauss (4/15/2021)

Treatment in Lieu of Conviction

Return to Table of Contents

Disciplinary Procedural Issues

Aggravation/ Mitigation

Consent-to-Discipline
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Bryant (2/16/2021)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)

Default Proceeding

Mental Health Suspension

Sanction Increase/ Decrease
Morton (11/23/2021) +

Other

Remanded by Court
Lindon (3/18/2021)

Return to Table of Contents

Sanction

Court Dismissal on Merits

Disbarment
Burchinal (3/17/2021)
Okuley (9/21/2021)
Polizzi (4/7/2021)

Indefinite Suspension
Cosgrove (6/30/2021)
Ford (10/20/2021)
Lindon (3/18/2021)
Long (11/10/2021)
Petracci (2/3/2021)

Public Reprimand
Alexander (2/16/2021)
Baker (6/8/2021)
Berta (4/15/2021)
Brand (6/29/2021)
Bryant (2/16/2021)
Burgess (2/16/2021)
Elter (2/16/2021)
Grendel (6/8/2021)
Vagotis (3/18/2021)
Weatherly (11/23/2021)

Term Suspension
Barbera (7/1/2021)
Berry (11/3/2021)
Bruner (11/17/2021)
Burgess (6/30/2021)
Chambers (2/16/2021)
Devanney (4/13/2021)
Dougherty (4/14/2021)
Family (11/17/2021)
Heller (7/1/2021)
Jones (11/18/2021)
Kathman (6/30/2021)
Kelley (6/16/2021)
Lewis (3/18/2021)
Ludwig (11/10/2021)
Morton (11/23/2021)
Pertee (8/3/2021)
Polly-Murphy (9/22/2021)
Porter (12/15/2021)
Repp (11/9/2021)
Robinson (6/29/2021)
Sabol (6/22/2021)
Simpson (4/9/2021)
Spoljaric (2/16/2021)
Strauss (4/15/2021)
Talley (11/23/2021)
Valenti (4/21/2021)
Weber (11/4/2021)
Wilcoxson (11/10/2021)
Winters (8/17/2021)

Return to Table of Contents