Ohio Board of Professional Conduct

Disciplinary Handbook

VOLUME XIV

2020

DISCIPLINARY HANDBOOK: VOLUME XIV

[CASES FROM 2020; CURRENT THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2020]

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

© 2021 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

Adelstein, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3000. Decided 5/21/2020.

Amaddio & Wargo, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-141. Decided 1/22/2020.

Armengau, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1421. Decided 4/14/2020.

Atway, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-2794. Decided 5/7/2020.

Bachman, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-6732. Decided 12/18/20.

Bahan, Columbus Bar Assn. v
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-434. Decided 2/12/2020.

Bailey & Bailey, Erie-Hudson Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3701. Decided 7/16/2020.

Berling, Toledo Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-2838. Decided 5/12/2020.

Blauvelt, Butler Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3325. Decided 6/17/2020.

Brenner, Warren County Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-142. Decided 1/22/2020.

Bruce, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-85. Decided 1/16/2020.

Brueggeman, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1578. Decided 4/23/2020.

Bulson, Columbus Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3001. Decided 5/21/2020.

Buttars, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion no. 2020-Ohio-1511. Decided 4/21/2020.

Christensen, Columbus Bar v.
Case No. 2020-0736. Decided 8/4/2020.

Christensen & Kluesener, Columbus Bar Assn. v. Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-167. Decided 1/23/2020.

Connors, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3339. Decided 6/18/2020.

Corley, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3303. Decided 6/16/2020.

Corner, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-961. Decided 3/18/2020.

Cramer, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4195. Decided 8/27/2020.

Doherty, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1422. Decided 4/14/2020.

Doute, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2020-1195. Decided 11/24/2020.

Falconer, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2020-0227. Decided 3/31/2020

Ford, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-998. Decided 3/19/2020.

Fortado, Akron Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-517. Decided

2/18/2020.

George, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-2902. Decided 5/13/2020.

Gibbons & Jenkins, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Case No. 2020-0471. Decided 5/26/2020.

Gonzalez, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3259. Decided 6/11/2020.

Goulding, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4588. Decided 9/29/2020

Hawkins, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4023. Decided 8/12/2020.

Haynes, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1570. Decided 4/23/2020.

Hoague, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-847. Decided 3/11/2020.

Mahin, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4098. Decided 8/19/2020.

Marsh, Stark Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-0737. Decided 8/4/2020.

Mostov, Mahoning Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Case No. 2020-0741. Decided 8/4/2020.

Piazza, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-603. Decided 2/25/2020.

Porzio, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1569. Decided 4/23/2020.

Rauzan & Wagner, Mahoning Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-355. Decided 2/6/2020.

Table of Cases Index

Reinheimer, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3941. Decided 8/6/2020.

Riddle, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4961. Decided 10/22/2020.

Sarver, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-5478. Decided 12/2/2020.

Schwarz, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-1542. Decided 4/22/2020.

Spinazze, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-957. Decided 3/17/2020.

Sullivan, Dayton Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-124. Decided 1/21/2020.

Thomas, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-5582. Decided 12/9/2020.

Tinch, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-2291. Decided 5/20/2020.

Turner, Cincinnati Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4030. Decided 8/13/2020.

Weir, Lorain Cty. Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No.2020-Ohio-3325. Decided 6/17/2020.

Wilson, Disciplinary Counsel v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3050. Decided 5/27/2020.

Yavorcik, Mahoning Cty. Bar Assn v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-123. Decided 1/21/2020.

Yoder, Toledo Bar Assn. v.
Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-4775. Decided 10/6/2020.

***Adelstein**, Disciplinary Counsel v.* 2020-Ohio-3000. Decided 5/21/2020

Case Summary

Sanction	One-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	1.15(a), 1.15(a)(3), 1.15(a)(5), 1.15(b), 1.15(c), 1.15(e), 8.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (4)(multiple offenses); **M-** (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Dockry (2012)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year stayed suspension for multiple violations arising from her mismanagement of two client trust accounts.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's report and recommendation of a one-year suspension, with six months stayed. Respondent objected to the recommended sanction in favor of a fully stayed suspension.

FINDINGS: In one count Respondent did not have enough funds in her IOLTA to pay for two checks that she had written. The Relator found that she had not converted client funds nor had she harmed her clients. In September, 2016, Relator was noticed by Respondent's bank of several subsequent overdraft notices including attempts to pay VW credit, Cash Central Loan, and Petsmart from her IOLTA. The bank later closed her personal and operating accounts due to excessive overdraft activity. Respondent admitted to depositing personal loans into her IOLTA, commingling personal and client funds, failing to maintain a general ledger and reconcile accounts, and failing to deposit unearned fees from two clients. In a second count, Relator was notified by Respondent's bank that it had declined three separate $3,500 electronic payment requests from Square due to insufficient funds. Respondent later opened a second client trust account at PNC Bank and the bank informed Relator that it had declined a $1,570.15 electronic payment request from Square. Based on her responses to letters of inquiry, Respondent stipulated that she failed to redeposit a client's retainer in her KeyBank IOLTA pending resolution of a fee dispute, engaged in dishonest conduct by providing Square with information that allowed Square to withdraw funds from her PNC IOLTA, even though she knew that the client's retainer had not been deposited in the account, and failed to reconcile her IOLTAs over a one-year period.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for one year, fully stayed, on the conditions that she complete an additional six hours of CLE on client-trust account management and recordkeeping, submit to an OLAP evaluation within 30 days, enter into an OLAP contract for the duration and comply with all treatment recommendations, commit no further misconduct, and serve a two-year period of monitored probation focused on law-office and client-trust account management and recordkeeping. Chief Justice O'Connor would only stay six months of the suspension.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Kennedy

Sanction	One-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	1.5(a), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (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	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondents received a one-year suspension for attempting to collect an excessive fee in a wrongful-death case in the absence of a signed contingent-fee agreement and circulating a frivolous draft petition to remove the decedent's father as administrator of the estate.

PROCEDURE: The parties entered into stipulations of fact, misconduct, and mitigating factors. The Board recommended both Respondents be suspended for six months, fully stayed.

FINDINGS: After the suicide of their daughter and an admission of responsibility by a hospital, decedent's parents decided to personally handle negotiations without lawyers and engage in "compassionate collaboration" to reach a settlement. However, the parents sought out Respondent Amaddio in the event negotiations broke down. A fee agreement was never signed, and the parents kept Respondent Amaddio apprised of the progress of the negotiations. Prior to the parents reaching a favorable settlement, Amaddio explained that it would be necessary to open an estate and obtain court approval for the settlement. Respondent Wargo prepared and filed the documents necessary to open the estate. The father agreed to meet with Amaddio to sign a contract. Amaddio presented the father with a 20 percent contingent-fee agreement, which the father refused to sign and referred him to Wargo to complete the estate process. Wargo suggested to the father that Amaddio would agree to a reduced fee. After obtaining new counsel, Respondents retained Wargo's law partner to pursue a claim for attorney fees and hand-delivered a draft petition to remove the father as the estate administrator and identify themselves as creditors. The petition accused the father of fraudulently representing that he would pay a 20 percent contingency fee to induce Amaddio to help in the negotiations. Respondents later abandoned their fee claim, agreed to donate $30,000 to a mental-health organization, and issue separate letters of apology to the decedent's parents.

SANCTION: The Court rejected the Board's recommended sanction and suspended Respondents for one year.

DISSENTING: Justices Kennedy and DeWine dissented and would have sanctioned Respondents for one year, fully stayed.

Sanction	-
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	-
Aggravation/ Mitigation	-
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was charged with multiple ethics violations based on several criminal offenses, representation of multiple offenses, and management of his law practice.

PROCEDURE: The Respondent was placed under two interim suspensions by the Supreme Court. The board initially stayed the underlying proceedings during the pendency of direct appellate proceedings regarding Respondent's criminal convictions. The criminal case was affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded to the trial court for resentencing. The Supreme Court declined to accept a discretionary appeal, Respondent was resentenced, and appealed the judgment to the 10th District Court of Appeals. The Board reinstituted proceedings based on a panel's report recommending that Respondent be disbarred. Respondent objected to the report and recommendation and argued that his disciplinary hearing should have been stayed until all direct appeals were exhausted, that the board prevented him from presenting evidence regarding his misconduct, and disbarment was not the appropriate sanction.

FINDINGS: Gov.Bar R. V(18)(C) requires that a disciplinary proceeding against a Respondent should not be instituted until all direct appeals from the conviction are concluded. The rule does not define the phrase "direct appeals." The Court concluded that because four counts were remanded for resentencing the judgment of convictions on the counts was no longer final. Consequently, the trial court's amended judgment entry on March 28, 2018 created a final appeal judgment of conviction Respondent had a right to appeal.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Board with instructions to stay the proceedings until all direct appeals of Respondent's convictions have concluded. The Court concluded that Respondent's remaining objections were not ripe for review.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive); **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	Lawrence (2016); Jacobs (2014)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was charged with misconduct arising from his felony conviction for federal tax evasion.

PROCEDURE: The Respondent was placed under an interim felony suspension. The parties jointly recommended Respondent be suspended for two years, with credit for time served.

FINDINGS: Respondent stipulated that he did not accurately report his income from his ownership of several Verizon Wireless stores between 2010-2012 and failed to file a return for 2013 for income related to the stores, his law practice, and a real-estate holding company. He pleaded guilty to a bill of information charging him with one count of willfully filing a false tax return in violation of 26 U.S.C. 7206(1) for tax year 2010. His conduct resulted in a loss of $250,000 to $1,500,000 in federal income-tax revenue. Respondent was sentenced to serve 12 months and one day in prison and one year of supervised release. He was ordered to pay a special assessment of $100, a fine of $5,000, and $600,000 in restitution. Respondent paid the penalties and restitution by November 2018.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board and suspended Respondent for two years, with credit for time served under his interim felony suspension. Chief Justice O'Connor and Justices Kennedy and Fischer would not have granted credit for time served.

Sanction	Six-month suspension
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	JCR 1.2, 2.2, 2.8(B)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Parker (2007); Cox (2007)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent engaged in judicial misconduct by holding a woman in direct contempt of court after she had disrupted a trial in his courtroom.

PROCEDURE: The hearing panel found that Respondent had engaged in the alleged misconduct and recommended a six-month stayed suspension that the Board adopted.

FINDINGS: Respondent, a magistrate in Hamilton County, left his bench and exited the courtroom to investigate a scream by a woman in the hallway that was heard inside the courtroom. He testified that he stopped his trial because he could not hear a question asked of a witness. Respondent, upon seeing the woman, ordered her to stop and return to the courtroom. He ran toward her and caught up with her near a stairwell. He again ordered her to return to the courtroom. He then placed his hand between her neck and shoulder and directed her to a side entrance. Once in the courtroom he directed her into the jury box and ordered her to sit and not to move. He then asked for a sheriff duty to come to the courtroom. After the deputies arrived, Respondent stated that the woman was in their custody for contempt of court for causing a ruckus that interrupted the hearing and indicated she was to receive three days in jail. After the woman resisted the deputies and screamed, Respondent increased the number of days in jail to ten. Two days after the incident, the administrative and presiding judge watched the video footage of the incident, issued an order mitigating the penalty, and ordered the woman's release from custody. Respondent resigned after he was informed that the general sentiment among the court's judges was that he should be terminated.

SANCTION: The Supreme Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, but suspended Respondent for six months.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy

NOT PARTICIPATING: Justice Fischer

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	7.3(a)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing; **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Willette (2008); Williamson (2017); Mason (2010); Reid (1999)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for engaging in in-person solicitation for professional employment.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation of a fully stayed six-month suspension. The panel and Board recommended the dismissal of the Prof.Cond.R. 8.4(d) and (h) charges, which the Court accepted.

FINDINGS: Respondent visited a murder suspect in jail after learning of her arrest and seeing her picture on the Internet. Respondent thought that the suspect had been a victim of domestic violence and that the incident had arisen because the suspect was trying to protect herself. During the visit she advised the suspect that she should not give any statements to the police and that she needed counsel. The suspect indicated that she was considering hiring an experienced local lawyer and requested Respondent contact him. On a second visit, Respondent brought a proposed fee agreement that only named her as counsel and discussed legal strategy with the suspect. After the suspect, now defendant, was indicted, Respondent met with the defendant's daughters, discussed legal fees, and requested a down payment. She asked the daughters whether they had access to the defendant's bank accounts and credit cards. She also discussed the possibility of selling defendant's assets. The local lawyer indicated he could not represent the defendant, but Respondent filed a notice of appearance in the case as well as a request for a bill of particulars, a motion to preserve evidence, and a demand for discovery. After other counsel was retained by defendant, Respondent texted defendant's daughters and stated she hoped she would be paid for work she had previously performed. Respondent sent the defendant a bill in the amount of $1,400 that included charges for the first two visits to the jail.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law, and agreed to dismiss the allegations of 8.4(d) and 8.4(h). The Court imposed a public reprimand, and ordered Respondent to pay the costs of the proceedings and not in engage in further misconduct.

CONCURRING: Justice French and Donnelly.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice DeWine.

DISSENTING: Chief Justice O'Connor and Justices Kennedy and Fischer would have imposed a fully stayed six-month suspension.

Sanction	One-year, six-month stayed suspension; public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	3.5(a)(5), 3.5(a)(6), 8.2(a),8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4)(multiple offenses), (7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing; **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (2)(no dishonest or selfish motive), (5) (good character), (6) (other penalties/sanctions); **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	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Grimes (1993)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent Kenneth Ronald Bailey ("Bailey") received a one-year suspension with six months stayed for refusing to participate in a client's criminal trial. Respondent Kenneth Richard Bailey ("Kenneth") received a public reprimand for posts on Facebook that falsely impugned the integrity of the trial court judge.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommendation to suspend Bailey for two years with one year stayed and to publicly reprimand Kenneth.

FINDINGS: Respondent Ronald Bailey was retained to represent a client charged with two counts of sexual imposition and two counts of rape of a child under the age of 13. Four days before trial Bailey filed a motion for continuance because an expert was unavailable to testify. The motion was granted to October 4, 2020. Three days later, Bailey moved for another continuance, explaining that he was traveling the weekend before the trial. The motion was denied. After a series of motions for reconsideration and a continuance, Bailey decided that he would refuse to participate in the trial on the grounds that the court's refusal to appoint an expert and continue the case prevented his client from receiving a fair trial. At trial he announced at sidebar that, "[I] cannot and will not be able nor willing to proceed today." Later at a bench conference, he reiterated his reasons for a continuance, was told the court had already ruled on the motion, and was told to "step back" from the bench but refused. The judge cautioned Bailey that he would be sanctioned for direct contempt if his behavior continued. He later refused to participate, his client was sentenced to 60 months of imprisonment, and the court found Bailey in contempt and imposed $250 file and 30 days in jail. Respondent Kenneth Bailey made false statements on Facebook concerning the integrity of the judge and posted several comments under his original post. The local newspaper published most of the Facebook post in an article. Kenneth Bailey later removed the post and emailed the judge in an effort to apologize.

SANCTION: The Court imposed a one-year, six-month stayed suspension on Bailey and public reprimand on Kenneth.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Chief Justice O'Connor and Justice Fischer.

Table of Cases Index

***Berling**, Toledo Bar Assn. v.* Case Summary
2020-Ohio-2838. Decided 5/12/2020

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.5(c)(1), 1.8(j), 1.15, 1.15(c), 5.3(b), 5.5(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
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), (9)(no restitution); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (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 two-year suspension for misconduct arising from the representation of eight clients.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct and recommended sanction. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: In the first count, Respondent was retained to represent a client on a contingent-fee basis, but failed to provide a written fee agreement, or deposit her retainer in his IOLTA. A second client retained Respondent to represent her in a divorce case. After several attempts at communication, the client learned that nothing had been filed in her case for months and retained new counsel. Another client paid Respondent $5,000 to vacate a child-support order. Respondent moved for a continuance of the hearing which was denied. A Civ.R. 60(B) motion was later denied because Respondent produced no evidence at hearing. Respondent was retained to represent another client in a divorce action in Michigan which necessitated the employment of a lawyer admitted in Michigan and obtaining pro hac vice admission. An agreement as to the lawyer's fees was never reached with the client and the client sought new counsel. Respondent also solicited sexual activity from the client and sent multiple text messages of a sexual nature. Respondent was terminated in a custody action after he failed to request a continuance in the case and failed to appear. The client appeared at the hearing on his own to obtain the continuance. In another domestic relations matter Respondent requested continuances, cancelled a settlement conference, but was later removed as counsel by the presiding magistrate. In a criminal representation Respondent accepted client funds without depositing them in his IOLTA. He later failed to appear at two scheduled court hearings, returned some of the client's money, but never fully refunded the fees. Respondent was paid $3,200 to represent a client in a divorce action but did not deposit the funds in his IOLTA. The parties agreed to a settlement and a draft entry was prepared that contained discrepancies. Respondent never objected to the draft and the court adopted the entry. A motion to address the issue several months later was denied as untimely.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, ordered restitution to clients, required as a condition of reinstatement that he provide an evaluation from OLAP, comply with any counseling or treatment recommendations, and obtain an opinion from a qualified healthcare professional that he is able to return to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

Sanction	Two-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3)(pattern of misconduct), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation) **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions), (7) (mental illness)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Linnen (2006)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year stayed suspension for misconduct arising from his guilty plea to charges of public indecency and reckless operation of a vehicle.

PROCEDURE: The parties entered into stipulations of fact, misconduct, and aggravating and mitigating factors and jointly recommended that Respondent serve a conditionally stayed two-year suspension. Neither party filed objections.

FINDINGS: In March 2018, police stopped Respondent's vehicle for a headlight violation and observed Respondent was naked. No charges were filed. In October 2018, the State Highway Patrol received a report that a motorist was masturbating while driving. The office suspected Respondent was intoxicated and arrested him. Respondent was charged with public indecency and operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs. He received a 30-day jail term for the public indecency charge, was ordered to pay a fine, and serve a one-year term of nonreporting probation. On the OVI charge he pleaded guilty to an amended charge of reckless operation of a vehicle, was sentenced to a suspended three-day jail term, ordered to pay a fine, and complete a driver-intervention program. Respondent admitted at hearing that there had been other occasions on which he drove his vehicle while naked but was not detected by authorities.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, with the suspension stayed on conditions that he comply with his OLAP contract; maintain full compliance with his treatment plan as prescribed by his mental-health practitioners; undergo a chemical-dependency evaluation; and follow any treatment or counseling plan; abstain from the use of alcohol; serve and successfully complete a five-year term of monitored probation to ensure his compliance with his treatment and recovery; and refrain from further misconduct.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (5)(lack of cooperation); **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	Wilcoxson (2018)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month stayed suspension for misconduct related to his representation of a client in a small-claims case.

PROCEDURE: The Board recommended adoption of the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement. The case was remanded to the Board after Respondent's motion for leave to answer was granted by the Court.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client to represent his company in a small-claims case that it had filed against one of its former customers. Respondent participated in the litigation and discussed defendant's discovery request with the client, but did not complete the discovery responses or produce them to the defendant. Respondent also failed to inform the client that the defendant had filed motions to compel discovery and to deem its requests for admissions admitted. The court granted the motions and ordered responses on a date certain. A motion for contempt was filed by defendant because Respondent did not comply with the court's order. Respondent did not attend the contempt hearing and the court found his client in contempt of the order, dismissed the complaint with prejudice and entered a judgment of $10,092.50 plus $1,455 in attorney fees on a counterclaim defendant had filed. The client received notice of the judgment from other sources, paid it in full, then filed a grievance and malpractice action against Respondent.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and suspended Respondent for six months, fully stayed, on conditions that he comply with his existing OLAP contract, follow treatment and counseling recommendations, make restitution in the amount of $14,114.76 plus pre-judgment interest, serve a one-year term of monitored probation, and engage in no further misconduct. The court also terminated its interim default suspension imposed on August 7, 2018. Reinstatement was also conditioned on compliance with the original interim-default-suspension order.

CONCURRING: Justice Fischer concurred in an opinion joined by Justice Donnelly.

DISSENTING: Justices Kennedy and DeWine.

Sanction	One-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.2(e), 4.2, 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (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 stayed suspension for conduct related to his attempts to collect money owed to him pursuant to a residential lease agreement.

PROCEDURE: The panel found that Respondent committed the stipulated violations and recommended a one-year fully stayed suspension. The Board adopted the panel's report. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent entered into an agreement with a couple to lease residential property with an option to purchase. The couple purchased the property in May 2016. Respondent did not receive rent payments for two months, and five checks that were issued were returned for insufficient funds. Respondent later informed the wife that he would file a civil action unless he received payment and warned her that it was a felony to pass bad checks and he would be forced to file a police report. After Respondent sent a text informing the wife that he would file the civil action and police report unless funds were deposited into his account, Respondent received a call from the wife's employer and lawyer. The lawyer informed Respondent that it was "grossly inappropriate" to file a police report. Respondent responded that he had not threatened the couple with criminal action but that he had laid out exactly what he intended to do. A civil action was later filed against the couple and on other occasions Respondent repeated the threat concerning criminal charges. An offer to settle the matter was made by Respondent but rejected. In February 2017, Respondent filed a criminal complaint against the husband and emailed a copy to the wife and her lawyer. The day before the husband's arraignment, another offer was made to settle the matter. Respondent agreed to settle so long as the couple released all claim. He sent a copy of his response to the wife without her lawyer's permission. As her lawyers began to negotiate an additional matter to settle the civil action, Respondent informed them that the wife had already agreed to resolve the dispute. Respondent later stated that he planned to enforce the agreement that he had negotiated directly with the wife. The husband's criminal charges were later dismissed and Respondent entered into a confidential settlement agreement and release with the couple that prompted the wife to email the Relator and ask that the couple's grievance be withdrawn.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for one year, fully stayed on the condition that he not engage in further misconduct.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, 18 months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(4), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (4) (multiple offenses); **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 a two-year suspension with 18 months stayed for providing incompetent representation to clients, neglect, dishonest conduct, and failure to comply with reasonable requests for information.

PROCEDURE: The Board found that Respondent committed all but one of the alleged rule violations. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client to handle the estate of her deceased brother. During the first meeting the client informed Respondent that she had a buyer for the decedent's truck and needed assistance transferring the vehicle. Respondent instructed the client to sign the decedent's name and backdate the signature so it would not have to pass through the probate estate. Respondent, on behalf of the estate, attempted to transfer the decedent's home to another sibling because the beneficiary of the home, their mother, was in a nursing home and on Medicaid. Based on the client's power of attorney, Respondent sought through the probate court a method to conduct the transfer, but was informed by the magistrate that it would be inappropriate because the mother was receiving Medicaid. Respondent informed his client that he could not achieve her objective, but did not adequately terminate his representation, stopped working on the case, and did not engage in further communication with his client. In another estate matter, Respondent filed the application to probate a decedent's will, but did not timely mail waivers of notice of the hearing on the inventory to the estate of each of the decedent's 14 children. The client and another beneficiary later appeared at the hearing without Respondent, but after Respondent had received a second deficiency notice. Respondent inquired of the magistrate how to proceed when the estate's liabilities exceeded the assets and unsecured creditors would not respond to his communications. He also asked the magistrate to file a certificate of transfer for the decedent's home though he had not resolved all the creditor's claims. The magistrate informed him the home could not be transferred until the creditors were satisfied. Respondent agreed to negotiate with the creditors, never told his client that he was terminating representation, and failed to respond to 40 attempted communications from his clients and family.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's finding of misconduct, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a two-year suspension with 18 months conditionally stayed and that he engage in no further misconduct.

Sanction	Eighteen-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.15(a), 1.15(a)(2), 1.15(a)(3), 1.15(a)(5), 1.16(d), 1.16(e), 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses), (5)(lack of cooperation), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim), **M-** (2)(no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character, (7)(mental illness)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an eighteen-month stayed suspension for neglect of three client matters, improper client-trust-account management and failure to cooperate in an ensuing disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board found that Respondent had committed all but two of the alleged rule violations.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to pursue a personal-injury claim for a client and entered into a one-third, contingent-fee agreement. The matter was settled for $7,500 and the proceeds were deposited in Respondent's IOLTA. The client authorized Respondent to pay all medical bills and to pay a court-reporter fee, but Respondent did not take any action. He later cashed checks issued to himself from his IOLTA, did not create or retain required trust-account records, and did not respond to his client's attempts to communicate with her. In another matter, Respondent was hired to represent a client in a juvenile-custody matter and was paid an initial retainer and filing fee that were not deposited into his IOLTA. Respondent prepared documents, but never filed them, performed no additional work on the case, did not respond to her repeated efforts to communicate, and did not honor her request of refund until December 2018. Respondent was also hired to represent clients in a personal-injury case, but the clients' telephone calls and text messages frequently went unanswered. In response to a grievance filed by the clients, Respondent disclosed that he had filed a lawsuit on their behalf, but had not perfected service, which he did not accomplish until one year after he filed the lawsuit. Relator asked Respondent to return his clients' file but he produced only publicly available court documents and admitted he could not locate their medical records or the only copy of a handwritten diary. Respondent also did not timely respond to Relator's letters of inquiry and requested and received two continuances for depositions.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's finding of misconduct, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of an eighteen-month stayed suspension on conditions that he continue mental-health treatment with his doctor and complete all treatment recommendations, waive the doctor-patient privilege with all healthcare professionals, remain in compliance with his OLAP contracts, serve a one-year period of monitored probation, meet with his monitor at least once a month, and engage in no further misconduct. Justice Kennedy concurs in judgment only.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.5(a), 1.8(a)(2), 3.3(a)(1), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple), (8)(harm to vulnerable victim), **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (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	Bandman (2010); Zapor (2010); Thomas (2016)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for conduct related to a felony conviction stemming from his administration of an estate.

PROCEDURE: After a hearing before a panel, the Board issued a report finding Respondent had engaged in the stipulated misconduct and recommended indefinitely suspending Respondent with no credit for time served under an interim felony suspension. Neither party filed objections.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented a client who suffered from mental illness, alcoholism, and depression. He assisted her in a landlord-tenant matter on a pro bono basis, provided that she pay him $20.00 per month. However, he later entered into a separate written fee agreement to represent her in any capacity for $250.00 an hour. Respondent later administered the client's mother's estate, until its termination in August 2016. During the representation he performed various nonlegal, personal services at both his regular hourly rate and occasionally at a paralegal rate. Overall, Respondent and his firm charged the client $90,626.44 for handling the eviction matter, administering the estate, and handling her personal matters. After adult protective services received a referral regarding the client, it filed a grievance. During his disciplinary proceeding, Respondent admitted that in addition to transferring $90,626.44 out of the client's account, he removed $57,084.41 to pay for his personal and business accounts, although none of the latter funds were earned. Respondent was indicted for theft from a person in a protected class. He pleaded guilty to a fourth-degree felony theft charge, was sentenced to two years of community control, ordered to complete 100 hours of community service, and make restitution of $29,450 within two years. In two additional counts Respondent was found to have lied to a court when indicating on probate forms that all attorney fees had been waived in the estate administration when he or his firm had already received substantial fees and for entering into a loan with the client without advising her of the desirability of seeking independent counsel.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served under the interim felony suspension. The Court conditioned his reinstatement on proof of restitution in the amount of $66,174.30.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	5.3(a), 5.3(b), 8.4(d), GBR V(23)(C), GBR V(23)(F)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4) (cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Gaba (2002); Willis (2002)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month stayed suspension for misconduct related to his employment of a suspended lawyer.

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

FINDINGS: Respondent employed a suspended lawyer in his law firm without registering the employment with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. Respondent also did not notify clients on whose matters the lawyer worked of the lawyer's suspension as required by Gov.Bar R. V., Sec. 23(F). The suspended lawyer was terminated by Respondent after being employed for over one year.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and issued a six-month, stayed suspension against Respondent.

DISSENTING: Justice Fischer

Sanction	Public reprimand; one-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 5.1(c) ,5.3(b), 5.3(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character); **A-** (1) (prior discipline); **M-** (4)(cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	In re Boyce, 371 S.C. 259 (2006); Davis (2019); Miller (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent Christensen received a public reprimand and Respondent Kluesener received a one-year stayed suspension for conduct related to the issuance of invalid subpoenas to opposing parties.

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

FINDINGS: Respondents stipulated that on several occasions they sent invalid subpoenas to opposing parties seeking information about potential personal-injury actions even though neither had filed a lawsuit or a R.C. 2317.48 action for discovery. The subpoenas used the term "pending" in the space provided for a case number or left the space blank. The forms included language threatening recipients with contempt or other sanctions for failure to comply. Respondents admitted that they used the invalid subpoenas as a way to obtain discovery when a letter requesting the same may not have been successful. Respondent Christensen mistakenly believed that the practice was acceptable based on a conversation with a clerk of court, but admitted he knew they were unenforceable. Respondent Kluesener also knew that the subpoenas were improper. Respondent Christensen admitted that he had responsibly as a lawyer supervisor for Kluesener's work. Respondent Kluesener admitted that he directed a nonlawyer assistant's issuance of an invalid subpoena.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreements and issued a public reprimand against Respondent Christensen and a one-year fully stayed suspension against Respondent Kluesener.

CONCURRING: Justice Fischer joined by Justice Donnelly.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Kennedy and DeWine.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h)
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	Ridenbaugh (2009); Ballato (2014); Grossman (2015); Martyniuk (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for misconduct arising out of his felony conviction for illegal use of a minor in nudity-oriented material or performance.

PROCEDURE: The parties entered into stipulations of fact, misconduct, and aggravating and mitigating factors and agreed to an indefinite suspension.

FINDINGS: In March 2017, law-enforcement recovered more than 1000 images of child pornography and erotica involving prepubescent females from electronic devices belonging to Respondent. He was later indicted with five fifth-degree felony counts of use of a minor in nudity-oriented material or performance in violation of R.C. 2907.323. The Franklin County Court of Common Pleas accepted Respondent's guilty plea to one count. He was sentenced to two years of community control and ordered to register as a Tier I sex offender for 15 years. Respondent denied at hearing that the images portrayed children in sexual acts. He also claimed that he did not knowingly download something he thought was illegal. The Board found that he had continued to download the images even though he knew that doing so was illegal.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent with no credit for time served. In addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. V(25), the Court conditioned his reinstatement on the submission of proof that he has complied with the terms of his court-ordered community control, engaged in continued treatment or counseling as recommended by a qualified healthcare professional, and obtained a prognosis from a qualified healthcare professional that he is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreements and issued a public reprimand against Respondent Christensen and a one-year fully stayed suspension against Respondent Kluesener.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, 18 months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (multiple offenses), (7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim), (9)(no restitution); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Hales (2008)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension with 18 months stayed for neglecting a client's matter and then refusing to pay a judgment entered against him in a malpractice action brought by the client.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panels' report finding the charged misconduct and recommending a suspension of two years with 18 months stayed. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: In June 2010, Respondent was retained by a client to represent her in a personal-injury action against a hospital. Respondent never informed the client in writing that he lacked malpractice insurance. Respondent filed the lawsuit but did not timely respond to the hospital's discovery requests or its motion for summary judgment which was granted. The client testified that Respondent rarely returned phone calls in response to her requests for information about the lawsuit. She denied Respondent's assertion that he had discussed a voluntary dismissal and she learned from the court that the case had been dismissed. After the lawsuit was dismissed she hired new counsel to file a legal-malpractice claim. Respondent did not answer the complaint and a default judgment was entered against him. He agreed to settle the matter for $25,000 but failed to execute the agreement, and stopped making payments after two months. The client had to later hire an attorney to enforce the judgment. After garnishments and other collection efforts, Respondent had only paid $7,102.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, with the final 18 months stayed on conditions that he make restitution in the amount of $24,981.74 and commit no further misconduct.

Sanction	One-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.1(a), 8.1(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Bunstine (2015)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year suspension, fully stayed, for making false statements and failing to disclose a material fact to Relator during its investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct and recommended sanction of a one-year suspension conditionally stayed and commencing upon Respondent's reinstatement from her February, 2016 suspension.

FINDINGS: Prior to her 2016 suspension, Respondent agreed to assist her stepmother with the purchase of property. A certificate of transfer was required from probate court to transfer the owner's decedent wife's interest in the property to him. Respondent's stepmother gave her a $75.00 check to obtain the certificate of transfer. Despite her suspension the next day, Respondent continued to help her stepmother in the filing of documents and other nonattorney tasks related to the property transfer. Relator later received a grievance, purportedly from the property owner, alleging Respondent was practicing law under suspension. In response to a letter of inquiry, Respondent admitted that she filed the certificate of transfer but denied having paid the filing fee and stated that she was unaware who had paid the fee. In a follow up letter, Respondent described her work as a part-time notary signing agent. She stated that she filed documents and paid filing fees on behalf of an entity that retained her. Respondent later refused to provide the name of the entity.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for one year, all stayed, on conditions that she achieve a passing score on the MPRE and engage in no further misconduct, commencing on her reinstatement from the 2016 suspension order.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy.

DISSENTING: Chief Justice O'Connor, Justice Fischer concurring in the dissenting opinion, would have suspended Respondent for two years with one-year stayed with no credit for time served under her prior suspension.

DISSENTING: Justice Fischer dissented and Chief Justice O'Connor concurred in a separate opinion.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.1,3.3(a)(1), 8.2(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-**(2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (multiple offenses), (5)(lack of cooperation), (6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Frost (2009); Pullins (2010)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for conduct related to the ancillary administration of her mother's estate.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct and recommended sanction.

FINDINGS: Respondent's sibling opened an estate in Alabama and retained Ohio counsel to file an application for ancillary administration in Franklin County to dispose of a house that their mother owned in Columbus. Three days before the hearing, Respondent filed an application to administer the entire estate in Ohio. A magistrate later appointed Respondent as the ancillary administrator. At a later hearing, all parties agreed to sell the property and surrender the remaining proceeds to the Alabama estate. One month later, the magistrate issued a decision recommending removal of Respondent as ancillary administrator based on findings that she had failed to list the property and had delayed the administration of the estate. In a judgment entry, the court found that Respondent willfully violated Civ.R. 11 by drafting and signing numerous frivolous documents and pleadings, had acted to harass and intimidate the new ancillary administrator, and ordered her to pay the ancillary administrator's attorney fees. Respondent made numerous disparaging statements about the integrity of the probate court, accused the magistrate of engaging in improper ex parte communication, and claimed the appointment of the new administrator was politically motivated. Respondent also placed different locks on the doors of the real estate after the court had revoked Respondent's authority subsequent to her forcible entry into the property and falsely alleging that an off-duty police officer had assisted her. In addition, Respondent acted outside the scope of her authority, obstructed the successor ancillary administrator's ability to sell the property, and threatened parties and witnesses. In her answer to the disciplinary complaint, she continued to impugn the integrity of the magistrate and court and commenced an attack on disciplinary counsel.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent from the practice of law. As additional conditions of reinstatement, Respondent must provide proof that she has submitted to an evaluation by OLAP and complied with the recommendations resulting from the evaluation, obtained an opinion from a qualified healthcare professional that she is able to resume the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law, and has paid the fees and costs assessed against her by the Franklin County Probate Court.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	Jud.Cond.R. 1.2, 1.3
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), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Marshall (2015); Resnick (2005)
Cited By	Gonzalez (2020); Hawkins (2020)

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand based upon her conviction for an OVI, failing to act in a manner as a judicial officer that promotes public confidence in the judiciary and abusing the prestige of office to advance her personal interests.

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

FINDINGS: Respondent drove her vehicle off of a highway and into a ditch. The responding police officer observed vomit inside the car and a strong odor of alcohol coming from Respondent's person. In response to questions, Respondent stated that she had been drinking alcohol, gave her name, and stated several times without prompting that she was a common pleas judge. After being placed in the police vehicle she stated "I am so intoxicated." Respondent later partially performed one of three field sobriety tests and refused a breathalyzer test. She also asked the officers to take her home and when they did not comply demanded that they call her friend, a local deputy sheriff. She was arrested and charged with a first-degree-misdemeanor count of OVI. At the first court appearance she entered a guilty plea and apologized to the court and public for her misconduct and made a statement to the news media acknowledging her poor judgment and apologized for harming the judiciary. The court sentenced Respondent to 180 days in jail, with 177 days suspended, suspended her driver's license for one year, ordered her to pay a fine of $1,074 with $700 suspended on the conditions that she have no other drug or alcohol related convictions and complete a driver-intervention program.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law and imposed a public reprimand upon Respondent.

NOT PARTICIPATING: Chief Justice O'Connor.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.3(a)(1), 8.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive)**; 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	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	DeMarco (2015); Spinazze (2020)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month stayed suspension for making a false statement of fact to a tribunal.

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

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a criminal defendant. When his client did not appear for a scheduled arraignment, Respondent advised the judge that his legal assistant had sent a letter with a request for his client to schedule a meeting with her. He informed the judge that he did not know if the letter included the date of the arraignment, but that he would check with his assistant. The judge instructed Respondent to advise her within a week whether the letter included the date of the arraignment. Upon reviewing the client file, Respondent determined that his office had never sent a letter to the client. He then fabricated a letter to the client, backdated it, and hand-delivered a copy to the judge's secretary. Later, Respondent drafted a letter to the judge admitting that he had fabricated the letter, however the letter did not reach the judge prior to the client's arraignment. Following the arraignment of his client, Respondent also admitted in private to the judge that he had fabricated the letter to his client.

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

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(4), 1.15(a), 1.16(d), 1.16(e)
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	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Ramos (2008); Malvasi (2015); Schnittke (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month stayed suspension for failing to act with reasonable diligence and failing to respond to reasonable requests for information with regard to two clients.

PROCEDURE: The Board recommended the Court adopt the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to assist in the handling of a client's mother's estate, the transfer of a tractor and vehicle, and the disbursement of an annuity of which the client was a beneficiary. Respondent failed to handle the transfer or disbursement, and the client transferred the tractor and vehicle on his own. The client and his wife telephoned Respondent 33 times regarding the administration of the estate, but only spoke to Respondent five of those times. Eventually, the client was required to hire another lawyer to recover documents from Respondent. Respondent was not paid a fee. In another matter Respondent was retained to obtain a bingo license for a county veteran's club, but did not deposit a flat fee into her IOLTA. For an eight-month period, Respondent assured the client she was in the process of filing the application – but never did. The client attempted to contact Respondent multiple times during a three-month period. Respondent responded to one text message from the client after a month had elapsed. Respondent refunded her fee.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement and imposed a six-month stayed suspension on conditions that Respondent undergo an OLAP evaluation within 60 days of the order, comply with recommendations resulting from the evaluation, and engage in no further misconduct.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(4), 1.15(a), 1.15(c), 1.16(d), 8.1(b), 8.4(c), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4)(multiple offenses), (5)(lack of cooperation); **M-** none
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for failing to comply with clients' requests for information, failing to deposit unearned fees in an IOLTA, engaging in dishonest conduct, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation, and failing to cooperate in the ensuing disciplinary investigations.

PROCEDURE: The Board recommended Respondent be indefinitely suspended. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent agreed to represent a client in her divorce and agreed to a flat fee that Respondent cashed on the same day and deposited into her husband's personal checking account. Several months after little or no contact from Respondent, the client asked for a refund. More than a year later, Respondent gave the client $1700 in cash and a $300 check that later was returned for insufficient funds. Relator subpoenaed Respondent for a deposition but she never appeared. At hearing Respondent testified that she had mailed a cashier's check to the client, but failed to comply with the panel chair's order to provide proof of restitution. In another matter Respondent agreed to represent a client in a postdecree matter for a flat fee. The client was awarded attorney fees, and Respondent deposited the attorney fees check in her husband's personal checking account. Respondent falsely indicated to the client that she was delayed in receiving the check and promised to forward a reimbursement check, which the client never received. Respondent failed to respond to Relator's letter of inquiry or appear at a scheduled deposition. In a separate matter Respondent failed to return the client's calls, texts, and emails for two months after an appearance at a pretrial hearing. In another matter Respondent agreed to represent a client in a postdecree matter and was paid an advance fee but did not deposit it in an IOLTA. Respondent attempted to file a separate motion to set aside child support. Respondent informed her client that another $250 for filing fees was needed and that a hearing had been scheduled on both motions. Respondent did not respond to her client's request for information and converted part of the $250 from the client for filing fees to personal use. She did not respond to the client's requests to terminate representation or to return her file. At hearing she claimed that she had sent a Venmo payment to the client over the previous weekend, but documentation showed that she had made the payment less than an hour before the hearing.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent and conditioned reinstatement on an OLAP evaluation, compliance with treatment recommendations, demonstration of a sustained period of treatment or counseling, and a prognosis from a qualified healthcare professional that she is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

CONCURRING AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Kennedy would not have imposed the additional conditions for reinstatement.

Sanction	One-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	1.8(j)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline); **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	Paris (2016); Siewert (2011)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a fully stayed one-year suspension by commencing a sexual relationship with a client during his legal representation.

PROCEDURE: The panel initially rejected a consent-to-discipline agreement filed by the parties and proceeded to hearing. The parties filed stipulations nearly identical to the consent-to-discipline agreement. The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and a recommended sanction of a one-year suspension with six months stayed on conditions.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client in a civil matter and commenced an intimate sexual relationship with her six months later. The legal representation concluded with a settlement and dismissal of an action filed against the client. After the intimate relationship concluded, Respondent represented the client in two separate matters. Respondent admitted that it was wrong of him to have entered into the intimate relationship.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for one year, fully stayed on the condition that he engage in no further misconduct.

DISSENTING: Justices Kennedy and Fischer dissented and would have imposed the Board's recommended sanction of one year with six months stayed.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b),8.4(c),8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4)(multiple offenses), (8)(harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (4)(cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was indefinitely suspended for misconduct related to his felony conviction for conspiracy to commit wire fraud and securities fraud.

PROCEDURE: A hearing panel found that Respondent had committed the charged misconduct and the Board issued a report recommending the sanction of an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served under his interim felony suspension.

FINDINGS: Respondent was indicted by a federal grand jury on eight counts of criminal conduct arising from his participation in a fraudulent and criminal scheme where a company would purchase crude-oil and refined-fuel products at deeply discounted prices and resell them at a substantial profit. The company solicited investors and promised a guaranteed return of up to 5 percent per month. Respondent allowed his client trust account to be used as a depository for the investor's funds and he was held out to the investors as an attorney and "escrow agent" to ensure investors that their money would be safe. The scheme ultimately bilked more than 70 investors out of more than $31 million over four years. The majority of the investor's funds were stolen by the company's principals. Respondent was not a principal of the company and did not perform any legal services for the company or its investors. Respondent testified that he left the company after observing improper conduct, but returned on a month-to-month basis after the principals assured him that they would change their practices. The principals increased Respondent's flat monthly fee from $2,500 to $4,000 a month. Respondent pleaded guilty to a single count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud and securities fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1349, was sentenced to 21 months in federal prison, followed by three years of supervised release, and ordered to pay restitution of more than $17 million, jointly and severally with his conspirators. Respondent was also permanently enjoined by the SEC from committing further violations and ordered to disgorge $125,940 plus prejudgment interest, representing his profits from the conspiracy. The LFCP awarded a total of $51,000 to two victims of the conspiracy.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent with no credit for time served. As additional conditions of reinstatement, Respondent was ordered to demonstrate that he has complied with the terms of the supervised release, completed three hours of CLE regarding the establishment and maintenance of a client trust account in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, made full restitution to LFCP, and has taken reasonable steps to comply with the orders of restitution imposed in connection with his criminal cases.

Sanction	Six-months stayed suspension; public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.16(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none**; 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	Hanni (2016); Kluesener (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent Gibbons received a six-month stayed suspension and Respondent Jenkins was publicly reprimanded, after failing to diligently represent a client or adequately communicate with him regarding habeas corpus proceedings from his death sentence and related litigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondents' client was convicted of two counts of aggravated murder with death penalty specifications and was sentenced to death on both counts. The Supreme Court vacated one of the sentences on appeal. Respondents were appointed to represent the client in a federal habeas corpus proceeding in February 2007, but the petition was denied. They represented him in an unsuccessful appeal to the Sixth Circuit and in a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court. During the appellate proceedings, Respondents sought and received three extensions of time to file their appellate brief, ultimately filed a defective brief, and missed three deadlines to file a corrected brief. The corrected brief was filed on July 19, 2010. During the pendency of the federal habeas proceedings from 2007 to 2012, Respondents met with their client on eight occasions, spoke with him by telephone on one occasion, and provided him with written status updates and copies of pleadings and orders. After conclusion of the habeas corpus proceedings, his execution date was set, but neither Respondent advised him of the date. In September 2014, the Governor granted multiple death-row inmates, including Respondents' client, reprieve of execution due to issues with the lethal-injection protocol. Neither Respondent advised their client of the reprieve or clemency presentations that might be made on his behalf. In federal court litigation challenging the lethal injection execution protocol, Respondent-Gibbons was counsel of record for the client, but over a five-year period, did not communicate with the client, take any action on his behalf, or file any pleadings. Respondent Gibbons failed to act or respond to several federal court notices or orders and withdrew from the federal lethal injection litigation. Respondents remained counsel of record in the clemency proceedings until the client filed a motion to have them replaced. New counsel for the client was initially unable to obtain the client's file from Respondent-Gibbons due to his failure to respond to emails or telephone messages.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommendation to accept a consent-to-discipline agreement and imposed a six-month stayed suspension against Respondent Gibbons and publicly reprimanded Respondent Jenkins.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	JCR 1.1, 1.3
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none**; M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4)(cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Doherty (2020); Williams (2017)
Cited By	Hawkins (2020)

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for failing to comply with the law as a judge and abusing the prestige of office to advance his personal interests.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the panel's findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS: Respondent was a newly appointed judge in Lucas County Common Pleas Court when he was stopped in Findlay by an Ohio State Highway Patrol sergeant for a marked-lanes violation and failing to signal when exiting the highway. The sergeant asked him to step out of the vehicle and sit in the front seat of the cruiser. While in the cruiser, Respondent stated that he was going to tell the sergeant who he was, "… I hate to make this political, and I don't want to go there, but I just got appointed judge in Lucas County by Governor DeWine in March." He continued to impress upon the sergeant that he was not asking for favors, but that the incident would "kill [him]." Another trooper responded and noticed a strong odor of alcohol emanating from Respondent, bloodshot and glassy eyes, droopy eyelids, and that Respondent was slurring his words. Respondent emphasized again that he was a judge in Lucas County and stated "I'm not trying to play that up, but." Respondent was arrested after a field sobriety test. Respondent mentioned a third time that he was a judge, asked that his parents be permitted to pick him up from the scene, and asked if there was "anything [he] can do?" Respondent refused to provide a chemical sample and was placed under an administrative license suspension pursuant to R.C. 4511.191. Respondent pleaded guilty to one count of OVI in violation of R.C. 4511.19(A)(1)(a) and was sentenced to 30 days in jail with 23 days suspended, ordered to complete a driver's-intervention program for five days of jail-time credit as well as a victim-impact-panel program for two days of jail-time credit. He was also ordered to pay a fine of $450 plus costs, and his operator's license was suspended for 365 days, with limited driving privileges. At Respondent's hearing he admitted that he was trying to persuade the troopers not to cite him for OVI. He self-reported his conduct to Relator. A substance-abuse assessment revealed that Respondent did not have a drinking problem.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension.
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	JCR 1.2, 1.3, 2.9(A)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4)(multiple offenses), (7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing)**; 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	Hoague (2000); Porzio (2020)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent, a common pleas judge, received a six-month stayed suspension for interfering in a case assigned to another judge, engaging in ex parte communications, and arranging the defendant's release on a recognizance bond two days before arraignment.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the panel's findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS: Friends of Respondent contacted him after a daughter's boyfriend was indicted on three second-degree felony counts of illegal use of a minor in a nudity-oriented performance and held without bail. Respondent then contacted the Lucas County Pretrial Services Department and confirmed with an officer that the defendant remained in custody. He asked the officer if a public-safety assessment had been performed. After learning that the case had been assigned to another judge on the common pleas court, he ordered a recognizance bond with a no-contact order allowing for the defendant's immediate release. In the interim, the daughter of Respondent's friends had been speaking with the defendant on her cell phone and gave the phone to Respondent who informed the defendant that he had arranged his release. Respondent later sent the defendant's lawyer a text message informing him that he had released the defendant. On a second call, Respondent asked the defendant a series of questions including whether a prior aggravated-menacing conviction had involved the same victim and about the facts underlying the charges pending against him. Respondent left a voicemail for the presiding judge informing him that he had set the bond in the case. However, he did not inform the defendant's lawyer that he had engaged in ex parte communications with the defendant or that he may have learned information that was material to the case. While preparing discovery, the prosecutor listened to the defendant's jail calls and recognized Respondent's voice. He informed his supervisor and notified Respondent that he would be listed as a state's witness in the case.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction and suspended Respondent for six months, all stayed.

CONCURRING IN PART, DISSENTING IN PART: Justice Donnelly would have imposed a public reprimand.

NOT PARTICIPATING: Justice Fischer

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	JCR 1.1, 1.2
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none**; M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4)(cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Gonzalez (2020); Doherty (2020); Williams (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for failing to comply with the law as a judge and not acting in a manner that promotes public confidence in the judiciary.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the panel's findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS: Respondent was reported by a motorist as a suspected intoxicated driver. A police officer responded to the call and stopped Respondent. When approached by the officer, Respondent stated that, "[she] was trying to figure out how to get home" and explained that she had gotten lost. The officer detected the smell of alcohol coming from the vehicle and asked if she had consumed any alcoholic beverages, to which Respondent replied, "No." Although she was not asked for her occupation or identification, Respondent stated that she was a judge. She stated that she had been at a restaurant in downtown, but could not recall the name of the establishment. The officer observed an injury on Respondent's head, which she denied having, scratches and cuts on her hands that she said was not the result of domestic violence, and vomit on her coat and the floor of the car. Respondent later handed a police sergeant her cell phone and said that her bailiff was on the phone. Respondent failed the field sobriety tests and was arrested for OVI. After being read her Miranda rights, Respondent refused to sign the acknowledgment form, refused to provide a breath sample, and later refused to submit to a blood draw after a warrant had been signed. Four hospital security officers held her down until her blood could be drawn. She was eventually charged with OVI under two statutory provisions and a marked lane violation. She pleaded guilty to a first-degree misdemeanor count of OVI, was sentenced to 90 days in jail with 87 days suspended with the opportunity to complete a 72-day driver intervention program in lieu of three days in jail, fined $375, had her license suspended for one year, and ordered to serve one year of probation.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's recommended sanction and publicly reprimanded Respondent.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (8)(harm to vulnerable victim); **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	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a fully stayed six-month suspension for failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness with a single client, failing to keep the client reasonably informed about the status of her case, and failing to comply with the client's reasonable requests for information about her case.

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

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a client in her divorce proceeding and was paid an initial retainer and a filing fee. The divorce decree awarded an interest to the client in her ex-husband's retirement plan and Respondent received an additional $5,000 fee from the division of property. Opposing counsel submitted a QDRO to effectuate transfer of the share of retirement benefits to the Ford Motor Company. Ford rejected the QDRO, and opposing counsel submitted a second QDRO to Respondent. At hearing, Respondent conceded that it was his responsibility to send the second QDRO to Ford. He did nothing to follow up on the status form April 2011 until April 2014 when opposing counsel retained QDRO Group to prepare a QDRO that would meet with Ford's approval. An associate of Respondent submitted third and fourth revised QDROs to Ford which were rejected. A fifth QDRO was prepared, but there is no evidence that it was ever submitted. Opposing counsel telephoned Respondent about the QDRO on numerous occasions, but did not speak with Respondent until April 2017. He promised that he would file the document, but did not follow through on his promise. In October 2017 the fifth QDRO was submitted to Ford, but was rejected. In response to Relator's February 2018 inquiry regarding the status of the case, Respondent obtained court approval of a sixth QDRO and submitted it to Ford. Ford approved the QDRO and the client was entitled to receive a monthly benefit of $402.92. Respondent stipulated that but for his failure to obtain timely approval of the QDRO, his client's benefits would have commenced approximately 82 months earlier.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of a fully stayed six-month suspension on condition that he engage in no further misconduct.

DISSENTING: Justices Fischer, joined by Chief Justice O'Connor and Justice French.

Sanction	Two-year suspension
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	3.3(a)(1), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (4)(multiple offenses); **M-** (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	Yes
Case Authority	Holland (2005); Stahlbush (2010)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension stemming from felony convictions for tampering with records and theft.

PROCEDURE: Based on the parties' stipulations, the Board recommended a two-year suspension with credit for time served.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by the parents of a defendant in a criminal case. At the time, the defendant was represented by a public defender. Respondent orally agreed to undertake the representation for a flat fee of $10,000. The defendant's parents paid Respondent a $4,000 retainer at the end of February and in mid-April, Respondent filed a notice of special, limited appearance of cocounsel stating that he would assist the public defender with motions practice and trial preparation. The prosecutor expressed concern that public funds were being used to provide legal representation to the defendant when he also had private counsel. The public defender later filed a motion to appoint Respondent as cocounsel, but Respondent reiterated at hearing that the defendant's family was "trying to make arrangements" to privately retain him. However, the court granted the motion and Respondent never disclosed that he had been privately retained nor rejected the appointment. At the conclusion of representation Respondent filed with the court a motion for extraordinary fees and requested approval of a $6,160 fee. He also filed a motion, entry, and certification for appointed-counsel fees in which he certified that he had received no other compensation in connection with the case. He did not disclose that he already had received $8,000 directly from his client's parents. The court granted the motion and awarded fees of $5,000. Respondent later received and cashed two more $500 checks from his client's parents.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law, and suspended Respondent for two-years with no credit for time served. The Court also required Respondent to complete six hours of CLE focused on ethics and professionalism in addition to the requirements in Gov.Bar R. X and provide proof of completion upon reinstatement.

CONCURRING: Chief Justice O'Connor, Justices Fischer and Stewart.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justices French, DeWine, and Donnelly would grant credit for time served under the felony suspension.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, one year stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.1, 3.4(c), 5.5, 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (4)(cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Dearfield (2011); Chambers (2010); Bruce (2020)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year stayed suspension stemming from rule violations in two client matters.

PROCEDURE: Respondent stipulated to two rule violations and the panel dismissed half of the alleged rule violations. The Board adopted the panel findings of misconduct and recommended sanction. Neither party objected to the Board's report.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a minor daughter in a personal-injury lawsuit. After accepting a filing fee, Respondent told the parents in January 2018 that he had filed the complaint. He later filed the complaint in June 2018, but the client terminated him after learning that he had lied. Respondent later sent a letter to the defendant's insurer placing a "lien" on his former client's claims. In a second client matter, Respondent filed a personal-injury complaint on behalf of two clients in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky. Under the court's local rules, a lawyer may apply for admission to the bar of that court if he or she had been admitted before the Supreme Court of Kentucky. In the alternative, a lawyer may apply for pro hac vice admission. Respondent was not admitted to Kentucky and failed to seek pro hac vice admission. Not having access to the electronic case-filing system, he filed a paper complaint in person. The clerk of the court notified Respondent that his check for filing fees had been returned for insufficient funds. The judge in the case ordered Respondent to file a status report regarding service of the complaint, which Respondent had not initiated, and to show cause why the complaint should not be dismissed. Respondent failed to file a response and the complaint was dismissed without prejudice. Respondent later refiled the complaint and an order was issued to show cause why the case should not be dismissed as untimely. He later failed to appear at a show cause hearing. The judge issued an order prohibiting Respondent from practicing law in the Eastern District of Kentucky for two years. Respondent stated that he did not receive the court's notices and orders, but acknowledged that he had failed to file a change-of-address form, failed to register for the court's electronic case-filing system, and failed to check the online docket. He also admitted that he had little experience practicing in federal court.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law, and suspended Respondent for two-years with the second year stayed on condition that he refrain from further misconduct.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	5.3(c), 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	Freedman (2016); Clark (2018)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month, stayed suspension for misconduct related to her use of two improperly witnessed and notarized powers of attorney.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondent's father was married to a woman Respondent believed was abusing her father. The father signed a power of attorney and a power of attorney for health care in Respondent's presence. Respondent later directed two employees in her law firm to sign the powers of attorney as attesting witnesses and another employee to notarize her father's signature. Respondent subsequently used the healthcare power of attorney to direct her father's medical care and the general power of attorney to sign an affidavit filed with the domestic relations court in Stark County in a petition for a domestic violence civil protection order, to file a complaint for divorce, and to execute a restraining order. Respondent later represented to the court that she had the power of attorney for her father. The court conducted two hearings regarding the validity of the power of attorney used in the domestic violence and divorce actions. At the hearings, Respondent admitted that the power of attorney was unwitnessed at the time of its execution and was later signed by her employees.

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

DISSENTING: Justice Kennedy

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.5(b), 1.5(c)(1), 1.5(d)(3)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **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	Seibel (2012)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for failing to properly communicate the basis or rate of his fee or a change in the basis or rate of the fee, failing to provide a written contingent fee agreement, and collecting a flat fee without advising a client that they may be entitled to a full or partial refund.

PROCEDURE: The Board accepted the parties' consent-to-discipline agreement.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to represent a couple with regard to claims arising from the installation of a septic tank on their property. The clients paid Respondent $6,000 as a flat fee, but Respondent did not provide them with an engagement letter or other document memorializing the nature of the fee or scope of the representation. Respondent also did not provide written notice that the fee was "earned upon receipt" or any written documentation regarding their responsibility for litigation expenses. After a lawsuit was filed and a mediation failed, Respondent informed his clients that his continued representation would require a 12 percent contingency fee, in addition to the $6,000 fee previously paid. The contingent fee agreement was never reduced to writing. The clients later terminated Respondent. Respondent did not refund any portion of the flat fee, but Relator concluded that Respondent did an appropriate amount of work on the case.

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

Sanction	Two-year suspension, one year stayed.
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.15(a), 1.15(a)(2), 1.15(a)(3), 1.15(a)(5), 1.15(b), 3.4(c), 8.4(c), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4) (multiple offenses); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (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	Joltin (2016)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension with one year stayed for conduct stemming from misdemeanors and for misusing his trust account.

PROCEDURE: Respondent stipulated to the charged conduct. The Board recommended the Court adopt the recommended sanction of a two-year suspension with one year stayed. Neither party filed objections to the Board's report.

FINDINGS: Respondent was arrested and charged with assault and disorderly conduct. A temporary criminal-protection order was issued prohibiting him from having any contact with the female victim. A month later he was questioned about going to the victim's home, denied it, but later admitted having gone there. He was charged with violating the protection order. He later informed the victim that she did not have to attend the scheduled criminal trial because the court was closed. The court dismissed the case without prejudice after the victim failed to appear. The charges were refiled and Respondent pleaded no contest and was sentenced to ten days in jail with credit for time served, a fine, and two years of probation. Respondent also had improper contact with the victim while they were both at Berea Municipal Court. Respondent later tested for cocaine while on probation. Based on a prior investigation of Respondent's IOLTA practices, Relator charged him with several violations related to his failure to maintain individual client ledgers, a general ledger, and failure to reconcile funds on a monthly basis. The 2018 investigation was closed based on Respondent's assurance he would comply with the IOLTA rule. Despite the prior assurances he continued to engage in misconduct related to his IOLTA including the misappropriation of funds.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board and suspended Respondent for two years, with one year stayed on conditions that he obtain an OLAP assessment within 60 days of the order and engage in no further misconduct. In addition, reinstatement was conditioned on submission of proof that he has complied with any OLAP contract and all treatment and counseling recommendations and submit an opinion of a qualified health-care professional that he is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law. Justice Fischer would have imposed probation for the stayed year of the suspension.

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	JCR 1.2, 2.9(A), 2.11(A)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** none; **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (2) (no dishonest or selfish motive), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Elum (2012)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a six-month stayed suspension for conduct stemming from her ex parte communications as a magistrate.

PROCEDURE: The hearing panel recommended a conditionally stayed six-month suspension. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent presided over a hearing on a petition and counterpetition for a civil stalking protection order. Both petitioners appeared pro se and testified on their own behalf. At the close of evidence, Respondent requested that the parties exit the courthouse separately and that petitioner Fish leave first. After Fish left the courtroom, Respondent engaged in a 23-minute conversation with petitioner Gerino and his witnesses and repeatedly criticized Fish's credibility. She stated that he was "such a liar," "made himself look like a fool," was "clueless," and acted "like he's 10 years old." She also discussed the evidence and indicated how she intended to decide the matter because neither party had proved its case. Respondent also made offhand and unnecessary comments about the parties' religion and ethnic backgrounds. She used inappropriate slang and profanity regarding Fish's testimony. A few months later, Respondent issued her decision granting petitioner Gerino a five-year civil protection order and denied Fish's counterpetition, despite the fact that she had previously told Gerino that neither party had proved their case.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction and suspended Respondent for six-months, all stayed, on conditions that she complete four hours of CLE in the area of judicial ethics, with two of the hours related to actual or implicit bias, in addition to the other requirements of Gov.Bar.R. X, and that she commit no further misconduct.

Rauzan & Wagner, *Mahoning Cty. Bar Assn. v.* 2020-Ohio-355. Decided 2/6/2020

Case Summary

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension; public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.4(c), 1.15(a), 1.15(c), 8.4(b)
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), (6)(other penalties/sanctions); **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	Yes
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	McCord (2016)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent Rauzan received a six-month stayed suspension stemming from his misdemeanor convictions and IOLTA violations related to his representation in a personal-injury matter. Respondent Wagner received a public reprimand for IOLTA violations related to representation in the same personal-injury matter.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommended sanctions. Neither party objected to the Board's report and recommendation.

Table of Cases Index

FINDINGS: Respondent Rauzan was convicted of four misdemeanors for attempted unauthorized use of property in violation of R.C. 2913.04(D) for searching OHLEG for purposes unrelated to his duties as police chief. He resigned as a police chief and surrendered his OPTA certificate. In 2018, Relator received a notice that Rauzan's IOLTA was overdrawn. Relator discovered that Rauzan had been commingling personal funds with client funds and was using his trust account as an operating account. Rauzan and Wagner were later retained by a couple in a potential personal-injury matter and were paid a $5,000 retainer that Wagner immediately placed in her IOLTA. During the next two weeks she transferred amounts to her operating account and Rauzan's trust account before sufficient legal work had been completed and the fees were earned.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanctions of the Board, suspended Respondent Rauzan for six months, all stayed, and issued a public reprimand to Respondent Wagner.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Chief Justice O'Connor and Justice Fischer would impose a conditionally stayed 12-month suspension on Respondent-Rauzan.

Sanction	-
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	-
Aggravation/ Mitigation	-
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Simecek (1998), Wiest (2016), Ruffalo ,U.S. (1968)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was charged with Prof.Cond.R. 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4(a) while representing a client in a civil defamation action.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommended sanction of a public reprimand. At hearing the panel unanimously dismissed violations of Prof.Cond.R. 1.1 and 1.3, leaving the 1.4(a)(3) violation remaining. During closing arguments, the Realtor suggested that the panel was not limited to a finding of one violation of Prof.Cond.R. 1.4, but could find based on the evidence a violation of any division of Prof.Cond.R. 1.4. After the hearing, Respondent moved to dismiss the case and argued that the additional finding of a rule violation would infringe on his due process rights. Based on the briefing, the hearing panel dismissed the remaining Prof.Cond.R. 1.4(a)(3) violation, but granted the motion to amend the complaint and found Respondent violated Prof.Cond.R. 1.4(a)(1) and 1.4(b). Respondent objected to the recommendation. The Court sustained Respondent's first objection because he did not have fair notice of the uncharged violations.

SANCTION: The Court dismissed the case.

CONCURRING: Chief Justice O'Connor, Justice Fisher, and Justice Donnelly

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justices Kennedy, DeWine and Stewart

Sanction	Six-month stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.4(a)(1), 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **M-** (1) (no prior discipline), (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 six-month, stayed suspension for misconduct related to her failure to communicate with an incarcerated client regarding his criminal appeal.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings and recommended sanction. Neither party filed objections.

FINDINGS: Respondent was appointed as appellate counsel for Andrew Kouts who had pleaded guilty to multiple felonies and had been sentenced to 16 ½ years in prison. Respondent did not contact Kouts nor communicate with trial counsel to determine why the appeal had been filed. Kouts later filed a motion to have Respondent removed as counsel and proceed pro se, and alleged that Respondent had failed to communicate with him. The Sixth District struck the motion. On the day the appellate brief was due, Respondent moved to withdraw as counsel and notified Kouts a week later that she had moved to withdraw, but she incorrectly addressed the letter. The letter was Respondent's first attempt at communicating with Kouts. Kouts then filed a motion for reconsideration in the court of appeals seeking to represent himself pro se because he had "no clue" as to the status of his appeal. The court later denied both the motion to withdraw and the motion for reconsideration and ordered Respondent to file the appellate brief within 21 days. Kouts subsequently filed a pro se brief. Respondent was aware of Kouts's brief, but made no attempt to discuss it with him. Respondent filed her appellate brief, but never consulted with, or sought Kouts's consent for the arguments raised in the brief. The Sixth District later vacated Kouts's plea and reversed the trial court's judgment. On remand, Kouts was appointed new counsel. At the disciplinary hearing, Respondent admitted that she had never attempted to contact Kouts by telephone and never met him with him in person.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of the Board, and suspended Respondent for six months, all stayed on the conditions that he complete a minimum of 12 hours of continuing legal education in law-office management and client communications within six months of the disciplinary order in addition to the other requirements of Gov.Bar.R. X, and refrain from any further misconduct.

Sanction	Disbarment
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.4(a)(1), 1.16(d), 3.4(c), 5.5(a), 8.1(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (2) (dishonest or selfish motive), (4)(multiple offenses), (7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** none
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was disbarred for filing a false affidavit of compliance with the Supreme Court, practicing under suspension, and committing other misconduct during his suspension and the ensuing disciplinary investigation.

PROCEDURE: The Board issued a report finding that Respondent omitted all the charged misconduct and recommended that he be permanently disbarred.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained to pursue a wrongful-death claim and Ohio Victims of Crime Compensation claim on behalf of the decedent's mother. For the first five months he only communicated with his client by telephone or through an intermediary. Respondent subsequently settled the wrongful-death claim with the insurer for $50,000. During the investigation and disciplinary proceeding, Respondent falsely claimed that he only filed an application for authority to administer the estate, and not other required documents, because he was told by a magistrate that an early distribution of the estate funds would streamline the probate process. The magistrate did not recall having spoken with Respondent. After a suspension was imposed against Respondent by the Supreme Court in 2018, Respondent continued to represent his client, now the estate's appointed fiduciary. In December, 2018, Respondent filed a false affidavit of compliance stating that he had complied with the suspension order including notifying clients and courts about his suspension. After receiving the settlement check from the insurer, Respondent signed his client's name to it and deposited it into his IOLTA. He immediately began to distribute the settlement proceeds and pay personal financial obligations without probate court approval. Testimony from the decedent's mother at the hearing revealed that he had signed the settlement release and check without her permission. Later, a representative of the Ohio Victims of Crime Compensation fund contacted Respondent's client to inform her that Respondent could no longer represent her because his law license had been suspended. When confronted, Respondent did not advise his client to consult with other counsel nor return her file.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the Board's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction of permanent disbarment and ordered restitution of $50,000 to Allstate Insurance Company or the estate of the decedent.

CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT ONLY: Justice Kennedy.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	8.4(b), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing), (8) (harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions), (8)(other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Goldblatt (2008)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served for misconduct related to his felony conviction for importuning.

PROCEDURE: Respondent stipulated to the charged misconduct and the parties jointly recommended an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served under Respondent's interim felony suspension.

FINDINGS: Respondent was convicted of importuning in violation of R.C. 2907.07, a fifth-degree felony. The conviction was based on Respondent's attempted unlawful sexual conduct with a minor. Respondent solicited an undercover law-enforcement officer who was posing as a 15-year-old male. During his disciplinary hearing, Respondent admitted that he had exchanged sexually charged text messages with the law-enforcement officer and also had arranged to meet the person at a restaurant. Respondent was designated a Tier 1 sex offender and sentenced to three years of community control with one year under supervised probation. He was also ordered to undergo a mental-health and sexual-offender evaluation.

SANCTION: The Court adopted the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanctions of the Board, and imposed an indefinite suspension with no credit for time served. The Court also conditioned his reinstatement on a demonstration that he has complied with the terms of the probation in his criminal case and his OLAP contract.

Sanction	Six-month suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.3(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4) (cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	Yes
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	DeMarco (2015); Phillabaum (2015)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for six months for making false statements to a court and his supervisor while serving as a part-time assistant prosecutor.

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

FINDINGS: Respondent met with a deputy sheriff and defense lawyer to review body-camera footage of a defendant's OVI arrest. The defense lawyer indicated his client would plead guilty to a reduced charge of having physical control of a vehicle while under the influence, a first-degree misdemeanor, however the deputy sheriff objected. Respondent later recommended reducing the OVI charge, but the municipal court judge requested that he appear in court and explain the basis for the recommendation. At his appearance he misled the court regarding the city's case against the defendant. Respondent stated that there was a question as to the observation made by the police of the defendant driving and that the city had some evidentiary concerns whether it could put the defendant in the car. Respondent also falsely stated that the arresting officers, including the deputy sheriff, had consented to the plea agreement. Based on Respondent's representations, the court accepted the defendant's plea. The city's chief prosecutor later reviewed Respondent's case file and his handwritten note that he agreed to the plea agreement because the court was going to dismiss the case. Respondent later admitted the notation was false. Upon further investigation the chief prosecutor listened to the court's audio recording and expressed concern that Respondent had misled the court. Respondent falsely claimed that he had made a mistake at hearing by relying on defense counsel's account of the incident and agreed to recommend reduction without first reviewing the file. The deputy sheriff later told the chief prosecutor that he had objected to the reduction. Respondent was placed on administrative leave, submitted a written apology to the municipal court judge and apologized in person to the deputy sheriff. Respondent reported his misconduct to Relator and was later terminated by the city.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for six months.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, one year stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.4(c), 8.1(b), 8.4(c)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4)(multiple offenses), (5)(lack of cooperation), (9)(no restitution); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (4)(cooperative attitude)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Stewart (2013)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a two-year suspension with one year stayed for multiple professional-conduct violations arising out of his representation of four clients.

PROCEDURE: Respondent admitted to the charged violations. The Board adopted the panel's findings and recommended sanction. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent successfully represented a landlord in an eviction action against a tenant and was further retained to pursue a judgment against the tenant for past due rent. The landlord client provided Respondent with debtor's employment information in order to initiate a garnishment and paid a filing fee. Over a period of a year, Respondent failed to give the client sufficient information regarding the status of the matter and falsely told the client the collection paperwork had been filed. In another matter, Respondent represented a client in a divorce decree, but after the divorce the client retained Respondent to seek a modification of the child-support order. Respondent never filed the motion, the client was ordered to show cause why he was not meeting his obligations, and did not attend a scheduled hearing date because he was on vacation. Respondent assured the client that the hearing would be continued, but the client was held in contempt, a warrant issued for his arrest, and he was ordered to pay attorney fees. In a separate matter Respondent represented a client convicted of three felonies, but a grievance alleged he had properly failed to defend the client. The grievance was dismissed, but Respondent did not cooperate with Relator's investigation. Respondent was also hired to represent a defendant in a criminal matter, but the client filed a grievance alleging that Respondent did nothing to resolve the case, refused to respond to requests for information, and only visited him in jail twice during an eight-month period. Respondent did not file a motion requesting reduction of bond, despite telling the client he had done so.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, with one year stayed on conditions of restitution, obtaining an OLAP assessment, completing 12 hours of CLE in law-office management in addition to the requirements in Gov.Bar R. X, and required Respondent to complete one year of monitored probation upon reinstatement.

CONCURRING IN A SEPARATE OPINION: Justices Fischer and Donnelly.

CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART: Justices Kennedy and DeWine.

Sanction	Public reprimand
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	3.5(a)(3)(i)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A**-(7)(refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing); **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	Stuard (2009); Sauter (2002)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a public reprimand for engaging in an ex parte communication with a judge by transmitting a letter to the judge's law clerk.

PROCEDURE: A majority of the hearing panel recommended dismissal of the complaint. The Board adopted the minority decision and recommended a public reprimand.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented a wife in a divorce case from late 2016 through 2018. During the case, Respondent learned that the husband's girlfriend planned to adopt a minor child. Respondent had a negative opinion of the girlfriend. After learning of the potential adoption, Respondent researched the court's records and discovered the girlfriend had moved to intervene in another couple's dissolution proceeding to obtain custody of their child. The parents of the child agreed to transfer custody to the girlfriend. Respondent had significant concerns about the child living with the girlfriend and believed that the presiding judge, Judge Glass, needed to be alerted that an investigation should be conducted. Respondent later attended a brown bag luncheon hosted by Judge Glass, and proposed a hypothetical to the audience based on the facts of the adoption case. Based on her hypothetical, attendees agreed it would be inappropriate to directly contact the judge presiding over the case. Respondent testified that Judge Glass then stated that if the matter was before her, she would want a detailed letter sent to her staff attorney. If the staff attorney believed that additional action was necessary, the letter would be shared with the litigants. Respondent further testified that at the end of the luncheon, Judge Glass patted her on the back and stated, "Now you get that letter out." Judge Glass and her staff attorney disputed at the disciplinary hearing that the judge had invited or suggested sending a letter to her staff attorney in response to Respondent's hypothetical. Respondent later sent a four-page letter to the judge's chambers addressed to her staff attorney stating, "I am sending this correspondence to you since it is ex parte communication and I do not wish to expose the Judge to a situation wherein she feels the need to recuse herself in this matter." Upon receiving the letter, the judge scheduled a hearing in the matter. The mater was referred to family court services for an investigation and inspection of the girlfriend's home.

SANCTION: The Court publicly reprimanded Respondent.

DISSENTING: Justice Stewart

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.15(a), 1.15(c), 1.16(d), 1.16(e), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), 8.4(h)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (2)(dishonest or selfish motive), (3)(pattern of misconduct), (4)(multiple offenses), (5)(lack of cooperation), (8)(harm to vulnerable victim); **M-** (1)(no prior discipline), (3)(restitution or rectified consequences), (4)(cooperative attitude), (5)(good character), (6)(other penalties/sanctions), (7)(mental illness)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	Yes
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	Deters (2018); Lemieux (2014); Lawson (2008)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for misconduct related to two instances of criminal conduct and his representation of 12 client matters.

PROCEDURE: Respondent initially received an interim default suspension because he did not answer the complaint or respond to the Court's show-cause order. After Respondent responded to a show-cause order the Court remanded the matter to the Board.

FINDINGS: Between 2015 through 2017, Respondent engaged in a pattern of misconduct including failing to deposit unearned fees into his IOLTA, misappropriation, missing client meetings and court appearances and failing to communicate with his clients about the status of their legal matters, refund fees, and return client files. Respondent began to display erratic behavior beginning in May 2017. Respondent offered a client Xanax and asked another client for Percocet or Vicodin pills. At a hearing in a domestic relations court, the magistrate adjourned the hearing shortly after it began and asked the judge to speak with Respondent. After observing Respondent, the judge would not permit him to leave the courthouse until he secured a ride home or submitted to a urine test. Sheriff deputies escorted Respondent to the probation office while he yelled obscenities and created a scene. He was later handcuffed and escorted back to the courtroom. He later posted disparaging and derogatory comments about the court on is personal and law-firm Facebook pages. Respondent was later indicted on a fifth-degree felony count of forgery and two first-degree misdemeanor counts of petty theft for accepting a $10,500 personal-injury settlement check on behalf of his employer. He pleaded guilty to forgery and one count of petty theft. The court granted his motion for intervention in lieu of conviction and held the charges pending his completion of a substance-abuse treatment program.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent with no credit for time served. He was required to submit proof to the relator that he made restitution to one client in the amount of $1,000. In addition to the conditions for reinstatement in Gov.Bar R. V(25), Respondent was required to submit proof that he maintained his sobriety throughout the suspension, complied with his OLAP contract, and obtained an opinion from a qualified healthcare professional or chemical-dependency counselor that he is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

Sanction	One-year stayed suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.15(a), 1.15(c), 1.15(d)
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	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received a one-year, stayed suspension for failing to deposit client funds into a trust account.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's findings of misconduct and recommended sanction. Neither party objected to the board's report.

FINDINGS: In two client matters, Respondent failed to deposit retainers in her client trust account for nearly two years. In one matter, Respondent was paid $2,500 as a retainer, but she failed to deposit the retainer in her trust account. Another client's sister paid a $5,000 retainer and a $375 filing fee. Again, Respondent failed to deposit the funds in her client trust account and the following month the client terminated Respondent. Respondent failed to return the $375 until after her March 2020 disciplinary hearing. Between February 2017 and November 2019, Respondent was counsel of record in 19 domestic-relations cases and admitted she deposited her client funds into her operating account rather than her client trust account. She also admitted that she did not regularly use her client trust account during the time period.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for one year with the suspension stayed on the conditions that she complete six hours of CLE in law-office management within 90 days of the Court's disciplinary order, in addition to the other requirements in Gov.Bar R. X, complete a one-year term of monitored probation focused on law-office management and maintenance of her client trust account, and refrain from further misconduct.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a),1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.4(a)(5), 1.4(b), 1.4(c), 1.16(d), 8.1(b), GBR V(9)(G)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (1)(prior discipline), (3) (pattern of misconduct), (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	Yes
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Delay (2019); Mathewson (2017)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for neglecting four client matters and failing to cooperate in the ensuing disciplinary investigations.

PROCEDURE: Respondent initially received an interim default suspension because he did not answer the complaint or respond to the Court's show-cause order. After Respondent responded to a show-cause order the Court remanded the matter to the Board. The Board recommended an indefinite suspension. Neither party objected to the Board's recommendation.

FINDINGS: Respondent was retained by a client to file her grandmother's estate and prepare an agreement transferring her grandmother's home to a cousin. The client made repeated attempts to contact the Respondent for an update, but never received a reply. Respondent emailed two questions to the client relating to the estate and admitted that he had sufficient information to file the estate. After another round of unsuccessful attempts to reach Respondent, the client requested that unless he filed an estate within 30 days, that he return her documents and the initial $500 payment, and also communicated that she would file a grievance. Thirty-one days later Respondent informed the client that his license was suspended and offered to refund half of the payment to resolve the matter. The client later discovered that Respondent had been suspended several months earlier and had not informed her of that fact. Respondent failed to return her file because he could not locate the documents or the original will. He never filed the estate or refunded any portion of the fee. Respondent later failed to submit a formal response to the Relator's letter of inquiry. Respondent committed similar misconduct in three other client matters including failing to attend a citation hearing in an estate case and failing to communicate with the client in advance of the hearing; failing to file an important document in a client's bankruptcy case and failing to respond to the client's attempts to reach him; and failing to reasonably communicate with his clients in a civil case, failing to explain discovery filings and the consequences of a voluntary dismissal, and failing to return the clients' file.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent with no credit for time served. He was required to submit proof to Relator that he made restitution to two clients, proof of compliance with his OLAP contract, proof that he followed any treatment or counseling recommendations made by a qualified healthcare professional, and an opinion from a qualified health care professional that he is capable of returning to the competent, ethical, and professional practice of law.

Sanction	Indefinite suspension
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.5(b), 1.15(a), 1.15(c), 1.15(d), 1.16(d), 3.3(a)(1), 3.4(c), 8.4(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
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), (6)(other penalties/sanctions), (8)(other rehabilitation)
Criminal Conduct	Yes
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	Yes
Case Authority	Cohen (2015); Young (2004)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent received an indefinite suspension for misconduct stemming from his felony conviction for telecommunications fraud and his handling of six separate client matters.

PROCEDURE: The Board adopted the panel's recommended sanction with an exception concerning probation.

FINDINGS: In count one, Respondent represented a defendant in a felony domestic violence case and offered to make arrangements for the victim who served as his secretary, to leave town. Respondent told his client that he would coordinate her disappearance for a price. He later met with the client and during a recorded conversation requested $2,000 to make the arrangements. After the meeting, the police arrested Respondent. He plead guilty to telecommunications fraud and was sentenced to one year of community control. In a second count, Respondent was retained to clear a lien on real property. He did not deposit a retainer in his IOLTA, never explained the basis for his fees, and did not attend a mediation conference. In a third count, Respondent was retained to seek custody of children for a couple. While he filed a complaint on the husband's behalf, he did not respond to inquiries about the status. Another custody case was dismissed because it was filed in the wrong county. In a third custody case, a settlement was reached, but Respondent never memorialized the agreement in a court ordered entry. In a representation involving a divorce, Respondent deposited a check representing the 2015 joint marital income-tax refund in his IOLTA. Pursuant to the divorce decree, the refund was to be distributed between the former spouses, but Respondent did not do so before he closed his law practice. He later misappropriated the funds. In a final count, Respondent was hired to represent a husband in a divorce. Both parties agreed to the appointment of a GAL and a deposit was to be filed with the clerk of court. The client paid Respondent the remainder of his fee, and the deposit for the GAL. The funds were not placed in Respondent's IOLTA. He falsely stated to the court that the deposit had already been paid.

SANCTION: The Court indefinitely suspended Respondent with credit for time served. He was ordered to submit proof of restitution to one client, and proof that he had complied with his OLAP contract and treatment recommendations from a qualified mental-health professional. Judgment on probation is reserved until reinstatement Chief Justice O'Connor and Justices Fischer and Stewart would not grant credit for time served.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, six months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	No
Rules Violated	1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.4(c), 1.15(a), 8.4(b)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (4)(multiple offenses); **M-** (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	McCord (2016); Ames (2016)
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years, six-months stayed and credit for time served based on his multiple felony convictions and the mishandling of a client matter.

PROCEDURE: Respondent was reinstated from an interim felony suspension after his convictions were vacated on appeal. A hearing was held on a second amended complaint and Respondent admitted to five violations. The Board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction. No objections were filed.

FINDINGS: Respondent was a candidate for Mahoning County prosecutor and received a check for $15,000 from a contributor that he placed in his business account. He later paid a polling consultant the same amount of money. He later misrepresented the source of the $15,000 on his campaign-finance report as his in-kind contribution to the campaign. He later failed to report the contribution as income on his federal tax return. He was fined by the Ohio Elections Commission for violating campaign-finance law. In a separate matter Respondent was retained to pursue a personal-injury claim on behalf of a client and his minor son. The client agreed to accept $10,000 for his son but was unsatisfied with the offer for his own injuries. Respondent filed a complaint against the driver and his insurer. When the check for the minor son was issued, Respondent placed it in his IOLTA, but he never applied to probate court for approval of a minor settlement. Respondent later transferred the client's file to another lawyer. After Respondent's IOLTA was closed by the bank, a check for $4,553.70 was issued, less than the amount he was supposed to hold in trust for the client's son. Respondent later sent his client two cashiers' checks in the amount of $10,931.28.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, with a credit of 18 months for time served under the 2016 interim suspension, the final six months stayed on conditions: assessment by OLAP for chemical-dependency within 90 days of the Court's order, completion of a one-year period of monitored probation focused on law-office practices, including management of his client trust account and Prof.Cond.R. 1.4(c), compliance with any recommendation from an OLAP evaluation, completion of six hours of CLE related to client-trust-account and law-office management in addition to the requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and engage in no further misconduct.

Sanction	Two-year suspension, six months stayed
Court Modified Sanction	Yes
Rules Violated	1.2(e), 3.1, 3.3(a)(1), 3.5(a)(6), 4.1(a), 4.4(a), 8.4(c), 8.4(d)
Aggravation/ Mitigation	**A-** (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)
Criminal Conduct	No
Public Official	No
Procedure/Process Issues	No
Prior Discipline	No
Case Authority	
Cited By	

OVERVIEW: Respondent was suspended for two years with six months stayed for multiple rule violations based on false statements he made regarding a magistrate and sending threatening letters to two witnesses whom he intended to call at his disciplinary proceeding.

PROCEDURE: The panel report dismissed many of the alleged rule violations, dismissed others, and recommended a two-year suspension with one year stayed. The board adopted the panel's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction.

FINDINGS: Respondent represented maternal grandparents in an effort to obtain custody of minor grandchildren. A family member, Dowe, sought to intervene and was awarded temporary custody. During the litigation, Respondent made false and threatening statements in his written communications. He accused Dowe of kidnapping the children by lying to his clients. Respondent later told Dowe, a nurse, that he contemplated reporting her alleged misconduct to the Ohio Board of Nursing. He later wrote both the Michigan and Ohio nursing boards and urged them to investigate Dowe's mental condition and fitness to be a nurse. Respondent later objected to the magistrate's order regarding GAL fees and filed an affidavit of prejudice and bias against him. He declared a ruling by the magistrate "…was the most insane decision [he had] ever encountered in almost 40 years" and was not what "a normal, competent magistrate would have done." In addition, Respondent accused the magistrate of lying about communications with a caseworker and the GAL and described the magistrate's "incredible arrogance," "taunt, threats and lectures," and "vendetta" against him. In a second count, Respondent represented a seller of a home concerning a mortgage discovered after the execution of a land contract. Upon receiving a letter from an attorney on behalf the buyers that referenced a future lawsuit, Respondent replied in writing "I don't know who you think you are, but do not ever threaten me or doubt when I tell you something." When plaintiff's counsel withdrew, Respondent sent a note to the buyers stating that their counsel had lied to them and in a letter to new counsel stated that the plaintiff's wife was a "very ignorant troubled woman," "a liar," and "an idiot" and opined that the former counsel was a "mentally ill attorney advising an idiot." In a third count, Respondent sent threatening letters to potential witnesses scheduled to testify in the disciplinary hearing reminding them that they would be testifying under oath and to contact an attorney.

SANCTION: The Court suspended Respondent for two years, with six months stayed and required proof that he has submitted to an evaluation by OLAP and that he complied with any recommendations arising from that evaluation.

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)

Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

(2) (dishonest or selfish motive)

Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

(3) (pattern of misconduct)

Berling (5/12/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(4) (multiple offenses)

Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(5) (lack of cooperation)

Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

(6) (false or deceptive practices during investigation)

Blauvelt (6/17/2020)

Cramer (8/27/2020)

(7) (refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(8) (harm to vulnerable victim)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(9) (no restitution)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)

Mitigation (Gov. Bar R. V, Section 13(C))
(1) (no prior discipline)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(2) (no dishonest or selfish motive)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

(3) (restitution or rectified consequences)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

(4) (full and free disclosure)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)

Atway (5/7/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

(5) (good character)

Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

(6) (other penalties/ sanctions)

Atway (5/7/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

(7) (chemical/ mental illness)

Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

(8) (other rehabilitation)

Connors (6/18/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

Return to Table of Contents

Table of Cases Index

Code of Judicial Conduct Violations

Jud.Cond.R. 1.1 (compliance with the law)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Jud.Cond.R. 1.2 (promoting confidence in the judiciary)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Jud.Cond.R. 1.3 (avoiding abuse of the prestige of judicial office)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Jud.Cond.R. 2.1 (giving precedence to the duties of judicial office)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.2 (impartiality and fairness)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
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)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Jud.Cond.R. 2.8(C) (prohibiting a judge from commending or criticizing jurors for their verdict)

Jud.Cond.R. 2.9 (ex parte contacts and communications with others)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
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)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
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)
- Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
- Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
- Mahin (8/19/2020)

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)
- Bruce (1/16/2020)
- Yoder (10/6/2020)

Rule 1.3 (acting with reasonable diligence and promptness)
- Berling (5/12/2020)
- Brenner (1/22/2020)
- Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
- Bulson (5/21/2020)
- Corley (6/16/2020)
- Falconer (3/31/2020)
- Ford (3/19/2020)
- Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
- Haynes (4/23/2020)
- Sullivan (1/21/2020)
- Tinch (5/20/2020)
- Weir (6/17/2020)
- Wilson (5/27/2020)

Rule 1.4 (communication)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Rule 1.4(a)(1) (promptly informing the client of any circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent is required)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Rule 1.4(a)(2) (reasonably consulting with client about means to accomplish objectives)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Rule 1.4(a)(3) (keeping client reasonably informed about status of matter)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
Rule 1.4(a)(4) (complying as soon as practicable with client's reasonable requests for information)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
Rule 1.4(a)(5) (consulting with client about limitations when client expects unlawful assistance)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Rule 1.4(b) (explaining matters for clients to make informed decisions)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Rule 1.4(c) (informing clients if professional-liability insurance is terminated)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
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)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Rule 1.5(b) (communicating to the client the nature and scope of representation and the basis or rate of the fee and expenses)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Rule 1.5(c) (contingent fee agreement)

Rule 1.5(c)(1) (contingent fee agreement in writing signed by the client)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Rule 1.5(c)(2) (preparing closing statement in contingent fee matter)

Rule 1.5(d)(3) ("Earned upon Receipt" or "non-refundable" fee)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
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)

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)

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)

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

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)

Rule 1.8(a) (entering a business transaction with a

client)

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)
Buttars (4/21/2020)

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)

Rule 1.8(e) (provide financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation)

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)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)

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 1.15 (safekeeping funds and property)
Berling (5/12/2020)

Rule 1.15(a) (property of clients in an interest-bearing client trust account)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

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)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)

Rule 1.15(a)(3) (maintaining a record for each bank account)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)

Rule 1.15(a)(4) (maintaining bank statements, deposit slips, and cancelled checks)

Rule 1.15(a)(5) (performing and maintaining a monthly reconciliation)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)

Rule 1.15(b) (depositing own funds in client trust account for bank service charges)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)

Rule 1.15(c) (depositing unearned/ advanced fees into a trust account)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

Rule 1.15(d) (promptly delivering funds or property to client or third party)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

Rule 1.15(e) (improperly holding funds in dispute)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)

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)

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)

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)

Rule 1.16(c) (withdrawing from representation in a proceeding without leave of court if required)

Rule 1.16(d) (taking steps to protect a client's interest as part of termination of representation)
- Bulson (5/21/2020)
- Falconer (3/31/2020)
- Ford (3/19/2020)
- Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
- Sarver (12/2/2020)
- Tinch (5/20/2020)
- Weir (6/17/2020)
- Wilson (5/27/2020)

Rule 1.16(e) (promptly refunding fee paid in advance that is not earned)
- Bulson (5/21/2020)
- Falconer (3/31/2020)
- Tinch (5/20/2020)

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)
- Cramer (8/27/2020)
- Yoder (10/6/2020)

Rule 3.3(a)(knowingly make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal)
- Spinazze (3/11/2020)

Rule 3.3(a)(1) (knowingly make or fail to correct a false statement of fact to a tribunal)
- Buttars (4/21/2020)
- Cramer (8/27/2020)
- Doute (11/24/2020)
- Hoague (3/11/2020)
- Wilson (5/27/2020)
- Yoder (10/6/2020)

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)
- Mahin (8/19/2020)
- Sarver (12/2/2020)
- Piazza (2/25/2020)
- Wilson (5/27/2020)

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)
- Thomas (12/9/2020)

Rule 3.5(a)(5) (engage in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal)
- Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)

Rule 3.5(a)(6) (undignified or discourteous conduct that is degrading to a tribunal)
- Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
- Yoder (10/6/2020)

Rule 4.1 (truthfulness in statements to others)

Rule 4.1(a) (making false statement to third person during representation)

Yoder (10/6/2020)
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)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
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)
Yoder (10/6/2020)
Rule 5.1(c)(managing lawyer is responsible for another's violation if managing lawyer orders or ratifies the conduct)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
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)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Rule 5.3(b) (supervisory lawyer must make reasonable efforts to ensure conduct is compatible with professional obligations)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Rule 5.3(c) (lawyer with direct supervisory responsibility for professional conduct rule violation of nonlawyer)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Rule 5.4(a) (prohibiting lawyer from sharing legal fees with a nonlawyer)

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)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
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)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
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)

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)
Bahan (2/12/2020)
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)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Rule 8.1(b) (failing to disclose fact or failing to respond to demand for information from a disciplinary authority)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Rule 8.2 (judicial officials)

Rule 8.2(a) (false or reckless statements concerning the integrity of a judicial officer)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
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)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

Rule 8.4(c) (conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

Rule 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

Rule 8.4(h) (conduct adversely reflecting on lawyer's fitness to practice)
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)

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)
Ford (3/19/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

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(23)(A)

Gov. Bar R. V(23)(C)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
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)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
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
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

CLE Suspension

Board Discipline
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Sarver (12/2/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

Other

Return to Table of Contents

Public Employee Discipline

Judges/ Former Judges/ Magistrates
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)

Public Officials/ Former Public Officials
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)

Return to Table of Contents

Criminal Conduct

Felony Conduct
Atway (5/7/2020)
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)

George (5/13/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)

Misdemeanor Conduct
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)

Treatment in Lieu of Conviction
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Return to Table of Contents

Disciplinary Procedural Issues

Aggravation/ Mitigation

Consent-to-Discipline
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)

Default Proceeding

Mental Health Suspension

Sanction Increase/ Decrease
Adelstein (5/21/2020)(-)
Amaddio &Wargo (1/22/2020) (+)
Bachman (12/18/2020)(+)
Bahan (2/12/2020) (-)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020) (-)
Fortado (2/18/2020)(-)
Hoague (3/11/2020)(+)
Reinheimer (8/6/2020)(-)
Yoder (10/6/2020)(+)

Other

Remanded by Court
Armengau (4/14/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)

Return to Table of Contents

Sanction

Court Dismissal on Merits
Reinheimer (8/6/2020)

Disbarment
Sarver (12/2/2020)

Indefinite Suspension
Buttars (4/21/2020)
Connors (6/18/2020)
Cramer (8/27/2020)
Ford (3/19/2020)
George (5/13/2020)
Schwarz (4/22/2020)
Tinch (5/20/2020)
Weir (6/17/2020)
Wilson (5/27/2020)

Public Reprimand
Bahan (2/12/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Doherty (4/14/2020)
Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Gonzalez (6/11/2020)
Hawkins (8/12/2020)
Mostov (8/4/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Thomas (12/9/2020)

Term Suspension
Adelstein (5/21/2020)
Amaddio & Wargo (1/22/2020)
Atway (5/7/2020)
Bachman (12/18/2020)
Bailey & Bailey (7/16/2020)
Berling (5/12/2020)
Blauvelt (6/17/2020)
Brenner (1/22/2020)
Bruce (1/16/2020)
Brueggeman (4/23/2020)
Bulson (5/21/2020)
Christenen (8/12/2020)
Christensen & Kluesener (1/23/2020)
Corley (6/16/2020)
Corner (3/18/2020)
Doute (11/24/2020)
Falconer (3/31/2020)
Fortado (2/18/2020)

Gibbons & Jenkins (5/26/2020)
Goulding (9/29/2020)
Haynes (4/23/2020)
Hoague (3/11/2020)
Mahin (8/19/2020)
Marsh (8/4/2020)
Piazza (2/25/2020)
Porzio (4/23/2020)
Rauzan & Wagner (2/6/2020)
Riddle (10/22/2020)
Spinazze (3/11/2020)
Sullivan (1/21/2020)
Turner (8/13/2020)
Yavorcik (1/21/2020)
Yoder (10/6/2020)

Return to Table of Contents

Ohio Board of Professional Conduct
65 South Front Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-3431