		rieges Mary constitution of the second	AMIL WAS AND	Sections of the Contract of th	D
--	--	---	--	--	---

Case No. 06-167-2610

## STATE BAR OF NEVADA

SOUTHERN NEVADA DISCIPLINARY BOARD BAR OF NEVADA

STATE BAR OF NEVADA,

Complainant,

vs.

BRENT BLANCHARD, ESQ.,

Respondent.

## **PUBLIC REPRIMAND**

TO: BRENT BLANCHARD, ESQ.

Richard and Paula Salerno contracted in November 2004 for the installation of a wood-and-glass staircase in their Henderson home. The Salernos later claimed that the installation was not done properly. Specifically, a glass panel allegedly was damaged by a workman.

In October 2005, the Salernos hired you to sue the contractors and various related individuals. On January 5, 2006, you filed a lawsuit on the Salernos' behalf in Henderson Justice Court.

For several months during the attorney-client relationship, the Salernos experienced communication problems with you. Specifically, you periodically failed to promptly comply with the Salernos' reasonable requests for information about the status of their civil matter.

/// ///

2<del>4</del>  The Salernos eventually hired another attorney, who filed a substitution of attorney in October 2006. The civil case remains pending in Henderson Justice Court.

The State Bar initially sent you three letters (August 28, September 15 and October 9, 2006, the latter two (2) letters sent by certified mail with signed receipts returned to the Office of Bar Counsel) requesting his written response to the Salernos' grievance. The October 9, 2006, letter warned you that if you did not provide a response, a grievance file would be opened and this matter would be presented to a screening panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board with the assumption that the Salernos' allegations were true.

You did not provide a response. Accordingly, a grievance file was opened and you were so informed in a certified letter dated November 21, 2006. That letter, for which a signed receipt was returned to the State Bar, directed you to provide a response by December 1, 2006.

This disciplinary matter was scheduled to be presented on January 23, 2007, to a Screening Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board. When the screening agenda was prepared, you had not responded to the State Bar despite four (4) letters and a telephone message left on January 16, 2007, by an Assistant Bar Counsel. Therefore, the Office of Bar Counsel recommended that this matter proceed to a Formal Hearing.

Approximately three (3) hours before the January 23, 2007, screening hearing, You faxed a two-page letter that apologized for not responding in a timely matter. You claimed the delay was caused by medical problems involving your wife and a heavy workload. Because of the last-minute arrival of your letter, the State Bar requested that this matter be held until a subsequent screening.

///

Your correspondence of January 23, 2007, did not address the Salernos' original complaint. Accordingly, on January 26, 2007, the State Bar sent you a letter requesting that you provide a substantive description of your representation of the Salernos. You were directed to provide a response by February 9, 2007.

You, however, did not provide a response. Therefore, the State Bar sent a certified letter on April 9, 2007, to you directing you to provide a response by April 19, 2007. A signed receipt for the April 9, 2007, letter was returned to the State Bar.

When the instant grievance was presented on May 22, 2007, to a Screening Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board, you still had not provided a substantive response to the State Bar regarding the Salernos' grievance.

In light of the foregoing, you violated Supreme Court Rule ("SCR") 154/Rule of Professional Conduct ("RPC") 1.4 (Communication) and RPC 8.1(b) (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters) and are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED.

Dated this // day of October, 2007.

CHRISTOPHER LAURENT, ESQ.

Formal Hearing Panel Chair

Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board