

bar counsel report

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

In re: Mehi Aholelei-Aonga
Bar No. 9743
Docket No.: 65029
Filed: September 24, 2014

ORDER OF SUSPENSION

Attorney suspended for five years, with conditions, for accepting two bankruptcy cases and failing to perform services and failing to respond to the state bar.

This is an automatic review, pursuant to SCR 105(3)(b), of a disciplinary board hearing panel's recommendation that attorney Mehi Aholelei-Aonga be suspended from the practice of law in Nevada for a period of five years, with conditions.

Aholelei-Aonga has been licensed in Nevada since 2006. In December 2008, she was placed on CLE suspension. She was reappointed to active status in March 2009. On June 22, 2011, she was placed on fee suspension, and in November 2011, she was again placed on CLE suspension. In addition, in December 2013, this court suspended Aholelei-Aonga for six months and one day, based on separate misconduct. *In re Discipline of Aholelei-Aonga*, Docket No. 61055 (Order of Suspension, December 6, 2013). That order stated that the ordered suspension would not commence until Aholelei-Aonga resolved her fee and CLE suspensions. *Id.* To date, Aholelei-Aonga remains suspended for failure to pay bar fees and for failure to meet CLE requirements. See SCR 98; SCR 213.

The instant recommendation for discipline arises from Aholelei-Aonga's acceptance of two clients in bankruptcy proceedings, and her subsequent failure to perform any services for either client, despite having received retainers that she did not return. She further failed to respond to repeated contacts from the State Bar of Nevada, seeking to investigate the grievances. Ultimately, on January 14, 2013, the state bar filed a formal complaint, alleging violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct, and a notice of intent to proceed by default. SCR 105. A disciplinary hearing panel was convened and a hearing was held on November 20, 2013. Aholelei-Aonga did not answer the complaint or attend the hearing.

The state bar alleged that Aholelei-Aonga agreed to represent Mr. and Mrs. Torres in a bankruptcy early in 2011. She advised them to take a class and get

a certificate before filing their petition. The Torreses took the class and paid Aholelei-Aonga a retainer of \$900. When they were finally able to set up a meeting with Aholelei-Aonga, she canceled one hour before the meeting and then failed to respond to numerous messages from the Torreses for months thereafter. The bankruptcy class certificates expired, and Aholelei-Aonga did not return the \$900.

In May 2011, Shirli Garcia paid Aholelei-Aonga a \$1,500 retainer for assistance with a bankruptcy. Aholelei-Aonga directed Garcia to take the class and get the certificate. Aholelei-Aonga told her she would contact Garcia as soon as she could set a court date. She also directed Garcia to take another class prior to the court date. Garcia was unable to contact Aholelei-Aonga after that. Garcia went to Aholelei-Aonga's office and was told Aholelei-Aonga had quit the premises and was not coming back. Aholelei-Aonga did not return Garcia's \$1,500.

The state bar also presented testimony from Laura Peters, a paralegal and investigator with the state bar, who testified regarding her efforts to contact and communicate with Aholelei-Aonga. Although most of the certified letters and notices were returned unclaimed, a copy of the complaint and designation of panel members, sent by the bar, via first class mail, appeared to have been received. Notice of the hearing, designation of witnesses and summary of evidence were sent to Aholelei-Aonga via certified mail, first class mail and to the private email address the state bar has on file.

The panel concluded that, although Aholelei-Aonga received notice and a copy of the complaint and her right to respond, notice of the intent to proceed by default, notice of the hearing and designation of witnesses, and the summary of evidence, she had not received a full 30-days' notice of the hearing date itself. SCR 105(2)(c). Accordingly, the panel delayed entering its findings of fact and conclusions of law, in order to give Aholelei-Aonga a further opportunity to respond. She did not do so.

The panel found that the allegations in the complaint were deemed admitted by Aholelei-Aonga's failure to respond. SCR 105(2). The allegations in both grievances specifically included violations of RPC 1.2 (Diligence), RPC 1.3 (Communication), RPC 1.5 (Fees), RPC 5.5 (Unauthorized practice of law), RPC 8.1(b) (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters) and SCR 98(12) (Suspension for Failure to Pay Fees).

The panel found as aggravating factors that Aholelei-Aonga had previously failed to pay fees and

maintain her CLE requirements, that she exhibited dishonest and selfish motives by retaining fees that had not been earned, that she committed multiple offenses and that she engaged in bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary process by intentionally failing to comply with Supreme Court Rules regarding discipline. SCR 102.5. The panel found no mitigating factors.

The panel recommended that Aholelei-Aonga be suspended for five years subject to the condition that Aholelei-Aonga:

1. Take and pass the Nevada Bar Exam, including the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination, prior to applying for reinstatement;
2. Make restitution to the Torreses and Garcia;
3. Demonstrate to bar counsel that she has notified all clients of her suspension within three days of the effective date of the suspension;
4. Place all of her clients with other counsel, conclude representation or, with the assistance of bar counsel, attempt to aid any clients in finding new counsel, within 15 days of the order of suspension; and
5. Pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings, pursuant to SCR 120.¹

Having reviewed the record, we approve the recommendation, and hereby order Aholelei-Aonga suspended for five years, subject to the above conditions. While the conditions of Aholelei-Aonga's suspension shall take effect immediately, Aholelei-Aonga's suspension term shall not commence until after Aholelei-Aonga resolves her bar fees and CLE suspensions. Accordingly, once Aholelei-Aonga resolves her bar fees and CLE suspensions, she shall begin serving a suspension term of five years, six months and one day. *See In re Discipline of Aholelei-Aonga*, Docket No. 61055 (Order of Suspension, December 6, 2013). Aholelei-Aonga and the State Bar of Nevada shall provide notice of this order, as required under SCR 115 and SCR 121.1. Bar Counsel must furnish this court with proof that notice has been served.

It is so ORDERED

In re: Joslyn LaMadrid
Bar No.: 9093
Docket Nos.: 61137, 62803
Filed: September 22, 2014

ORDER OF SUSPENSION

Attorney suspended for one year after converting client funds for own use, failure to communicate with clients and the State Bar of Nevada.

Docket No. 61137 is an automatic review, under SCR 105(3)(b), of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's findings that attorney Joslyn LaMadrid violated numerous Rules of Professional Conduct and its recommendation that she be suspended from the practice of law for one year. In Docket No. 62803, LaMadrid and counsel for the State Bar of Nevada jointly petitioned this court for an order transferring LaMadrid to disability inactive status.

On June 11, 2014, this court entered an order transferring LaMadrid to disability inactive status, SCT 117(3), and suspending disciplinary proceedings pending against her, including those in Docket No. 61137. SCR 117(2). Our order also directed LaMadrid to submit to an examination by a licensed medical expert, in order to determine her present capacity to practice law, and to file a report of the expert's findings by July 21, 2014.² To date, LaMadrid has failed to file such a report. In light of LaMadrid's failure to comply with our order to provide a recent examination of her capacity to practice law, we conclude that LaMadrid is not incapacitated from practicing law, and disciplinary proceedings against her, including the one in Docket NO. 61137, may resume. *See* SCR 117(3).³

The disciplinary proceedings against LaMadrid, in Docket No. 61137, arose when LaMadrid, who was working for a firm, accepted money and gifts directly from clients and did not deposit retainer funds into the firm's trust account. LaMadrid kept the funds for personal use, failed to perform requested legal services, and failed to communicate with clients and the state bar. Despite proper notice, LaMadrid did not appear at the hearing before disciplinary board hearing panel. The panel found that LaMadrid violated RPC 1.3 (Diligence), RPC 1.4 (Communication), RPC 1.15 (Safekeeping Property), RPC 8.1 (b) (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters) and RPC 8.4(c) (Misconduct). The panel recommended that LaMadrid be suspended from the practice of law for one year and be ordered to pay costs of the disciplinary proceedings.

continued on page 42

bar counsel report

The findings and recommendations of a disciplinary board hearing panel are persuasive; however, our automatic review of a panel recommending a suspension is conducted de novo, requiring the exercise of independent judgment by this court. SCR 105(3)(b); *In re Discipline of Stuhff*, 108 Nev. 629, 633, 837 P.2d 853, 855 (1992). Having reviewed the records of the disciplinary proceedings, we conclude that clear and convincing evidence supports the findings that LaMadrid violated RPC 1.3 (Diligence), RPC 1.4 (Communication), RPC 1.15 (Safekeeping Property), RPC 8.1(b) (Bar admission and disciplinary matters) and RPC 8.4 (c) (Misconduct). SCR 105(2)(f). We further conclude that the panel's recommended discipline is appropriately tailored to LaMadrid's misconduct. Accordingly, LaMadrid is hereby suspended from the practice of law for one year.⁴ In addition, LaMadrid shall pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings within 30 days of receipt of the state bar's bill of costs. See SCR 120.

LaMadrid and the state bar shall comply with the applicable provisions of SCR 115 and SCR 121.1.

It is so ORDERED.

In re: Curtis W. Cannon
Bar No.: 10535
Docket No.: 62540
Filed: September 24, 2014

ORDER OF TRANSFER TO DISABILITY INACTIVE STATUS AND REFERRAL FOR EXAMINATION BY QUALIFIED MEDICAL EXPERT

Attorney placed on disability inactive status and his disciplinary matters suspended. Attorney ordered to obtain a medical examination within 30 days of the date of the order.

Counsel for the State Bar of Nevada and attorney Curtis W. Cannon have jointly petitioned this court for an order transferring Cannon to disability inactive status.⁵ The parties have stipulated that Cannon is disabled under SCR 117, as the result of a major depressive disorder, and request that, in addition to transferring him to disability inactive status, any disciplinary matters pending against him be suspended.⁶

Having reviewed the joint petition and its attachments, we conclude that Cannon must be

transferred to disability inactive status, pending further determination by a qualified medical expert of Cannon's capacity to practice law.⁷ SCR 117(3). Accordingly, Curtis W. Cannon is transferred to disability inactive status until further order of this court. Any pending disciplinary proceedings against Cannon are suspended.

Within 30 days of the date of this order, Cannon shall submit to an examination by a Nevada-licensed medical expert (i.e., psychologist or psychiatrist) for determination of his current capacity to practice law. Within 40 days of the date of this order, Cannon's counsel shall file the medical expert's report in this court.

Pursuant to SCR 117(7), Cannon shall comply with SCR 115. The state bar shall affect notice of this order as required under SCR 121.1. Bar Counsel shall provide this court with proof that notice has been served.

In re: Matthew Peirce
Bar No.: 6449
Docket No.: 62091
Filed: September 24, 2014

ORDER OF REINSTATEMENT

Attorney reinstated to the practice of law, with conditions, following suspension and successfully retaking the bar examination.

This is a petition for reinstatement to the practice of law, pursuant to SCR 116, filed by suspended attorney Matthew Peirce. In 2006, this court suspended Peirce from the practice of law for a period of two years, by way of reciprocal discipline, stemming from discipline Peirce received from the United States Patent and Trademark Office. *In re Discipline of Peirce*, 122 Nev. 77, 128 P.3d 443 (2006); SCR 114. In 2012, Peirce filed, with the state bar, a petition for reinstatement, pursuant to SCR 116, and a hearing was held before a panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board. The panel issued its findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation, recommending that Peirce be reinstated to the practice of law, subject to conditions.

The panel concluded that Peirce had demonstrated, by clear convincing evidence, that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in law required for admission to practice law, and

that his resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar, to the administration of justice or to the public interest. The panel recommended that Peirce's petition be granted, subject to the condition that Peirce:

1. Take the Nevada State Bar Examination and provide proof of successful passage prior to reinstatement;
2. Complete six hours of additional CLE, on the subject of law office management, within one year of reinstatement;
3. Fully reimburse the state bar for the cost of the reinstatement proceedings and reimburse the Client Security Fund within one year of reinstatement; and
4. Obtain a mentor, selected by the state bar, to review his practice and report back to the state bar for one year after Peirce is reinstated.

SCR 116(2) requires that an attorney seeking reinstatement must:

Demonstrate[e] by clear and convincing evidence that he or she has the moral qualifications, competency, and learning in law required for admission to practice law in this state, and that his or her resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar, to the administration of justice, or to the public interest.

Additionally, SCR 116(5) provides that for an attorney who has been "continuously suspended for 5 years or more at the time a petition for reinstatement is filed, irrespective of the term of suspension initially imposed, successful completion of the examination for admission to practice shall be a mandatory condition of reinstatement."

Having reviewed the record, we conclude that clear and convincing evidence supports the panel's findings and conclusions. We therefore approve the panel's recommendation that the petition be granted subject to the above conditions.⁸ Additionally, we include the condition that Peirce take the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination, if he has not done so already, and provide proof of passage to the Office of Bar Counsel within one year of reinstatement.

It is so ORDERED.

SOUTHERN NEVADA DISCIPLINARY BOARD

In re: Thomas Shaddix
Bar No.: 7905
Case No.: SG11-1182
Filed: August 1, 2014

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Public Reprimand imposed on attorney who was referred to the State Bar of Nevada by Las Vegas Justice Court, after he failed to inform the proper client to appear in court on a traffic ticket.

TO: Thomas Shaddix, Esq.

You have a high-volume law practice, Traffic Defenders, with a focus on traffic tickets and related offenses. On or about June 11, 2011, an individual named Alejandro Rodriguez appeared in Justice Court in a misdemeanor arraignment case. The judge noted that the gentleman before the court appeared much older than the defendant's listed age and the court quickly determined this was the wrong Alejandro Rodriguez, wholly unrelated to the actual defendant.

Rodriguez, who speaks no English, advised the court, through an interpreter, that he showed up in court because he had receive a notice from your office, specifically a form letter, dated June 27, 2011, prominently labeled as a legal advertisement across the top.

The letter indicated, inter alia, that, "Public records show that you were recently charged for the above alleged criminal misdemeanor," and included the date and time of the arraignment. The format of the letter closely resembled the format used by the Justice Court's website to relay information.

The court forwarded the matter to the State Bar of Nevada for review. A grievance file was opened and you thereafter failed to timely respond, resulting in the matter going to a screening panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board, without a response from you.

When you did respond, you informed the state bar that the underlying matter was caused by communication problems in your intake process. Specifically, a family member of the actual defendant spoke to your intake staff about potential representation but never came back; neither did

bar counsel report

the actual defendant contact your office. Out of an abundance of caution, you sent the notice letter regarding the arraignment date to Rodriguez directly. However, because of the uncertainty of the contact information you had from intake, you included the requisite advertising disclaimers.

Unfortunately, your staff prepared the letter with an address for the wrong Alejandro Rodriguez.

You admit to being dilatory in responding to the state bar, necessitating the initiation of formal disciplinary proceedings. You also stated you fully understand the stress and inconvenience this error caused Rodriguez, and have audited your intake process to ensure this does not happen again.

The foregoing conduct violates Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC) 1.4 (Communication) and RPC 8.1(b) (Bar Disciplinary Matters: Responding to the State Bar), and you are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED.

Furthermore, any future knowing failures to respond to the state bar, resulting in a file going to a screening panel without a response, will result in the state bar's recommendation for a formal hearing and your suspension, irrespective of the underlying allegations.

In re: Ryan E. Alexander
Bar No.: 10845
Case No.: SG12-1679
Filed: August 28, 2014

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Attorney publicly reprimanded after client's case was dismissed.

TO: RYAN E. ALEXANDER, ESQ.

You were retained by Sharon Finger on November 9, 2009, to prosecute a medical malpractice case against dentist Dr. Afshin Arian for negligent dental treatment she received in 2009. Finger's records were examined by Dr. Robert S. McNamara, D.D.S., who authored a letter, dated July 5, 2010, indicating that Arian's work was negligent. You received this letter, along with McNamara's contact information, on July 19, 2010.

You stated that you contacted McNamara in July, stating he would need a formal NRS 41A.071 affidavit, and that one would be prepared for his signature and notarization. You also stated that McNamara agreed to provide this affidavit.

You stated that you attempted to contact McNamara in late August of 2010, and were advised he was on vacation, returning the second week in September. You stated that McNamara's office refused to contact him during his vacation.

You filed a complaint, on behalf of Finger against Arian, on September 7, 2010, alleging causes of action for:

1. Professional negligence - dental malpractice;
2. Negligence; and
3. Breach of contract.

The September 7, 2010, complaint did not contain an affidavit of merit, as required pursuant to NRS 41A.071, but did include the July 10, 2010 letter.

You did not receive McNamara's signed and notarized affidavit until November 18, 2010. A Motion to Dismiss was filed by counsel for Arian on January 13, 2011, based on your failure to comply with NRS 41A.071. The court granted Arian's Motion to Dismiss and Finger's case was dismissed.

On March 29, 2011, you refiled Finger's complaint, alleging causes of action for:

1. Professional negligence - dental malpractice;
2. Negligence; and
3. Breach of contract.

You attempted to file McNamara's affidavit of merit, as required pursuant to NRS 41A.071, with the complaint but the submission was rejected by the court for electronic formatting reasons. On April 4, 2011, you filed "exhibits" to the March 29, 2011 complaint, which consisted of an "Affidavit of Robert S. McNamara, D.D.S." in an electronic format accepted by the court.

A Motion to Dismiss was filed by counsel for Arian, based on your failure to comply with NRS 41A.071 and because the claim was barred by the Statute of Limitations pursuant to NRS 41A.097. The court granted the Motion to Dismiss, on the grounds that Finger's case was barred by the Statute of Limitations pursuant to NRS 41A.097.

In light of the foregoing, you violated Rule of Professional Conduct (RPC) 1.3 (Diligence) and RPC 1.4 (Communication) and are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED.

In re: Jonathan MacArthur, Esq.
Bar No.: 7072
Case No.: SG11-1381
Filed: August 27, 2014

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Attorney publicly reprimanded for failure to represent client, found in contempt of court, fined \$500, ordered to reimburse the district attorney's office for its time and expense, and removed as track attorney for that court.

TO: JONATHAN MACARTHUR

This Public Reprimand is issued pursuant to a Conditional Guilty Plea in Exchange for a Stated Form of Discipline. SCR 113.

On or about November 9, 2009, you were appointed to represent a client in a criminal matter, charging her with child abuse and neglect with serious bodily harm, in Eighth Judicial District Court, Case Number C-09-265163-1.

Trial was initially scheduled to begin October 4, 2010. At the calendar call, held on September 30, 2010, you advised the court that you were not ready to proceed and the trial was rescheduled for February 22, 2011.

Subsequently, at the state's request, the trial was rescheduled again for June 27, 2011. In the interim, a representative of the District Attorney offered a plea, which you understood would be left open until the June 23, 2011, calendar call.

The prosecutor who offered the plea in this matter retired and when you called, a few days prior to June 23, 2011, to accept the plea, the new prosecutor assigned to the case was unaware of the plea, found no notes in the file referencing it and would not agree to it.

Consequently, on June 23, 2011, you advised the court you were not ready to proceed and the trial was rescheduled, once again, for September 15, 2011.

At the fourth calendar call, held on September 15, 2011, you stated that you were ready to proceed but you and your client were unhappy the District Attorney was no longer offering the plea. Trial was set for September 19, 2011.

On September 16, 2011, you sent an email to the Deputy District Attorney assigned to this matter which stated, in relevant part:

I do not feel that your office has acted honorably, and I won't cooperate with the trial proceedings. I will not subpoena my witnesses, nor will I conduct any further preparations for trial, thus rendering myself ineffective. Should you choose to continue preparing for trial, that is your choice. If you choose to take the position that there are no outstanding offers, that of course, is also your choice. Just know that there won't be a trial.

On September 19, 2011, on the first day of the trial process, you admitted to presiding Judge Susan Johnson, that you had failed to file the Notice of Expert Witnesses and failed to subpoena at least three necessary expert witnesses. You also stated to the court that you were unable to contact your client and her cell phone was turned off.

The judge directed you to check other courtrooms to see if your client was there. You sent your secretary to check the courtrooms as directed, and she did not see the client, although she reported back that she was unable to physically enter Courtroom 15D as a trial was in session.

After about 30 minutes of looking, to no avail, you advised the court that your client was not in the other courtrooms and Johnson issued a bench warrant, vacated the trial, and excused the prospective jury panel.

Later in the day, at around 4:30 p.m., you called the judge to report that your client had been sitting in Courtroom 15D all afternoon, watching a medical malpractice trial. You requested that the bench warrant be quashed.

The judge denied the motion and directed that the trial would proceed the next day, on September 20, 2011.

Subsequently, at a bench conference the following day, you told the judge you "respectfully decline[d] to participate in the trial," understanding that the judge would take action against you.

On September 28, 2011, Johnson found you in contempt and issued an order wherein you were fined \$500, payable to the Clark County Law Library within 30 days, ordered to reimburse the District Attorney's office for its time and trial expenses, removed as counsel on the case and removed from the list of track attorneys for the court.

You filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition/Mandamus before the Nevada Supreme Court, seeking to have the contempt order overturned; it was denied on July 30, 2012. You thereafter fully complied with the contempt order and paid the related fine, costs and expenses directed therein.

The foregoing conduct violates Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1 (Competence), RPC 1.4 (Communication), RPC 3.4 (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel) and RPC 3.5 (Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal and Relations with the Jury), and you are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED. ■

continued on page 46

bar counsel report

1. The panel also recommended that, if reinstated, Aholelei-Aonga must enter into a mentoring agreement for one year with a state bar approved mentor submitting quarterly reports to the state bar, regarding Aholelei-Aonga's practice. While this condition appears reasonable, such a condition is more appropriately considered as part of a reinstatement proceeding, and we thus decline to impose it now.
2. Our order was sent to the address LaMadrid has on file with this court, which appears to be the same permanent mailing address LaMadrid has provided to the state bar pursuant to SCR 79(1)(a); *see also* SCR 79(3).
3. In light of our determination, we will take no further action on the petition in Docket No. 62803, and that matter is now closed.
4. We note that LaMadrid is currently suspended for failure to complete required continuing legal education (CLE) requirements. The suspension imposed in this order is separate from, and in addition to, LaMadrid's CLE suspension; the suspension imposed here shall not begin until LaMadrid has resolved her CLE suspension.
5. We note that Cannon has been suspended from the practice of law in Nevada since December 2012, for failure to complete required continuing legal education requirements. *See* SCR 205-215; *In re Application of Bd. of Continuing Legal Educ.*, Docket No. 61517 (Order Dismissing Petition as to Certain Respondent Attorneys and Granting Petition as to Certain Respondent Attorneys, December 28, 2012).
6. The petition indicates that Cannon is the subject of five open state bar grievance files; the only grievance described in the petition arose after a criminal complaint was filed against Cannon, for engaging in voluntary sexual conduct with a prisoner (who was Cannon's client), a felony in violation of NRS 212.187.
7. The evaluation supporting the petition was made almost two years ago and indicated that Cannon was continuing to receive treatment for his disability; thus, Cannon's disability may have been resolved, and a more recent examination of his competency is necessary for us to determine his current capacity to practice law and defend the disciplinary charges against him. *See* SCR 117(2).
8. The state bar filed a notice that Peirce took, and passed, the February 2014 Nevada State Bar Exam, thus Peirce has satisfied that condition.

DISCIPLINE KEY

Resignation with charges pending: SCR 98(5)(b)
Types of possible discipline listed generally: SCR 102
Attorneys convicted of crimes: SCR 111
Conditional guilty plea agreements (discipline by consent): SCR 113
Reciprocal discipline: SCR 114
Disbarred/Suspended attorneys: SCR 115
Reinstatement: SCR 116
Disability Inactive: SCR 117

Supreme Court Rules (SCRs):
www.leg.state.nv.us/CourtRules/SCR.html

DISBARMENT – License to practice revoked.

SUSPENSION – License suspended for a time certain, ineligible to practice. More than six months requires petition for reinstatement and court order.

DISABILITY INACTIVE – Ineligible to practice until further order of the court. In the interim, disciplinary proceedings held in abeyance.

INTERIM TEMPORARY SUSPENSION – Interim suspension based on showing of a substantial threat of serious harm to the public, in effect until further court order, usually after hearing.

RESIGNATION WITH CHARGES PENDING – Ineligible to practice. Requires Bar Counsel approval. Resignation is irrevocable, with readmission only possible upon application as a new admittee.

PUBLIC REPRIMAND – Misconduct found and public censure issued, including attorney's name and the underlying facts and charges. Published in *Nevada Lawyer* and made available to the press. Remains eligible to practice law.

LETTER OF REPRIMAND – Lowest level of discipline. Not published, but disclosed upon request under the new rules. November also include up to a \$1,000 fine and restitution. Remains eligible to practice.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUSPENSION – Attorneys November be administratively suspended for failure to pay bar fees (SCR 98(12)), and/or for failure to complete and report the required Continuing Legal Education hours (SCR 212). While these **are not disciplinary suspensions**, the attorney is **ineligible to practice law** until the deficiency is remedied and the procedures to transfer back to active status completed as set forth in the applicable rules.