



FILED

JUL 10 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE BAR OF NEVADA

SOUTHERN NEVADA DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA

STATE BAR OF NEVADA,)
)
 Complainant,)
)
 vs.)
)
 THOMAS SHADDIX, ESQ.,)
 BAR NO. 7905,)
)
 Respondent.)

BY: *[Signature]*
OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

TO: Thomas Shaddix, Esq.
Bar No. 7905
3234 S. Eastern Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89169

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 ("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 it 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 website to relay information.

1 The Court forwarded the matter to the State Bar for review. A grievance file was
2 opened and you thereafter failed to timely respond, resulting in the matter going to a
3 Screening Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board without a response from you.

4 When you did respond, you informed the State Bar that the underlying matter was
5 caused by communication problems in your intake process. Specifically, a family member of
6 the actual defendant spoke to your intake staff about potential representation but never came
7 back. Neither did the actual defendant contact your office. Out of an abundance of caution
8 you sent the notice letter regarding the arraignment date to Mr. Rodriguez directly. However,
9 because of the uncertainty of the contact information you had from intake, you included the
10 requisite advertising disclaimers.

11 Unfortunately, your staff prepared the letter with an address for the wrong Alejandro
12 Rodriquez.

13 You admit to being dilatory in responding to the State Bar, necessitating the initiation
14 of formal disciplinary proceedings. You also stated you fully understand the stress and
15 inconvenience this error caused Mr. Rodriquez and have audited your intake process to
16 ensure this does not happen again.

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

20 Furthermore, any future knowing failures to respond to the State Bar resulting in a file
21 going to a Screening Panel without a response will result in the State Bar's recommendations
22 for a Formal Hearing and your suspension, irrespective of the underlying allegations.

23
24
25