

Oregon  State Bar

2021

**Disciplinary
Counsel's Office**

Annual Report

March 2022

Courtney C. Dippel
Disciplinary Counsel

Page left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	STATE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY BOARD (SPRB)	1
III.	SYSTEM OVERVIEW.....	2
	A. Complaints Received	2
	B. Interim Suspension Proceedings.....	3
	C. SPRB	4
	D. Formal Proceedings	5
	E. Dispositions Short of Trial	6
	F. Appellate Review.....	6
	G. Contested Admissions/Contested Reinstatements.....	7
IV.	DISPOSITIONS.....	7
V.	SUMMARY OF CASELOAD	8
VI.	STAFFING/FUNDING.....	9
	Disciplinary Counsel	9
VII.	OTHER DEVELOPMENTS	9
	A. Continuing Legal Education Programs	9
	B. Changes in DCO Rules and Procedures	9
	C. Technology Improvements	10
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	10
	APPENDICES	11
	APPENDIX A - 2021.....	12
	APPENDIX B - 2020	13
	APPENDIX C.....	14
	APPENDIX D.....	18

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the Annual Report of the Oregon State Bar Disciplinary Counsel's Office for 2021. The report and evaluation provides an overview of Oregon's lawyer discipline system, an analysis of the caseload within the system, along with the dispositions in 2021, and a discussion of significant developments over the last year.

Disciplinary Counsel's Office performs many of the Bar's core regulatory functions. Its primary goal is to administer an objective, efficient, consistent, and cost-effective system for the regulation of lawyers in order to serve the public interest, and promote public and member confidence in our regulatory system.

II. STATE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY BOARD (SPRB)

Disciplinary Counsel's Office's principal responsibility is to serve as counsel to the State Professional Responsibility Board (SPRB), the body to which the investigative and prosecutorial functions within the discipline system are delegated by statute. The SPRB seeks to enforce the disciplinary rules in the Rules of Professional Conduct (the RPCs), while operating within the procedural framework of the Bar Rules of Procedure (the BRs). The SPRB is a ten-member board of unpaid volunteers, consisting of one lawyer each from Board of Governors (BOG) Regions 1 through 4, 6, and 7, two lawyers from Region 5, and two public members.

The SPRB met eight times in 2021 and considered approximately 131 case specific agenda items during the year. This does not include any policy matters the board also considered.

The Bar was fortunate to have the following individuals on the SPRB in 2021:

- Todd Grover (Bend) – Chairperson
- Harry Auerbach (Portland)
- Joel Benton (Medford)
- David Carlson (Salem)
- Mary Moffitt (Portland) – Public Member
- Zena Polly (Lake Oswego) – Public Member
- Joshua Ross (Portland)
- Erin Fennerty (Eugene) (through September)
- Thanh Tran (Clackamas)
- Lauren Walchli (Hillsboro)

The terms of Todd Grover, Zena Polly, and Joel Benton expired at the end of 2021. Additionally, Erin Fennerty left the board in September following her appointment to the Lane County Circuit Court. The new appointments for 2022 are Jino Hwang (Eugene), Megan Burgess (Bend), Matthew Rowan (Medford), and Lillian Erwin (Portland – Public Member). David Carlson is the SPRB Chairperson for 2022.

III. SYSTEM OVERVIEW

A. Complaints Received

The Bar's Client Assistance Office (CAO) handles the intake of all oral and written inquiries and complaints about lawyer conduct. Only when the CAO finds that there is sufficient evidence to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred is a matter referred to Disciplinary Counsel's Office for investigation. See BR 2.5.

The table below reflects the number of files opened by Disciplinary Counsel in recent years, including the 292 files opened in 2021.

Files Opened by Disciplinary Counsel					
Month	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
January	17	34	13	24	22
February	49	25	20	25	21
March	20	33	24	11	37
April	22	32	44	12	27
May	51	39	36	22	27
June	20	37	20	16	25
July	31	42	25	18	19
August	27	14	25	16	30
September	15	19	41	16	19
October	37	36	39	27	16
November	40	24	31	32	30
December	28	14	9	37	19
TOTAL	357	349	327	256	292

Of the 292 files opened in 2021, 223¹ were referrals from the Client Assistance Office and 47 were trust account overdraft notices from financial institutions that came directly to Disciplinary Counsel's Office. Disciplinary Counsel's Office opened up 27 new matters on its own initiative.

For 2021, statistical information regarding complainant type and complaint subject matter is found in Appendix A to this report. Similar information for 2020 is found in Appendix B for comparison purposes.

Every complaint Disciplinary Counsel's Office received in 2021, was acknowledged in writing by staff and analyzed and investigated to varying degrees depending on the nature of the allegations. As warranted, staff corresponded with the complainant and the responding attorney, and obtained

¹ This number differs from the 224 that Client Assistance Office reports in their Annual Report. A file originally referred to Disciplinary Counsel's Office in November 2021 was taken back and then referred back to Disciplinary Counsel's Office in January 2022.

relevant information from other sources, to develop a “record” upon which a decision on merit could be made.

If, after investigation, staff determined that probable cause did not exist to believe that misconduct had occurred, the matter was dismissed by Disciplinary Counsel. BR 2.6(b). In 2021, staff dismissed 128 new matters. Complainants have the right under the Rules of Procedure to contest or appeal a dismissal by Disciplinary Counsel staff. In those cases, the matters are submitted to the SPRB for review. The SPRB considered 35 such appeals in 2021 and affirmed the dismissals in all such cases.

When Disciplinary Counsel determined from an investigation that there may have been probable cause of misconduct by a lawyer, the matter was referred to the SPRB for review and action. Each matter was presented to the board by means of a grievance summary (factual review, ethics analysis, and recommendation) prepared by staff. Each file also was made available to the SPRB. In 2021, the SPRB reviewed 108 of these probable cause investigations. The following section describes that process of review in more detail.

B. Interim Suspension Proceedings

In any given year, Disciplinary Counsel’s Office receives several hundred new matters for investigation. With such a caseload, the department is responsible for prioritizing its work to best protect the public. At the outset of an investigation, Disciplinary Counsel’s Office identifies any lawyers who may pose a substantial risk of imminent harm by their continued practice of law, either due to evidence of affirmative misconduct (e.g. theft, conversion of client funds, practice abandonment), or because the lawyer has been adjudged to be incapacitated or appears to be suffering from some type of impairment that is precluding him/her/them from practicing law safely and competently.

In the first situation, Disciplinary Counsel moves for an immediate suspension of the lawyer’s license pending adjudication of the formal disciplinary charges. Such proceedings are heard by the Adjudicator on an accelerated schedule. In the second situation, Disciplinary Counsel petitions the Oregon Supreme Court for an order transferring the attorney to inactive membership status if there has been an adjudication of incapacity, or may petition the court to determine whether the lawyer is disabled from continuing to practice law due to a personality disorder, mental infirmity or illness, diminished capacity, or addition to drugs, narcotics, or intoxicants.

In 2021, Disciplinary Counsel filed one petition for a lawyer’s immediate suspension based on knowing conversion of client funds and the abandonment of an active litigation practice pursuant to BR 3.1. The Adjudicator suspended the lawyer in the interim while the Disciplinary Board considers the charges and the sanction to impose.

Disciplinary Counsel also filed one petition with the Oregon Supreme Court for an immediate transfer to involuntary inactive based on an adjudication of incapacity pursuant to BR 3.2. The court granted the petition.

Additionally, the department also prioritizes any other cases in which a lawyer may present a significant risk by his/her/their continued practice due to the seriousness of the allegations (e.g. felony criminal conduct, false statements to a tribunal or under oath), or based on the number of referrals from CAO. While an immediate suspension may not be warranted, staff quickly acts to expedite the investigation with the intent to refer the matter to the SPRB within three to six months from receipt. Disciplinary Counsel's Office did not receive any such referrals that warranted expedited investigation beyond the petitions referenced above.

C. SPRB

The SPRB acts as a grand jury in the disciplinary process, determining in each matter referred to it by Disciplinary Counsel whether probable cause of an ethics violation exists. Options available to the SPRB include dismissal if there is no probable cause of misconduct; referral of a matter back to Disciplinary Counsel for additional investigation; issuing a letter of admonition if a violation has occurred but is not of a serious nature; or authorizing a formal disciplinary proceeding in which allegations of professional misconduct are litigated. A lawyer who is offered a letter of admonition may reject the letter, in which case the Rules of Procedure require the matter to proceed to a formal disciplinary proceeding. Rejections are rare.

As an alternative to seeking authority from the SPRB to offer an attorney an admonition or to file a formal complaint, Disciplinary Counsel's Office has the option of offering an attorney to divert a grievance on the condition that the attorney enter into a diversion agreement through which the attorney agrees to participate in a remedial program. There are criteria for eligibility set forth in BR 2.10(b) related to the type of misconduct, the perceived causes of the misconduct, and the likelihood that a remedial program will prevent a recurrence. Prior to 2018, the SPRB approved all requests for lawyers to enter into diversion agreements. In 2021, three lawyers entered into such agreements with the Bar.

A lawyer who is notified that a formal disciplinary proceeding will be instituted against him, her, or they, may request that the SPRB reconsider that decision. Such a request must be supported by new evidence not previously available that would have clearly affected the board's decision, or legal authority not previously known to the SPRB which establishes that the decision to prosecute is incorrect.

In 2021, the SPRB made probable cause decisions on 108 matters investigated by Disciplinary Counsel staff. Action taken by the SPRB in recent years and in 2021 is summarized in the following table:

Actions taken by the SPRB					
Year	Pros.	Admon. Offered	Admon. Accepted	Dismissed	Diversion
2017	75	16	16	26	9
2018	133	35	35	34	N/A
2019	58	34	34	16	N/A
2020	29	17	17	7	N/A
2021	54	33	33	12	N/A

Fifty-four cases were authorized for prosecution, not necessarily the number of lawyers being prosecuted. One lawyer may be the subject of numerous complaints that are consolidated into one disciplinary proceeding.

D. Formal Proceedings

(1) Prosecution Function

After the SPRB authorizes formal proceedings in a given matter, attorneys in Disciplinary Counsel's Office draft and serve a formal complaint, and engage in appropriate discovery prior to trial.

Discovery methods in disciplinary proceedings are similar to those in civil litigation. Requests for admission, requests for production, and depositions are common. The Disciplinary Board Adjudicator, Mr. Mark Turner, resolves any discovery disputes.

Pre-hearing conferences to narrow the issues and to explore settlement are available at the request of either party. Upon request, the Adjudicator appoints a member of the Disciplinary Board to serve as the presiding member and conduct the conference.

(2) Adjudicative Function

The Adjudicator and two other members of the Disciplinary Board, appointed by the Supreme Court, sit in panels of three (two lawyers, one non-lawyer). The regional chairperson appoints the two other members to serve with the Adjudicator. The Adjudicator rules on all pretrial matters and is responsible for bringing each case to hearing within a specific time frame established by the rules.

After hearing, the panel is required to render its decision within 28 days (subject to time extensions), make findings of fact, conclusions of law, and arrive at a disposition. Panels rely on the ABA *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions* and Oregon case law in determining appropriate sanctions when misconduct has been found.

Ten disciplinary cases were tried in 2021, including six contested matters that were tried before the Disciplinary Board, while four matters went by default. Of the six contested matters, some were single-day hearings; while others

were multi-day hearings of between two to five days, and included numerous witnesses, expert witnesses, and exhibits.

E. Dispositions Short of Trial

Many of the disciplinary proceedings authorized by the SPRB are resolved short of trial with resignations or stipulations. A Form B resignation (resignation “under fire”) does not require an admission of ethics violations by a respondent but, because charges are either under investigation or are pending, is treated like a disbarment such that the lawyer is not eligible for reinstatement in the future under the current rules. Three lawyers submitted Form B resignations in 2021 that the court accepted, thereby eliminating the need for further prosecution in those cases. While a resignation ends an investigation or formal proceeding, it is often obtained only after a substantial amount of investigation, discovery, and trial preparation.

A significant number of cases are resolved by stipulations for discipline in which there is no dispute over material facts and both the Bar and the respondent lawyer agree on the violations committed and appropriate sanction. Stipulations must be approved by the SPRB or its chairperson on behalf of the Bar. Once that approval is obtained, judicial approval is required from the Disciplinary Board Adjudicator in cases where sanctions do not exceed a 6-month suspension, or from the Supreme Court for cases involving greater sanctions. Judicial approval is not always given, in which case the parties must negotiate further or proceed to trial.

In 2021, all 18 proposed stipulations were approved.

F. Appellate Review

The Supreme Court does not automatically review discipline cases in Oregon. Trial panel decisions, even those imposing disbarment, are final unless either the Bar or the respondent lawyer seeks Supreme Court review. Appellate review by the court is mandatory if requested by a party.

When there is an appeal, lawyers in Disciplinary Counsel’s Office prepare the record for submission to the court, draft and file the Bar’s briefs and present oral argument before the court. The SPRB decides for the Bar whether to seek Supreme Court review.

In 2021, the Supreme Court rendered four discipline opinions in contested cases, and found that the respondents had committed ethics violations in each matter. The court imposed sanctions ranging from a public reprimand to disbarment.

Regarding the disciplinary system overall, 32 disciplinary proceedings were concluded in 2021: four by a Supreme Court decision; seven by a final trial panel decision; four by reciprocal discipline order; 18 by stipulation; and three by Form B resignation.

G. Contested Admissions/Contested Reinstatements

Disciplinary Counsel's Office also represents the Board of Bar Examiners (BBX) in briefing and arguing before the Supreme Court those cases in which the BBX has made an adverse admissions recommendation regarding an applicant. The actual investigation and hearing in these cases are handled by the BBX under a procedure different from that applicable to lawyer discipline cases. In 2021, the court issued one opinion in a contested admissions matter and denied the applicant's admission to the Bar.

For reinstatement applicants who have had significant, prior disciplinary problems, Disciplinary Counsel initially makes a recommendation to the Bar's Chief Executive Officer regarding reinstatement. If the Chief Executive Officer cannot favorably recommend the applicant for reinstatement, the Chief Executive Officer refers the application to the Board of Governors. After review, the Board of Governors makes a recommendation to the Supreme Court. In cases when the board recommends against reinstatement of an applicant, the Supreme Court may refer the matter to the Disciplinary Board for a character and fitness hearing before a three member panel much like a lawyer discipline matter. Disciplinary Counsel's Office has the same responsibilities for prosecuting these contested cases as with disciplinary matters and handles the appeal of these cases before the Supreme Court. In 2021, the court referred one disciplinary reinstatement application to the Disciplinary Board for a character and fitness hearing.

IV. DISPOSITIONS

Attached as Appendix C is a list of disciplinary dispositions from 2021. The following table summarizes dispositions in recent years:

SANCTION TYPE	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Disbarment	3	4	4	3	1
Form B Resignation	8	7	4	7	3
Suspension	22	16	22	13	15
Suspension stayed/probation	4	18	14	2	2
Reprimand	11	16	24	9	11
Involuntary inactive Transfer	2	2	1	0	1
TOTAL Lawyer Sanctions	51	63	68	34	33
Dismissals after Admonition	1	1	2	1	1
Dismissed as moot	0	0	0	0	1
Diversion	11	13	5	3	3
Admonitions	21	37	34	17	33

As reflected in Appendix C, but not captured in the foregoing table, Disciplinary Counsel's Office obtained administrative suspensions of lawyers pursuant to BR 7.1 for lawyers' failure to respond to requests for information in 20 separate matters in 2021.

In conjunction with a stayed suspension or as a condition of admission or reinstatement, it is common for a period of probation to be imposed upon a lawyer. Disciplinary Counsel's Office was monitoring 20 lawyers on probation at the end of 2021, along with four lawyers in diversion. Most probations and diversions require some periodic reporting by the lawyer as well as active monitoring by a probation supervisor, typically another lawyer in the probationer's community.

The types of conduct for which a disciplinary sanction was imposed in 2021, or a Form B resignation was submitted, varied widely. The following table identifies the misconduct most often implicated in those proceedings that were concluded by decision, stipulation, order, or resignation in 2021:

Type of misconduct	% of cases in which type of misconduct was present
Neglect of legal matter	38%
Inadequate client communication	34%
Trust account violation	34%
Excessive or illegal fees	25%
Dishonesty or misrepresentation	25%
Failure to return property or funds	22%
Conduct prejudicial to justice	19%
Criminal conduct	19%
Conflicts of Interest	13%
Contact with a Represented Party	13%
Other	10%
Failure to respond to OSB	9%

V. SUMMARY OF CASELOAD

A summary of the pending caseload in Disciplinary Counsel's Office at the end of 2021 follows:

New complaints pending	223
Pending formal proceedings	48*
Probation/diversion matters	24
Contested admission/contested reinstatement matters	1
TOTAL	296

*Reflects no. of lawyers; no. of complaints is greater.

VI. STAFFING/FUNDING

In 2021, Disciplinary Counsel's Office employed 16 staff members, along with occasional temporary help. In addition to Disciplinary Counsel, there were seven staff lawyer positions. Support staff included one investigator, one office administrator/manager, one paralegal, and three legal assistants. The staff members for 2021 include:

Disciplinary Counsel

Courtney C. Dippel

Assistants Disciplinary Counsel

Angela W. Bennett
Eric J. Collins
Susan R. Cournoyer
Sam Leineweber
Stacy Owen
Rebecca M. Salwin
Veronica Rodriguez

Support Staff

Lynn Bey
Carrie Daugherty
Emily Dougherty
Karen Duncan
R. Lynn Haynes
Emily Schwartz

Disciplinary Counsel's Office is funded out of the Bar's general fund. Revenue is limited (roughly \$107,000 for 2021) and comes from cost bill collections, reinstatement fees, ethics school and trust account school.

Expenses for 2021 were approximately \$1,907,000 with an additional \$475,000 assessed as a support services (overhead) charge. Of the actual program expense, 95.5% consisted of salaries and benefits. An additional 3.3% of the expense budget went to out of pocket expenses for court reporters, witness fees, investigative expenses, and related items. Approximately 1.2% of the expense budget was spent on general and administrative expenses such as copying charges, postage, telephone, and staff travel expenses.

VII. OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

A. Continuing Legal Education Programs

Throughout 2021, Disciplinary Counsel staff participated in numerous CLE programs dealing with ethics and professional responsibility issues. Staff spoke to local bar associations, specialty bar organizations and general CLE audiences.

B. Changes in DCO Rules and Procedures

In 2021, the Supreme Court approved amendments to some of the Bar Rules of Procedure governing formal disciplinary proceedings to memorialize some of the changes approved and implemented pursuant to the Chief Justice's Order 20-009 to address issues identified in disciplinary matters during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- (1) Any pleading or document required to be served on the respondent, applicant, attorney, or the Bar may be served by email at the recipient's last designated email address on file with the Bar.
- (2) Filings with the Disciplinary Board Clerk may be filed by email to dbclerk@osbar.org.
- (3) Declaration may replace affidavits with the exception of Form B resignations.
- (4) The Adjudicator may order hearings or proceeding take place by videoconference.
- (5) Attorneys may designate a post office address in lieu of a business address but must be in county or state in which the lawyer is geographically located.

C. Technology Improvements

During 2021, Disciplinary Counsel's Office staff continued to participate in the refinement and testing of components of the department's document management system, Net Documents. The department continues to enhance, through currently available technology and software, the extent to which documentation is stored and transmitted electronically, in order to reduce paper and postage costs and render records more readily accessible through means other than a paper file, working with IDT to make incremental refinements in the disciplinary database.

- (1) Files are now made available to the SPRB through secure links in our document management system saving us the cost of mailing these files and not having access to them while in the possession of the board members.
- (2) Additional enhancements include the ability to create sets of documents for exhibits, research, trial preparation, and other investigative mechanisms within the document management system saving time and money copying documents and creating numerous notebooks.
- (3) Cabinet home pages give everyone in the department tools to better manage cases and access to research tools.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In 2021, the Oregon State Bar remained committed to maintaining a system of lawyer regulation that fairly but effectively enforces the disciplinary rules governing Oregon lawyers. Many dedicated individuals, both volunteers and staff, contributed significantly toward that goal throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney C. Dippel
Disciplinary Counsel

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - 2021

COMPLAINANT TYPE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Respondent (self-reported)	7	2.4%
Client	110	37.7%
Judge	10	3.4%
Opposing Counsel	31	10.6%
Opposing Party	40	13.7%
Third Party	30	10.3%
Unknown	0	0%
OSB	64	21.9%
TOTAL	292	100.0%
COMPLAINT SUBJECT MATTER		
Adoption	1	0.34%
Advertisement	0	0%
Arbitration	0	0%
Bankruptcy	3	1.03%
Business	5	1.71%
Civil dispute (general)	17	5.82%
Conservatorship	1	0.34%
Criminal	52	17.81%
Domestic Relations	41	14.04%
Estate Planning	1	0.34%
Guardianship	4	1.37%
Immigration	5	1.71%
Juvenile	5	1.71%
Labor Law	2	0.69%
Litigation (general)	27	9.25%
Land Use	1	0.34%
Other	36	12.33%
Paternity	0	0%
Personal injury	15	5.14%
Probate	19	6.51%
Real Estate	4	1.37%
Social Security	1	0.34%
Tenant/landlord	5	1.71%
Tax	1	0.34%
Trust Account Overdraft	42	14.38%
Workers Comp.	0	0%
Unknown	4	1.37%
TOTAL	292	100.0%

APPENDIX B - 2020

COMPLAINANT TYPE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Respondent (self-reported)	14	5.47%
Client	98	38.28%
Judge	9	3.52%
Opposing Counsel	13	5.08%
Opposing Party	25	9.77%
Third Party	39	15.23%
Unknown	2	0.78%
OSB	56	21.87%
TOTAL	256	100.0%
COMPLAINT SUBJECT MATTER		
Adoption	0	0%
Advertisement	2	0.78%
Arbitration	2	0.78%
Bankruptcy	3	1.17%
Business	10	3.91%
Civil dispute (general)	20	7.81%
Conservatorship	0	0%
Criminal	39	15.24%
Domestic Relations	29	11.33%
Estate Planning	2	0.78%
Guardianship	3	1.17%
Immigration	4	1.56%
Juvenile	8	3.13%
Labor Law	9	3.52%
Litigation (general)	14	5.47%
Land Use	2	0.78%
Other	39	15.24%
Paternity	0	0%
Personal injury	7	2.73%
Probate	2	0.78%
Real Estate	3	1.17%
Social Security	3	1.17%
Tenant/landlord	3	1.17%
Tax	0	0%
Trust Account Overdraft	48	18.75%
Workers Comp.	3	1.17%
Unknown	1	0.39%
TOTAL	256	100.0%

**OSB DISPOSITION LIST
2021**

Case No.	Case Name/Cite	Disposition	CC/Stip	SCT/ DB	Date of Action	Effective Date	RPCs ORS	Bulletin Summary
1	20-65 Douglas V. OSBORNE	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	1/19/2021	1/19/2021		NA
2	19-96 Richard F. ALWAY 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	CC	DB	12/22/2020	1/22/2021	1.4(a), 5.3(a) NG – 1.4(b)	April 2021
3	20-64 Joseph Raymond SANCHEZ 35 DB Rptr	1-year suspension	RD	DB	1/6/2021	2/6/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 5.3(a)	April 2021
4	19-94 Timothy Richard GASSNER 35 DB Rptr	180-day suspension, all stayed, 2-year probation	Stip	DB	2/24/2021	3/2/2021	1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(c), 5.3(a)	May 2021
5	19-64 Melissa Blythe JAFFE 35 DB Rptr	120-day suspension	Stip	DB	3/1/2021	3/31/2021	1.5(a), 1.5(c)(3), 1.8(a), 1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(c)	April 2021
6	20-59 David J. CELUCH 35 DB Rptr	60-day suspension	Stip	DB	3/4/2021	6/11/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.5(c)(3), 1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(c), 1.15-1(d)	June 2021
7	21-15 Kevin Elliott PARKS	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	3/10/2021	3/10/2021		NA
8	20-55 Gary R. LUISI 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	3/12/2021	3/12/2021	4.2	May 2021
9	21-16 Micah D. FARGEY	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	3/17/2021	3/17/2021		NA
10	21-31 Gregory S. HOOVER 35 DB Rptr	30-day suspension	RD	DB	3/30/2021	3/30/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b)	May 2021
11	21-17 Mark Austin CROSS	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	3/30/2021	3/30/2021		NA
12	21-32 William A. HENDERSON	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	4/21/2021	4/21/2021		NA
13	18-175 18-197 Erik GRAEFF SC S067639 35 DB Rptr	5-year suspension	CC	Sct	4/22/2021	4/22/2021	1.4(a), 1.4(b), 8.4(a)(2)	June 2021
14	21-23 Robert M. SNEE 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	4/29/2021	4/29/2021	1.15-1(d), 1.16(d)	June 2021
15	21-39 Jason P. MUNN	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	4/29/2021	4/29/2021		NA
16	21-36 Jia J. FENG	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	4/22/2021	4/22/2021		NA
17	21-37 Jia J. FENG	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	4/22/2021	4/22/2021		NA
18	21-13 Leila Louise HALE 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	RD	DB	3/30/2021	4/30/2021	1.5(a), 5.3(a), 5.3(b)	July 2021

OSB DISPOSITION LIST
2021

Case No.	Case Name/Cite	Disposition	CC/Stip	Sct/ DB	Date of Action	Effective Date	RPCs ORS	Bulletin Summary
19	21-01 Athul K. ACHARYA 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	RD	DB	4/7/2021	5/8/2021	8.4(a)(2)	July 2021
20	21-38 Micah D. FARGEY	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	5/12/2021	5/12/2021		NA
21	21-34 Lincoln NEHRING	Form B resignation	--	Sct	5/20/2021	5/20/2021	8.4(a)(2), 8.4(a)(3)	July 2021
22	21-46 Elizabeth LOHRKE	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	6/7/2021	6/7/2021		NA
23	21-47 Claudia A. CULLISON	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	6/14/2021	6/14/2021		NA
24	20-41 20-42 20-65 21-48 21-58 Douglas V. OSBORNE	BR 3.1 suspension	--	DB	6/16/2021	6/16/2021		NA
25	20-12 20-13 Lance R. CLARK 35 DB Rptr	180-day suspension, 90 days stayed, 2-year probation	Stip	DB	6/18/2021	7/18/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), 8.4(a)(3)	Aug/Sept 2021
26	21-42 Mark COLEMAN 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	6/29/2021	6/29/2021	1.3, 1.4(a)	Aug/Sept 2021
27	21-59 Micah D. FARGEY	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	6/30/2021	6/30/2021		NA
28	21-49 James BAKER	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	7/1/2021	7/1/2021		NA
29	20-21 Claud A. INGRAM SC S068627	Form B resignation	--	Sct	7/8/2021	7/8/2021	1.15-1(a), 8.4(a)(4)	NA
30	19-35 19-36 Nicole E. SCHAEFER 35 DB Rptr	Probation revoked- 60-day suspension imposed	CC	DB	7/14/2021	8/13/2021		NA
31	18-104 Brian CONRY SC S067502 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	CC	Sct	7/15/2021	7/15/2021	1.6(a)	November 2021
32	21-60 Katie H. HARAGUCHI	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	7/16/2021	7/16/2021		NA
33	21-61 Katie H. HARAGUCHI	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	7/16/2021	7/16/2021		NA

OSB DISPOSITION LIST
2021

Case No.	Case Name/Cite	Disposition	CC/Stip	Sct/ DB	Date of Action	Effective Date	RPCs ORS	Bulletin Summary
34	Andrew LONG SC S067095 35 DB Rptr	Disbarment	CC	Sct	7/29/2021	9/27/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), 1.5(a), 1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(c), 1.15-1(d), 1.16(d), 8.1(a)(2), 8.4(a)(2), 8.4(a)(3)	January 2022
35	Douglas V. OSBORNE SC S068657	Form B resignation	--	Sct	7/29/2021	7/29/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), 1.5(a), 1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(b), 1.15-1(c), 1.15-1(d), 1.16(a)(1), 1.16(d), 8.1(a)(1), 8.4(a)(2), 8.4(a)(3)	October 2021
36	Stewart B. MYERS	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	8/3/2021	8/3/2021		NA
37	Jessica Lee MOLLIGAN 35 DB Rptr	120-day suspension	Stip	DB	8/5/2021	10/4/2021	1.4(a), 1.15-1(a), 1.16(c), 1.16(d), 8.1(c)(4), 8.4(a)(4)	October 2021
38	Thomas O. CARTER 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	8/5/2021	8/5/2021	5.5(a), 9.160(1)	October 2021
39	Micah D. FARGEY	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	8/25/2021	8/25/2021		NA
40	Kevin Elliott PARKS 35 DB Rptr	240-day suspension	CC	DB	7/26/2021	8/26/2021 effective 9/25/2021	1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), 1.5(c)(3), 1.15-1(a), 1.15-1(c), 1.16(d), 8.1(a)(1)	December 2021
41	Elaine D. SMITH-KOOP 35 DB Rptr	Dismissed	CC	DB	7/29/2021	8/31/2021	NG – 1.7(a)(2)	October 2021
42	Vicki R. VERNON 35 DB Rptr	180-day suspension	Stip	DB	9/2/2021	12/31/2021	1.3	January 2022

OSB DISPOSITION LIST
2021

Case No.	Case Name/Cite	Disposition	CC/Stip	Sct/DB	Date of Action	Effective Date	RPCs ORS	Bulletin Summary
43	21-19 Lucinda R. GIORGETTI 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	9/2/2021	9/2/2021	4.2	December 2021
44	20-61 Michael S. STERNER 35 DB Rptr	60-day suspension	Stio	DB	9/15/2021	11/14/2021	1.1, 1.3, 8.4(a)(4)	November 2021
45	21-46 Elizabeth LOHRKE	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	9/15/2021	9/15/2021		NA
46	21-87 21-88 21-89 Micah D. FARGEY	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	10/4/2021	10/4/2021		NA
47	21-43 Adam KIMMEL 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	10/18/2021	10/18/2021	1.9(a)	December 2021
48	21-77 Louis Paul MARCANTI	BR 7.1 suspension	--	DB	10/27/2021	10/27/2021		NA
49	18-115 19-126 James D. HUFFMAN 35 DB Rptr	181-day suspension with formal reinstatement	Stip	DB	11/3/2021	2/1/2022	1.3, 1.6(a), 1.16(a)(1), 8.1(a)(2), 8.1(c), 8.4(a)(4)	X
50	20-60 Carolina SLYTHE 35 DB Rptr	30-day suspension	Stip	DB	11/3/2021	1/3/2022	1.3, 1.5(c)(3), 1.15-1(c), 1.15-1(d), 7.1	X
51	19-49 19-50 19-51 Donald R. SLAYTON 35 DB Rptr SC S068386	18-month suspension	CC	DB	2/18/2021 11/4/2021	1/3/2022	1.2(a), 1.3, 1.4(a), 1.6(a), 1.9(c)(1), 3.3(a)(1), 8.4(a)(4)	
52	21-81 Richard F. ALWAY 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	11/12/2021	11/12/2021	1.5(a), 4.2(a), 7.1, 7.5(a)	X
53	21-85 Brad LARSON 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	Stip	DB	11/17/2021	11/17/2021	1.15-1(e)	X
54	19-107 William Chika IGBOKWE 35 DB Rptr SC S069005	10-month suspension	Stip	Sct	11/24/2021	12/4/2021	1.16(c), 1.16(d), 3.3(a)(1), 8.4(a)(2), 8.4(a)(3)	January 2022
55	20-54 Walter J. LEDESMA 35 DB Rptr	30-day suspension	CC	DB	10/25/2021	11/25/2021 eff 12/25/2021	1.15-1(d), 1.16(d)	January 2022
56	19-101 John BASSETT 35 DB Rptr	Reprimand	CC	DB	10/25/2021	11/25/2021	1.8(a)	X
57	Kevin Richard KAUFFMAN SC S067932	Admission denied	CC	Sct	12/2/2021	12/2/2021		NA
58	21-98 Clayton H. MORRISON SC S069087	BR 3.2 transfer to inactive status	--	Sct	12/14/2021	12/14/2021		NA
59	19-93 Marlin D. ARD SC S068497	1-year suspension	CC	Sct	12/30/2021	2/28/2022	8.4(a)(4)	

APPENDIX D



