

1 Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Doan.

2 [Cite as *Disciplinary Counsel v. Doan* (1997), _____ Ohio St.3d _____.]

3 *Attorneys at law -- Kentucky attorney not registered in Ohio*
4 *preparing and signing deeds in Ohio as "attorney at law" and*
5 *notarizing documents indicating that notary "commission has*
6 *no expiration date" is engaged in the unauthorized practice of*
7 *law.*

8 (No. 96-1297 -- Submitted September 10, 1996 -- Decided January

9 15, 1997.

10 ON CERTIFIED REPORT by the Board of Commissioners on the

11 Unauthorized Practice of Law of the Supreme Court, No. UPL-95-2.

12 On July 31, 1995 the Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("relator") filed

13 a complaint charging David William Doan of Cold Spring, Kentucky

14 ("respondent"), with the unauthorized practice of law in Ohio. The parties

15 filed a stipulation with the Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized

16 Practice of Law of the Supreme Court of Ohio ("board"), agreeing that in

17 February 1992, when respondent was hired as in-house counsel by Blue

18 Chip Title Agency, Inc. of Cincinnati, he represented that he had applied to

19 practice law in Ohio. While employed at Blue Chip, respondent prepared

1 and signed deeds as “attorney at law” and notarized documents indicating
2 that his notary “commission has no expiration date.” He also used
3 stationery identifying himself as an “Attorney at Law” with an office in
4 Cincinnati and signed these letters as “David W. Doan, Attorney at Law.”
5 In early March 1992, Blue Chip terminated respondent after discovering
6 that although admitted to the bar in Kentucky, he had neither registered for
7 the Ohio bar examination nor asked for admission by reciprocity. In
8 December 1992, respondent was granted permission to resign from the
9 Kentucky Bar Association pursuant to an “indefinite suspension.”

10 The board accepted these stipulations and further found that
11 respondent had not been admitted to active practice, granted active status, or
12 registered to practice in Ohio. It also found that respondent had not
13 qualified as a notary whose commission has no expiration date under R.C.
14 147.03, since he was neither an attorney nor had he filed an appropriate
15 certificate with the Secretary of State. The board concluded that respondent
16 had engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and recommended that this
17 court issue an order prohibiting him from engaging in the unauthorized
18 practice of law in the future.

