

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

MONDAY

September 18, 1995

MOTION DOCKET

95-1142. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Doerger.

On September 6, 1995, respondent filed a document titled "Mandamus/ Procedendo of Order Issued to Thomas J. Moyer in the Above-Referenced Case". To the extent that respondent's document seeks a writ of mandamus and/or procedendo, the document does not meet the requirements for filing an original action pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. X. To the extent that respondent's document seeks reconsideration of this court's decision of August 2, 1995, the request for reconsideration is untimely under S.Ct.Prac.R. XI(1)(A). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, effective September 15, 1995 that respondent's document titled "Mandamus/Procedendo of Order Issued by Thomas J. Moyer in the Above-Referenced Case" be, and hereby is, stricken.

95-1679. State ex rel. Ricchiuto v. Reagan.

In Mandamus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus regarding an expedited election matter. Upon consideration of respondents' motion for leave to file reply memorandum in support of respondents' motion to dismiss,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion for leave to file reply memorandum in support of respondents' motion to dismiss be, and hereby is, denied, effective September 15, 1995.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

95-1617. Abood v. Nemer.

Summit County, No. 16877. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and cross-appeals and as a claimed appeal of right. It appears from the records of this court that appellees/cross-appellants, Ray R. Nemer and Melia Corporation, has not filed a memorandum in response/memoranda in support of their cross-appeals, due September 7, 1995, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore have failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the cross-appeals be, and hereby are, dismissed, effective September 15, 1995.

MISCELLANEOUS DOCKET

1995 TERM

In re Report of the Commission :
on Continuing Legal Education : September 15, 1995

Gwendolyn Ruth Bowers :
(#0000901),
Respondent. : E N T R Y

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6) (A) (1) (b) and (A) (2) (d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1992-1993 reporting period.

On August 11, 1995, this court entered an order adopting the commission's recommendation related to the 1992-1993 reporting period and imposing a fee sanction upon the respondent.

On August 29, 1995, the commission filed a motion to vacate, requesting that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to the above-named respondent, be vacated. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, effective September 15, 1995, that the motion to vacate be, and the same is hereby, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to respondent, is hereby vacated and this cause is dismissed.

In re Report of the Commission : 1995 TERM
On Continuing Legal Education. :
: To wit: August 11, 1995

Phillip K. Cobb : O R D E R
(#0038448)
Respondent.

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6) ((A) (1) (b) and (A) (2) (d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1992-1993 reporting period.

Respondent has been granted corporate status under Gov.Bar R. VI. Section 4 of Gov.Bar R. VI provides that an attorney who is admitted to the practice of law in another state but not in Ohio and who is employed full-time by a nongovernmental Ohio employer may register for corporate status by filing a Certificate of Registration and paying the registration fee required under the rule. An attorney who is granted corporate status may perform legal services in Ohio solely for a nongovernmental employer, as long as the attorney is a full-time employee of that employer. The legal education requirements of Gov. Bar R. X apply to attorneys registered under Gov.Bar R. VI for corporate status.

The commission's report recommended imposition of a sanction against the respondent in the total amount of \$750 for noncompliance with Gov.Bar R. X in the 1992-1993 reporting period. Furthermore, the commission's report

recommended that the respondent be suspended from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(5)(A)(4) for failure to pay a previous court-ordered sanction for noncompliance in a previous reporting period in addition to noncompliance in the 1992-1993 reporting period. On March 24, 1995, this court issued to the respondent an order to show cause why the commission's recommendation should not be adopted and an order was so entered against the respondent. Respondent filed no objections to the commission's recommendation and this cause was considered by the court. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the recommendation of the commission is adopted and the corporate status granted to respondent pursuant to Gov.Bar R. VI(4)(A) is immediately revoked, effective August 11, 1995.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent immediately cease and desist from the practice of law in Ohio in any form, and respondent is hereby forbidden to provide legal services as an employee of a nongovernmental Ohio employer.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent is divested of each, any and all of the rights, privileges and prerogatives customarily accorded to an attorney registered in good standing for corporate status.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's name be stricken from the roll of registered attorneys maintained by this court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before September 11, 1995, respondent shall:

1. Notify respondent's employer of the revocation of respondent's registration in corporate status and consequent disqualification to provide legal services for the employer after the effective date of this order;
2. File with the Clerk of this court and the Disciplinary Counsel of the Supreme Court an affidavit showing compliance with this order and setting forth the address where the affiant may receive communications.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before September 11, 1995, respondent shall pay to the Commission on Continuing Legal Education, by certified check or money order, a sanction fee which is hereby imposed in the total amount of \$750.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, payment of the sanction fee notwithstanding, respondent shall comply with the requirements imposed by Gov.Bar R. X for the 1992-1993 reporting period. See CLE Reg. 503.4.

1995 TERM

In re Report of the Commission :
on Continuing Legal Education. :

September 15, 1995

Richard Gerard Convertino :
(#0041494),
Respondent. :

E N T R Y

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1992-1993 reporting period.

On August 11, 1995, this court entered an order adopting the commission's recommendation related to the 1992-1993 reporting period, imposing a fee sanction upon the respondent, and suspending the respondent from the practice of law.

On August 29, 1995, the commission filed a motion to vacate, requesting that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to the above-named respondent, be vacated. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, effective September 15, 1995, that the motion to vacate be, and the same is hereby, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to respondent, is hereby vacated and this cause is dismissed.

1995 TERM

In re Report of the Commission :
on Continuing Legal Education. :

September 15, 1995

Stuart Dobbie Eagleson :
(#0029266),
Respondent. :

E N T R Y

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1992-1993 reporting period.

On August 11, 1995, this court entered an order adopting the commission's recommendation related to the 1992-1993 reporting period and imposing a fee sanction upon the respondent.

On August 29, 1995, the commission filed a motion to vacate, requesting that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to the above-named respondent, be vacated. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to vacate be, and the same is hereby, granted, effective September 15, 1995.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the order of August 11, 1995, pertaining to respondent, is hereby vacated and this cause is dismissed.

In re Report of the Commission :
on Continuing Legal Education. :

1995 TERM

To wit:

September 15, 1995
Steven Anders Larson :
(#0034151), :
Respondent. :

ENTRY

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1992-1993 reporting period.

On August 11, 1995, this court adopted the recommendation of the commission, imposed a sanction fee upon the respondent, and suspended the respondent from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(B)(3), and

Gov.Bar R. X(5)(A)(4). The court further ordered that respondent shall not be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio until respondent complies with the requirements for reinstatement set forth in Gov.Bar R. X(7).

On September 8, 1995, the commission filed a recommendation pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(7)(B)(2), finding that the respondent has paid all fees assessed for noncompliance, has made up all deficiencies and is now in full compliance with all requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and recommending that the respondent be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, effective September 15, 1995, that the recommendation of the commission is adopted and respondent, Steven Anders Larson, is hereby reinstated to the practice of law.