

05/27/98

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

WEDNESDAY
May 27, 1998

DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

94-1375. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Wolosin.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-436. Columbus Bar Assn. v. Sterner.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-1433. Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Rea.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-1466. Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Droe.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-1966. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Hatfield.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-2428. Akron Bar Assn. v. Snyder.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

96-2480. Disciplinary Counsel v. Gatwood.

This matter is pending before the court upon the filing by the Clients' Security Fund of a motion for leave to file motion for order to show cause. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is, hereby, granted.

98-626. Disciplinary Counsel v. Lutchin.

On March 31, 1998, movant filed a motion for this court to issue an order requiring respondent to appear and show cause why respondent should not be held in contempt for failure to obey three different subpoenas duces tecum issued by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline.

IT IS ORDERED by this court that the motion be, and is hereby, granted to the extent that respondent show cause by filing a written response with the Clerk of this court on or before twenty days from the date of this order why he should not be found in contempt.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, sua sponte, that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, sua sponte, that service shall be deemed made on respondent by sending this order, and all other orders in this case, by certified mail to the most recent address respondent has given to the Attorney Registration Office.

98-664. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Adjustment Serv. Corp.

On April 7, 1998, movant filed a motion to show cause why respondent should not be punished for contempt for failure or refusal, without just cause or just excuse, to obey the commands of the court to appear in response to the subpoena duces tecum issued by the Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law and to produce the documents the production of which was ordered by the subpoena duces tecum. On April 17, 1998, respondent filed a response. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by this court that the motion be, and is hereby, granted to the extent that respondent show cause by filing a written response with the Clerk of this court on or before twenty days from the date of this order why respondent should not be punished for contempt.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, sua sponte, that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

98-666. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Fuqua.

On April 7, 1998, movant filed a motion to show cause why respondent should not be punished for contempt for failure or refusal, without just cause or just excuse, to obey the commands of the court to appear in response to the subpoena duces tecum issued by the Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law and to produce the documents the production of which was ordered by the subpoena duces tecum. On April 17, 1998, respondent filed a response. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by this court that the motion be, and is hereby, granted to the extent that respondent show cause by filing a written response with the Clerk of this court on or before twenty days from the date of this order why respondent should not be punished for contempt.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, sua sponte, that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

98-820. In re Resignation of Rucker.

On April 28, 1998, Andrew J. Rucker submitted an affidavit of resignation from the practice of law in Ohio. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED by the court that the affidavit of resignation is not accepted and disciplinary proceedings shall proceed.

Douglas, Resnick and Pfeifer, JJ., dissent and would accept the affidavit of resignation.