

CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION v. GONZALEZ.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION v. STAFFORD.

[Cite as *Cuyahoga Cty. Bar Assn. v. Gonzalez*, 2000-Ohio-221.]

Attorneys at law—Misconduct—Public reprimand—While appearing in a professional capacity, engaging in undignified or discourteous conduct that is degrading to a tribunal.

(Nos. 00-412 and 00-413—Submitted April 26, 2000—Decided August 16, 2000.)

ON CERTIFIED REPORT by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court, No. 98-61.

{¶ 1} On April 2, 1999, relator, Cuyahoga County Bar Association, filed an amended complaint charging respondents Vincent Gonzalez, Attorney Registration No. 0008558, and Vincent Stafford, Attorney Registration No. 0059846, both of Cleveland, Ohio, with several violations of the Code of Professional Responsibility. Respondents answered, and the matter was heard by a panel of the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court (“board”).

{¶ 2} The board found that in January 1998, respondents appeared in the chambers of Magistrate Barbara Porzio for the purpose of negotiations before resuming trial on a domestic relations visitation schedule. During a heated discussion, respondent Gonzalez called respondent Stafford “a piece of shit,” and Stafford responded by calling Gonzalez “a total asshole.” These remarks and the demeanor of the respondents caused the magistrate to call for a court deputy. The respondents left the magistrate’s chambers and walked into the courtroom, where they stood chest to chest and continued to shout at each other.

{¶ 3} The panel concluded that by their conduct respondents violated DR 7-106(C)(6) (in appearing in a professional capacity, a lawyer shall not engage in

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

undignified or discourteous conduct which is degrading to a tribunal) and recommended that each respondent be publicly reprimanded. The board adopted the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the panel.

Howard A. Shulman and Lester S. Potash, for relator.

Wesley A. Dumas, for respondent Gonzalez.

Charles W. Kettlewell, for respondent Stafford.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 4} We adopt the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the board. Respondent Gonzalez and respondent Stafford are hereby publicly reprimanded. Costs of these proceedings are taxed equally to each respondent.

Judgment accordingly.

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER, COOK and LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., concur.