Office of Disciplinary Counsel ν . Mascio.

[Cite as Disciplinary Counsel v. Mascio, 2000-Ohio-341.]

Judges—Misconduct—Public reprimand—Failing to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities—Canon 4.

(No. 99-1865—Submitted December 1, 1999—Decided March 29, 2000.)

ON CERTIFIED REPORT by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and

Discipline of the Supreme Court, No. 98-71.

{¶ 1} On October 12, 1998, relator, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, filed a four-count complaint charging respondent, John J. Mascio of Steubenville, Ohio, Attorney Registration No. 0020112, with several violations of the Disciplinary Rules and the Code of Judicial Conduct for actions taken while respondent was a judge. Respondent answered, and the matter was referred for hearing to a panel of the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court ("board").

{¶ 2} Based on stipulated facts, the panel found that on July 1, 1994 and on July 3, 1997, respondent hosted pool parties at his residence. The invitations to the events were undignified, lacking in taste, and may have been offensive to many of the invitees.

{¶ 3} The panel concluded that respondent's conduct violated Canon 4 of the Code of Judicial Conduct (a judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities) and recommended that he be publicly reprimanded. The board adopted the findings, conclusion, and recommendation of the panel.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Jonathan E. Coughlan, Disciplinary Counsel, and Kenneth R. Donchatz, Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, for relator.

J. Craig Wright and Kirk A. Lindsey, for respondent.

Per Curiam.

 $\{\P\ 4\}$ We adopt the findings, conclusion, and recommendation of the board. Respondent is hereby publicly reprimanded. Costs are taxed to respondent.

Judgment accordingly.

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

DOUGLAS, J., concurs in judgment only.

2