

CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION v. RUBINO.

[Cite as *Cuyahoga Cty. Bar Assn. v. Rubino*, 2000-Ohio-480.]

Attorneys at law—Misconduct—Public reprimand—Failure to cooperate in discipline investigation.

(No. 99-1560—Submitted October 12, 1999—Decided January 5, 2000.)

ON CERTIFIED REPORT by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court, No. 98-31.

{¶ 1} On June 8, 1998, relator, Cuyahoga County Bar Association, filed a complaint charging respondent, Corey J. Rubino of Cleveland, Ohio, Attorney Registration No. 0058480, with the violation of several Disciplinary Rules and with failure to cooperate in the investigation it conducted with respect to the violations.

{¶ 2} After respondent answered, the matter was submitted to a panel of the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court (“board”) on stipulations in which the relator withdrew the charges in the complaint and the respondent agreed that he had not fully cooperated in the attempted investigation of the complaint by the relator.

{¶ 3} Based upon the stipulations, the panel concluded that respondent violated Gov.Bar R. V(4)(G) (no attorney shall neglect or refuse to assist or testify in an investigation or hearing). The panel recommended that respondent receive a public reprimand. The board adopted the findings, conclusion, and recommendation of the panel.

Mary Ann Rini, Joan M. Litzow and John D. Sutula, for relator.

Carl C. Monastra, for respondent.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Per Curiam.

{¶ 4} We adopt the findings, conclusion, and recommendation of the board. An attorney is required to cooperate with a disciplinary investigation even when the subject of the investigation is himself. *Lake Cty. Bar Assn. v. Vala* (1998), 82 Ohio St.3d 57, 59, 693 N.E.2d 1083, 1084. Respondent is hereby publicly reprimanded. Costs are taxed to respondent.

Judgment accordingly.

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