

# The Supreme Court of Ohio

---

## CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

January 31, 2013

[Cite as *01/31/2013 Case Announcements, 2013-Ohio-253.*]

---

## DISCIPLINARY CASES

**2008-1203. Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. v. McFaul.**

This cause came on for further consideration upon respondent's application to terminate probation.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that the application is denied. Respondent may reapply to terminate his probation at the end of the probationary period ordered by this court in its December 3, 2008 order.

**2009-2302. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Kellogg.**

On petition for reinstatement of Paul Joseph Kellogg, Attorney Registration No. 0062303. The petition is granted, and respondent is reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio.

**2011-2110. Cleveland Metro. Bar Assn. Certified Grievance Commt. v. Lemieux.**

This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing by respondent of a motion to redact order. Relator filed a memorandum in opposition to the motion.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered that respondent's motion is denied.

**2012-1886. Disciplinary Counsel v. Nicotera.**

On certified order of the Supreme Court of New York, Third Department Appellate Division, Thomas Charles Nicotera, Attorney Registration No. 0018903, is suspended from the practice of law in Ohio for a period of seven years.

**2012-2070. Disciplinary Counsel v. O'Malley.**

This cause is pending before the court upon the filing of a report by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline that recommends the court impose discipline against respondent. On January 8, 2013, respondent filed an objection to the court increasing recommended sanction and request for oral argument. On January 15, 2013, relator filed a motion to strike respondent's objection to the court increasing the recommended sanction and request for oral argument.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that relator's motion to strike respondent's objection to the court increasing the recommended sanction is granted. It is further ordered that respondent's request for oral argument is denied.