

**DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL v. PEARSON.**

**[Cite as *Disciplinary Counsel v. Pearson*, 151 Ohio St.3d 1230,  
2016-Ohio-5723.]**

(No. 2016-1105—Submitted September 7, 2016—Decided September 9, 2016.)

ON CERTIFIED ORDER of the New Hampshire Supreme Court Professional  
Conduct Committee, Case Nos. 13-026 and 14-032.

---

{¶ 1} This cause is pending before the Supreme Court of Ohio in accordance with the reciprocal-discipline provisions of Gov.Bar R. V(20).

{¶ 2} On July 28, 2016, relator, disciplinary counsel, filed with this court a certified copy of an order of the New Hampshire Supreme Court Professional Conduct Committee entered May 4, 2016, in *Pearson v. Attorney Discipline Office*, case Nos. 13-026 and 14-032, in which respondent, Michael Taylor Pearson, was suspended from the practice of law in New Hampshire for a period of six months, with the entire suspension stayed on conditions. On August 3, 2016, this court ordered respondent to show cause why identical or comparable discipline should not be imposed in this state. No objections to said final report were filed, and this cause was considered by the court.

{¶ 3} On consideration thereof, it is ordered and adjudged by this court that pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(20)(B), respondent, Michael Taylor Pearson, Attorney Registration No. 0061360, last known business address in Contoocook, New Hampshire, is suspended from the practice of law for a period of six months, with the entire suspension stayed provided that respondent complies with the conditions ordered by the New Hampshire Supreme Court Professional Conduct Committee. If respondent fails to comply with the conditions of the stay, the stay will be lifted and respondent shall serve the entire six-month suspension. It is

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

further ordered that respondent will not be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio until such time as respondent is reinstated to the practice of law in the state of New Hampshire.

{¶ 4} It is further ordered by the court that within 90 days of the date of this order, respondent shall reimburse any amounts that have been awarded against respondent by the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection pursuant to Gov.Bar R. VIII(7)(F). It is further ordered by the court that if after the date of this order, the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection awards any amount against respondent pursuant to Gov.Bar R. VIII(7)(F), respondent shall reimburse that amount to the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection within 90 days of the notice of that award.

{¶ 5} It is further ordered that until such time as respondent fully complies with this order, respondent shall keep the clerk and disciplinary counsel advised of any change of address where respondent may receive communications.

{¶ 6} It is further ordered 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. All case documents are subject to Sup.R. 44 through 47, which govern access to court records.

{¶ 7} It is further ordered that service shall be deemed made on respondent by sending this order, and all other orders in this case, to respondent's last known address.

{¶ 8} It is further ordered that the clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(17)(D)(1) and that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(17)(D)(2).

O'CONNOR, C.J., and PFEIFER, O'DONNELL, LANZINGER, KENNEDY, FRENCH, and O'NEILL, JJ., concur.