DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL v. SMITH.

[Cite as Disciplinary Counsel v. Smith, 173 Ohio St.3d 1240, 2023-Ohio-3802.]

(No. 2021-0448—October 18, 2023—Decided October 20, 2023.)
ON APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT.

{¶ 1} This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing of an application for reinstatement by respondent, Samuel Ray Smith II, Attorney Registration No. 0076242, last known business address in Cleveland, Ohio.

 $\{\P\ 2\}$ The court coming now to consider its order of March 23, 2022, wherein the court, pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(12)(A)(3), suspended respondent from the practice of law for a period of two years, with the final six months stayed on conditions, finds that respondent has complied with that order and with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. V(24).

- {¶ 3} Therefore, it is ordered by this court that respondent is reinstated to the practice of law in the state of Ohio. It is further ordered that, consistent with the opinion rendered herein on March 23, 2022, respondent shall be required to work with a monitoring attorney designated by relator for a period of one year.
- $\{\P 4\}$ 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)(E)(1) and that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(17)(E)(2).
- {¶ 5} For earlier case, see *Disciplinary Counsel v. Smith*, 168 Ohio St.3d 196, 2022-Ohio-840, 197 N.E.3d 533.

KENNEDY, C.J., and FISCHER, DEWINE, DONNELLY, STEWART, BRUNNER, and DETERS, JJ., concur.