

New Hampshire Supreme Court
Professional Conduct Committee

Margaret H. Nelson, Chair
Benette Pizzimenti, Vice Chair
Toni M. Gray,* Vice Chair
David N. Cole
Thomas P. Connair
Alan J. Cronheim
Nancy R. Hacking*

4 Park Street, Suite 304
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
603-224-5828 ♦ Fax 228-9511

Gretchen Rule Hamel
James R. Martin
Richard B. McNamara
David N. Page*
Stephen B. Stepanek*
* non attorney member

Holly B. Fazzino, Admin. Coordinator

Salomon, Craig N. advs. Lisa Beaudry #02-127

**ORDER ON MOTION TO PERMIT WAIVER OF HEARINGS COMMITTEE PROCESS
and
PUBLIC CENSURE**

On April 19, 2005, Professional Conduct Committee considered the above-captioned matter. The matter was presented pursuant to NH Sup. Ct. R. 37(A)(111) by letter from Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel, dated April 4, 2005, Motion to Permit Waiver of Hearings Committee Process and Stipulation of Facts and Sanction.

Members present included: Margaret H. Nelson, Chair, Benette Pizzimenti, Vice Chair, Toni M. Gray, Vice Chair, Thomas C. Connair, Reporter, James R. Martin, Richard B. McNamara, Alan Cronheim, Stephen B. Stepanek, David N. Cole, Nancy R. Hacking, Gretchen Rule Hamel. David N. Page was absent from the meeting.

After deliberation, the Committee voted to grant Disciplinary Counsel's Motion to Permit Waiver of the Hearings Committee Process.

On May 17, 2005, the Professional Conduct Committee deliberated the above-captioned matter.

Members present included Margaret H. Nelson, Chair, Benette Pizzimenti, Vice Chair, Toni M. Gray, Vice Chair, David N. Cole, Alan Cronheim, Nancy R. Hacking, Gretchen Rule Hamel, James R. Martin, Richard B. McNamara, David N. Page, Stephen B. Stepanek. Thomas P. Connair was absent from the meeting.

I. FACTUAL FINDINGS

The Professional Conduct Committee determined that the record supports the Findings of Fact by clear and convincing evidence as outlined in the Stipulation of Facts and Sanction enclosed herewith and made part thereof.

II. RULINGS OF LAW

The attached Stipulation of Facts and Sanction, having been found by clear and convincing evidence, the Professional Conduct Committee concludes that there is clear and convincing evidence Craig N. Salomon violated the Rules of Professional Conduct: Rule 3.3(d): Failure to Inform Tribunal of Adverse Material Facts; Rule 8.4(a): Catch-all Rule.


III. SANCTION

Having made the above findings and rulings, the Professional Conduct Committee concludes that the appropriate discipline in this matter is a Public Censure. This sanction is in accord with the purposed of attorney discipline as described by the New Hampshire Supreme Court. *See, e.g., Feld's Case*, 149 N.H. 19, 28 (2002). This sanction is also in accord with the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (1991). *See, e.g., Shillen's Case* 149 N.H. 132, 139 (2003) (noting that although the Court has never formally adopted these Standards, the Court has considered them when imposing sanctions).

IV. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Professional Conduct Committee issued a Public Censure to Craig N. Salomon for violating N.H. Prof. Conduct Rules 3.3(d) and 8.4(a).

Date: 6/24/05

By: 
Margaret H. Nelson
Chair

c.c. Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel
Craig N. Salomon, Esquire
File

NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE

Salomon, Craig N.

advs.

Lisa Beaudry

#02-127

MOTION TO PERMIT
WAIVER OF HEARINGS COMMITTEE PROCESS

NOW COMES Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel, and respectfully requests that the Professional Conduct Committee permit all parties to waive the process before the Hearings Committee and seek a ruling from the Professional Conduct Committee in this matter.

In support, Disciplinary Counsel states as follows:

1. On February 22, 2005, Disciplinary Counsel issued a Notice of Charges in this matter. (A copy of the Notice of Charges is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.)
2. Disciplinary Counsel and Mr. Salomon have executed a "Stipulation of Facts and Sanction" dated March 29, 2005. (A copy of the "Stipulation of Facts and Sanction" is attached as Exhibit 2.)
3. In that "Stipulation of Facts and Sanction," Mr. Salomon conceded all allegations contained in the Notice of Charges and agreed that a

Public Censure was the appropriate sanction. Lisa Beaudry, the complainant, is in agreement with the recommended sanction.

4. On March 29, 2005, Disciplinary Counsel forwarded the “Stipulation of Facts and Sanction” to the Chairman of the Hearings Committee for the appointment of a hearing panel.
5. Shortly thereafter, Disciplinary Counsel discussed with Mr. Salomon and Ms. Beaudry the possibility of waiving the hearing before the Hearings Committee and seeking a more expeditious result directly from the Professional Conduct Committee.
6. Disciplinary Counsel finds support for the proposition that the parties can seek a waiver of the process before the Hearings Committee in the “Preface” to N.H. Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III). That Rule states: “As good cause appears and as justice may require, the professional conduct committee may waive the application of any rule under this section.”
7. After obtaining the consent and approval of all parties, Disciplinary Counsel filed a “Motion to Withdraw” her request for the appointment of a hearing panel. (A copy of the “Motion to Withdraw” is attached as Exhibit 3.)
8. On April 1, 2005, the Honorable Chairman of the Hearings Committee granted that “Motion to Withdraw.” (A copy of Chairman Varney’s Order is attached as Exhibit 4.)

9. Where, as is the case here, the Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel have entered into a stipulation on both facts and sanction, and the complainant is in agreement with the sanction, there is “good cause” to permit the parties to waive the Hearings Committee process and seek the Committee’s ruling on the pleadings.
10. All parties agree that this request is made in an effort to seek a more expeditious result while preserving scarce judicial resources.
11. In the event the Committee grants this request, all parties agree to waive oral argument before the Committee.


WHEREFORE, Disciplinary Counsel respectfully requests that this Honorable Committee:

- (A) Grant this “Motion To Permit Waiver Of Hearings Committee Process”;
- (B) Issue a Ruling on the basis of the Notice of Charges and “Stipulation of Facts and Sanction”; and
- (C) Grant such other relief as is fair and in the public interest.

Respectfully submitted,


New Hampshire Supreme Court
Attorney Discipline Office
4 Park Street, Suite 304
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 224-5828

Dated: April 4, 2005

By: 
Landya B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel

CERTIFICATION

I, Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel of the New Hampshire Supreme Court Attorney Discipline Office, certify that a copy aforesaid "Motion To Permit Waiver Of Hearings Committee Process" is being sent on this 4th day of April, 2005 to Craig N. Salomon, Esquire, Law Office of Craig N. Salomon, P.O. Box 427, North Hampton, New Hampshire 03862 and to Ms. Lisa Beaudry, 24 Bradstreet Road, Hampton, New Hampshire 03842 by regular mail postage prepaid.



Landya B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel

NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE OFFICE

Salomon, Craig N.

advs.

Lisa Beaudry

#02-127

NOTICE OF CHARGES

1. This Notice of Charges is issued pursuant to New Hampshire Supreme Court Rule 37A(III)(b)(2). In accordance with that Rule, this Notice of Charges sets forth both the allegations of misconduct against you, as well as the disciplinary rules alleged to have been violated.

Summary of Allegations

2. You represented Robert and Mary Lou Harrold ("the Harrolds") in an equity action they filed against Lisa M. Beaudry in Rockingham County Superior Court. The lawsuit involved a dispute between the Harrolds and Ms. Beaudry concerning activities in their condominium association.
3. Ms. Beaudry is the Complainant in this attorney discipline matter.
4. On October 18, 2000, the Rockingham County Superior Court (Abramson, J.) issued an Order awarding the Harrolds their reasonable

costs and attorney's fees for the litigation. The relevant section of the Order states:

In light of Beaudry's unreasonable, capricious and vexatious conduct, the Court ORDERS Beaudry to pay all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Harrold, the Association and the Commons after her January 24, 2000 representation.

(Emphasis in original).

5. On December 19, 2000, you wrote a letter to Lawrence Forsley, counsel for Ms. Beaudry. In relevant part, you wrote, "Please be advised that the Harrold's legal fees from January 25, 2000 to the date hereof are \$2,449.20. Please have your client remit this amount to my office in the form of a bank check payable to Robert and Mary Lou Harrold. . . ."
6. In the meantime, Ms. Beaudry appealed the award of attorney's fees to the Supreme Court. On January 4, 2002, the Supreme Court affirmed Judge Abramson's Order.
7. On January 16, 2002, Mr. Forsley sent you the following letter:

Dear Craig:

Referencing your letter dated December 19, 2000, enclosed please find our check in the amount of \$2449.20 as payment in full for the Harrolds' attorney's fees/costs in accordance with Judge Abramson's Order.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call.
8. The check to the Harrolds was cashed.

9. On July 2, 2002, you filed on behalf of the Harrolds a "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment" in the Hampton District Court. On that same date, the Hampton District Court (Frasier, J.) granted the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment" in the amount you had requested (\$10,000.00).
10. In the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment," you were required to certify facts sufficient to establish probable cause of your clients' "basic right to recovery and the amount" of the requested attachment. See RSA 511-A:8. The form petition which you used instructs the author to "specify facts in detail." You certified the following facts:

The Plaintiffs received an award of attorney fees from the Superior Court due to the bad faith of the Defendant; the Defendant appealed to the Supreme Court which upheld the Superior Court's Decision; that the Plaintiffs now seek to recover their costs and attorney fees for defending the Appeal to the Supreme Court.

11. In the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment," you neglected to mention the following facts, all of which were adverse to your clients' "basic right to recovery" and the amount specified:
 - a) The fact that, after Judge Abramson's Order, you had written a letter to Mr. Forsley requesting attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,449.20.
 - b) The fact that Ms. Beaudry paid that amount "in full" shortly after the Supreme Court affirmed Judge Abramson's Order.
 - c) The fact that you made no request for additional attorney's fees either in writing or by telephone before filing the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment."
 - d) The fact that you charged the Harrolds a flat fee of \$2,500.00 to handle the Supreme Court appeal.

12. Along with the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment," you also filed a Writ of Summons on July 2, 2002. That Writ of Summons is similarly lacking the aforementioned facts.

Alleged Disciplinary Rules Violated

13. Your conduct in this case raises questions under New Hampshire Rules of Professional Conduct **3.3(d) and 8.4(a)**.

**Rule 3.3(d): Failure to Inform Tribunal
of Adverse Material Facts**

14. Rule 3.3(d) states: In an *ex parte* proceeding, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer which will enable the tribunal to make an informed decision, whether or not the facts are adverse.
15. In filing the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment" in this case, you failed to include adverse material facts known to you, as listed in this Notice of Charges at paragraph 11.
16. These omitted facts were material because they could have influenced Judge Frasier either to deny your request for an attachment or to reduce the amount of your requested attachment.
17. If proven by clear and convincing evidence, your failure to inform the tribunal of the material facts listed in paragraph 11 of this Notice of Charges would constitute a violation of N.H. R. Prof. Conduct 3.3(d).

Rule 8.4(a): Catch-all Rule

18. In the event that any one of the above allegations is proven by clear and convincing evidence, this would necessarily constitute a violation of Rule 8.4(a).

Conclusion


19. You are advised that you must answer this Notice of Charges within 30 days of the date of your receipt of this Notice of Charges. See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(3)(A). Your answer must be in writing, must respond specifically to each allegation of this Notice of Charges, and must assert all affirmative defenses. See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(3)(B).
20. **In the event you fail to file an answer, the allegations set forth in this Notice of Charges “shall be deemed to be admitted.”** See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(3)(A).
21. It is the duty of Disciplinary Counsel to request that the chair of the Hearings Committee appoint a hearing panel in this matter either upon receiving an answer from you, or upon the expiration of the 30-day period for you to file an answer. See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(4).
22. You are advised that you have the right to be represented by counsel, and to testify and present evidence on your own behalf. See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(2).
23. This Notice of Charges and the file of Disciplinary Counsel (other than work product and internal memoranda of the Attorney Discipline Office) is now a public file. Further, the proceedings related to this Notice of

Charges that take place before the Hearings Committee and Professional Conduct Committee, as well as the written decisions (other than work product, internal memoranda, and deliberations) of both, shall be public. See Sup. Ct. R. 37(20)(b)(2).

24. Your attention is also directed to Supreme Court Rule 37A(III)(b)(5), which governs discovery in this matter, as well as subsection (6) of that Rule, which provides for a pre-hearing conference. In the absence of "good cause," such pre-hearing conference must be requested within 30 days of the appointment of a hearing panel in this matter. See Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III)(b)(6)(A).

New Hampshire Supreme Court
Attorney Discipline Office
4 Park Street, Suite 304
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 224-5828


Date: February 22, 2005

By: 


Landya B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel

CERTIFICATION

I, Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel of the New Hampshire Supreme Court Attorney Discipline Office, certify that the original of the aforesaid Notice of Charges is being sent on this 22nd day of February, 2005 to Craig N. Salomon, Esquire, Law Office of Craig N. Salomon, P.O. Box 427, North Hampton, New Hampshire 03862 by certified mail #7002 3150 0001 5385 5566, return receipt requested, and a copy to Mr. Salomon by regular mail postage prepaid.



Landya B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel



NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT

HEARINGS COMMITTEE

Salomon, Craig N.

advs.

Lisa Beaudry

#02-127

STIPULATION OF FACTS AND SANCTION

Disciplinary Counsel, Landya B. McCafferty, and Respondent, Craig N. Salomon, hereby submit this Stipulation in the above-referenced case.

I. Stipulation of Facts

Summary of Allegations

1. Craig N. Salomon represented Robert and Mary Lou Harrold (“the Harrolds”) in an equity action they filed against Lisa M. Beaudry in Rockingham County Superior Court. The lawsuit involved a dispute between the Harrolds and Ms. Beaudry concerning activities in their condominium association.
2. Ms. Beaudry is the Complainant in this attorney discipline matter.
3. On October 18, 2000, the Rockingham County Superior Court (Abramson, J.) issued an Order awarding the Harrolds their

reasonable costs and attorney's fees for the litigation. The relevant section of the Order states:

In light of Beaudry's unreasonable, capricious and vexatious conduct, the Court ORDERS Beaudry to pay all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Harrold, the Association and the Commons after her January 24, 2000 representation.

(Emphasis in original).

4. On December 19, 2000, Mr. Salomon wrote a letter to Lawrence Forsley, counsel for Ms. Beaudry. In relevant part, Mr. Salomon wrote, "Please be advised that the Harrold's legal fees from January 25, 2000 to the date hereof are \$2,449.20. Please have your client remit this amount to my office in the form of a bank check payable to Robert and Mary Lou Harrold. . . ."
5. In the meantime, Ms. Beaudry appealed the award of attorney's fees to the Supreme Court. On January 4, 2002, the Supreme Court affirmed Judge Abramson's Order.
6. On January 16, 2002, Mr. Forsley sent Mr. Salomon the following letter:

Dear Craig:

Referencing your letter dated December 19, 2000, enclosed please find our check in the amount of \$2449.20 as payment in full for the Harrolds' attorney's fees/costs in accordance with Judge Abramson's Order.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call.

7. The check to the Harrolds was cashed.
8. On July 2, 2002, Mr. Salomon filed on behalf of the Harrolds a "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment" in the Hampton District Court. On that same date, the Hampton District Court (Frasier, J.) granted the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment" in the amount Mr. Salomon had requested (\$10,000.00).
9. In the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment," Mr. Salomon was required to certify facts sufficient to establish probable cause of Mr. Salomon's clients' "basic right to recovery and the amount" of the requested attachment. See RSA 511-A:8. The form petition which Mr. Salomon used instructs the author to "specify facts in detail." Mr. Salomon certified the following facts:

The Plaintiffs received an award of attorney fees from the Superior Court due to the bad faith of the Defendant; the Defendant appealed to the Supreme Court which upheld the Superior Court's Decision; that the Plaintiffs now seek to recover their costs and attorney fees for defending the Appeal to the Supreme Court.

10. In the "Petition for Ex Parte Attachment," Mr. Salomon neglected to mention the following facts, all of which were adverse to Mr. Salomon's clients' "basic right to recovery" and the amount specified:
 - a) The fact that, after Judge Abramson's Order, you had written a letter to Mr. Forsley requesting attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,449.20.

- b) The fact that Ms. Beaudry paid that amount “in full” shortly after the Supreme Court affirmed Judge Abramson’s Order.
- c) The fact that you made no request for additional attorney’s fees either in writing or by telephone before filing the “Petition for Ex Parte Attachment.”
- d) The fact that you charged the Harrolds a flat fee of \$2,500.00 to handle the Supreme Court appeal.

11. Along with the “Petition for Ex Parte Attachment,” Mr. Salomon also filed a Writ of Summons on July 2, 2002. That Writ of Summons is similarly lacking the aforementioned facts.

II. Stipulation as to Rules Violated

Rule 3.3(d): Failure to Inform Tribunal of Adverse Material Facts

12. Rule 3.3(d) states: In an *ex parte* proceeding, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer which will enable the tribunal to make an informed decision, whether or not the facts are adverse.
13. In filing the “Petition for Ex Parte Attachment” in this case, Mr. Salomon failed to include adverse material facts known to him, as listed in this Notice of Charges at paragraph 10.
14. These omitted facts were material because they could have influenced Judge Frasier either to deny Mr. Salomon’s request for

an attachment or to reduce the amount of his requested attachment.

15. Mr. Salomon's failure to inform the tribunal of the material facts listed in paragraph 11 of this Notice of Charges would constitute clear and convincing evidence of a violation of N.H. R. Prof. Conduct 3.3(d).

Rule 8.4(a): Catch-all rule

16. Because there exists clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Salomon violated the above rule, there is necessarily clear and convincing evidence of a violation of N.H. R. Prof. Conduct 8.4(a).

III. Stipulation as to Sanction


17. Mr. Salomon and Disciplinary Counsel jointly recommend a Public Censure as the appropriate sanction in this matter. A Public Censure would be consistent with the purposes of attorney discipline, see Feld's Case, 149 N.H. 19, 28 (2002), and the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions § 6.13. See also Shillen's Case, 149 N.H. 132, 139 (2003) (noting that, although the Court has never formally adopted the ABA Standards, the Court has "considered them when imposing sanctions").
18. Mr. Salomon's only prior disciplinary history is a Warning dated March 25, 1998, a copy of which is attached to this Stipulation.

IV. Stipulation as to Costs

19. Mr. Salomon agrees to pay the expenses incurred by the Attorney Discipline Office in the investigation and prosecution of this matter.


Respectfully submitted

Dated: March 28, 2005



Craig N. Salomon, Esquire

Dated: March 29, 2005



Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel



The State of New Hampshire Supreme Court

*Professional Conduct Committee • 4 Park Street, Suite 304 • Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 224-5828*

March 25, 1998

Craig N. Salomon, Esquire
Salomon, Randlett & Bernard
750 Exeter Road
Hampton, New Hampshire 03842

Re: Salomon, Craig N. advs. Joseph Fiumara - #97-093

Dear Mr. Salomon:

The Professional Conduct Committee has recently made a thorough review of all of the information it has received as to the above entitled matter.

After discussion, deliberation and due consideration it has dismissed this matter with a finding of no professional misconduct on your part. However, the Committee warns you to follow the requirements of an escrow agreement to the letter and to secure written authorization where required.


The warning contained in this letter does not constitute discipline by this Committee. Pursuant to the provisions of § 2.8 of the Rules and Procedures of the Professional Conduct Committee, you may submit a written response to this letter and such response would be maintained with the file relative to this matter. Pursuant to provisions of §1.8 the fact that you have been issued this warning may, together with the basis of this warning, be considered in determining whether to impose discipline and the extent of discipline to be imposed, in the event that additional charges of misconduct are brought against you.

Joseph Fiumara is being advised of this disposition.

Sincerely,

Peter F. Kearns
Chairperson

PFK/bg



NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT
HEARINGS COMMITTEE

Salomon, Craig N.

advs.

Lisa Beaudry

#02-127

MOTION TO WITHDRAW

NOW COMES Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel, and respectfully requests that she be allowed to Withdraw her request for a hearing.

In support, undersigned counsel states as follows:

1. On March 29, 2005, Disciplinary Counsel hand-delivered to Ms. Fazzino, the Administrative Coordinator of the Hearings Committee, an original "Stipulation of Facts and Sanction" in this matter, with a cover letter requesting the appointment of a hearing panel.
2. Since yesterday's date, Disciplinary Counsel has spoken with Mr. Salomon and the complainant, Lisa Beaudry, about the possibility of waiving the hearing before the Hearings Committee and forwarding the "Stipulation of Facts and Sanction" directly to the Professional Conduct Committee for the Committee's ruling. Mr.

Salomon and Ms. Beaudry are in favor of waiving that process and sending the matter directly to the Professional Conduct Committee. All parties seek this result in order to achieve a more expeditious ruling and to spare limited judicial resources.

3. Disciplinary Counsel finds support for such a waiver pursuant to the "Preface" to N.H. Sup. Ct. R. 37A(III), which states: "As good cause appears and as justice may require, the professional conduct committee may waive the application of any rule under this section."
4. Accordingly, and with all parties consent and approval, Disciplinary Counsel seeks withdrawal of her request for the appointment of a hearing panel in this matter so that the parties may pursue a more expeditious process and ruling from the Professional Conduct Committee.

WHEREFORE, Disciplinary Counsel respectfully requests that the Honorable Chairman of the Hearings Committee:

- (A) Grant this "Motion to Withdraw";
- (B) Return the original Stipulation back to Disciplinary Counsel to file before the Professional Conduct Committee forthwith; and
- (C) Grant such other relief as is fair and in the public interest.

Respectfully submitted,

New Hampshire Supreme Court
Attorney Discipline Office
4 Park Street, Suite 304
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 224-5828

Landy B. McCafferty

Dated: March 30, 2005

By: *by: James L. DeH...*

Landy B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel

CERTIFICATION

I, Landya B. McCafferty, Disciplinary Counsel of the New Hampshire Supreme Court Attorney Discipline Office, certify that a copy aforesaid "Motion to Withdraw" is being sent on this 30th day of March, 2005 to Craig N. Salomon Esquire, Law Office of Craig N. Salomon, P.O. Box 427, North Hampton, New Hampshire 03862 and to Ms. Lisa Beaudry, 24 Bradstreet Road, Hampton, New Hampshire 03842 by regular mail postage prepaid.

Landy B. McCafferty
by: James L. DeH...

Landy B. McCafferty
Disciplinary Counsel

NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT
HEARINGS COMMITTEE



CRAIG N. SALOMON

advs.


LISA BEAUDRY

#02-127

ORDER

The assented to Motion to Withdraw is granted, and the Stipulation is returned to Disciplinary Counsel for filing before the full Professional Conduct Committee for such disposition as it deems appropriate.

Dated: April 1, 2005



Robert C. Varney
Chair