

Public Discipline

These summaries are based on information provided by the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR), an agency of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The OLR assists the court in supervising the practice of law and protecting the public from misconduct by lawyers. The full text of matters summarized can be located at <https://compendium.wicourts.gov/app/search>.

Public Reprimand of Walter W. Stern III

The Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) and Walter W. Stern III entered into an agreement for the imposition of a public reprimand, pursuant to SCR 22.09(1). A Wisconsin Supreme Court-appointed referee approved the agreement and issued the public reprimand on Aug. 15, 2024, pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

Stern represented a woman in a lawsuit against her former employer. Before hiring Stern, the client had filed a complaint and amended complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The employer fired the client after the client filed the complaints, but the client had failed to file any subsequent complaint alleging constructive discharge or any other termination-based claim. The client was issued a right-to-sue letter.

In violation of SCR 20:1.3, Stern failed to diligently review the complaints the client had filed and the right-to-sue letter that had been issued and, therefore, could not provide the client with informed legal advice about any possible constructive discharge or other termination-based claim she may have had, including whether she should file a new complaint with the EEOC alleging those claims.

During his representation of the client, Stern began making plans to retire. Stern brought two new attorneys into the case, describing them to the client as co-counsel. The client consented to the addition of the new attorneys. Although the client continued to contact Stern for information pertaining to her case, Stern failed to inform her that co-counsel had cut him out of the representation, effectively ending his representation of the client, in vio-

lation of SCR 20:1.16(d). Despite believing he no longer represented the client, Stern never filed a motion to withdraw, also in violation of SCR 20:1.16(d).

Stern had three prior private reprimands, two prior public reprimands, and two prior suspensions.

Disciplinary Proceedings Against Kristin D. Lein

On Aug. 9, 2024, the Wisconsin Supreme Court revoked the law license of Kristin D. Lein, effective immediately. In addition, the court ordered Lein to pay the cost of the disciplinary proceeding, which totaled \$659.17 as of the date of the order. The court also ordered Lein to pay the \$1,369,491 restitution obligation set forth in her federal judgment of conviction. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Lein*, 2024 WI 34.

In May 2023, the U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin filed an information alleging that Lein received \$1,643,818 in funds belonging to an estate and used most of those funds for her own purposes. Lein was charged with one count each of wire fraud, engaging in a monetary transaction in property derived from a specified unlawful activity, and tax fraud. The same day the information was filed, Lein pled guilty to all three counts. Lein was sentenced to 45 months in prison on the first two counts and 36 months on the third count.

Based on her conviction, Lein's law license was summarily suspended on Dec. 12, 2023. The Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) subsequently filed a disciplinary complaint alleging violations of SCR 8.4(b) and SCR 20:8.4(c) and seeking revocation of Lein's law license. After the

filing of the complaint, the OLR and Lein filed a stipulation to as the misconduct and the appropriate discipline. A supreme court-appointed referee filed a report concluding that Lein had violated SCR 20:8.4(b) and SCR 20:8.4(c) and recommended Lein's license be revoked. The supreme court adopted the referee's report.

Lein had no prior discipline.

Disciplinary Proceedings Against Paul E. Overson

On Sept. 20, 2024, the Wisconsin Supreme Court suspended the law license of Paul E. Overson for 30 days as discipline reciprocal to that imposed by the Supreme Court of Minnesota. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Overson*, 2024 WI 35.

The suspension of Overson's license to practice law in Minnesota was based on findings that Overson had knowingly made a misleading statement to a court during a hearing and subsequently failed to correct his misleading statement. Additionally, Overson did not notify the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) of the suspension of his Minnesota license within 20 days after its effective date, as required by SCR 22.22(1).

Overson and the OLR entered into a stipulation agreeing that Overson was subject to reciprocal discipline and that a 30-day suspension was the appropriate level of discipline. SCR 22.22(3) requires that the supreme court impose discipline identical to that imposed by another jurisdiction unless one or more exceptions is met. Overson did not claim that any of those exceptions applied, and the supreme court accepted the stipulation.

Overton has no prior discipline.

Denial of Reinstatement of James C. Ritland

On Oct. 10, 2024, the Wisconsin Supreme Court denied James C. Ritland's petition for reinstatement of his license to practice law in Wisconsin and ordered him to pay the cost of the proceeding, \$13,528.91. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Ritland*, 2024 WI 38.

In 2021, Ritland's law license was suspended for two years for paying money to

two women to perform sex acts and being convicted of attempted adultery and disorderly conduct. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Ritland*, 2021 WI 36, 396 Wis. 2d 509, 957 N.W.2d 540. Ritland filed a petition for reinstatement of his license in April 2023. The Office of Lawyer Regulation opposed his petition.

A Wisconsin Supreme Court-appointed referee found that Ritland met some, but not all, of the criteria for reinstatement. The referee found that Ritland failed to do the following: 1) demonstrate he had the necessary moral character to practice law in Wisconsin; 2) demonstrate that his resumption of the practice of law would not be detrimental to the administration of justice or subversive of the public interest; 3) comply with several provisions of SCR 22.26(1) requiring him to take certain actions on or before the effective date of his suspension; 4) show that his conduct after his suspension had been exemplary; 5) show that he has a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards that are imposed on members of the bar and that he would act in conformity with those standards; and 6) demonstrate that he could be safely recommended to the public and the legal community as fit to provide representation and to serve as an officer of the court.

Among other things, the referee noted that the sexual misconduct leading to Ritland's suspension involved the misuse of his status as an attorney but that Ritland continued to minimize the connection between the two, instead portraying his misconduct as a personal failing. The referee also noted that Ritland twice misrepresented the reason for his need to withdraw from a case, stating he was retiring. Additionally, after his suspension, Ritland filed an Amended and Restated Disclosure of Compensation of Attorney for Debtor in a bankruptcy case. The bankruptcy court found that the document was inaccurate and violated both federal law and a court rule. The bankruptcy court ordered that Ritland's client be relieved of any fee obligation.

The supreme court adopted the referee's report and accepted the referee's recommendation that Ritland's reinstatement petition be denied. **WL**

**DON'T GAMBLE WITH YOUR
LEGAL MALPRACTICE COVERAGE.
WE SEE YOUR NEEDS,
AND WE RAISE YOUR PEACE OF MIND.
WILMIC - BEST BET EVER**



A Member Benefit of



**STATE BAR
OF WISCONSIN**

Private Discipline

The Wisconsin Supreme Court permits the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) to publish, for educational purposes, a summary of facts and professional conduct rule violations in matters in which the OLR imposed private reprimands. The summaries do not disclose information identifying the reprimanded attorneys. The summaries of selected private reprimands are printed to help attorneys avoid similar misconduct problems.

Lack of Diligence and Communication

Violations of SCR 20:1.3, SCR 20:1.4(a)(3), SCR 20:8.4(c), and SCR 22.03(2) and (6), enforceable via SCR 20:8.4(h)

A lawyer represented a client regarding municipal charges of resisting or obstructing a peace officer and unlawful trespass.

At a pretrial conference, the assistant city attorney relayed a settlement offer to the lawyer and asked that the matter be set for a review conference to allow the lawyer to confer with the client. The lawyer failed to appear at the review conference. As a courtesy, the assistant city attorney asked that the court reschedule the matter. The court set another review conference and mailed a notice to the lawyer. The lawyer again failed to appear at the review conference, and the city attorney's office requested that a default judgment be entered. The court issued an order of default judgment in the client's case.

The lawyer's misconduct consisted of failing to file a motion to reopen the client's case, in violation of SCR 20:1.3; failing to inform the client of the default

judgment and failing to keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the case, in violation of SCR 20:1.4(a)(3); informing the client that the lawyer had filed a motion to reopen the client's case when the lawyer had not done so, in violation of SCR 20:8.4(c); and willfully failing to provide the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) with a timely written response to the grievance, in violation of SCR 22.03(2) and (6), enforceable via SCR 20:8.4(h).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Criminal Act Reflecting Adversely on Fitness to Practice

Violation of SCR 20:8.4(b)

An attorney was arrested and charged with second-offense operating while intoxicated (OWI) and second-offense operating with a prohibited alcohol concentration (PAC). Police officers received a suspicious-vehicle call from an individual who stated they observed a vehicle swerve and hit the curb. A police officer was dispatched to the scene and saw the vehicle parked along the roadway. As the officer spoke to the driver (the attorney), he smelled a strong odor of intoxicants and noticed the attorney's watery eyes. The attorney told the officer that he would not perform any standardized field-sobriety tests. The attorney's breath alcohol test reading was 0.21 g/210L.

The attorney pleaded guilty and was convicted of OWI (second offense). The operating with PAC (second offense) charge was dismissed but read in. The attorney's sentence included 45 days in jail with Huber privileges, driver's license revocation for 16 months, and a fine.

By engaging in conduct leading to a criminal conviction of OWI (second offense), the attorney violated SCR 20:8.4(b).

The attorney had no prior discipline.

Criminal Act Reflecting Adversely on Fitness to Practice

Violation of SCR 20:8.4(b)

An attorney was arrested and cited for possessing an open intoxicant in a motor vehicle and first-offense OWI. The attorney was also charged with two counts of resisting or obstructing an officer and cited for refusing to take a test for intoxication after arrest and first-offense operating with PAC >=0.15.

The attorney pled no contest to first-offense OWI and no contest to one count of resisting or obstructing an officer. The circuit court accepted the attorney's pleas, dismissed and read in the other count of resisting or obstructing an officer, and dismissed all other citations on the prosecutor's motion. The parties entered into and the court approved a deferred prosecution agreement.

By entering a no-contest plea to misdemeanor resisting or obstructing an officer, the attorney violated SCR 20:8.4(b).

The attorney had no prior discipline.

Lack of Diligence and Communication

Violations of SCR 20:1.3 and SCR 1.4(a)(4)

In mid-2020, an immigration attorney took over the case of a woman whose employment authorization document (EAD) would expire on March 16, 2021. After the attorney took over the case, but before the expiration of the client's EAD, the client called the attorney to schedule an appointment to renew the EAD. The attorney failed to return the client's voicemail messages. After being asked by the employer's office manager to call the client, the attorney met with the client in March 2021 after the expiration of the EAD. The attorney submitted the client's application for employment authorization. On May 5, 2021, the application was rejected because it included an incorrect payment amount. The attorney resubmitted the application with the correct payment

For The **Record** Inc.

Excellence in Court Reporting

888-892-0392

To Schedule, please email office@FTRMadison.com
or visit our scheduling page on our website

**Full-Service Court Reporting –
Covering Wisconsin**

Proudly celebrating our 21st year in business
Fully certified Court Reporters you know and trust.

www.ftmadison.com

amount. The client did not receive a new EAD until Sept. 8, 2021. The client lost her job because the EAD had expired, and she was unemployed for several months.

By failing to return the client's voice-mail messages about scheduling an appointment to renew the EAD, the attorney violated SCR 20:1.4(a)(4) and 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(r).

By failing to meet with the client and submit the application for employment authorization prior to the expiration of the EAD, the attorney violated SCR 20:1.3 and 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(q).

The attorney had no prior discipline.

Disrespect Toward Tribunal; Failure to Comply with Judge's Order

Violations of SCR 40.15, enforceable via SCR 20:8.4(g); and SCR 3.4(c)

After a videoconference hearing had concluded, a lawyer mistakenly failed to leave the conference, then made derogatory comments about the judge. The comments were based on the lawyer's

personal feelings toward the judge, unrelated to the case before the court. The lawyer violated SCR 40.15, enforceable via SCR 20:8.4(g), by making derogatory comments about a judge in front of the client while still present in the virtual courtroom.

The lawyer also violated SCR 20:3.4(c) by failing to comply with the judge's order to go back on the record to discuss the outburst. The lawyer apologized profusely, said it was a mistake, and left the videoconference.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had prior public reprimands in 2011 and 2018.

Lack of Diligence and Communication

Violations of SCR 20:1.3 and SCR 1.4(b)

An individual (the client) was self-repre-

sented as a defendant in a small claims matter. The client hired the lawyer to seek de novo review after a court commissioner entered judgment against the client in the small claims matter. Before the trial date, the plaintiff filed a motion to dismiss based on the lawyer's failure to serve the plaintiff by mail. The court granted the plaintiff's motion. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.3 by failing to effect service of a demand for trial on the plaintiff, which resulted in the denial of the client's de novo trial demand.

The lawyer also violated SCR 20:1.4(b) by failing to take reasonable steps to explain to the client the effect of the court's decision. Having lost the opportunity to seek de novo review, the client was to provide full payment of the judgment to the plaintiff or complete a financial disclosure of assets. At a contempt hearing, the client was ultimately ordered to pay an additional sum for failing to pay the entire amount by the deadline.

There's still time to make an impact in 2024 – with the support of Every Member. Every Year.

While 2024 is racing to a close, it's not too late to make a difference in your community. With the support of every member, every year, your Wisconsin Law Foundation can continue to support critical programs that promote civic understanding, leadership development, access to justice, and diversity and inclusion initiatives across Wisconsin.

Giving is easy.

Your investment of any amount helps fund critically needed programs and activities, furthering the cause of justice throughout Wisconsin. As you consider your end-of-year giving plans, please remember your Wisconsin Law Foundation in your planning.

Donate online at wisbar.org/wlfdonate



WLF142 10/24

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The parties considered aggravating and mitigating factors pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions in support of the proposed private reprimand. An aggravating factor was that the client lost the ability to seek a trial de novo.

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Lack of Diligence and Communication Violations of SCR 20:1.3 and SCR 1.4(a) and (b)

A lawyer represented two beneficiaries of a trust, one of whom was a co-trustee of the trust. The other co-trustee refused to cooperate with the sale of two parcels of real estate and distribution of funds. One parcel was sold following a foreclosure action. Because the co-trustees did not agree on a trust distribution plan, the lawyer filed a letter with the court, without informing the clients, asking that the court not release the funds until a stipulation was filed. For over six months, the lawyer took no action regarding distribution of the foreclosure funds. During the same period, the lawyer told the clients that the lawyer was working on obtaining the foreclosure funds from the court. Ultimately, the clients obtained the funds from the court more than one year after the funds were available.

The other parcel was sold in a private sale. The lawyer received a check made payable to the trust, which the lawyer forwarded to the other co-trustee for endorsement. Despite multiple requests from the clients regarding the status of that check, the lawyer failed to respond until after the clients discovered that the check had not been cashed for more than one year and needed to be reissued.

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.4(a)(3) by failing to provide timely and accurate information to the clients regarding the status of trust assets and distribution of those assets.

The lawyer also violated SCR 20:1.3 by failing to advance the clients' interests in obtaining disbursement of the foreclosure funds held by the court.

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.4(b) by failing for more than three years to explain to the clients that the lawyer would not take action to seek removal of the co-trustee and that the clients would need to hire new counsel to take this action.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Failure to Safekeep Property; Trust and Fiduciary Accounts

Violation of SCR 20:1.15(b)(1)

Pursuant to a settlement agreement, a lawyer was required to disburse more than \$270,000 to clients from their trust account. A third party (the fraudster) sent the lawyer an email message from an email address that was similar but not identical to the clients' email address. The message included wire transfer instructions to an out-of-state bank in which the clients did not have accounts.

The lawyer did not contact the clients to confirm the wire transfer instructions and did not contact the bank to confirm the account belonged to the clients. Instead, the lawyer sent the funds by wire transfer to the out-of-state bank pursuant to the fraudster's wire transfer instructions. The clients never received the funds. After the fraud was discovered, the lawyer reimbursed the clients with proceeds from the law firm's malpractice insurance carrier.

By initiating a wire transfer of client funds pursuant to fraudulent wiring instructions without taking reasonable steps to safeguard client funds, including failing to verify the wiring instructions with the client or client's bank and failing to recognize numerous red flags that should have raised suspicions about the fraud, the lawyer violated SCR 20:1.15(b)(1).

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The parties considered aggravating and mitigating factors pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions in support of their joint request that the referee impose a private reprimand. A mitigating factor was that the lawyer promptly reimbursed the clients for the missing funds plus interest.

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Failure to Provide Written Fee Agreement; Conflict of Interest Violations of SCR 20:1.5(b)(1), (2), and (f) and SCR 20:1.8(h)(3)

A client paid the lawyer \$1,000 to help secure the client's deceased parent's possessions and settle the parent's estate by small estate affidavit. The client paid the lawyer an additional \$500 to draft an offer to purchase the property that the client's parent and stepparent owned. Upon accepting a total of \$1,500, the lawyer did not require the client to enter into a written fee agreement. By failing to enter into a written fee agreement with the client, the lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(b)(1) and (2).

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(f) by depositing the advanced fees totaling \$1,500 into an operating account, without using the alternative advanced-fee-placement measures in SCR 20:1.5(g)(1).

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.8(h)(3) by sending an email to the client suggesting the client withdraw the grievance. After the client filed a grievance with the OLR, OLR staff requested the lawyer provide a response. Before the response was due, the lawyer sent an email to the client indicating that if the client informed OLR staff that the client no longer had a grievance, the lawyer would not pursue the client for additional legal fees.

In a separate representation, the lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(b)(1) and (2) by

failing to enter into a written fee agreement with a client. The client hired the lawyer to provide representation in a temporary restraining order case. The client's parent paid the lawyer \$3,500. The lawyer did not require the client to enter into a written fee agreement.

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(f) by depositing the \$3,500 advanced fee into an operating account, without using the alternative advanced-fee-placement measures in SCR 20:1.5(g)(1).

The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(f) by depositing advanced fees totaling \$1,500 into an operating account, without using the alternative advanced-fee-placement measures in SCR 20:1.5(g)(1). The client also hired the lawyer's firm for representation in a divorce. The client made two payments, totaling \$1,500. Both payments were deposited into the firm's operating account.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Lack of Diligence

Violation of SCR 20:1.3

A lawyer represented a client's company in a lawsuit filed in a jurisdiction other than Wisconsin. The lawyer was admitted pro hac vice in that case. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.3 by failing to adequately review the other jurisdiction's law governing civil procedure, failing to take reasonable steps to make sure the lawyer and local counsel complied with procedural requirements, and failing to fully review opposing counsel's motion and supporting materials.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer was privately reprimanded in 2000 for unrelated conduct.

Lack of Communication and Diligence; Failure to Provide Written Fee Agreement; Failure to Hold Fees in Trust; Conflict of Interest

Violations of SCR 20:1.3; SCR 20:1.4(a)(2); SCR 20:1.5(b)(1), (2), and (f); and SCR 20:8.4(a)

A court appointed a lawyer to represent a defendant as successor counsel in a pending criminal case. The lawyer only communicated with the client before or after hearings at which the client was produced in person. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.4(a)(2) by failing to respond to the client's correspondence discussing strategies for the client's defense and available discovery, failing to communicate with the client for two periods of about six months each, failing to review all discovery (including a forensic interview of a minor victim) with the client, and failing to consult with the client regarding the client's defense for the approximately six-month period before ultimately

withdrawing from the case. The lawyer also violated SCR 20:1.3 by failing to take reasonable steps to advance the client's interests in the case.

In another matter, the lawyer agreed to represent a client in filing for divorce. The lawyer requested an initial advanced fee of \$2,500, of which he collected \$1,000. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(b)(1) and (2) by failing to communicate in writing to the divorce client the rate and basis of the lawyer's fees and any expenses for which the client could be responsible. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.5(f) by failing to hold in trust the \$1,000 of advanced fees. The lawyer violated SCR 20:8.4(a) by making an agreement with the client to return the \$1,000 fee payment in exchange for the client withdrawing the client's grievance with the OLR.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private

Reach Wisconsin's Legal Community, Grow Your Business

The State Bar of Wisconsin has NEW targeted monthly and quarterly opportunities to reach Wisconsin's legal community through a variety of marketing channels, in addition to the following:

- *Wisconsin Lawyer*TM magazine display and classified advertising
- Digital advertising through WisBar website, *InsideTrack*, *CaseLaw Express*, or *WisLawNOW*
- Sponsorships
- Legal expos
- Mailing lists



Crystal Brabender
Advertising Sales Manager
(800) 444-9404, ext. 6132
(608) 250-6132
cbrabender@wisbar.org

Contact Crystal to learn how these business development opportunities will build your reputation, increase awareness of your practice, generate business, and grow revenue!



STATE BAR OF WISCONSIN

LAWYER DISCIPLINE

consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Failure to Allocate Authority Between Lawyer and Client; Failure to Communicate

Violations of SCR 20:1.2(a) and SCR 20:1.4(a)(3)

The Wisconsin State Public Defender appointed a lawyer to represent a client on felony charges. In a letter to the client, the lawyer stated they would not assert the client's statutory right to a speedy trial. Irrespective of the considerations the lawyer identified in the letter, the client has a right to a speedy trial, which the lawyer refused to assert. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.2(a) by failing to abide by the client's decision to assert the client's right to a speedy trial.

The lawyer also violated SCR 20:1.4(a)(3) by failing to keep the client reasonably informed regarding the status of the case. For nearly eight months, the lawyer neither called nor met with the client at the prison in which the client was incarcerated to discuss the case. The attorney sent two letters to the client during that time.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement,

including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Lack of Communication and Diligence Violations of 20:1.3 and SCR 20:1.4(a)(3)

Federal agents seized several items from the client and the client's spouse and sent a notice of seizure of property and initiation of administrative forfeiture proceedings to the client, which the client delivered to the lawyer. The lawyer did not file a claim contesting the forfeitures by the required deadlines. The lawyer violated SCR 20:1.3 by failing to file a timely claim for the client to contest federal law enforcement forfeitures by the required deadlines.

The lawyer also violated SCR 20:1.4(a)(3) by failing to inform the client in a timely manner that the lawyer did not file a claim to contest the forfeitures by the deadlines and by failing to keep the client reasonably informed regarding the status of the matter. The lawyer did not inform the client for over four months that the lawyer had not filed a timely claim. Over the next year, the lawyer continued to follow up on the status of the seized prop-

erty by speaking with federal government lawyers until the lawyer finally informed the client that the property had been forfeited and sent the client a copy of the declarations of forfeiture.

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline.

Criminal Act Reflecting Adversely on Fitness to Practice

Violation of SCR 20:8.4(b)

A sheriff's deputy was dispatched to the scene of a single-vehicle accident. At the scene, the deputy made contact with the vehicle's driver (the lawyer). The lawyer had called 911 to report the accident. The deputy observed that the lawyer's eyes appeared slightly bloodshot and glassy and there was an odor of intoxicants coming from the lawyer. The deputy had the lawyer perform field-sobriety tests and a preliminary breath test, which had a reported value of .123%. The deputy then placed the lawyer under arrest for OWI (second offense). The lawyer submitted to an evidentiary chemical breath test. The intoximeter test record had a reported value of .12.

The lawyer was sentenced to 30 days in jail with Huber privileges, driver's license revocation for 16 months, ignition interlock for 16 months, and a fine.

The lawyer violated SCR 20:8.4(b) by engaging in conduct leading to a criminal conviction of OWI (second offense).

A supreme court-appointed referee approved the parties' reprimand agreement, including their stipulation of facts and proposed violations, and issued a private consensual reprimand pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

The lawyer had no prior discipline. WL

STATE BAR OF WISCONSIN

Membership has its benefits.

State Bar of Wisconsin members can easily stay on top of Wisconsin case law by subscribing to **CaseLaw Express™**. Every Monday, the most recent Wisconsin Supreme Court and Court of Appeals decisions are delivered in an email digest that's designed for easy scanning!



Visit www.wisbar.org/caselaw to learn more.



STATE BAR
OF WISCONSIN