

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 Jeremy Campshure

The Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) and Jeremy Campshure 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 Dec. 3, 2024, pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

Campshure represented a man charged with several felonies. At the sentencing hearing, the court asked Campshure if he had discussed the presentence report with the client. Campshure said he had. When the court asked the client the same question, the client said he had not discussed the presentence report with Campshure. Campshure responded by saying he was concerned the client didn't remember their last meeting. The court then asked the client if he had met with Campshure, and the client insisted he had not. The court asked Campshure if what his client was saying was not true. Campshure stammered a bit.

A man sitting in the courtroom then addressed the court. He said he had been ministering to the client every week for two years and said no one had been to visit the client the week before. Campshure then apologized to the court, saying he had mixed up his files. The sentencing hearing was adjourned so Campshure could discuss the report with the client. At the adjourned hearing, Campshure again apologized to the court.

By knowingly making a false statement to the court about having met with the

client to discuss the presentence report, Campshure violated SCR 20:3.3(a)(1).

Campshure had no prior discipline.

Disciplinary Proceedings Against Thomas R. Napierala

On Dec. 3, 2024, the Wisconsin Supreme Court publicly reprimanded Thomas Napierala and ordered that he pay the \$2,567.80 cost of the proceeding. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Napierala, 2024 WI 42*.

Napierala's reprimand is based on four counts of misconduct related to two client matters. In the first matter, Napierala failed to timely file an expert-witness disclosure or a motion to extend the time to do so, failed to file a response to a fee petition, failed to file a response to a motion for summary judgment, and failed to file a response to a motion for sanctions. In each instance he violated SCR 20:1.3. In the same matter, he also misrepresented to a federal court the date on which opposing counsel had provided health-care authorizations, the date on which he had taken on the representation of the client, and that he had provided the client with a copy of his motion to withdraw when he had not done so. In each instance, Napierala violated SCR 20:3.3(a)(1).

In the second matter, Napierala failed to do the following: 1) review the clients' home mortgage or homeowners policy, 2) take reasonable steps to review checks provided to him by the clients to ensure that all required endorsements were obtained before depositing the checks, 3) take reasonable steps to ascertain the

ownership interests in funds entrusted to him by the clients, and 4) take reasonable steps to ascertain the amount of insurance proceeds available to repair the clients' home so that he could advise them and third parties about the funds available to repair the home. In each instance, Napierala violated SCR 20:1.3. In the same matter, Napierala disbursed repair proceeds before determining the mortgage company's interests in the funds, before notifying the mortgage company of his receipt of the funds, and before resolving their respective interests in the funds, in violation of SCR 20:1.15(e)(1) and (3).

Napierala was publicly reprimanded in 2018.

Reinstatement of Jason S. Jankowski

On Dec. 3, 2024, the supreme court reinstated the law license of Jason S. Jankowski, with conditions, and ordered that he pay the \$4,108.87 cost of the proceedings. *Board of Bar Examiners v. Jankowski, 2024 WI 41*.

Jankowski was conditionally admitted to practice law in Wisconsin on Dec. 15, 2014. On May 18, 2018, the court revoked Jankowski's license due to his willful failure to comply with the terms of his conditional admission. On Sept. 18, 2023, Jankowski petitioned for reinstatement of his license.

The OLR initially opposed Jankowski's petition but on July 18, 2024, Jankowski and the OLR entered into a stipulation whereby they jointly recommended that Jankowski's license be reinstated and recommended that certain conditions be imposed on his return to the practice of law. The referee hearing the case recommended the court adopt the parties' stipulation. The court did so and reinstated Jankowski's license on the following conditions:

- Before the reinstatement of his law license, Jankowski must reinstate with a therapeutic provider for the purpose of engaging in formal, consistent therapy for issues to include, but not be limited to, alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA)

and anger management. Jankowski must continue the therapy until the provider discharges him from therapy.

- Within 30 days after his reinstatement, Jankowski must enter into a contract with WisLAP to participate in its monitoring program for 30 months.

- Jankowski must self-report to the OLR within 72 hours any police contact involving drug or alcohol violations, arrests, or criminal charges brought against him.

- Jankowski must pay all costs incurred under this proceeding, including the cost of therapy.

If the OLR or WisLAP determines that Jankowski has failed to comply with any of the conditions contained in the stipulation between the OLR and Jankowski, the OLR can petition the court for a summary and immediate suspension of Jankowski's law license pending any further investigation or proceedings that may be necessary under the circumstances.

Denial of Reinstatement of Amoun Vang Sayaovong

On Dec. 17, 2024, the supreme court denied Amoun Vang Sayaovong's petition for reinstatement of his license to practice law in Wisconsin and ordered him to pay the \$4,165.75 cost of the proceeding. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Sayaovong*, 2024 WI 43.

In 2014, Sayaovong was publicly reprimanded. As a condition of the reprimand, Sayaovong was ordered to pay restitution to two clients. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Sayaovong*, 2014 WI 94, 357 Wis. 2d 312, 850 N.W.2d 940. In 2015, Sayaovong's license was suspended for six months. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Sayaovong*, 2015 WI 100, 365 Wis. 2d 200, 871 N.W.2d 271.

In March 2023, Sayaovong filed a petition for reinstatement of his law license. The OLR opposed the petition, and the matter was set for hearing before a court-appointed referee. The referee issued a report finding that Sayaovong met some, but not all, of the criteria for

reinstatement laid out in SCR 22.29(4). The referee found that Sayaovong failed to demonstrate 1) that his resumption of the practice of law would not be detrimental to the administration of justice or subversive of the public interest, 2) that his representations in the reinstatement petition were substantiated, and 3) that he complied fully with the terms of the order of suspension.

In addition, the referee found that Sayaovong failed to demonstrate that he has a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards imposed upon members of the bar and that he will act in conformity therewith; that he can be safely recommended to the legal profession, the courts, and the public as a person fit to be consulted by others and to represent them and otherwise act in matters of trust and confidence and in general to aid in the administration of justice as a member of the bar and as an officer of the courts; and that he made restitution to or settled all claims of persons injured or harmed by his misconduct.

The court adopted the referee's report, noting among other things that Sayaovong admitted he did not pay restitution as ordered in 2014. Sayaovong blamed the OLR for not telling him where to find the former clients even though he apparently made no effort to find them. He blamed the misconduct that led to his discipline in 2014 and 2015 on depression that was so severe it resulted in years of incapacity. Sayaovong said he was fully recovered and ready to resume the practice of law, even though he never sought medical diagnosis or treatment for his condition, and he chastised the referee for questioning his assurances and the testimony and letters of his character witnesses that he will not relapse. The court noted that although the record indicated that Sayaovong has taken strides to turn his life around, the justices shared the referee's concern that, at the present time, he failed to demonstrate that he has satisfied the requirements for resuming the practice of law.

Disciplinary Proceeding Against James Westbrook

On Dec. 17, 2024, the supreme court granted James Westbrook's petition for consensual revocation of his license to practice law in Wisconsin, effective immediately. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Westbrook*, 2024 WI 44.

On Feb. 20, 2024, the state of Wisconsin charged James Westbrook with four counts of child sexual exploitation and four counts of possession of child pornography. The next day, Westbrook was federally indicted on similar charges. Following the federal indictment, the state dismissed the criminal complaint. On Sept. 11, 2024, the supreme court temporarily suspended Westbrook's law license because of the pending criminal charges against him, which raised concerns under SCR 20:8.4(b). On Sept. 16, 2024, Westbrook pled guilty to the federal charges. The OLR submitted a memo recommending that the supreme court grant Westbrook's petition. In his petition, Westbrook stated that he could not successfully defend himself against the allegations of misconduct. He averred that he was filing the petition freely, voluntarily, and knowingly; that he understood that he has the right to retain counsel in the matter; that he understood he is giving up his right to contest the misconduct allegations; and that he is aware that if the supreme court grants the petition and revokes his license to practice law in Wisconsin, SCR 22.26 – 22.33 apply. **wl**

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