

Other Orders/Judgments

1:07-mc-00053-SSB In Re: Carole H. Squire

07-492

U.S. District Court

Southern District of Ohio

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 9/26/2008 at 10:20 AM EDT and filed on 9/26/2008

Case Name: In Re: Carole H. Squire

Case Number: 1:07-mc-53

Filer:

Document Number: 15

Docket Text:

ORDER suspending Respondent Squire from the practice of law in this Court coterminus with the 10/25/07 Order of The Supreme Court of Ohio. Signed by Chief Judge Sandra S Beckwith on 9/25/08. Respondent to comply as set forth by 10/24/08. (sb1,)

1:07-mc-53 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Percy Squire psquire@sp-lawfirm.com

1:07-mc-53 Notice has been delivered by other means to:


The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1040326259 [Date=9/26/2008] [FileNumber=1995011-0] [01809ce001933ea6f473649b3cfa238c07f8a1265fbef11a16690766bf479ea12b99485591d43aeab1b7fed7dc73631caba4dc9c20e7d5ed54aa1f6fdb57f5a]]



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

IN RE: CAROLE H. SQUIRE

Case No. 1:07mc53

ORDER

Respondent Carole H. Squire has opted to challenge the imposition of a suspension from the practice of law in this Court in conformity with the Ohio Supreme Court's suspension of Respondent's privilege to practice law in the state courts entered on October 25, 2007, for two years with 12 months stayed on condition that Respondent commit no further disciplinary violations within the two-year period of suspension, Disciplinary Counsel v. Squire, 876 N.E.2d 933, 952 (Ohio 2007).

Standard of Review

The Model Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement as adopted by this Court and specifically Rule II (D) (1), (2), (3) and (4) provide that this Court "shall impose the identical discipline [imposed by the Ohio Supreme Court] unless the respondent-attorney demonstrates, or this Court finds, that upon the face of the record upon which the discipline in another jurisdiction is predicated it clearly appears:

1. that the procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process; or
2. that there was such an infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that this Court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion on that subject; or
3. that the imposition of the same discipline by this Court would result in grave injustice; or
4. that the misconduct established is deemed by this Court to warrant substantially different discipline."

15

The Rule does not contemplate a review de novo or further evidentiary proceedings, rather this Court reviews the existing record before the Ohio Supreme Court.

This Court has carefully reviewed the materials submitted by Respondent and the record before the Ohio Supreme Court. The Court concludes that the decision of the Ohio Supreme Court in the matter was correct in all respects and, therefore adopts its findings, conclusions and choice of discipline. Because the reasoning that supports the decision of the Ohio Supreme Court has been clearly articulated in its thorough and comprehensive analysis, the issuance of a detailed written opinion by this Court would be unduly duplicative.

The Court concludes that Respondent has failed to show good cause for this Court to refuse to adopt the discipline previously imposed upon Respondent by the Ohio Supreme Court. The procedure was not so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process, nor was there such an infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that this Court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion on that subject. The Court concludes further that the imposition of the same discipline by this Court would not result in grave injustice nor does this Court find that the misconduct established warrants a substantially different discipline.

Although Respondent has implied and inferred that racial or personal animus may have played a part in the resolution of this matter in the State disciplinary process, the Court notes that at no time during the State proceedings did Respondent adduce any evidence that placed the integrity of the State process in doubt.

Thus, this Court **ORDERS** that Carole H. Squire shall be suspended from the

practice of law before this Court; that the name of Carole H. Squire be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice law before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, pursuant to Gov. Bar R. V, Sec. 6(B) (3) of the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio, and Rule II of the Model Federal Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement adopted by this Court on February 5, 1979. She is hereby ordered to cease and desist from the practice of law in any form and is forbidden to appear on behalf of another before this Court. It is further ordered that she be forbidden to counsel or advise, or prepare legal instruments for others or in any manner perform services of any kind for others which would constitute the practice of law in this Court. She is also forbidden to hold herself out to another or to the public as being authorized to perform legal services, and she is hereby divested of each and all of the rights, privileges and prerogatives customarily accorded to a member in good standing of the Bar of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Respondent, Carole H. Squire, surrender her certificate of admission to practice in this Court to the Clerk of this Court, forthwith, and that her name be stricken from the roll of attorneys maintained by this Court. It is further ordered that on or before October 24, 2008, the Respondent shall:

1. Notify all clients being represented in pending matters in this Court and any co-counsel of her suspension and her consequent disqualification to act as an attorney after the effective date of this Order, and, in the absence of co-counsel, also notify the clients to seek legal service elsewhere, calling attention to any urgency in seeking the substitution of another attorney in her place;
2. Regardless of any fees or expenses due Respondent, deliver to all clients

being represented in pending matters in this Court any papers or other property pertaining to the clients, or notify the clients or co-counsel, if any, of a suitable time and place where the papers or other property may be obtained, calling attention to any urgency for obtaining such papers or other property;

3. Regarding any actions pending in this Court, refund any part of any fees or expenses paid in advance that are unearned or not paid, and account for any trust money or property in possession or control of Respondent;

4. Notify opposing counsel in pending litigation in this Court, in the absence of counsel, the adverse parties, of her disqualification to act as an attorney after the effective date of this Order;

5. All notices required by this Order shall be by certified mail and shall contain a return address where communications may thereafter be directed to Respondent;

6. File with the Clerk of this Court an affidavit showing compliance with this Order and Proof of Service of Notices required therein. Such affidavit shall set forth the address where the affiant may receive communications and the Clerk shall be kept advised of any change of address;

7. Retain and maintain a record of the various steps taken by Respondent pursuant to this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court issue certified copies of this Order to the Disciplinary Counsel of the Supreme Court of Ohio, to the Clerks of the Supreme Court of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, to the National Discipline Data Bank and to its Divisional Offices.

8. Readmission to practice before this Court shall require the filing of an application for reinstatement with James Bonini, Clerk of Court, Joseph P. Kinneary U.S. Courthouse, 85 Marconi Boulevard, Room 260, Columbus, Ohio 43215. The application shall include an affidavit from Respondent that the Ohio Supreme Court has reinstated her to the practice of law in Ohio and that she is in good standing with that Court.

Upon receipt of the application, the Clerk shall refer the application to the Chief Judge of this Court, who may require the Respondent to take the next available bar examination for admission to practice in this Court. Additionally, the Chief Judge may require Respondent to appear in person to demonstrate clear and convincing evidence that she has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice law before this Court and that her resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or to the administration of justice, or subversive of the public interest. Should the Court find the attorney unfit to resume practice before this Court, the application shall be dismissed. No application for reinstatement shall be filed within one year following an adverse judgment upon an application for reinstatement filed by or on behalf of the same attorney.

If the attorney is found fit to resume practice before this Court, the judgment shall reinstate her, provided that reinstatement may be conditioned upon the attendance of the attorney at a Federal Court Practice Seminar. A copy of the Certificate of Training for successfully completing the Federal Court Practice Seminar should accompany the application for reinstatement. Registration in the Court's CM/ECF system will also be

required.

All attorneys admitted to practice in this Court are required to submit a written notice of a change of business address and/or email address to the Clerk upon the change in address.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: September 25, 2008

s/Sandra S. Beckwith
Sandra S. Beckwith
Chief United States District Judge