

**ORIGINAL**

**IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**DOREEN MARIE CANTRELL**  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, OH 44094  
Attorney Registration No. (0040032)

**11-0281**

**CASE NO. 2009-2044**

Respondent

**DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, OH 43215

**RELATOR'S ANSWER TO  
RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS TO  
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS'  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Relator

---


**RELATOR'S ANSWER TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS TO THE BOARD OF  
COMMISSIONERS' REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**JONATHAN E. COUGHLAN (0026424)**  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Relator  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

**DOREEN MARIE CANTRELL (0040032)**  
Respondent  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, Ohio 44094

**HEATHER L. HISSOM (0068151)**  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
Counsel for Relator



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
RELATOR'S ANSWER TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS	3
I.    RESPONDENT SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD ABSENT EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES	3
II.   THIS COURT SHOULD AFFIRM THE RECOMMENDED SANCTION OF DISBARMENT	6
CONCLUSION	9
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	9
BOARD REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	Appendix A

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
<i>Butler County Bar Assn. v. Portman</i> , 121 Ohio St.3d 518, 2009-Ohio-1705, 905 N.E.2d 1203	6
<i>Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Blake</i> , 100 Ohio St.3d 298, 299 , 2003-Ohio-5755, 798 N.E.2d 610	7
<i>Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Witt</i> , 85 Ohio St.3d 9, 1999-Ohio-198, 706 N.E.2d 763	3
<i>Dayton Bar Assn. v. Stephan</i> , 108 Ohio St.3d 327, 2006-Ohio-1063, 843 N.E.2d 771	3
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Bein</i> , 105 Ohio St.3d 62, 2004-Ohio-7012, 822 N.E.2d 358	8
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Cantrell</i> , 125 Ohio St.3d 458, 2010-Ohio-2114, 928 N.E.2d 1100	6
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. McShane</i> , 121 Ohio St.3d 169, 2009-Ohio-746, 902 N.E.2d 980	6
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Shaw</i> , 126 Ohio St.3d 494, 2010-Ohio-4412, 935 N.E.2d 405	5
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Sweeney</i> , 84 Ohio St.3d 388, 1999-Ohio-486, 704 N.E.2d 248	7, 8
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Williams (1997)</i> , 80 Ohio St.3d 539, 687 N.E.2d 682	7, 8
<i>Disciplinary Counsel v. Williams</i> , 66 Ohio St.3d 41, 1993-Ohio-88, 607 N.E.2d 832	8
<i>In re Cantrell</i> , 123 Ohio St.3d 1517, 2009-Ohio-6503, 918 N.E.2d 162	2

## **RULES, STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES**

### **RULES OF PRACTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

S.Ct. Prac. R 6.2(B)(5)(b) 2

### **SUPREME COURT RULES FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE BAR**

Gov. Bar R. V 4

Gov. Bar R. V(5) 2

### **DISCIPLINARY RULES**

#### **Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct**

Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(b) 1

Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(h) 1

#### **Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline Procedural Regulations**

BCGD Proc. Reg. 10(B)(1) 1

BCGD Proc. R. 10(B)(2)(g) 4

**IN  
THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,**  
Relator

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CASE NO. 2009-2044**

**DOREEN MARIE CANTRELL,**  
Respondent

**RELATOR'S ANSWER TO  
RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS  
TO THE BOARD OF  
COMMISSIONERS' REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**RELATOR'S ANSWER TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS  
TO THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS' REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

Now comes relator, Disciplinary Counsel, and hereby submits this answer to respondent's objections to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation of the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline ("board").

Based upon clear and convincing evidence, the board found violations of Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(b) [A lawyer shall not engage in an illegal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty or trustworthiness] and Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(h) [A lawyer shall not engage in conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law].

The board recommended that respondent be disbarred. (Report at 4).

The board found the following aggravation evidence: prior disciplinary history<sup>1</sup>, a dishonest or selfish motive, multiple criminal offenses and failure to appear at the hearing. See BCGD Proc. R. 10(B)(1). (Report at 3-4).

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondent was indefinitely suspended on May 20, 2010. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Cantrell*, 125 Ohio St.3d 458, 2010-Ohio-2114, 928 N.E.2d 1100.

The board's report was certified to this Court on September 28, 2010. This Court issued a Show Cause Order on March 1, 2011. Respondent's objections were filed on March 21, 2011<sup>2</sup>. It is to those objections that relator now responds.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

Respondent was indicted on February 23, 2009 for one count of Tampering with Records, two counts of Grand Theft and two counts of Falsification related to respondent illegally obtaining Section 8 housing benefits from the government. (Jt. Stip. 2, Jt. Ex. 1). Respondent was indicted again on July 13, 2009 for one count each of Possession of Cocaine, Trafficking in Cocaine, and Complicity to Trafficking in Cocaine. (Jt. Stip. 5, Jt. Ex.2).

On September 23, 2009 respondent pled guilty to two counts of Grand Theft, each a felony of the fourth degree. (Jt. Stip. 3, Jt. Ex. 3). She also pled guilty to Possession of Cocaine, a fifth degree felony. (Jt. Stip. 6, Jt. Ex. 4).

Respondent was sentenced on October 28, 2009 to a jail term of 120 days with credit for 65 days served, after which she would enter and complete the North East Ohio Community Alternative Program and comply with all aftercare recommendations. Respondent was suspended by this Court pursuant to Gov. Bar R.V(5) on December 14, 2009. *In re Cantrell*, 123 Ohio St.3d 1517, 2009-Ohio-6503, 918 N.E.2d 162. After completing the program, respondent served an additional 30 days in jail. She was then placed on three years' probation and was ordered to perform 200 hours of community service. (Jt. Stip. 4,7; Jt. Ex. 5).

Respondent did not appear at her disciplinary hearing on December 16, 2010, and did not offer any witnesses or exhibits.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to S.Ct. Prac. R. 6.2(B)(5)(b), respondent was required to attach a copy of the board's report to her objections but did not. A copy is attached hereto as Appendix A.

## RELATOR'S ANSWER TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS

### I. Respondent should not be permitted to supplement the record absent exceptional circumstances.

As and for her objections, respondent has requested that this Court reduce the recommended sanction from disbarment to an indefinite suspension<sup>3</sup>. In support of her request for a reduced sanction, to her objections respondent attached multiple documents including some personal medical records, a report from a psychologist and a letter from a doctor who is providing her with outpatient services. Notwithstanding the obvious authenticity and admissibility issues, respondent attempts to submit mitigation evidence to this court that was not submitted to the hearing panel.

This court has stated that it will consider supplements to the record in a disciplinary case only under exceptional circumstances. See, e.g. *Dayton Bar Assn. v. Stephan*, 108 Ohio St.3d 327, 2006-Ohio-1063, 843 N.E.2d 771. Respondent has not alleged any circumstance that would have prevented her from appearing at the hearing on December 6, 2010, presenting the documents that she has attached to her objections, and/ or from testifying in her own behalf. Respondent had ample notice to appear at the hearing and to submit evidence to the panel. She failed to do so.

In *Stephan*, this Court stated that an attorney has an "obligation to assist in disciplinary matters and that the record should be developed in the answer and hearings prior to reaching this court." Id. at ¶5, citing *Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Witt*, 85 Ohio St.3d 9, 1999-Ohio-198, 706 N.E.2d 763.

---

<sup>3</sup> Respondent has not suggested whether such an indefinite suspension should be imposed concurrently or consecutively to her present indefinite suspension.

Moreover, even if respondent could establish some exceptional circumstances, the documentation attached to respondent's objections does not comply with the requirements for mitigation evidence set forth in BCGD Proc. R. 10(B)(2)(g). Pursuant to Gov. Bar R. V, a respondent must provide evidence of the following to establish mitigation of mental disability or chemical dependence: i) a diagnosis of chemical dependence or mental disability by a qualified health care professional or alcohol/substance abuse counselor; ii) a determination that the chemical dependency or mental disability contributed to cause the misconduct; iii) in the event of chemical dependency, a certification of successful completion of an approved treatment program or in the event of mental disability, a sustained period of successful treatment; and, iv) a prognosis from a qualified health care professional or alcohol/substance abuse counselor that the attorney will be able to return to competent, ethical professional practice under specified conditions. BCGD Proc. R. 10(B)(2)(g).

The documents that are attached to respondent's objections do not meet the requirements of BCGD Proc. R. 10(B)(2)(g). For example, respondent attached an incomplete report from Farshid Afsarifard, Ph.D., dated October 15, 2009. Although the report provides an evaluation and diagnosis of respondent's mental disability and chemical dependency, it does not provide a treatment recommendation. There are no follow-up records from Dr. Afsarifard and his report makes it clear that he is evaluating respondent at the request of her attorney in the 2009 criminal case.

Respondent also attached a letter from Praveen Abraham, D.O. dated March 17, 2011. Dr. Abraham states he is providing outpatient treatment to respondent and opines that with continued treatment, respondent "may well be able to meet the requirements of returning to the practice of law in the future." The report does not provide any information about how long

respondent has been in treatment, her treatment regimen or her prognosis. Relator had never seen the report before the objections were filed nor is Dr. Abraham's hearsay report admissible evidence.

Respondent's objections state that she is attending AA meetings in an "attempt to join the Ohio Lawyer's Assistance Program." Respondent is not currently involved in a contract for monitored treatment with the Ohio Lawyer's Assistance Program (OLAP). By her own statement she is "attempting to join" OLAP, foreshadowing the inherent problems with the absence of an existing monitored treatment contract.

Further, this Court should not remand this matter for further proceedings or allow respondent a hearing to present the mitigation evidence. In *Disciplinary Counsel v. Shaw*, 126 Ohio St.3d 494, 2010-Ohio-4412, 935 N.E.2d 405, this Court refused to remand a case to the board to allow the respondent to present mitigation evidence. Shaw had been given notice of the date and time of his original disciplinary hearing and he failed to appear. The panel decided to reconvene at a later date and Shaw appeared at the second hearing. When he did appear, Shaw failed to present mitigation evidence.

In Shaw's objections, he requested a remand to present evidence regarding restitution, character and reputation, community involvement and his compliance with OLAP. This Court specifically found that Shaw had been given the opportunity to present this evidence at the hearing and failed to do so. This Court concluded that Shaw failed to demonstrate any "exceptional circumstances warranting a remand." *Id.* at 500.

Respondent has a history of not appearing at disciplinary hearings. She failed to appear at this disciplinary hearing in December 2010 after signing joint stipulations. She failed to appear

at her first hearing in July 2009, again after signing joint stipulations. Like Shaw, respondent has been given a full opportunity to present evidence at a hearing and has failed to do so.

Although this Court has occasionally remanded cases to permit a respondent to present mitigation evidence, it has done so only in cases involving default proceedings. See, e.g. *Butler County Bar Assn. v. Portman*, 121 Ohio St.3d 518, 2009-Ohio-1705, 905 N.E.2d 1203 and *Disciplinary Counsel v. McShane*, 121 Ohio St.3d 169, 2009-Ohio-746, 902 N.E.2d 980. This is not a default proceeding. Respondent had a full opportunity to present her evidence at a disciplinary hearing. Respondent signed stipulations, agreed to joint exhibits and filed a witness list.

Respondent had the opportunity to present her alleged mitigation evidence to a hearing panel. Respondent chose not to attend her hearing. Respondent's efforts to introduce evidence to this Court are procedurally deficient and legally insufficient. This Court should reject respondent's request to supplement the record.

## **II. This Court should affirm the recommended sanction of disbarment.**

Respondent pled guilty to three felonies in September, 2010. Two of the felonies involved respondent falsifying an application for Section 8 housing benefits and receiving those benefits even though she did not qualify. Her third felony was possession of crack cocaine.

In her first disciplinary case, on May 20, 2010, respondent was indefinitely suspended for misuse of her lawyer's trust account, theft from an estate and falsifying a court document. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Cantrell*, 125 Ohio St.3d 458, 2010-Ohio-2114, 928 N.E.2d 1100. In that case, respondent commingled funds, routinely deposited personal funds into her lawyer's trust account, and used that account to pay her personal expenses, as well as those of her son and brother. Respondent failed to maintain adequate funds in her trust account. Respondent also

knowingly made false statements to relator by providing conflicting statements regarding checks written from her trust account. Further, respondent began representation of an estate and accepted a retainer, while her license was on inactive status. Respondent also used funds from the estate to pay her personal expenses, depleting the estate. See, *id.*

This Court has stated that “disbarment is warranted when an attorney turns to crime and is convicted of theft offenses.” *Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Blake*, 100 Ohio St.3d 298, 299 , 2003-Ohio-5755, 798 N.E.2d 610, 611. There is nothing about the present case that warrants a departure from that pronouncement.

In *Disciplinary Counsel v. Sweeney*, 84 Ohio St.3d 388, 1999-Ohio-486, 704 N.E.2d 248, this Court disbarred Sweeney for a conviction of mail fraud, failure to make restitution as ordered by the court and failure to make restitution in a prior disciplinary case. At the time of his conviction, Sweeney was serving a two year suspension with one year stayed for neglect of client matters. Restitution was a condition of his reinstatement after the one-year actual suspension. At his disciplinary hearing on the felony conviction, Sweeney presented evidence that he was dependent on alcohol and cocaine at the time he committed mail fraud. Sweeney presented evidence that he had been free of drugs and alcohol for 18 months before the disciplinary hearing, was compliant with an OLAP contract and attended AA meetings. This Court found that despite the evidence of mitigation, Sweeney’s felony conviction for mail fraud and failure to make the court-ordered restitution required disbarment.

This Court disbarred an attorney for convictions of theft and receiving stolen property in *Disciplinary Counsel v. Williams* (1997), 80 Ohio St.3d 539, 687 N.E.2d 682. Williams was already indefinitely suspended for prior theft convictions. Williams presented mitigation evidence that he suffered from gender dysphoria and committed the theft in an attempt to get

money to complete a sex change operation. Williams had presented the same mitigation evidence in his first disciplinary hearing. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Williams*, 66 Ohio St.3d 41, 1993-Ohio-88, 607 N.E.2d 832. This Court pointed out that Williams had been given a second chance in the sanction for his first discipline but turned around and committed another theft.

Respondent in this matter is like the attorneys in both *Sweeney* and *Williams*. She was already serving an indefinite suspension for misconduct involving theft. In fact, before this Court issued its 2010 decision indefinitely suspending respondent, she had been convicted of three felonies involving fraud, theft and possession of cocaine. Respondent has repeatedly engaged in criminal conduct involving theft and the proper sanction is permanent disbarment.

In permanently disbarring the attorney in *Disciplinary Counsel v. Bein*, 105 Ohio St.3d 62, 2004-Ohio-7012, 822 N.E.2d 358, this Court stated that the legal profession “is and ought to be a high calling dedicated to the service of clients and the public good.” *Id.* at 65, 105. The *Bein* court also stated that a lawyer “who engages in the kind of criminal conduct committed by respondent violates the duty to maintain personal honesty and integrity, which is one of the most basic professional obligations owed by lawyers to the public.” *Id.* at 65, 105. Bein had been convicted of two counts of conspiracy involving transporting stolen goods across state lines for resale.


The Court’s statements in *Bein* apply equally to the respondent in this matter. As an attorney, respondent owed the same duty to the public and yet she stole money from the public in the form of Section 8 benefits.

This Court should adopt the board’s recommendation and disbar respondent from the practice of law.

## CONCLUSION

This Court should not permit respondent to supplement the record absent a showing of exceptional circumstances, which she has not demonstrated. This Court should not modify the sanction recommendation of the board and should affirm the recommended sanction of disbarment.

Respectfully submitted,




Jonathan E. Coughlan (0026424)



Heather L. Hissom (0068151)  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
Counsel of Record  
Office of Disciplinary Counsel  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-7411  
614.461.0256

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing answer brief was served via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, upon respondent, Doreen Marie Cantrell, Esq., 701 Cherokee Trail, Willoughby, OH 44094, and via hand delivery upon Jonathan W. Marshall, Secretary, Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, 65 S. Front Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Columbus, Oh 43215-3431 this 31<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2011.



Heather L. Hissom  
Counsel for Relator

## APPENDIX A

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON  
GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE  
OF  
THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

<b>In Re:</b>	:	
<b>Complaint against</b>	:	<b>Case No. 09-093</b>
<b>Doreen Cantrell</b>	:	<b>Findings of Fact,</b>
<b>Attorney Reg. No. 0040032</b>	:	<b>Conclusions of Law and</b>
	:	<b>Recommendation of the</b>
<b>Respondent</b>	:	<b>Board of Commissioners on</b>
	:	<b>Grievances and Discipline of</b>
<b>Disciplinary Counsel</b>	:	<b>the Supreme Court of Ohio</b>
	:	
<b>Relator</b>	:	
	:	

This matter was heard on December 16, 2010, in Columbus, Ohio, before a panel consisting of members Lawrence R. Elleman, Lynn B. Jacobs, and Janica Pierce Tucker, Chair. None of the panel members resides in the appellate district from which the complaint arose or served as a member of the probable cause panel that reviewed the complaint. Respondent Doreen Cantrell was not present at the hearing. Attorney Heather L. Hissom, Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, represented Relator.

**DISCIPLINARY CHARGES**

Respondent was charged in a complaint filed on November 24, 2009 with violations of the following provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct in both counts of the complaint:

- 1) Prof. Cond. R. 8.4(b) [illegal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty or trustworthiness]; and

2) Prof. Cond. R. 8.4(h) [conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

3) As outlined in the attached Agreed Stipulation, on February 23, 2009, Respondent was indicted on one count of tampering with records, two counts of grand theft, and two counts of falsification related to illegally obtaining Section 8 housing benefits.

4) On September 23, 2009, Respondent pled guilty to two counts of grand theft, both felonies of the fourth degree.

5) On July 13, 2009, Respondent was indicted on one count of possession of cocaine, one count of trafficking cocaine, and one count of complicity to trafficking cocaine.

6) On September 23, 2009, Respondent pled guilty to one count of possession of cocaine, a felony of the fifth degree.

7) Respondent was sentenced to 120 days in jail and ordered to complete an in-jail treatment program.

8) Respondent served part of her time at the North East Ohio Community Alternative Program and was placed on probation for three years and ordered to complete 200 hours of community service.

9) In her answer, Respondent claimed she had a mental health diagnosis at the time of the commission of the alleged misconduct and a chemical dependency. However, Respondent did not present any evidence to support her claim.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

10) Respondent's conduct in both counts violates the following provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct:

11) Prof. Cond. R. 8.4(b) [illegal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty or trustworthiness]; and

12) Prof. Cond. R. 8.4(h) [conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law].

## RECOMMENDED SANCTION

13) The Panel has reviewed the guidelines for imposing lawyer sanctions and makes the following findings:

14) Aggravating factors as set forth in BCGD Proc. Reg. 10(B)(1):

- a. Respondent has prior disciplinary offenses. Respondent received a felony suspension from the Supreme Court on December 14, 2009. Case No. 2009-2044. On May 20, 2010, Respondent was indefinitely suspended by the Supreme Court in *Disciplinary Counsel v. Cantrell*, 125 Ohio St.3d 458, 2010-Ohio-2114. Respondent's interm felony suspension was dismissed on May 20, 2010, due to the issuance of the indefinite suspension.
- b. Respondent exhibited a dishonest or selfish motive;
- c. Respondent engaged in multiple criminal offenses; and
- d. Respondent failed to appear at the hearing.

15) Mitigating factors set forth in BCGD Proc. Reg. (10)(B)(2):

- a. Respondent provided full and free disclosure during the investigation;
- b. Respondent displayed a cooperative attitude; and

c. Respondent received other penalties and sanctions.

16) Relator recommends permanent disbarment.


17) In *Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Blake*, 100 Ohio St.3d 298, 2003-Ohio-5755, the respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of one count of theft in violation of R.C. 2913.02(A)(1), a fourth-degree felony; two additional counts of theft in violation of R.C. 2913.02(A)(1); and one count of forgery. The court sentenced him to five years of community control and ordered him to make restitution and perform community service. The Supreme Court found that the criminal activity violated DR 1-102(A)(3), DR 1-102(A)(4), DR 1-102(A)(5), and DR 1-102(A)(6), and that the failure of respondent to respond to investigators' letters of inquiry violated Gov. Bar R.V(4)(G). The Court ordered disbarment.

18) Based upon the Panel's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and the aggravating and mitigating factors established by the evidence, the Panel recommends Respondent be permanently disbarred.

#### **BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

Pursuant to Gov. Bar Rule V(6)(L), the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court of Ohio considered this matter on February 11, 2011. The Board adopted the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation of the Panel and recommends that Respondent, Doreen Cantrell, be permanently disbarred from the practice of law in the State of Ohio. The Board further recommends that the cost of these proceedings be taxed to Respondent in any disciplinary order entered, so that execution may issue.

Pursuant to the order of the Board of Commissioners on  
Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court of Ohio,  
I hereby certify the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions  
of Law, and Recommendation as those of the Board.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Jonathan W. Marshall". The signature is written over a horizontal line that serves as a separator between the signature and the printed name below it.

**JONATHAN W. MARSHALL, Secretary**

**Board of Commissioners on  
Grievances and Discipline of  
the Supreme Court of Ohio**

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE  
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Doreen Marie Cantrell, Esq.  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, OH 44094

Atty. Reg. No.: (0040032)

**Respondent**

FILED

NOV 23 2010

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON GRIEVANCES & DISCIPLINE

AGREED  
STIPULATIONS  
BOARD NO. 09-093

**DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-7411

**Relator**

**AGREED STIPULATIONS**

Relator, Disciplinary Counsel, and respondent, Doreen Marie Cantrell, do hereby stipulate to the admission of the following facts and exhibits.

**STIPULATED FACTS**

1. Respondent, Doreen Marie Cantrell, was admitted to the practice of law in the state of Ohio on July 11, 1988. Respondent is subject to the Code of Professional Responsibility, Rules of Professional Conduct and the Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio.

**Count One**

2. Respondent was indicted on February 23, 2009 for one count of Tampering with Records, two counts of Grand Theft and two counts of Falsification related to respondent illegally obtaining Section 8 housing benefits.

3. On September 23, 2009 respondent pled guilty to two counts of Grand Theft, each a felony of the fourth degree.
4. Respondent was sentenced on October 28, 2009 to a jail term of 120 days with credit for 65 days served, after which she will enter and complete the North East Ohio Community Alternative Program and comply with all aftercare recommendations. After completing the program, respondent will serve an additional 30 days in jail. She will then be placed on 3 years probation and perform 200 hours of community service.

### Count Two

5. On July 13, 2009 respondent was indicted for one count each of Possession of Cocaine, Trafficking in Cocaine, and Complicity to Trafficking in Cocaine.
6. On September 23, 2009 respondent pled guilty to Possession of Cocaine.
7. Respondent was sentenced on October 28, 2009 to a jail term of 120 days with credit for 65 days served, after which she will enter and complete the North East Ohio Community Alternative Program and comply with all aftercare recommendations. After completing the program, respondent will serve an additional 30 days in jail. She will then be placed on 3 years probation and perform 200 hours of community service.

### **STIPULATED VIOLATIONS**

Respondent's actions in Count One constitute violations of the following: Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(b) [A lawyer shall not commit an illegal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty or trustworthiness]; and Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(h) [A lawyer shall not engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law].

Respondent's actions in Count Two constitute violations of the following: Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(b) [A lawyer shall not commit an illegal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty or

trustworthiness]; and Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4(h) [A lawyer shall not engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice law].

### STIPULATED MITIGATION AND AGGRAVATION

Pursuant to BCGD Proc. Rule 10(B)(1) and (2), respondent and relator stipulate to the following mitigation and aggravation:

#### Mitigation:

- a. Respondent provided full and free disclosure during the investigation and has displayed a cooperative attitude.
- b. Respondent received other penalties or sanctions.

#### Aggravation:

- a. Respondent has prior disciplinary offenses. Respondent's license was felony suspended by the Supreme Court of Ohio on December 14, 2009. See case #2009-2044. On May 20, 2010, respondent was indefinitely suspended by the Court on a prior disciplinary case. See case #2009-2339. Respondent's felony suspension was dismissed on May 20, 2010 due to the issuance of the indefinite suspension.
- b. Respondent exhibited a dishonest or selfish motive.
- c. Respondent engaged in multiple criminal offenses.

### STIPULATED EXHIBITS

1. Indictment, February 23, 2009, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 08-CR-000641
2. Indictment, July 13, 2009, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 09-CR-491
3. Judgment Entry of Sentence, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 08-CR-000641


4. Judgment Entry of Sentence, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 09-CR-491.
5. Amended Judgment Entry, Amending, Nunc Pro Tunc, Judgment Entry of October 30, 2009, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 08-CR-000641

### CONCLUSION

The above are stipulated to and entered into by agreement by the undersigned parties on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November, 2010.

---

Jonathan E. Coughlan (0026424)  
Disciplinary Counsel



---

Doreen Marie Cantrell, Esq. (0040032)  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, OH 44094


---

Heather L. Hissom (0068151)  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-461-0256

4. Judgment Entry of Sentence, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 09-CR-491.
5. Amended Judgment Entry, Amending, Nunc Pro Tunc, Judgment Entry of October 30, 2009, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 08-CR-000641

### CONCLUSION

The above are stipulated to and entered into by agreement by the undersigned parties on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2010.

  
Jonathan E. Coughlan (0026424)  
Disciplinary Counsel


\_\_\_\_\_  
Doreen Marie Cantrell, Esq. (0040032)  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, OH 44094

  
Heather L. Hissom (0068151)  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-461-0256


4. Judgment Entry of Sentence, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 09-CR-491.
5. Amended Judgment Entry, Amending, Nunc Pro Tunc, Judgment Entry of October 30, 2009, *State of Ohio v. Doreen M. Cantrell*, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Case no. 08-CR-000641

### CONCLUSION

The above are stipulated to and entered into by agreement by the undersigned parties on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2010.

  
Jonathan E. Coughlan (0026424)  
Disciplinary Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Doreen Marie Cantrell, Esq. (0040032)  
701 Cherokee Trail  
Willoughby, OH 44094

  
Heather L. Hissom (0068151)  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-461-0256