

ORIGINAL

**BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**LAWRENCE E. WINKFIELD** :  
**(Attorney Reg. No. 0034254)** :  
336 South High Street :  
Columbus, OH 43215 :  
RESPONDENT, :

**CASE NO. 2005-1115**

**RELATOR'S MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**COLUMBUS BAR ASSOCIATION** :  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100 :  
Columbus, OH 43215 :  
RELATOR. :

---

**RELATOR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

---

**Lori J. Brown (0040142)**  
Bar Counsel, Counsel of Record  
Columbus Bar Association  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5134  
(614) 340-2053/ (614) 221-4850 (fax)  
[Lori@cbalaw.org](mailto:Lori@cbalaw.org)

**Geoffrey L. Oglesby (0023949)**  
618 West Washington Street  
Sandusky, Ohio 44870  
(419) 625-9500  
[OglesbyLaw@aol.com](mailto:OglesbyLaw@aol.com)

Counsel for Respondent

**Judith M. McInturff, Esq. (0019809)**  
175 South Third St., Ste. 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 221-2054  
[judy@cbalaw.org](mailto:judy@cbalaw.org)

**Lawrence E. Winkfield (0034254)**

Respondent

**A. Alysha Clous (0070627)**  
Assistant Bar Counsel  
Columbus Bar Association  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5134  
(614) 340-2034/ (614) 221-4850 (fax)  
[alysha@cbalaw.org](mailto:alysha@cbalaw.org)

Co-counsel for Relator



**BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**LAWRENCE E. WINKFIELD** :  
**(0034254)** :  
336 South High Street :  
Columbus, OH 43215 :  
RESPONDENT, :

**CASE NO. 2005-1115**

**RELATOR'S MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**COLUMBUS BAR ASSOCIATION** :  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100 :  
Columbus, OH 43215 :  
RELATOR. :

---

**RELATOR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Now comes relator, the Columbus Bar Association, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 18.02, and moves this court to reconsider its April 15, 2016 order in this case. Appendix A. This court's April 15, 2016 order was "on the merits of" this case; therefore, this Motion for Reconsideration is filed in accordance with S.Ct.Prac.R. 18.02(B). Pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 18.02(A), this motion is timely having been filed with the Clerk of this court within 10 days after the court's order was filed.

Relator respectfully submits that for all of the reasons set forth herein, the order of this court should be modified and clarified.

## **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Relator's motion for reconsideration is not an effort to expand its previous arguments nor has relator introduced new claims. Instead, for the following reasons, relator urges this court to grant this motion for reconsideration and to modify and clarify its April 15, 2016 order as that decision was made in error. *State ex rel. Huebner v. West Jefferson Village Council* (1996), 75 Ohio St.3d 381, 383, 662 N.E.2d 339.

### **The Court Should Reconsider its Decision to Appoint OLAP to Monitor Respondent**

For the reasons set forth herein, this court's order of April 15, 2016 should be reconsidered as it was made in error. Respondent has repeatedly ignored this court's orders and caused harm to his clients. Relator's position was and is that respondent's license to practice law should be suspended in order to protect the public. Nevertheless, if this court allows respondent to continue to practice, the second condition of the April 15, 2016 order must be reconsidered and modified.

Pursuant to the second condition of the order, "OLAP" is to "assume the duty of monitoring respondent[,]" Lawrence E. Winkfield. Relator first asks this court to reconsider that portion of the 2016 order and to clarify whether the 2016 order is an exception to the express requirements of the Rules for the Government of the Bar and/or whether the order really means that respondent will be monitored by "OLAP," the entity.

OLAP, the Ohio Lawyers' Assistance Program, is a nonprofit corporation.<sup>1</sup> The appointment of "OLAP" as respondent's monitor contravenes the Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio.

Gov.Bar R. V(21) requires that "the attorney" appointed as a monitor be admitted to practice law in Ohio, in good standing, and not a member of a certified grievance committee or counsel for relator. Obviously, "OLAP" is not an "attorney." OLAP's non-attorney agents, some of whom are licensed professionals in areas other than law, are not required or expected to know the Rules of Professional Conduct, the Rules for the Government of the Bar, or, for example, whether respondent has "refrain[ed] from any further illegal conduct" per the April 15, 2016 order.

Moreover, pursuant to the second condition of the order, "OLAP" is required to "report to relator regarding respondent's compliance with the court's order[.]" Unfortunately, however, the 2016 order does not provide an exemption under the Rules of Professional Conduct or Gov.Bar R.V so that "OLAP" or any member, employee or agent thereof can actually fulfill its monitoring responsibilities.

Before the April 15, 2016 order was issued, any information obtained by OLAP while performing the duty of assisting respondent with his substance abuse or mental health problems was privileged. *See* Prof. Cond. Rule 8.3(c). That privilege is irreconcilable with the reporting requirements of the April 15, 2016 order.

---

<sup>1</sup> Relator recognizes that the "face" of OLAP has, for many years, been Ohio-licensed attorney Scott R. Mote. As OLAP's Executive Director, Mote has responsibilities to Ohio's judges and lawyers, to OLAP, to its employees and agents, and to the courts of the state of Ohio. Ordering OLAP to expend its limited resources to monitor one respondent with a lengthy disciplinary history and expecting Mote to tacitly accept that responsibility is unfair to OLAP, to Mote, to the public, and to all of Ohio's lawyers.

Prof. Cond. R. 8.3(c) states:

Any information obtained by a member of a committee or subcommittee of a bar association or by a member, employee, or agent of a nonprofit corporation established by a bar association, designed to assist lawyers with substance abuse or mental health problems, provided the information was obtained while the member, employee, or agent was performing duties as a member, employee, or agent of the committee, subcommittee, or nonprofit corporation, shall be privileged for all purposes under this rule.

Based upon the foregoing rule, OLAP and its agents are universally exempt from the reporting requirements set forth in Prof. Cond. Rules 8.3(a) and 8.3(b) yet, the April order expressly requires OLAP to report to relator.

Unless the April 15, 2016 order is reconsidered and modified by this court, when “OLAP” reports to relator pursuant to its duty as respondent’s monitor, that report will, quite simply, eviscerate the privilege established by Prof. Cond. Rule 8.3(c). Without clarification, without an express exemption for this case only, and/or without modifying this order, the heretofore confidential relationships developed by OLAP and cultivated by relators across this state will be for naught.

If this court will not reconsider its order and suspend respondent, the court can resolve the foregoing issues if it modifies the April 15, 2016 order to specifically indicate that respondent’s “probation involves recovery from a disorder.” *See* Gov.Bar R.V(21)(A)(6). Pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(21)(A)(6), relator would then select an attorney designated by OLAP to monitor respondent’s compliance with the recommendations of OLAP in regard to treatment for both his mental health and the use of alcohol.

In contrast to the current order, an attorney appointed to monitor respondent pursuant to Gov.Bar R.V(21)(A)(6) would not be a member, employee, or agent of OLAP. As a result, the

monitor would be able to comply with the reporting requirements of the April 15, 2016 order without violating Prof. Cond. Rule 8.3.

In light of the foregoing, this court now has the opportunity to reflect upon its prior decision. Relator urges this court to reconsider, modify and clarify its previous order as it was made in error.

### **Guidance is Needed Regarding Gov.Bar R.V(21)(I)**

As expressed by the hearing panel of the Board of Professional Conduct in its report and recommendation and also by relator in its objections, the anticipated course of action for all parties when an attorney is conditionally reinstated after an indefinite suspension is entirely unclear. Gov.Bar R.V(21)(I) addresses only attorneys serving a stayed suspension. This court's April 15, 2016 order, has left the parties and the board in the unenviable position of not knowing how to proceed in the event of another violation by respondent of the conditional reinstatement order at any time during what will now be a five-year probationary period.

This motion for reconsideration is an opportunity for this court to clarify the parties' and the board's rights and responsibilities with regard to Gov.Bar R.V(21) *vis-a-vis* a previously indefinitely suspended respondent.

### **This Case Should Have Been Heard at Oral Argument**

Relator filed this probation revocation case pursuant to Gov.Bar R.V(21)(E). Following a hearing before a panel of the Board of Professional Conduct, the panel determined that relator proved by clear and convincing evidence that respondent failed to comply with two of the three conditions of his probation. In its report, the panel recommended that this court grant relator's

petition in part and that it cite respondent for contempt. The panel further recommended that this court modify its 2014 order of reinstatement to comply with the terms set forth in the panel's report. The panel's report was filed with this court by the Board of Professional Conduct. Appendix B, page 5.

After the board's report was filed, this court issued an order to show cause. In response to the show cause order, relator filed objections to the panel's recommendations and respondent filed an answer.

Despite this court's own rules, clear precedence, and the Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio, this court did not hold an oral argument. Relying upon this court's rules and long-established practice, relator awaited an oral argument before this court. Instead, the order of this court has resulted in relator's and OLAP's inability to understand or effectively comply with the court's order.

This court's order was filed without an opportunity for relator to answer questions from the court, to emphasize OLAP's position, and to implore this court to evaluate the enormous problems inherent in allowing the panel's recommendations to remain unchanged. Relator was confident that it was unnecessary for OLAP to devote its limited resources to writing an amicus curiae brief as there would certainly be an opportunity to emphasize OLAP's position during the oral argument. The fact that an oral argument was not held provides further incentive for this court to reconsider its April 15, 2016 order.

S.Ct.Prac.R. 13.04(A)(1) provides as follows: "Oral argument will be scheduled and heard after the filing of objections and briefs to a final certified report filed by the Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness, the Board of Professional Conduct, or the Board on the Unauthorized Practice of Law." In this case, the final certified report was filed by the board on

January 27, 2016 and objections and briefs were filed. Thereafter and notwithstanding the clear language of S.Ct.Prac.R. 13.04(A)(1), no oral argument was held.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, in every case located by relator that is procedurally identical to this case, the court heard the parties at oral argument. Relator did not find a single probation revocation case where objections were filed in which the court made its decision without holding an oral argument.

In all of the following probation revocation cases, this court scheduled oral arguments after objections were filed:

- *Disciplinary Counsel v. Nicholson*, 77 Ohio St.3d 1453, 672 N.E.2d 177 (1996) (oral argument held April 16, 1997);
- *Columbus Bar Assn. v. Connors*, 71 Ohio St.3d 1223, 646 N.E.2d 1119 (1995) (oral argument held March 7, 1995);
- *Disciplinary Counsel v. Phillips*, 78 Ohio St.3d 311, 677 N.E.2d 1187 (1997) (oral argument held January 22, 1997);
- *Disciplinary Counsel v. Oglesby*, 90 Ohio St.3d 455, 739 N.E.2d 346 (2000) (oral argument held July 12, 2000); and,
- *Columbus Bar Assn. v. King*, 95 Ohio St.3d 93, 766 N.E.2d 131 (2000) (oral argument held January 8, 2002).

The lack of opportunity to address the court at oral argument may also run afoul of the Rules for the Government of the Bar. To wit, relator's petition to revoke respondent's probation

---

<sup>2</sup> S.Ct.Prac.R. 13.01(A) states that "S.Ct.Prac.R. 13.01 through 13.05 shall apply to cases that involve the admission to the practice of law, the discipline of persons so admitted, and all other matters relating to the practice of law as provided for in Article IV, Section 2(B)(1)(g) of the Ohio Constitution." Clearly, this probation revocation case filed pursuant to Gov.Bar R.V(21) is a "matter relating to the practice of law."

was filed in accordance with Gov.Bar R.V(21). Pursuant to Gov.Bar R.V(21)(J), after the panel's report was filed, this court issued a show cause order. In response to the show cause order, relator filed objections and respondent filed an answer.

Gov.Bar R.V(21)(K), *i.e.* the very next section of the same rule provides, as follows, "(K) Review by Court. After a hearing on objections, or if objections are not filed within the prescribed time, the Supreme Court shall enter an order as it finds proper in accordance with Section 17 of this rule." (Emphasis added). Relator acknowledges that the word "hearing" and not the phrase "oral argument" appears in the rule and relator accepts that the word "hearing" is not expressly defined in Gov.Bar R.V; however, based upon every previously decided probation revocation case located by relator in which objections were filed, this court did not decide the case until after an oral argument.


An oral argument would have provided relator with the opportunity to emphasize and further explain to this court the many reasons that OLAP cannot fulfill the role of respondent's monitor. Based upon this court's clearly established precedence, relator and OLAP had every reason to expect that an oral argument would be scheduled in this case.

Relator urges this court to schedule this matter for oral argument before issuing a reconsidered decision and order. If this is a procedural impossibility, relator asks that the rationale for enjoining the oral argument be explained in a decision of this court so that future matters can proceed in a predictable manner.


## CONCLUSION

Recognizing that accepting that standard for reconsideration is nebulous, relator nevertheless moves this court to consider all of the foregoing and reject its prior decision as having been made in error. This court should modify its order as set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted,



Judith M. McInturff, Esq. (0019809)  
175 South Third St., Ste. 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 221-2054  
judy@cbalaw.org



Lori J. Brown (0040142)  
Bar Counsel  
Columbus Bar Association  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5134  
(614) 340-2053/ (614) 221-4850 (fax)  
Lori@cbalaw.org




A. Alysha Clous (0070627)  
Assistant Bar Counsel  
Columbus Bar Association  
175 South Third Street, Suite 1100  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5134  
(614) 340-2034/ (614) 221-4850 (fax)  
alysha@cbalaw.org

Co-counsel for Relator

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of April 2016, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Objections was served via electronic and U.S. Mail upon respondent's counsel, Geoffrey Oglesby, Esq., 618 West Washington Street, Sandusky, OH 44870, and via hand delivery upon Richard A. Dove, Esq., Director, Board of Professional Conduct, Supreme Court of Ohio, 65 S. Front Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Columbus, OH 43215.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lori J. Brown (0040142)  
Counsel for Relator

FILED

The Supreme Court of Ohio

APR 15 2016

Columbus Bar Association,  
Relator,  
v.  
Lawrence Edward Winkfield,  
Respondent.

CLERK OF COURT  
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO  
Case No. 2005-1115


ORDER

This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing by a panel of the Board of Professional Conduct of a report and recommendation on relator's petition for revocation of probation, recommending that the court issue an order denying relator's petition in part and modifying the conditions of its June 12, 2014 reinstatement order. The panel further recommends that the court grant relator's petition in part, find respondent in contempt, and allow respondent to be purged of the contempt upon compliance with the modified conditions. Relator filed objections to said report, respondent filed an answer, and this matter was considered by the court.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that relator's petition for revocation of probation is denied in part. It is further ordered that the conditions of the June 12, 2014 reinstatement order are modified as follows: (1) respondent shall undergo an evaluation by the Ohio Lawyers Assistance Program ("OLAP") within 60 days of the date of this order, (2) OLAP shall assume the duty of monitoring respondent and shall report to relator regarding respondent's compliance with the court's order, (3) respondent shall continue to serve the three-year probation ordered on June 12, 2014, and shall serve an additional two years of monitored probation, (4) respondent shall promptly and fully comply with all recommendations made by OLAP in regard to treatment for both his mental health and the use of alcohol, and (5) respondent shall refrain from any further illegal conduct.

It is further ordered by the court that relator's petition for revocation of probation is granted in part. Respondent is found in contempt for his violations of conditions two and three of the June 12, 2014 reinstatement order. It is further ordered that respondent may purge himself of contempt upon providing proof that he is in compliance with the modified conditions of the reinstatement order.

It is further ordered that respondent be taxed the costs of these proceedings in the amount of \$2,344.41, which costs shall be payable to this court by cashier's check or money order on or before 90 days from the date of this order. It is further ordered that if these costs are not paid in full on or before 90 days from the date of this order, interest at the rate of 10% per annum shall accrue as of 90 days from the date of this order and the matter may be referred to the Attorney General for collection. It is further ordered that respondent is liable for all collection costs pursuant to R.C. 131.02 if the debt is certified to the Attorney General for collection.



Maureen O'Connor  
Chief Justice

# THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

## CASE DOCKET

Columbus Bar Association v. Lawrence Edward Winkfield

### Case Information

<b>Number</b>	2005-1115
<b>Type</b>	Disciplinary Case/On Report of Board
<b>Date Filed</b>	06/22/2005
<b>Status</b>	Disposed
<b>Prior Jurisdiction</b>	Board of Commissioners on Grievances & Discipline
<b>Prior Decision Date</b>	06/10/2005
<b>Prior Case Numbers</b>	0230

### Parties

Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline; Board of Commissioners  
Grievances and Discipline

*Represented by:*

Board of Professional Conduct; Board of Professional Conduct

*Represented by:*

Dove, Richard Allan (20256), Counsel of Record

Jack Gilbert Gibbs Jr., Attorney At Law; Monitoring Attorney

*Pro Se*

Lawrence Edward Winkfield; Petitioner

*Represented by:*

Oglesby, Geoffrey Lynn (23949), Counsel of Record

Columbus Bar Association; Relator

*Represented by:*

McInturff, Judith Margaret (19809), Counsel of Record

Brown, Lori Jean (40142)

Clous, Aimee Alysha (70627)


Lawrence Edward Winkfield; Respondent

*Represented by:*

Oglesby, Geoffrey Lynn (23949), Counsel of Record

### Docket

<b>Date Filed</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Filed By</b>
06/22/2005	Report recommending indefinite suspension	Board of Commiss on Griev and Disci



Date Filed	Description	Filed By
06/22/2005	Statement of board costs in the amount of \$3291.94	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
06/22/2005	Original board papers	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
07/01/2005	<b>DECISION: Order to show cause; objections and brief in support due 20 days from the date of this order; answer brief due 15 days</b>	
07/05/2005	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Winkfield 7/2/05 (R&B)	
07/06/2005	Return receipt for Bruce Campbell, Esq.	
07/06/2005	Return receipt for Columbus Bar Association	
07/06/2005	Return receipt for Jill McQuain, Esq.	
07/06/2005	Return receipt for Judith McInturff, Esq.	
07/14/2005	Return receipt for Fred Thomas, Esq.	
07/20/2005	Notice of county for publication under Gov. Bar R. V 8(D)(2)	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
07/22/2005	Return receipt for James A. Hofelich, Esq.	
01/11/2006	<b>DECISION: Attorney suspended indefinitely. See opinion at 2006-Ohio-6 (<a href="https://supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2006/2006-ohio-6.pdf">https://supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2006/2006-ohio-6.pdf</a>)</b>	DISPOSITIVE
01/25/2006	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Winkfield (R&B) 1/14/06	
01/25/2006	Return receipt for James Hofelich, Esq.	
03/24/2006	<b>DECISION: Sua sponte, order to show cause within 20 days from the date of this order why respondent should not be held in contempt for failure to file an affidavit of compliance</b>	
03/29/2006	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Winkfield 3/28/06 (R&B)	
04/03/2006	Return receipt for James A. Hofelich, Esq.	
07/17/2006	Invoice of publication costs in the amount of \$267.20	
09/21/2006	<b>DECISION: Sua sponte, respondent is found in contempt for failure to file an affidavit of compliance</b>	
09/27/2006	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Winkfield 9/23/06 (R&B)	
10/02/2006	Return receipt for James Hofelich, Esq.	
10/20/2006	Notice of imposition of reciprocal discipline by U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division	
05/19/2008	Payment of board costs in the amount of \$3,291.94 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1586486	Petitioner
05/19/2008	Payment of interest on board costs in the amount of \$692.10 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1586486	Petitioner
07/07/2008	Petition for reinstatement	Petitioner
07/07/2008	<b>09/29/09 Denied</b> And motion to vacate entry of contempt against petitioner with attached affidavit of compliance	Petitioner

Date Filed	Description	Filed By
	<b>07/23/08 Granted; respondent is granted leave to file the affidavit of compliance</b>	
07/07/2008	\$500 deposit for costs by Lawrence Winkfield, receipt #1586519	Petitioner
07/07/2008	Payment of publication costs and interest in the amount of \$311.51 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1586518	Petitioner
07/09/2008	Notice of appearance of Wilbur H. Flippin, Jr.	Petitioner
07/29/2008	Return receipt for Wilbur H. Flippin Jr., Esq.	
07/29/2008	Return receipt; received by Lawrence E. Winkfield 7/25/08 (R&B)	
08/22/2008	Affidavit of compliance	Petitioner
12/15/2008	Notice of substitution of counsel William H. Smith for James Hofelich and Wilbur Flippin	Petitioner
06/18/2009	Report recommending denial of readmission to the practice of law	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
06/18/2009	Statement of board costs in the amount of \$1,115.31 (\$1,615.31 less \$500 deposit)	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
06/18/2009	Original board papers	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
07/01/2009	<b>DECISION: Order to show cause; objections and brief in support due 10 days from the date of this order; answer brief due 15 days</b>	
07/08/2009	Stipulation of time to file objections and brief in support to 7/27/09	Relator
07/21/2009	Notice of county for publication under Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(2)	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
07/21/2009	Return receipt for Certified Grievance Committee	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for Disciplinary Counsel	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for Bruce A. Campbell, Esq.	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for A. Alysha Clous, Esq.	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for Ohio State Bar Assn.	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for US District Court Northern District	
07/21/2009	Return receipt for William H. Smith, Esq.	
07/23/2009	Return receipt received by Lawrence Winkfield (R&B) 7/3/09	
07/23/2009	Return receipt received by Susan J. Dlott, USDC 7/2/09	
07/23/2009	Return receipt received by Leonard Green 6th Cir 7/2/09	
07/23/2009	Return receipt received by Bradley N. Frick, Esq. 7/2/09	
07/27/2009	Objections and brief in support	Petitioner
08/10/2009	Stipulation to extension of time to file answer brief to 8/31/09	Relator
08/27/2009	Answer brief	Relator
11/03/2009	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Edward Winkfield (R only)	

Date Filed	Description	Filed By
11/04/2009	Return receipt for William H. Smith, Esq.	
08/10/2012	Payment of board costs in the amount of \$1,115.31 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1587260; interest in the amount of \$286.80 remains outstanding	Petitioner
08/05/2013	Payment of interest on board costs in the amount of \$286.80 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1587434	Petitioner
10/04/2013	Petition for reinstatement	Petitioner
	<b>06/12/14 Attorney reinstated to practice of law on conditions and is placed on monitored probation for three years.</b>	
10/04/2013	\$500 deposit for costs by Lawrence E. Winkfield, receipt #1587449	Petitioner
10/15/2013	Petition for reinstatement forwarded to Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline.	
04/07/2014	Report recommending reinstatement to practice of law with conditions	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
04/07/2014	Statement of board costs in the amount of \$2,326.25	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
04/07/2014	Original board papers	Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline
04/16/2014	<b>DECISION: Order to show cause; objections due within 10 days of receipt of this order; answer due 15 days from objections.</b>	
04/16/2014	Clerk's request for information from the Clients' Security Fund.	
04/18/2014	Clerk's request for information from Attorney Services Division.	
04/18/2014	Notice from Clients' Security Fund	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by USDC, Southern Dist	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Franklin County Clerk of Courts	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Geoffrey L Oglesby Esq.	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Disciplinary Counsel	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Lawrence E Winkfield (R&B)	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Franklin County Administrative Judge	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by USDC, Northern Dist	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Alysha Clous Esq.	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Columbus Bar Certified Grievance Comm	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Bruce A Campbell Esq.	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Judith M McInturff Esq.	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by Ohio State Bar Association	
04/28/2014	Return receipt; received by US 6th Circuit Ct of Appeals	
05/05/2014	Notice from Office of Attorney Services regarding CLE and/or attorney registration	
07/11/2014	Notice of appointment of monitoring attorney Jack G. Gibbs, Jr.	Relator
07/16/2014	Return receipt; received by Geoffrey L Oglesby Esq.	

Date Filed	Description	Filed By
07/16/2014	Return receipt; received by Lawrence E Winkfield (R&B)	
09/12/2014	Payment of board costs in the amount of \$2,326.25 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1587540	Petitioner
09/12/2014	Payment of interest on board costs in the amount of \$1.26 by Lawrence Winkfield; receipt #1587540	Petitioner
01/27/2016	Report recommending an order modifying reinstatement conditions and finding respondent in contempt with permission to purge	Board of Professional Conduct
01/27/2016	Statement of board costs in the amount of \$2,344.41	Board of Professional Conduct
01/27/2016	Original board papers	Board of Professional Conduct
02/01/2016	<b>DECISION: Order to show cause - objections due within 20 days of order; answer brief due within 15 days of objections.</b>	
02/09/2016	Return receipt; received by Geoffrey L Oglesby Esq.	
02/19/2016	Objections and brief in support	Relator
03/04/2016	Return receipt; received by Judith M McInturff Esq.	
03/04/2016	Return receipt; received by Lawrence Winkfield (B)	
03/07/2016	Answer brief	Respondent
03/23/2016	Certified mail returned - unclaimed - Lawrence Winkfield (R)	
04/15/2016	<b>DECISION: Petition granted in part and denied in part; conditions of 6-12-14 reinstatement order modified; respondent found in contempt; ordered to pay \$2,344.41 in costs. See announcement at 2016-Ohio-1555 (<a href="https://supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2016/2016-ohio-1555.pdf">https://supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2016/2016-ohio-1555.pdf</a>).</b>	

End of Docket