



THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO



Office of Disciplinary Counsel
2015 ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	Overview and Staffing
3	Significant Office Developments
6	Grievances
7	Formal Complaints and Dismissals
7	Appeals
7	Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL)
7	Reciprocals
8	Child Support
8	Resignations and Retirements
8	Interim Suspensions
8	Hearings and Oral Arguments
9	TABLE 1: A Five Year Comparison (2011-2015) Disposition of Grievances Received, Caseload Comparison, and Sanctions Issued
10	TABLE 2: Grievances Received and Opened for Investigation By Primary Violation: A Five Year Comparison (2011-2015)
11	TABLE 3: 2015 Sanctions Issued by The Supreme Court of Ohio Pursuant to Cases Filed by Disciplinary Counsel
13	TABLE 4: Status of Formal Matters Pending as of Dec. 31, 2015
14	TABLE 5: ODC Matters Received in 2015 based on County of Respondents' Principal Ohio Office Locations
15	TABLE 6: Operational Expenses in Fiscal Year 2015

A MESSAGE FROM DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

Dear Chief Justice O'Connor and Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court:

In accordance with Rule V, Section 4(D) of the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio, I respectfully submit for your consideration the 2015 Annual Report of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

In 2015, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed 40 complaints that were certified by the Board of Professional Conduct. The Office also processed the retirements or resignations with disciplinary action pending of an additional 41 Ohio lawyers and disposed of 2,171 grievances during 2015. The Office's investigative caseload at the end of 2015 was 595 cases, the lowest year-end figure in at least the past five years.

Additionally, in order to implement this Court's amendment to Gov.Bar R. V(5)(D)(1)(e), the Office of Disciplinary Counsel developed and presented a training program for bar counsel and volunteer grievance committee members who are designated trial counsel of record in cases prosecuted before the Board of Professional Conduct. After developing the training and resource materials during the first half of the year, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel presented its training program to more than 275 bar counsel and certified grievance committee members in eight separate locations throughout Ohio between mid-September and mid-December. Evaluation forms submitted by the attendees reflect their assessment that the program was extremely valuable and well-presented. The Office will be presenting additional sessions of the program through the first half of 2016, and a new training program will be introduced during the second half of the year.

In addition, as part of its educational outreach program, attorneys from the Office of Disciplinary Counsel made presentations at 38 separate meetings and events during 2015, with the undersigned disciplinary counsel making 16 of those presentations and the chief assistant disciplinary counsel making 11 presentations.

The 28-member staff of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel is committed to its public protection mission and to its service to the Supreme Court, the legal profession and the public in ensuring that Ohio judges and attorneys are competent and ethical in the performance of their duties.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott J. Drexel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end of the last name.

Scott J. Drexel
Disciplinary Counsel



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

The position of Disciplinary Counsel and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) have been established by The Supreme Court of Ohio pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(3) (B). In accordance with that rule, Disciplinary Counsel is authorized to investigate allegations of misconduct, mental illness, or substance abuse by attorneys and judges under the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct, the Code of Judicial Conduct, and rules governing the Unauthorized Practice of Law (“UPL”). Disciplinary Counsel also has the authority to: (a) initiate complaints based upon its investigations; (b) certify bar counsel designated by certified grievance committees; (c) review the dismissals of grievances by certified grievance committees for abuse of discretion or error of law; (d) develop and offer an education curriculum for bar counsel and certified grievance committee members, in consultation with the Board of Professional Conduct (the “Board”) and representatives of certified grievance committees; (e) review registration forms for the employment of suspended or disqualified attorneys; (f) and investigate and prepare confidential reports regarding the applications for retirement or resignation with disciplinary action pending.

STAFF OVERVIEW

The 28-person staff of the ODC is comprised of the following positions:

- **Disciplinary Counsel:** Scott J. Drexel
- **Chief Assistant Disciplinary Counsel:** Joseph M. Caligiuri
- **Assistant Disciplinary Counsel:** Stacy Beckman,¹ Jennifer Bondurant,² Michelle Bowman, Dionne DeNunzio, Karen Osmond, Casey Russo, Donald Scheetz, Amy Stone, Audrey Varwig, and Kevin Williams³
- **Administrative Officer:** Joel Kent
- **Executive Administrative Assistant:** Jennifer Dennis
- **Legal Research Analysts:** Paula Adams, Orsolya Hamar-Hilt, and Linda Hardesty-Fish⁴
- **Investigators:** Donald Holtz and Peter Simpson
- **Administrative Assistant:** Christine McKrimmon
- **Legal Secretaries:** Sara Early, Laura Johnston, Karen Loy, and Shannon Scheid
- **Receptionist:** Elizabeth Reynolds
- **Clerical Support Staff:** Hartland Ruben and Marc Stevens⁵
- **Summer and Fall Law Clerk:** Miriah Lee

The office also contracts with two part-time field investigators who provide investigative services as needed in the northeastern and southwestern portions of Ohio.

¹ Ms. Beckman is part-time and works a four-day per week schedule;

² Ms. Bondurant commenced her employment with ODC on Oct. 5, 2015;

³ Mr. Williams served as a full-time temporary attorney at ODC for six months (July-December 2015);

⁴ Ms. Hardesty-Fish is part-time and works 40 hours per pay period;

⁵ Mr. Stevens' position was approved by the Court in June 2015, and he commenced his employment on Aug. 31, 2015.

SIGNIFICANT OFFICE DEVELOPMENTS

The work of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel was significantly impacted by a number of factors during 2015.

A. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Judge Angela Stokes, Bd. Case No. 13-057*

The vigorously contested judicial discipline proceeding filed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel against Cleveland Municipal Court Judge Angela M. Stokes significantly tested the Office's ability to simultaneously handle a proceeding of extraordinary size and length and continue to handle all of its other investigations and prosecutions in a timely and efficient manner.

The complaint against Judge Stokes was certified by the former Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline in October 2013, prior to the date the undersigned became Disciplinary Counsel. An amended complaint was thereafter filed on April 29, 2014. Additionally, on Nov. 4, 2014, relator filed a motion for interim remedial suspension, which was subsequently granted by the Supreme Court on Dec. 18, 2014.

Trial in the proceeding against Judge Stokes commenced on Feb. 26, 2015. From the time the initial complaint was certified in October 2013, until December 2014, the lead counsel for relator was an outside prosecutor, Michael E. Murman of Cleveland.⁶ Prior to the filing of the original complaint, Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Karen Osmond was assigned to provide part-time assistance to Mr. Murman in a support capacity. Thereafter, in or about March 2014, a second assistant disciplinary counsel, Audrey Varwig, was also assigned to assist Mr. Murman on a part-time basis. However, by approximately September 2014, both Osmond and Varwig were working on the *Stokes* matter on essentially a full-time basis. Moreover, as the trial date approached, the undersigned concluded that the prosecution of this matter should be pursued by the Office's attorney staff. Therefore, on Dec. 23, 2014, Chief Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Joseph M. Caligiuri made his initial appearance in this matter, joining Osmond and Varwig.

The number of witnesses and proposed exhibits in this case were enormous. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel identified 92 witnesses and approximately 205 exhibits, including videos. Respondent Stokes identified 141 witnesses, marked 3,020 documents as potential exhibits, and identified an additional 458 audio/video exhibits.

In order to cope with the magnitude of this case, the undersigned was compelled to assign Caligiuri, Osmond, and Varwig to the *Stokes* matter on a full-time basis. They ceased to have new investigations assigned to them, they no longer took turns in handling attorney ethics calls and many of their existing investigation cases were reassigned to other attorneys in the office.

The one-third reduction in the number of attorneys available to investigate and prosecute disciplinary matters had an unavoidable impact upon the efficiency and productivity of the Office during 2015. That impact was ameliorated to some degree by the ability of the undersigned to hire an attorney, Kevin L. Williams, on a temporary six-month contract, to assist in handling investigations and prosecutions. Mr. Williams previously worked for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel but left the office in 2004. Mr. Williams made a tremendous contribution to the Office during his temporary tenure but could not fully

⁶ The primary factor influencing the original appointment of an outside prosecutor in this case was the scheduled departure of the prior Disciplinary Counsel on Oct. 30, 2013 and the considerable turnover among the attorneys in the Office of Disciplinary Counsel during 2013.

replace the three experienced litigators who were assigned on a full-time basis to the *Stokes* matter.

A mid-trial agreement for the resolution of the *Stokes* matter was finally reached by the parties in December 2015, resulting in the hearing panel’s dismissal of the proceeding on Jan. 6, 2016, conditioned upon respondent Stokes’ agreement to immediately resign from the Cleveland Municipal Court and to never again seek or hold a state judicial position in Ohio. At the time the case was resolved, 19 days of trial had been conducted with an additional 24 days of trial scheduled through mid-2016.

B. ODC Training Program for Bar Counsel and Members of Certified Grievance Committees Designated as Trial Counsel of Record

Effective Jan. 1, 2015, the Supreme Court adopted amendments to Rule V of the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio. Those amendments included the addition of Rule V(5)(D)(1)(e), which provides that, on or after Jan. 1, 2016, any bar counsel or volunteer certified grievance committee member who is designated as trial counsel of record in a case prosecuted before the Board of Professional Conduct must have attended and completed a training program offered by Disciplinary Counsel that relates to the preparation and prosecution of formal complaints.

During the spring of 2015, all of the attorneys in the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, as well as the office’s three legal research assistants, participated in the preparation of proposed materials for the training program. Thereafter, in July and August 2015, the materials were edited and organized into a 50-page “Reference Guide for Bar Counsel and Certified Grievance Committees,” which also included approximately two dozen sample letters, pleadings, and other documents. Additionally, Disciplinary Counsel developed a 3 ½ hour training program that included a 90-minute presentation on “best practices” in the intake, investigation, complaint drafting and trial processes, and an additional two hours of interactive small group analysis and discussion regarding investigation and complaint drafting using two hypothetical grievances that had been submitted against a hypothetical Ohio attorney.

Commencing on Sept. 11, 2015, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel conducted eight separate training programs for bar counsel and members of certified grievance committees throughout the State of Ohio (*see box at right*).

With the exception of the training program in Portsmouth, there were at least four Disciplinary Counsel attorneys who participated in each of the training programs, including Disciplinary Counsel Scott Drexel, Chief Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Joesph Caligiuri, and Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Stacy Beckman and Amy Stone. Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Audrey Varwig participated in two of the training sessions.

2015 TRAINING PROGRAMS

DATE	LOCATION
Sept. 11, 2015	Dayton
Sept. 25, 2015	Toledo
Oct. 9, 2015	Canton
Oct. 16, 2015	Geneva-on-the-Lake (Ashtabula County)
Oct. 30, 2015	Cincinnati
Nov. 6, 2015	Columbus
Nov. 20, 2015	Portsmouth (Scioto County)
Dec. 14, 2015	Cleveland

A total of 275 bar counsel and certified grievance committee members successfully completed the training programs conducted by Office of Disciplinary Counsel during the fall of 2015. A “make-up” training session was conducted in Columbus on Feb. 19, 2016, which was completed by an additional 28 bar counsel and certified grievance committee members.

Each attendee at the training sessions was asked to complete a course questionnaire and an evaluation sheet for the training. *(The scoring system for the evaluation sheet is shown in the box to the right).*

EVALUATION SCORING SYSTEM	
Excellent	5
Good	4
Average	3
Fair	2
Poor	1

The average rating for the quality of the program was 4.7 out of the highest possible rating of 5.0.

Additionally, in rating the individual presentations of the various speakers at the training program, the average rating was again a 4.7 out of the highest possible rating of 5.0.

Finally, the training program attendees reported that they found the materials regarding complaint drafting and the trial and appellate proceedings before the Board and the Supreme Court to be the most valuable topics on the program, with the intake process and investigation process being somewhat less valuable. Attendees particularly found the “hands-on” grievance investigation and complaint drafting exercises to be extremely helpful.

C. Educational Outreach

In the undersigned’s view, the education of Ohio attorneys and judges about the requirements and obligations imposed by the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Code of Judicial Conduct serves an important and valuable part of the work of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. The purpose of attorney and judicial proceedings is not to “punish” the particular attorney or judge but, rather, to protect the public and the legal profession. The undersigned believes that there are circumstances in which education can be just as effective in preventing future misconduct as a disciplinary prosecution.

Therefore, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel attempts to accommodate all requests for a member of the Office to address groups of attorneys or judges on issues relating to legal ethics and the requirements of the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Code of Judicial Conduct.

In addition to the eight bar counsel and certified grievance committee training seminars conducted throughout Ohio in 2015 — each of which were taught by at least three attorneys from the Office — the Office made presentations at a total of at least 38 other meetings and events. These included 16 speaking engagements by the undersigned disciplinary counsel and 11 speaking engagements by Chief Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Joesph Caligiuri.

D. Abandoned Attorney Files

In accordance with Gov.Bar R. V(26), when an attorney dies, is suspended or disbarred, or otherwise abandons his or her client files and there is no partner, executor, or other responsible party who is available and willing to assume responsibility, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel may take possession of the attorney’s files, inventory the files, and take such action as is necessary to protect the interest of clients of the attorney.

During 2014 and 2015, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel took possession of approximately 1,198 boxes of files from 18 attorneys. Although the number of client files contained in each box may vary significantly, there are an average of approximately 20-25 client files per box. Therefore, during 2014 and 2015, Office of Disciplinary Counsel took possession of more than 20,000 individual client files. On a number of occasions, ODC declined to take possession of abandoned client files because it simply had no storage space for the files.

By contrast, in 2012 and 2013, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel took possession of 579 boxes of client files from 18 attorneys.

As a result of this significant increase in the number of abandoned client files that the Office of Disciplinary Counsel has been asked to collect, inventory, and return to clients, the undersigned sought and was granted permission to hire a second staff assistant to help inventory the abandoned files, contact clients regarding their files and, as requested, return the files to the clients. Each of the two staff assistants spend approximately 80 percent of their time on processing, inventorying, and returning abandoned client files.

Finally, in accordance with Gov.Bar R. V(26)(E), Disciplinary Counsel may destroy abandoned files seven years after completing an inventory of the abandoned files and after a reasonable effort has been made to return the files to the clients. In January and March 2016, Disciplinary Counsel destroyed a total of 101 boxes of abandoned files belonging to eight attorneys that met the destruction criteria set forth in Section V(26)(E).

GRIEVANCES

In 2015, ODC received a total of 2,704 new matters. This figure includes all relevant categories, such as grievances filed against attorneys, judges, magistrates and Justices, appeals from dismissals by the Certified Grievance Committees, felony convictions, board cases, Unauthorized Practice of Law investigations, UPL board cases, child support, contempt, reciprocals, retirements and resignations. Of that total, 1,831 represented grievances originally filed with ODC against attorneys and 561 represented grievances originally filed against judges.

A total of 1,439 grievances were dismissed on intake or after initial review, of which 942 were against attorneys and 490 were against judges. For administrative reasons, 78 grievances initially received by ODC were transferred to local bar associations for investigation. Under that same rationale, another 43 grievances were forwarded to the Board for reassignment and one was forwarded to the chief justice of the Ohio courts of appeals, pursuant to Gov. Jud. Rule II (2)(B). The remaining 978 grievances were opened for investigation. For a detailed analysis of grievances received in 2015 and opened for investigation, please refer to **Table 2** (p.10). The data identifies the alleged primary violation and also includes data from the prior four calendar years to assist in tracking grievances and reporting trends in the state. **Table 5** (p. 14) represents a geographic distribution by Ohio county of the matters filed with ODC in 2015, based on the location of the respondent attorneys' principal Ohio offices.

One violation category, "Failure to Maintain Funds in a Trust," had experienced a dramatic increase in the first five years following adoption of a new statutory requirement in the fall of 2005 mandating that banks notify ODC in each instance where an IOLTA is overdrawn. The number of such grievances reported in 2005 was 110, increasing to 243 in 2006, 289 in 2007, 319 in 2008, 338 in 2009, and 382 in 2010. Thereafter, ODC began to experience a downturn in the number of statutory reports with 353 in 2011, 338 in 2012, 254 in 2013 and 247 in 2014. However, the number of IOLTA overdrafts reported in 2015 increased to 256.

At the beginning of 2015, there were 668 grievances pending with ODC. As of Dec. 31, 2015, there were 595 grievances pending or under investigation.

FORMAL COMPLAINTS AND DISMISSALS

In 2015, ODC filed 40 formal complaints with the Board of Professional Conduct, one of which alleged judicial misconduct. Of the 47 Board cases closed in 2015, 13 of these complaints were dismissed at various stages of the process — five at the hearing panel stage, seven by the Board, and one by the Court. Six of the dismissals resulted when the respondents' applications for resignation status were approved with the designation "with disciplinary action pending." Five others cases were dismissed as a result of the imposition of an indefinite suspension upon the respondent.

APPEALS

In Ohio, both ODC and 33 certified grievance committees, which are associated with local bar associations across the state, are authorized to receive, investigate, and prosecute grievances. If a grievance is initially submitted to and dismissed by any of the certified grievance committees, the grievant has 14 days within which to appeal that dismissal to the director of the Board, who shall refer the request for review to ODC. ODC is authorized to open a new case and to conduct a separate investigation (*for details, see Gov.Bar R. V(10)(D)*).

In 2015, ODC received 168 appeals, an increase of 10 from 2014. During the year, 172 appeals were closed. One of those appeals resulted in ODC filing a formal complaint with the Board. As of Dec. 31, 2015, 57 appeals were pending.

UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW (UPL)

ODC is authorized to receive grievances against an individual or organization who/that is not authorized to engage in the practice of law in Ohio (*see Gov.Bar R. VII*). The respondent may be a former attorney who no longer is currently licensed under Ohio rules, an attorney licensed in another jurisdiction but not Ohio, or someone who has never been admitted to the practice of law in any state. Also subject to ODC's investigatory powers are businesses or other entities that offer legal services without the authority to do so.

The number of UPL grievances received in 2015 totaled 31, a decrease of 14 from the 45 received in 2014. During the year, 21 UPLs were closed, and as of Dec. 31, 2015, there were 42 UPL investigations pending. In 2015, ODC filed no UPL Board cases. One UPL Board case closed in 2015, dismissed by the UPL hearing panel.

RECIPROCAL

Attorneys may be licensed to practice law in multiple state jurisdictions. When an attorney admitted to the practice of law in Ohio has been sanctioned by another state, the attorney is required to notify both ODC and the clerk of the Ohio Supreme Court of the action. In addition, ODC frequently learns of the imposition of discipline in other jurisdictions from the disciplinary agency itself. Once a certified copy of the original disciplinary order has been received, the Court may impose a sanction upon that attorney with either identical or comparable discipline (*for details, please see Gov.Bar R. V(20)*). ODC received two reciprocal matters and closed one in 2015. The Court sanctioned one attorney on reciprocal complaints in 2015. (*See Table 3 on p. 11 for sanction and original state jurisdiction*).

CHILD SUPPORT

If an Ohio attorney, justice, or judge has been found in a final and enforceable determination to be in default of a child support order, ODC is authorized under Gov.Bar R. V (18) to pursue an interim suspension. No child support matters were filed by ODC in 2015, and none were pending at the close of the year.

RESIGNATIONS AND RETIREMENTS

Attorneys may submit an application to the Court to resign or retire from the practice of law which, once approved, is final and irrevocable. The application contains both an affidavit and written waiver permitting ODC to conduct a review of the application to determine whether the application should be classified either as a retirement or a resignation with disciplinary action pending.

During the investigation, ODC seeks to determine whether the applicant is currently the subject of any disciplinary investigation(s) or proceeding(s). If disciplinary action is pending, ODC prepares a sealed report to the Office of Attorney Services indicating that the applicant may resign, but with the added phrase appended “with Disciplinary Action Pending.” Retirement or resignation applicants found to have no pending discipline are approved as retirements (*for details, see Gov.Bar R. VI(7)*). In 2015, 47 retirement or resignation applications were received for review by ODC. In 2015, the Court announced 20 resignations with disciplinary action pending and 21 retirements (*see Table 3 on p. 12*).⁸ Additionally two applications were withdrawn and two applicants passed away during the review process.

INTERIM SUSPENSIONS

There were 21 interim suspensions decided by the Court in 2015 — 11 for a felony conviction, 10 for default, none for interim remedial, and none for mental health.

HEARINGS AND ORAL ARGUMENTS

In 2015, ODC attorneys appeared at 16 hearings before panels of the Board and participated in nine oral arguments before the Ohio Supreme Court. As of Dec. 31, 2015, there were 27 cases awaiting hearing dates before the Board and three cases awaiting reports from the Board; two cases pending oral argument before the Court; and 20 cases pending decision by the Court (*see Table 4 on p. 13*). In 2015, the Court issued formal sanctions in 74 cases in which ODC was the relator. (Tables 1 & 3).

⁸ In September 2007 the Court repealed Gov.Bar R. V (11)(G) and replaced it with Gov.Bar R. VI (6), which eliminated “regular resignations” and made retirement a permanent status.

- TABLE 1 -
A FIVE-YEAR COMPARISON (2011-2015)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
DISPOSITION OF GRIEVANCES					
Dismissed on Intake or After Investigation	2,658	2,601	2,466	2,210	2,171
Pending at End of Year	708	632	650	668	595
CASELOAD COMPARISON					
Grievances Received	2,950	2,744	2,679	2,585	2,392
Appeals Received	206	221	205	158	168
UPLs Received	66	48	34	45	31
Formal Complaints Filed	57	46	31	46	40
SANCTIONS ISSUED (SEE TABLE 3 ON P. 11 FOR DETAILS)					
Public Reprimands	1	0	2	5	6
Six-Month Suspensions	5	11	3	3	4
One-Year Suspensions	3	10	6	4	3
18-Month Suspensions	2	2	0	0	0
Two-Year Suspensions	3	9	2	11	3
Indefinite Suspensions	9	5	7	10	15
Interim Default Suspensions	-	-	7	6	10
Interim Felony Suspensions	-	-	2	8	11
Interim Remedial Suspensions	0	0	0	1	0
Mental Health Suspensions	0	0	1	0	0
Disbarments	5	4	3	2	1
Reciprocal Disciplines	3	10	5	7	1
Resignations with Disciplinary Action Pending	12	20	6	18	20
Retirements (Technically these are not sanctions)	9	15	20	19	21

- 2013 is the first year ODC began to track Interim Default Suspensions and Interim Felony Suspensions.

- TABLE 2 -

GRIEVANCES RECEIVED AND OPENED FOR INVESTIGATION

A FIVE-YEAR COMPARISON (2011-2015)

Alleged Primary Violation	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Neglect/Failure to Protect Interests of the Client	317	256	320	259	211
Failure to Account or Turn Over File	43	70	61	31	24
Improper Withdrawal (Refusal to Withdraw)	4	9	8	12	7
Excessive Fees	68	76	75	71	61
Personal Misconduct	118	88	126	78	80
Misrepresentation/False Statement /Concealment	37	18	14	17	15
Criminal Conviction	15	5	14	12	33
Failure to File Income Tax Returns	0	0	0	1	0
Commingling of Funds	1	0	0	0	0
Conversion	29	25	18	14	22
Embezzlement	3	1	2	5	1
Failure to Maintain Funds in Trust	353	338	254	237	256
Breach of Client Confidence	10	9	7	6	3
Conflict of Lawyer's Interest	21	36	34	26	19
Conflict of Client's Interest	74	55	35	46	37
Communication with Adverse Party Represented by Counsel	10	13	7	3	5
Trial Misconduct	100	82	71	90	72
Failure to Register	2	0	10	1	2
Practicing While Under Suspension	12	20	11	13	27
Assisting in the Unauthorized Practice of Law	8	5	6	6	4
Advertising/Solicitation	20	21	16	19	10
Judicial Misconduct	108	106	134	92	82
Mental Illness	3	0	0	1	3
Substance Abuse	5	4	5	1	4
Other	5	2	0	1	0
TOTAL	1,365	1,239	1,228	1,042	978

- TABLE 3 -

SANCTIONS ISSUED IN 2015 BY THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
PURSUANT TO CASES FILED BY DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

6	PUBLIC REPRIMANDS		10	INTERIM DEFAULT SUSPENSIONS	
	Bruce Martin Broyles	2015-0598		Mohammed Noure Alo	2014-2078
	Gregory Steven Costabile	2014-1743		Timothy Eric Bellew	2015-1197
	William Tierney Marshall	2014-1383		Joseph Robert Compoli	2015-0356
	Erin GERALYN Rosen	2015-0278		Jennifer Lynn Coriell	2015-1423
	Fred Phillip Schwartz	2015-0999		Stephanie Gail Gussler	2015-1129
	Kierra Loree Smith	2015-1639		Richard Lake Hiatt	2015-0602
				Mattheuw William Oberholtzer	2015-0059
4	SIX MONTH SUSPENSIONS			Sean P. Ruffin	2015-0606
	Edward Royal Bunstine	2014-1392		Mark Allan Thomas	2015-1547
	Natalie Ference Grubb	2014-1391		James Christopher Zury	2015-0354
	Bradley Francis Hubbell	2015-0592			
	Charles Richard Quinn	2014-2159	11	INTERIM FELONY SUSPENSIONS	
3	ONE YEAR SUSPENSIONS			Arthur Arnold Ames	2015-1956
	Jennifer Ann Gorby	2014-0541		Gary Nieland Bakst	2015-0609
	Jason Richard Phillabaum	2015-0279		James Michael Burge	2015-0579
	Richard Grove Ward	2013-1979		John Edward Mahin	2015-0014
0	EIGHTEEN MONTH SUSPENSIONS			Andrew Osyp Martyniuk	2015-1863
3	TWO YEAR SUSPENSIONS			Dennis Michael McGrath	2015-0785
	Marcus Edward Coleman	2014-2148		Susan Joan Phillips	2015-1510
	David Charles Eisler	2014-0970		Timothy Eugene Potts	2015-0232
	Stephen Edwin Weithman	2014-0544		Kevin Purcell	2015-0096
15	INDEFINITE SUSPENSIONS			Kenneth Jay Warren	2015-0472
	Mohammed Noure Alo	2014-2078		Angela Marie Whitt	2015-1200
	Gregory Alan Cohen	2014-1740	0	INTERIM REMEDIAL SUSPENSIONS	
	Joseph Robert Compoli	2015-0356	0	MENTAL HEALTH SUSPENSIONS	
	Henry Roosevelt Freeman	2014-1755	1	DISBARMENTS	
	Jason Courtland Grossman	2014-2156		Anthony Orlando Calabrese	2014-1390
	John Charles Henck	2014-1106	1	RECIPROCAL DISCIPLINES	
	Regina Lynn Hilburn	2014-0452		Robert Hansford Hoskins*	2015-0481
	Shawn Patrick Hooks	2014-2214			
	Gregory Keith Klima	2014-1997			
	Aristotle R. Matsa	2014-1292			
	Rebecca Christine Meyer	2014-0968			
	Mattheuw William Oberholtzer	2015-0059			
	Sharri Una Rammelsberg	2013-0312			
	Ronald Robinson	2015-0128			
	James Christopher Zury	2015-0354			

*60 day suspension (Kentucky)

- TABLE 3 -

SANCTIONS ISSUED IN 2015 BY THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
PURSUANT TO CASES FILED BY DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

**20 RESIGNATIONS WITH
DISCIPLINARY ACTION PENDING**

Rami Majed Awadallah	2015-0809
Gary Nieland Bakst	2015-1894
Gary James Boecker	2015-0041
Darrell Marion Crosgrove	2015-1059
Jana Bassinger DeLoach	2015-0605
Ronald John Denicola	2015-1424
Terrence Joseph Fairfax	2015-1526
Michael William Fine	2015-1084
Paul Michael Kaufman	2015-0361
Paul Stephen Kormanik	2015-0731
Edward George Kramer	2015-1206
Lynn Ann Lape	2015-0919
Thomas Joseph McArdle	2015-1438
James Joseph Paterson	2015-0755
Kevin Purcell	2015-0684
Christopher Paul Roser	2015-1250
Eric Lafayette Sanders	2015-1086
Kenneth Anthony Schuman	2015-0610
Teddy Sliwinski	2015-1541
Roger Scott Stark	2015-1091

21 RETIREMENTS*

Myroslava Anna Basladynsky
Gary Allen Billig
Douglas Lee Campbell
Gerald Francis Cooper
John Charles Deal
Brian Patrick Follen
Frank Anthony Gartland
Trina DuVon Hennis
Clifton E. Johnson
Thomas Richard King
Frank Charles Manak
Richard Allen Mendelsohn
Susan Jean Michael
James Joseph Mulligan
Patrick Jarrett Mulligan
Timothy Roy Parry
Patricia Williams Pribisko
Richard Charles Rastetter
Melissa Jane Slaton
Michael Anthony Wozniak
Anthony Joseph Zaharieff

* Resignation applications received in 2008 and after, found to have no disciplinary action pending, are designated as Retirements and are not assigned Supreme Court case numbers.

- TABLE 4 -
STATUS OF FORMAL MATTERS PENDING
 AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

Reinstatements	3
<hr/>	
BEFORE THE PROBABLE CAUSE PANEL	
Awaiting Certification to Board	0
Appeal of Panel Dismissal to Full Board	1
<hr/>	
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT	
Awaiting Hearing	27
Awaiting Board Report	3
<hr/>	
BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO	
Awaiting Oral Argument	2
Awaiting Supreme Court Decision	20
<hr/>	
TOTAL PENDING	56

- TABLE 5 -

MATTERS RECEIVED BY ODC IN 2015

BASED ON COUNTY OF RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPAL OHIO OFFICE LOCATION

Adams	5	Hamilton	176	Noble	3
Allen	29	Hancock	5	Ottawa	14
Ashland	8	Hardin	4	Paulding	4
Ashtabula	23	Harrison	2	Perry	7
Athens	9	Henry	4	Pickaway	3
Auglaize	2	Highland	8	Pike	3
Belmont	12	Hocking	8	Portage	26
Brown	5	Holmes	6	Preble	4
Butler	37	Huron	7	Putnam	2
Carroll	1	Jackson	5	Richland	30
Champaign	5	Jefferson	16	Ross	12
Clark	22	Knox	13	Sandusky	20
Clermont	16	Lake	39	Scioto	13
Clinton	4	Lawrence	7	Seneca	10
Columbiana	11	Licking	31	Shelby	7
Coshocton	2	Logan	5	Stark	97
Crawford	10	Lorain	45	Summit	139
Cuyahoga	542	Lucas	84	Trumbull	36
Darke	1	Madison	3	Tuscarawas	17
Defiance	5	Mahoning	75	Union	4
Delaware	47	Marion	7	Van Wert	2
Erie	24	Medina	21	Vinton	3
Fairfield	15	Meigs	5	Warren	31
Fayette	7	Mercer	6	Washington	10
Franklin	418	Miami	20	Wayne	10
Fulton	3	Monroe	3	Williams	6
Gallia	4	Montgomery	112	Wood	24
Geauga	18	Morgan	6	Wyandot	5
Greene	27	Morrow	1		
Guernsey	12	Muskingum	11	TOTAL	2,601

- TABLE 6 -

FISCAL YEAR 2015 REPORT OF OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

I.	Payroll (Salaries & Benefits)	\$ 2,157,341
II.	Personal Services (Consultants, Independent Contractors, Temporary help)	\$ 25,869
III.	Education, Tuition and Training	\$ 5,463
IV.	Supplies and Materials	\$ 42,345
V.	Automobile and Parking	\$ 7,926
VI.	Travel and Conferences (In-State & Out-of-State)	\$ 75,102
VII.	Postal and Shipping Expenses	\$ 21,188
VIII.	Communication Expenses	\$ 9,392
IX.	Maintenance and Repair Services	\$ 12,421
X.	Building, Utilities and Facilities	\$ 253,088
XI.	Insurances, Licenses and Permits	\$ 1,642
XII.	Dues and Memberships	\$ 4,090
XIII.	Books and Subscriptions	\$ 14,524
XIV.	Investigation and Discovery	\$ 70,558
XV.	Equipment	\$ 46,697
		\$ 2,747,646
	Less any credit adjustments, refunds	\$ (3,513)
	TOTAL	\$ 2,744,133

Published by
THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO
April 2016



THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
250 Civic Center Drive, Ste. 325
Columbus, Ohio 43215-7411