

**TRANSFER TO DISABILITY
INACTIVE STATUS**

J. MICHAEL DONAHOE

Bar No. 003212; File No. 02-5000

By Arizona Supreme Court order dated Mar. 14, 2005, J. Michael Donahoe, 6801 E. Evans Rd., Scottsdale, AZ 85260, a suspended member of the State Bar, was transferred to disability inactive status until further order. All disciplinary proceedings in 01-2261, 02-0168, 02-0664 and 02-0775 are stayed.

INTERIM SUSPENSION

JAMES F. MILLER

Bar No. 017381; File No. SB-05-0128-D

On August 17, 2005, the State Bar transmitted for filing Cochise County Superior Court's certified copy of a felony conviction dated June 30, 2005, involving James F. Miller, 4314 E. Allison Rd., Tucson, AZ 85712, a member of the State Bar, pursuant to Rules 53(h)(1) and 53(h)(2), ARIZ.R.S.Ct. Mr. Miller has not filed a motion seeking relief from the automatic interim suspension provision of Rule 53(h)(2), ARIZ.R.S.Ct. Accordingly, by Arizona Supreme Court order dated September 1, 2005, Mr. Miller was placed on interim suspension from the practice of law until final disposition of all pending proceedings against him.

EDMUND Y. NOMURA

Bar No. 007209; File No. 05-1086

By Arizona Supreme Court order dated August 29, 2005, Edmund Y. Nomura, 5151 N. 16th St., Suite 138, Phoenix, AZ 85016, a member of the State Bar, was placed on interim suspension from the practice of law until final disposition of all pending proceedings against him.

SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS

JASON J. BRYN

Bar No. 018750; File Nos. 03-2228, 04-0313, 04-1141

By Arizona Supreme Court amended judgment and order dated June 30, 2005, Jason J. Bryn, 5956 E. Pima, Suite 120, Tucson, AZ 85712, a member of the State Bar, was suspended from the practice of law for six months and one day followed by two years of probation with terms to be determined upon reinstatement. He was assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings.

Mr. Bryn overdrew his trust account by writing a check to himself for \$2,970 when the balance was \$714.68. In the two other cases, Mr. Bryn failed to adequately and diligently represent clients. He missed deadlines, failed to file and respond to motions, failed to take material witness depositions, failed to perform services for his clients and did not keep his clients adequately informed. Mr. Bryn also failed to cooperate with the State Bar.

Four aggravating factors were found: dishonest or selfish motive; pattern of misconduct;

CAUTION! Nearly 16,000 attorneys are eligible to practice law in Arizona. Many attorneys share the same names. All discipline reports should be read carefully for names, addresses and Bar numbers.

multiple offenses; and bad-faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceedings.

Three mitigating factors were found: absence of prior disciplinary record; personal or emotional problems; and inexperience in the practice of law.

Mr. Bryn violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.Ct., ERs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.15, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 8.1(b), and 8.4(d) and Rules 43, 44, 53, ARIZ.R.S.Ct.

CHADWICK M. CORD

Bar No. 015680; File Nos. 03-1743, 03-1850, 03-2037

By Arizona Supreme Court judgment and order dated June 29, 2005, Chadwick M. Cord, 7517 E. Sundown Circle, Scottsdale, AZ 85250, a suspended member of the State Bar, was suspended from the practice of law for six months and one day. He will be placed on probation for two years upon reinstatement. In addition, he must submit to fee arbitration in one of the involved cases and was assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings in the amount of \$687.50, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of judgment.

In the first case, a criminal matter, Mr. Cord failed to keep his client informed regarding the status of the matter; failed to interview material witnesses; failed to timely file a motion for reconsideration; and failed to provide an accounting to his client. In the second case, a child-support matter, Mr. Cord failed to provide an accounting of client money held in his trust account and failed to adequately communicate with his client. In the third case, Mr. Cord failed to pay court-ordered child support and arrearages. He was found in contempt and jailed for one week. Mr. Cord also failed to inform his clients of a prior suspension, failed to cooperate with the State Bar, and failed to provide the State Bar with his current address.

Three aggravating factors were found: prior disciplinary offenses; pattern of misconduct; and bad-faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency. No mitigating factors were found.

Mr. Cord violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.Ct., ERs 1.3, 1.4, 1.15(b), 1.16(d), 8.1(b) and 8.4(d), and Rules 43(d), 44(b), 53(c), (d) & (f) and 72(a), ARIZ.R.S.Ct.

THEODORE E. HANSEN

Bar No. 006359; File No. 03-1463

By Arizona Supreme Court judgment and order dated March 23, 2005, Theodore E. Hansen, 2266 S. Dobson Rd., Suite 200, Mesa, AZ 85202, a suspended member of the State Bar, was suspended from the practice of law for six months. He was ordered to be placed on probation upon reinstatement and pay in full any and all claims paid by the Client Protection Fund.

He was assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings in the amount of \$705, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of judgment.

While on disciplinary suspension, Mr. Hansen exchanged communications regarding settlement documents with opposing counsel as an “agent” for a former client. Mr. Hansen did not inform opposing counsel of his status as a suspended lawyer. Mr. Hansen’s misconduct involved the unauthorized practice of law.

Two aggravating factors were found: prior disciplinary offenses and substantial experience in the practice of law.

Four mitigating factors were found: absence of a dishonest or selfish motive; personal or emotional problems; full and free disclosure to the disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings; and remorse.

Mr. Hansen violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., ER 5.5 and Rule 31(b), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

DANIEL INSERRA

Bar No. 017284; File No. 03-0507

By Arizona Supreme Court judgment and order dated August 23, 2005, Daniel Inserra, 8930 E. Raintree Dr., Suite 100, Scottsdale, AZ 85260, a member of the State Bar, was censured and placed on probation for two years with participation in the State Bar’s Law Office Management Assistance and Member Assistance Programs. He also was assessed \$1,030.70 in costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings.

Mr. Inserra failed to competently represent his client in a civil litigation. He failed to conduct any research on landlord/tenant law and failed to make any meaningful argument opposing summary judgment against his client. Without client consent, he filed an appeal that he then abandoned, entered into negotiations agreeing to opposing party bringing a new action that resulted in a judgment against his client, and waived participating in a court-ordered mediation and his client’s right to a trial.

One aggravating factor was found: prior disciplinary offenses that did not involve the same type of misconduct. Three mitigating factors were found: personal or emotional problems; absence of a dishonest or selfish motive; and full and free disclosure to the disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings.

Mr. Inserra violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., ERs 1.1, 1.2(a), 1.3, 1.4(a), 3.2 and 8.4(d).

ANDREW MANKOWSKI

Bar No. 016637; File Nos. 03-0310, 03-0703, 03-0871, 03-1350, 03-1445, 03-1739, 03-1767, 03-1769, 04-0135, 04-0328

By Arizona Supreme Court judgment and order dated March 23, 2005, Andrew Mankowski, P.O. Box 11661, Glendale, AZ

85318, a member of the State Bar, was suspended for six months and one day. Upon reinstatement, he will be placed on probation for two years and required to pay restitution, participate in the State Bar's Law Office Management Assistance and Member Assistance programs and participate in fee arbitration with the complainants named in counts 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9. He also was ordered to pay the sanction as ordered by the court in count 10 and pay any and all claims paid by the Client Protection Fund. He was assessed the State Bar's costs and expenses of \$1,210, together with interest at the legal rate.

In this 10-count matter Mr. Mankowski failed to adequately communicate with his clients in all cases. In the first case, a personal-injury matter, he failed to appear at several hearings. In the third case, a child-custody matter, and the fifth case, a federal criminal matter, Mr. Mankowski failed to provide an accounting to his clients. In the fourth case, a personal-injury matter he failed to attend depositions, missed medical examinations, ignored discovery requests and failed to respond to disclosure requests forcing opposing counsel to file four motions to compel. In the sixth case, Mr. Mankowski lied to his domestic-relations client about the case having been filed and papers served.

The other four cases involved domestic-relations matters. In the seventh case, Mr. Mankowski missed hearings, failed to prosecute the case and lost client documents. The client attempted to fire him, which he rejected. He also failed to respond to the court's order to address the client's allegations to the court and the State Bar. In the eighth case, Mr. Mankowski was found in contempt for failing to pay sanctions. In the ninth case, he failed to appear at hearings, serve orders of protection and provide a final account to his client. In the tenth case, Mr. Mankowski failed to timely file a court-ordered decree, and the one he eventually filed failed to accurately represent the terms of the settlement. He also failed to respond to his client's request to correct the errors in the decree.

Five aggravating factors were found: prior disciplinary record; a pattern of misconduct; multiple offenses; bad-faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with the rules or orders of the disciplinary agency; and substantial experience in the practice of law.

Two mitigating factors were found: absence of a dishonest or selfish motive and personal or emotional problems.

Mr. Mankowski violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.C.T., ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.16, 3.2, 3.3(a)(1), 3.4(c), 4.1, 4.4 and 8.4(b), (c) and (d), and Rule 53(c), (d) and (f), ARIZ.R.S.C.T. 