

REINSTATED ATTORNEY

ROBERT J. ROSEPINK

Bar No. 004251, File Nos. 08-1678, 09-0687, 09-2184

PDJ No. 2011-9080

By order of the presiding disciplinary judge, Robert J. Rosepink, Scottsdale, Ariz., was reinstated as an active State Bar member as of Dec. 1, 2011.

SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS

ROBERT BLAKEY

Bar No. 002934; File Nos. 10-0206 et al.

PDJ No. 2011-9048

By judgment and order dated Dec. 15, 2011, the presiding disciplinary judge accepted an agreement for discipline by consent by which Robert Blakey, Prescott, Ariz., was suspended for 45 days effective Jan. 20, 2012. Upon reinstatement, Mr. Blakey either will resign as a member of the State Bar or be placed on supervised probation for two years. Mr. Blakey also was ordered to pay the State Bar's costs and expenses of \$1,360.21.

In count one, and while representing a client, Mr. Blakey filed two motions to recuse the entire Yavapai County judiciary from hearing his client's matter. In one motion, Mr. Blakey accused two judicial officers of engaging in insurance fraud and conspiring to break Arizona law and violate the Canons of Judicial Conduct based on an evidentiary dispute Mr. Blakey had with the two judges in an earlier, unrelated matter. In count two, Mr. Blakey filed an identical motion on behalf of a client's matter three different times after being ordered by the court twice not to file the motion.

Two aggravating factors and six mitigating factors were found. Mr. Blakey was found to have violated Rule 41(c) and Rule 42, specifically ERs 3.1, 3.4(c), 4.4(a), and 8.4(d), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

ELIZABETH A. CIRILLO

Bar No. 020795; File Nos. 10-1974, 11-0358

PDJ No. 2011-9072

By a Nov. 10, 2011, order of the presiding disciplinary judge, Elizabeth A. Cirillo, Tucson, was reprimanded. She also was assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding.

Ms. Cirillo failed to have measures in place to ensure that her temporary employee was acting in accordance with her professional obligations. She shared legal fees with the temporary employee and allowed him to work totally unsupervised, during which he held himself out to an opposing client to be a lawyer. The temporary employee also was the only person who dealt directly with the clients, discussing the cases with them and helping them determine whether to pursue a legal remedy.

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.

There were no aggravating factors.

Mitigating Factors: absence of prior discipline, absence of selfish motive, full and free disclosure to a disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings, and character or reputation.

Ms. Cirillo violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., specifically ERs 5.3(a), 5.4(a), and 5.5(a).

RIISA PETERSEN

Bar No. 024941; File No. 11-0338

PDJ No. 2011-9083

By a Dec. 15, 2011, order of the presiding disciplinary judge, Riisa Petersen, Tucson, was reprimanded. Ms. Petersen will be placed on probation for two years during which time she must consult with the State Bar's Member Assistance Program director to develop terms and conditions of probation. She also was assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding.

Ms. Petersen engaged in a personal, sexual relationship with a Tucson City Court magistrate, before whom she appeared on several occasions. She did not disclose the conflict to anyone, leaving open the potential for injury to her clients, the legal system and the profession.

There are no aggravating factors.

Mitigating factors: absence of prior discipline, absence of selfish motive, personal and emotional problems, full and free disclosure to a disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings, inexperience in the practice of law, character or reputation, and remorse.

Ms. Petersen violated Rule 42, specifically ERs 1.7(a) and 8.4(d), and Rule 41(g), ARIZ.R.S.CT.