

**REINSTATED ATTORNEYS**

**EDWARD. D. FITZHUGH**

Bar No. 007138; File No. 08-0477

Supreme Court No. SB-11-0075-D

By the presiding disciplinary judge's order dated Jan. 26, 2012, Edward. D. Fitzhugh, Tempe, Ariz., was reinstated as an active member of the State Bar of Arizona effective the date of the order.

**MICHAEL A. URBANO**

Bar No. 023029; File Nos. 09-1631, 09-2339

PDJ No. 2012-9004

By the presiding disciplinary judge's order dated Feb. 1, 2012, Michael A. Urbano, Phoenix, was reinstated as an active State Bar member, effective the date of the order.

**SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS**

**WILLIAM M. KING**

Bar No. 005255; File Nos. 10-1438, 10-1564, 10-1639, 11-0193, 11-0176

PDJ No. 2012-9011

By judgment and order dated Feb. 17, 2012, the presiding disciplinary judge accepted an agreement for discipline by consent by which William M. King, Phoenix, was suspended for four months, effective Mar. 1, 2012. Upon reinstatement Mr. King will be placed on probation for one year.

In count one, Mr. King failed to adequately supervise a suspended attorney he employed as a paralegal. As a result, the paralegal provided unauthorized legal advice to a client concerning her bankruptcy matter and left the client with the impression that the paralegal was Mr. King. Mr. King was also unable to provide evidence of having memorialized his fee with the client.

In count two, Mr. King, after accepting a new client's payment, failed to respond to repeated faxes and telephone calls for a period of seven months. Mr. King's position was that he decided that the matter needed to be filed in Pima County and that the client should retain a Pima County attorney. Mr. King did not communicate this to his client in writing and failed to refund the client's money until after a complaint was filed with the State Bar.

In count three, Mr. King entered into a barter agreement as compensation for representation in a criminal matter but failed to comply with ER 1.8(a). He was advanced additional compensation to prepare for a possible trial. The matter settled but Mr. King did not issue a refund until after a complaint had been filed with the State Bar. Mr. King also failed to respond to his client's request for an itemized bill.

In count four, Mr. King failed to respond to opposing counsel's motion in a family law matter. As a result, a child-support order unsatisfactory to his client was entered. Mr. King informed the client that he did not receive a copy of the motion. When asked by his client whether the

**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.

situation could be remedied, Mr. King told him that nothing could be done.

In count five, Mr. King was hired to place a client's property into a family trust. Mr. King repeatedly lost the client's paperwork and failed to complete the work for nearly four years. The work was ultimately completed after the client filed a complaint with the State Bar.

Aggravating factors: prior disciplinary offenses and a pattern of misconduct.

Mitigating factor: full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings.

Mr. King violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., specifically ERs 1.1, 1.2, 5.3, 5.5(a), 1.2, 1.3., 1.4, 1.5, 1.15(a), 1.16(a) and 8.4(d).

**RONALD S. MATHENY**

Bar No. 013951; File No. 11-1804

PDJ No. 2011-9005

By judgment and order dated Jan. 24, 2012, the presiding disciplinary judge accepted an agreement for discipline by consent by which Ronald Matheny, Surprise, Ariz., was suspended from for 150 days effective that same date.

Mr. Matheny was originally suspended in April 2008. Although eligible to apply for reinstatement since April 2009, Mr. Matheny had not done so. On Feb. 10, 2010, while still suspended, Mr. Matheny created an estate plan for the father of a friend and co-worker. Mr. Matheny did not meet with or communicate with the father about the estate plan or whether it met the father's needs. Mr. Matheny also failed to respond to the State Bar's screening investigation.

Aggravating factors: Prior discipline history, pattern of misconduct and substantial experience in the practice of law.

Mitigating factors: Absence of dishonest or selfish motive and remorse.

Mr. Matheny violated Rule 32(c), ARIZ.R.S.CT.; Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., specifically ERs 1.4, 5.5, and 8.1(b); and Rule 54(c), ARIZ.R.S.CT. Mr. Matheny was ordered to pay the State Bar's costs and expenses totaling \$1,020.

**DAVID R. WROBLEWSKI**

Bar No. 020079; File Nos. 11-0936, 11-0973, 11-0984, 11-0985, 11-1031, 11-1062, 11-1120, 11-1122, 11-1126, 11-1144, 11-1148, 11-1169, 11-1183, 11-1220, 11-1224, 11-1226, 11-1229, 11-1246, 11-1266, 11-1286, 11-1328, 11-1341, 11-1437, 11-1439, 11-1441, 11-1444, 11-1446, 11-1452, 11-1454, 11-1458, 11-1491, 11-1493, 11-1509, 11-1510, 11-1512, 11-1664, 11-1666, 11-1668, 11-1670, 11-1672, 11-1723, 11-1724, 11-1726, 11-1728, 11-1731; 11-2089, 11-2093, 11-2095, 11-2126, 11-2128, 11-2130, 11-2132, 11-

2134, 11-2138, 11-2140, 11-2142, 11-2145, 11-2147, 11-2149, 11-2161, 11-2169, 11-2175, 11-2274, 11-2275, 11-2276, 11-2277, 11-2293, 11-2305, 11-2366, 11-2428, 11-2430, 11-2432, 11-2484, 11-2502, 11-2583, 11-2731, 11-2734, 11-2849, 11-3117, 11-3118, 11-3120, 11-3334

PDJ No. 2011-9100

By the presiding disciplinary judge's judgment and order dated Jan. 10, 2012, David R. Wroblewski, Phoenix, was reprimanded and placed on probation for two years. He was also assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding.

Shortly after Mr. Wroblewski purchased another lawyer's bankruptcy practice, Mr. Wroblewski terminated the employment of one of the firm's bankruptcy lawyers. The fired lawyer sent solicitation letters to the firm's Chapter 7 bankruptcy clients. The solicitations resulted in a large number of clients who discharged Mr. Wroblewski's firm demanding prompt refunds of unearned fees, accountings of earned fees, and their files. Due to the volume of requests, Mr. Wroblewski and his staff were unable to promptly respond to all of his former clients' requests.

Mr. Wroblewski failed to adequately supervise his lawyer and non-lawyer staff, which prevented him from ensuring that all clients received appropriate communication and diligent representation. In addition, some clients were initially charged an unreasonable amount for administrative fees.

Aggravating factors: multiple offenses, vulnerability of the victims (some clients were unable to immediately obtain a refund of unearned fees), and substantial experience in the practice of law.

Mitigating factors: absence of a prior disciplinary record, absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, and full and free disclosure to bar counsel and cooperative attitude toward the disciplinary proceedings.

Mr. Wroblewski violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., specifically ER 1.5(a), ER 5.1(a), and ER 5.3(a).