

**REINSTATED ATTORNEY
LESLIE HATFIELD**

Bar No. 012177; File Nos. 01-0328, 01-2297, 02-0212, 02-0957, 02-1026
By Supreme Court judgment and order dated June 4, 2004, Leslie Hatfield, 411 N. Central Ave., Suite 900, Phoenix, AZ 85004, was reinstated pursuant to Rule 64(c), ARIZ.R.S.Ct. Ms. Hatfield served a 30-day suspension beginning April 17, 2004.

**SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS
STEPHEN M. JOHNSON**

Bar No. 015831; File No. 03-0346
By Supreme Court judgment and order dated May 27, 2004, Stephen M. Johnson, 1212 E. Osborn Road, Phoenix, AZ 85014, was suspended from the practice of law for six months and one day. The court also ordered that Mr. Johnson be assessed the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings as provided in Rule 60(b), ARIZ.R.S.Ct.

Mr. Johnson was appointed to represent a client in a criminal matter. Thereafter, the client filed a complaint against Mr. Johnson with the State Bar of Arizona alleging lack of communication and diligence. Mr. Johnson responded to the complaint and attached a fabricated letter addressed to the client at his current address instead of the address at which the client resided at the time the letter was

allegedly written. Mr. Johnson later admitted that he fabricated the letter in an attempt to support his response to the client's complaint.

Mr. Johnson knowingly made a false statement of material fact in connection with a disciplinary matter, in violation of ER 8.1(a), Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.Ct.

Four aggravating factors were found: prior disciplinary offenses; dishonest or selfish motive; submission of false evidence, false statements or other deceptive practices during the disciplinary process; and substantial experience in the practice of law. Two mitigating factors were found: remorse and timely good-faith effort to make restitution or to rectify consequences of misconduct.

MICHAEL B. MORRISON

Bar No. 007650; File No. 03-0245
By Supreme Court judgment and order dated May 27, 2004, Michael B. Morrison, 4590 E. Calle Tuberia, Phoenix, AZ 85018, was suspended from the practice of law for six months and one day. Mr. Morrison also was ordered to pay the State Bar's costs and expenses of \$2,550.18, together with interest at the legal rate.

During his representation of a client in a criminal matter, Mr. Morrison failed to appear at the

Opinion No. 04-04 (June 2004)

Under revised Ethical Rule 1.10 a separate "Conflicts Unit" may not be employed to address imputed conflicts involving former clients even if screening is employed as defined under ER 1.0. Two current clients may give a written informed waiver of a conflict under certain circumstances in accordance with ER 1.7. If both clients do not give consent, however, the Public Defender's office and the proposed Conflicts Unit would constitute one firm for purposes of ER 1.10, such that referral of a case to the Conflicts Unit would not resolve the ethical conflict.

Need an Opinion?

Check out the State Bar Web site at www.myazbar.org/Ethics/ for a listing of the ethics opinions issued between 1985 and 2004. If you are an Arizona attorney and have an ethics question, call (602) 340-7284.

time set for a court hearing, requested the hearing be continued, then again failed to appear, and instead sent a handwritten motion to continue via facsimile and falsified the time the motion was sent. The court then issued a warrant for the client's arrest and set an order to show cause hearing regarding Mr. Morrison's actions. The next day court staff telephoned Mr. Morrison and directed him to appear for a hearing that afternoon. Mr. Morrison was 45 minutes late, and the hearing was rescheduled. At the rescheduled hearing, the court sanctioned Mr. Morrison \$250 and referred the matter to the State Bar for investigation. Thereafter, Mr. Morrison failed to respond to the State Bar, filed an untimely answer to the State Bar's notice of default, twice provided the State Bar and assigned hearing officer with an invalid mailing address, and failed to appear and participate in the formal proceedings against him.

Mr. Morrison's misconduct included lack of diligence; knowingly making false statements of material fact or law to a tribunal; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice; knowingly failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority; failing to furnish information to an inquiry or request from bar counsel; and refusing to cooperate with officials and staff of the State Bar acting in the course of their duties.

Six aggravating factors were found: prior disciplinary offenses, dishonest or selfish motive, multiple offenses, bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding, refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct and substantial experience in the practice of law. No mitigating factors were found.

Mr. Morrison violated ERs 1.3, 3.3, 8.1(b), 8.4(c) and (d), Rule 42, and Rule 51(h) and (i), ARIZ.R.S.Ct. [AZ](#)

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.