

from the board — STATE BAR BOARD OF GOVERNORS June Meeting Review

Below are highlights from the June 13, 2001, State Bar Board of Governors meeting. Meetings are held monthly at the Arizona Bar Center in Phoenix.

- ▶ The Board interviewed several finalists recommended by the Standing Appointments Committee to fill two nonlawyer public member positions on the Board of Governors. The Board selected Emily R. Johnston, a business owner from Tucson, and James B. Matthews, Assistant Director of Human Resources and Strategic Processes at AHCCCS, to serve two-year terms.
- ▶ José de Jesus Rivera, former United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, provided information regarding the increased burden on the five district courts situated along the U.S./Mexico border due to burgeoning illegal immigration and drug activities. The Board reviewed a proposal from the ABA Standing Committee on Federal Judicial Improvements supporting enactment of legislation to authorize related permanent and temporary judgeships.
- ▶ The Board approved proposed language for online MCLE affidavits.
- ▶ The Board endorsed, for submission to the Supreme Court, the proposed amendments to Rule 57, ARIZ.R.S.Ct., which expand the reporting requirements when attorneys are charged or convicted of felonies or serious crimes as defined in the rule.
- ▶ The Board approved the establishment of a Standing State Bar Conflict Case Committee that would handle discipline matters involving bar counsel, Board of Governors members and other involved parties. The 11 committee members, recommended by the Standing Appointments Committee and appointed by the Board, will serve staggered three-year terms.
- ▶ The Board discussed ways it could encourage a member of the Pima County Board of Supervisors to fill vacant public member positions on the county's Trial Court Commission.
- ▶ The Board discussed the initial Report and Recommendations of the Board Governance Committee, but deferred action on the proposal to a future meeting.
- ▶ The Board received and certified the Election Tellers Report and welcomed new Board members Michael V. Black and Joseph A. Kanefield (Phoenix), Raymond A. Hanna (Prescott) and Richard T. Platt (Florence). The Board also welcomed Kenneth S. Countryman who, as President of the Young Lawyers Division (YLD), serves on the Board during his one-year term.
- ▶ The Board approved the Consent Agenda: Bankruptcy Law Section's one-time \$500 donation to the Robert G. Mooreman Scholarship at the University of Arizona Law School; Real Property Section's annual \$1,000 donation to a law student at each Arizona law school; summary suspension of members for their failure to pay discipline costs or to comply with Rule 45 (MCLE); recognition by the Board of Legal Specialization of national certifying agencies; and minutes of the May 20, 2001 Board meeting.
- ▶ The Board congratulated Nicholas Wallwork on his ascension to the office of State Bar President. The Board elected its remaining officers for the coming year: President-Elect Ernest Calderón; First Vice President Pamela A. Treadwell-Rubin; Second Vice President Charles W. Wirken; and Secretary/Treasurer Helen Perry Grimwood.
- ▶ The Board voted to expend \$1,500 in support of the National Federal Bar Association (FBA) Conference, which will be held in Tucson in September and which is being planned and hosted by the FBA's Tucson chapter.
- ▶ Treasurer Charles Wirken presented the report and recommendations of the Board's Finance Committee, and the Board voted in support of a \$20 increase in dues per year over the next four years. It further voted to increase the contribution, which has remained constant for more than a decade, to the Client Protection Fund by \$5 per year over the same four-year period.
- ▶ Outgoing Board members were thanked for their service and were presented with gifts of appreciation: Immediate Past President Dee-Dee Samet; Raymond W. Brown (Prescott); Jess A. Lorona and Janet K. Phillips (Phoenix); YLD President Roger H. Contreras; and Public Board Members Dr. Christine C. Iijima Hall (Tempe) and Jaime P. Gutiérrez (Tucson). The Board presented gifts of appreciation to Outgoing President Kirk v Karman.

specialization

The following attorneys have demonstrated that they meet the qualifications for certification or recertification as specialists and have been certified by the State Bar of Arizona Board of Legal Specialization:

BANKRUPTCY LAW

Recertification

Mary B. Artigue
Robert D. Beucler
Joseph Wm. Kruchek
Howard C. Meyers

CRIMINAL LAW

Initial Certification

Grant Bashore
John R. Gaertner
J. Scott Halverson
Stephen C. Kunkle

Recertification

James J. Syme
Stephen J. Young

ESTATE & TRUST LAW

Initial Certification

Barry B. Cline
Michael A. Friedman
Catherine J. Leas
Bridget O. Swartz
Craig H. Wisnom

FAMILY LAW

Initial Certification

Erika L. Cossitt
Jennifer G. Gadow
Recertification
G. Mark Cord
Alyce L. Pennington

INJURY & WRONGFUL DEATH LITIGATION

Initial Certification

Jeffrey I. Ostreicher
Mark R. Siegel
Recertification
Bernard I. Rabinovitz

REAL ESTATE LAW

Initial Certification

Marc D. Blonstein
Edwin C. Bull
Frank J. Cassidy
Joshua J. Meyer

TAX LAW

Recertification

James Roach, II

WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW

Certification

Lisa M. LaMont

Recertification

Donald L. Cross
Richard E. Taylor

SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS

WILLIAM J. CRIMMINS, II

Bar No. 007369, File No. 98-1865

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated March 7, 2001, William J. Crimmins, II, 1205 South Maple, Tempe, AZ, was censured for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer. The Discipline Commission and the Supreme Court approved the Discipline by Consent for censure and restitution. Mr. Crimmins also was ordered to pay costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar of \$999.60 with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

Mr. Crimmins represented a client in a DUI criminal proceeding and a Department of Motor Vehicles administrative proceeding. Mr. Crimmins accepted a \$1,000 retainer and then failed to adequately represent the client by failing to interview two potential witnesses. In addition, Mr. Crimmins failed to promptly return a portion of the client's retainer. Although Mr. Crimmins agreed to return \$400, he immediately returned only \$100, and he delayed refunding the remaining \$300.

There were three aggravating factors found pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Section 9.22: (a) prior disciplinary offenses, (i) substantial experience in the practice of law and (j) indifference to making restitution. There were three mitigating factors found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards: (b) absence of dishonest or selfish motive, (e) full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceeding and (g) character or reputation.

Mr. Crimmins' conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., particularly ER 1.1, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 1.16(d) and ER 8.4(d).

WILLIAM C. LOFTUS

Bar No. 005802, File Nos. 98-0747 and 99-0512

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated April 6, 2001, William C. Loftus, 8601 North Black Canyon Highway, #107, Phoenix, AZ, was censured for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer and placed on two years' probation with LOMAP and ordered to attend the State Bar's Ethics Enhancement Program. Mr. Loftus was ordered to pay restitution to two clients in the amount of \$6,770. Mr. Loftus also was ordered to pay costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar of \$3,749.60

with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

In Count One, Mr. Loftus was retained for representation in a dissolution matter. Mr. Loftus' misconduct arose from a failure to communicate with and to diligently represent the client. Mr. Loftus failed to abide by his client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation and failed to expedite the litigation consistent with the interests of the client. Mr. Loftus did not return the client's phone calls and failed to advise the client as to the status of the case. The dissolution matter was dismissed for failure to prosecute. Mr. Loftus then failed to inform the client of the dismissal. When the State Bar of Arizona made inquiry into this matter, Mr. Loftus failed to furnish information or to timely respond to inquiries and requests from bar counsel concerning his conduct.

In Count Two, Mr. Loftus was retained for representation in a breach of contract lawsuit. Thereafter, the court held that the contract contained a valid arbitration clause and referred the matter to arbitration. Mr. Loftus failed to make any disclosure or conduct discovery on the matter. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss or preclude discovery and proceed to arbitration. Respondent failed to file a response to the motion, and the court granted the motion and dismissed the case with prejudice. Mr. Loftus did not notify the client of the dismissal. The arbitrator subsequently entered an award in favor of defendants for attorneys' fees and costs.

There were five aggravating factors found pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Section 9.22: (a) prior disciplinary offenses, (d) multiple offenses, (g) refusal to acknowledge

wrongful nature of conduct, (i) substantial experience in the practice of law and (j) indifference to making restitution. There were two mitigating factors found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards: (g) character or reputation and (m) remoteness of prior offense.

Mr. Loftus' conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., particularly ER 1.1, ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 1.16(d), ER 3.2 and ER 8.4 and Rule 51(h), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

T. ANDREW MOHLING

Bar No. 010676

File Nos. 98-0031, 98-1847, 98-2388, 99-0214, 99-0530, 99-0885 and 99-1580

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated May 31, 2001, T. Andrew Mohling, 135 West Council, Tucson, AZ 85701, was suspended for 18 months retroactive to March 3, 2000, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, by consent. Mr. Mohling also was ordered to pay costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar of \$1,417.76, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

In Count One, Mr. Mohling was retained by a client to represent the client in three criminal matters. When the client did not pay his fee, Mr. Mohling attempted to withdraw, whereupon the court appointed him as indigent defense counsel. The client was convicted and, as a result of postconviction pleadings, the court determined that Mr. Mohling had abandoned the client. During the bar investigation of this count, Mr. Mohling provided false or misleading information about the level of communication with the client.

In Count Two, Mr. Mohling was retained by the parents to represent the wife's son alleged to have molested the

**Opinion No. 2001-06
(June 2001)**

A lawyer should not enter into a criminal defense contract to provide legal services paid by a third party if the contract might induce the lawyer improperly to curtail services or to perform them in a way contrary to the client's interests because of insufficient funding and that requires authorizations from nonlawyer third parties. [ERs 1.7(b), 1.8(f), 5.4(c)]

Need an Opinion?

Check out the State Bar Web site at www.azbar.org/EthicsOpinions/ for a listing of the ethics opinions issued between 1985 and 2001.

If you are an Arizona attorney and have an ethics question, please contact Lynda Shely, Director of Ethics, at (602) 340-7284.

husband's younger daughter. Even though there was no DNA testing, Mr. Mohling advised the parents to accept a plea agreement because of DNA results that he falsely claimed to have. Mr. Mohling also said he would interview psychologists before trial but convinced his client to take the plea without ever having interviewed the psychologists or reviewing their records. The son was later allowed to withdraw from the plea agreement. Mr. Mohling made other false statements to his clients, including a statement that the trial judge owed him a favor and that the judge had polled the jury and learned they were against the client. Based on this information, the client pled guilty. Mr. Mohling failed to file a written response to the Bar's inquiries on this count.

In Count Three, Mr. Mohling was retained by a mother and daughter to represent the daughter in a criminal matter. Mr. Mohling failed to adequately communicate information that would have led the daughter to accept a plea agreement, and he failed to assist the mother with revising character letters to be used at sentencing and failed to visit the daughter in jail.

In Count Four, Mr. Mohling was retained by a client to represent the client on a traffic citation. Mr. Mohling informed the client that the client did not have to appear for a hearing. The client received a notice from the court that the client had been found guilty for failure to appear. Mr. Mohling said he would take care of this before the fine was due and then promised to pay the client's fine and did so. Mr. Mohling again failed to respond in writing to the State Bar's inquiries.

In Count Five, a client retained Mr. Mohling to represent him in a criminal matter. Mr. Mohling abandoned the client, failing to communicate, obtain evidence, file motions, advise the client of a plea offer or submit his portion of a joint pretrial statement. Mr. Mohling again failed to respond in writing to the State Bar's inquiries.

In Count Six, Mr. Mohling rendered ineffective assistance of counsel on several criminal defense matters reported by deputy public defenders.

In Count Seven, Mr. Mohling failed to file a timely response to allegations raised by the mother relating to the representation of her son that were later determined to have no merit.

There were three aggravating factors found pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Section 9.22: (a) prior disciplinary offenses, (c) pattern of misconduct and (d) multiple offenses. There were five mitigating factors found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards: (b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, (c) personal or emotional problems, (g) character or reputation, (i) chemical dependency including drug abuse and (l) remorse.

Mr. Mohling's conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., particularly ER 1.1, ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 3.3, ER 4.1, ER 8.1(b) and Rule 51(h) and (i), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

WENDY B. MORGAN

Bar No. 015503, File No. 01-0454

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated March 23, 2001, Wendy B. Morgan, 120 North San Francisco St., Flagstaff, AZ, pursuant to Rule 59(b)(1)(D), was transferred to disability inactive status for an indefinite period and until further order of the Disciplinary Commission.

STEPHEN J. POLITI

Bar No. 011045, File Nos. 98-1223 and 98-2192

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated February 16, 2001, Stephen J. Politi, 903 South Rural Road, Suite 101, Tempe, AZ, was suspended for two years retroactive to February 18, 1999, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, by consent agreement. Mr. Politi, upon reinstatement, will be placed on two years' probation, continuing in MAP and having a practice monitor. Mr. Politi was ordered to reimburse the Client Protection Fund for any and all claims paid by the Fund. Mr. Politi also was ordered to pay costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar of \$670.30 together with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

In Count One, Mr. Politi, who has a history of addiction to painkillers and abuse of alcohol, pled guilty to misdemeanor DUI in August 1998. On February 18, 1999, Mr. Politi was arrested for DUI while driving on a suspended license. On June 7, 1999, Mr. Politi pled guilty to aggravated DUI, a class 4 felony. On July 13, 1999, Mr. Politi was placed on probation for five years, with a four month term of imprisonment with the Department of Corrections, a fine of \$250 and 50 hours

of community service. Mr. Politi's partner informed the State Bar that Mr. Politi was no longer fit to practice.

In Count Two, Mr. Politi represented a husband in a dissolution of marriage proceeding between November 1994 and December 1996. In October 1995, Mr. Politi agreed to represent the wife, who was a police officer, in proceedings before the Police Officer Standards and Training Board. The police officer was charged with assault and battery upon a woman she believed to be her husband's girlfriend. The police officer continued to be violent toward her now ex-husband. On April 23, 1997, Mr. Politi wrote a letter to his client/husband about his client/police officer-wife, advising him that it might be appropriate to file criminal assault charges against his client/police officer-wife to prevent her from committing further acts of violence toward him.

There were two aggravating factors found pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Section 9.22: (c) pattern of misconduct and (i) substantial experience in the law. There were six mitigating factors found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards: (a) absence of prior disciplinary record, (b) absence of selfish or dishonest motive, (d) timely good faith effort to make restitution or to rectify consequences of misconduct, (e) full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceeding, (i) mental disability or chemical dependency and (k) imposition of other penalties or sanctions.

Mr. Politi's conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., particularly ER 1.7, ER 1.9, ER 8.4(a) and (d) and Rules 51(a) and 57(a), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

SAMUEL V. WHITTEN

Bar No. 014925

File Nos. 97-2033, 98-0431, 98-1566 and 99-0407

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated December 18, 2000, Samuel V. Whitten, 6729 East Camino De Los Ranchos, Scottsdale, AZ 85254, was suspended for two years for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer. Mr. Whitten was ordered to pay restitution to three clients totaling \$4,250. Mr. Whitten also was ordered to pay costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar of \$896.71 with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

Mr. Whitten's misconduct in File nos. 97-2033, 98-0431 and 98-1566 arose from multiple acts of negligence involving

three separate clients. In Count One, Mr. Whitten was retained to handle a divorce. The client did not sign a retainer agreement, and Mr. Whitten performed little or no work on the case. Mr. Whitten, however, billed the client for time he spent helping the client move from the marital residence. In Count Two, Mr. Whitten was retained in an employment discrimination matter. Mr. Whitten abandoned his office and practice without notifying clients and failed to provide an accounting of costs and return the client's file upon request. Mr. Whitten failed to follow up on a particular report and failed to provide the client with a motion for summary judgment. In Count Three, Mr. Whitten was retained in a child custody matter. Mr. Whitten performed little or no work on the case and failed to communicate with the client. Mr. Whitten further failed to cooperate with the State Bar in the investigation of these three matters.

In File no. 99-0407, Mr. Whitten was retained for representation in a dissolution proceeding. At the conclusion of the dissolution, Mr. Whitten was to forward a quitclaim deed to opposing counsel. Mr. Whitten failed to forward the deed, and the client's attempts to contact Mr. Whitten regarding this matter were unsuccessful. Mr. Whitten again failed to cooperate and respond to the State Bar's inquiry of these matters.

There were four aggravating factors found pursuant to the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Section 9.22: (a) prior disciplinary offenses, (c) pattern of misconduct (d) pattern of misconduct and (e) bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary process by intentionally failing to comply with rules and orders of the disciplinary agency. There was one mitigating factor found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards: (f) inexperience in the practice of law.

Mr. Whitten's conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.CT., particularly ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 1.5, ER 1.15, ER 1.16, ER 1.16(d), ER 8.1(b) and ER 8.4 and Rule 51(h) and (i), ARIZ.R.S.CT.

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, ages, addresses and Bar numbers.

FORMER AZ BAR COUNSEL LANDS ABA AWARD

CHICAGO—John T. Berry, former Bar Counsel for the State Bar of Arizona and now the executive director of the State Bar of Michigan, has received the American Bar Association's 2001 Michael Franck Professional Responsibility Award.



The award honors an individual "whose lifetime commitment to professional responsibility law demonstrates the best accomplishments of lawyers in modern society." ABA President Martha Barnett presented the award during the ABA's annual meeting.

Berry also has worked on the ABA's Commission on Evaluation of Disciplinary Enforcement, created in 1989 to conduct a nationwide assessment of lawyer discipline and provide a model for responsible regulation of the legal profession. He is a past president of the National Organization of Bar Counsel and is a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professionalism.

Among other accomplishments, Berry coordinated the Florida state bar's response to the ValuJet plane crash in 1996 in Florida's Everglades. The bar provided neutral legal information, advice and assistance to the public, creating a system that has become a model for other state bars' mass disaster responses.

CURSING AT POLICE IS PROTECTED SPEECH

SAN FRANCISCO—In a case involving a Yosemite National Park ranger and a hostile park visitor, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that Nolan Poocha's cursing at the ranger was protected speech.

"Poocha's unpleasant response to the rangers, tasteless as it may have been, falls squarely within the protection of the First Amendment," wrote Judge Stephen Reinhardt in *United States v. Poocha*, 01 C.D.O.S. 6770. In reversing the disorderly conduct conviction,

Reinhardt wrote that Poocha's intent was to criticize police actions, not start a civil disturbance. Reinhardt wrote, "In fact, the question is not even a close one."

Judge A. Wallace Tashima dissented, seeing Poocha's words as an incitement to others present.

Judge Marsha Berzon disputed Tashima's view, pointing out that the officer who was the object of the hostile gestures apparently did not see them, undercutting the theory that the ranger felt a physical threat.

ONLINE LEGAL CAREER CENTER LAUNCHED

PHOENIX—It's now easier for law firms and job seekers to find each other, thanks to the State Bar's online Legal Career Center. Featured on the home page of the Bar's Web site, www.azbar.org, the service allows lawyers, paralegals and support staff to search for jobs in Arizona and across the country. It also allows law firms and other companies to search resumes that are posted online.

The Legal Career Center has many features available 24 hours a day:

Job Seekers:

- Free Job Search—See which firms are hiring, Arizona or nationwide, by searching through detailed job descriptions.
- Free Job Notification—Sign up for a free e-mail delivery service that notifies you of new job postings.
- Post Confidential Resumes—Post your resume online for free. The system is secure and confidential.

Employers:

- Post Jobs—Create detailed job listings for attorneys and support staff.
- Jobs can be listed the very same day and stay up for an entire month.
- Search Resumes—Search a large bank of resumes of qualified legal professionals who are seeking new opportunities.
- Firm Profiles—Place a profile of your organization on the Career Center, free of charge.
- Help Desk—A toll-free service to answer all your questions.

For more information, go to www.azbar.org.

MARK YOUR CALENDAR CLE OPPORTUNITIES THIS MONTH

Sept. 7

Representing the Juvenile in Adult Court

Sept. 7

Parting Shots IV

Sept. 13

Representing the Technology Industry

Sept. 14

Annual Update on Constitutional Law & Criminal Issues

Sept. 20

Arizona Insurance Coverage

Sept. 21

State Bar of Arizona Course on Professionalism

Sept. 28

Annual Employment Law Seminar

For more information or to register, go to www.azbar.org/CLE, or call (602) 340-7339.

NEW PEOPLE, NEW PLACES

Sacks Tierney, Phoenix, has announced that **Alan H. Susman** has joined the firm as a partner; he concentrates his practice in complex civil litigation, including real estate, construction, corporate and employment law. Also joining the firm is **Steven Ray Beehley**, who practices in all phases of civil litigation.

Dona A. Nutini has joined **Jennings, Strauss & Salmon, PLC**, as a member (partner). She concentrates her practice on defending employers in unfair labor practice matters and handles litigation of labor and employment discrimination cases, as well as arbitrations.



Nutini

Andrew R. Sherwood, named Attorney of the Year for 2000 by the State Bar of Arizona, has joined **Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP** as a partner in the Litigation Practice Group. Sherwood will focus on complex civil and white-collar criminal litigation, with an emphasis on professional negligence issues, government contracting, securities litigation and environmental matters. Joining the firm as associates are **Lee M. Holtry** and **Stephen Wade Nebgen**.



Sherwood



Holtry

Paul Cragan, the City Attorney for **Surprise**, was appointed to a four-year term as City of Surprise Municipal Judge. He will become the city's first full-time judge and will work in Municipal Court, which has begun to operate full-time due to increased caseloads and demands for judicial services. To replace Cragan, the City Council appointed Deputy City Attorney **David Ward** to the City Attorney position; Ward is a 1996 graduate of the ASU Law School.



Cragan



Ward

Rebecca K. Barnes has been elected to partner at **Brown & Bain, PA**. She practices primarily in business litigation, with an emphasis on professional liability, securities and antitrust.



Barnes

Gregory Z. Meyerson has been appointed an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) with the National Labor Relations Board. Previously,

he was an ALJ with the Social Security Administration and an Immigration Judge with the Department of Justice.

Steven Partridge has joined Gallagher & Kennedy, Phoenix, as of counsel. He practices in state and local tax law. Also joining the firm as associates are David Damore, David Lunn and Eric Wilhelm.



Partridge



Damore



Lunn



Wilhelm

HONORS & AWARDS

Christopher D. Payne, of the Phoenix firm Beshears Muchmore Wallwork, was awarded a prestigious Marshall Memorial Fellowship by the German Marshall Fund of the United States. Payne is one of 58 emerging American leaders who will travel to Europe on intensive study tours. The first person from Arizona to receive the fellowship, Payne is a former President of the Hayzel B. Daniels Bar Association.

Heidi Staudenmaier, a partner with Snell & Wilmer, has been appointed to a two-year term as Chair of the Editorial Board of *Business Law Today*, a bimonthly publication of the American Bar Association Business Law Section.

Elizabeth A. Crampton, a new associate with Ryley Carlock & Applewhite, achieved the highest score on the Arizona bar exam given in February 2001. She received her J.D. from California Western School of Law. A Ryley Carlock shareholder, William F. Wilder, has been named a Vice President of the Desert Botanical Garden. He continues to be a Trustee of the Garden and to be a member of the Executive and Finance committees.

Gregory W. Falls of Mohr Hackett Pederson Blakley & Randolph was named the Attorney of the Month for July by the Volunteer Lawyers Program and the Maricopa County Bar Association. The VLP in



Clancy

Tucson named Dennis Clancy the Outstanding Pro Bono Attorney of the Month for June; while he has been a member of the VLP, he has assisted 60 clients seeking bankruptcy relief. Clancy is a member of Raven & Awerkamp, PC, Tucson.