

REINSTATED MEMBERS

CYNTHIA H. ALLRED

Bar No. 003746; File No. 00-2447

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated November 6, 2001, Cynthia H. Allred, 2425 North Saratoga Street, Tempe, AZ 85281, was reinstated pursuant to Rule 72 after completing her suspension.

Ms. Allred was also placed on two years' probation with MAP and LOMAP elements and ordered to attend the Ethics Enhancement Program. In addition, Ms. Allred was ordered to attend at least 12 hours of CLE in the areas of criminal and juvenile law within the first six months of reinstatement and to attend an additional 15 hours of CLE for the calendar year commencing July 1, 2001, including the State Bar's Professionalism Course.

CHADWICK M. CORD

Bar No. 015680; File Nos. 98-1579, 98-1859 and 99-0042

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated October 31, 2001, Chadwick M. Cord, 11445 East Via Linda, Suite 2, PMB 434, Scottsdale, AZ 85259, was reinstated pursuant to Rule 71(c) after completing his suspension ordered on May 2, 2001.

STANLEY D. MURRAY

Bar No. 007208; File Nos. 97-2165 and 98-1862

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated October 24, 2001, Stanley D. Murray, 12419 North 41st Place, Phoenix, AZ 85032, was reinstated pursuant to Rule 71(c) after completing his suspension ordered on December 18, 2000.

WILLIAM L. SCHOLL

Bar No. 003965; File No. 97-0622

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated October 30, 2001, William L. Scholl, 100 North Stone, Suite 801, Tucson, AZ 85701, was reinstated pursuant to Rule 71(c) after completing his suspension ordered on May 11, 2001.

SANCTIONED ATTORNEY

RICHARD B. SANDERS

Bar No. 001665; File No. 95-1717

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated September 11, 2001, Richard B. Sanders, 229 Rainbow Drive, Suite 12984, Livingston, TX 77399, was censured by consent agreement, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer. Mr. Sanders was ordered to pay costs and expenses in the amount of \$685.80 incurred by the State Bar, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of the judgment.

In 1993, Mr. Sanders was the attorney for a general partnership, Client A, and another client, Client B. Client B was looking for a short-term capital loan of approximately \$300,000. Mr. Sanders suggested to Client A that they lend the money to Client B. Although Mr. Sanders provided some general information and wrote a conflict waiver letter stating he would be representing Client A, he failed to diligently advise them of some important facts known to Mr. Sanders relating to Client B's financial status. Client A loaned the money to Client B, who later filed for bankruptcy. Client A filed suit, and the case settled. Client B also filed suit, but the suit was dismissed for lack of prosecution. Mr. Sanders engaged in a conflict of interest and failed to appropriately communicate with Client A by failing to fully disclose information needed to make a fully informed decision.

There was one aggravating factor found pursuant to the ABA *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions*, Section 9.22: (i) substantial experience in the practice of law. There were four mitigating factors found pursuant to Section 9.32 of the ABA *Standards*: (a) absence of a prior disciplinary record, (b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, (c) full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings and (g) character and reputation.

Mr. Sanders' conduct violated Rule 42, ARIZ.R.S.Ct., particularly ER 1.4(a) and (b) and ER 1.7(b). ▀



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.