

SANCTIONED ATTORNEYS

ERIC G. CROCKER

Bar No. 012099; File No. 01-0165

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated June 16, 2003, Eric G. Crocker, 210 N. Center Street, Mesa, AZ 85201, was censured by consent. Mr. Crocker was placed on probation for two years, including participating in the Law Office Management Assistance Program and attending the State Bar's Trust Account Ethics Enhancement Program. Mr. Crocker must pay restitution to one client in the amount of \$5,667.50. Mr. Crocker must also pay the State Bar's costs and expenses of \$1,493.24, with interest.

Mr. Crocker represented a client in a personal injury matter. In investigating the client's charges, the State Bar reviewed Respondent's trust account and found that Respondent failed to maintain individual client ledgers and failed to perform monthly reconciliations of his trust account. In addition, Respondent failed to safeguard funds in his trust account.

One aggravating factor was found: pattern of misconduct. Five mitigating factors were found: absence of a prior disciplinary record, personal or emotional problems, absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, good character and reputation and remorse.

Mr. Crocker violated ER 1.15 and Rules 43 and 44, ARIZ.R.S.C.T.

MORTON GOLLIN

File No. 02-0052

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated June 30, 2003, Morton Gollin, 3001 Tahquitz Canyon Way, Suite 105, Palm Springs, CA 92262, was censured. Mr. Gollin was ordered to pay the State Bar's costs and expenses in the amount of \$666.90, with interest.

Mr. Gollin represented a client in an Arizona personal injury action when he was not admitted to practice in Arizona. Mr. Gollin made false and misleading representations to the opposing party, the insurance company, regarding the legal guardianship of his minor client. Mr. Gollin also failed to turn over the personal injury settlement proceeds to the true legal guardian of the minor.

One aggravating factor was found: substantial experience in the practice of law. Three mitigating factors were found: absence of a prior disciplinary record, absence of a dishonest or selfish motive and cooperative attitude toward proceedings.

Mr. Gollin violated ER 1.2, 1.15, 4.1, 5.5 and 8.4(c).

O. MARK MARQUEZ

Bar No. 001627; File No. 01-0370

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated July 1, 2003, O. Mark Marquez, P.O. Box 248, Tucson, AZ 85702, was suspended for 30 days by consent effective 30 days from the date of the Judgment and Order. Upon reinstatement, Mr. Marquez will be placed on probation for one year to include participation in the Member Assistance Program. Mr. Marquez must pay the State Bar's costs and expenses totaling \$870.70, with interest.

Mr. Marquez' misconduct involved making unwelcome sexual comments and unwelcome touching of an opposing party, who was representing herself pro per. Mr. Marquez persisted in this conduct in the face of repeated and forceful rejections of his advances. Mr. Marquez then denied the allegations, until confronted with a tape recording of one of the instances. Mr. Marquez then engaged in unjustified attacks on the credibility of the complainant in the matter, which the Disciplinary

Commission found to constitute the submission of false evidence to the Bar during its investigation.

Six aggravating factors were found: multiple offenses, pattern of misconduct, submission of false evidence, false statements or other deceptive practices during the disciplinary process, refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of his conduct, vulnerability of the victim and substantial experience in the practice of law. Two mitigating factors were found: character or reputation and remorse.

Mr. Marquez violated ER 1.7, 8.1(a) and 8.4(d).

CONNIE R. ZAKRAJSEK

File Nos. 01-1776, 01-1868, 01-2021, 01-2100, 01-2287 and 01-2365

By Supreme Court Judgment and Order dated July 2, 2003, Connie R. Zakrajsek, P.O. Box 7608, Tempe, AZ 85281, was censured. Ms. Zakrajsek was ordered to pay restitution to two clients totaling \$2,200.

Ms. Zakrajsek is not a member of the State Bar of Arizona, but resides in Arizona. Ms. Zakrajsek has been disbarred in three other states: California, Illinois and Washington. Ms. Zakrajsek engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in Arizona and filed numerous pro hac vice applications that contained material misrepresentations. The Disciplinary Commission found that disbarment would have been appropriate if Ms. Zakrajsek had been a member of the State Bar of Arizona, but since she was not, the only sanction available was a censure. Ms. Zakrajsek violated ER 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5(a), 1.16(d), 3.3(a), 5.5(a), 7.1, 7.5, 8.1 and 8.4(c).

CAUTION: Nearly 16,000 attorneys are eligible to practice law in Arizona. Many attorneys share the same names. All reports should be read carefully for names, addresses and Bar numbers.