CERTIFIED COPY

Page Document

1 Memo Opinion

Date 05/10/2018

I, Wendy A. Wussow, Clerk of the Nebraska Supreme Court, certify that I have compared the following 4 page(s) to be a full, true, and correct copy of the original record on file.

Supreme Court No:S-17-0971Caption:State ex rel Counsel for Discipline v. LearyTrial Court:Original Action

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have placed my signature and seal of said courses Sea Jendy Ci. Date: May 10, 2018 BY THE COURT: CLERK

FILFD 1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEBRASKA MAY 10 2018 2 3 NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT COURT APPEALS 4 State of Nebraska ex rel.) 5 Counsel for Discipline) No. S-17-971. 6 of the Nebraska Supreme Court,) 7) 8 Relator,) MEMORANDUM OPINION 9) AND 10 v. JUDGMENT ON APPEAL) 11) 12 Erin Leary,) 13) 14 Respondent.) 15 16 HEAVICAN, C.J., MILLER-LERMAN, CASSEL, STACY, FUNKE and PAPIK, JJ., 17 and SCHREINER, District Judge. 18 PER CURIAM. 19 INTRODUCTION 20 The Arizona Supreme Court entered a private reprimand of respondent, Erin Leary, on June 15, 2017. 21 The Counsel for 22 Discipline of the Nebraska Supreme Court, relator, filed a motion for reciprocal discipline against respondent. We grant the motion 23 24 for reciprocal discipline. 25 FACTS 26 Erin Leary was admitted to the practice of law in the State of Nebraska on July 12, 1984. She has been admitted to the practice 27 28 of law in Arizona since 2000. 29 On June 15, 2017, the Arizona Supreme Court, through the office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, entered a Final 30 31 Judgment and Order of Admonition ("Admonition"). The Admonition

- 1 -



was entered on consent of the parties and was based on facts not
 repeated here.

On September 12, 2017, relator filed a motion for reciprocal 3 discipline pursuant to Neb. Ct. R. § 3-321 of the disciplinary 4 rules. On October 17, we filed an order to show cause as to why we 5 6 should not impose reciprocal discipline. On December 1, respondent responded to the order to show cause, arguing that the proper 7 8 "identical" reciprocal discipline is a private reprimand by the Committee on Inquiry or Disciplinary Review Board. See Neb. Ct. R. 9 § 3-304. On November 1, relator filed a response to the order to 10 11 show cause, in which relator requested that we impose a public 12 reprimand.

13

ANALYSIS

The basic issues in a disciplinary proceeding against an 14 15 attorney are whether discipline should be imposed and, if so, the 16 type of discipline appropriate under the circumstances. State ex rel. Counsel for Dis. v. Murphy, 283 Neb. 982, 814 N.W.2d 107 17 In a reciprocal discipline proceeding, a judicial 18 (2012). 19 determination of attorney misconduct in one jurisdiction is 20 generally conclusive proof of quilt and is not subject to relitigation in the second jurisdiction. Id. Neb. Ct. R. § 3-304 21 of the disciplinary rules provides that the following may be 22 considered as discipline by the Nebraska Supreme Court for attorney 23 misconduct: 24

- 2 -

Certified Page 2 of 4

1 (A) Misconduct shall be grounds for:

(1) Disbarment by the Court; or

3 (2) Suspension by the Court; or

4 (3) Probation by the Court in lieu of or subsequent to 5 suspension, on such terms as the Court may designate; or

6 (4) Censure and reprimand by the Court; or

(5) Temporary suspension by the Court; or

8 (6) Private reprimand by the Committee on Inquiry or
9 Disciplinary Review Board.

(B) The Court may, in its discretion, impose one or more of
 the disciplinary sanctions set forth above.

12

2

7

13 Section 3-321 of the disciplinary rules provides in part:

14 (A) Upon being disciplined in another jurisdiction, a member 15 shall promptly inform the Counsel for Discipline of the 16 discipline imposed. Upon receipt by the Court of appropriate notice that a member has been disciplined in another 17 18 jurisdiction, the Court may enter an order imposing the 19 identical discipline, or greater or lesser discipline as the 20 Court deems appropriate, or, in its discretion, suspend the member pending the imposition of final discipline in such 21 22 other jurisdiction.

23

In imposing attorney discipline, we evaluate each case in light of its particular facts and circumstances. *State ex rel. Counsel for Dis. v. Murphy, supra.*

- 3 -

Upon due consideration of the record, the facts as determined by the Arizona Supreme Court, and the availability of sanctions, we determine that public reprimand is appropriate.

CONCLUSION

5 Respondent is reprimanded. Respondent is directed to pay 6 costs and expenses in accordance with Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 7-114 and 7 7-115 (Reissue 2012) and Neb. Ct. R. §§ 3-310(P) (rev. 2014) and 8 3-323(B) of the disciplinary rules within 60 days after an order 9 imposing costs and expenses, if any, is entered by the court.

10

4

JUDGMENT OF REPRIMAND.

Certified Page 4 of 4