

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

April 12, 2007

[Cite as *04/12/2007 Case Announcements, 2007-Ohio-1691.*]

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2006-1304. Leininger v. Pioneer Natl. Latex.

Ashland App. No. 05-COA-048, 2006-Ohio-2673. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Ashland County. Upon consideration of the motion of amicus curiae, Ohio Management Lawyers Association, for leave to participate in oral argument scheduled for April 18, 2007, in support of the appellants,

It is ordered by the court that the motion is granted, and the amicus curiae shall share the time allotted to appellants.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2001-0370. Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Young.

On July 18, 2001, this court permanently disbarred respondent, Leonard Young, Attorney Registration No. 0023715, last known address in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(6)(B)(1).

On November 27, 2006, relator, Cleveland Bar Association, filed with this court a motion for an order requiring respondent to appear and show cause why respondent should not be held in contempt for failing to obey this court's July 18, 2001 order of disbarment.

This court ordered respondent to appear in person before the court on February 28, 2007. Respondent did not appear before the court on the scheduled date.

On March 6, 2007, this court granted relator's motion for contempt and found Leonard Young in contempt. The court ordered respondent to: 1) return to Carolyn Bridges-Graves all documents she provided to respondent; 2) return the retainer of \$300 paid by Ms. Bridges-Graves; and, 3) reimburse the Clients'

Security Fund in the amount of \$27,892.61, plus interest, for awards made against him. The court further ordered respondent to file proof of such compliance within ten days of the date of the order. If respondent failed to file such proof, a warrant for respondent's arrest would be issued and respondent would be ordered to serve 30 days in jail.

On March 19, 2007, respondent filed a notice of proof of compliance and motion for stay of issuance of warrant for arrest. Respondent asserted that he returned the \$300 retainer and all documents to Ms. Bridges-Graves, and he requested additional time to reach an agreement for repaying the Client's Security Fund.

On March 26, 2007, this court stayed the issuance of the arrest warrant for a period of ten days to allow respondent time to enter into an agreement with the Client's Security Fund for repayment of the full amount, plus interest, of all awards made against respondent. On April 4, 2007, respondent filed proof of an executed promissory note to repay the Clients' Security Fund. Respondent requests a permanent stay of the issuance of an arrest warrant. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered that the issuance of the arrest warrant is stayed. If respondent fails to make payments to the Clients' Security Fund according to the terms of the promissory note dated March 28, 2007, the stay will be lifted, an arrest warrant will be issued, and respondent will be ordered to serve 30 days in jail.

It is further ordered, sua sponte, that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

It is further ordered, sua sponte, that service shall be deemed made on respondent by sending this order, and all other orders in this case, by certified mail to the most recent address respondent has given to the Attorney Registration Section.

2004-1143. In re McCord.

On September 2, 2004, this court suspended respondent, Michael McCord, Attorney Registration No. 0020304, last known business address in Columbus, Ohio, for an interim period pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(5)(A)(4). On April 4, 2007, the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline submitted a notice pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(5)(D)(1)(c) notifying this court that respondent no longer was in default of the child support order previously submitted to the court. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by the court that pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(5)(D)(1), respondent be reinstated to the practice of law.

It is further ordered that pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(5)(D)(2), reinstatement of respondent shall not terminate any pending disciplinary proceedings against respondent.

It is further ordered that the clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(1), that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(2), and that respondent bear the costs of publication.

2006-0461. Cuyahoga County Bar Assn.v. Maybaum.

On December 27, 2006, this court indefinitely suspended respondent and ordered him to pay Board costs in the amount of \$7,190.08. On March 19, 2007, respondent filed a motion for relief from payment of court costs. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by this court that the motion is denied.

2006-0731. Disciplinary Counsel v. Stranke.

On application for reinstatement of Terry Lynn Stranke, Attorney Registration No. 0043184. Application granted and respondent reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

1998-2558. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Telford.

This matter came on for further consideration upon relator's filing of a motion for an order permitting withdrawal of the motion for contempt. On consideration thereof,

It is ordered by the court that the motion is granted. Relator is permitted to withdraw its motion for contempt filed on December 15, 2006. If relator does not withdraw the motion within ten days of the date of this order, the matter shall proceed before the Board on the Unauthorized Practice of Law pursuant to this court's order of January 16, 2007.

In re Report of the Commission
on Continuing Legal Education

Richard Hilton Bailes
(0023836),
Respondent.



CLE-2006-23836

ENTRY

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys and judges, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the applicable continuing legal education provisions of Gov.Bar R. X and Gov.Jud.R. IV for the 2004-2005 reporting period.

On December 29, 2006, pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(B)(1), this court issued to the respondent an order to show cause why the recommended sanction should not be adopted by the court and an order so entered against the respondent.

It has now come to the court's attention that the respondent is deceased. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by the court that the recommendation of a sanction against the above-named respondent, and the related matter now pending before the court, are hereby dismissed.