IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINE OF R. CHRISTOPHER READE, BAR NO. 6791

. . .

. .

Case No. 7098 Electronically Filed Jan 17 2018 02:49 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

STATE BAR'S RESPONSE AND NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR REHEARING

COMES NOW the State Bar of Nevada ("State Bar") and hereby submits

its Response and Notice of Non-Opposition to Petition for Rehearing.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17^{+1} day of January, 2018.

STATE BAR OF NEVADA C. STANLEY HUNTERSON, BAR COUNSEL

By:

Jason R. Dworin, Assistant Bar Counsel Nevada Bar No. 9006 Bri F. Corrigan, Assistant Bar Counsel Nevada Bar No. 11999 3100 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Attorneys for The State Bar of Nevada

.	9		
	1		TABLE OF CONTENTS
	2		TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiii
	3	I.	STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW1
	4	II.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE1
	5	ш.	STANDARD OF REVIEW2
	6	IV.	ARGUMENT2
	7		1. The State Bar does not oppose Reade's request that his suspension be retroactive to January 16, 20142
	8	V.	CONCLUSION
	9 10	VI.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE
	10	VII.	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE7
	11		
	12		
	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
			i
		11	

¢	1
1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2	
	Cases Cited Page(s)
3	State Bar of Nevada v. Claiborne, 104 Nev. 115, 756 P.2d 464 (1988)2
4	Court Rules
5	Supreme Court Rule 1052
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
	ii

•••	
1	I.
2	STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW
3	The issue presented for review is as follows:
4	1. Should this Court make Reade's suspension retroactive to January 14,
5	2014?
6	II.
7	STATEMENT OF CASE
8	1. Statement of the Case
9	The State Bar does not disagree with the majority of the relevant factual
10	representations contained in Reade's Petition for Rehearing, but does note that
11	Reade and/or his counsel were reminded that this Court's review of discipline is
12	de novo during discussions regarding this matter. With respect to the references
13	that this matter would be "the model for how other attorneys could take steps to
14	be proactive in how to handle matters under these circumstances," the
15	undersigned has no personal knowledge of the same as such discussions predated
16	his involvement in this matter. Lastly, the State Bar agrees and acknowledges
17	that Reade has been cooperative throughout this process, including choosing to
18	go inactive before a final decision was made as to his discipline in an effort to
19	demonstrate the same.
20	

. .

1

1

III.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

3 The Nevada Supreme Court reviews discipline de novo. SCR 105. The 4 purpose of attorney discipline is not to punish the attorney, but to protect the 5 public and the integrity of the bar. See, State Bar of Nevada v. Claiborne, 104 Nev. 115, 129, 756 P.2d 464, 473 (1988) ("paramount objective of bar 6 7 disciplinary proceedings is not additional punishment of the attorney, but rather 8 to protect the public from persons unfit to serve as attorneys and to maintain 9 public confidence in the bar as a whole"). 10 IV. 11 ARGUMENT 12 1. The State Bar does not oppose Reade's request that his suspension be retroactive to January 16, 2014. 13 14 As Reade voluntarily decided to go inactive in an effort to demonstrate good faith and cooperation with the State Bar, the State Bar does not oppose his 15 request that his suspension be retroactive to January 14, 2014. The State Bar 16 agrees with Reade's position that it would serve public policy to make his 17 suspension retroactive as he voluntarily ceased practicing and it may encourage 18 other similarly situated attorneys to do the same. As such, the State Bar believes 19 that honoring Reade's request would further the purpose of attorney discipline in 20

1	that voluntarily going inactive would act to protect the public sooner by removing
2	the attorney from the practice of law while a final decision as to discipline is
3	pending, thereby preventing any further wrongdoing during the time period
4	where the attorney is awaiting a final decision as to discipline. Furthermore,
5	choosing to go inactive during this "limbo" period also helps the attorney to
6	demonstrate that the attorney has begun to acknowledge and attempt to remedy
7	his/her wrongdoing early in the discipline process. Accordingly, the State Bar
8	does not oppose Reade's request.
9	///
10	///
11	///
12	///
13	
14	
15	///
16	///
17	///
18	///
18 19 20	///
20	
	3

· * ||

. .

	V.
2	v. CONCLUSION
3	As all of these factors contribute to the paramount objective of protecting
4	the public from attorneys unfit to serve and maintaining public confidence in the
5	bar as a whole, the State Bar does not oppose Reade's request that his suspension
6	be retroactive to January 16, 2014.
7	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17^{\prime} day of January, 2018.
8	STATE BAR OF NEVADA C. STANLEY HUNTERSON, BAR COUNSEL
9	1 RA
10	By: Jason/R. Dworin, Assistant Bar Counsel Nevada Bar No. 9006
11	Bri F. Corrigan, Assistant Bar Counsel Nevada Bar No. 11999
12	3100 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
13	Attorneys for the State Bar of Nevada
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
	4

۰ ،

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

VI.

1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5), and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Word 2010 in Times New Roman 14 point font size.

2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page or type volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7), it is proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and contains 791 words.

///

'//

///

1	3. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read the foregoing Answering
2	Brief of the State Bar of Nevada, and to the best of my knowledge, information
3	and belief, this brief is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I
4	further certify this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate
5	Procedure, including the requirement of NRAP 28(e), which requires every
6	assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by
7	appropriate references to the record on appeal. I understand that I may be subject
8	to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the
9	requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.
10	DATED this $//$ day of January, 2018.
11	STATE BAR OF NEVADA C. STANLEY HUNTERSON, BAR COUNSEL
12	$\int dx = dx$
13	By: Jason R. Dworin, Assistant Bar Counsel
14	Nevada Bar No. 9006 Bri F. Corrigan, Assistant Bar Counsel Nevada Bar No. 11999
15	3100 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
16	Attorneys for the State Bar of Nevada
17	
18	
19	
20	
	6

-*

+ ?

an i go er	
1	VII.
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL
3	The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the
4	foregoing STATE BAR OF NEVADA'S ANSWERING BRIEF was served on
5	the following parties by placing a copy, postage fully prepaid for regular mail,
6	and deposited in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, addressed to:
7	Richard Wright, Esq. WRIGHT STANISH & WINCKLER
8	300 S. 4 TH Street, Suite 701 Las Vegas, NV 89101
9	
10	Jay A. Shafer, Esq. PREMIER LEGAL GROUP 1333 North Buffalo Drive, Suite 210
11	Las Vegas, NV 89128
12	Attorneys for R. Christopher Reade, Esq.
13	DATED this $174h$ day of January, 2018.
14	AR
15	An employee of the State Bar of Nevada
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
	7