In the Matter of Stephen J. Renard; Bar No. 021991; Nos. 09-1526, 09-1750, 09-1921, 10-0736, 10-0412, 10-0573 and 10-0824

01/28/2011. Attorney Disbarred.

The PDJ approved a Consent to Disbarment submitted by the parties and disbarred Stephen J. Renard, attorney registration number 021991, from the practice of law.

In August 2008, Respondnet entered into a non-written fee agreement with his client. He filed four separate petitions on his behalf all of which the court struck because they did not comply with the rules or procedure. He failed and refused to respond to Bar Counsel.

In March 2009, Respondent was retained in regards to a family trust. There was no written agreement regarding his fee agreement. He failed to respond to the requests for status updates from his client. His client referred the matter to the Bar on September 29, 2009 as Respondent never gave a status update to his client. Respondent deemed the relationship ended upon the filing of the referral without informing his client. He then failed to protect the interests of his client.

In 2008 he entered into a non-written contingency fee agreement with his client and obtained a default judgment. In January 2010, the State Bar notified respondent that it had not received his 2008-2009 mandatory continuing legal education affidavits. He failed to respond. The Arizona Supreme Court suspended him by order dated February 4, 2010. Despite the suspension, he began attempting to collect a judgment on behalf of a client but did not inform the judge in that case of his suspension. Without advising his client in writing of the desirability of seeking independent legal counsel and without obtaining written informed consent, he had his client assign the entirety of the judgment to him so he could continue with the collection efforts. After his suspension, Respondent on multiple cases continued to represent clients without informing them, the court or opposing counsel of his suspension.

Respondent's misconduct constituted grounds for the imposition of discipline pursuant to the Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona, and violated Rule 42, ER 1.1, 1.3, 1.5(b), 1.5(c), 1.8(a), 5.5(a), 8.4(c), and Rule 31(b), 53(f), and 72(a)(3) and (4), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.