



BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA
BY *[Signature]*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

LAURENCE B. STEVENS,
Bar No. 006460

RESPONDENT.

Nos. 01-2377, 02-0605, 02-0689

**DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
REPORT**

This matter came before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona on October 18, 2003, pursuant to Rule 56(a), Ariz. R. S. Ct., for consideration of the Tender of Admissions and Agreement for Discipline by Consent (Agreement) and Joint Memorandum in Support of Agreement for Discipline by Consent (Joint Memorandum) filed July 28, 2003, providing for a censure, probation with a six month extension of Respondent's current Law Office Management Assistance Program (LOMAP) contract, and costs of these disciplinary proceedings. Respondent, Respondent's counsel and counsel for the State Bar were present.

Decision

The nine¹ members of the Commission unanimously recommend accepting and incorporating by reference the Agreement² and Joint Memorandum providing for a censure,

¹ Gary Bonwell, M.D., a former commissioner from Tucson participated as an ad hoc member. One public member seat remains vacant.

² At oral argument, the parties stipulated to remove 9.32(c) as a factor in mitigation due to lack of evidence to support it. See Commission transcript, pp. 15:18-16:2.

probation, and costs. The terms of probation are as follows:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

- 1) Respondent shall, within thirty days of the final Judgment and Order, meet with the Director of LOMAP in order to extend his current LOMAP contract for an additional six months. The six month extension shall begin the date of the final Judgment and Order. Respondent shall remain on probation until the completion of the new contract.
- 2) In the event Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing terms and information thereof is received by the State Bar, bar counsel shall file a Notice of Non-Compliance with the Disciplinary Commission. The Disciplinary Commission may refer the matter to a hearing officer to conduct a hearing at the earliest possible date, but in no event later than thirty days following receipt of said notice. If the matter is referred to a hearing officer, the hearing officer shall determine whether the terms of probation have been breached, and if so, to recommend appropriate action and response to such breach.
- 3) If there is an allegation that Respondent failed to comply with any of the foregoing terms, the burden of proof shall be on the State Bar to prove non-compliance by a preponderance of the evidence.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of November 2003.



Jessica G. Funkhouser, Chair
Disciplinary Commission

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk
this 4th day of November 2003.

Copy of the foregoing mailed
this 4th day of November 2003 to:

Christopher D. Thomas
Hearing Officer 8Z
40 North Central, Suite 2700
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4441

Richard J. Woods
Respondent's Counsel
1850 North Central Ave, Suite 2400
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4527

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered
this 4th day of November 2003 to:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

John A. Furlong
Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
111 West Monroe, Suite 1800
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1742

By K. Weigand

/kdl