


BEFORE A HEARING OFFICER
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA



IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF)
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA)
)
MARGO A SHORR,)
Bar No. 016752)
)
Respondent.)

No. 04-1095

Report on Proposed Agreement
For Discipline by Consent

THE FOREGOING matter having come on before the undersigned Hearing Officer upon a Tender of Admissions and Agreement for Discipline Consent (with attached exhibits) jointly executed by Respondent and the State Bar and filed with the Disciplinary Clerk on May 11, 2006; and the same having been filed with the Hearing Officer on June 15, 2006;

And the Consent Agreement having been reviewed and considered pursuant to Rule 56(e), Rules S. Ct.;

The Agreement and the proportionality of the sanction to be imposed is reviewed as follows:

1. The Respondent is an attorney licensed to practice in the State of Arizona having been admitted to practice on October 21, 1995.
2. The Complaint was initiated based on a client's allegations relative to acts and activities connected with the representation of one client, James Bonner, in a domestic relations proceeding.
3. The subsequent investigation revealed numerous discrepancies with respect to the Respondents management of her trust account. There were instances of commingling, overdrafts and failure to maintain complete client ledgers, and a failure to maintain an audit trail with the result that unanswered questions remain concerning funds.
4. The matters involving the client case handling complaint were largely issues of failure of communication and lax billing. No actual legal prejudice was apparently suffered by the client.
5. The aggravation factors present are the failure of Respondent to respond to the State Bar requests for trust account records and substantial experience (10 years) in the practice of law.
6. The mitigation factors are that the Respondent has no prior discipline and did not


have a dishonest or selfish motive. In addition, the Respondent's client case handling was affected by personal matters arising out of the illness and subsequent death of her mother.

7. Similar cases include *In re Vingelli*; Supreme Court No. SB-03-0161-D (2004); *In re Glanville*; Supreme Court No. SB-04-0007-D (2004); *In re Hall*; Supreme Court No. 02-0122-D (2002) and *In re Smith*; No. SB-02-0121-D (2002). All these cases involved similar acts involving mishandling of the attorney's trust accounts. The first three cases resulted in censure followed by a period of probation to insure trust account compliance. In the *Smith* case there was a censure, but no probation was required because the attorney had taken a position with a public legal agency and was not handling a trust account.

THEREFORE, based upon the foregoing facts and cases;

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Consent Agreement between the Respondent Margo A. Shorr, and the State Bar for Censure and Probation be accepted.

Dated this 30th day of June, 2006.


Philip M. Haggerty
Hearing Officer 6K

Original mailed this 30th day
of June 2006 to:

Disciplinary Clerk
Arizona Supreme Court
1501 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3231

and copies mailed this 30th day
of June, 2006 to:

Shauna R. Miller
Senior Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85016

and

Mark D. Rubin
Law Offices of Mark D. Rubin, P.L.C.
4574 North First Avenue
Suite 150
Tucson, AZ 85718
Counsel for Respondent Margo A. Shorr