

sanction.


1 The Commission determined that either application of the rule was a procedurally
2 acceptable option, and ultimately remanded the matter for the filing of a new compliant
3 based on the existing record. See Commission Report filed November 21, 2006. In
4 December 2006, the State Bar filed a Motion for Reconsideration to accept the Hearing
5 Officer's recommendation, which was denied. See Commission Order filed June 13, 2007
6

7 This matter then came before the Commission on February 23, 2008, for
8 consideration of the Hearing Officer's Report filed December 17, 2007, recommending a
9 six-month and one-day suspension and costs. No objections were filed.

10 **Decision**

11 Having found no facts clearly erroneous, the eight members² of the Disciplinary
12 Commission unanimously recommend accepting and incorporating the Hearing Officer's
13 findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation for a six-month and one-day
14 suspension and costs of the disciplinary proceedings.³
15

16 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of March, 2008

17
18 

19 _____
20 Daisy Flores, Chair
21 Disciplinary Commission

22 Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk
23 this 19th day of March, 2008.

24 Copy of the foregoing mailed
25 this 20th day of March, 2008, to:

26 ² Commissioner Belleau did not participate in these proceedings. Former Commissioner Barbara Atwood, a lawyer member from Tucson, participated as an ad hoc member. One lawyer member seat remains vacant.

³ A copy of the Hearing Officer's Report is attached as Exhibit A.

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

Mark S Sifferman
Hearing Officer 9J
Norling, Kolsrud, Sifferman & Davis, P L C
16427 North Scottsdale Road, Suite 210
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

Allan Barfield
Respondent
1279 E Ivy Lane
Baxter Spring, KS 66713

Denise K. Tomaiko
Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6288

by: *D. Tomaiko*

/mps