

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER)	Supreme Court
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,)	No. SB-06-0169-D
)	
)	Disciplinary Commission
)	Nos. 05-0748, 05-0857
CHRISTOPHER J. PIEKARSKI,)	
Bar No. 019251)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	JUDGMENT AND ORDER
)	

This matter having come on for hearing before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona, it having duly rendered its decision, there having been no discretionary review and *sua sponte* review having been declined by the Court,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that **CHRISTOPHER J. PIEKARSKI**, a member of the State Bar of Arizona, is hereby suspended from the practice of law for a period of 30-days, effective thirty (30) days from the date of this order, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, as disclosed in the Disciplinary Commission Report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **CHRISTOPHER J. PIEKARSKI** shall be placed on probation for a period of two years, upon reinstatement and effective upon the signing of the probation contract. Bar Counsel shall notify the Disciplinary Clerk of the date on which the probation begins. The terms of probation are as follows:

- 1) Respondent shall contact the director of Law Office Management Assistance Program (LOMAP) to schedule an assessment as to the effectiveness of Respondent's mail and correspondence handling in his office.
- 2) Respondent shall comply with any changes suggested by LOMAP, and permit LOMAP personnel access to his office and staff to confirm that any recommended changes have been accomplished and remain in effective.
- 3) Respondent shall pay the costs associated with LOMAP.
- 4) Respondent shall obtain a qualified practice monitor approved by bar counsel.
- 5) In the event that Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing conditions, and the State Bar receives information to that effect, bar counsel shall file with the Hearing Officer a Notice of Non-Compliance, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The Hearing Officer shall conduct a hearing within thirty days after receipt of said notice, to determine whether the terms of probation have been violated and if an additional sanction should be imposed. In the event there is an allegation that any of these terms have been violated, the burden of proof shall be on the State Bar of Arizona to prove non-compliance by clear and convincing evidence.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with all the provisions of Rule 72, Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona, including, but not limited to, Rule 72(a), which requires that Respondent notify all of his clients, within ten (10) days from the date hereof, of his inability to represent them and that he should promptly inform this Court of his compliance with this Order as provided in Rule 72(e).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with all rule provisions regarding reinstatement proceedings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be assessed costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings as provided in Rule 60(b).

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2006.

NOEL K. DESSAINT
Clerk of the Court

TO:

Christopher J. Piekarski, Respondent (Certified Mail, Return Receipt and Regular Mail)
Maret Vessella, Bar Counsel
Donna Lee Elm, Hearing Officer 6N
Lauren E. Eiler, Disciplinary Clerk (Cert. Copy)
Sandra Montoya, Lawyer Regulation Records Manager, State Bar of Arizona (Cert. Copy)
Cathy Catterson, Clerk, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Cert. Copy)
Richard Weare, Clerk, United States District Court, District of Arizona (Cert. Copy)
West Publishing Company (Jode Ottman)
Lexis-Nexis

tel