SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A SUSPENDED MEMBER)	Supreme Court	
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,)	No.	SB-08-0027-D
)		
)	Discip	olinary Commission
)	Nos.	04-0491, 04-2115, 05-0079,
ROBERT HORTON GREEN, JR.,			05-0448, 05-0715, 05-0918,
Bar No. 015089)		05-1343, 05-1563, 05-1818
)		06-0066, 06-1279
)		
RESPONDENT.)	JUDO	SMENT 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 **ROBERT HORTON GREEN, JR.**, a suspended member of the State Bar of Arizona, is hereby suspended from the practice of law for a period of two years retroactive to August 31, 2005, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, as disclosed in the Disciplinary Commission Report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **ROBERT HORTON GREEN, JR.** 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 shall include:

- 1) Respondent shall be placed on probation for two years, with specific terms and conditions to be determined at formal reinstatement proceedings.
- 2) Respondent shall participate in fee arbitration where appropriate with any client disputes.
- 3) Respondent shall pay all costs and expenses incurred in these discipline proceedings.
- 4) 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.

Arizona Supreme Court No. SB-08-0027-D Page 2 of 2

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 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 pursuant to Rule 60(b), the State Bar of Arizona is granted judgment against **ROBERT HORTON GREEN**, **JR.** for costs and expenses of these proceedings in the amount of \$1,968.50, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of this judgment.

DATED this day of	, 2008.
	Rachelle M. Resnick
	Clerk of the Court

TO:

Robert Horton Green, Jr., Respondent (Certified Mail, Return Receipt)

Maret Vessella, Deputy Chief Bar Counsel

T.H. Guerin, Jr., Hearing Officer

Leticia V. D'Amore, Disciplinary Clerk (Cert. Copy)

Sandra Montoya, Lawyer Regulation Records Manager, State Bar of Arizona (Cert. Copy)

Perry Thompson, Director of Admissions, Supreme Court of the United States (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

clf