SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OFA SUS	PENDED MEMBER)	Supre	me Court
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,)	No.	SB-08-0152-D
)		
)	Discip	olinary Commission
)	No.	07-1908
STEVEN D. FLAGGMAN,)		
Bar No. 019463)		
)		
	RESPONDENT.)	JUD(GMENT AND ORDER
)		

This matter having come before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona, it having duly rendered its decision, and no discretionary or *sua sponte* review occurring,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that **STEVEN D. FLAGGMAN** a member of the State Bar of Arizona, is hereby suspended from the practice of law for a period of eighteen months, retroactive to January 8, 2008, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, as disclosed in the Disciplinary Commission Report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **STEVEN D. FLAGGMAN** shall be placed on probation for a period of two years upon reinstatement. Bar Counsel shall notify the Disciplinary Clerk of the date on which the probation begins. The terms of probation are as follows:

- Respondent has entered into a voluntary contract with MAP and shall
 continue with the terms of his voluntary contract upon reinstatement and shall,
 at the discretion of the MAP director undergo a subsequent evaluation at the
 time of reinstatement. Any recommendations resulting from such assessment
 shall also be incorporated in the probation terms and conditions. Probation will
 begin to run at the time of reinstatement and will conclude two years from the
 date that all parties have signed the terms and conditions of probation.
- 2. Respondent shall refrain from engaging in any conduct that would violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.
- 3. In the event that Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing probation terms and information thereof is received by the State Bar of Arizona, Bar Counsel shall file a Notice of Noncompliance with the imposing entity pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. The imposing entity may refer the matter to a hearing officer to conduct a hearing at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than thirty days after receipt of notice, to determine whether a term of probation has been breached and, if so, to recommend an appropriate sanction. 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 of Arizona to prove noncompliance by clear and convincing evidence.

Arizona Supreme Court No. SB-08-0152-D Page 2 of 2

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 60(b), the State Bar of Arizona is granted judgment against **STEVEN D. FLAGGMAN** for costs and expenses of these proceedings in the amount of \$762.00, together with interest at the legal rate. Respondent shall pay all costs within thirty days of this judgment and order.

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

TO:

Steven D. Flaggman, Respondent (Certified Mail, Return Receipt and Regular Mail)

Nancy A. Greenlee, Respondent's Counsel

Stephen P. Little, Bar Counsel

Stanley R. Lerner, Hearing Officer 7V

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

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

Molly Dwyer, 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