BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA **RUBY TORRES** **Bar No. 030347,** **Respondent.**	**PDJ 2025-9106** **FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER** [State Bar No. 25-0203] **FILED MAY 11, 2026**

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge having accepted the parties' Agreement for Discipline by Consent ("Agreement") submitted pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.,

IT IS ORDERED that **RUBY TORRES, Bar No. 030347**, is suspended for a period of six (6) months for her conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct as outlined in the Agreement, effective 30 days from the date of this order.

IT IS ORDERED pursuant to Rule 57(a)(5)(B), Ruby Torres shall **immediately** comply with the requirements of Rule 72, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., relating to notification of clients and others.

IT IS ORDERED as a condition precedent to being reinstated, and no sooner than sixty (60) days prior to the date the suspension period expires, Ruby Torres must complete a fitness-to-practice evaluation (as described *infra* in the probation order) in order to be considered eligible for reinstatement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Ruby Torres will satisfy the Medicare lien within thirty (30) days of entry of this Order. Ruby Torres shall secure the cessation of the garnishment of Ms. Darby's Social Security benefits **before seeking reinstatement**.

In the event reinstatement proceedings are held,

IT IS ORDERED that Ruby Torres shall be subject to any additional terms imposed by the Presiding Disciplinary Judge as a result of reinstatement proceedings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED upon reinstatement, Ruby Torres must immediately participate in probation for a period of two (2) years. The terms of probation shall include:

1. State Bar's Member Assistance Program ("MAP"):

    a. As a condition precedent to being reinstated, and no sooner than sixty (60) days prior to the date she is eligible to reinstate, Ms. Torres shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602)340-7258, to schedule a fitness-to-practice evaluation with the State Bar's MAP provider, Dr. Bashah, or her designee.

b. Ms. Torres will be responsible for any costs associated with the evaluation.

c. Assuming the evaluation concludes that Ms. Torres is fit to practice, the Compliance Monitor shall develop terms and conditions of participation if the results of the assessment so indicate, and the terms, including reporting requirements, shall be incorporated herein.

d. Ms. Torres will be responsible for any costs associated with MAP participation and compliance.

2. Ms. Torres shall not commit any further violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct or Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Ruby Torress will forego any claim that she might otherwise have asserted for attorney fees or costs related to the representation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Ruby Torres shall pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of $1,200.00 within 30 days. There are no costs or expenses incurred by the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge in these proceedings.

DATED this 11th day of May, 2026.

Lisa A. VandenBerg
Hon. Lisa A. VandenBerg
Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Copy of the foregoing emailed
this 11th day of May, 2026, to:

Stacy Shuman
LRO@staff.azbar.org

Brian Holohan
bh@bowwlaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

by: CLopez

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA **RUBY TORRES** **Bar No. 030347,** **Respondent.**	**PDJ 2025-9106** **ORDER ACCEPTING AGREEMENT FOR DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT** [State Bar No. 25-0203] **FILED MAY 11, 2026**

On May 6, 2026, the parties filed an Agreement for Discipline by Consent ("Agreement") pursuant to Rule 57(a), Arizona Rules of Supreme Court ("Ariz. R. Sup. Ct."). The State Bar of Arizona is represented by Staff Bar Counsel Stacy Shuman. Respondent Ruby Torres is represented by Counsel Brian Holohan. The Agreement seeks to address State Bar No. 25-0203. A formal complaint was filed on December 31, 2025.[1]

By order dated April 23, 2026, the Presiding Disciplinary Judge ("PDJ") granted the State Bar's motion for judgment on the pleadings, in part, and found that Respondent had violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., ER

[1] The Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee ("ADPCC") entered an order of probable cause on December 18, 2025.

1.3 and ER 1.4(a)(2) and (3),[2] the factual basis set forth in that order is incorporated by reference herein.

Contingent upon approval of the proposed form of discipline, Ms. Torres voluntarily waives her right to an adjudicatory hearing, as well as all motions, defenses, objections, or requests that could be asserted. Pursuant to Rule 53(c)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., the State Bar provided Notice of the Agreement and an opportunity to file a written objection to the Complainant by telephone and email on April 27, 2026. The Agreement indicates the Complainant does not object to the Agreement.

The Agreement details a factual basis in support of Ms. Torres' conditional admissions and is incorporated by reference.[3] In addition to the rule violations already found by the court regarding ER 1.3 and ER 1.4(a)(2) and (3), Ms. Torres conditionally admits her conduct violated Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., Rule 42, ER 1.15(d) (failure to promptly notify of and disburse funds to client or third person) and ER 1.16(d)(upon termination failure to

[2] Page 2 of the Agreement states the PDJ found that Respondent had violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., ER 1.3, ER 1.4(a)(2) and (c), however, the Order Re Judgment on the Pleadings dated April 23, 2026 found Respondent had violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., ER 1.3, ER 1.4(a)(2) and (3).
[3] *See* Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.

take steps to protect a client's interest) and the Rules of Professional Conduct. As a sanction, the parties agree to suspension for a period of six (6) months and probation for a period of two (2) years. Ms. Torres also agrees to pay the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding, within 30 days from the date of this order.

The State Bar has agreed to dismiss the allegation that Ms. Torres violated ER 1.2 and ER 3.2. Ms. Torres has paid $1,000 in restitution to Ms. Darby. Additionally, Ms. Torres will satisfy the Medicare lien within thirty (30) days of entry of the final judgment and order. Ms. Torres shall secure the cessation of the garnishment of Ms. Darby's Social Security benefits before seeking reinstatement and will forego any claim that she might otherwise have asserted for attorney fees or costs related to the representation.

Generally speaking, the issues arose after Ms. Torres was retained to represent an elderly client with her personal injury case. After her client sent executed settlement documents, Ms. Torres failed to diligently communicate with her client with regard to the settlement. After a settlement was reached, Ms. Torres failed to insure timely receipt and disbursement of settlement funds. Only after the client initiated a bar charge, did Ms. Torres take action. Due to the failure to disburse funds timely, Medicare made demands to the client for reimbursement which led to a lien. When Ms. Torres advised her client that she could no longer represent her due to the bar charge, she advised her client that she had initiated an appeal of the Medicare lien which would temporarily stop collection efforts. However, the collection efforts did not stop, leading to the garnishment of her client's monthly benefits to satisfy the Medicare lien.

Sanctions imposed against lawyers "shall be determined in accordance with the American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions*" ("ABA Standards"). Rule 58(k), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. In determining an appropriate sanction, the PDJ has considers: the duties violated, the lawyer's mental state, the actual or potential injury caused by the misconduct, and the existence of aggravating and mitigating factors. ABA *Standard* 3.0.

Ms. Torres agrees that she "knowingly" failed to adequately communicate with the client; diligently represent the client; or resolve the Medicare lien asserted against the client's settlement proceeds or otherwise disburse the settlement fund. Ms. Torres violated her duties to the client and the profession. While the Agreement reflects that there was no actual harm to the client and the profession, the PDJ finds that there was potential harm to both. It is not missed on the PDJ that there was a potential for a great deal of unnecessary stress and anxiety for Ms. Torres's client.

The Agreement relies on ABA *Standards* 4.12 (*Failure to Preserve the Client's Property), Standard* 4.42 (*Lack of Diligence),* and *Standard 7.2 (Violations of Other Duties Owed as a Professional)* as the appropriate *Standards* given the facts and circumstances of this matter. More specifically:

Standard 4.12 states:

> Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows or should know that he is dealing improperly with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

Standard 4.42 states:

> Suspension is generally appropriate when:
> a) A lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or potential injury to a client, or

b) A lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

Standard 7.2 states:

> Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a profession and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

The Agreement recites two (2) aggravating factors: 9.22(a) prior disciplinary offenses[4]; and 9.22(h) vulnerability of victim. The Agreement identifies two (2) mitigating factors: 9.32(b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive; and 9.32(c) personal or emotional problems.[5]

The responsibility to determine the appropriate measure of discipline "imposes a concomitant responsibility to pay special care to the purposes served by such discipline." *In re Rivkind*, 164 Ariz. 154, 157 (1990). The objective of attorney discipline proceedings "is not to punish the lawyer, but to protect the public and deter similar conduct by other lawyers." *Id*.

---

[4] PDJ 2021-9057 [19-3454, 20-1602] Reprimand with probation. Respondent violated ER's 1.3, 1.4(a) and (b), 1.15(d), 3.4(c), 8.1(b), 8.4(d) and Rule 54(d)(2).

[5] The PDJ considered the Respondent's Memorandum Re Mitigation submitted under seal.

Ms. Torres' mitigation is compelling. However, it also highlights the significant amount of therapy, and potentially other interventions, that Ms. Torres will need to employ in order to be fit to return to the practice of law. Having considered the parties' planned safeguards with regard to reinstatement and probation terms thereafter, the PDJ concludes that the Agreement achieves appropriate protections to the public and the other recognized purposes of the lawyer discipline process.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED accepting the Agreement for Discipline by Consent under seal. A final judgment and order is separately filed this date.

DATED this 11th day of May, 2026.

Lisa A. VandenBerg

Hon. Lisa A. VandenBerg
Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Copy of the foregoing e-mailed
this 11th day of May, 2026 to:

Stacy Shuman
LRO@staff.azbar.org

Brian Holohan
bh@bowwlaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

by: CLopez

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE
FILED
05-6-2026

C.LOPEZ
DISCIPLINARY CLERK

Stacy Shuman, Bar No. 018399
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Telephone (602) 340-7247
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Brian Holohan, Bar No. 009124
Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson PC
2800 N CENTRAL AVE STE 1600
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-1047
Email: bh@bowwlaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **RUBY TORRES** **Bar No. 030347** Respondent.	**PDJ 2025-9106** **AGREEMENT FOR DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT** [State Bar File No. 25-0203]

The State Bar of Arizona (the State Bar), and Respondent Ruby Torres, who is represented in this matter by counsel, Brian Holohan, hereby submit their Agreement for Discipline by Consent pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. A probable cause order was entered on December 18, 2025. A formal complaint was filed December 31, 2025. By order dated April 23, 2026, the Court granted the State

Bar's motion for judgment on the pleadings, in part, and found that Respondent had violated ER 1.3 and ER 1.4(a)(2) and (c).[1]

Respondent voluntarily waives the right to an adjudicatory hearing, unless otherwise ordered, and waives all motions, defenses, objections or requests which have been made or raised, or could be asserted thereafter, if the conditional admission and proposed form of discipline is approved.

Pursuant to Rule 53(c)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., notice of this agreement was provided to the complainant by telephone and email on April 27, 2026. Complainant was notified of the opportunity to file a written objection to the agreement with the State Bar within five (5) business days of bar counsel's notice. Complainant confirmed by email to Bar Counsel that she does not object to the agreement.

In addition to the rule violations already found by the Court, Respondent conditionally admits that her conduct, as set forth below, violated Rule 42, ER 1.15(d) and ER 1.16(d). Upon acceptance of this agreement, Respondent agrees to accept imposition of the following discipline: **Six (6) month Suspension. Upon reinstatement, Respondent shall be placed on Probation for two (2) years, the terms of which are set forth below.**

[1] The factual basis for the Court's findings is set forth in its Order, which will not be restated herein.

Respondent also agrees to pay the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding, within 30 days from the date of this order. If costs are not paid within 30 days interest will begin to accrue at the legal rate.[2] The State Bar's Statement of Costs and Expenses is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

FACTS

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. At all times relevant, Respondent was a lawyer licensed to practice law in the state of Arizona having been first admitted to practice in Arizona on July 12, 2013.

COUNT ONE (File no. 25-0203/DARBY)

1. On or about October 8, 2019, April Darby was injured in an automobile accident.

2. On October 5, 2021, Ms. Darby retained Respondent to represent her in her personal injury case.

3. On October 8, 2021, Respondent filed a complaint on Ms. Darby's behalf in Maricopa County Superior Court, Case No. CV 2021-015857, *Darby v Herzinger*.

---

[2] Respondent understands that the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding include the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona, the Disciplinary Clerk, the Probable Cause Committee, the Presiding Disciplinary Judge and the Supreme Court of Arizona.

4. The case continued in normal course and on November 17, 2022, Counsel for the parties filed a Notice of Settlement.

5. On December 22, 2022, Ms. Darby sent Respondent the executed settlement documents, including a power of attorney that authorized Respondent to endorse and deposit the settlement check into her trust account.

6. In the Fall of 2024, Ms. Darby received a letter from Medicare demanding reimbursement for $2,000 paid on her behalf for medical services.

7. Respondent knew that Ms. Darby was a Medicare recipient.

8. Ms. Darby sent copies of the demand letters to Respondent. Respondent does not remember receiving them.

9. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) referred Ms. Darby's account to the Department of Treasury's Bureau of Fiscal Services. CMS is authorized to recover Medicare payments that should have been the responsibility of another payer.

10. The Department of Treasury's Bureau of Fiscal Services then referred Ms. Darby's account to ConServe, a private debt collection agency authorized to collect certain types of delinquent Medicare debts.

11. Respondent did not receive the settlement check; did not communicate with Ms. Darby; and did not take any action to locate the check until after Ms. Darby

contacted the State Bar on January 23, 2025, to complain about Respondent's conduct.

12. After Respondent was contacted by the State Bar, she contacted the insurance adjuster to re-issue the settlement check, which by that time had gone stale.

13. By letter dated January 30, 2025, Respondent advised NGHP (Non-Group Health Plan) that she represented Ms. Darby and requested a copy of any conditional payment issued and any and all documents relating to the demand for reimbursement. Medicare is a secondary payer to certain NGHPs.

14. By May 2025, Respondent had received the replacement settlement check, which she deposited in her IOLTA Trust account pending resolution of the Medicare lien.

15. By letter dated July 29, 2025, Respondent advised the Department of Treasury that she represented Ms. Darby and disputed the Medicare lien.

16. By letter dated August 12, 2025, Respondent again advised the Department of Treasury that she represented Ms. Darby and disputed the Medicare lien.

17. By letter dated November 5, 2025, Respondent advised ConServe that she represented Ms. Darby and disputed the Medicare lien.

18. By letters dated December 10, 2025, Respondent advised NGHP, ConServe and the Department of Treasury that she no longer represented Ms. Darby and that all communications should be directed to her former client.

19. By letter dated December 17, 2025, Respondent, through counsel, advised Ms. Darby that she could not continue to represent her because the State Bar had obtained authorization from the Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee to initiate formal disciplinary proceedings against her.

20. Respondent's counsel advised Ms. Darby that Respondent had initiated an appeal of the Medicare lien, which would temporarily stop collection efforts, but that Ms. Darby would have to deal with Medicare and/or its collection agent directly herself or engage an attorney to do so.

21. However, collection efforts continued, and Ms. Darby's monthly benefits were garnished to satisfy the Medicare lien.

22. Respondent's counsel advised Ms. Darby that Respondent continues to hold the $1,000 settlement proceeds in her trust account and asserted that Respondent could not distribute the settlement proceeds without Medicare's consent.

23. Respondent did not resolve the putative Medicare lien before she withdrew from the representation.

CONDITIONAL ADMISSIONS

Respondent's admissions are being tendered in exchange for the form of discipline stated below and are submitted freely and voluntarily and not as a result of coercion or intimidation. Respondent conditionally admits that she violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., specifically ER 1.15(d) and ER 1.16(d).

CONDITIONAL DISMISSALS

The State Bar has conditionally agreed to dismiss the allegations of violations of ER 1.2 and ER 3.2 for evidentiary considerations.

RESTITUTION

Respondent has paid $1,000 in restitution to Ms. Darby. Additionally, Respondent will satisfy the Medicare lien within thirty (30) days of entry of the final judgment and order. She shall secure the cessation of the garnishment of Ms. Darby's Social Security benefits before seeking reinstatement. And, Respondent will forego any claim that she might otherwise have asserted for attorney fees or costs related to the representation.

SANCTION

Respondent and the State Bar of Arizona agree that based on the facts and circumstances of this matter, as set forth above, the following sanction is appropriate: **Suspension for six (6) months, and Probation for two (2) years, if reinstated, the sole term being participation in the State Bar's Member Assistance Program (MAP).** The parties agree as follows:

1. As a condition precedent to being reinstated, and no sooner than sixty (60) days prior to the date that she is eligible to reinstate, Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, to schedule a fitness-to-practice evaluation with the State Bar's MAP provider, Dr. Bashah, or her designee. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with the evaluation. Assuming the evaluation concludes that Respondent is fit to practice, the Compliance Monitor shall develop terms and conditions of participation if the results of the assessment so indicate and the terms, including reporting requirements, shall be incorporated herein. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with participation with compliance.

Respondent shall commit no further violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

NON-COMPLIANCE LANGUAGE

If Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing probation terms and the State Bar of Arizona receives information thereof, Bar Counsel shall file a notice of noncompliance with the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The Presiding Disciplinary Judge may conduct a hearing within 30 days to determine whether Respondent breached a term of probation and, if so, to recommend an appropriate sanction. If the State Bar alleges 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 a preponderance of the evidence.

If Respondent violates any of the terms of this agreement, the State Bar may bring further discipline proceedings.

LEGAL GROUNDS IN SUPPORT OF SANCTION

In determining an appropriate sanction, the parties consulted the American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (Standards)* pursuant to Rule 57(a)(2)(E). The *Standards* are designed to promote consistency in the imposition of sanctions by identifying relevant factors that courts should consider and then applying those factors to situations where lawyers have engaged in various types of misconduct. *Standard* 1.3, *In re Pappas*, 159 Ariz. 516, 768 P.2d 1161 (1988). The *Standards* provide guidance with respect to an appropriate sanction in this matter.

In determining an appropriate sanction, the Court considers the duty violated, the lawyer's mental state, the actual or potential injury caused by the misconduct and the existence of aggravating and mitigating factors. *Standard* 3.0.

The parties agree that the following *Standards* apply under the facts and circumstances of this matter:

1) *4.12 Failure to Preserve the Client's Property,* which states that Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows or should know that she is

dealing improperly with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

2) *4.42 Lack of Diligence,* which states that Suspension is generally appropriate when (a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or potential injury to a client; or (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

3) *7.2 Violations of Other Duties Owed as a Professional*, which states that Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional, and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

The duty violated

Respondent's conduct violated her duty to the client and the profession.

The lawyer's mental state

Respondent knowingly failed to adequately communicate with the client; diligently represent the client; or resolve the Medicare lien asserted against the client's settlement proceeds or otherwise disburse the settlement fund in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The extent of the actual or potential injury

There was actual harm to the client and the profession.

Aggravating and mitigating circumstances

The presumptive sanction is Suspension. The parties conditionally agree that the following aggravating and mitigating factors should be considered:

In aggravation:

a) 9.22(a) prior disciplinary offenses. PDJ 2021-9057 [19-3454, 20-1602] Reprimand with probation. Respondent violated ERs 1.3, 1.4(a) and (b), 1.15(d), 3.4(c), 8.1(b) 8.4(d) and Rule 54(d)(2). In that case, Respondent represented a client in a personal injury matter, during which she negligently failed to adequately communicate or diligently represent her client. Respondent also failed to promptly distribute (or interplead) the client's settlement funds. The parties stipulated to certain mitigating factors that included 9.32(c), personal or emotional problems, which is addressed below.

b) 9.22(h) vulnerability of victim. Ms. Darby is an elderly individual, whose Social Security benefits are being garnished because Responded failed to timely address and resolve a Medicare lien.

In mitigation:

a) 9.32(b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive. Respondent maintained the settlement funds in her IOLTA both before and after the commencement of these proceedings.

b) 9.32(c) personal or emotional problems. In PDJ 2021-9057 [19-3454, 20-1602], which is referenced above, Respondent was given consideration for personal and medical issues that she experienced beginning in 2019. Respondent has experienced personal and medical issues since that time, for which the parties agree she should be given consideration. The supporting documentation is being filed contemporaneously herewith under seal.

Discussion

Based on the *Standards* and in light of the facts and circumstances of this matter, the parties conditionally agree that the sanction set forth above is an appropriate sanction and will serve the purposes of lawyer discipline.

CONCLUSION

The object of lawyer discipline is not to punish the lawyer, but to protect the public, the profession and the administration of justice. In re *Peasley, 208 Ariz. 27 (2004)*. Recognizing that determination of the appropriate sanction is the prerogative of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, the State Bar and Respondent believe that the objectives of discipline will be met by the imposition of the proposed sanction of Suspension with Probation and the imposition of costs and expenses. A proposed form of order is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATED this 6th day of May 2026

STATE BAR OF ARIZONA

/s/Stacy L. Shuman
Stacy L. Shuman
Staff Bar Counsel

This agreement, with conditional admissions, is submitted freely and voluntarily and not under coercion or intimidation. I acknowledge my duty under the Rules of the Supreme Court with respect to discipline and reinstatement. I understand these duties may include notification of clients, return of property and other rules pertaining to suspension.

DATED this 6th day of May, 2026.

Ruby Torres
Respondent

DATED this 6th day of May, 2026.

Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson PC

Brian Holohan
Counsel for Respondent

Approved as to form and content

Maret Vessella
Chief Bar Counsel

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk of

the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this 6th day of May 2026.

Copy of the foregoing emailed
this 6th day of May 2026, to:

Honorable Lisa A. VandenBerg
Presiding Disciplinary Judge
Supreme Court of Arizona
1501 West Washington Street, Suite 102
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
E-mail: officepdj@courts.az.gov

Brian Holohan
Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson PC
2800 N CENTRAL AVE STE 1600
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-1047
Email: bh@bowwlaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th St., Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: */s/Jackie Brokaw*
SLS/rm

EXHIBIT A

Statement of Costs and Expenses

In the Matter of a Member of
The State Bar of Arizona, Ruby Torres
Bar No. 030347, Respondent.

File No. 25-0203

Administrative Expenses

The Supreme Court of Arizona has adopted a schedule of administrative expenses to be assessed in lawyer discipline. If the number of charges/complainants exceeds five, the assessment for the general administrative expenses shall increase by 20% for each additional charge/complainant where a violation is admitted or proven.

Factors considered in the administrative expense are time expended by staff bar counsel, paralegal, secretaries, typists, file clerks and messenger; and normal postage charges, telephone costs, office supplies and all similar factors generally attributed to office overhead. As a matter of course, administrative costs will increase based on the length of time it takes a matter to proceed through the adjudication process.

General Administrative Expenses
for above-numbered proceedings **$1,200.00**

Additional costs incurred by the State Bar of Arizona in the processing of this disciplinary matter, and not included in administrative expenses, are itemized below.

Additional Costs

Total for additional costs $ 0.00

TOTAL COSTS AND EXPENSES INCURRED $ 1,200.00

EXHIBIT B

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **RUBY TORRES** **Bar No. 030347** Respondent.	**PDJ 2025-9106** **FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER** State Bar No. 25-0203

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, having reviewed the Agreement for Discipline by Consent pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., accepts the parties' proposed agreement.

Accordingly:

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent, **Ruby Torres,** is Suspended for six (6) months for her conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents, effective 30 days from the date of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, as a condition precedent to being reinstated, and no sooner than sixty (60) days prior to the date that she is eligible to do so, Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, to schedule a fitness-to-practice evaluation with the State Bar's Member

Assistance Program (MAP) provider, Dr. Bashah, or her designee. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with participation in the evaluation. Assuming the evaluation concludes that Respondent is fit to practice, the Compliance Monitor shall develop terms and conditions of participation if the results of the assessment so indicate and the terms, including reporting requirements, shall be incorporated herein. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with participation with compliance.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall satisfy the Medicare lien within 30 days of this Order. Respondent shall also secure the cessation of the garnishment of Ms. Darby's Social Security benefits before seeking reinstatement.

Respondent shall commit no further violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be subject to any additional terms imposed by the Presiding Disciplinary Judge as a result of reinstatement hearings held.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Rule 72 Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., Respondent shall immediately comply with the requirements relating to notification of clients and others.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of $ _______________, within 30 days from the date of service of this Order. If not paid within 30 days, interest will begin to accrue at the legal rate.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall pay the costs and expenses incurred by the disciplinary clerk and/or Presiding Disciplinary Judge's Office in connection with these disciplinary proceedings in the amount of _______________, within 30 days from the date of service of this Order. If not paid within 30 days interest will begin to accrue at the legal rate.

DATED this ______ day of May, 2026.

____
Honorable Lisa A. VandenBerg,
Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk of
the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this ______ day of May, 2026.

Copies of the foregoing emailed
this ______ day of May, 2026, to:

Brian Holohan
Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson PC
2800 N CENTRAL AVE STE 1600
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-1047
Email: bh@bowwlaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

Stacy L. Shuman
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by:____________________