

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF  
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

**STEVEN R. RENSCH,**  
**Bar No. 009914**

Respondent.

**PDJ 2017-9064-PV**

**ORDER EXTENDING  
PROBATION**

[State Bar No. 15-0544]

**FILED SEPTEMBER 11, 2017**

By Final Judgment and Order of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge (“PDJ”) filed September 4, 2015, Mr. Rensch was reprimanded and placed on probation with the State Bar’s Law Office Management Assistance Program (LOMAP) for eighteen (18) months to monitor his compliance with trust account rules and procedures.

The State Bar filed a Motion to Extend Probation (“Motion”) for an additional six (6) months on May 17, 2017, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5)(A). The State Bar alleged Mr. Rensch failed to comply with the mandatory trust account fundamentals stated in his terms of probation and supplemented its Motion with a report (covering the period April 2016-March 2017) by the State Bar’s compliance monitor. Mr. Rensch opposed the extension and asserted the State Bar should prove any violation by a preponderance of the evidence. On June 1, 2017, the PDJ granted the parties’ stipulated motion extending the time for the State Bar to file a reply, however, no reply was filed, and a hearing was then set for June 28, 2017.

Under Rule 60(a)(5)(C), a hearing shall be held, “to determine if the terms of probation have been violated and if an additional sanction should be imposed.” If it is determined the terms of probation have been violated, an additional sanction may, but is not required, to be imposed.

On June 28, 2017, David L. Sandweiss appeared on behalf of the State Bar. Mr. Rensch did not properly calendar the hearing and therefore did not appear in person. With the approval of the PDJ, he appeared telephonically. All exhibits were admitted. The State Bar requested an additional sanction for noncompliance reflecting a ninety (90) day suspension and an additional two (2) years of probation upon reinstatement. Mr. Rensch asserted an additional sanction is unnecessary. He admits he has made some mathematical mistakes but argued he overall strove to comply with the terms of probation.

Now therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** granting the Motion.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5)(C), imposing an additional sanction extending Mr. Rensch’s probation for an additional six (6) months.

**DATED** this 11<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2017.

*William J. O’Neil*  

---

**William J. O’Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge**

Copies of the foregoing emailed  
this 11<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2017, and  
mailed September 12, 2017, to:

Steven R. Rensch  
Law Office of Steven Rensch  
3121 E. Fargo Cir  
Mesa, AZ 85213-5416  
Email: srench@renschlawoffice.com  
Respondent

David L. Sandweiss  
Senior Bar Counsel  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 N 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266  
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: AMcQueen