BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **MATTHEW JASON HUM, Bar No. 028959** Respondent.	**PDJ 2018-9128** **FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER** [State Bar Nos. 18-2475 and 18-2848] **FILED JANUARY 4, 2019**

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge accepted the Agreement for Discipline by Consent of the parties filed on December 13, 2018.

Accordingly:

IT IS ORDERED Respondent, **MATTHEW JASON HUM, Bar No. 028959,** is suspended for three (3) years for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents, effective immediately.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED if Mr. Hum is reinstated to the practice of law, he shall be placed on probation for two (2) years and shall participate in the following programs as terms of probation upon reinstatement:

1. LOMAP: Mr. Hum shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258 within ten (10) days of the date of his reinstatement. He shall submit to a LOMAP examination of his office procedures. He shall sign terms and conditions of participation, including reporting requirements, which shall be incorporated herein. Mr. Hum shall be responsible for any costs associated with LOMAP.
2. LRO MAP: Mr. Hum shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258 within ten (10) days of the date of his reinstatement to schedule a full assessment. 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. Mr. Hum shall be responsible for any costs associated with participation and with compliance.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Mr. Hum shall be subject to any additional terms imposed by the Presiding Disciplinary Judge because of reinstatement hearings held.

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PROBATION

If Mr. Hum 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 a term of probation has been breached and, if so, whether to impose an appropriate sanction. If there is an allegation that Mr. Hum 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.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Mr. Hum shall pay costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona for $1,200.00, within thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

DATED this 4th day of January 2019.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

COPY of the foregoing e-mailed/mailed
on this 4th day of January 2019, to:

Craig D. Henley
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Janet Hong Linton
Udall Law Firm LLP
4801 E. Broadway Blvd., Suite 400
Tucson, AZ 85711-3638
Email: jlinton@udalllaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

by: AMcQueen

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **MATTHEW JASON HUM,** **Bar No. 028959** Respondent.	**PDJ-2018-9128** **DECISION ACCEPTING DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT** [State Bar Nos. 18-2475 and 18-2848] **FILED JANUARY 4, 2019**

Under Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.,[1] an Agreement for Discipline by Consent ("Agreement"), was filed on December 13, 2018. A Probable Cause Order issued on November 20, 2018 regarding Bar charge 18-2475. No formal complaint has been filed. The parties wish to resolve both charges listed above with this Agreement. Mr. Hum is represented by Janet Hong Linton, *Udall Law Firm LLP* and the State Bar of Arizona is represented by Senior Bar Counsel Craig D. Henley.

Rule 57 requires admissions be tendered solely "…in exchange for the stated form of discipline…." Under that rule, the right to an adjudicatory hearing is waived only if the "…conditional admission and proposed form of discipline is approved…." If the agreement is not accepted, those conditional admissions are automatically withdrawn and shall not be used against the parties in any subsequent proceeding. Mr.

[1] Unless otherwise stated all Rule references are to the Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.

Hum has voluntarily waived the right to an adjudicatory hearing, and waived all motions, defenses, objections or requests that could be asserted upon approval of the proposed form of discipline. Pursuant to Rule 53(b)(3), the complainant was given notice by email on November 21, 2018 of the opportunity to file a written objection. No objection has been received by the Presiding Disciplinary Judge.

The Agreement details a factual basis to support the conditional admissions. It is incorporated by this reference. Mr. Hum admits violating Rule 42, ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 3.2 and ER 8.4(c). Upon acceptance of the agreement the parties stipulate to a three-year (3) suspension, probation if reinstated, and the payment of costs of $1,200.00 within thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

Charge No. 18-2475. Mr. Hum represented a company in a Superior Court case. He obtained a preliminary injunction forcing the return of intellectual property provided his client posted a bond. His client directed he obtain an agreement that the funds be deposited in the trust account of Mr. Hum. Upon the agreement being rejected, his client directed that an emergency motion be filed so the Court could consider the request. Mr. Hum did not file the motion and instead lied that he had filed the motion and lied further in telling his client a hearing on the motion had been set. He also created a false court order to deceive his client that the hearing was set. He compounded his lie by telling him the hearing had taken place.

His client learned the truth two days later and fired him. Mr. Hum changed his licensing status to inactive and does not currently engage in the practice of law.

Charge No. 18-2848. Mr. Hum represented a client in a product defects case. He lied to his client and told him the law suit was filed and being pursued. When confronted by his client, Mr. Hum falsely stated the case was in the discovery phase.

The parties stipulate that restitution is not an issue.

The parties agree *Standard* 4.42, applies to a violation of ER 1.2, (client authority), ER 1.3 (diligence), and ER 1.4 (communication). It provides that suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

Standard 6.22 applies to a violation of ER 3.2 (expedite litigation). It also provides that suspension is generally appropriate when a party knowingly interferes with a legal proceeding. *Standard* 4.62 applies to a violation of ER 8.4(c), (dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation). It also provides that suspension is generally appropriate for knowing deceit and injury or potential injury to a client.

Mr. Hum's conduct violated his duty to his clients and the legal profession. He intentionally created false documents and made false statements intending to deceive his clients. There was actual harm to the clients and the legal profession. In mitigation, the parties agree *Standard* 9.32(c) applies. Mr. Hum submitted a letter under seal of

personal or emotional problems. If his actions had benefited him or violated a Court order, disbarment would be warranted. A long-term suspension is in accordance with the *Standards*.

Now Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED accepting the Agreement and incorporating it with any supporting documents by this reference. A final judgment and order is signed this date.

DATED this 4th day of January 2019.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

COPY of the foregoing e-mailed/mailed
on this 4th day of January 2019, to:

Craig D. Henley
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Janet Hong Linton
Udall Law Firm LLP
4801 E. Broadway Blvd., Suite 400
Tucson, AZ 85711-3638
Email: jlinton@udalllaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

by: AMcQueen

Craig D. Henley, Bar No. 018801
Senior Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Telephone (602) 340-7272
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE
SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA
DEC 13 2018
FILED
BY

Janet Hong Linton, Bar No. 024818
Udall Law Firm LLP
4801 E. Broadway Blvd., Suite 400
Tucson, AZ 85711-3638
Telephone 520-623-4353
Email: jlinton@udalllaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **MATTHEW JASON HUM** **Bar No. 028959** Respondent.	**PDJ 2018-9128** **AGREEMENT FOR DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT** [State Bar Nos. 18-2475 and 18-2848]

The State Bar of Arizona, through undersigned Bar Counsel, and Respondent, Matthew Jason Hum, who is represented in this matter by counsel, Janet Hong Linton, hereby submit their Agreement for Discipline by Consent,

pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. A probable cause order was entered on November 20, 2018 in State Bar No. 18-2475 but a formal complaint has not been filed in this matter. Respondent and his counsel have also reviewed the allegations in State Bar No. 18-2848 and wish to globally resolve State Bar Nos. 18-2475 and 18-2848 with this Consent Agreement.

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(b)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., notice of this agreement was provided to the complainant(s) by email on November 21, 2018. Complainant(s) have been 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. Copies of Complainants' objections, if any, have been or will be provided to the presiding disciplinary judge.

Respondent conditionally admits that his conduct, as set forth below, violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 3.2 and ER 8.4(c).

Upon acceptance of this agreement, Respondent agrees to accept imposition of the following discipline: Three Year Suspension.

Respondent also agrees to pay the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding, within 30 days from the date of this order, and if costs are not paid within the 30 days, interest will begin to accrue at the legal rate.[1] The State Bar's Statement of Costs and Expenses is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

FACTS

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent was licensed to practice law in Arizona on November, 14, 2011.

COUNT ONE (File No. 18-2475/ PLLC)

2. Respondent represented Executive Private Investment Funding Company, LLC (EPI) in the Maricopa County Superior Court case of *Executive Private Investment Funding Company, LLC v. Gate6, LLC*, CV 2018-007482.

---

[1] 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.

3. On June 8, 2018, Respondent successfully obtained a preliminary injunction in the lawsuit forcing Gate6 to return certain intellectual property purportedly belonging to EPI as long as EPI posted a $157,000.00 bond.

4. While EPI provided Respondent with a check for the bond, EPI requested that Respondent approach Gate6 to obtain an agreement that the money be deposited in the law firm's trust account instead of the Clerk of Court. EPI requested that the check not be deposited in the law firm's trust account until Gate6 agreed.

5. When Gate6 rejected the request and demanded that EPI deposit the funds with the Clerk of Court, EPI requested that Respondent immediately file the appropriate pleadings to set an emergency hearing so that the Court could consider the request.

6. Respondent failed to file the motion as requested.

7. After receiving several requests from EPI for an update, Respondent admitted to the State Bar that he "lied and not only made up a fictitious hearing date, (he) also created a false court order setting a hearing date on August 15, 2018, when no motion had been filed and no hearing date existed."

8. On August 9, 2018, Respondent provided EPI with the false court order.

9. On August 15, 2018, Respondent e-mailed EPI claiming that the hearing occurred.

10. On August 17, 2018, EPI discovered Respondent's misconduct and contacted the law firm. Respondent was immediately fired.

11. The law firm is currently seeking substitutions of counsel for all of Respondent's cases including, but not limited to, the EPI lawsuit.

12. Respondent voluntarily changed his licensing status to inactive and does not currently engage in the practice of law.

COUNT TWO (File No. 18- 2848/Fernandez)

13. Mr. Fernandez hired Respondent in June 2015 for representation in a product defects case.

14. Despite repeated assurances from Respondent that the case was filed and being pursued, Fernandez recently discovered that Respondent never filed the case.

15. When confronted by Fernandez, Hum falsely stated that the case was in the discovery phase.

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 his conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., ER 1.2, ER 1.3, ER 1.4, ER 3.2 and ER 8.4(c).

CONDITIONAL DISMISSALS

The State Bar has conditionally agreed to dismiss none of the allegations in this matter.

RESTITUTION

Restitution is not an issue in this matter.

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 sanctions are appropriate: Three Year Suspension.

If Respondent violates any of the terms of this agreement, further discipline proceedings may be brought.

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. *Standards* 1.3, Commentary. The *Standards* provide guidance with respect to an appropriate sanction in this matter. *In re Peasley,* 208 Ariz. 27, 33, 35, 90 P.3d 764, 770 (2004); *In re Rivkind*, 162 Ariz. 154, 157, 791 P.2d 1037, 1040 (1990).

In determining an appropriate sanction consideration is given to 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. *Peasley*, 208 Ariz. at 35, 90 P.3d at 772; *Standard* 3.0.

The parties agree that the following *Standards* are the appropriate *Standards* given the facts and circumstances of this matter:

ER 1.2: (Client Authority)

Standard 4.42

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer: a) knowingly fails to perform services for a client or b) engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

ER 1.3: (Diligence)

Standard 4.42

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client or engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

ER 1.4: (Communication)

Standard 4.42

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client or engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

ER 3.2: (Expedite Litigation)

Standard 6.22

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly violates a court order or rule, and there is injury or potential injury to a client or a party, or interference or potential interference with a legal proceeding;

ER 8.4(c): (Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Misrepresentation)

Standard 4.62

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly deceives a client, and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

The duty violated

As described above, Respondent's conduct violated his duty to his clients and the legal profession.

The lawyer's mental state

For purposes of this agreement the parties agree that Respondent intentionally created false documents and made false statements with the intent of deceiving his clients about the status of the respective representations and that his conduct was in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The extent of the actual or potential injury

For purposes of this agreement, the parties agree that there was actual harm to the clients and the legal profession.

Aggravating and mitigating circumstances

The presumptive sanction in this matter is suspension. The parties conditionally agree that the following aggravating and mitigating factors should be considered.

In aggravation:

Standard 9.22(a) prior disciplinary offenses (trust account violations); and
Standard 9.22(b) dishonest or selfish motive.

In mitigation:

Standard 9.32 (c) personal or emotional problems [see Mitigation Letter dated October 29, 2018, which is contemporaneously filed with this Consent Agreement under seal pursuant to protective order PO 2018-094].

Discussion

The parties have conditionally agreed that, upon application of the aggravating and mitigating factors to the facts of this case, the presumptive sanction is appropriate.

The parties have conditionally agreed that a greater or lesser sanction would not be appropriate under the facts and circumstances of this matter.

This agreement was based on the following:

Notwithstanding the Respondent's mitigation letter dated October 29, 2018, which is being filed separately under seal and incorporated by reference, the misconduct involved intentional deceptive acts and statements meant to deceive his clients.

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 within the range of 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. *Peasley, supra* at ¶ 64, 90 P.3d at 778. 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 Long-Term Suspension and the imposition of costs and expenses.

A proposed form of order is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATED this _____ day of November 2018.

STATE BAR OF ARIZONA

_____
Craig D. Henley
Senior 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 30th day of November, 2018.

Matthew Jason Hum
Respondent

DATED this _____ day of November, 2018.

Udall Law Firm LLP

_____
Janet Hong Linton
Counsel for Respondent

A proposed form of order is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATED this 13th day of ~~November~~ December 2018.

STATE BAR OF ARIZONA



Craig D. Henley
Senior 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 _____ day of November, 2018.

_____
Matthew Jason Hum
Respondent

DATED this 29th day of November, 2018.

Udall Law Firm LLP



Janet Hong Linton
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 13th day of ~~November,~~ 2018.
December NR

Copy of the foregoing emailed
this 13th day of ~~November~~, 2018, to:
December NR

The Honorable William J. O'Neil
Presiding Disciplinary Judge
Supreme Court of Arizona
1501 West Washington Street, Suite 102
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
E-mail: officepdj@courts.az.gov

Copy of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this 13th day of ~~November~~, 2018, to:
December NR

Janet Hong Linton
Udall Law Firm LLP
4801 E. Broadway Blvd., Suite 400
Tucson, AZ 85711-3638
Email: jlinton@udalllaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered
this 13th day of ~~November~~ December, 2018, to:

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

by: _____
CDH/nr

EXHIBIT A

Statement of Costs and Expenses

In the Matter of a Member of the State Bar of Arizona,
Matthew Jason Hum, Bar No. 028959, Respondent

File No. 18-2475 & 18-2848

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.

Staff Investigator/Miscellaneous Charges

Total for staff investigator charges	$ 0.00
TOTAL COSTS AND EXPENSES INCURRED	$ 1,200.00

EXHIBIT B

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **MATTHEW JASON HUM** **Bar No. 028959** Respondent.	**PDJ** **FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER** [State Bar Nos. 18-2475 and 18-2848]

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge, having reviewed the Agreement for Discipline by Consent filed on _____, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., accepts the parties' proposed agreement. Accordingly:

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent, **Matthew Jason Hum**, is suspended for a period of three years for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents, effective immediately.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if reinstated to the practice of law, Respondent shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Matthew Jason Hum shall participate in the following programs as a term of probation if reinstated:

1. LOMAP: Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, within 10 days from the date of reinstatement. Respondent shall submit to a LOMAP examination of their office procedures. Respondent shall sign terms and conditions of participation, including reporting requirements, which shall be incorporated herein. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with LOMAP.
2. LRO MAP: Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, within 10 days from the date of reinstatement, to schedule a full assessment. 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 be subject to any additional terms imposed by the Presiding Disciplinary Judge as a result of reinstatement hearings held.

NON-COMPLIANCE LANGUAGE

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 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 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 a preponderance of the evidence.

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 thirty (30) days from the date of this Order.

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.

DATED this _____ day of November, 2018

_____
William J. O'Neil, 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 November, 2018.

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this _____ day of November, 2018, to:

Janet Hong Linton
Udall Law Firm LLP
4801 E. Broadway Blvd., Suite 400
Tucson, AZ 85711-3638
Email: jlinton@udalllaw.com
Respondent's Counsel

Copy of the foregoing emailed/hand-delivered
this ____ day of November, 2018, to:

Craig D. Henley
Senior Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered
this ____ day of November, 2018 to:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

by:_____
CDH/nr