

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY  
JUDGE**

---

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

**PETER KRISTOFER STROJNIK,  
Bar No. 026082**

Respondent.

**PDJ 2016-9083**

[State Bar File No. 15-0695]

**FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER**

**FILED NOVEMBER 16, 2016**

---

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, having reviewed the agreement for discipline by consent filed on November 10, 2016, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., hereby accepts the parties' proposed agreement. Accordingly:

**IT IS ORDERED** Respondent, **Peter Kristofer Strojnik**, is suspended for thirty (30) days for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents. The suspension is effective thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** upon reinstatement Mr. Strojnik shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years. The terms of probation are as follows:

1. Mr. Strojnik will undergo intensive outpatient chemical dependency (IOPCD) treatment in a group setting and shall follow the program's aftercare recommendations. The IOPCD group that Mr. Strojnik chooses must first be approved by Dr. Lett. Mr. Strojnik shall start treating in an approved group within thirty (30) days from signing the terms of probation.

2. Mr. Strojnik shall not use alcohol, other drugs, or any other mood-altering substances except on prescription from a treating health care professional; provided, however, that said prescription has been fully disclosed to the compliance monitor.
3. Within thirty (30) days of completing the IOPCD, Mr. Strojnik shall undergo a comprehensive psychological evaluation. Any recommendations generated from the psychological evaluation shall be incorporated into the terms of probation.
4. Mr. Strojnik shall comply with all other standard Member Assistance Program (MAP) terms as set forth in the terms of probation that will be prepared by the compliance monitor of the State Bar.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** Mr. Strojnik shall be responsible for any costs associated with the terms of probation.

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

#### **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** Mr. Strojnik shall pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$1,210.25 within thirty (30) days from the date of this order. There are no costs or expenses incurred by the disciplinary clerk and/or Presiding Disciplinary Judge's Office in connection with these disciplinary proceedings.

**DATED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016.

*William J. O'Neil*

---

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

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed this 16th day of November, 2016, to:

Peter Kristofer Strojnik, Bar No. 026082  
The Strojnik Firm LLC  
Esplanade Center III  
2415 E Camelback Rd Ste 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-4245  
Telephone 602-510-9409  
Email: [strojnik@skplaw.com](mailto:strojnik@skplaw.com)  
Respondent

Shauna R. Miller  
Senior Bar Counsel  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 North 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266  
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: AMcQueen



**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY  
JUDGE**

---

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

**PETER KRISTOFER STROJNIK,**  
**Bar No. 026082**

Respondent.

**PDJ-2016-9083**

**DECISION ACCEPTING  
CONSENT FOR DISCIPLINE**

[State Bar File No. 15-0695]

**FILED NOVEMBER 16, 2016**

In PDJ-2016-9072, an Agreement for Discipline by Consent was filed on July 12, 2016, and submitted under Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The parties conditionally concluded Mr. Strojnik acted "negligently" not "knowingly." As a result the parties stipulated *Standard 7.3*, applied and stipulated to the entry of a reprimand followed by probation. An Order of Probable Cause issued on January 27, 2016 however, no formal complaint had been filed. Under Rule 53(b)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., notice of this agreement was provided to the complainant by letter on May 11, 2016. Complainants were notified of the opportunity to file a written objection within five days. No objection was received.

The PDJ noted the admissions supported no negligent state of mind but, at a minimum, a knowing state of mind. The PDJ directed "the parties file a modification stipulating to a knowing state of mind with a thirty (30) day suspension followed by the same terms of probation not later than August 17, 2016. When no modification was submitted, that Agreement For Discipline by Consent was rejected.

On September 2, 2016, the complaint was filed and assigned File No. PDJ-2016-9083. An answer was filed on September 28, 2016. The telephonic initial case management conference was conducted on October 4, 2016, and a firm hearing was set to commence January 12, 2017. On November 10, 2016, the parties filed an Amended Agreement for Discipline by Consent, ("Agreement"), which mirrored the modifications recommended by the PDJ.

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.

The Agreement details a factual basis for the admissions to the charge in the Agreement. The parties agree that while representing a client, Mr. Strojnik used inappropriate means to compel a settlement. Representation of the client began in December 2014 and Mr. Strojnik filed a complaint in Federal Court on March 19, 2015 alleging sexual harassment of his client. In his demand to defendants, Mr. Strojnik threatened to use press releases to alert the public to the sexual allegations to facilitate settlement.

In a correspondence to the opposing party he announced he had created a website regarding the allegations and personally posted unprofessional comments. He assured the opposing party he would cause a "shame on" you banner to be placed in a public area of the businesses of the defendants. To force settlement, Mr. Strojnik also told the opposing party he scheduled meetings with police and the Department of Justice regarding the lawsuit alleging the hiring and harboring of undocumented

workers, and asserted that through his efforts that CBS 5 Investigates was investigating the allegations to compel settlement.

Mr. Strojnik was warned his conduct was actionable under Arizona law and violated his ethical obligations. For about five weeks Mr. Strojnik stopped. When "settlement efforts broke down he reverted to his previous conduct." He reopened his website, posted content on that site and arranged to have flyers distributed at the business of defendants stating defendant was a "predator" with defendant's picture. In response to a settlement offer Mr. Strojnik stated, "I do not engage in hyperbole. What I say is what I do." Mr. Strojnik stated he intended to "destroy" the businesses of defendant.

The parties conditionally stipulate that at the insistence of Senior United States District Court Judge Neil V. Wake, Mr. Strojnik eliminated the need for a restraining order by agreeing to cease his inappropriate conduct. The parties stipulate "The Court made it very clear, however, that Respondent's behavior was unprofessional." It is stipulated Mr. Strojnik was warned his conduct was illegal and unprofessional. It is stipulated Mr. Strojnik returned to that behavior *after* the warning.

Mr. Strojnik conditionally admits he violated Supreme Court Rule 42, ERs 4.4 (respect for rights of others), 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice), and Rule 41(g) (unprofessional conduct). Mr. Strojnik conditionally agrees he engaged in overly zealous tactics to ruin the opposing party personally and that his conduct "under all of the circumstances, was unprofessional and prejudicial to the administration of justice." The parties agree the actions of Mr. Strojnik caused actual harm to the opposing party, and violated his duty to the profession, the legal system, and the public."

Rule 42, ER 4.4(a) precludes a lawyer from using “means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person.” Rule 4.4(a) prohibits conduct that has no *substantial* purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person. The wording replaces that of the predecessor Model Code provision, DR 7-102(A)(1), which forbade the lawyer from taking action that would serve *merely* to harass or maliciously injure another. It is not uncommon that charges of violating Rule 4.4(a) involve conduct that has both a “legitimate purpose and an illegitimate purpose.” *In re Royer*, 78 P.3d 449 (Kan. 2003).

The parties stipulate *Standard 7.2* applies. It states,

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 parties agree aggravating factors are present: *Standard 9.22(a)* (prior discipline); although not considered prior discipline, Mr. Strojnik was *conditionally admitted* to the practice of law and placed on probation. There is no information regarding the conditional admission in the Agreement; and 9.22(i) (substantial experience in the practice of law). Mitigating factors include: *Standard 9.32 (a)* (absence of prior disciplinary record and successful completion of the terms of the conditional admission order); 9.32(b) (absence of selfish or dishonest motive), and 9.32(c) (personal or emotional problems arising from his addressing a substance abuse problem involving alcohol which exacerbated personal issues).

The purpose of Lawyer Discipline is stated in *Standard 1.1*.

The purpose of lawyer discipline proceedings is to protect the public and the administration of justice from lawyers who have not discharged, will not discharge, or are unlikely properly to discharge their professional duties to clients, the public, the legal system, and the legal profession.

**IT IS ORDERED** incorporating the Agreement and any supporting documents by this reference. The agreed upon sanctions are: thirty (30) days suspension, two (2) years of probation under conditions set forth in the agreement, and the payment of costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding for \$1,210.25 to be paid within thirty (30) days of the final order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Agreement is accepted. Costs as submitted are approved for \$1,210.25 and shall be paid not later than December 21, 2016. Now therefore, a final judgment and order is signed this date. Mr. Strojnik is suspended effective thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** all additional case management dates and deadlines set forth in the Order re: Initial Case Management Conference, including the hearing set for January 12 and 13, 2016, are vacated.

The State Bar shall give notice to the assigned settlement officer that the scheduled settlement conference is hereby vacated.

**DATED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016.

*William J. O'Neil*

---

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

Copy of the foregoing mailed/emailed  
this 16<sup>th</sup> day of November to:

Shauna R. Miller  
Senior Bar Counsel  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6266  
Email: lro@staff.azbar.org

Peter Kristofer Strojnik  
The Strojnik Firm LLC  
Esplanade Center III  
2415 E. Camelback Rd. Ste. 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-4245  
Email: strojnik@skplaw.com

by: AMcQueen

Shauna R. Miller, Bar No. 015197  
Senior Bar Counsel  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266  
Telephone (602)340-7278  
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

OFFICE OF THE  
PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE  
SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

NOV 10 2016

FILED  
BY 

Peter Kristofer Strojnik, Bar No. 026082  
The Strojnik Firm LLC  
Esplanade Center III  
2415 East Camelback Road, Suite 700  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-4245  
Telephone (602)510-9409  
Email: [strojnik@skplaw.com](mailto:strojnik@skplaw.com)  
Respondent

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY  
JUDGE**

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

**PETER KRISTOFER STROJNIK,  
Bar No. 026082,**

Respondent.

**PDJ 2016-9083**  
[State Bar File No. 15-0695]

**AMENDED AGREEMENT FOR  
DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT**

The State Bar of Arizona, through undersigned Bar Counsel, and Respondent, Peter Kristofer Strojnik, who chooses not to be represented by counsel, hereby submit their Amended Agreement for Discipline by Consent, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. A probable cause order was entered on January 27, 2016, and a formal complaint was filed on September 2, 2016. On July 12, 2016, the State Bar and Respondent submitted an agreement for discipline by consent. On August 2, 2016, the presiding disciplinary judge (PDJ) file a recommendation for modification. On August 16, 2016, a motion to extend time to file modified agreement for a discipline by consent was filed. On August 18, 2016, the PDJ filed an order extending the time

to file a modified agreement. On or about September 6, 2016, Respondent decided to proceed to hearing. Respondent, however, has again decided to settle this matter with the State Bar and the parties submit this amended agreement for discipline by consent.

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 the previous agreement was provided to the complainants by letter on May 11, 2016. None of the complainants filed a written objection to the agreement for a reprimand. The parties do not believe it is necessary to give further notice of a greater sanction.

Respondent conditionally admits that his conduct, as set forth below, violated Rule 42, ERs 4.4 (respect for rights of others), 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice), and Rule 41(g) (unprofessional conduct). Upon acceptance of this agreement, Respondent agrees to accept imposition of a thirty (30) day suspension and two years' of probation. 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.<sup>1</sup> The State Bar's Statement of costs and expenses is attached hereto as exhibit A.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

## **FACTS**

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

1. Respondent was licensed to practice law in Arizona on May 14, 2008.

### **COUNT ONE (File no. 15-0695/ Mullis & Peters)**

2. Complainants submitted the bar complaint on behalf of their clients, JGP Restaurants, LLC (whose principal is Joseph Popo ("Mr. Popo")), and three other LLC's collectively referred to as the "Restaurants." The underlying dispute arises out a claim of sexual harassment against Mr. Popo and the Restaurants by a former employee, Amy Patterson. Ms. Patterson worked at each of the Restaurants for a varying period of time as a server and a manager. She resigned in December of 2014, and retained Respondent.

3. On March 19, 2015, Respondent filed a complaint in Federal Court on Ms. Patterson's behalf.

4. Respondent used inappropriate means to compel settlement in the matter. In his initial demand to Complainants, he threatened to use press releases to alert the public to the sexual allegations that occurred at the Restaurants. In a February 1, 2015, correspondence, Respondent announced the opening of his [www.stoneandvinesexualallegations.com](http://www.stoneandvinesexualallegations.com) website. Respondent assured Complainants that a "shame on" banner would be placed in a public area of the Restaurants. Respondent told Complainants that he had had a meeting with Scottsdale police about the lawsuit, that CBS 5 Investigates was looking at the matter, and that his client would be meeting with the Department of Justice to report the hiring and harboring of undocumented workers.

5. On February 2, 2015, Complainants warned Respondent that his conduct was actionable under Arizona law and violated his ethical obligations. For about five weeks, Respondent removed the website, but when settlement efforts failed, he reverted to his previous conduct. If this matter were to proceed to hearing, Respondent would testify that, at least in part, Respondent's posts and conduct after the settlement offer was rejected were made in response to vile and degrading online posts about his client that he believed were directly or indirectly initiated by the plaintiff.

6. When a new restaurant opened in Chandler, Respondent posted content on its webpage and arranged to have flyers distributed calling Mr. Popo a "predator" and posted a picture of Mr. Popo's picture with the tagline "Joe Pop. Does he look like a sexual predator to you?"

7. On March 17, 2015, in response to a settlement offer from Complainant Mullis' firm, Respondent wrote: "Robert, I do not engage in hyperbole. What I say is what I do. I intend to destroy these restaurants. Two years from now, we'll wind up with quadruple, [the Restaurant] will be out of business and Popo will sue Farmers on fiduciary issues. No big deal. We'll wait."

8. Mr. Popo and the Restaurants answered the complaint and, because of Respondents conduct, also filed a cross-complaint, an application for a temporary restraining order, a motion to disqualify Respondent, and a motion to strike portions of the complaint. Judge Wake held a scheduling hearing on Friday, April 3, 2015.

9. To eliminate the need for a hearing on the Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO"), and at the insistence of Judge Wake, Respondent agreed to cease the

conduct which precipitated the TRO request. The Court made it very clear, however, that Respondent's behavior was unprofessional.

10. Respondent engaged in overly zealous tactics to ruin Mr. Popo personally, and take the restaurants down. If this matter were to proceed to hearing Respondent would testify that his conduct was also meant to protect his client. His conduct, under all of the circumstances, was unprofessional and prejudicial to the administration of justice.

11. On July 24, 2015, the lawsuit was dismissed by court order after the parties reached a settlement.

#### **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., specifically ERs 4.4 (respect for rights of others), 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice), and Rule 41(g) (unprofessional conduct).

#### **CONDITIONAL DISMISSALS**

The State Bar has conditionally agreed to dismiss ERs 3.6(a) and 4.2.

#### **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: thirty (30) day suspension and probation for two years. The terms of probation are addressed in the proposed order.

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 *Standard* 7.2, violation of duties owed as a professional, are appropriate given the facts and circumstances of this matter.

#### *Standard* 7.2

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

The parties agree that the more egregious misconduct was when Respondent knowingly reopened his website, posted content on that site, and arranged for flyers to be distributed at the business of the defendants stating that defendant was a "predator" with defendant's picture. Respondent also stated that he does not engage in hyperbole, and that he intended to "destroy" defendant's business. Thus, the presumptive sanction is suspension.

**The duty violated**

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

**The lawyer's mental state**

For purposes of this agreement the parties agree that Respondent acted knowingly in his zealouslyness in representing his client.

**The extent of the actual or potential injury**

For purposes of this agreement, the parties agree that there was actual harm to the opposing party.

**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)* Although Respondent has not had any prior discipline, he was conditionally admitted to practice, which the State Bar treats as a prior probation.

*Standard 9.22 (i)* Substantial experience in the practice of law.

**In mitigation:**

*Standard 9.32 (a)* Absence of a prior disciplinary record and successful completion of the terms of the conditional admission order.

*Standard 9.32 (b)* Absence of a dishonest or selfish motive.

*Standard 9.32 (c)* Personal or emotional problem. Respondent has been addressing a substance abuse problem involving alcohol. This issue created and exacerbated personal issues including chronic fatigue; anger and irritability; interpersonal and marital conflict; family dysfunction; and estrangement from close and supportive family members including Respondent's mother and sister.

The parties have conditionally agreed that, upon application of the aggravating and mitigating factors to the facts of this case, a thirty (30) day suspension is appropriate.

**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 a thirty (30) days suspension with two years' probation and the imposition of costs and expenses. A proposed form order is attached hereto as exhibit B.

DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November 2016.

**STATE BAR OF ARIZONA**



Shauna R. Miller  
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 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016.



---

Peter Kristofer Strojnik  
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 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016.

Copy of the foregoing emailed  
this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016, to:

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 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016, to:

Peter Kristofer Strojnik, Bar No. 026082  
The Strojnik Firm LLC  
Esplanade Center III  
2415 E Camelback Rd Ste 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-4245  
Telephone 602-510-9409  
Email: [strojnik@skplaw.com](mailto:strojnik@skplaw.com)  
Respondent

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered  
this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016, to:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 North 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

by:   
SRM aib

# **EXHIBIT A**

## Statement of Costs and Expenses

In the Matter of a Member of the State Bar of Arizona,  
PETER Kristofer. STROJNIK Bar No. 026082, Respondent

File No. 15-0695

### **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**

11/25/15	Investigator Mileage to Serve Subpoena	\$	10.35
	Total for staff investigator charges	\$	10.35
<b><u>TOTAL COSTS AND EXPENSES INCURRED</u></b>			<b><u>\$1,210.25</u></b>

# **EXHIBIT B**

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY  
JUDGE**

---

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

**PETER KRISTOFER STROJNIK,  
Bar No. 026082,**

Respondent.

**PDJ 2016-9083**

[State Bar File No. 15-0695]

**FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER**

The undersigned Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, having reviewed the agreement for discipline by consent filed on November 10, 2016, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., hereby accepts the parties' proposed agreement. Accordingly:

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Respondent, **Peter Kristofer Strojnik**, is suspended for thirty (30) days for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents. The suspension is effective thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, upon reinstatement Respondent shall be placed on probation for a period of two years. The terms of probation are as follows:

1. Respondent will undergo intensive outpatient chemical dependency (IOPCD) treatment in a group setting and shall follow the program's aftercare recommendations. The IOPCD group that Respondent chooses must first be approved by Dr. Lett. Respondent must start treating in an approved group within 30 days from signing the terms of probation.

2. Respondent shall not use alcohol, other drugs, or any other mood-altering substances except on prescription from a treating health care professional; provided, however, that said prescription has been fully disclosed to the compliance monitor.
3. Within 30 days of completing the IOPCD, Respondent shall undergo a comprehensive psychological evaluation. Any recommendations generated from the psychological evaluation shall be incorporated into the terms of probation.
4. Respondent shall comply with all other standard MAP terms as set forth in the terms of probation that will be prepared by the compliance monitor of the State Bar.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated the terms of probation.

**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.

#### **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 Respondent pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$1,210.25 within 30 days from the date of service 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, 2016.

---

**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, 2016.

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November, 2016, to:

Peter Kristofer Strojnik, Bar No. 026082  
The Strojnik Firm LLC  
Esplanade Center III  
2415 E Camelback Rd Ste 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-4245  
Telephone 602-510-9409  
Email: [strojnik@skplaw.com](mailto:strojnik@skplaw.com)  
Respondent

Copy of the foregoing emailed/hand-delivered  
this \_\_\_\_ day of November, 2016, to:

Shauna R. Miller  
Senior Bar Counsel  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 North 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266  
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered  
this \_\_\_\_ day of November, 2016, to:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager  
State Bar of Arizona  
4201 North 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

by: \_\_\_\_\_