

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,)	Supreme Court No. SB-10-0022-D
)	
)	Disciplinary Commission No. 08-2230
MICHAEL T. TELEP, JR., Bar No. 011995)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	JUDGMENT AND ORDER FILED 04/07/2010
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		

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

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that **MICHAEL T. TELEP, JR.**, a member of the State Bar of Arizona, is hereby suspended from the practice of law for a period of sixty days, effective thirty days from the date of this Judgment and Order, for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, as disclosed in the Disciplinary Commission Report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **MICHAEL T. TELEP, JR.**, shall be placed on probation for a period of one year upon reinstatement. The terms of probation are as follows:

1. Respondent shall within one year following reinstatement, attend a continuing legal education program relating to Victim's Rights.
2. Respondent's probation will conclude upon proof of compliance with term one above.
3. Respondent shall refrain from engaging in any conduct that would violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.
4. In the event that Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing probation terms, and the State Bar receives information thereof, Bar Counsel shall file a Notice of Non-Compliance with the imposing entity pursuant to Rule (60)(a)(5), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. The imposing entity may refer the matter to a Hearing Officer to conduct a hearing at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than thirty days following receipt of notice, to determine whether a term of probation has been breached and, if so, to recommend an appropriate sanction. If there is an allegation that Respondent failed to comply with any of the foregoing terms, the burden of proof shall be on the State Bar to prove non-compliance by a preponderance of the evidence.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with all the provisions of Rule 72, Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona, including, but not limited to, Rule 72(a), which requires that Respondent notify all of his clients, within ten days from the date hereof, of his inability to represent

them and that he should promptly inform this Court of his compliance with this Order as provided in Rule 72(e).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with all rule provisions regarding reinstatement proceedings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 60(b), the State Bar of Arizona is granted judgment against **MICHAEL T. TELEP, JR.**, for costs and expenses of these proceedings in the amount of \$1,908.75, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of this judgment.

DATED this _____ day of _____ April , 2010.

Suzanne D. Bunnin
Chief Deputy Clerk

TO:

Michael T. Telep, Jr., Respondent
David Sandweiss, Bar Counsel
Hon. Jonathan H. Schwartz, Hearing Officer 6S
Leticia V. D'Amore, Disciplinary Clerk
Sandra Montoya, Lawyer Regulation Records Manager, State Bar of Arizona
Molly Dwyer, Clerk, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Attn: Don Lewis
Richard Weare, Clerk, United States District Court, District of Arizona
Attn: Beth Stephenson
West Publishing Company (Jode Ottman)
Lexis/Nexis