

SUPREME COURT OF VERMONT

In re Jessica Wilson

2026 VT 23 · No. 26-AP-157 · Decided June 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The Vermont Supreme Court imposed reciprocal discipline on Jessica E. Wilson after she was publicly reprimanded in Connecticut for professional misconduct and failure to timely respond to a grievance complaint. The court found that she failed to establish any basis under Vermont Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D) for imposing discipline different from the Connecticut sanction and entered an order publicly reprimanding her.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Vermont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paul L. Reiber, Chief Justice; Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice; Nancy J. Waples, Associate Justice; Christina E. Nolan, Associate Justice; Michael P. Drescher, Associate Justice
JURISDICTION	Vermont Supreme Court
DECIDED	June 12, 2026
DOCKET	26-AP-157
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original-jurisdiction reciprocal attorney-discipline proceeding arising from respondent's public reprimand in Connecticut.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Court determines from the face of the foreign disciplinary record and the submissions whether any of the grounds in Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D) warrants imposing discipline different from the discipline imposed by the other jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published entry order; precedential status identified as published, subject to formal revision.

TOPICS

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Vermont was required to impose identical reciprocal discipline after Wilson was disciplined in Connecticut.
2. Whether Wilson established any Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D) ground warranting discipline different from the Connecticut public reprimand.
3. Whether Wilson could relitigate the merits of the Connecticut disciplinary decision in the Vermont reciprocal-discipline proceeding.

HOLDINGS

1. Under Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D), Vermont must impose the identical discipline imposed by the other jurisdiction unless the record or the submissions establish one of the specified grounds for deviation.
2. A respondent may not relitigate misconduct already established in another jurisdiction in a Vermont reciprocal-discipline proceeding.
3. A generalized assertion that reciprocal discipline is unfair or that the respondent has already been punished does not establish the grave-injustice exception under Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D)(3).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Absent the required showing under Rule 24(D), the imposition of discipline for misconduct in another jurisdiction “establish[es] conclusively the misconduct” for the purpose of imposing the identical discipline in this State.” (¶ 2)

“Our rules expressly provide for the imposition of reciprocal discipline in service of the purposes identified above.” (¶ 5)

“The purpose of sanctions is not to punish attorneys, but rather to protect the public from harm and to maintain confidence in our legal institutions by deterring future misconduct.” (¶ 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wilson was admitted to practice law in Vermont and was publicly reprimanded in Connecticut after the Connecticut Statewide Grievance Committee found violations of Rules 8.4(1) and 8.4(4) of the Rules of Professional Conduct and a failure to timely respond to the grievance complaint. Wilson did not promptly notify Vermont disciplinary counsel of the Connecticut discipline as required by Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(A). In Vermont, she challenged the merits of the Connecticut decision and argued that reciprocal discipline was unwarranted because she had already been punished.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Connecticut Statewide Grievance Committee publicly reprimanded Jessica Wilson for professional misconduct and directed her to complete continuing legal education in legal ethics. After receiving notice of the

Connecticut discipline, the Vermont Supreme Court gave Wilson and disciplinary counsel an opportunity to show why identical reciprocal discipline would be unwarranted under Administrative Order 9, Rule 24(D). Wilson responded by attempting to relitigate the Connecticut proceedings and asserting that additional discipline would be unfair; the Vermont Supreme Court found no qualifying basis for deviation and entered a public reprimand.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Ragaller, 2025 VT 14, ¶ 11, 220 Vt. 642, 336 A.3d 316 (mem.)
- In re Palmisano, 2017 VT 94, ¶ 16, 205 Vt. 636, 177 A.3d 1105 (mem.)
- In re Manby, 2023 VT 45, ¶ 46, 218 Vt. 323, 308 A.3d 465
- In re Thav, 852 F. Supp. 2d 857, 861-62 (E.D. Mich. 2012)