

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Disciplinary Counsel v. Medley

2015-Ohio-5008 (Ohio 2015) · No. 2010-1793 · Decided December 4, 2015

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court of Ohio granted William Scott Medley’s petition for reinstatement to the practice of law. Reinstatement was conditioned on filing an affidavit confirming compliance with a prior suspension order, and the court assessed costs and other reimbursement obligations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Ohio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	O'Connor, C.J.; Pfeifer, J.; O'Donnell, J.; Lanzinger, J.; Kennedy, J.; French, J.; O'Neill, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio
DECIDED	December 4, 2015
DOCKET	2010-1793
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On petition for reinstatement to the practice of law after suspension.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Supreme Court opinion
PARTIES	Disciplinary Counsel v. William Scott Medley

TOPICS

appellate procedure costs contempt civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

legal ethics and attorney discipline professional licensing and reinstatement

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether William Scott Medley should be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio.
- What conditions should accompany reinstatement, including compliance with the prior suspension order, payment of costs, and reimbursement obligations.

HOLDINGS

1. Medley's petition for reinstatement is granted, and he is reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio subject to the condition that he file an affidavit by December 15, 2015, confirming compliance with the court's January 27, 2011 suspension order.
2. Medley must pay the proceeding costs, reimburse amounts awarded against him by the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection, and comply with the specified payment deadlines and collection consequences.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

William Scott Medley, an Ohio attorney, petitioned for reinstatement after a prior suspension imposed by the Supreme Court of Ohio on January 27, 2011. The Board of Professional Conduct reviewed the petition and recommended reinstatement. The court granted the petition on the condition that Medley file an affidavit confirming compliance with the prior suspension order and satisfy specified cost, reimbursement, and filing obligations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

William Scott Medley filed a petition for reinstatement on May 1, 2015. The petition was referred to the Board of Professional Conduct under Gov.Bar R. V(25)(E), and the board recommended reinstatement in its October 6, 2015 final report. No objections were filed, and the Supreme Court of Ohio granted reinstatement subject to compliance with its prior suspension order and additional financial conditions.

DISPOSITION

other

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as Disciplinary Counsel v. Medley, ___ Ohio St.3d ___, 2015-Ohio-5008.] DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL v. MEDLEY. [Cite as Disciplinary Counsel v. Medley, ___ Ohio St.3d ___, 2015-Ohio-5008.] (No. 2010-1793—Submitted December 2, 2015—Decided December 4, 2015.) ON PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT. _____ {¶ 1} This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing on May 1, 2015, of a petition for reinstatement by respondent, William Scott Medley, Attorney Registration No. 0031001.

In accordance with Gov.Bar R. V(25)(E), respondent's petition for reinstatement was referred to the Board of Professional Conduct. The board filed its final report in this court on October 6, 2015, recommending that respondent be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio. No objections to the final report were filed, and this cause was considered by the court. {¶ 2} Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by this court that the petition for reinstatement of respondent is granted and that respondent, William Scott Medley, last known address in Gallipolis, Ohio, is reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio on the condition that he file by December 15, 2015, an affidavit that he has

complied with this court's January 27, 2011 suspension order. {¶ 3} It is further ordered by the court that respondent be taxed the costs of these proceedings in the amount of \$695.37, less the deposit of \$500.00, for a total balance due of \$195.37 payable by cashier's check or money order by respondent on or before 90 days from the date of this order.

If costs are not paid on or before 90 days from the date of this order, interest at the rate of 10 percent per annum will accrue until costs are paid in full. It is further ordered that if costs are not paid in full on or before 90 days from the date of this order, the matter may be referred to the Attorney General for collection and respondent may be SUPREME COURT OF OHIO found in contempt and suspended until all costs and accrued interest are paid in full.

It is further ordered that respondent is liable for all collections costs pursuant to R.C. 131.02 if the debt is certified to the Attorney General for collection. {¶ 4} It is further ordered by the court that within 90 days of the date of this order, respondent shall reimburse any amounts that have been awarded against respondent by the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection pursuant to Gov.Bar R. VIII(7)(F).

It is further ordered by the court that if after the date of this order the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection awards any amount against respondent pursuant to Gov.Bar R. VIII(7)(F), respondent shall reimburse that amount to the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection within 90 days of the notice of such award. {¶ 5} It is further ordered that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

All case documents are subject to Sup.R. 44 through 47 which govern access to court records. {¶ 6} It is further ordered that the clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(17)(D)(1) and that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(17)(D)(2). O'CONNOR, C.J., and PFEIFER, O'DONNELL, LANZINGER, KENNEDY, FRENCH, and O'NEILL, JJ., concur. _____ 2