

SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Matter of William Glenn Rogers, Jr.

375 S.C. 535, 654 S.E.2d 538 (2007) · No. No. 26403 · Decided December 10, 2007

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court of South Carolina accepted an Agreement for Discipline by Consent concerning attorney William Glenn Rogers, Jr. The court imposed a sixty-day suspension from the practice of law, retroactive to his interim suspension, based on failures involving client representation and responses to disciplinary authorities.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chief Justice Toal; Justice Moore; Justice Waller; Justice Pleicones; Justice Beatty
JURISDICTION	South Carolina
DECIDED	December 10, 2007
DOCKET	No. 26403
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Attorney disciplinary matter submitted to the Supreme Court of South Carolina on an Agreement for Discipline by Consent.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion

TOPICS

administrative law agency adjudication appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

legal ethics attorney discipline professional responsibility

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the Agreement for Discipline by Consent should be accepted.
- What sanction was appropriate for respondent's admitted violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement.
- Whether the suspension should be made retroactive to the date of respondent's interim suspension.

HOLDINGS

1. The court accepted the Agreement for Discipline by Consent.
2. A sixty-day suspension from the practice of law was the appropriate sanction for respondent's misconduct.
3. The sixty-day suspension was made retroactive to the date of respondent's interim suspension.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We find a sixty day suspension is the appropriate sanction for respondent's misconduct.” (538)

“Accordingly, we accept the Agreement for Discipline by Consent and suspend respondent from the practice of law for sixty days, retroactive to the date of his interim suspension.” (538)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Respondent, a public defender, failed to appear for a case, failed to notify his client of the trial, and later sought a continuance after appearing for trial. The trial judge held him in contempt, ordered him to pay the jury costs and apologize to the jurors, and respondent complied. In that matter and three others, respondent failed to respond to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel's inquiries and investigation notices, which he attributed to depression. After his interim suspension, he cooperated with disciplinary authorities and obtained mental-health assistance.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel entered into an Agreement for Discipline by Consent under Rule 21 of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement. The respondent admitted misconduct and consented to a range of sanctions. The Supreme Court accepted the agreement and imposed a sixty-day suspension retroactive to the date of the respondent's interim suspension.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In the Matter of Rogers, 375 S.C. 58, 650 S.E.2d 463 (2007)
- In the Matter of Treacy, 277 S.C. 514, 290 S.E.2d 240 (1982)