

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

In re Janoski

Janoski · No. 124,955 · Decided May 8, 2026

OPINION

In re Janoski

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

No. 124,955 In the Matter of JASON MICHAEL JANOSKI, Respondent.

ORDER

On March 11, 2025, the court reinstated Jason Michael Janoski's Kansas law license to active status. At that time, the court imposed conditions and limitations on Janoski's practice of law for one year. In re Janoski, 320 Kan. 255, 256-57, 564 P.3d 1273 (2025). On April 21, 2026, Janoski filed a motion asking the court for an order acknowledging that his practice conditions and limitations have now expired. The Office of the Disciplinary Administrator (ODA) responded that Janoski complied with all imposed conditions and that it has no objection to Janoski's motion. As the ODA noted in its response, the court explained in its order of reinstatement that there are different procedures when the court places a respondent on probation as a form of discipline and when the court reinstates an attorney's law license to active status with conditions or limitations. Janoski, 320 Kan. at 255-56; see In re Shaw, 317 Kan. 546, 546-47, 533 P.3d 311 (2023). Supreme Court Rule 227(g)-(i) (2026 Kan. S. Ct. R. at 283) governs the procedure for a respondent on probation. Rule 227(h) states that a "respondent remains on probation, subject to each condition of probation, until the Supreme Court discharges the respondent from probation, regardless of whether the ordered term of probation has expired." No corresponding provision exists under the rule governing reinstatement. See Supreme Court Rule 232 (2026 Kan. S. Ct. R. at 292). 1 Accordingly, the court denies Janoski's motion as moot because the conditions and limitations on his practice of law automatically expired at the end of the one-year period. The court directs the Reporter of Decisions to publish this order in the Kansas Reports. Dated this 8th day of May 2026. 2