

SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Matter of Stephen A. Yacobi

422 S.C. 355, 811 S.E.2d 791 (2018) · No. 2017-002324 · Decided March 14, 2018

SUMMARY

The South Carolina Supreme Court accepted an Agreement for Discipline by Consent and publicly reprimanded attorney Stephen A. Yacobi. The court found misconduct involving diligence, client communication, supervision of nonlawyer staff, trust-account management, financial recordkeeping, and failure to respond to disciplinary authorities. Yacobi was ordered to pay investigative costs, complete specified ethics and law-office-management programs, and submit trust-account records for two years.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Beatty, C.J.; Kittredge, J.; Hearn, J.; James, J.
JURISDICTION	South Carolina
DECIDED	March 14, 2018
DOCKET	2017-002324
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Attorney disciplinary matter submitted to the South Carolina Supreme Court on the parties' Agreement for Discipline by Consent under Rule 21 of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published South Carolina Supreme Court attorney-disciplinary opinion

TOPICS

[administrative law](#) [appellate procedure](#) [judicial review of agency action](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[legal ethics](#) [attorney discipline](#) [professional responsibility](#) [trust account compliance](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Agreement for Discipline by Consent should be accepted.
2. Whether the admitted misconduct warranted a public reprimand or other professional discipline.

HOLDINGS

1. The court accepted the Agreement for Discipline by Consent.
2. The respondent's misconduct warranted a public reprimand.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We accept the Agreement and issue a public reprimand.”

“We find respondent's misconduct warrants a public reprimand.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The respondent represented clients in workers' compensation, family court, and real estate matters. His misconduct included mishandling settlement-fund disbursements, failing to communicate and timely pursue a family court matter, failing to supervise nonlawyer staff and bookkeeping services, mishandling trust-account funds, failing to maintain required financial records, and failing to respond to disciplinary inquiries. He admitted the violations and consented to discipline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel entered into an Agreement for Discipline by Consent. The respondent admitted professional misconduct and consented to either a public reprimand or a definite suspension not exceeding nine months. The Supreme Court accepted the Agreement and imposed a public reprimand, along with education, reporting, and cost-payment requirements.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In the Matter of Treacy, 277 S.C. 514, 290 S.E.2d 240 (1982)