

SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA

In re the Petition for Disciplinary Action against Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham

889 N.W.2d 560 (Minn. 2017) · No. A16-0674 · Decided January 19, 2017

SUMMARY

The Minnesota Supreme Court conditionally reinstated Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham to the practice of law effective January 21, 2017. Reinstatement was subject to successful completion of a professional-responsibility examination, and Brantingham was placed on disciplinary probation for two years. The order also established monitoring, professional-conduct, and law-office recordkeeping requirements, with automatic re-suspension for failure to complete the examination by December 8, 2017.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David R. Stras
JURISDICTION	Minnesota
DECIDED	January 19, 2017
DOCKET	A16-0674
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Following a 30-day suspension from the practice of law, respondent petitioned for reinstatement after complying with the suspension order except for completing the required professional-responsibility examination. The Director of the Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility did not oppose the request.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published

TOPICS

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

legal ethics and professional responsibility

attorney discipline

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether respondent should be conditionally reinstated to the practice of law after serving the suspension and otherwise complying with the prior suspension order.
2. What conditions should govern respondent's reinstatement and disciplinary probation.

HOLDINGS

1. Respondent was conditionally reinstated to the practice of law in Minnesota effective January 21, 2017, subject to successful completion of the written professional-responsibility examination and two years of disciplinary probation.
2. If respondent failed to file proof of successful completion of the professional-responsibility examination by December 8, 2017, he would be automatically re-suspended pending successful completion of the examination.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham had been suspended from practicing law in Minnesota for a minimum of 30 days. He represented that he had complied with the suspension order except for successfully completing the written professional-responsibility examination required for admission to practice. The Director did not oppose conditional reinstatement.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Minnesota Supreme Court had suspended Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham for a minimum of 30 days by order filed December 8, 2016, effective December 22, 2016. After respondent submitted an affidavit of compliance and requested reinstatement, the court conditionally reinstated him effective January 21, 2017, imposed two years of disciplinary probation, and required completion of the professional-responsibility examination. The order provided for automatic re-suspension if proof of successful completion was not filed by December 8, 2017.

DISPOSITION

other

OPINION

DAVID, J.

January 19, 2017 STATE OF MINNESOTA IN SUPREME COURT A16-0674 In re the Petition for Disciplinary Action against Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham, a Minnesota Attorney Registration No. 0299558. ORDER By order filed on December 8, 2016, we suspended respondent Jeremy Lloyd Brantingham from the practice of law for a minimum of 30 days, effective December 22, 2016. Respondent has filed an affidavit stating that he has fully complied with the terms of the suspension order, except for successful completion of the written examination required for admission to the practice of law by the State Board of Law Examiners on the subject of professional responsibility, and requests reinstatement.

The Director of the Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility does not oppose the request. Based upon all the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT: 1. Effective January 21, 2017, respondent is conditionally reinstated to the practice of law in Minnesota, subject to his successful completion of the written examination required for admission to the practice of law by the State Board of Law Examiners on the subject of professional responsibility, and is placed on disciplinary probation for 2 years subject to the following terms and conditions: a. Respondent shall cooperate fully with the Director's Office in its efforts to monitor compliance with this probation.

Respondent shall promptly respond to the Director's correspondence by the due date. Respondent shall provide to the Director a current mailing address and shall immediately notify the Director of any change of address. Respondent shall cooperate with the Director's investigation of any allegations of unprofessional conduct that may come to the Director's attention.

Upon the Director's request, respondent shall provide authorization for release of information and documentation to verify compliance with the terms of this probation. b. Respondent shall abide by the Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct. c. Respondent shall maintain law office and trust account books and records in compliance with Minn. R. Prof. Conduct 1.15 and Appendix 1.

These books and records shall include the following: client subsidiary ledgers; checkbook registers; monthly trial balance reports; monthly reconciliation reports; bank statements; canceled checks (if they are provided with the bank statements); duplicate deposit slips; bank reports of interest, service charges, and interest payments to the Minnesota IOLTA Program; and bank wire, electronic, or telephone transfer confirmations.

Such books and records shall be made available to the Director immediately and thereafter shall be made available to the Director at such intervals as the Director deems necessary to determine compliance. 2. By December 8, 2017, respondent shall file with the Clerk of the Appellate Courts and serve upon the Director of the Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility proof of successful completion of the written examination required for admission to the practice of law by the State Board of Law Examiners on the subject of professional responsibility.

Failure to do so shall result in automatic re-suspension, pending successful completion of the examination, pursuant to Rule 18(e)(3), Rules on Lawyers Professional Responsibility. Dated: January 19, 2017 BY THE COCRT: David R. Stras Associate Justice