

SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Matter of Daniel Carson Boles

Opinion No. 28334 (S.C. May 27, 2026) · No. 2026-000975 · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The South Carolina Supreme Court accepted Daniel Carson Boles's Agreement for Discipline by Consent and imposed a thirty-day definite suspension from the practice of law. The court found that Boles disrupted a magistrate court proceeding, acted disrespectfully toward the magistrate and others, and violated the South Carolina Rules of Professional Conduct and Lawyer's Oath; it also imposed treatment, reporting, and cost-payment conditions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Chief Justice Kittredge; Justice Few; Justice James; Justice Hill; Justice Verdin
JURISDICTION	South Carolina Supreme Court
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	2026-000975
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Attorney disciplinary proceeding based on an Agreement for Discipline by Consent entered under Rule 21 of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published

TOPICS

- sanctions
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- legal ethics
- attorney discipline
- professional responsibility

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Boles's admitted conduct violated the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Lawyer's Oath.
- What disciplinary sanction and conditions should be imposed for the admitted misconduct.

HOLDINGS

1. Boles's conduct violated Rule 3.5(d), which prohibits conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal, and Rule 8.4(e), which prohibits conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice.
2. Boles's conduct violated the Lawyer's Oath requirement of respect and courtesy toward judges and judicial officers and constituted grounds for discipline.
3. The court accepted the Agreement for Discipline by Consent and imposed a thirty-day definite suspension, together with treatment, reporting, and cost-payment conditions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respect for a tribunal and the rule of law is foundational to our system of justice.” (Section III)

“Accordingly, we accept the Agreement and impose a thirty-day definite suspension as a sanction for Respondent's misconduct.” (Section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

During a preliminary hearing in Charleston County Magistrate Court, Boles's associate requested a continuance because Boles felt ill, but the magistrate denied the request. Boles then came to the courthouse, angrily confronted the assistant solicitor, aggressively knocked on and entered the magistrate's chambers while she was on the telephone, demanded a continuance, made derisive remarks, and slammed the chamber door. He continued interrupting and arguing with the magistrate during the hearing and acted belligerently and without decorum before victims, courtroom personnel, counsel, and court staff.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel and Daniel Carson Boles entered into an Agreement for Discipline by Consent. Boles admitted misconduct, agreed to pay costs, and consented to a confidential admonition, public reprimand, or definite suspension of up to thirty days. The Supreme Court of South Carolina accepted the Agreement and imposed a thirty-day definite suspension, treatment conditions, reporting requirements, and costs.

DISPOSITION

other