## LAGETAE

## STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a Regular Term of the Supreme Court of Appeals continued and held at Charleston, Kanawha County, on the 20th of November, 2007, the following order was made and entered:

Lawyer Disciplinary Board, Petitioner

vs.) No. 33153

John A. Grafton, a member of The West Virginia State Bar, Respondent

On a former day, to-wit, October 1, 2007, came the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board, by John W. Bennett, its chairperson, pursuant to Rule 3.10 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, and presented to the Court its written recommended disposition in this matter, recommending that: (1) the respondent be reprimanded; (2) the respondent shall complete an additional three hours of continuing legal education during the 2006-2008 reporting period to what he is otherwise required to complete to maintain his active license, specifically in office management, substance abuse or elimination of bias in the legal profession over and above that already required; (3) respondent shall sign and follow a plan of supervised practice for a period of one year with a supervising attorney of respondent's choice, said supervisor to be approved by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and be available to respond to inquiries by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. The supervisor shall first meet with respondent to conduct an initial review of respondent's office practices, focusing upon calendaring, scheduling, a "tickler" system, mail handling, returning telephone calls and advising clients of the status of cases by mail. Respondent shall also report to the supervising attorney the status of all of his

legal matters he has undertaken, report any oral or written complaints he has received from his clients or the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, and report any letters or other inquiries to which he has not yet respondent; and (4) respondent shall pay the costs of this disciplinary proceeding.

Upon consideration whereof, the Court is of opinion to and doth hereby adopt the written recommended disposition of the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board. It is therefore ordered that: (1) the respondent be, and he hereby is, reprimanded; (2) the respondent shall complete an additional three hours of continuing legal education during the 2006-2008 reporting period to what he is otherwise required to complete to maintain his active license, specifically in office management, substance abuse or elimination of bias in the legal profession over and above that already required; (3) the respondent shall sign and follow a plan of supervised practice for a period of one year with a supervising attorney of respondent's choice, said supervisor to be approved by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and be available to respond to inquiries by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. The supervisor shall first meet with respondent to conduct an initial review of respondent's office practices, focusing upon calendaring, scheduling, a "tickler" system, mail handling, returning telephone calls and advising clients of the status of cases by mail. Respondent shall also report to the supervising attorney the status of all of his legal matters he has undertaken, report any oral or written complaints he has received from his clients or the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, and report any letters or other inquiries to which he has not yet respondent; and (6) pursuant to Rule 3.15 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, respondent shall pay the costs of this disciplinary proceeding.

Justice Albright would issue an admonishment rather than reprimand, and agrees with the remainder of the sanctions.

Service of an attested copy of this order shall constitute sufficient notice of its contents.

A True Copy

Attest:

Clerk, Supreme Court of Appeals