VIRGINIA:

BEFORE THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR DISCIPLINARY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF NANCY THERESA LORD

VSB DOCKET NO. 20-000-118890

RULE TO SHOW CAUSE AND ORDER OF SUMMARY SUSPENSION AND NOTICE OF HEARING

It appearing to the Board that Nancy Theresa Lord was licensed to practice law within the Commonwealth of Virginia on April 25, 1991, and,

It further appearing that Nancy Theresa Lord has been suspended from the practice of law for a period of six months and one day by Mandate dated December 20, 2017.

It further appearing that such disciplinary action has become final.

It is ORDERED, pursuant to Rules of Court, Part Six, Section IV, Paragraph 13-24, that the license of Nancy Theresa Lord to practice law within the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and the same is, hereby suspended effective September 4, 2020.

It is further ORDERED that Nancy Theresa Lord appear before the Virginia State Bar

Disciplinary Board at 9:00 a.m. on September 25, 2020, via video conferencing, utilizing the

Microsoft Teams platform, to show cause why the same discipline that was imposed in the other

jurisdiction should not be imposed by the Board. Pursuant to Part Six, Section IV, Paragraph 13
24.C of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, Nancy Theresa Lord has 14 days from the date
of this Rule to Show Cause and Order of Summary Suspension and Hearing to file a written response
with the Clerk of the Disciplinary System, which shall be confined to argument and exhibits
supporting one or more of the grounds for dismissal or imposition of a lesser discipline specified in
paragraph 13-24.C. Failure to file a written response within 14 days may result in the Disciplinary
Board's refusal to consider during the hearing in this matter any evidence or argument supporting the
existence of one or more of the grounds specified in Paragraph 13-24.C.

It is further ORDERED that Nancy Theresa Lord shall forthwith give notice, by certified mail, of the suspension of her license to practice law in Virginia to all clients for whom she is currently handling matters and to all opposing attorneys and the presiding judges in pending litigation. The Attorney shall also make appropriate arrangements for the disposition of matters then in her care in conformity with the wishes of her clients. The Attorney shall give such notice within fourteen (14) days of the effective date of the suspension order, and make such arrangements as are required herein within forty-five (45) days of the effective date of the suspension order. The Attorney shall also furnish proof to the bar within sixty (60) days of the effective date of the suspension order that such notices have been timely given and such arrangements for the disposition of matters made. Issues concerning the adequacy of the notice and arrangements required herein shall be determined by the Disciplinary Board, which may impose a sanction of revocation or suspension for failure to comply with the requirements of this subparagraph.

It is further ORDERED that a copy of the Order of Suspension entered in the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, No. 73447, be attached to this Rule to Show Cause and Order of Summary Suspension and Hearing and made a part hereof.

It is further ORDERED that an attested copy of this Rule to Show Cause and Order of Summary Suspension and Hearing, with attachments, shall be mailed to Nancy Theresa Lord by certified mail at her address of record with the Virginia State Bar, #220, 1970 North Leslie Road, Pahrump, NV 89060, and to Shelley L. Spalding, Assistant Bar Counsel, Virginia State Bar, 1111 East Main Street, Suite 700, Richmond, Virginia 23219-0026.

ENTERED THIS 28th DAY OF AUGUST, 2020

Me Kein

VIRGINIA STATE BAR DISCIPLINARY BOARD

John A.C. Keith

Chair Designate

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINE OF NANCY T. LORD, BAR NO. 6697.

No. 73447

FILED

DEC 2.0 2017

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF SUSPENSION

This is an automatic review of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's recommendation that attorney Nancy T. Lord be suspended for six months and one day for violations of RPC 1.1 (competence), RPC 1.3 (diligence), RPC 1.15 (safekeeping property), RPC 3.4(c) (fairness to opposing party and counsel), RPC 3.5 (impartiality and decorum of the tribunal), RPC 8.1(b) (bar admission and disciplinary matters: failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority), RPC 8.2 (judicial and legal officials), RPC 8.4(c) (misconduct: engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation), and RPC 8.4(d) (misconduct: engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). Because no briefs have been filed, this matter stands submitted for decision based on the record. SCR 105(3)(b).

The State Bar has the burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that Lord committed the violations charged. *In re Discipline of Drakulich*, 111 Nev. 1556, 1566, 908 P.2d 709, 715 (1995). Here, the charges alleged in the first complaint are deemed admitted because Lord failed to answer the complaint and a default was entered.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A (C)

17-43936

SCR 105(2). As to the second complaint, Lord waived her right to challenge the facts and charges in exchange for bar counsel recommending that the hearing panel consolidate the two complaints and impose a six-month-and-one-day suspension for the conduct alleged in both complaints. Thus, the record establishes that Lord violated the above-referenced rules by failing to file an opening brief and appendix in this court in Docket No. 68112, despite being ordered to do so; by interrupting a criminal proceeding wherein she was the defendant, making false accusations about the judge, and causing the judge to recuse himself and continue the trial; by overdrawing her trust account on five occasions, at least four of which appear to be the result of her utilizing her trust account to pay personal expenses; and by failing to respond to the State Bar's letters of investigation.

Turning to the appropriate discipline, we review the hearing panel's recommendation de novo. SCR 105(3)(b). Although, we "must... exercise independent judgment," the panel's recommendation is persuasive. In re Discipline of Schaefer, 117 Nev. 496, 515, 25 P.3d 191, 204 (2001). In determining the appropriate discipline, we weigh four factors: "the duty violated, the lawyer's mental state, the potential or actual injury caused by the lawyer's misconduct, and the existence of aggravating or mitigating factors." In re Discipline of Lerner, 124 Nev. 1232, 1246, 197 P.3d 1067, 1077 (2008).

Lord violated duties owed to her clients (competence, diligence, and safekeeping property), the legal system (impartiality and decorum of the tribunal, making false statements about the integrity of a judge, and engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice), the public (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or

misrepresentation), and the profession (failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority). The record supports the panel's finding that Lord knowingly engaged in the misconduct as she knew that she needed to file the opening brief with this court, that the statements she made about the judge were false, and that she could not use her trust account as a personal account especially since she had been previously disciplined for doing so. Lord's misconduct harmed her client because her client's appeal was dismissed as a result of Lord's failure to file the opening brief and appendix. Additionally, the legal system was harmed because Lord's criminal case was continued as a result of her disruption and dishonest statements regarding the judge.

The baseline sanction for her misconduct, before consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances, is suspension. See Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Compendium of Professional Responsibility Rules and Standards Standard 4.12 (Am. Bar Ass'n 2015) (recommending suspension for knowingly improperly dealing with client's property; id. at Standard 4.42 ("Suspension is generally appropriate when ... a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or potential injury to a client."); id. at Standard 6.12 (recommending suspension for knowingly making false statement to the court and causing an adverse effect on the legal proceedings); id. at Standard 6.22 ("Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer . . . causes interference or potential interference with a legal proceeding."); id. at Standard 7.22 (providing that suspension is appropriate when a lawyer knowingly violates the rules of professional conduct causing actual or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system). The panel found and the record supports three aggravating circumstances (pattern of misconduct, multiple offenses, and

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA



substantial experience in the practice of law) and one mitigating circumstance (personal or emotional problems). Considering all the factors, the recommended suspension is appropriate to serve the purpose of attorney discipline. See State Bar of Nev. v. Claiborne, 104 Nev. 115, 213, 756 P.2d 464, 527-28 (1988) (observing that the purpose of attorney discipline is to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession, not to punish the attorney).

Accordingly, we hereby suspend attorney Nancy T. Lord from the practice of law in Nevada for a period of six months and one day commencing from the date of this order. Further, Lord shall pay the costs of the bar proceedings associated with both bar complaints, plus \$2,500 in administrative costs pursuant to SCR 120, within 30 days of the date of this order. The parties shall comply with SCR 115 and SCR 121.1.

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry

Parraguirre

Gibbons

Stiglich

cc: Chair, Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board
Nancy Lord
C. Stanley Hunterton, Bar Counsel, State Bar of Nevada
Kimberly K. Farmer, Executive Director, State Bar of Nevada
Perry Thompson, Admissions Office, U.S. Supreme Court