VIRGINIA:

BEFORE THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR DISCIPLINARY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF
JOHN JAMES GOOD Jr. **VSB DOCKET NO. 19-060-113221, 19-060-113987, 19-060-114295**

MEMORANDUM ORDER

THIS MATTER came to be heard on August 23, 2019, before a panel of the Disciplinary Board consisting of Michael A. Beverly, First Vice Chair, Carolyn V. Grady, Brendan K. Feeley, T. Tony Pham, and Nancy L. Bloom, Lay Member. The Virginia State Bar ("VSB" or "Bar") was represented by Prescott L. Prince, ("Bar Counsel").

The Chair opened the hearing by calling the case in the hearing room and causing the Assistant Clerk to call Respondent's name three times in the adjacent hall. The Respondent did not answer or appear.

The Chair polled the members of the Board Panel as to whether any of them was conscious of any personal or financial interest or bias which would preclude any of them from fairly hearing this matter and serving on the panel, to which inquiry each member responded in the negative. Jennifer L. Hairfield, court reporter, P.O. Box 9349, Richmond, VA 23227, telephone (804) 730-1222, after being duly sworn, reported the hearing and transcribed the proceedings.

All required notices were timely sent by the Clerk of the Disciplinary System ("Clerk") to the Respondent by Certified Mail, in the manner prescribed by the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, Part VI, Section IV, Paragraphs 13-18.

The matter came before the Board on the District Committee Determination for Certification by the 6th District Committee pursuant to Part VI, Section IV, Paragraphs 13-18 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia. Prior to the proceedings and at the final Prehearing

Conference, VSB Exhibits 1-33 were admitted into evidence by the Chair, without objection. VSB Exhibits 34-39 were offered by the Bar during its presentation and admitted into evidence by the Chair, without objection.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant hereto, John James Good, Jr. ("Respondent") has been an attorney licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

VSB Docket No. 19-060-113221 (Complainants: William and Liz Bailey)

2. Respondent represented William and Liz Bailey (husband and wife) for a number of years as their family estate planning attorney. In that capacity, Respondent possessed financial records belonging to the Baileys.

3. In mid-2018, the Baileys were in the process of purchasing a home and made multiple attempts to contact Respondent to obtain access to their financial records and to consult with Respondent regarding legal issues related to the purchase of the home.

4. Respondent never responded to the Baileys' attempts to contact him. William and/or Liz Bailey went to Respondent's office and the front desk attendant stated that she had not seen or spoken with Respondent for several weeks. Thereafter, the Baileys filed their Bar Complaint.

5. On August 3, 2018, the Virginia State Bar (VSB) Intake Office sent, via email to Respondent's last known email address, a letter notifying him of the Baileys' Bar Complaint and requesting a response. The letter stated *inter alia*:

> Pursuant to Virginia Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(c), you have a duty to comply with the bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6 which governs confidentiality of information. This request constitutes a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary

authority pursuant to Rule 8.1(c).

6. Respondent did not respond to this emailed letter. The matter was then referred for investigation and on August 15, 2018, Bar Counsel sent Respondent a letter notifying him that the matter had been referred for investigation. The letter stated *inter alia:*

> Pursuant to Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1 (c), there is a duty to comply with the bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6. An investigator's demands for information constitute lawful demands under Rule 8.1(c). Failure to comply with a bar investigator's demands for information in a timely manner may result in the imposition of disciplinary sanctions.

7. The matter was referred to VSB Investigator Edward S. Bosak and, in furtherance of the investigation, Investigator Bosak made multiple attempts to contact Respondent. Respondent initially failed to respond to Investigator Bosak's attempts to contact him.

8. On September 24, 2018, the VSB issued a subpoena *duces tecum* demanding that Respondent produce his entire file related to the representation of the Baileys by or before October 15, 2018. A copy of the subpoena *duces tecum* was sent by certified mail to Respondent's office, that being his address of record, and by regular mail to Respondent's home address.

9. Though issuance of a subpoena *duces tecum* to a respondent’s address of record is proper service under the Rules, Investigator Bosak took the additional step of attempting to serve the subpoena at the Respondent’s residence. When the investigator arrived at the entrance of the driveway of the residence, he happened upon an individual who was exiting a car in the driveway. That individual claimed to be a delivery person and went into the house. He did not respond when the investigator knocked on the door. Investigator Bosak testified that the person who evaded him was Mr. Good, the Respondent. The investigator posted the subpoena *duces*

tecum at the door of the Respondent's residence.

10. Respondent did not comply with the subpoena *duces tecum*.

11. On October 17, 2018 a Notice of Noncompliance was sent by certified mail to Respondent at his address of record. The Notice advised Respondent that he had not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and informed him that his license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia would be suspended unless, within 10 days after service of the notice, Respondent petitioned the Disciplinary Board to withhold entry of the interim Order of Suspension pending a hearing on the matter.

12. On October 26, 2018, Respondent sent Investigator Bosak a letter via email. In the letter, Respondent acknowledged receiving the Notice of Noncompliance and Request for Interim Suspension, but Respondent did not provide documents responsive to the subpoena *duces tecum* and did not request that the Board withhold the interim Order of Suspension. The letter provided no substantive information regarding the Bar Complaint, but stated, *inter alia*, that due to "overwhelming and continuing circumstances" related to health issues of Respondent's wife, and of his own personal issues, Respondent needed to withdraw from the Bar.

13. On November 6, 2018, the Disciplinary Board entered its interim Order of Suspension. As of the date of this proceeding, Respondent has not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and the interim Order of Suspension remains in place.

14. The Bar withdrew the charge that Respondent had violated Rule 1.16(e).

MISCONDUCT IN DOCKET NO. 19-060-113221 (Complainants: William and Liz Bailey)

The pertinent Rule of Professional Conduct that the Respondent was charged with in this matter was:

Rule 8.1 Bar Admission And Disciplinary Matters

An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer already admitted to the bar, in connection with a bar admission application, any certification required to be filed as a condition of maintaining or renewing a license to practice law, or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

> …
> (c) fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or
> (d) obstruct a lawful investigation by an admissions or disciplinary authority.

The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's failure to respond to the subpoena *duces tecum* constitutes a violation of RPC 8.1(c), the "failure to respond to a lawful demand for information from a[]…disciplinary authority…" and a violation of RPC 8.1(d), as an "obstruct[ion] [of] a lawful investigation by a[]…disciplinary authority. Respondent's failure to respond in a meaningful way to the multiple efforts of the Investigator to contact him constitutes a further violation of RPC 8.1(d), proven by clear and convincing evidence.

VSB Docket No. 19-060-113987 (Complainant: Sarabeth Truebenbach)

14. Sarabeth Truebenbach retained Respondent on or about April 6, 2016 to take over a civil lawsuit, in which she was the plaintiff, that was currently pending in the Circuit Court of Spotsylvania County, VA.

15. Truebenbach signed an Engagement Agreement, but Respondent failed to provide her with a signed copy.

16. As provided in the Engagement Agreement, Truebenbach paid Respondent $3000

as an initial deposit. Over the course of the representation, Truebenbach paid Respondent an additional $9647.62 in periodic payments, with the total amount of funds paid to Respondent being $12,647.62.

17. Respondent entered his appearance in the matter, and on April 18, 2016, the Circuit Court of Spotsylvania County entered an order identifying Respondent as attorney of record for Truebenbach.

18. From April 2016 until March 2017, Truebenbach received invoices from Respondent on an approximate quarterly basis. These invoices referenced work performed by Respondent. Truebenbach promptly paid the amounts listed as "due" on the billing statements.

19. Respondent periodically communicated with Truebenbach, but Truebenbach did not regularly check to confirm that all work billed by Respondent was performed as reported. Truebenbach stated that she never appeared in any court relative to her case, and Respondent never informed her of any court hearing that she was required to attend.

20. Respondent informed Truebenbach of the hearing that was scheduled for October 19, 2017 related to his request for discovery from the opposing party. Respondent subsequently informed Truebenbach that, shortly before the court proceeding, the opposing counsel provided Respondent with a CD that purported to contain the requested discovery documents. Respondent made the court aware of this development and the presiding judge entered an Order that stated, in pertinent part *"that this matter be removed from the docket. The plaintiff shall review the documents and notify this Court should this motion require additional review by this Court."*

21. Respondent subsequently informed Truebenbach that he had reviewed the CD and that some of the requested discovery was still missing. Thereafter, however, Respondent made

no effort to contact Truebenbach to inform her of developments in the case. If Respondent took further actions to obtain the discovery, he did not inform Truebenbach of any such action.

22. Starting approximately in early 2018, Truebenbach made numerous attempts to contact Respondent in an effort to obtain information regarding the status of her case. Respondent did not respond to any of Truebenbach's attempts to contact him.

23. Truebenbach never received copies of any pleadings or other documents associated with her case during Respondent's representation of her.

24. Respondent's de facto withdrawal of representation of Truebenbach required her to retain another attorney at additional expense to her.

25. On November 5, 2018, Bar Counsel sent Respondent a letter along with a copy of Truebenbach's Bar Complaint to Respondent's address of record with the VSB. The letter demanded that Respondent provide a written answer to the Bar Complaint within 21 days and also informed him that the matter had been referred for investigation. The letter stated *inter alia:*

> Pursuant to Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(c), you have a duty to comply with the Bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6. Failure to respond in a timely manner to this and other lawful demands from the bar for information about the complaint may result in the imposition of disciplinary sanctions.

The letter further informed Respondent that the request for a written response as well as Investigator's requests for information constituted lawful demands for information under Rule 8.1(c).

26. Respondent failed to respond to the letter and did not respond to Investigator Bosak's multiple attempts to contact him.

27. On November 28, 2018, the VSB issued a subpoena *duces tecum* demanding that

Respondent produce his entire file related to the representation of Truebenbach by or before December 19, 2018.

28. Respondent did not comply with the subpoena *duces tecum.* On December 20, 2018, a Notice of Noncompliance was sent by certified mail to Respondent at his address of record. The Notice informed Respondent that he had not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and further informed him that his license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia would be suspended unless, within 10 days after service of the Notice, Respondent petitioned the Disciplinary Board to withhold entry of the interim Order of Suspension pending a hearing on the matter.

29. Respondent continued to be unresponsive to the subpoena *duces tecum* and he did not petition the Board to withhold entry of the interim Order of Suspension. Accordingly, on January 7, 2019, the Disciplinary Board entered its interim Order of Suspension. As of the date of this proceeding, Respondent has not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and the interim Order of Suspension remains in place.

MISCONDUCT IN DOCKET NO. 19-060-113987 (Complainant: Sarabeth Truebenbach)

The pertinent Rules of Professional Conduct that the Respondent was charged with in this matter are as follows:

Rule 1.3 Diligence

(a) A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

(b) A lawyer shall not intentionally fail to carry out a contract of employment entered into with a client for professional services, but may withdraw as permitted under Rule 1.16

Rule 1.4 Communication

(a) A lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.

Rule 1.16 Declining or Terminating Representation

(c) In any court proceeding, counsel of record shall not withdraw except by leave of court after compliance with notice requirements pursuant to applicable Rules of Court. In any other matter, a lawyer shall continue representation notwithstanding good cause for terminating the representation, when ordered to do so by a tribunal.

(d) Upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, refunding any advance payment of fee that has not been earned and handling records as indicated in paragraph (e).

(e) All original, client-furnished documents and any originals of legal instruments or official documents which are in the lawyer's possession (wills, corporate minutes, etc.) are the property of the client and, therefore, upon termination of the representation, those items shall be returned within a reasonable time to the client or the client's new counsel upon request, whether or not the client has paid the fees and costs owed the lawyer. If the lawyer wants to keep a copy of such original documents, the lawyer must incur the cost of duplication. Also upon termination, the client, upon request, must also be provided within a reasonable time copies of the following documents from the lawyer's file, whether or not the client has paid the fees and costs owed the lawyer: lawyer/client and lawyer/third-party communications; the lawyer's copies of client-furnished documents (unless the originals have been returned to the client pursuant to this paragraph); transcripts, pleadings and discovery responses; working and final drafts of legal instruments, official documents, investigative reports, legal memoranda, and other attorney work product documents prepared or collected for the client in the course of the representation; research materials; and bills previously submitted to the client. Although the lawyer may bill and seek to collect from the client the costs associated with making a copy of these materials, the lawyer may not use the client's refusal to pay for such materials as a basis to refuse the client's request. The lawyer, however, is not required under this Rule to provide the client copies of billing records and documents intended only for internal use, such as memoranda prepared by the lawyer discussing conflicts of interest, staffing considerations, or difficulties arising from the lawyer-client relationship. The lawyer has met his or her obligation under this paragraph by furnishing these items one time at client request upon termination; provision of multiple copies is not required.

Rule 8.1 Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters

An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer already admitted to the bar, in connection with a bar admission application, any certification required to be filed as a condition of maintaining or renewing a license to practice law, or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

> …
> (c) fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or
>
> (d) obstruct a lawful investigation by an admissions or disciplinary authority.

The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's abandonment of the case without notice to Truebenbach of his intent to terminate representation and his failure to return documents constitutes violations of RPC 1.3(a) & (b) and RPC 1.16(d) & (e). Respondent's abandonment of Truebenbach's case without permission of the Circuit Court constitutes a violation of RPC 1.16(c). Respondent's failure to respond to Truebenbach's multiple requests for information regarding the status of her case constitutes a violation of RPC 1.4(a). Respondent's failure to respond to Truebenbach's multiple requests for information regarding the status of her case constitutes a violation of RPC 1.4(a). Respondent's failure to respond to the Bar Complaint, and the subpoena *duces tecum*, and failure to respond to the Investigator's multiple attempts to contact him constitutes violations of RPC 8.1(c) & (d). The Board makes these finding based on the clear and convincing evidence outlined in paragraphs 14-29 *supra*.

VSB Docket No. 19-060-114295 (Complainant: James Wasek)

30 . Dr. James Wasek ("Wasek") retained Respondent in mid-February 2017 to represent him in his capacity as Executor of the Estate of Gregory Douglas Twitchell.

31. Wasek met with Respondent to discuss the filing requirements/accountings for the Estate and the sale of a piece of real estate in North Carolina that the decedent had owned.

32. Respondent informed Wasek that he would prepare the final tax returns for the Estate. In reliance on this representation, Wasek provided Respondent with the decedent's original 2016 tax returns and original 2017 documents needed to prepare the returns.

33. When Wasek provided Respondent with the documents, Wasek was preparing to travel overseas in furtherance of an urgent work assignment. Wasek did not retain copies of the documents and specifically informed Respondent of this fact.

34. Wasek received three invoices from Respondent, the dates of the invoices being April 2017, December 2017 and March 2018, each of which referenced work performed by Respondent. Wasek promptly paid the amounts listed as "due" on the billing statements. Over the course of the representation, Wasek paid Respondent $7673.

35. Although Wasek promptly paid Respondent, he did not confirm that Respondent had performed the work he claimed to have performed on the invoices.

36. Wasek's last contact from Respondent was an email dated May 8, 2018 regarding the decedent's real estate in which Respondent stated, "Let me look more into this. Thanks."

37, Wasek subsequently discovered that Respondent failed to prepare the tax returns as promised.

38. Wasek made numerous attempts to contact Respondent via voice-mail messages, email, and text messages to inquire about the status of his case and to recover the original documents he had entrusted to Respondent. Respondent did not respond to Wasek or return his documents.

39. Respondent's failure to provide the legal services as promised and further, to return original documents to Wasek caused significant harm to Wasek in that Wasek has been unable to complete the necessary filings for the Estate.

40. As the result of the actions detailed above, Wasek filed a Bar Complaint and the matter was referred for investigation.

41. On December 21, 2018, Bar Counsel sent Respondent a letter, along with a copy of Wasek's Bar complaint to Respondent's address of record with the VSB. The letter demanded that Respondent provide a written answer to the Bar Complaint within 21 days and also informed him that the matter had been referred for investigation. The letter stated *inter alia:*

> Pursuant to Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(c), you have a duty to comply with the bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6. Failure to respond in a timely manner to this and other lawful demands from the bar for information about the complaint may result in the imposition of disciplinary sanctions.

The letter further informed Respondent that the request for a written response as well the Investigator's requests for information constituted lawful demands for information under Rule 8.1(c).

42. Respondent failed to respond to the letter and did not respond to Investigator Bosak's attempts to contact him.

43. On January 4, 2019, the VSB issued a subpoena *duces tecum* demanding that Respondent produce his entire file related to the representation of Wasek by or before January 25, 2019.

44. Respondent did not comply with the subpoena *duces tecum.*

45. On February 27, 2019, a Notice of Noncompliance was sent by certified mail to Respondent at his address of record. The Notice informed Respondent that he had not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and further informed him that his license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia would be suspended unless, within 10 days after service of the Notice, Respondent petitioned the Disciplinary Board to withhold entry of the interim Order of Suspension pending a hearing on the matter.

46. Respondent continued to be unresponsive to the subpoena *duces tecum* and he did not petition the Board to withhold entry of the interim Order of Suspension. Accordingly, on March 13, 2019, the Disciplinary Board entered its interim Order of Suspension. As of the date of this proceeding, Respondent has not complied with the subpoena *duces tecum* and the interim Order of Suspension remains in place.

MISCONDUCT IN DOCKET NO, 19-060-114295 (Complainant: James Wasek)

The pertinent Rules of Professional Conduct that the Respondent was charged with in this matter are as follows:

Rule 1.3 Diligence
(a) A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

(b) A lawyer shall not intentionally fail to carry out a contract of employment entered into with a client for professional services, but may withdraw as permitted under Rule 1.16

Rule 1.4 Communication

(a) A lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.

Rule 1.16 Declining or Terminating Representation

(d) Upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, refunding any advance payment of fee that has not been earned and handling records as indicated in paragraph (e).

(e) All original, client-furnished documents and any originals of legal instruments or official documents which are in the lawyer's possession (wills, corporate minutes, etc.) are the property of the client and, therefore, upon termination of the representation, those items shall be returned within a reasonable time to the client or the client's new counsel upon request, whether or not the client has paid the fees and costs owed the lawyer. If the lawyer wants to keep a copy of such original documents, the lawyer must incur the cost of duplication. Also upon termination, the client, upon request, must also be provided within a reasonable time copies of the following documents from the lawyer's file, whether or not the client has paid the fees and costs owed the lawyer: lawyer/client and lawyer/third-party communications; the lawyer's copies of client-furnished documents (unless the originals have been returned to the client pursuant to this paragraph); transcripts, pleadings and discovery responses; working and final drafts of legal instruments, official documents, investigative reports, legal memoranda, and other attorney work product documents prepared or collected for the client in the course of the representation; research materials; and bills previously submitted to the client. Although the lawyer may bill and seek to collect from the client the costs associated with making a copy of these materials, the lawyer may not use the client's refusal to pay for such materials as a basis to refuse the client's request. The lawyer, however, is not required under this Rule to provide the client copies of billing records and documents intended only for internal use, such as memoranda prepared by the lawyer discussing conflicts of interest, staffing considerations, or difficulties arising from the lawyer-client relationship. The lawyer has met his or her obligation under this paragraph by

furnishing these items one time at client request upon termination; provision of multiple copies is not required.

Rule 8.1 Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters
An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer already admitted to the bar, in connection with a bar admission application, any certification required to be filed as a condition of maintaining or renewing a license to practice law, or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

> …
> (c) fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or
>
> (d) obstruct a lawful investigation by an admissions or disciplinary authority.

The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's failure to prepare the tax returns and deliver them to Wasek constitutes a violation of RPC 1.3(a) & (b). The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's failure to respond to Wasek's multiple requests for information regarding the status of his case constitutes a violation of RPC 1.4(a). The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's abandonment of the case without notice to Wasek of his intent to terminate representation and his failure to return original documents to Wasek constitute violations of RPC 1.16(d) & (e). The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's failure to respond to the Bar Complaint constitutes a violation of RPC 8.1(c). The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent 's failure to respond to the subpoena *duces tecum* constitutes a further violation of RPC 8.1(c) and a violation of RPC 8.1(d). The Board finds by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's failure to respond in a meaningful way to the multiple efforts of the Investigator to contact him constitutes a further violation of RPC 8.1(d).

IMPOSITION OF SANCTION

Thereafter, the Board received further evidence and arguments in aggravation and mitigation from the Bar, including Respondent's disciplinary record, reflecting no prior discipline. The Board recessed to deliberate what sanction to impose upon its finding of misconduct by Respondent.

A majority of the Board found that the Respondent's multiple offenses, pattern of misconduct, and intentional obstruction of the disciplinary proceedings were aggravating factors that outweighed the lack of any prior disciplinary record. After due deliberation, the Board reconvened to announce the sanction. The Chair announced, by majority vote of the board,[1] the license of the Respondent to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia should be and is hereby revoked effective August 23, 2019.

It is further ORDERED that, as directed in the Board's November 6, 2018 interim Order in this matter, the Respondent must comply with the requirements of Part 6, Section IV, Paragraphs 13-29 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia. The Respondent shall forthwith give notice, by certified mail, of the revocation of his license to practice law in Virginia to all clients for whom he is currently handling matters and to all opposing attorneys and presiding

---

1During the misconduct phase of the hearing, evidence was presented (VSB Exh 10) of an October 26, 2018, letter from the Respondent to the Virginia State Bar which briefly outlined the personal difficulties in the Respondent's life during the pendency of the Bar Complaints. Because of the content and tenor of that letter, a minority of the Board believed that there might be an impairment issue underlying the Respondent's conduct, and that the appropriate action should have been a continuance of the hearing and the appointment of a Guardian ad Litem to explore the possible impairment issue(s). The majority of the Board were of the opinion that the Respondent's statement in the letter that "my health is also at issue," was not sufficient reason to start an impairment investigation under §13-23(b).

judges in pending litigation. The attorney shall also make appropriate arrangements for the disposition of matters then in his care in conformity with the wishes of his clients. Respondent shall give such notice within 14 days of the date of this hearing and make such arrangements as are required herein within 45 days of the effective date of the suspension. The Respondent shall also furnish proof to the Bar within 60 days of the effective date of the suspension that such notices have been timely given and such arrangements made for the disposition of matters.

It is further ORDERED that if the Respondent is not handling any client matters on the effective date of the order, he shall submit an affidavit to that effect to the Clerk of the Disciplinary System at the Virginia State Bar within 60 days of the effective date of the revocation.

It is further ORDERED that pursuant to Part Six, Section IV, Paragraph 13-9E of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall assess all costs against the Respondent.

It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall mail an attested copy of this Order to Respondent at his address of record with the Virginia State Bar, being 800 Corporate Dr., Suite 301, Stafford, VA 22554, by Certified Mail, return receipt requested, to 202 Bosun Cove, Stafford, VA 22554, by regular mail and by hand delivery to Prescott L. Prince, Assistant Bar Counsel, Virginia State Bar, 1111 E. Main St., Suite 700, Richmond, VA 23219-0026.

Enter this Order this 13day of September, 2019

VIRGINIA STATE BAR DISCIPLINARY BOARD



Michael A. Beverly
First Vice Chair