

In the Matter of William M. King, Bar No. 005255, PDJ 2012-9011, effective March 1, 2012. *Attorney Suspended, Probation and Costs Imposed.*

Pursuant to Rule 57(a), the presiding disciplinary judge accepted an agreement for discipline by consent by which Respondent William M. King, Phoenix, was suspended for four (4) months, effective March 1, 2012. Upon reinstatement Respondent King will be placed on probation for one (1) year.

In Count One, Respondent failed to adequately supervise his employee, a suspended attorney employed as a paralegal. As a result, the paralegal engaged in the unauthorized practice of law by giving the client legal advice regarding her bankruptcy matter. Respondent failed to memorialize his fee with the client.

In Count Two, Respondent failed to adequately communicate with his client for seven months. Respondent further failed to refund the client's retainer until after a complaint was filed with the State Bar.

In Count Three, Respondent entered into a barter agreement as compensation for representation in a criminal matter but then failed to comply with ER 1.8(a). Respondent received additional compensation to prepare for a possible trial. The matter ultimately settled however, Respondent failed to respond to his client's request for an itemized bill and a refund.

In Count Four, Respondent failed to respond to opposing counsel's motion in a family law matter and an unsatisfactory child-support order was entered against his client. Respondent told the client that he did not receive a copy of the motion and when the client inquired as to how to remedy the situation, Respondent informed the client that nothing could be done.

In count five, Respondent was retained to establish a family trust. Respondent failed to diligently represent the client. Respondent repeatedly lost the client's paperwork and failed to complete the work for nearly four years.

Aggravating factors: prior disciplinary offenses and a pattern of misconduct.

Mitigating factor: full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings.

Respondent violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., specifically ERs 1.1, 1.2, 5.3, 5.5(a), 1.2, 1.3., 1.4, 1.5, 1.15(a), 1.16(a) and 8.4(d).