

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE
1501 W. WASHINGTON, SUITE 102, PHOENIX, AZ 85007-3231

**IN THE MATTER OF A SUSPENDED
MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF
ARIZONA,**

WILLIAM F. DORAN,
Bar No. 014400

Respondent.

PDJ-2013-9076

**REPORT AND ORDER IMPOSING
SANCTIONS**

[State Bar File Nos. 12-1643, 13-
0901, 13-1277]

FILED NOVEMBER 21, 2013

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The State Bar of Arizona (SBA) filed its complaint on September 3, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the complaint was served on Mr. Doran by certified mail, delivery restricted to Mr. Doran, as well as by regular first class mail, pursuant to Rules 47(c) and 58(a)(2), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona ("PDJ") was assigned to the matter.

A notice of default was properly filed on October 3, 2013 and served on Mr. Doran. That notice cautioned him that "[A]n effective entry of default shall not be set aside except in cases where such relief would be warranted under Rule 60(c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure." Despite that notice, Mr. Doran did not file an answer or otherwise defend against the allegations in the complaint and an Effective Entry of Default was filed by the Disciplinary Clerk and effective on

October 24, 2013. That notice again cautioned Mr. Doran that "Default shall not be set aside except in cases where such relief would be warranted under Rule 60(c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure."

That Effective Entry of Default also included a notice that was sent to all parties notifying them that the Aggravation/Mitigation Hearing was scheduled for November 19, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. at 1501 West Washington, Room 109, Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231. That notice again cautioned Mr. Doran that "[D]efault shall not be set aside except in cases where such relief would be warranted under Rule 60(c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure."

On November 19, 2013, the Hearing Panel, comprised of volunteer attorney member, the Hon. Noel A. Fidel (retired) and public member, Douglas Pilcher heard argument. Shauna R. Miller appeared on behalf of the State Bar and Mr. Doran did not appear.

The State Bar detailed extensively the facts alleged in its complaint and bears the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Doran committed the violations charged. Mr. Doran failed to file an answer or otherwise defend against the allegations in the SBA's complaint. Default was properly entered and effective. Mr. Doran failed to answer. The allegations in the complaint "shall be deemed admitted" pursuant to Rule 58(d), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.

The purpose of an aggravation/mitigation hearing is not only to weigh mitigating and aggravating factors, but also to assure there is a nexus between a respondent's judicially admitted behavior and the merits of the State Bar's case. A respondent against whom a default has been entered no longer has the right to litigate the merits of the factual allegations of the complaint. However, the

respondent retains the right to appear and participate in the aggravation/mitigation hearing concerning that nexus and the sanctions sought. Included with that right to appear is the right to dispute the allegations relating to aggravation and to offer evidence of mitigation. Mr. Doran was afforded those rights.

At the same time, the Hearing Panel does not operate in a vacuum. The State Bar properly demanded documents and records from Mr. Doran. Even if a respondent were present and testified, the testimony of a defaulted respondent is not a reliable substitute for documents and records that were required to be disclosed but were not. As pointed out above, in this matter Mr. Doran did not appear. Notwithstanding, a hearing panel is not precluded from giving consideration to the failure to cooperate or disclose records or documents.

Regardless, due process requires a hearing panel to independently determine whether, under the facts deemed admitted, ethical violations have been proven by clear and convincing evidence. The hearing panel must also exercise discretion in deciding whether sanctions should issue for the Mr. Doran's misconduct. If the hearing panel finds that sanctions are warranted, it independently determines which sanctions should be imposed. It is not the function of a hearing panel to simply endorse or "rubber stamp" any request for sanctions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

We hereby adopt and incorporate by reference the factual background of this case, as fully admitted in the admitted complaint. [See the admitted complaint for further detailed findings of fact.]

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant, Mr. Doran was licensed to practice law in Arizona. Mr. Doran was admitted to practice in Arizona on October 24, 1992. On March 19, 2013, Mr. Doran was suspended from the practice of law in Arizona for a period of six months and one day. Mr. Doran's suspension was a result of his non-compliance with the terms of the Court's July 17, 2012, judgment and order in *In re William F. Doran*, PDJ 2013-9002, State Bar file numbers 11-1605 and 11-3102.

COUNT ONE (File No. 12-1643/Budhu)

On January 31, 2012, Annetta Budhu (Ms. Budhu) paid Mr. Doran \$500.00 to act as an escrow agent in the sale of her business, RF Lounge LLC, to SWINE LLC. On February 3, 2012, a \$50,500.00 wire transfer was made to Mr. Doran's J. P Morgan Chase trust account. The funds were to be used by Ms. Budhu to pay the IRS Bulk Sales Tax on the sale of the property. Mr. Doran was to hold the funds in his trust account for a period of 90 days and then release the funds to Ms. Budhu no later than April 31, 2012.

As of June 13, 2012, Mr. Doran had only sent Ms. Budhu \$15,000.00 of the \$50,500.00 funds in his trust account. Mr. Doran told Ms. Budhu that he would send the remainder of the funds but failed to do so. Mr. Doran's failure to release the full escrow amount forced Ms. Budhu to charge the tax to a credit card, resulting in fees and interest being incurred by Ms. Budhu.

Mr. Doran told Ms. Budhu that he had spent the escrow funds but would find a way to replace the money by selling stocks and by borrowing funds from a third party. On June 13, 2012, Ms. Budhu filed a charge against Mr. Doran with the State Bar. By letter dated July 10, 2012, a State Bar's Attorney/Consumer

Assistance Program (A/CAP) bar counsel informed Mr. Doran of the charge and requested trust account records and additional information regarding his handling of the funds, no later than July 19, 2012. Mr. Doran failed to respond.

A/CAP bar counsel attempted to contact Mr. Doran by telephone and email but Mr. Doran failed to respond. The matter was submitted for a screening investigation and by letter dated September 4, 2012, Mr. Doran was again asked to respond. Mr. Doran failed to respond and the correspondence mailed to Mr. Doran's address of record was returned to the State Bar.

On September 13, 2012, Ms. Budhu sent an email to the State Bar saying the matter had been resolved. On October 8, 2012, the State Bar sent to both Ms. Budhu and Mr. Doran letters citing to Rule 48(g), informing them that Ms. Budhu's request would not abate the investigation. Mr. Doran was given an additional ten days to file a response. Mr. Doran failed to file a response.

Chase Bank provided bar counsel with the trust records of Mr. Doran pursuant to a Subpoena Duces Tecum on February 28, 2013. A reconstruction of Mr. Doran's trust account for the period of January 1, 2012, through October 31, 2012, was prepared. The trust account reconstruction revealed the following violations of the trust account rules:

- a. On February 3, 2012, Mr. Doran received a wire transfer for \$50,500.00 on Ms. Budhu's behalf;
- b. On February 9, 2012, the balance in Mr. Doran's trust account dropped to \$26,824.38 before any disbursements had been made in Ms. Budhu's matter, thus converting other client funds.

- c. On May 1, 2012, after various transactions in the trust account, Mr. Doran had enough money to wire Ms. Budhu \$15,000.00; however, there should have been another \$35,500.00 in the trust account belonging to Ms. Budhu.
- d. The balance in the trust account, after the wire to Ms. Budhu on May 1, 2012, was \$2,295.68.
- e. Mr. Doran wired the remaining \$35,500.00 to Ms. Budhu on June 20, 2012.
- f. Mr. Doran converted other client funds for approximately 130 days.
- g. Mr. Doran deposited personal funds into the trust account:
 - i. On March 30, 2012, Mr. Doran deposited a US Treasury check made payable to himself for \$1,874.00.
 - ii. On April 25, 2012, Mr. Doran made another deposit of \$1,874.00 from a US Treasury check made payable to himself.
 - iii. On October 24, 2012, Mr. Doran made a third deposit for \$1,592.90 with a US Treasury check payable to him.
- h. Mr. Doran disbursed funds without using a pre-numbered check or by electronic transfer and did not maintain a record of such disbursements in accordance with the requirements of the rule.
- i. Mr. Doran disbursed \$100.00 on April 25, 2012, and \$4,425.68 on June 29, 2012, without using a pre-numbered check or an electronic transfer.

COUNT TWO (File No. 13-0901/McDonald)

On or about April 22, 2013, Carol McDonald (Ms. McDonald), filed a charge against Mr. Doran with the State Bar alleging that Mr. Doran was drafting fraudulent quitclaim deeds, including one for real property owned by Ms. McDonald. A charging letter, with copies of the information submitted by Ms. McDonald, was sent to Mr. Doran on April 30, 2013, with a request for a response within 20 days of the letter. Mr. Doran failed to respond.

By letter dated June 6, 2013, Mr. Doran was notified that the investigation into the matter was concluded. A copy of the State Bar's investigative report was included with the June 6, 2013, letter and Mr. Doran was given a deadline for submitting a written statement summarizing his response to the charges. Mr. Doran did not respond to the State Bar's letter and did not submit a response to the Arizona Discipline Probable Cause Committee (ADPCC).

By letter dated July 18, 2013, Mr. Doran was informed that the ADPCC had entered an Order of Probable Cause and Mr. Doran was provided with a copy of the order. Mr. Doran has made no contact with the State Bar in response to the investigation of this matter.

COUNT THREE (File No. 13-1277/Ferris)

Dan Drew ("Mr. Drew") created a Living Trust, and a pour-over Will. Mr. Drew died in March of 2007. Shortly thereafter, the first Trustee renounced his nomination and Mr. Drew's granddaughter, Brandi Gladden ("Brandi"), assumed the position. She retained attorney Roger Honig to represent her and the formal probate proceedings were started in March 2008.

On May 7, 2009, Mr. Doran filed his notice of appearance on behalf of Brandi.

Beneficiaries Don Drew and John Drew consulted with Scott Ferris (Mr. Ferris) in March 2011 regarding the probate. Neither had received any notices or communications from Brandi, attorney Honig, or Mr. Doran.

On April 25, 2011, Mr. Ferris filed a Petition for Order to Show Cause ("OSC") and an initial hearing was set. Prior to the hearing, Mr. Doran contacted Mr. Ferris and told him that the allegations of Don and John Drew were unfounded and he would provide documentation from his file before the matter proceeded to litigation. However, Mr. Doran failed to provide any documentation and failed to respond to Mr. Ferris' continuing requests for the documents.

Mr. Doran eventually provided Mr. Ferris with a file. Mr. Ferris says it was "completely unorganized, which required significant time to review. Upon completion of the review, it was clear that his representations to [Mr. Ferris] ... were untrue, and that he and [Brandi] had completely failed to advance the administration of the Trust and of the Estate in the four (4) years since the death of the Decedent/Trustor."

The OSC was set for a status conference and Mr. Doran was advised by Judge Klein that sanctions would be imposed if the allegations in the OSC proved true. Mr. Doran was ordered to complete an inventory, appraisement, and interim accounting of the Estate and the Trust. Mr. Doran failed to comply and on January 10, 2012, Judge Klein removed Brandi as trustee and appointed an independent private fiduciary to succeed her. In a January 10, 2012, minute entry Judge Klein stated in part:

The Court agrees that the dilatory conduct on the part of the personal representative/successor trustee and her counsel is sanctionable. Their collective failure to comply with the most elementary of statutory duties under Arizona law is indefensible, and their refusal to comply

with discovery/disclosure deadlines and respond to pleadings is inexcusable. Besides failing to respond to Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Disposition, they never responded to the Petition for Order to Show Cause that was filed on April 25, 2011, they never prepared a disclosure statement in violation of the Court's October 19, 2011 Order, and counsel for the personal representative/successor trustee failed to sign the September 8, 2011 Joint Memorandum for Scheduling Order despite the fact that he was asked for his input and his signature was sought.

...

Petitioners' Request for Reasonable Attorney's Fees and Costs against Brandi Gladden and her attorney is granted under ARS § 12-349, which provides that a court shall assess reasonable fees and costs against an attorney or party if, among other things, by their actions they unreasonably expand or delay the proceedings. In this case, Brandi, through counsel, has not responded to pleadings, has not complied with Court orders, discovery or disclosure deadlines, and she has not fulfilled her statutory duties as personal representative or successor trustee to the estate and beneficiaries. Each of those actions has in the Court's view unreasonably expanded and delayed the proceedings.

The court entered an award against Brandi and Mr. Doran, jointly and severally, in the amount of \$32,550.00 in attorney's fees, and \$1,921.92 in costs, for a total of \$34,471.92.

On September 27, 2012, Mr. Ferris had a subpoena duces tecum issued and set Mr. Doran's deposition. Mr. Doran failed to comply with the subpoena or attend the debtor's exam.

On October 19, 2012, Mr. Ferris filed a petition to compel Mr. Doran's compliance and for further sanctions. Mr. Doran failed to respond and on November 20, 2012, the court entered an Order awarding Sanctions and Compelling Compliance. Mr. Doran was deemed to be in contempt, sanctions were

entered, and Mr. Doran was compelled to appear at a subsequently scheduled debtor's exam and provide all requested documents.

Mr. Doran again failed to provide any documents or appear for the debtor's exam. On March 5, 2013, Mr. Ferris filed a Second Petition for Order Re: Deeming [Mr. Doran] to be in Contempt of Court. In a March 6, 2013, minute entry Judge Klein stated in part:

The Court has now learned that [Mr. Doran] failed to provide information concerning the identity of his insurance carrier by February 4, 2013 and has failed to respond to attorney Ferris' efforts to reach him. Both of these are in direct violation of the agreement Mr. Doran reached with Dyer & Ferris, in direct violation of a court order, and in direct violation of representations [Mr. Doran] made to the Court at the hearing on January 31, 2013. Thus, there is no need for a follow-up hearing and for providing [Mr. Doran] with yet another opportunity to try to explain himself when no rational explanation can be offered.

Based upon the foregoing, the Court finds [Mr. Doran] in contempt of this Court's January 31, 2013 order, and in breach of the written agreement dated January 30, 2013. Additional sanctions are warranted in the form of reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by Dyer & Ferris in having to assert their Second Petition for Order Deeming William Mr. Doran in Contempt.

An independent investigation conducted by Mr. Ferris' office revealed that Mr. Doran is a judgment debtor under judgments entered against him totaling at least \$725,429.15. Such judgments range from 2006 through 2012.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Doran failed to file an answer or otherwise defend against the allegations in the State Bar's complaint. Default was properly entered and the allegations were therefore deemed admitted pursuant to Rule 58(d), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. Based upon the facts deemed admitted, the Hearing Panel finds by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Doran engaged in the following misconduct.

Count One (File No. 12-1643): By engaging in the conduct set forth in Count One, Mr. Doran violated the following: Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., ERs 1.15(a) and 8.1(b), and Rules 43(b)(5) and (d)(3), and 54(d)(2), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

Mr. Doran knowingly failed to respond to the State Bar in this matter, in violation of ER 8.1(b), Rule 42 and Rule 54(d)(2). Mr. Doran violated ER 1.15(a) by converting client funds. Mr. Doran violated ER 1.15(a) by commingled his personal funds with client funds in the trust account. Mr. Doran violated Rule 43(b)(5), when he made improper disbursements from the client trust account. Mr. Doran violated ER 1.15(a) and Rule 43(d)(3), when he failed to provide trust account records to the State Bar creating a rebuttable presumption, now unrebutted and thus established, that Mr. Doran failed to properly safeguard client funds.

Count Two (File No. 13-0901): By engaging in the conduct set forth in Count Two, Mr. Doran violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., ER 8.1(b), and Rule 54(d), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. by failing to respond to the State Bar's requests for information

Count Three (File No. 13-1277): By engaging in the conduct set forth in Count Three, Mr. Doran count violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., ERs 3.3(a), 3.4(c), 8.4(c) and (d), and Rule 54(c), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. Mr. Doran violated ER 3.3(a)(Candor toward the tribunal). Mr. Doran made misrepresentations to the court. Mr. Doran violated ER 3.4(c)(Knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of a tribunal). Mr. Doran failed to respond discovery/disclosure deadlines. He failed to respond to Mr. Ferris' Motion for Partial Summary Disposition, failed to respond to the Petition for Order to Show Cause, and failed to prepare a disclosure statement in violation of the Court's October 19, 2011 Order. Mr. Doran violated ER 8.4(c)(Knowing misrepresentations). Mr. Doran continually made statements about fulfilling his

obligations to his client, Mr. Ferris, and the court. Mr. Doran violated ER 8.4(d)(Conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). Mr. Doran's failure to provide the legal services he was hired to provide caused thousands of dollars of unnecessary fees and costs by multiple parties and the unnecessary expenditure of judicial time. Mr. Doran violated Rule 54(c). Mr. Doran failed to comply with court orders, continues to be in contempt of such orders, and has failed to satisfy any of the judgments entered against him.

ABA STANDARDS ANALYSIS

The American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions* (*Standards*) are "a useful tool in determining the proper sanction." *In re Cardenas*, 164 Ariz. 149, 152, 791 P.2d 1032, 1035 (1990). In imposing a sanction, the following factors should be considered: (1) the duties violated; (2) the lawyer's mental state; (3) the actual or potential injury caused by the lawyer's misconduct; and (4) the existence of aggravating or mitigating factors. *Standard 3.0*.

Duties Violated

Mr. Doran violated his duty to his clients by violating ERs 1.15(d), 3.3(a), 3.4(c), 8.4(c) and (d); his duty to the public by violating ER 8.4(d); his duty to the legal system by violating ER 8.4(d) and Rule 43 (b) and (d); and his duty to the legal profession by violating ER 8.1(a) & (b), ER 8.4(c), and Rule 54(d), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.

The Lawyer's Mental State

Mr. Doran engaged in most—if not all—of the misconduct with a knowing or intentional state of mind (e.g., Mr. Doran told Ms. Budhu that he spent the money he was supposed to be holding on her behalf in his trust account).

The Extent of the Actual or Potential Injury

Mr. Doran's conduct resulted in actual harm. He misappropriated Ms. Budhu's money for a substantial period of time and he caused the beneficiaries in a probate matter to incur unnecessary and substantial attorney's fees.

Applicable Presumptive Standards

Mr. Doran violated his duty to Ms. Budhu, thereby implicating *Standard 4.11*: Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly converts client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.

Mr. Doran violated his duties to the profession. *Standard 6.11*: Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer, with the intent to deceive the court, makes a false statement, submits a false document, or improperly withholds material information, and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a party, or causes serious or potentially serious adverse effect on the legal proceeding.

Aggravation and Mitigation

The Hearing Panel finds the following aggravating factors and one mitigating factor are supported by reasonable evidence.¹

Aggravating Factors

Standard 9.22(a): prior disciplinary record:

- Informal reprimand 11/07/05 for violation of ERs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.16, and 8.4(d); two years probation from 11/07/05 – 02/29/08;
- Reprimand 07/12/12 for violation of ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.15(a), and 8.1(b), and Rules 43(b) and (d), and 54(d) Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.; two years probation 07/12/12; Hearing for probation violation 01/25/13.
- Suspension six months and one day, 04/05/13. In file nos. 11-1605 and 11-3102, Mr. Doran was reprimanded for violation of ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.15(a), and 8.1(b), and Rules 43(b) and (d), and 54(d) Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., and placed on probation for two years. Mr. Doran failed to fully

¹ Factors that may aggravate or mitigate the presumptive sanction "need only be supported by reasonable evidence." *In re Abrams*, 227 Ariz. 248, 252 ¶27, 257 P.3d 167, 171 (2011) (quoting *In re Peasley*, 208 Ariz. 27, 36 ¶36, 90 P.3d 764, 773 (2004)).

participate in probation and the State Bar filed a Notice of Non-Compliance on 01/25/13.

Standard 9.22(b): dishonest or selfish motion;

Standard 9.22(c): a pattern of misconduct;

Standard 9.22(d): multiple offenses;

Standard 9.22(e): bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency (i.e., Mr. Doran failed to respond in any of the three files);

Standard 9.22(i): substantial experience in the practice of law (Mr. Doran was admitted to practice law in Arizona on October 24, 1992).

Standard 9.22(j): indifference to making restitution (Mr. Doran has failed to pay court order sanctions).

Mitigating Factor

There are no mitigating factors.

RESTITUTION

The conduct deemed admitted as a result of the entry of default and notarized affidavits from Mr. Doran's clients, which were admitted at the Aggravation/Mitigation Hearing, establish by a preponderance of evidence that restitution should be ordered to Scott R. Ferris, Esq. for \$36,963.48., along with the statutory interest rate from January 14, 2013, until paid in full.

CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court "has long held that the objective of disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public, the profession and the administration of justice and not to punish the offender." *In re Alcorn*, 202 Ariz. 62, 74, 41 P.3d 600, 612 (2002) (quoting *In re Kastensmith*, 101 Ariz. 291, 294, 419 P.2d 75, 78 (1966)). It is also the purpose of lawyer discipline to "deter similar conduct by other lawyers." *In re Fioramonti*, 176 Ariz. 182, 187, 859 P.2d 1315, 1320 (1993) (citing *In re Rivkind*, 164 Ariz. 154, 157, 791 P.2d 1037, 1040 (1990)). Another goal of lawyer regulation is to protect and instill public confidence in the integrity of individual

members of the State Bar. *In re Horwitz*, 180 Ariz. 20, 29, 881 P.2d 352, 361 (1994) (citing *In re Loftus*, 171 Ariz. 672, 675, 832 P.2d 689, 692 (1992)).

The Hearing Panel has made the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, and utilized the facts deemed admitted, the ABA *Standards* (including *Standards* addressing aggravating and mitigating factors), and the goals of the attorney discipline system to determine an appropriate disciplinary sanction. The presumptive disciplinary sanction is disbarment and disbarment is warranted.

Based upon the foregoing, the Hearing Panel orders as follows:

IT IS ORDERED, disbarring **William F. Doran, Bar No. 014400**, from the practice of law effective immediately.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, Mr. Doran shall pay \$36,963.48 to Scott R. Ferris, Esq. with interest at the legal rate accruing from January 14, 2013.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, Mr. Doran shall pay the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings as approved by the Hearing Panel

A Final Judgment and Order will follow.

DATED this 21th day of November, 2013.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

CONCURRING:

Noel A. Fidel

Judge Noel A. Fidel (Retired), Volunteer Attorney Member

Douglas S. Pilcher

Douglas S. Pilcher, Volunteer Public Member

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk
of the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this 21st day of November, 2013.

Copy of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this 21st day of November, 2013, to:

William F. Doran
Post Office Box 54099
Phoenix, Arizona 85078-4099
Email: wdoransr@aol.com
Respondent

Copy of the foregoing emailed/ hand delivered
this 21st day of November, 2013, to:

Shauna R. Miller
Senior Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: lro@staff.azbar.org

Sandra Montoya
Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6288

by: MSmith

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE
1501 W. WASHINGTON, SUITE 102, PHOENIX, AZ 85007-3231

IN THE MATTER OF A SUSPENDED
MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

WILLIAM F. DORAN,
Bar No. 014400

Respondent.

PDJ-2013-9076

[State Bar File Nos. 12-1643, 13-
0901, 13-1277]

JUDGMENT AND ORDER

FILED DECEMBER 12, 2013

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, in conjunction with a duly appointed hearing panel, has rendered a decision in the above-captioned matter. Accordingly:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent, **William F. Doran, Bar. No. 014404**, is hereby disbarred for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, effective immediately and his name is hereby stricken from the roll of lawyers. Mr. Doran is no longer entitled to the rights and privileges of a lawyer but remains subject to the jurisdiction of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be subject to terms and conditions of probation that may be imposed by a hearing panel as a result of reinstatement hearings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 72, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., Respondent shall immediately comply with the requirements relating to notification of clients and others.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent pay restitution to the following persons in the following amounts:

Scott R. Ferris, Esq. . . . \$36,963.48

Interest shall accrue from January 14, 2013 at the statutory interest rate until paid in full.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$2,017.70, within thirty (30) days from the date of entry of this Order. There are no costs or expenses incurred by the disciplinary clerk and/or Presiding Disciplinary Judge's Office in connection with these disciplinary proceedings.

DATED this 12th day of December, 2013.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk
of the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this 12th day of December, 2013.

Copy of the foregoing mailed/mailed
this 12th day of December, 2013, to:

William F. Doran
P.O .Box 54099
Phoenix, AZ 85078-4099
Email: wdoransr@aol.com
Respondent

Copy of the foregoing emailed/hand-delivered
this 12th day of December, 2013, to:

Shauna R. Miller
Senior Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: lro@staff.azbar.org

Sandra Montoya
Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6288

by: MSmith