BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

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

KRISTINA REEVES, Bar No. 031171

Respondent.

PDJ 2019-9102

FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER

State Bar No. 19-1650

FILED DECEMBER 31, 2019

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge accepted the parties' Agreement for Discipline by Consent pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.

Accordingly:

IT IS ORDERED Respondent, KRISTINA REEVES, Bar No. 031171, is reprimanded for her conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Respondent shall pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$1,200.00, within thirty (30) days from the date of this order. The are no costs or expenses incurred by the Office of the

Presiding Disciplinary Judge in the proceedings.

DATED this 31st day of December, 2019.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed this 31st day of December, 2019, to:

Anne. E. McClellan
J. Scott Rhoads
Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, PLC
One East Washington Street
Suite 1900
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2554
Emails: amcclellen@jsslaw.com
srhoads@jsslaw.com

Respondent's Counsel

David L. Sandweiss Senior Bar Counsel State Bar of Arizona 4201 N 24th Street, Suite 100 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266 Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: MSmith

BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

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

KRISTINA REEVES, Bar No. 031171

Respondent.

PDJ 2019-9012

DECISION ACCEPTING
DISCIPLINE BY CONSENT

[State Bar No. 19-1650]

FILED DECEMBER 31, 2019

Under Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., an Agreement for Discipline by Consent ("Agreement"), was filed on December 20, 2019. A Probable Cause Order issued on November 19, 2019 but nor formal complaint has been filed. The State Bar of Arizona is represented by Senior Bar Counsel David L. Sandweiss and Ms. Reeves is represented by Anne McClellan and J. Scott Rhodes, *Jennings, Strouss & Salmon*, PLC.

Rule 57 requires admissions be tendered solely "...in exchange for the stated form of discipline...." Under that rule, the right to an adjudicatory hearing is waived only if the "...conditional admission and proposed form of discipline is approved...." If the agreement is not accepted, those conditional admissions are automatically withdrawn and shall not be used against the parties in any subsequent proceeding. Ms. Reeves has voluntarily waived the right to an adjudicatory hearing, and waived all motions, defenses, objections or requests that could be asserted upon approval of the

proposed form of discipline. Notice of the Agreement and an opportunity to object within five (5) days pursuant to Rule 53(b)(3), is unnecessary as the State Bar is the complainant.

The Agreement details a factual basis to support the conditional admissions. It is incorporated by this reference. Ms. Reeves admits she violated Rule 42, ER 8.4(c) (engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation). The parties stipulate to a reprimand and the payment of costs of \$1,200.00 within 30 days from this order.

The parties stipulate that in May 2019, Ms. Reeves plagiarized her judicial application for appointment to the Arizona Court of Appeals. She subsequently withdrew her application.

The parties agree Ms. Reeves knowingly violated her duties to the legal profession and the public. Her conduct caused actual harm to the profession and the public. ABA *Standards* 5.13, *Failure to Maintain Personal Integrity* and 7.2, *Violations of Other Duties Owed as a Professional* apply, and the presumptive sanction is suspension.

The parties agree that aggravating factor 9.22(i) substantial experience in the practice of law is present. The parties further agree that factors 9.32(a) absence of prior disciplinary offenses, (c) personal or emotional problems, (d) timely good faith effort

¹ Evidence of this factor was sealed by protective order.

to make restitution or to rectify consequences of misconduct, (e) full and free disclosure to disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings, (g) character or reputation,² (k) imposition of other penalties or sanctions³ and, (l) remorse are present. The parties stipulate that based on the mitigation present, a reduction of the presumptive sanction to reprimand is appropriate.

IT IS ORDERED accepting the Agreement and incorporating it with any supporting documents by this reference. A final judgment and order is signed this date.

DATED this 31st day of December 2019.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

COPY of the foregoing e-mailed/mailed on this 31st day of December 2019, to:

Anne. E. McClellan
J. Scott Rhoads
Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, PLC
One East Washington Street
Suite 1900
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2554
Emails: amcclellen@jsslaw.com
srhoads@jsslaw.com

² Numerous letters were offered in support of this factor.

³ While Respondent's public and personal humiliation is a mitigating factor, it is not considered a penalty or sanction. *See Matter of Walker*, 200 Ariz. 155 (2001).

David L. Sandweiss Senior Bar Counsel State Bar of Arizona 4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266 Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: MSmith