

continued from page 41

practice of law since his suspension, we conclude a longer suspension is necessary to protect the public and the legal profession. The aggravating circumstances (pattern of misconduct and refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of conduct) also support a longer suspension.

Accordingly, we hereby suspend attorney Martin Crowley from the practice of law in Nevada for 18 months from the date of this order. Crowley shall refund Hummel \$400 within 30 days of the date of this order. Further, Crowley shall pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings, including \$2,500 under SCR 120, within 60 days from the date of this order. (While Crowley challenges the imposition of costs and fees, we conclude the SCR 120 fees apply to this matter, are reasonable, and Crowley was on notice that reasonable fees would be assessed.) Should Crowley seek reinstatement, the conditions placed on his reinstatement in the prior suspension order still apply, and he also shall be required to pay the costs from this matter and the refund to Hummel before seeking reinstatement. The State Bar shall comply with SCR 121.1. It is so ORDERED.

In Re: AARON A. AQUINO

Bar No.: 11772

Case Nos.: OBC 16-0995 and OBC 16-1226

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

To Aaron Aquino:

On Friday, August 25, 2017 a Hearing Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Panel convened to determine whether your representation of your clients violated the Rules of Professional Conduct.

In the first matter, OBC 16-0995, you agreed to represent your clients in a personal injury case which resulted from a motor vehicle accident. The case had originally been filed by other attorneys; however your representation on the matter began on July 13, 2015.

On December 17, 2015, the insurance company filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on behalf of their insured. Your office failed to file an opposition. Approximately one month later the time to respond to the Motion had lapsed, you filed a motion to remand the matter to state court and sought an extension to respond to the Motion for Summary Judgment.

The motion for extension of time was denied because you failed to demonstrate excusable grounds for failing to respond in a timely fashion and your motion to remand was denied as being without merit. The insurance company was subsequently granted \$32,025.00 from your clients.

While it is true that you did not file the suit which was flawed from the outset because your clients had not complied with the terms of the insurance contract, you failed to act with reasonable diligence with regard to your representation of your clients by failing to timely respond to the Motion for Summary Judgment. As such you violated Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3 (Diligence). Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3 provides that: "A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client."

In the second matter, OBC 16-0995, you again represented your clients in a personal injury matter. In this case, your three clients sought treatment from a practitioner of "Oriental Medicine," subsequent to a motor vehicle accident. At the culmination of treatment the Doctor sent notice of the liens she had regarding this matter to your office to be paid. Your office initially sought to have the liens reduced, but when those efforts failed, you distributed the money to your clients and ignored the lien.

Rule of Professional Conduct 1.15(e) provides that: "When in the course of representation a lawyer is in possession of funds or other property in which two or more persons (one of whom may be the lawyer) claim interests, the property shall be kept separate by the lawyer until the dispute is resolved. The lawyer shall promptly distribute all portions of the funds or other property as to which the interests are not in dispute."

Since you failed to safe keep the funds and either pay the lien or interplead the monies in dispute you violated the Rule, and are hereby REPRIMANDED.

TIPS FROM THE OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL

Inactive Attorneys and the "Digital Footprint"

If, for any reason, your license changes from active to inactive, in addition to complying with the requirements of SCR 115 to notify your clients, opposing counsel and the courts (including the Nevada Supreme Court), you must also comply with RPC 5.5(d)(2)(iii), which prohibits a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in Nevada from representing or holding out to the public that he or she is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

In addition to removing any physical advertising materials, such as billboards, print ads, letterhead, business cards and signage, you must take care to scrub your "digital footprint:" the trail of data you leave when using the internet. Take care to update your website, email signatures and social media accounts (such as Facebook and LinkedIn) and remove any statements indicating that you are an active lawyer in this jurisdiction. Note that SCR 115(7) gives you 15 days to "wind down" your practice.