

baseline sanction of disbarment is appropriate and that a lengthy suspension along with conditions for reinstatement is sufficient to serve the purpose of attorney discipline. We do not believe, however, that a four-year suspension is sufficient.

Accordingly, we hereby suspend attorney Amy M. Gamage from the practice of law in Nevada for five years and one day from the date of her temporary suspension, May 11, 2018. Gamage is jointly and severally responsible with her law partner for the payment of restitution to clients and lienholders as set forth in the State Bar's restitution chart. Such restitution sums may be reduced upon receipt of sufficient documentation demonstrating reasonable fees and costs and negotiations with lien holders. Funds paid to clients through the State Bar Client Security Fund shall be reimbursed to the fund. Restitution must be paid in full before Gamage seeks reinstatement. Gamage shall also pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings, including \$2,500 under SCR 120, within 30 days from the date of this order. The State Bar shall comply with SCR 121.1.

**It is so ORDERED.**

**CHANDAN MANANSINGH**

**Bar No.: 12033**

**Docket No.: 78582**

**Dated: 07/09/2019**

**ORDER OF REINSTATEMENT**

This is an automatic review of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's recommendation to reinstate suspended attorney Chandan Manansingh. As no briefs have been filed, this matter stands submitted for decision. SCR 116(2).

This court suspended Manansingh from the practice of law for four years and required he pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings. Manansingh's suspension term has passed, he has paid the costs, and the panel has recommended he be reinstated to the practice of law in Nevada.

Based on our de novo review, we agree with the panel's conclusions that Manansingh has satisfied his burden in seeking reinstatement by clear and convincing evidence. SCR 116(2); *Application of Wright*, 75 Nev. 111, 112-13, 335 P.3d 609, 610 (1959) (reviewing a petition for reinstatement de novo). We therefore approve the panel's recommendation that the petition be granted and Manansingh be reinstated.

Accordingly, Chandan Manansingh is hereby reinstated to the practice of law in Nevada. Additionally, Manansingh shall pay the costs of the reinstatement proceeding, including \$2,500 under SCR 120, within 30 days of this order, if he has not done so already.

**It is so ORDERED.**

1. Taylor is currently suspended. *In re Discipline of Taylor*, Docket No. 75437 (Order of Suspension, July 19, 2018).
2. The first complaint concerned Taylor's breach of probation from a 2015 disciplinary matter and grievances regarding misappropriation of one client's funds and allegations that he had fraudulently obtained loans in his clients' names. The second complaint was filed following an audit of Taylor's accounts and alleged commingling of personal and client funds and misappropriation of client funds. Taylor answered the first complaint filed on August 20, 2018. The second complaint filed on November 13, 2018, was served on Taylor through regular and certified mail and the State Bar attempted personal service of the complaint.
3. The amended complaint and the notice of intent to take a default were served on Dennie through regular and certified mail. The amended complaint, the order appointing the hearing panel chair, and the scheduling order were emailed to Dennie. Dennie attended one telephonic conference on October 23, 2018, and bar counsel spoke with Dennie by phone the day before the hearing and Dennie confirmed that he knew when the hearing was occurring. Yet, Dennie did not appear at the hearing.
4. The State Bar sent the bar complaint and notice of intent to enter default to Gamage through first-class mail and certified mail at his SCR 79 address and an alternative address, as well as through email. Gamage's failure to respond resulted in entry of a default judgment. Following default and the disciplinary hearing, Gamage was permitted to provide mitigation information to the hearing panel.

**TIPS FROM THE OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL**

**Can I Venmo you?**

Modern society loves the convenience of peer-to-peer apps like Venmo. Writing a check feels almost medieval. Anyone with a mobile phone can simply input a name and an amount, and send money. But these apps present unique challenges to a lawyer.

First, peer-to-peer apps have privacy and security concerns. They often announce payments to other users. This social feature is great for announcing your payment to a favorite pizza place, but terrible for announcing that an abused spouse just sent money to a divorce lawyer.

Second, peer-to-peers apps have financial risks. A lawyer must connect an account to withdraw the money. Advanced fees should go into a client trust account. But connecting an IOLTA to a peer-to-peer app often leads to misappropriation. If you split the tab at happy hour without a sufficient balance, then Venmo will draw from your clients' IOLTA. Venmo's own terms of service state, "if you have a personal account, you are not permitted to use Venmo as a payment method for purchases of goods and services."

Peer-to-peer money transfer apps are not ready for the legal industry just yet. The Office of Bar Counsel recommends you stick with good old cash, check or credit card.