- 1 Erie-Huron Counties Joint Certified Grievance Committee v. Miles.
- 2 [Cite as Erie-Huron Counties Joint Certified Grievance Commt. v. Miles
- 3 (1996), ____Ohio St. 3d _____.]

Attorneys at law -- Misconduct -- One-year suspension from date of 4 5 announcement of order -- Failing to maintain complete records of all funds and properties of client coming into attorney's 6 7 possession -- Failing to promptly pay or deliver funds, securities, or other properties in attorney's possession which 8 9 client is entitled to receive -- Commingling client and office 10 funds in attorney's escrow account and failing to return funds when requested, or not accounting for funds retained in a 11 businesslike fashion. 12 (No. 96-917 -- Submitted June 25, 1996 -- Decided October 2, 1996.) 13 14 On Certified Report by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances 15 and Discipline of the Supreme Court, No. 95-61. On October 23, 1995, relator, Erie -Huron Counties Joint Certified 16 17 Grievance Committee, filed a six-count amended complaint charging 18 respondent, Gaye Harris Miles of Sandusky, Ohio, Attorney Registration No. 0037220, with violations of DR 9-102(B)(3) (failing to maintain 19 complete records of all funds and properties of a client coming into 20 21 possession of an attorney) and 9-102(B)(4)(failing to promptly pay or

1	deliver to the client as requested by a client the funds, securities or other
2	properties in possession of an attorney which the client is entitled to
3	receive). The respondent filed an answer, and a hearing was held on
4	January 19, 1996 before a panel of the Board of Commissioners on
5	Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court ("board").
6	The evidence adduced at the hearing and stipulations before the panel
7	were as follows: Carrie Shaw retained respondent in 1989 to pursue a
8	personal injury claim. Respondent settled the matter for \$7,500 and assured
9	Shaw that she would pay Shaw's chiropractor's fee of \$1,377 from the
10	proceeds. Respondent remitted \$4,052 to Shaw but failed to pay the
11	chiropractor. Two years later, the chiropractor sued Shaw and recovered
12	\$243 from Shaw's bank account. In 1994, after Shaw complained to relator,
13	respondent paid the chiropractor. During its investigation, relator
14	discovered that respondent's trust account was in disarray, repeatedly
15	overdrawn, and was frequently used to pay respondent's office expenses.
16	In February 1991, two of respondent's close friends, Valerie and
17	Tutse Tonwe, were arrested in Delaware and contacted respondent. After
18	respondent flew to Delaware, the Tonwes gave her blank checks on their

1	accounts and powers of attorney, and turned over their automobiles to her.
2	Respondent reported to the Tonwes that she had found \$16,500 in their
3	bank accounts, which she placed in her trust account. Respondent then
4	transferred the vehicles to her own name, and moved some of the Tonwes'
5	furniture from their offices to an airport storage unit and some to her own
6	office.
7	The Tonwes said that they gave possession of these assets to
8	respondent with the intention that she use them to set up a trust account for
9	the Tonwes' children. Respondent had a different understanding. Although
10	the Tonwes had retained a Dan Lyons as their attorney, respondent believed
11	that she had been retained by the Tonwes and that these assets were to cover
12	her legal fees.
13	In April 1991, the Tonwes found that they were running out of
14	money, respondent having used the funds to coordinate the Tonwes'
15	criminal defense. At that point the Tonwes demanded a return of the
16	automobiles, cash and other property. Respondent returned some cash and
17	one vehicle, but retained one automobile as security for her fees in

1 representing the Tonwes, which she claimed was at an agreed-upon rate of

2 \$200 per hour.

3	After federal authorities confiscated the car which respondent had
4	retained, respondent sued the Tonwes for her fees and the Tonwes
5	counterclaimed. The papers she filed with her lawsuit constituted the first
6	detailed accounting respondent provided to the Tonwes with respect to their
7	property. Shortly thereafter, respondent filed for bankruptcy. The
8	bankruptcy court found that respondent's debt to the Tonwes was
9	nondischargeable, but that the Tonwes owed fees for legal services to
10	respondent. The net result, as the bankruptcy court found in In re Harris-
11	Miles (Bankr.N.D.Ohio 1995), 187 B.R. 178, 183, was that respondent
12	owed the Tonwes \$2,595.
13	The panel found that respondent had violated DR 9-102(B)(3) and 9-
14	102(B)(4) in her representation of Shaw, and DR 9-102(A), 9-102 (B)(3),
15	and 9-102(B)(4) in her handling of the Tonwes' funds by commingling
16	client and office funds in her escrow account and failing to return funds
17	when requested, or not accounting for funds retained in a businesslike
18	fashion.

1	In mitigation, respondent produced several character witnesses,
2	including an assistant prosecuting attorney and an attorney in private
3	practice, who testified to her being a decent and honorable person. The
4	panel found that this was respondent's first offense and she had made
5	restitution in the Shaw matter and will do so in the Tonwes matter. The
6	panel recommended that respondent be suspended for one year with the
7	entire suspension stayed, provided that during one year stayed suspension,
8	she pay the bankruptcy court judgment, complete all continuing legal
9	education requirements, complete one year of monitored probation after the
10	period of suspension, and work with an accountant or an attorney familiar
11	with law office management to assure that she implements appropriate
12	practices and controls with respect to her client trust accounts.
13	The board adopted the findings, conclusions and recommendation of
14	the panel.
15	
16	Dennis E. Murray, Jr., for relator.
17	Geoffrey L. Oglesby, for respondent.
18	

1	Per Curiam. Canon 9 of our Code of Professional Responsibility
2	requires the separation of client funds from those of the lawyer, not only to
3	protect the client, but also to avoid even the appearance of impropriety. In
4	the Shaw case the lawyer mingled the client's funds with her own and in
5	both the Shaw and Tonwes cases she failed to maintain complete records
6	relating to her clients' funds. Moreover, respondent did not turn over funds
7	to the Tonwes promptly when requested nor did she promptly and
8	accurately account to either Shaw or the Tonwes for their funds and
9	property in her possession.
10	It is possible that neither client suffered monetary damage as a result
11	of respondent's lax attitude toward the client money in her control. Shaw's
12	physician was eventually paid, the Tonwes' property was eventually
13	returned, and the respondent was subjected to a judgment in favor of the
14	Tonwes for the \$2,595 she owed to them. But the chiropractor was paid
15	only after Shaw underwent the tribulation of an unnecessary lawsuit and
16	complained to relator about respondent, and the Tonwes obtained a
17	judgment against respondent only after a trial in the bankruptcy court.

1	The imposition on these clients was damage enough. But even if
2	there were no damage caused by respondent's actions, we would be
3	disinclined to relax our standards to the extent of imposing the one-year
4	stayed suspension proposed by the board. We hold it of the utmost
5	importance that attorneys maintain their personal and office accounts
6	separate from their clients' accounts and that the violation of that rule
7	warrants a substantial sanction whether or not the client has been harmed.
8	To find otherwise would be to encourage speculation with clients' accounts.
9	We therefore adopt the findings and conclusions of the board, but
10	direct that the respondent be suspended from the practice of law in Ohio for
11	one year from the date of the announcement of this order. Costs taxed to
12	respondent.
13	Judgment accordingly.
14	MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER and
15	STRATTON, JJ., concur.
16	Соок, J., dissents.
17	Cook, J., dissenting. According to the hearing panel, Miles secreted
18	assets of convicted criminals; was reprimanded by a federal court for

1	commiting "defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity"; lied to the
2	panel about paying Dr. Heilman, claiming that a basement flood destroyed
3	the cancelled check; and refused to return the Lincoln Continental, arguing
4	that it was payment for "legal fees," although the services she rendered were
5	non-legal. Moreover, Miles denied any wrongdoing other than a few
6	bookkeeping errors.
7	I question whether the minimal sanction recommended by the panel
8	members resulted from their troubling conclusion that "[t]his panel was not
9	as impressed with the Respondent's veracity as they were with her
10	emotions." The appropriately severe sanction is an indefinite suspension
11	from the practice of law.