

1 In re Application of Kantor.

2 [Cite as In re Application of Kantor (1997), \_\_\_\_\_Ohio St.3d \_\_\_\_\_.]

3 *Attorneys at law -- Application to register as candidate for admission*  
4 *to the practice of law -- Application denied when applicant fails*  
5 *to prove his character and fitness to practice law -- Applicant*  
6 *may reapply for admission to take the July 1997 bar*  
7 *examination subject to second complete character and fitness*  
8 *investigation.*

9 (No. 97-413 -- Submitted March 31, 1997 -- Decided June 18, 1997.)

10 ON CERTIFIED REPORT of the Board of Commissioners on Character  
11 and Fitness of the Supreme Court, No. 150.

12 In January 1996, Matthew Kantor of Columbus (“applicant”)  
13 registered for admission to the practice of law in Ohio and in April 1996  
14 applied to take the July 1996 bar examination. Two members of the  
15 Columbus Bar Association Admissions Committee (“committee”)  
16 interviewed the applicant and concluded that he did not possess the  
17 qualifications required for admission to the practice of law. Two other  
18 committee members conducted another interview and likewise concluded  
19 that the applicant did not possess the necessary qualifications. The  
20 committee then filed a report with the Board of Commissioners on

1 Character and Fitness of the Supreme Court (“board”) and recommended  
2 that applicant not be approved for admission to the practice of law.  
3 Applicant appealed the committee’s recommendation, and a hearing was  
4 held in January 1997 before a panel of the board.

5 The panel received evidence with respect to applicant’s employment  
6 as a legal assistant with a Columbus, Ohio law firm, events leading to his  
7 termination from that firm, and the manner in which he described these  
8 events on his application for bar admission. Specifically, the panel received  
9 evidence about the applicant’s keeping of time sheets, his attitude toward  
10 the tasks assigned to him, his tardy filing of documents with the court, and  
11 the quality of his work. There was further evidence that applicant had  
12 falsely answered a question on his admissions application. Two panel  
13 members concluded that the applicant had the present character, fitness and  
14 moral qualifications for admission to the practice of law in Ohio and  
15 recommended that he be permitted to take the February 1997 Ohio Bar  
16 examination. One panel member concluded that because of applicant’s false  
17 statement on his application, his failure to provide certain other information  
18 during the application review process, his involvement in acts of dishonesty,

1 and his demonstrated lack of diligence and neglect of professional  
2 obligations, applicant was not presently qualified to take the bar  
3 examination and recommended that applicant not be allowed to sit for the  
4 examination before July 1997.

5 The board adopted the findings of the dissenting panel member and  
6 recommended that the current application of the applicant be disapproved,  
7 that the applicant be permitted to reapply to take the July 1997 bar  
8 examination, and that upon reapplication, the applicant be required to  
9 submit to a second complete character and fitness investigation.

10

---

11 *Keith McNamara and Michael R. Moran*, for Columbus Bar  
12 Association Admissions Committee.

13 *Charles W. Kettlewell*, for applicant.

14

---

15 *Per Curiam*. We accept the board's findings, conclusions and  
16 recommendations. Applicant is hereby authorized to reapply for  
17 authorization to take the July 1997 bar examination. Costs of these  
18 proceedings are taxed to the applicant.

1

*Judgment accordingly.*

2

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY and PFEIFER, JJ.,

3

concur.

4

COOK and LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., dissent and would require

5

applicant to wait and reapply for the July 1998 bar examination.