

# SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

---

CASE No. : 2001AP1784-D & 2003AP1743-D

COMPLETE TITLE :

In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings  
Against Virginia Rose Ray, Attorney at Law:

Office of Lawyer Regulation f/k/a Board of  
Attorneys  
Professional Responsibility,  
Complainant,

v.

Virginia Rose Ray,  
Respondent.

---

REINSTATEMENT PROCEEDINGS FOR RAY

---

ORDER FILED: March 16, 2011

SUBMITTED ON BRIEFS:

ORAL ARGUMENT:

---

SOURCE OF APPEAL:

COURT:

COUNTY:

JUDGE:

---

JUSTICES:

CONCURRED:

DISSENTED:

CONCURRED/DISSENTED CROOKS, J. concurs in part; dissents in part.

NOT PARTICIPATING:

---

ATTORNEYS:

# SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

## NOTICE

This order is subject to further editing and modification. The final version will appear in the bound volume of the official reports.

No. 2009AP2007-D & 2003AP1743-D

---

**In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings  
Against Virginia Rose Ray, Attorney at Law:**

**Office of Lawyer Regulation f/k/a Board of  
Attorneys  
Professional Responsibility,**

**Complainant,**

**v.**

**Virginia Rose Ray,**

**Respondent.**

**FILED**

**MAR 16, 2011**

A. John Voelker  
Acting Clerk of  
Supreme Court  
Madison, WI

---

The Court entered the following order on this date:

On May 18, 2009, Virginia Rose Ray filed a petition for reinstatement of her license to practice law in Wisconsin following her suspension for professional misconduct. See In re Disciplinary Proceedings Against Ray, 2004 WI 45, 270 Wis. 2d 651, 678 N.W.2d 246; In re Disciplinary Proceedings Against Ray, 2002 WI 116, 256 Wis. 2d 19, 651 N.W.2d 727. Attorney Stanley F. Hack was appointed referee. Hearings on the petition were held in Madison, Wisconsin, on July 20, September 14, 15, 16, 22, and 24, and October 24, 2010. The referee filed his report on December 13, 2010, concluding that Attorney Ray failed to prove by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence that she has satisfied the requisites for reinstatement under SCR 22.29(4) and (4m).<sup>1</sup> The referee found that Attorney Ray has

---

<sup>1</sup> SCR 22.29(4) provides:

The petition for reinstatement shall show all of the following:

(a) The petitioner desires to have the petitioner's license reinstated.

(b) The petitioner has not practiced law during the period of suspension or revocation.

(c) The petitioner has complied fully with the terms of the order of suspension or revocation and will continue to comply with them until the petitioner's license is reinstated.

(d) The petitioner has maintained competence and learning in the law by attendance at identified educational activities.

(e) The petitioner's conduct since the suspension or revocation has been exemplary and above reproach.

(f) The petitioner has a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards that are imposed upon members of the bar and will act in conformity with the standards.

(g) The petitioner can safely be recommended to the legal profession, the courts and the public as a person fit to be consulted by others and to represent them and otherwise act in matters of trust and confidence and in general to aid in the administration of justice as a member of the bar and as an officer of the courts.

(h) The petitioner has fully complied with the requirements set forth in SCR 22.26.

(j) The petitioner's proposed use of the license if reinstated.

(k) A full description of all of the petitioner's business activities during the period of suspension or revocation.

practiced law during her suspension; has failed to fully comply with the terms of the order of her suspension; and has health issues that remain open and need attention. No appeal challenging the referee's findings and conclusions has been filed.

The referee's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation are approved and adopted. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for reinstatement is denied;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the file be placed under seal because it contains confidential information; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the day of this order, Virginia Rose Ray pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which total \$30,354.68 as of January 3, 2011.

Crooks, J., concurs in the denial of the petition for reinstatement and dissents from the portion of the order placing the file under seal.

---

(4m) The petitioner has made restitution to or settled all claims of persons injured or harmed by petitioner's misconduct, including reimbursement to the Wisconsin lawyers' fund for client protection for all payments made from that fund, or, if not, the petitioner's explanation of the failure or inability to do so.