1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

FILED

NOV 2 6 2012

DISCIPLINARY BOARD

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re

._. |

Under Rule 9.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), the following

Stipulation to a three year suspension is entered into by the Washington State Bar Association

Proceeding No. 09#00102

DRAKE DEE MESENBRINK,

Lawyer (Bar No. 16711).

STIPULATION TO SUSPENSION

12

1314

15

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

2324

(Association), through disciplinary counsel Debra Slater, Respondent lawyer Drake Dee Mesenbrink, and Respondent's counsel Kurt M. Bulmer.

Respondent understands that he is entitled under the ELC to a hearing, to present exhibits and witnesses on his behalf, and to have a hearing officer determine the facts, misconduct and sanction in this case. Respondent further understands that he is entitled under the ELC to appeal the outcome of a hearing to the Disciplinary Board, and, in certain cases, the Supreme Court. Respondent further understands that a hearing and appeal could result in an outcome more favorable or less favorable to him. Respondent chooses to resolve this

proceeding now by entering into the following stipulation to facts, misconduct and sanction to

avoid the risk, time, and expense attendant to further proceedings.

Stipulation to Discipline Page 1

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207

1	letter dated October 9, 2007, which is the letter he stated he had sent to Werner.		
2	12. The October 9, 2007 letter was not created on October 9, 2007, but actually had been		
3	created by Respondent on December 23, 2008, at around the same time he prepared his		
4	Response to the Werner grievance.		
5	13. Respondent backdated the letter to make it appear that he had sent it to Werne		
6	during the time he represented him.		
7	14. Respondent knew that the October 9, 2007 letter he sent to the Association was		
8	fabricated.		
9	15. Respondent's statements that he had sent the October 9, 2007 letter to Werner were		
10	false and Respondent knew they were false.		
11	16. Respondent fabricated the letter and falsely stated that he had sent it to Werner in		
12	order to benefit himself by misleading the disciplinary process and avoiding discipline.		
13	17. After receiving notice of Werner's concerns, Respondent notified his malpractice		
14	insurance carrier of a possible claim against him by Werner.		
15	18. The Association sent a copy of Respondent's response, including the purported		
16	October 9, 2007 letter to Werner.		
17	19. Werner denied ever having received the October 9, 2007 letter.		
18	20. Werner's reply was sent to Respondent.		
19	21. Respondent replied to the Association on February 12, 2008.		
20	22. In his reply, Respondent stated:		
21	I drafted the letter which Mr. Werner claims he did not receive. My assistant mailed the letter to the address Mr. Werner provided to my		
22	office, which is the same address that all documents were mailed to Mr. Werner.		
23			
24	23. The statements in Respondent's February 12, 2008 letter to the Association were		
	Stipulation to Discipline WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION		

1	false.
2	24. Respondent knew that the statements were false.
3	25. Respondent made the false statement in order to benefit himself by misleading the
4	disciplinary process and avoiding discipline.
5	26. On April 20, 2009, the Association requested that Respondent provide the
6	Association with his complete client file for Werner.
7	27. On May 1, 2009, Respondent provided what he asserted was a complete copy of the
8	Werner file.
9	28. The file contained a copy of the fabricated October 9, 2007 letter.
10	29. Respondent submitted the file to the Association knowing it contained the fabricated
11	October 9, 2007 letter.
12	30. The file also contained a document purported to be a client ledger for Werner.
13	31. The client ledger contained an entry on October 9, 2007 that stated: "Letter to client.
14	Re: recommended settlement- NC."
15	32. The notation NC meant that Respondent did not charge Werner for that work.
16	33. Respondent had altered the client ledger on December 23, 2008 in order to
17	corroborate his false statements that he had created the October 9, 2007 letter on that date.
18	34. The fabricated letter and the altered client ledger were not part of the original client
19	file.
20	35. Respondent submitted the client ledger to the Association knowing it contained the
21	false and fabricated October 9, 2007 entry.
22	36. Respondent submitted the false client ledger in order to benefit himself by
23	misleading the disciplinary process and avoiding discipline.
24	

1	37. On May 21, 2009, Respondent submitted a copy of a second client ledger for
2	Werner's matter. The client ledger reflected the same false entry regarding the October 9, 2007
3	letter.
4	38. Respondent submitted the second false client ledger in order to benefit himself by
5	misleading the disciplinary process and avoiding discipline.
6	39. On January 14, 2010, the Association filed a Formal Complaint, alleging that
7	Respondent made false statements to the Association during its investigation of the Werner
8	grievance, that Respondent had provided falsified documents to the Association, and that
9	Respondent failed to provide a truthful response to the Association during its investigation of
10	the Werner grievance.
11	40. On February 22, 2010, Respondent filed his Answer to the Formal Complaint. In his
12	Answer, he admitted that he had made false statements to the Association, provided falsified
13	documents to the Association, and failed to provide a truthful response to the Association during
14	its investigation of the Werner grievance.
15	III. STIPULATION TO MISCONDUCT
16	41. By submitting falsified documents to the Association during its investigation of the
17	grievance filed by Werner, Respondent violated RPC 8.1(a), RPC8.4(c), and RPC 8.4(d).
18	42. By making false statements to the Association in the December 23, 2008 letter, the
19	February 12, 2009 letter, and the Werner client ledgers, Respondent violated RPC 8.1(a), RPC
20	8.4(c), and RPC 8.4(d).
21	43. By failing to provide a full and complete response to the Association in its
22	investigation of the Werner grievance and knowingly making false statements of material fact in
23	his response, Respondent violated RPC 8.1(a), RPC 8.4(<i>l</i>), and ELC 5.3(e).

24 |

1 IV. PRIOR DISCIPLINE 2 44. Respondent has no prior discipline. 3 V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS 4 45. The following American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions 5 (1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case: 6 ABA Standard 7.0 applies to Respondent's violation of RPC 8.1(a), 8.4(c), and 8.4(l). 7 **Disbarment** is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages 7.1 in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional with the 8 intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another, and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client, the public, or the legal system. 9 Respondent knowingly made false statements of material fact to the Association, 10 knowing submitted the fabricated October 9, 2007 letter and falsified client ledger to the 11 Association in connection with this disciplinary matter. There was serious injury to his client, 12 the public and the legal system as a result of Respondent's conduct. The public's confidence in 13 the legal system was seriously eroded because of Respondent's actions, and the legal system 14 was injured because the Office of Disciplinary Counsel was required to expend additional 15 resources to uncover what actually occurred. The presumptive sanction is disbarment. 16 ABA Standard 6.1 applies to Respondent's violation of RPC 8.4(d): 17 6.11 **Disbarment** is generally appropriate when a lawyer, with the intent to deceive the court, makes a false statement, submits a false document, or 18 improperly withholds material information, and causes serious or 19 potentially serious injury to a party, or causes a significant or potentially significant adverse effect on the legal proceeding. 20 21 Respondent intentionally submitted false documents to the Association. His actions 22 caused unnecessary delay in the disciplinary proceedings and imposed an additional burden on 23 the Association in investigating the Werner grievance. There was serious injury to the legal 24

24

system and the discipline system in particular as additional investigation was required to determine whether Respondent's submissions were, in fact, truthful. Creating false documents to cover up misconduct prejudices the administration of justice, tarnishes the profession in the eyes of the public, and unnecessarily delays the disciplinary proceedings.

The presumptive sanction is disbarment.

The following aggravating factors apply under ABA Standards Section 9.22:

- (b) dishonest or selfish motive;
- (d) multiple offenses;
- substantial experience in the practice of law [Respondent was admitted in Washington on May 20, 1987].

The following mitigating factors apply under ABA Standards Section 9.32:

- (a) absence of prior disciplinary records;
- (b) personal or emotional problems;
- (1) remorse.

Respondent has a history of depression and anxiety disorder, some of which stems from significant childhood abuse. He experiences extreme panic attacks in response to stress. These attacks manifest as extreme anxiety and include vomiting, heart palpitations, and crying.

After the incident that is the subject of the grievance, Respondent consulted Dr. David Wait, a psychiatrist. Dr. Wait diagnosed Respondent as suffering from major depression. According to Dr. Wait, the major depression and Respondent's anxiety combined to the point that it interfered with Respondent's ability to make proper choices, leading to Respondent's irrational and self-destructive conduct. Dr. Wait has indicated that this combination of depression and anxiety likely significantly contributed to Respondent's actions in this case and that the pattern of compulsive, self-abusive behavior was a considerable factor in the poor choices Respondent made.

Dr. Wait prescribed medication to deal with the depression and therapy to deal with long-standing issues that are significant in Respondent's depression. Respondent began a

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
	9	
	0	
2		-
	2	
2	3	I

therapeutic relationship with Emily Hart, LCPC. He also continued to see Dr. Wait. According to Dr. Wait, Respondent has significantly improved. Dr. Wait also reports that with the individual therapy and anti-depressants, it would be unlikely that this kind of event would occur again as it is out of character for Respondent. Dr. Wait's medical records regarding Respondent have been provided to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

Respondent is currently taking medication to control his depression. Because of issues with his health insurance, he is no longer seeing Dr. Wait or Emily Hart. However, he continues in therapy with a different doctor.

Respondent has been deposed by the Association and has demonstrated clear remorse and understanding of the nature and character of his actions.

Based on the factors set forth above, the presumptive sanction should be mitigated to a three year suspension.

VI. STIPULATED DISCIPLINE

46. The parties stipulate that Respondent will receive a three year suspension. Respondent's reinstatement is conditioned on payment of all costs.

VII. RESTITUTION

47. Restitution is not appropriate in this case.

VIII. COSTS AND EXPENSES

48. Respondent shall pay attorney fees and administrative costs of \$2,750.95 in accordance with ELC 13.9(i). The Association will seek a money judgment under ELC 13.9(l) if these costs are not paid within 30 days of approval of this stipulation.

IX. VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT

49. Respondent states that prior to entering into this Stipulation he had an opportunity to consult independent legal counsel regarding this Stipulation, that Respondent is entering into

24

this Stipulation voluntarily, and that no promises or threats have been made by the Association, nor by any representative thereof, to induce the Respondent to enter into this Stipulation except as provided herein.

X. LIMITATIONS

- 50. This Stipulation is a compromise agreement intended to resolve this matter in accordance with the purposes of lawyer discipline while avoiding further proceedings and the expenditure of additional resources by the Respondent and the Association. Both the Respondent lawyer and the Association acknowledge that the result after further proceedings in this matter might differ from the result agreed to herein.
- 51. This Stipulation is not binding upon the Association or the respondent as a statement of all existing facts relating to the professional conduct of the respondent lawyer, and any additional existing facts may be proven in any subsequent disciplinary proceedings.
- 52. This Stipulation results from the consideration of various factors by both parties, including the benefits to both by promptly resolving this matter without the time and expense of hearings, Disciplinary Board appeals, and Supreme Court appeals or petitions for review. As such, approval of this Stipulation will not constitute precedent in determining the appropriate sanction to be imposed in other cases; but, if approved, this Stipulation will be admissible in subsequent proceedings against Respondent to the same extent as any other approved Stipulation.
- 53. Under Disciplinary Board policy, in addition to the Stipulation, the Disciplinary Board shall have available to it for consideration all documents that the parties agree to submit to the Disciplinary Board, and all public documents. Under ELC 3.1(b), all documents that form the record before the Board for its review become public information on approval of the