DEC 04 2017

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THOMAS EDWARD GATES,

Lawyer (Bar No. 34010).

Proceeding No. 17#00063

ODC File No(s). 17-00359

STIPULATION TO ADMONITION

Under Rule 9.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), is entered into by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) of the Washington State Bar Association (Association) through disciplinary counsel M Craig Bray and Respondent lawyer Thomas Edward Gates.

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 Stipulation to Discipline

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

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

1	avoid the risk, time, and expense attendant to further proceedings.
2	I. ADMISSION TO PRACTICE
3	1. Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of Washington on October 27,
4	2003.
5	II. STIPULATED FACTS
6	2. Dianne Sullivan executed a will on March 23, 2012.
7	3. In the will, Dianne ¹ stated that she had three children, "Elisabeth Cole, Ranse
8	Sullivan, and a third child, Russ Eastland, who was adopted at birth."
9	4. The will bequeathed nothing to Elisabeth, but bequeathed \$1,000 to Mr. Eastland,
10	and left the remainder of the estate in three equal shares to Ranse, "my granddaughter Keara
11	Sullivan [Ranse's daughter], and my grandson Elijah Cole [Elisabeth Cole's minor son]."
12	5. Ranse, Elisabeth, Elijah, Keara, and Mr. Eastland were all potential heirs of Dianne's
13	estate.
14	6. The will nominated Ranse as personal representative (PR).
15	7. Dianne died in October 2015.
16	8. Ranse hired Respondent to probate the estate.
17	9. Ranse gave Respondent a copy of the 2012 will.
18	10. The copy of the will did not include an affidavit signed by the witnesses to its
9	execution.
20	11. Ranse told Respondent that he contacted the will's witnesses and they refused to
21	provide an affidavit.
22	12. Respondent believed it would be difficult to have the will admitted to probate and
23	¹ Because some of the players share the same last name we use first names to avoid confusion.
4	Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL Page 2 OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

1	deemed valid without an affidavit.	
2	13. Respondent did not contact the will's witnesses or attempt to get an affidavit	
3	himself.	
4	14. Ranse falsely told Respondent that Elisabeth was dead.	
5	15. Respondent did not conduct an inquiry into the status of Diane's other family	
6	members that was adequate to determine if they were potential heirs.	
7	16. After consultation, Respondent and Ranse decided to file for an intestate probate.	
8	17. On January 19, 2016, Respondent filed an intestate Petition for Letters of	
9	Administration and Nonintervention Powers.	
10	18. Respondent did not disclose the existence of the 2012 will in the Petition.	
H	19. Respondent stated in the Petition that Ranse was the only heir.	
12	20. Ranse was not the only potential heir of the intestate estate.	
13	21. Elijah was a potential heir had Elisabeth actually been deceased.	
14	22. Mr. Eastland was a potential heir if he had been legally adopted by Dianne.	
15	23. Ranse was appointed PR of the intestate estate.	
16	24. Elisabeth hired lawyer Frank DeMarco in November 2016.	
17	25. Mr. DeMarco wrote a letter to Respondent seeking information about the probate	
8	action, notifying Respondent that Elisabeth was not dead, and expressing concern that the	
19	Petition did not acknowledge Elisabeth's existence.	
20	26. Mr. DeMarco filed a petition seeking to remove Ranse as PR and to admit a prior	
21	will of Dianne's that Elisabeth had in her possession.	
22	27. Respondent withdrew from the representation of Ranse for health reasons on January	
23	17, 2017. At the time, Elisabeth's motion to admit the prior will was pending.	
24	Stipulation to Discipline Page 3 OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539	

(206) 727-8207

1	28. Ranse hired a different lawyer to represent him.		
2	29. Ranse found the original 2012 will shortly thereafter. The witnesses, one of whom		
3.	a lawyer, provided an affidavit to its execution.		
4	30. The 2012 will and the affidavit were filed with the court.		
5	31. Probate continued under the terms of the 2012 will.		
6	III. STIPULATION TO MISCONDUCT		
7	32. By failing to attempt to obtain an affidavit from witnesses to the 2012 will, failing to		
8	disclose the existence of the will in the Petition, and failing to adequately inquire into the status		
9.	of other family members listed in the will to determine if they were potential heirs, Respondent		
10	violated RPC 1.1 (competence) and 1.3 (diligence).		
11	IV. PRIOR DISCIPLINE		
12	33. Respondent does not have any prior public discipline.		
13	V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS		
14	34. The following American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions		
15	(1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case:		
16	4.4 Lack of Diligence		
	4.41 Disbarment is generally appropriate when:		
17	(a) a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or		
18	(b) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and		
	causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or		
19	(c) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client.		
20	4.42 Suspension is generally appropriate when:		
	(a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and		
21	causes injury or potential injury to a client, or (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or		
22	potential injury to a client,		
	4.43 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does		
23	not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes		
24	injury or potential injury to a client. Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL		
₩ "}	Page 4 OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207		

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

Page 5

24

Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207

expenditure of additional resources by the Respondent and ODC. Both the Respondent and ODC acknowledge that the result after further proceedings in this matter might differ from the result agreed to herein.

- 53. This Stipulation is not binding upon ODC 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.
- 54. 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.
- 55. Under ELC 3.1(b), all documents that form the record before the Hearing Officer for his or her review become public information on approval of the Stipulation by the Hearing Officer, unless disclosure is restricted by order or rule of law.
- 56. If this Stipulation is approved by the Hearing Officer, it will be followed by the disciplinary action agreed to in this Stipulation. All notices required in the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct will be made.
- 57. If this Stipulation is not approved by the Hearing Officer, this Stipulation will have no force or effect, and neither it nor the fact of its execution will be admissible as evidence in the pending disciplinary proceeding, in any subsequent disciplinary proceeding, or in any civil or criminal action.

1	WHEREFORE the undersigned being fully advised, adopt and agree to this Stipulation
2	to Discipline as set forth above.
3	Thomas E Salet Dated: 11/21/17
4	Thomas Edward Gates, Bar No. 34010 Respondent
5	
6	Dated: 11/27/2017 M Craig Bray, Bar No. 20821
7	Disciplinary Counsel
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Agenus Suite 600

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

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD		
7	OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION		
8	In re	Proceeding No. 17#00063	
9		•	
10	THOMAS EDWARD GATES,	ADMONITION	
11	Lawyer (Bar No. 34010).		
12 13	Pursuant to Rule 13.5 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct, the following		
14	Admonition was issued by the Disciplinary Boa	ard Chair.	
	I. ADMISSION	N TO PRACTICE	
15 16	At all times material to the complain	t, you were licensed to practice in the state of	
	Washington.		
17	II. F	FACTS	
18	You were hired by the son of a deceased woman to file a probate action and have the son		
19 20	appointed personal representative of the estate.		
20	You filed a petition for intestate probate that stated there was no will and that the son		
22	was the only heir of the estate.		
23	But the son had provided you with a copy of a will that was not accompanied by an		
24	affidavit of witnesses attesting to its execution. Although this will might have been deemed		

1	invalid by the court, you should nevertheless have disclosed its existence to the court.	
2	The heir who hired you was not the only heir to the estate. The will named other family	
3	members of the decedent who potentially could have taken shares of the estate under either the	
4	will or the law of intestacy. You should have conducted an inquiry into the status of these other	
5	family members and either ruled them out as potential heirs or listed them in the petition.	
6	III. MISCONDUCT	
7	Your conduct described above violated Rules 1.1 (competence) and 1.3 (diligence) of	
8	the Rules of Professional Conduct.	
9	IV. ADMONITION	
10	YOU ARE HEREBY ADMONISHED FOR THIS MISCONDUCT. This admonition is	
11	not a disciplinary sanction, but is a disciplinary action, and shall be admissible in evidence in	
12	subsequent discipline or disability proceedings involving you.	
13		
14	Dated this day of, 2017.	
15		
16	Marc L. Silverman, Chairperson	
17	Disciplinary Board	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		