

Nov 4, 2022

Disciplinary Board

Docket # 014

DISCIPLINARY BOARD
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MERWIN MOE SPENCER,

Lawyer (Bar No. 40963).

Proceeding No. 22#00022

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND HEARING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The undersigned Hearing Officer held a default hearing, on written submission, on October 14, 2020 under Rule 10.6 of the Washington Supreme Court's Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC).

FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW REGARDING CHARGED VIOLATIONS

- The Formal Complaint (Bar File No. 22#00020) charged Merwin Moe Spencer with misconduct as set forth therein. A copy of the Formal Complaint is attached to this decision.
- Under ELC 10.6(a)(4), the Hearing Officer finds that each of the facts set forth in the Formal Complaint is admitted and established.
- 3. Under ELC 10.6(a)(4), the Hearing Officer concludes that each of the violations charged in the Formal Complaint is admitted and established as follows:

1	COUNT 1
2	By failing to deposit Green's advance fees into Respondent's trust account, Respondent
3	violated RPC 1.15A(c)(2).
4	COUNT 2
5	By charging an unreasonable fee and failing to refund unearned fees at the end of the
6	representation, Respondent violated RPC 1.5(a) and RPC 1.16(d).
7	COUNT 3
8	By practicing law with a suspended license, Respondent violated RPC 5.5(a)
9	(unauthorized practice of law) and RPC 5.8(a) (engaging in the practice of law while suspended
10	for any cause).
11	COUNT 4
12	By failing to respond to the grievance, Respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(l)
13	by violating Respondent's duties under ELC 1.5, 5.3(f) and 5.3(g).
l 4	COUNT 5
15	By failing to prosecute Humphreys's lawsuit diligently, failing to respond to Halsan's
16	motions, and failing to appear for properly scheduled court dates, Respondent violated RPC 1.3
17	and RPC 3.2.
8	COUNT 6
19	By failing to keep Humphreys reasonably informed about the status of Humphreys's case
20	and by failing to promptly comply with Humphreys's reasonable requests for information,
21	Respondent violated RPC 1.3 and RPC 1.4.
22	COUNT 7
23	By failing to provide information responsive to the opposing party's discovery requests
24	and failing to make efforts to have Humphreys appear at a properly scheduled deposition,

1	Respondent violated RPC 8.4(d) and RPC 3.4(d).
2	COUNT 8
3	By making one or more misrepresentations to Humphreys, Respondent violated RPC
4	8.4(c) and RPC 1.4.
5	COUNT 9
6	By failing to surrender Humphreys's client file to Humphreys or Humphreys's new lawyer
7	upon termination of representation, Respondent violated RPC 1.16(d).
8	COUNT 10
9	By failing to respond to the grievance, Respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(l)
10	by violating Respondent's duties under ELC 1.5, 5.3(f), and 5.3(g).
11	COUNT 12 ¹
12	By failing to produce records and/or attend the deposition, it appears that Respondent
13	violated RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(l) by violating Respondent's duties under ELC 1.5 and 5.5(d).
14	
15	FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW REGARDING RECOMMENDED SANCTION
16	4. The following standards of the American Bar Association's Standards for Imposing
17	Lawyer Sanctions ("ABA Standards") (1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) presumptively apply in this
18	case:
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	l There is no count 11
24	¹ There is no count 11.

1	4 and 10 is suspension under ABA <u>Standard</u> 7.2.
2	Respondent knowingly failed to diligently prosecute Humphrey's lawsuit, knowingly
3	failed to respond to Halsan's motion, knowingly failed to respond to discovery requests, and
4	knowingly failed to appear for properly scheduled court dates. Respondent's conduct caused
5	actual harm to Humphreys who was deprived of the ability to move forward with the case against
6	Halsan, and is liable for a \$6,158.50 judgment. The presumptive sanction for Count 5 is
7	suspension under ABA Standard 4.42(a).
8	10. Respondent knowingly failed to communicate with Humphreys, causing actual harm
9	to Humphreys. The presumptive sanction for Count 6 is suspension under ABA <u>Standard</u> 4.42(a).
10	11. Respondent knowingly failed to provide information responsive to the opposing
11	party's discovery requests, and knowingly failed to make efforts to have Humphreys appear at a
12	properly scheduled deposition causing actual harm to Humphreys and the judicial system. The
13	presumptive sanction for Count 7 under ABA <u>Standard</u> 6.22 is suspension.
14	12. Respondent knowingly misled Humphreys, causing actual injury to Humphreys. The
15	presumptive sanction for Count 8 is suspension under ABA <u>Standard</u> 4.62.
16	 Respondent knowingly failed to surrender Humphreys client file to Humphreys,
17	causing actual injury. The presumptive sanction for Count 9 is suspension under ABA Standard
18	7.2.
19	 Respondent knowingly failed to appear for Respondent's deposition in the Dasse,
20	Caggiano, and Humphreys grievances, causing actual harm to ODC and the discipline system.
21	The presumptive sanction for Count 12 under ABA <u>Standard</u> 7.2 is suspension.
22	15. Under <u>In re Disciplinary Proceeding Against Petersen</u> , 120 Wn.2d 833, 854, 846 P.2d
23	1330 (1993), the "ultimate sanction imposed should at least be consistent with the sanction for
24	

1	the most serious instance of misconduct among a number of violations."
2	16. The following aggravating factors set forth in Section 9.22 of the ABA Standards
3	apply in this case:
4	(b) dishonest or selfish motive;
5	(c) pattern of misconduct; (d) multiple offenses;
6	(g) refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct; and (i) substantial experience in the practice of law.
7	17. It is an additional aggravating factor that Respondent failed to file an answer to the
8	Formal Complaint as required by ELC 10.5(a).
9	18. The following mitigating factors set forth in Section 9.32 of the ABA Standards apply
10	to this case:
11	(a) absence of a prior disciplinary record.
12	RECOMMENDATION
13	19. Based on the ABA Standards and the applicable aggravating and mitigating
14	factors, the Hearing Officer recommends that Respondent Merwin Moe Spencer be suspended for
15	a period of 3 years and pay restitution to Green in the amount of \$12,850 plus interest at a rate of
16	12% per annum beginning January 1, 2021 and to Humphreys in the amount of \$6,158.50 plus
17	interest at a rate of 12% per annum beginning November 1, 2020.
18	20. Respondent shall be subject to probation for a period of 24 months beginning on
19	the date Respondent is reinstated to the practice of law.
20	21. The conditions of probation are set forth below. Respondent's compliance with
21	these conditions will be monitored by the Probation Administrator of the Office of Disciplinary
22	Counsel ("Probation Administrator"). Failure to comply with a condition of probation listed
23	herein may be grounds for further disciplinary action under ELC 13.8(b).
24	

Practice Monitor

- a) During the period of probation, Respondent's practice will be supervised by a practice monitor. The practice monitor must be a WSBA member with no record of public discipline and who is not the subject of a pending public disciplinary proceeding.
- b) The role of the practice monitor is to consult with and provide guidance to Respondent regarding case management, office management, and avoiding violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct, and to provide reports and information to the Probation Administrator regarding Respondent's compliance with the terms of probation and the RPC. The practice monitor does not represent the Respondent.
- c) At the beginning of the probation period, the Probation Administrator will select a lawyer to serve as practice monitor for the period of Respondent's probation.
 - Initial Challenge: If, within 15 days of the written notice of the selection of a practice monitor, Respondent sends a written request to the Probation Administrator that another practice monitor be selected, the Probation Administrator will select another practice monitor. Respondent need not identify any basis for this initial request.
 - ii) Subsequent Challenges: If, after selection of a second (or subsequent) practice monitor, Respondent believes there is good cause why that individual should not serve as practice monitor, Respondent may, within 15 days of notice of the selected practice monitor, send a written request to the Probation Administrator asking that another practice monitor be selected. That request must articulate good cause to support the request. If the Probation Administrator agrees, another practice monitor will be selected. If the Probation Administrator disagrees, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel will submit its proposed selection for practice monitor to the Chair of the Disciplinary Board for appointment pursuant to ELC 13.8(a)(2), and will also provide the Chair with the Respondent's written request that another practice monitor be selected.
- d) In the event the practice monitor is no longer able to perform the practice monitor's duties, the Probation Administrator will select a new practice monitor at the Probation Administrator's discretion.
- e) During the period of probation, Respondent must cooperate with the named practice monitor. Respondent must meet with the practice monitor at least once per month. Respondent must communicate with the practice monitor to schedule all required meetings.
- f) The Respondent must bring to each meeting a current, complete written list of all pending client legal matters being handled by the Respondent. The list must identify the current status of each client matter and any problematic issues regarding each

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I certify that I caused a copy of the <u>Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and HO's Recommendation</u> to be emailed to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and to Respondent Merwin Moe Spencer, at <u>moe.spencer101@gmail.com</u>, on the 4th day of November, 2022.

Clerk to the Disciplinary Board