JAN 29 2013

STIPULATION TO 60-DAY SUSPENSION Page 1

DISCIPLINARY BOARD

## BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re

## PHILIP A. DUNLAP,

Lawyer (Bar No. 10636).

Proceeding No. 12#00085

STIPULATION TO 60-DAY SUSPENSION

Under Rule 9.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), the following Stipulation to 60-day suspension is entered into by the Washington State Bar Association (Association), through Senior Disciplinary Counsel Joanne S. Abelson and Respondent lawyer Philip A. Dunlap.

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.

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

## I. ADMISSION TO PRACTICE

1. Respondent Philip A. Dunlap was admitted to the practice of law in the State of Washington on May 12, 1980.

## II. STIPULATED FACTS

- 2. Ute Michael and her ex-husband divorced in Washington in 1981.
- 3. In 2004, the spousal support order was modified to award Ms. Michael a portion of Mr. Michael's military retirement pay.
- 4. In approximately 2007, Ms. Michael hired Respondent's former firm to represent her with respect to a second modification of the spousal support order.
  - 5. When Respondent left the firm, he took Ms. Michael's case with him.
- 6. Ms. Michael sought increased support because her ex-husband became disabled in 2006, so part of his retirement pay was converted to disability pay. As a result, the amount of spousal support she had been receiving based on his military retirement decreased.
  - 7. The trial court granted the motion to modify the spousal support order.
- 8. Mr. Michael appealed. The issue on appeal was whether the trial court erred in awarding a portion of Mr. Michael's military disability pay to Ms. Michael.
- 9. In July 2008, the Court of Appeals issued a published decision remanding the matter to the trial court. Among other things, the Court of Appeals ruled that the Washington Supreme Court precedent that the trial court applied had been superseded by a change in federal law: under the new law, Mr. Michael's full military retirement benefits will be restored over nine years, so Ms. Michael's benefits will be restored in turn. The Court of Appeals directed the trial court to consider whether the extent of the time-limited reduction constituted "extraordinary circumstances" to justify reopening the judgment.

1	10. Months after the Court of Appeals decision, Respondent wrote opposing counsel		
2	offering to settle Ms. Michael's claim for \$5,000.		
3	11. In June 2009, opposing counsel rejected the offer.		
4	12. In October 2009, Respondent wrote opposing counsel again about settlement, but he		
5	did not provide the information opposing counsel sought to move the discussions along.		
6	13. Respondent never took any action to bring the matter back to the trial court.		
7	14. Ms. Michael tried to contact Respondent to obtain information from him about her		
8	case but has been unable to reach him.		
9	III. STIPULATION TO MISCONDUCT		
10	15. By failing to represent Ms. Michael diligently after the Court of Appeals remanded		
11	the case to the trial court, Respondent violated RPC 1.3.		
12	16. By failing to communicate with Ms. Michael about the status of her case		
13	Respondent violated RPC 1.4.		
14	IV. PRIOR DISCIPLINE		
15	17. On March 19, 2012, Respondent was suspended for six months based on his failure,		
16	in 2010, to represent two clients diligently and to communicate with them adequately. He has		
17	not been reinstated to practice as of the date of this stipulation.		
18	V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS		
19	18. The following American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions		
20	(1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case:		
21	Standard 4.4 Lack of Diligence		
22	4.41 Disbarment is generally appropriate when:  (a) a lawver abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious		
23	<ul> <li>(a) a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or</li> <li>(b) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes</li> </ul>		
24	(b) a lawyer knowingry rains to perform services for a chefit and causes		

1 2	serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or (c) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client.		
3	4.42 Suspension is generally appropriate when:  (a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes		
5	injury or potential injury to a client, or  (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client.		
6 7	4.43 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes injury or potential injury to a client.		
8	4.44 Admonition is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a client.		
10	19. Respondent knew that he was not attending to Ms. Michael's matter diligently and		
11	not communicating with her adequately.		
12	20. Ms. Michael was harmed because she was unable to litigate her issue following		
13	remand and because she was subjected to unnecessary stress and frustration.		
14	21. The presumptive sanction is suspension under Standard 4.42(a).		
15	22. The following aggravating factors apply under ABA Standards Section 9.22:		
16	<ul> <li>(a) prior disciplinary offenses [see ¶ 17];</li> <li>(i) substantial experience in the practice of law [admitted 1980].</li> </ul>		
17	23. The following mitigating factors apply under ABA <u>Standards</u> Section 9.32:		
18	(b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive;		
19 20	(d) timely good faith effort to make restitution or to rectify consequences of misconduct [Respondent has refunded to Ms. Michael all the funds he held for her in trust, approximately \$1,600].		
21	24. It is an additional mitigating factor that Respondent has agreed to resolve this matter		
22	at an early stage of the proceedings.		
23	25. On balance the aggravating and mitigating factors do not require a departure from		
24	the presumptive sanction of suspension.		

24

36. 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.

37. 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 Stipulation by the Board, unless disclosure is restricted by order or rule of law.

38. If this Stipulation is approved by the Disciplinary Board and Supreme Court, 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.

39. If this Stipulation is not approved by the Disciplinary Board and Supreme Court, 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.

20

21

22

24

1	WHEREFORE the undersigned being fully advised, adopt and agree to this Stipulation	
2	to Discipline as set forth above.	
3	Par A Dulgs	Dated: <b>December 13, 2012</b>
4	Philip A. Dunlap, Bar No. 10636 Respondent	
5		
6	$\mathcal{M}$	Dated: 12/13/12
7	Joanne S. Abelson, Bar No. 24877 Senior/Disciplinary Counsel	isatea.
8		
9		
10		· •
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		•
22		
23		
24		