MAR 1 5 2013

## BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE 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

MICHAEL J. MCLAUGHLIN,

Lawyer (Bar No. 13367).

Proceeding No. 12#00050

STIPULATION TO REPRIMAND AND PROBATION

Under Rule 9.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), the following Stipulation to Reprimand and Probation is entered into by the Washington State Bar Association (Association), through disciplinary counsel Scott G. Busby, and by Respondent Michael J. McLaughlin.

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, to 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 Reprimand and Probation to avoid

1	the risk, ti	me, 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 July 7, 1983.
4		II. STIPULATED FACTS
5	2.	In April 2010, WSBA Auditor Lainie D. Patterson conducted a random examination
6	of Respon	dent's books and records under ELC 15.1(a). The purpose of the examination was to
7	determine	whether Respondent was complying with RPC 1.15A and RPC 1.15B.
8	3.	Ms. Patterson examined records relating to two IOLTA accounts at Mountain West
9	Bank: an a	account ending in 435 that Respondent used for funds relating to escrow services, and
10	an accoun	t ending in 954 that Respondent used for funds relating to other legal services. The
11	examination	on covered the period between December 1, 2008, and March 31, 2010.
12	4.	Ms. Patterson's audit revealed the following:
13	a)	Respondent failed to reconcile or review his accounts, resulting in Respondent's
14		failure to detect negative balances and employee theft.
15	b)	As a result of shortages in account #435, Respondent disbursed funds on behalf of
16		clients or third persons that exceeded the funds of those persons on deposit.
17	c)	About 24 clients had account balances left over from escrow transactions that had
18		concluded more than a year earlier.
19	d)	Respondent allowed non-lawyers to be authorized signatories on account #435.
20	e)	Respondent failed to properly supervise his non-lawyer employees, one of whom
21		stole more than \$18,000 from account #435.
22	5.	As a result of the audit and its findings, the Chair of the Disciplinary Board ordered
23	that the m	atter be referred to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for investigation under ELC
24		

- 15.1(c). Senior Auditor Cheryl M. Heuett then conducted an audit of Respondent's books and records for the period between July 1, 2007, and July 31, 2010.
  - 6. Ms. Heuett's audit revealed the following:
  - a) Respondent provided an inaccurate checkbook register for account #954. Respondent provided no checkbook register for account #435. Instead, Respondent provided computer-generated reports, none of which show a running balance for the account as required by RPC 1.15B(a)(1)(v). The ending balances shown in those reports were inaccurate, in one month by over \$40,000. For some periods, Respondent provided multiple versions of the same report that did not match each other.
  - b) Respondent provided inaccurate client ledgers for account #954. The "balance reports" that Respondent provided in lieu of client ledgers for account #435 did not show a running balance as required by RPC 1.15B(a)(2)(v). The client balances shown in the "balance reports" did not match the client ledgers that Ms. Heuett reconstructed from the records Respondent provided.
  - c) All bank statement reconciliations for account #954 were done on the same day, rather than monthly, as required by RPC 1.15A(h)(6). The reconciliation reports do not match the checkbook register and the client ledgers that Respondent provided. Respondent's checkbook register and client ledgers were revised so that they could be reconciled with the bank statements. For account #435, the totaled "balance reports" that Respondent provided in lieu of client ledgers did not match the reconciled balance shown on the "statement proofing register report" that Respondent provided in lieu of a check register.

- d) Respondent's client ledgers for account #954 showed a shortage of \$5,731.03 as of July 31, 2010, the end of the audit period. The shortage was partially, but not completely, corrected. Reconstructed client ledgers for account #435 showed a shortage of \$30,498.12 as of December 31, 2008, as well as shortages in varying amounts every month between July 31, 2008, and July 31, 2010. The shortages indicate that funds were disbursed on behalf of a client or third person that exceeded the funds of that person on deposit, and consequently that someone else's funds were used on that person's behalf.
- e) Between January 1, 2008 and July 31, 2010, monthly payments on behalf of client ROP were deposited in account #954. The majority of each payment was disbursed to ROP, but the remainder of each payment, which was an earned fee, was left in trust.
- f) For account #954, the auditor's reconstruction showed 25 clients with positive balances totaling \$2,429 for whom there had been no activity in the account since at least January 1, 2008. For account #435, the auditor's reconstruction showed 38 clients with positive balances totaling \$20,633.10 for whom there had been no activity for more than a year. These funds were not disbursed to the persons entitled to receive them.
- g) In several instances, Respondent disbursed funds from account #435 before the corresponding deposits had cleared the bank. In some cases, Respondent disbursed funds before the corresponding deposits had been made.
- h) Respondent allowed two non-lawyer employees, Wenona Jones and Stephanie Pitts, to be to be authorized signatories on his trust accounts. Ms. Jones apparently made

1	V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS	
2	16. The following American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions	
3	(1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case:	
4	17. ABA Standards std. 4.1 applies to the lawyer's duties under RPC 1.15A and 1.15B.	
5	Std. 4.1 provides:	
6	4.11 <b>Disbarment</b> is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly converts client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.	
8	4.12 <b>Suspension</b> is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows or should know that he is dealing improperly with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.	
9	4.13 <b>Reprimand</b> is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent in dealing with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client.	
11 12	4.14 <b>Admonition</b> is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent in dealing with client property and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a client.	
13	18. Respondent was negligent in dealing with client property.	
14	19. Respondent caused injury or potential injury to his clients, some of whom did not	
15	receive money to which they were entitled.	
16	20. The presumptive sanction is reprimand.	
17	21. The following aggravating factors apply under ABA Standards std. 9.22:	
18	(c) a pattern of misconduct; (d) multiple offenses;	
19 20	<ul><li>(i) substantial experience in the practice of law.</li><li>22. The following mitigating factors apply under ABA <u>Standards</u> std. 9.32:</li></ul>	
21	(a) absence of a prior disciplinary record; (b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive.	
23	23. It is an additional mitigating factor that Respondent has agreed to resolve this matter	
24	at an early stage of the proceedings.	

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

- 39. This Stipulation is not binding upon the Association or Respondent as a statement of all existing facts relating to the professional conduct of Respondent, and any additional existing facts may be proven in any subsequent disciplinary proceedings.
- 40. 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.
- 41. 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.
- 42. 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.
- 43. 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 the facts and
2	terms of this Stipulation to Reprimand and Probation as set forth above.
3	Dotted: 12 12 13
4	Michael J. McLauthlin, Bar No. 13367 Respondent
5	Respondent V
6	Scott G. Busby, Bar No. 17522 Dated: 12-18-12
7	Disciplinary Counsel
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	