FILED
Sep 24, 2026
Disciplinary
Board
Docket # 059

DISCIPLINARY BOARD
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re **CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL HOXIE**, Lawyer (Bar No. 46293).	Proceeding No. 25#00029 ODC File No(s). 23-00845, 23-00848, 23-00882, 25-02105 STIPULATION TO THREE-YEAR SUSPENSION

Under Rule 9.1 of the Washington Supreme Court's Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), the following Stipulation to three-year suspension is entered into by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) of the Washington State Bar Association (Association) through disciplinary counsel Nate Blanchard, disciplinary counsel Claire Carden, Respondent's Counsel Kenneth Scott Kagan, and Respondent lawyer Christopher Michael Hoxie.

A hearing occurred on August 4, 2026, and Respondent had the opportunity to present exhibits and witnesses on Respondent's behalf. The parties agree to this stipulation before the Hearing Officer has issued Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Respondent understands that Respondent is entitled under the ELC to have a hearing officer determine the facts, misconduct and sanction in this case. Respondent further understands that Respondent is entitled under the ELC to appeal the outcome of a hearing to the Disciplinary Board, and, in certain cases,

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

the Supreme Court. Respondent further understands that the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and appeal could result in an outcome more favorable or less favorable to Respondent. Respondent chooses to resolve this proceeding now by entering into the following stipulation to facts, misconduct and sanction to avoid the risk, time, expense attendant to further proceedings.

I. ADMISSION TO PRACTICE

1. Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of Washington on September 23, 2013.

II. STIPULATED FACTS

2. At all relevant times, Respondent was an owner and managing partner of Clearwater Law Group (Clearwater).

3. At all relevant times, Respondent had supervisory authority over Clearwater lawyers and non-lawyer assistants.

Representation of Anaheim and Sofia

4. Anaheim Calvario Munguia (Anaheim) is a Mexican national and a beneficiary of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. In or around 2004, Anaheim was the victim of a crime, which made Anaheim eligible to apply for an I-918 U-Visa (U-Visa). Because Anaheim was a child at the time of the crime, Anaheim's mother, Sofia Munguia Pacheco (Sofia), also became eligible to apply for an I-918 U-Visa. Through Sofia's U-Visa application, Sofia could list Sofia's spouse/Anaheim's father and Sofia's child/Anaheim's sibling as derivative beneficiaries of Sofia's U-Visa application.

5. On December 8, 2020, Anaheim and Sofia signed a flat fee agreement and paid $500 to hire Clearwater to represent Anaheim and Sofia on each of their U-Visa applications.

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

6. Clearwater lawyer Shane Crager represented Anaheim and Sofia, and on March 18, 2021, Crager filed a notice of appearance with the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on behalf of Anaheim and Sofia. Crager monitored Anaheim and Sofia's cases until Crager separated from Clearwater in July 2022.

7. After Crager separated from Clearwater, Respondent represented Anaheim and Sofia. Respondent, however, did not file a notice of appearance with USCIS on behalf of Anaheim or Sofia.

8. After Crager's separation, Respondent knew Respondent was overwhelmed by immigration cases. Respondent, however, elected to not withdraw from representing Respondent's immigration related clients because Respondent's firm did not have sufficient funds to refund them all.

9. USCIS sent a Request for Evidence (RFE), dated August 10, 2022, to Clearwater regarding Anaheim's U-Visa application. Clearwater received the August 10, 2022 RFE on August 12, 2022.

10. Respondent knew or should have known about the August 10, 2022 RFE because it was entered into CLIO[1], Respondent's electronic case management system.

11. Respondent could have reviewed the August 10, 2022 RFE but did not do so.

12. On August 17, 2022, Respondent's nonlawyer assistant informed Anaheim via Anaheim's father, Martin Calvario Encinas (Martin), of the RFE and that USCIS requested additional evidence to process Anaheim's U-Visa application.

13. On August 22, 2022, Sofia met with Respondent's nonlawyer assistant at the

[1] CLIO is a legal office management software system that tracks case status. An additional feature of CLIO, as used by Clearwater, allowed employees to track what tasks they performed for the case and time spent. Employees can enter a note describing the task that they performed.

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

Clearwater office. Sofia provided most of the documentation requested by the RFE.

14. On August 25, 2022, Respondent's nonlawyer assistant informed Respondent, through CLIO, of additional work needed to be completed to submit a response to the August 10, 2022, RFE. This work was not completed by either Respondent or Respondent's nonlawyer assistants. Respondent could have reviewed this note during the representation but did not do so.

15. Respondent did not inform Anaheim or Sofia that additional information was needed to respond to the RFEs.

16. USCIS sent a different RFE, dated August 30, 2022, to Clearwater regarding Sofia's U-Visa application. Clearwater received the August 30, 2022 RFE.

17. Respondent could have reviewed the August 30, 2022 RFE but did not do so.

18. On October 24, 2022, Sofia telephoned Clearwater and spoke with Respondent's nonlawyer assistant to request an update. Neither Respondent nor Respondent's nonlawyer assistants responded to Sofia's request for information.

19. The August 10, 2022 RFE stated the response deadline was November 5, 2022.

20. The August 30, 2022 RFE stated the response deadline was November 30, 2022.

21. Because of the Covid-19 Pandemic, USCIS extended the response deadline for the August 10, 2022 RFE to January 5, 2023, and the response deadline for the August 30, 2022 RFE to January 25, 2023.

22. Both RFEs contained a warning that the response must be received no later than the stated deadline, and if Anaheim/Sofia did not respond to the RFE, then the U-Visa application may be denied. Respondent did not respond to the August 10, 2022 or August 30, 2022 RFEs.

23. Respondent did not inform Anaheim or Sofia that Respondent did not respond to the August 10, 2022 or August 30, 2022 RFEs.

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

24. USCIS sent Clearwater a decision dated March 1, 2023 that denied Sofia's U-Visa application because USCIS did not receive a response to the August 30, 2022 RFE.

25. Sometime in mid-March 2023, Respondent assistant called Sofia's home and spoke with Martin to inform Sofia that USCIS denied Sofia's U-Visa petition.

26. On March 15, 2023, Martin and Sofia called Clearwater to ask for an explanation of why Sofia's U-Visa petition was denied and whether Respondent would help them with an appeal. They also went in-person to Clearwater to ask to meet with Respondent. Respondent did not speak or meet with Anaheim's father or Sofia. On March 16, 2023, Clearwater closed Anaheim and Sofia's file.

27. After these events, USCIS sent Clearwater a decision dated March 23, 2023 that denied Anaheim's U-Visa application because USCIS did not receive a response to the August 10, 2022 RFE.

28. Clearwater received the March 1, 2023 and March 23, 2023 decisions from USCIS.

29. Respondent reviewed the March 23, 2023 decision and the March 1, 2023 decision. Respondent did not send Anaheim or Sofia a copy of the decisions.

30. Respondent did not speak or meet with Anaheim, Sofia, or Anaheim's father at any other point in Respondent's representation of them.

31. Anaheim and Sofia hired new counsel, Stephen Brown, to appeal USCIS's decision to deny their U-Visa applications. On June 23, 2023, Brown filed a motion to reopen Anaheim and Sofia's U-Visa applications based on ineffective assistance of counsel. USCIS denied the motion as untimely, but reopened Anaheim's and Sofia's U-Visa applications on USCIS's own motion because "the evidence submitted appear[ed] to overcome the grounds for denial" and placed them into deferred action. Anaheim's U-Visa petition has been granted. Sofia's U-Visa application

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

remains pending.

Representation of Hermelinda

32. On November 20, 2020, Hermelinda Mendoza-Ramirez (Hermelinda) hired Clearwater to represent Hermelinda on behalf of Hermelinda's application for asylum.

33. Shane Crager represented Hermelinda until Crager separated from Clearwater in July 2022.

34. After Crager separated from Clearwater, Respondent represented Hermelinda.

35. On October 3, 2022, Respondent and Hermelinda appeared before an immigration court in Portland, Oregon for a merits hearing on Hermelinda's application for asylum.

36. At the end of the hearing, United States Immigration Judge Richard Zanfardino reserved decision.

37. On October 7, 2022, Judge Zanfardino issued a written decision denying Hermelinda's asylum request and ordered Hermelinda removed.

38. The decision stated that Hermelinda's appeal due date was November 7, 2022.

39. Clearwater received a copy of the decision on or about October 13, 2022.

40. A nonlawyer assistant notified Respondent of the decision on or about October 13, 2022.

41. Respondent did not mail or otherwise send a copy of the written decision to Hermelinda.

42. Respondent believed that Respondent's nonlawyer assistant sent a copy of the decision to Hermelinda and a letter from Respondent explaining the effect of the decision and appeal deadline. Respondent did not verify that the written decision and letter were sent to Hermelinda. Hermelinda did not receive a copy of the written decision or letter from Respondent.

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

43. Respondent did not call Hermelinda after the written decision was issued or otherwise meet with Hermelinda to explain the decision or that Respondent would not represent Hermelinda to appeal the decision.

44. On January 16, 2023, Hermelinda visited Clearwater and learned for the first time that Hermelinda's asylum application was denied.

45. On June 26, 2023, Stephen Robbins, Hermelinda's new lawyer, filed a motion with the Board of Immigration Appeals to permit an untimely appeal of the October 7, 2022 written decision. On October 13, 2023, the Board of Immigration Appeals issued an interim decision accepting the untimely filing for Hermelinda's appeal.

Representation of Roberto

46. Roberto Herrera Gonzalez (Roberto) is a Mexican citizen who entered the United States in the 1990s.

47. On November 21, 1995, Roberto was ordered removed *in absentia*.

48. On our around early 2020, Roberto hired Beacon Immigration to pursue an adjustment of status under § 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

49. Crager, then employed at Beacon Immigration, represented Roberto.

50. On February 10, 2020, Crager submitted a motion to the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) to reopen Roberto's removal proceeding.

51. Crager also requested EOIR terminate the removal proceeding because Roberto was statutorily eligible for an adjustment of status under § 245(i).

52. On March 2, 2020, an immigration judge granted the motion to reopen the removal proceeding but denied the motion to terminate, citing lack of authority to terminate the removal proceeding.

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

53. EOIR scheduled a master hearing for Roberto's removal proceeding for February 9, 2021.

54. On or about October 23, 2020, Beacon Immigration closed. Crager was subsequently hired by Clearwater Law Group.

55. On November 19, 2020, Roberto hired Clearwater to pursue an adjustment of status under § 245(i). Roberto's spouse also hired Clearwater to pursue an adjustment of status under INA § 245(a).

56. Roberto paid Clearwater a $3,000 flat fee to jointly represent Roberto and Roberto's spouse for their respective applications for adjustment of status.

57. Crager represented Roberto.

58. On November 24, 2020, EOIR continued Roberto's master hearing to May 4, 2021.

59. March 8, 2021, Crager submitted to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) a petition for alien relative (I-130) by Roberto's son, Estevan Herrera (Estevan), that named Roberto as the beneficiary of the petition.

60. USCIS granted Estevan's I-130 on April 14, 2021.

61. On April 23, 2021, EOIR continued Roberto's master hearing to a date to be determined by EOIR.

62. On December 28, 2022, Respondent took over the representation of Roberto.

63. On March 22, 2024, EOIR scheduled a master hearing for Roberto's removal proceeding for June 24, 2025.

64. On June 4, 2025, EOIR scheduled an individual calendar hearing for Roberto for September 22, 2025.

65. On or around August 20, 2025, Respondent submitted an application for adjustment

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

of status (I-485) for Roberto under § 245(i).

66. A report of medical examination and vaccination record (I-693) and proof of physical presence in the United States on December 21, 2000, are required for an adjustment of status under § 245(i).

67. Respondent did not submit a report of medical examination and vaccination record (I-693).

68. Respondent did not submit proof of Roberto's physical presence in the United States on December 21, 2000.

69. Before the individual calendar hearing, Roberto paid Respondent an additional $1,500 for representation at the hearing despite the Clearwater fee agreement stating the fee included representation at an individual calendar hearing.

70. On September 22, 2025, the individual calendar hearing was held. Both Respondent and Roberto appeared at the hearing.

71. Upon inspecting the I-485 application form and supporting documents, the immigration judge asked whether Respondent submitted an I-693 form and proof of Roberto's physical presence in the United States on December 21, 2000.

72. Respondent explained Respondent did not have the documents but requested a continuance.

73. The immigration judge denied the motion to continue and denied Roberto's application for adjustment of status.

74. The immigration judge ordered Roberto removed.

75. After the hearing, Roberto hired Crager to file a motion to reopen the removal hearing based on ineffective assistance of counsel.

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

76. On December 16, 2025, Crager filed a motion to reopen the removal hearing based on ineffective assistance of counsel, which remains pending.

Respondent's Personal and Emotional Problems and Absence of Dishonest or Selfish Motive

77. Respondent had no prior experience in immigration law at the time Crager separated from Clearwater. Respondent retained hundreds of immigration clients and had no funds to refund immigration clients who paid flat fees to Clearwater. For that reason, Respondent felt that Respondent's only recourse was to do Respondent's best to handle the immigration cases on Respondent's own. This resulted in tremendous financial losses to Clearwater, and Respondent worked without pay for at least three years.

78. Respondent tried to learn immigration law in an abbreviated amount of time and had no knowledge of how to represent the immigration clients. Respondent's efforts to either hire a new immigration lawyer or to transition those clients to new lawyers were unavailing.

79. Respondent experienced panic attacks when Respondent reviewed immigration files and fell into debilitating anxiety and depression. Respondent was unable to sleep and was unable to fight Respondent's way out of the paralyzing depression and fatigue. For these reasons, Respondent had a great deal of difficulty completing the tasks Respondent was obligated to perform for Respondent's immigration clients. Respondent's anxiety coincided with Respondent entering a depressed state in 2022, which led to Respondent living in a significantly unsanitary condition at home, which in turn caused Respondent to develop pneumonia. This pneumonia led to Respondent being hospitalized in September 2024, during which time Respondent suffered a collapsed lung, requiring invasive surgery. Respondent was discharged in October 2024, with medical advice to avoid stress for the following two months.

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

III. STIPULATION TO MISCONDUCT

80. By failing to respond to the August 10, 2022 request for evidence regarding Anaheim's U-Visa application, Respondent violated RPC 1.3.

81. By failing to respond to the August 30, 2022 request for evidence regarding Sofia's U-Visa application, Respondent violated RPC 1.3.

82. By failing to keep Anaheim reasonably informed about the status of Anaheim's U-Visa application, Respondent violated RPC 1.4(a)(3).

83. By failing to keep Sofia reasonably informed about the status of Sofia's U-Visa application, Respondent violated RPC 1.4(a)(3).

84. By failing to respond to Sofia's reasonable requests for information, Respondent violated RPC 1.4(a)(4).

85. By failing to ensure Hermelinda was timely informed of the written decision denying Hermelinda's asylum request and appeal deadline, Respondent violated RPC 1.4(a) and (b).

86. By failing to submit the I-693 form and proof of Roberto's physical presence in the United States on December 21, 2000, with Roberto's adjustment of status application, Respondent violated RPC 1.3.

IV. PRIOR DISCIPLINE

87. On October 10, 2023, Respondent received a reprimand for violations of RPC 1.3, RPC 1.4, RPC 1.5, and RPC 1.16.

V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS

88. The following American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case:

4.4 ***Lack of Diligence***

4.41 Disbarment is generally appropriate when:

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

(a) a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or

(b) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes 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.

4.42 Suspension is generally appropriate when:

(a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes 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.

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.

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.

89. Respondent acted knowingly with respect to Respondent's violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct described above in paragraphs 80 through 86.

90. Respondent caused potentially serious injury. In re Disciplinary Proceeding Against Anschell, 141 Wn.2d 593, 611, 9 P.3d 193 (2000) (risk of deportation and loss of the right to legally live and work in the United States rises to the level of serious injury).

91. The presumptive sanction is disbarment under ABA Standard 4.41(b) with respect to Respondent's violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct described above in paragraphs 80 through 86.

92. The presumptive sanction is disbarment.

93. The following aggravating factors apply under ABA Standard 9.22:

(a) prior discipline (2023 Reprimand for violating RPCs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, and 1.16);

(d) multiple offenses; and

(i) As to the Roberto grievance, substantial experience in the practice of law (licensed in Washington since 2013).

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

94. The following mitigating factors apply under ABA Standard 9.32:

(b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive;

(c) personal or emotional problems; and

(l) remorse.

95. On balance the aggravating and mitigating factors should mitigate the presumptive sanction of disbarment to suspension.

VI. STIPULATED DISCIPLINE

96. The parties stipulate that Respondent shall be suspended from the practice of law for three years.

VII. CONDITIONS OF REINSTATEMENT

97. Reinstatement from suspension is conditioned on payment of restitution, costs and expenses, as provided below.

98. As an additional condition of reinstatement, Respondent shall, at least 30 days before a request for reinstatement, undergo an independent examination by a licensed clinical psychologist approved by ODC to evaluate Respondent's fitness to practice law.

99. Respondent shall pay all expenses associated with the examination.

100. Respondent shall execute all necessary releases and authorizations to permit the evaluator and disciplinary counsel to obtain full access to all pertinent health care and treatment records for the applicable time period, and to permit the evaluator to release information regarding the evaluation to disciplinary counsel, including a written report of the evaluator's findings, diagnosis, and recommended treatment plan, if any. Respondent shall provide disciplinary counsel with a copy of the releases and authorizations.

101. If the evaluator concludes there is reasonable cause to believe that Respondent

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

does not have the mental or physical capacity to practice law, then disciplinary counsel may report to a review committee as provided in ELC 8.2.

102. If the evaluator recommends treatment, then Respondent shall undergo treatment with a treatment provider and be subject to probation for a period of 24 months beginning on the date Respondent is reinstated to the practice of law. The conditions of probation are set forth below.

103. If the evaluator does not recommend treatment, then Respondent will not be required to undergo treatment and will not be subject to probation requiring mental health treatment.

VIII. CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

104. These conditions of probation apply if the evaluator recommends treatment, as provided above. Respondent's compliance with these conditions shall be monitored by the Probation Administrator of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("Probation Administrator"). Failure to comply with a condition of probation listed herein may be grounds for further disciplinary action under ELC 13.8(b).

105. Respondent shall be subject to probation for a period of 24 months beginning on the date Respondent is reinstated to the practice of law

106. The conditions of probation are set forth below. Respondent's compliance with these conditions shall be monitored by the Probation Administrator of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("Probation Administrator"). Failure to comply with a condition of probation listed herein may be grounds for further disciplinary action under ELC 13.8(b).

a. Within 60 days after probation begins, Respondent shall provide the Probation Administrator with the name and contact information of a proposed mental-health evaluator. The proposed evaluator must be a licensed physician or psychologist. The Probation Administrator will either approve

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

or reject the proposed evaluator and will notify Respondent of that decision in writing. If the evaluator is not approved, Respondent shall provide the Probation Administrator with the name and contact information of another proposed evaluator within three weeks of the date of the Probation Administrator's letter.

b. Within 60 days of the date of the Probation Administrator's written approval of an evaluator, Respondent shall undergo a mental-health evaluation.

c. Respondent shall execute an authorization allowing the evaluator to release information regarding the evaluation to the Probation Administrator, to include a written report of the evaluator's findings, diagnosis, and recommended treatment plan, if any. Respondent shall provide the Probation Administrator with a copy of the authorization.

d. If the mental-health evaluator recommends treatment, Respondent shall undergo treatment with the evaluator or with another treatment provider approved by the Probation Administrator. Respondent will not be required to undergo mental-health treatment if not recommended by a mental-health evaluator approved by the Probation Administrator.

e. Respondent shall comply with all requirements and recommendations of the treatment provider, including but not limited to the completion of any period of in- or out-patient treatment and aftercare and the taking of all prescribed medications.

f. Respondent shall execute an authorization[s] allowing and directing the treatment provider to take the following actions:

i. on a quarterly basis, send written reports to the Probation Administrator that include the dates of treatment, whether Respondent has been cooperative with treatment, and whether continued treatment is recommended;

ii. report immediately to the Probation Administrator if Respondent fails to appear for treatment or stops treatment without the provider's agreement and consent prior to either termination of the treatment plan or expiration of the probation period set forth in this stipulation;

iii. report immediately to the Probation Administrator if Respondent fails to comply with any treatment recommendations of the treatment provider;

iv. report immediately to the Probation Administrator if Respondent otherwise violates any of the terms or conditions of treatment;

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

v. report immediately to the Probation Administrator if the provider will no longer serve as treatment provider to Respondent prior to termination of the treatment plan or expiration of the probation period set forth in this stipulation; and

vi. report to the Probation Administrator if Respondent successfully completes treatment and is discharged from further treatment.

Respondent shall provide a copy of the authorization to the Probation Administrator upon execution.

g. Respondent is responsible for paying any and all fees, costs, and/or expenses of mental health evaluation and treatment.

IX. RESTITUTION

107. Respondent is ordered to pay restitution in the amount of $1,500 to Roberto Herrera Gonzalez. The restitution order shall bear interest at 12% per annum.

108. Reinstatement from suspension is conditioned on payment of restitution.

X. COSTS AND EXPENSES

109. Respondent shall pay attorney fees and administrative costs of $1000, representing half of the attorney fees and administrative costs under ELC 13.9(c)(4). Respondent shall also pay the costs reasonably and necessarily incurred by the Association under ELC 13.9(b). ODC will request a costs order for ELC 12.9(b) costs upon approval of this stipulation. 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 the entry of a costs order.

110. Reinstatement from suspension is conditioned on payment of costs.

XI. VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT

111. Respondent states that prior to entering into this Stipulation Respondent has consulted independent legal counsel regarding this Stipulation, that Respondent is entering into this Stipulation voluntarily, and that no promises or threats have been made by ODC, the

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

Association, nor by any representative thereof, to induce the Respondent to enter into this Stipulation except as provided herein.

112. Once fully executed, this stipulation is a contract governed by the legal principles applicable to contracts, and may not be unilaterally revoked or modified by either party.

XII. LIMITATIONS

113. 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 ODC. Both the Respondent lawyer and ODC acknowledge that the result after further proceedings in this matter might differ from the result agreed to herein.

114. 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, and any additional existing facts may be proven in any subsequent disciplinary proceedings.

115. 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.

116. Under ELC 9.1(d)(4), the Disciplinary Board reviews a stipulation based solely on the record agreed to by the parties. 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.

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

117. 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.

118. 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.

WHEREFORE the undersigned being fully advised, adopt and agree to this Stipulation to Suspension as set forth above.

Christopher Hoxie
Christopher Michael Hoxie, Bar No. 46293
Respondent
Dated: 8/19/26

Kenneth S. Kagan
Kenneth Scott Kagan, Bar No. 12983
Counsel for Respondent
Dated: 8/19/2026

Nate Blanchard
Nate Blanchard, Bar No. 58620
Disciplinary Counsel
Dated: 8/19/2026

Claire Carden, Bar No. 50590
Disciplinary Counsel
Dated: 8/19/2026

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