

FILED



FEB 04 2016

Board of Disciplinary
Appeals

No. 56620

**Before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals
Appointed by
The Supreme Court of Texas**

**CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH,
APPELLANT**

V.

**COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,
APPELLEE**

*On Appeal from the Evidentiary Panel
For the State Bar of Texas District 4-6
No. 201402059*

**BRIEF OF APPELLEE
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE**

LINDA A. ACEVEDO
CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON
SENIOR APPELLATE COUNSEL

LAURA BAYOUTH POPPS
DEPUTY COUNSEL FOR
ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF DISCIPLINARY
COUNSEL
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE
STATE BAR OF TEXAS
P.O. BOX 12487
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2487
cynthia.hamilton@texasbar.com
512.427.1350; 1.877.953.5535
FAX: 512.427.4167

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL

APPELLANT

CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH
9888 Bissonnet Street, Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77036
Telephone: 832-681-0083
Email: cyril_chukwurah@yahoo.com

APPELLEE

COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE
STATE BAR OF TEXAS
P.O. Box 12487
Austin, Texas 78711

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEE

LINDA A. ACEVEDO
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

LAURA BAYOUTH POPPS
Deputy Counsel for Administration

CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON
Senior Appellate Counsel
STATE BAR CARD NO. 00790419
Email: cynthia.hamilton@texasbar.com

State Bar of Texas
P.O. Box 12487
Austin, Texas 78711-2487
512.427.1350; 1.877.953.5535
Fax: 512.427.4167

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL1

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES.....4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE7

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES8

 1. Is there more than a scintilla of evidence to support the Evidentiary Panel’s determination that Chukwurah violated Rule 1.14(b) based on evidence demonstrating that he received insurance settlement funds on behalf of his client but failed to remit the portion of the funds due to the client’s medical provider until after the client filed a grievance against him more than two years later?

 2. Is there more than a scintilla of evidence to support the Evidentiary Panel’s determination that Chukwurah violated Rule 8.04(a)(7) based on evidence demonstrating that he continued to hold himself out as a lawyer during a disciplinary suspension and failed to inform his clients of the suspension as required by the disciplinary judgment?

STATEMENT OF FACTS.....9

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT11

ARGUMENT13

 I. Under the substantial-evidence standard of review, the Board must determine whether there is a reasonable basis for the findings of misconduct.....13

 II. The evidence provides a reasonable basis for the Evidentiary Panel’s findings that Chukwurah violated Rule 1.14(b) and Rule 8.04(a)(7).....14

A.	Testimony provides strong support for the findings	16
1.	Singh testified about Chukwurah’s representation of him and his daughter	16
2.	Chukwurah’s deposition testimony admitted his misconduct	17
B.	Documentary evidence provided further support for the findings.....	19
C.	Chukwurah offered little evidence to counter the strong evidence offered by the Commission	20
	CONCLUSION AND PRAYER	22
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	23
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	23
	APPENDIX.....	25

<u>CASES</u>	<u>INDEX OF AUTHORITIES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<i>City of El Paso v. Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex.</i> , 883 S.W.2d 179 (Tex. 1994)		13, 14
<i>Comm'n for Lawyer Discipline v. Schaefer</i> , 364 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2012)		13
<i>Maritime Overseas Corp. v. Ellis</i> , 971 S.W.2d 402 (Tex. 1998)		20
<i>R.R. Comm'n of Tex. v. Torch Operating Co.</i> , 912 S.W.2d 790 (Tex. 1995)		13
<i>Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cuellar</i> , 58 S.W.3d 781 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 2001, no pet.)		13
<i>Tex. State Bd. of Dental Exam'rs v. Sizemore</i> , 759 S.W.2d 114 (Tex. 1988)		13
 <u>STATUTES</u>		 <u>PAGE</u>
TEX. DISCIPLINARY RULES PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.14(b)		14
TEX. DISCIPLINARY RULES PROF'L CONDUCT R. 8.04(a)(7).....		14
TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 81.072(b)(7) (West 2015).....		13

No. 56620

**Before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals
Appointed by
The Supreme Court of Texas**

**CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH,
APPELLANT**

V.

**COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,
APPELLEE**

*On Appeal from the Evidentiary Panel
For the State Bar of Texas District 4-6
No. 201402059*

**BRIEF OF APPELLEE
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE**

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS:

Appellee, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, submits this brief in response to the brief filed by Appellant, Cyril Okey Chukwurah. For clarity, this brief refers to Appellant as “Chukwurah” and Appellee as “the Commission.” References to the record are labeled CR (clerk’s record), RRI (first volume of reporter’s record), RRII (second volume of reporter’s record), Pet. Ex. (Petitioner’s exhibit to reporter’s record), and App. (appendix to brief). References to rules

refer to the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct¹ unless otherwise noted.

¹ *Reprinted in* TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN., tit. 2, subtit. G app A-1. (West 2011).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Type of Proceeding: Attorney Discipline

Petitioner/Appellee: The Commission for Lawyer Discipline

Respondent/Appellant: Cyril Okey Chukwurah

Evidentiary Panel: 4-6

Judgment: Judgment of Disbarment

*Violations found (Texas
Disciplinary Rules of
Professional Conduct):*

Rule 1.14(b): Upon receiving funds or other property in which a client or third person has an interest, a lawyer shall promptly notify the client or third person. Except as stated in this rule or otherwise permitted by law or by agreement with the client, a lawyer shall promptly deliver to the client or third person any funds or other property that the client or third person is entitled to receive and, upon request by the client or third person, shall promptly render a full accounting regarding such property.

Rule 8.04(a)(7): A lawyer shall not violate any disciplinary or disability order or judgment.

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

1. Is there more than a scintilla of evidence to support the Evidentiary Panel's determination that Chukwurah violated Rule 1.14(b) based on evidence demonstrating that he received insurance settlement funds on behalf of his client but failed to remit the portion of the funds due to the client's medical provider until after the client filed a grievance against him more than two years later?

2. Is there more than a scintilla of evidence to support the Evidentiary Panel's determination that Chukwurah violated Rule 8.04(a)(7) based on evidence demonstrating that he continued to hold himself out as a lawyer during a disciplinary suspension and failed to inform his clients of the suspension as required by the disciplinary judgment?

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 29, 2011, Surinder Singh and his minor daughter Arshdeep Kaur were involved in a car accident (RRI 54). Both Singh and Kaur were injured and had to be treated at a hospital (RRI 54-55). Two days after the accident, Singh went to Chukwurah's Law Firm to hire an attorney to represent him and his daughter (RRI 55-58). He met with Chukwurah and another person named "Eric," whom he believed to be an attorney (RRI 55-58, 68-69). Singh hired Chukwurah that day (RRI 55-58; Pet. Ex. 6).

Less than two weeks after Singh hired Chukwurah to represent him and his daughter, Chukwurah's law license was suspended pursuant to a disciplinary judgment (RRI 94; Pet. Ex. 1). The disciplinary judgment ordered Chukwurah to inform his clients of the suspension (Pet. Ex. 1). However, Chukwurah did not inform Singh or Kaur of the suspension (RRI 59). And Chukwurah admitted that he never complied with a provision of the judgment that ordered him to submit an affidavit swearing that he had informed his clients of the suspension (RRI 95). Chukwurah also admitted that he did not change his firm's letterhead stationery and, as a result, it continued to identify him as an "attorney at law" during his suspension (RRI 110-11; Pet. Ex. 7).

Chukwurah retained sole control over the firm's IOLTA trust account throughout his suspension, and he endorsed and deposited the settlement checks

received on behalf of Kaur and Singh on March 6, 2012 (RRI 104-05, 114-16; Pet. Ex. 11 and 12). A portion of Kaur's settlement (\$3,908.00) was withheld to pay St. Luke's Vintage Hospital (RRI 60-61; Pet. Ex. 13). However, the first payment to St. Luke's was not made until September 5, 2012, and was for only a small fraction (\$500.00) of the withheld amount (Pet. Ex. 18). Chukwurah failed to pay the remainder until after Kaur filed a grievance against him on April 7, 2014 (RRI 73-75; Pet. Ex. 27). In the meantime, the firm's IOLTA balance fell below zero (RRII 6-9).

As a result of Kaur's grievance, the Commission filed a disciplinary action against Chukwurah on October 3, 2014 (CR 42-46). The Commission alleged that Chukwurah's conduct violated two provisions of the disciplinary rules – Rule 1.14(b) and Rule 8.04(a)(7) (CR 42-46). After a full evidentiary hearing, the Evidentiary Panel found that Chukwurah violated both rules and entered a judgment of disbarment (CR 749-53).

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

In this appeal, Chukwurah raises two issues. In the first, he attacks the sufficiency of the evidence to support the Evidentiary Panel's finding that he violated Rule 1.14(b) by failing to promptly deliver funds to St. Luke's Vintage Hospital on behalf of his client Arshdeep Kaur. In the second, he attacks the finding that he violated Rule 8.04(a)(7) by failing to comply with two disciplinary judgments.

The gist of Chukwurah's position is that he never represented the complainants in this case and, therefore, he could not have violated the rules at issue. However, testimony from Surinder Singh convincingly demonstrated otherwise. He described his first meeting with Chukwurah and Chukwurah's associate wherein Singh sought legal representation for himself and his minor daughter (Kaur) after an auto accident in which both were injured. He testified that he hired Chukwurah and that Chukwurah was present at the firm and discussed Singh's case with him when he subsequently returned to the firm (despite Chukwurah's suspension from the practice of law at the time of the subsequent visit). He also testified that Chukwurah never informed him of his suspension, though the disciplinary judgment ordered Chukwurah to notify his clients of the suspension.

Singh's testimony is obviously sufficient to support both of the findings of misconduct because it provides a reasonable basis for the findings. And it is supported by correspondence with Singh and Kaur's insurance company regarding their claim, as well as documentary evidence showing that Chukwurah continued to control the finances at the firm during his suspension. In fact, Chukwurah admitted that he retained sole control over the firm's bank accounts. He also admitted that the firm continued to use letterhead stationery that identified him as an attorney during the suspension.

Because the evidence provides strong support for the judgment, Chukwurah's arguments have no merit. Thus, there is no basis for reversal, and the Board should affirm the judgment in all respects.

ARGUMENT

I. Under the substantial-evidence standard of review, the Board must determine whether there is a reasonable basis for the findings of misconduct.

In disciplinary cases, the substantial evidence standard of review applies. TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 81.072(b)(7) (West 2015) (State Bar Act); *Comm'n for Lawyer Discipline v. Schaefer*, 364 S.W.3d 831, 835 (Tex. 2012). Under the substantial evidence test, the findings of an administrative body are presumed to be supported by substantial evidence, and the party challenging the findings bears the burden of proving otherwise. *City of El Paso v. Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex.*, 883 S.W.2d 179, 185 (Tex. 1994). The reviewing court may not substitute its judgment for that of the administrative body and must consider only the record upon which the decision is based. *R.R. Comm'n of Tex. v. Torch Operating Co.*, 912 S.W.2d 790, 792 (Tex. 1995); *Tex. State Bd. of Dental Exam'rs v. Sizemore*, 759 S.W.2d 114, 116 (Tex. 1988).

The substantial evidence standard focuses on whether there is *any* reasonable basis in the record for the administrative body's findings. *City of El Paso*, 883 S.W.2d at 185. Anything more than a scintilla of evidence is sufficient to support a finding. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cuellar*, 58 S.W.3d 781, 783 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 2001, no pet.). The ultimate question is not whether a

finding is correct, but only whether there is some reasonable basis for it. *City of El Paso*, 883 S.W.2d at 185.

II. The evidence provides a reasonable basis for the Evidentiary Panel's findings that Chukwurah violated Rule 1.14(b) and Rule 8.04(a)(7).

The Commission alleged that Chukwurah's conduct violated two provisions of the disciplinary rules – 1.14(b) and 8.04(a)(7). Rule 1.14(b) provides:

Upon receiving funds or other property in which a client or third person has an interest, a lawyer shall promptly notify the client or third person. *Except as stated in this rule or otherwise permitted by law or by agreement with the client, a lawyer shall promptly deliver to the client or third person any funds or other property that the client or third person is entitled to receive* and, upon request by the client or third person, shall promptly render a full accounting regarding such property.

TEX. DISCIPLINARY RULES PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.14(b) (emphasis added).

Rule 8.04(a)(7) provides:

A lawyer shall not violate any disciplinary or disability order or judgment.

TEX. DISCIPLINARY RULES PROF'L CONDUCT R. 8.04(a)(7).

The live evidentiary petition set forth the Commission's factual allegations in detail (CR 308-310). Those allegations included that Arshdeep Kaur (daughter) and Surinder Singh (father) hired Chukwurah on October 31, 2011, for representation in their personal injury cases related to an auto accident. Shortly thereafter, on November 10, 2011, a disciplinary judgment suspended Chukwurah's law license. The suspension began on November 10, 2011, and

continued until February 4, 2013.² The disciplinary judgment ordered Chukwurah to notify all of his clients of the suspension. However, Chukwurah did not inform Kaur or Singh of his suspension. Instead, his firm continued to represent Kaur and Singh, who had no knowledge that their lawyer had been suspended from the practice of law.

Chukwurah retained sole control over the firm's IOLTA trust account throughout his suspension, and he endorsed and deposited the settlement checks received on behalf of Kaur and Singh on March 6, 2012. A portion of Kaur's settlement (\$3,908.00) was withheld to pay St. Luke's Hospital. However, the first payment to St. Luke's was not made until September 5, 2012, and was for only a small fraction (\$500.00) of the withheld amount. Chukwurah failed to pay the remainder until after Kaur filed a grievance against him on April 7, 2014. In the meantime, the firm's IOLTA balance fell below zero.

² On June 25, 2012, a second judgment against Chukwurah suspended his law license for forty-eight months. Thus, his law license was suspended continuously from November 10, 2011, through the date of his disbarment in the proceedings below.

A. Testimony provides strong support for the findings.

The Commission offered strong evidence to support the allegations of misconduct. The Commission's evidence included testimony from Singh and Chukwurah, as well as multiple documentary exhibits.³

1. Singh testified about Chukwurah's representation of him and his daughter.

Singh testified that on October 29, 2011, he and his daughter were injured in an auto accident (RRI 54). He went to Chukwurah's law firm to hire an attorney two days after the accident, and he met with both Chukwurah and another person named "Eric," whom he believed to be an attorney (RRI 55-58, 69).⁴ He hired Chukwurah and Eric to represent him in connection with the accident (RRI 55-58). And both Chukwurah and Eric were at the firm when he went to pick up his settlement checks after his claim was settled (RRI 59). Chukwurah and Eric were the only two people from the law firm who worked with him (RRI 62). He incorrectly believed that Eric was a lawyer (RRI 57).

³ Kaur testified that she had little firsthand knowledge of the details of Chukwurah's representation because her father primarily handled it (RRI 72-73). However, she provided information regarding Chukwurah's failure to timely pay her medical bills, which resulted in credit problems and caused her to be unable to purchase a car without a co-signer (RRI 73-74).

⁴ Chukwurah later testified that a nonlawyer named Eric Amoako worked in his office (RRI 107-08; RRII 11). Amoako had previously been a lawyer before the surrender of his law license in 2009 (RRII 60; Pet. Ex. 95).

Singh also testified that Eric told him the firm would pay his medical bills from the settlement funds but the firm failed to pay the bills, which caused bill collectors and creditors to call Singh (RRI 59). As a result, Singh again went to the law firm, and both Chukwurah and Eric discussed his case with him and gave him a check dated April 16, 2012, for \$900.00 (RRI 61-62; Pet. Ex. 16).

Singh testified that Chukwurah never informed him of his suspension (RRI 59).

2. Chukwurah's deposition testimony admitted his misconduct.

The Commission also presented testimony from Chukwurah's deposition that supported both findings of misconduct, including testimony that:

- At all times, he was the sole shareholder for his firm (RRI 91-92);
- The suspension of his law license began on November 10, 2011 (RRI 94);
- He was required to notify all clients of his suspension by December 10, 2011 (RRI 94);
- He was required to submit an affidavit to the State Bar by December 10, 2011, stating that he had notified all clients and opposing counsel of his suspension (RRI 95);
- He failed to submit the required affidavit (RRI 95);
- A second judgment imposing a four-year active suspension was entered against him on February 4, 2013 (RRI 97-99);

- As a result of the two judgments, Chukwurah's law license was suspended continuously from November 10, 2011, through the date of the evidentiary hearing in this case (RRI 100);
- He took no steps to change his law firm's stationery and, as a result, the stationery included his name and identified him as an attorney at law during his suspension (RRI 110-11);
- In 2013 or 2014, he signed a new lease for space for his law firm (RRI 103);
- He was the only signatory on his law firm's IOLTA account and the only person with authority to write checks on or withdraw money from the account (RRI 104-05);
- He was responsible for the movement of client funds in and out of the IOLTA account throughout his suspension (RRI 105);
- He was the only person with signatory authority on his law firm's business account (RRI 105);
- He endorsed the \$16,500.00 settlement check that the law firm received on behalf of Singh (RRI 114-15);
- He did not know who was responsible for the proper disbursement of settlement funds that the law firm received (RRI 115-16);
- He never asked questions about deposits to or disbursements from the firm's IOLTA account – he just authorized them by signing as requested by the law firm's staff (RRI 119-23);
- He endorsed and deposited a check for \$11,500.00 that the firm received on behalf of Arshdeep Kaur, wrote a check to Kaur for \$2,213.00 very shortly after depositing the \$11,500.00 check, and did not know or try to ascertain what happened to the remaining \$9,287.00 (RRII 50-52);
- On May 3, 2012, the balance in the firm's IOLTA account was \$185.31 (RRII 6-7);

- On July 15, 2012, the IOLTA balance was \$4.01 (RRII 8);
- On September 19, 2012, the IOLTA balance was less than zero (RRII 8-9);
- The \$3,908 that the law firm withheld to pay St. Luke's hospital was not kept in trust (RRII 6-8);
- All of the law firm's expenses, including business expenses and payroll expenses, were paid from the IOLTA account (RRII 13-14); and
- He had to take out two personal loans and deposit the proceeds into the IOLTA account in order to keep the account "liquid" (RRII 17-20).

B. Documentary evidence provided further support for the findings.

In addition to testimony from Singh and Chukwurah, the Commission presented documentary evidence to support the allegations of misconduct. The evidence included copies of the two judgments that suspended Chukwurah's law license (Pet. Ex. 1 and 4); a copy of a letter dated December 19, 2011, from Singh and Kaur's insurance company to Chukwurah acknowledging Chukwurah's representation of Singh and Kaur (Pet. Ex. 6); a copy of a letter dated January 31, 2012, to Singh and Kaur's insurance company ostensibly signed by Chukwurah and sent under a letterhead for "Chukwurah's Law Firm" that identified Chukwurah as the firm's only attorney (Pet. Ex. 7); copies of three additional letters from Singh and Kaur's insurance company to Chukwurah regarding the

settlement of the clients' claims (Pet. Ex. 8, 9, and 10); a copy of the "Client's Closing Statement" prepared by Chukwurah's firm to show the intended disbursement of Kaur's insurance settlement proceeds (Pet. Ex. 13); copies of checks documenting the transfer of funds from (1) Singh and Kaur's insurance company to Chukwurah's firm, (2) Chukwurah's firm to Singh and Kaur, and (3) Chukwurah's firm to St. Luke's Vintage Hospital (Pet. Ex. 14, 15, 16, 18, and 27); and copies of statements from Chukwurah's IOLTA account showing that between the time he withheld Kaur's funds to pay St. Luke's Vintage Hospital and the time he paid the hospital in full, the account balance became overdrawn (Pet. Ex. 22, 24, and 26).

C. Chukwurah offered little evidence to counter the strong evidence offered by the Commission.

Chukwurah's defense rested on his testimony that he never represented Kaur or Singh (RRI 108-09; RRII 23-24).⁵ However, Singh's testimony contradicted Chukwurah's testimony, and the Evidentiary Panel had sole authority to determine which testimony to credit because a reviewing court may not reverse a credibility determination. *Maritime Overseas Corp. v. Ellis*, 971 S.W.2d 402, 407 (Tex. 1998).

⁵ Chukwurah's brief includes extensive accusations regarding supposed racial prejudice in the proceedings below. However, there is absolutely nothing in the record to support his accusations.

Chukwurah also testified that two attorneys, Dominique Ameachi and Chidi Umeh, took over the cases he was handling when his suspension began (RRI 95-97). But correspondence with Nationwide Insurance regarding Singh and Kaur's claims showed otherwise (Pet. Ex. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10). Chukwurah provided no legitimate explanation for Nationwide's continuing to treat him as if he were Singh and Kaur's attorney during his suspension.

In the final analysis, Chukwurah's defense did little to refute the convincing evidence that the Commission offered. It was clear from the evidence that Chukwurah did not take steps that he was required to take once his law license was suspended. Instead, he attempted to maintain control of his law firm, and he engaged in conduct that harmed his clients. Therefore, the Evidentiary Panel correctly determined that he violated the disciplinary rules as alleged.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

Because Chukwurah has not shown that the Evidentiary Panel erred, the Commission prays that the Board affirm the Judgment of Disbarment in all respects.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

LINDA A. ACEVEDO
CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

LAURA BAYOUTH POPPS
DEPUTY COUNSEL FOR ADMINISTRATION

CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON
SENIOR APPELLATE COUNSEL

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF DISCIPLINARY
COUNSEL
STATE BAR OF TEXAS
P.O. BOX 12487
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711
TELEPHONE: 512.427.1350; 1.877.953.5535
FAX: 512.427.4167

/s/ Cynthia Canfield Hamilton
CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON
STATE BAR CARD No. 00790419
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to the Board of Disciplinary Appeals Internal Procedural Rules, the foregoing brief on the merits contains approximately 2,716 words (total for all sections of brief that are required to be counted), which is less than the total words permitted by the Board's Internal Procedural Rules. Counsel relies on the word count of the computer program used to prepare this petition.

/s/ Cynthia Canfield Hamilton
CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that the above and foregoing brief of Appellee, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, has been served on Mr. Cyril Okey Chukwurah, by email to cyril_chukwurah@yahoo.com on the 4th day of February 2016.

/s/ Cynthia Canfield Hamilton
CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON

No. 56620

**Before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals
Appointed by
The Supreme Court of Texas**

**CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH,
APPELLANT**

V.

**COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,
APPELLEE**

*On Appeal from the Evidentiary Panel
For the State Bar of Texas District 4-6
No. 201402059*

**APPENDIX TO BRIEF OF APPELLEE
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE**

LINDA A. ACEVEDO
CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

LAURA BAYOUTH POPPS
DEPUTY COUNSEL FOR
ADMINISTRATION

CYNTHIA CANFIELD HAMILTON
SENIOR APPELLATE COUNSEL

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF DISCIPLINARY
COUNSEL
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE
STATE BAR OF TEXAS
P.O. Box 12487
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2487
512.427.1350; 1.877.953.5535
FAX: 512.427.4167

No. 56620

Before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals
Appointed by
The Supreme Court of Texas

CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH,
APPELLANT

V.

COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,
APPELLEE

*On Appeal from the Evidentiary Panel
For the State Bar of Texas District 4-6
No. 201402059*

APPENDIX TO BRIEF OF APPELLEE
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS:

The Commission for Lawyer Discipline attaches the following documents in support of the foregoing brief:

APPENDIX 1: Judgment of Disbarment (CR 749-53)

Appendix 1

FILED

AUG 25 2015

STATE BAR OF TEXAS
HOUSTON CDC

BEFORE THE DISTRICT 4 GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE
EVIDENTIARY PANEL 4-6
STATE BAR OF TEXAS

COMMISSION FOR LAWYER	§	
DISCIPLINE,	§	
Petitioner	§	201402059 [ARSHDEEP KAUR]
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
CYRIL OKEY CHUKWURAH,	§	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
Respondent	§	

JUDGMENT OF DISBARMENT

Parties and Appearance

On August 12, 2015 and August 19, 2015, came to be heard the above styled and numbered cause. Petitioner, Commission for Lawyer Discipline, appeared by and through its attorney of record and announced ready. Respondent, Cyril Okey Chukwurah, Texas Bar Number 24048394, appeared in person and through attorney of record and announced ready.

Jurisdiction and Venue

The Evidentiary Panel 4-6, having been duly appointed to hear this complaint by the chair of the Grievance Committee for State Bar of Texas District 4, finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action and that venue is proper.

Professional Misconduct

The Evidentiary Panel, having considered all of the pleadings, evidence, stipulations and argument, finds Respondent has committed Professional Misconduct as defined by Rule 1.06(W) of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure.

Findings of Fact

The Evidentiary Panel, having considered the pleadings, evidence and argument of counsel, makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. Respondent is an attorney licensed to practice law in Texas and is a member of the State Bar of Texas.
2. Respondent resides in or maintains his principal place of practice in Harris County, Texas.
3. Respondent failed to promptly deliver to Arshdeep Kaur and to St. Luke's Vintage Hospital funds that they were entitled to receive.
4. Respondent violated the disciplinary judgments entered in Case No. H0071031213, *Commission for Lawyer Discipline v. Cyril O. Chukwurah*, and Case No. H0041132816, *Commission for Lawyer Discipline v. Cyril O. Chukwurah*.
5. The Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas has incurred reasonable attorneys' fees and direct expenses associated with this Disciplinary Proceeding in the amount of \$4,442.75.

Conclusions of Law

The Evidentiary Panel concludes that, based on foregoing findings of fact, the following Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct have been violated: Rules 1.14(b) and 8.04(a)(7).

Sanction

The Evidentiary Panel, having found Respondent committed Professional Misconduct, heard and considered additional evidence regarding the appropriate sanction to be imposed against Respondent. After hearing all evidence and arguments, the Evidentiary Panel considered the past disciplinary record of the Respondent. Respondent's past disciplinary record was extensive, including a four-year active suspension from the practice of law that was ordered in 2012. The Evidentiary Panel also heard Respondent's own testimony that his law office has continued to remain open for business during the entire time that Respondent has been actively suspended from the practice of law over the past several years. Although Respondent has denied engaging in the

practice of law during his active suspension, evidence and exhibits introduced at the Evidentiary Hearing established that Respondent continued to engage in the practice of law while being actively suspended. Based upon all the testimony and evidence, based upon Respondent's failure to comply with past suspension orders, and after having considered the factors in Rule 2.18 of the Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure, the Evidentiary Panel finds that proper discipline of the Respondent for each act of Professional Misconduct is DISBARMENT.

Disbarment

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that effective August 21, 2015, Respondent, Cyril Okey Chukwurah, State Bar Number 24048394, is hereby DISBARRED from the practice of law in the State of Texas.

It is further ORDERED Respondent is prohibited from practicing law in Texas, holding himself out as an attorney at law, performing any legal services for others, accepting any fee directly or indirectly for legal services, appearing as counsel or in any representative capacity in any proceeding in any Texas court or before any administrative body or holding himself out to others or using his name, in any manner, in conjunction with the words "attorney at law," "attorney," "counselor at law," or "lawyer," or "law firm," including "Chukwurah's Law Firm."

Notification

It is further ORDERED Respondent shall immediately notify each of the current clients of Chukwurah's Law Firm, P.C. in writing of this disbarment. In addition to such notification, Respondent is ORDERED to return any files, papers, unearned monies and other property belonging to clients and former clients of Chukwurah's Law Firm, P.C. in the Respondent's possession to the respective clients or former clients or to another attorney at the client's or former client's request. Respondent is further ORDERED to file with the State Bar of Texas, Chief Disciplinary Counsel's

Office, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711-2487 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701) within thirty (30) days of the signing of this judgment by the Panel Chair, an affidavit stating that all current clients have been notified of Respondent's disbarment and that all files, papers, monies and other property belonging to all clients and former clients have been returned as ordered herein.

It is further ORDERED Respondent shall, on or before thirty (30) days from the signing of this judgment by the Panel Chair, notify in writing each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, administrative judge or officer and chief justice of each and every court or tribunal in which Chukwurah's Law Firm, P.C. has any matter pending of the terms of this judgment, the style and cause number of the pending matter(s), and the name, address and telephone number of the client(s) Chukwurah's Law Firm, P.C. is representing. Respondent is further ORDERED to file with the State Bar of Texas, Chief Disciplinary Counsel's Office, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711-2487 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), within thirty (30) days of the signing of this judgment by the Panel Chair, an affidavit stating that each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, administrative judge or officer and chief justice has received written notice of the terms of this judgment.

Surrender of License

The Evidentiary Panel notes that Respondent's law license and permanent State Bar Card were previously surrendered to the Supreme Court of Texas.

Attorneys' Fees and Expenses

It is further ORDERED Respondent shall pay all reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees and direct expenses to the State Bar of Texas in the amount of \$4,442.75. The payment shall be due and payable on or before sixty (60) days from the signing of this judgment by the Panel Chair, and shall be made by certified or cashier's check or money order. Respondent shall forward the funds,

made payable to the State Bar of Texas, to the Chief Disciplinary Counsel's Office, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711-2487 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701).

It is further ORDERED that all amounts ordered herein are due to the misconduct of Respondent and are assessed as a part of the sanction in accordance with Rule 1.06(Z) of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure. Any amount not paid shall accrue interest at the maximum legal rate per annum until paid and the State Bar of Texas shall have all writs and other post-judgment remedies against Respondent in order to collect all unpaid amounts.

Publication

It is further ORDERED this disbarment shall be made a matter of record and appropriately published in accordance with the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure.

Conditions Precedent to Reinstatement

It is further ORDERED that payment of the foregoing restitution and attorneys' fees and expenses amounts shall be a condition precedent to any consideration of reinstatement from disbarment as provided by Rules 2.19, 2.20 and 11.02(D) of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure.

Other Relief

All requested relief not expressly granted herein is expressly DENIED.

SIGNED this 21st day of August, 2015.

EVIDENTIARY PANEL
DISTRICT NO. 4
STATE BAR OF TEXAS



MICHAEL L. PHIFER
District 4-6 Presiding Member