



**BEFORE THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS
APPOINTED BY
THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS**

IN THE MATTER OF	§	
ALEXANDER LOUIS BEDNAR	§	CAUSE NO. 62368
STATE BAR CARD NO. 24044456	§	

JUDGMENT OF DISBARMENT

On the 29th day of January, 2021, the above-styled and numbered disciplinary action was called for hearing before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals. Petitioner, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, appeared by attorney and announced ready. Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, appeared by attorney. All properly raised matters of fact as well as law were submitted to the Board of Disciplinary Appeals for determination. Having considered the pleadings on file, having received evidence, and having heard the argument of counsel, the Board of Disciplinary Appeals is of the opinion that Petitioner is entitled to entry of the following findings and orders.

Findings of Fact

The Board of Disciplinary Appeals finds that:

- (1) Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, State Bar Card Number 24044456, is licensed but not currently authorized to practice law in the State of Texas by the Supreme Court of Texas.
- (2) On January 11, 2018, the Oklahoma Bar Association (OBA) filed a Complaint with the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma (hereinafter Oklahoma Supreme Court) in a matter styled, *State of Oklahoma ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association, Complainant v. Alexander Louis Bednar, Respondent*, OBAD #2166 SCBD #6618. The forty-four page Complaint alleged eleven counts of professional misconduct, as well as an allegation in support of enhancement of discipline based on a judgment of reciprocal discipline issued April 2, 2013 by the Oklahoma Supreme Court in a matter styled *State of Oklahoma ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association, Complainant v. Alexander Louis Bednar, Respondent*, SCBD #5927.

- (3) In that 2013 reciprocal case, Respondent asserted that he had mental health conditions that constituted a “disability,” and the Oklahoma Supreme Court ordered an evidentiary hearing before a Professional Responsibility Tribunal (PRT) to determine whether the matter should be treated as a proceeding under Rule 10 of the Oklahoma Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings (RGDP), relating to attorneys found to be “personally incapable of practicing law.” *State of Ok. ex rel. Ok. Bar Ass’n v. Bednar*, 299 P.3d 488, 491 (Ok. 2013) [hereinafter *Bednar* 2013]. Based on the PRT’s report, the Oklahoma Supreme Court concluded that “[w]hile it is possible that Respondent may suffer from an illness which makes it more difficult for him to manage himself, his affairs or the affairs of others, it does not remove from him the responsibility of acting with honesty and integrity.” *Id.* at 492. The court declined to convert the matter to a disability proceeding under Rule 10 and instead ordered that Respondent be suspended from the practice of law for one year. *Id.* at 493.
- (4) A reciprocal discipline case was brought before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals based on that 2013 Oklahoma one-year disciplinary suspension. *See In the Matter of Alexander Louis Bednar*, BODA Case No. 52882. That case was resolved by agreed judgment for a one-year suspension from the practice of law in Texas, issued August 28, 2013. In that agreed judgment, signed by Respondent, the Board concluded that identical reciprocal discipline was warranted.
- (5) In the underlying disciplinary case brought by the OBA in 2018, the Oklahoma Supreme Court assigned the matter to a PRT. The PRT found that Respondent failed to respond to the Complaint in accordance with Oklahoma RGDP 6.4, which provides that “[i]n the event the respondent fails to answer, the charges [in the complaint] shall be deemed admitted.” *State ex re. Ok. Bar Ass’n v. Bednar*, 441 P.3d 91, 96 (Ok. 2019) [hereinafter *Bednar* 2019] (quoting RGDP 6.4). Respondent also failed to respond to the OBA’s motion to deem allegations admitted. *Id.* at 94, 96. The PRT issued an order granting the OBA’s motion, deeming admitted the allegations in the Complaint, referenced in paragraph (2) above. *Id.*
- (6) A two-week trial was held before the PRT. *Id.* at 94. The OBA called twenty-nine witnesses. Respondent, appearing pro se, called five witnesses and cross-examined the OBA’s witnesses. On agreement of the parties to the proceeding before this Board, the Board took official notice of the 2551-page transcript of that trial.
- (7) The PRT filed a Trial Panel Report in the Oklahoma Supreme Court in the matter styled, *State of Oklahoma ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association, Complainant v. Alexander Louis Bednar, Respondent, SCBD #6618*. The PRT found by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent violated Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct (ORPC) 1.1, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4(a), 8.1(b), 8.2(a), 8.4(c)–(d) and Oklahoma RGDP 1.3 and 5.2, set out in paragraph (16) below. The PRT recommended that Respondent be permanently disbarred.
- (8) In the Trial Panel Report, the PRT expressed that Respondent failed to uphold his

obligations to cooperate in the grievance process and properly respond to inquiries throughout the disciplinary proceeding; repeatedly failed to act in good faith, asserted frivolous claims and issues, and demanded irrelevant and oppressive discovery; failed to represent his clients competently or to exercise due diligence in verifying the truth of pleadings he submitted; continually persisted in unauthorized communications with a person represented by counsel after reiterated requests to desist; lacked candor with the court and failed to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation or notify defendants of filings; submitted fraudulent filings, directly and intentionally misrepresented facts, and knowingly disobeyed a court order. The PRT found that Respondent's behavior was prejudicial to the administration of justice and caused numerous parties unnecessary pecuniary loss and personal harm.

- (9) The PRT also noted in the Trial Panel Report that although Respondent had defended a prior disciplinary action by asserting that he suffered from mental health issues, "no such defense was asserted this time."
- (10) The Oklahoma Supreme Court reviewed the PRT's report and recommendation, referenced in paragraph (7) above, conducting "a full-scale, nondeferential, *de novo* review of all relevant facts." *Bednar* 2019, 441 P.3d at 95. "Even when allegations are deemed admitted, the Court will impose discipline only upon finding clear and convincing evidence was presented demonstrating the misconduct." *Id.* at 97 (citing RGDP 6.12(c)).
- (11) On March 12, 2019, the Oklahoma Supreme Court issued a per curiam opinion and order titled Proceeding for Bar Discipline (hereinafter Oklahoma Order) in the matter styled, *State of Oklahoma ex rel. Oklahoma Bar Association, Complainant v. Alexander Louis Bednar, Respondent, SCBD #6618*. The court found clear and convincing evidence of professional misconduct in nine counts. *Bednar* 2019, 441 P.3d at 113. The court ordered that "RESPONDENT IS DISBARRED AND ORDERED TO PAY COSTS," commenting that "[a]nything less than disbarment would invite further victimization and greater disintegration of public confidence in the legal system of this State." *Bednar* 2019, 441 P.3d at 112–13.
- (12) In the Oklahoma Order, the Oklahoma Supreme Court noted that in investigating grievances filed against Respondent, the OBA was concerned that Respondent's physical and/or mental health might be affecting his practice of law. *Id.* at 98. The OBA requested certain healthcare information, which Respondent refused to provide. *Id.* The court determined that Respondent's "refusal to submit medical records foreclosed the possibility of the Bar proceeding under Rule 10." *Id.* at 98–99.
- (13) The Oklahoma Supreme Court considered Respondent's allegations that the OBA's investigative process was fraught with procedural and substantive due process violations, and that Respondent was subjected to "trial by ambush." *Id.* at 96. On de novo review, the Oklahoma Supreme Court concluded that "[t]horough review

of the record reveals that Respondent's allegations of due process violations are without merit." *Id.* at 97.

- (14) On April 29, 2019, the Oklahoma Supreme Court entered an order in that same matter, denying Respondent's Motion for Rehearing.
- (15) On May 31, 2019, the Oklahoma Supreme Court entered another order in the same matter, striking Respondent's request to the Supreme Court to review and reconsider his case.
- (16) In the Oklahoma Order, the Oklahoma Supreme Court found that Alexander Louis Bednar violated the following ORPC:
 - 1.1 A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.
 - 1.3 A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.
 - 3.1 A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law. A lawyer for the defendant in a criminal proceeding, or the respondent in a proceeding that could result in incarceration, may nevertheless so defend the proceeding as to require that every element of the case be established.
 - 3.2 A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client.
 - 3.3 (a) A lawyer shall not knowingly:
 - (1) make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer;
 - (2) fail to disclose to the tribunal legal authority in the controlling jurisdiction known to the lawyer to be directly adverse to the position of the client and not disclosed by opposing counsel; or
 - (3) offer evidence that the lawyer knows to be false. If a

lawyer, the lawyer's client, or a witness called by the lawyer, has offered material evidence and the lawyer comes to know of its falsity, the lawyer shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal. A lawyer may refuse to offer evidence that the lawyer reasonably believes is false.

(4) fail to disclose a fact to a tribunal when disclosure is necessary to avoid assisting a criminal or fraudulent act by the client.

(b) A lawyer who represents a client in an adjudicative proceeding and who knows that a person intends to engage, is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceeding shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal.

(c) The duties stated in paragraphs (a) and (b) continue to the conclusion of the proceeding, and apply even if compliance requires disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6.

(d) In an ex parte proceeding, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer which will enable the tribunal to make an informed decision, whether or not the facts are adverse.

3.4 A lawyer shall not:

(a) unlawfully obstruct another party's access to evidence or unlawfully alter, destroy or conceal a document or other material having potential evidentiary value. A lawyer shall not counsel or assist another person to do any such act;

(b) falsify evidence, counsel or assist a witness to testify falsely, or offer an inducement to a witness that is prohibited by law;

(c) knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of a tribunal except for an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation exists;

(d) in pretrial procedure, make a frivolous discovery request or fail to make reasonably diligent effort to comply with a legally proper discovery request by an opposing party;

(e) in trial, allude to any matter that the lawyer does not reasonably believe is relevant or that will not be supported by admissible evidence, assert personal knowledge of facts in issue except when

testifying as a witness, or state a personal opinion as to the justness of a cause, the credibility of a witness, the culpability of a civil litigant or the guilt or innocence of an accused; or

(f) request a person other than a client to refrain from voluntarily giving relevant information to another party unless:

(1) the person is a relative or an employee or other agent of a client; and

(2) the lawyer reasonably believes that the person's interests will not be adversely affected by refraining from giving such information.

4.2 In representing a client, a lawyer shall not communicate about the subject of the representation with a person the lawyer knows to be represented by another lawyer in the matter, unless the lawyer has the consent of the other lawyer or is authorized to do so by law or a court order.

4.4(a) In representing a client, a lawyer shall not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person, or use methods of obtaining evidence that violate the legal rights of such a person.

8.1 An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer in connection with a bar admission application or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

(b) fail to disclose a fact necessary to correct a misapprehension known by the person to have arisen in the matter, or knowingly fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6.

8.2(a) A lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, adjudicatory officer or public legal officer, or of a candidate for election or appointment to judicial or legal office.

8.4 It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

(d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.

The Oklahoma Supreme Court also found that Alexander Louis Bednar violated the following RGDP:

- 1.3 The commission by any lawyer of any act contrary to prescribed standards of conduct, whether in the course of his professional capacity, or otherwise, which act would reasonably be found to bring discredit upon the legal profession, shall be grounds for disciplinary action, whether or not the act is a felony or misdemeanor, or a crime at all. Conviction in a criminal proceeding is not a condition precedent to the imposition of discipline.
 - 5.2 After making such preliminary investigation as the General Counsel may deem appropriate, the General Counsel shall either (1) notify the person filing the grievance and the lawyer that the allegations of the grievance are inadequate, incomplete, or insufficient to warrant the further attention of the [Professional Responsibility] Commission, provided that such action shall be reported to the Commission at its next meeting, or (2) file and serve a copy of the grievance (or, in the case of an investigation instituted on the part of the General Counsel or the Commission without the filing of a signed grievance, a recital of the relevant facts or allegations) upon the lawyer, who shall thereafter make a written response which contains a full and fair disclosure of all the facts and circumstances pertaining to the respondent lawyer's alleged misconduct unless the respondent's refusal to do so is predicated upon expressed constitutional grounds. Deliberate misrepresentation in such response shall itself be grounds for discipline. The failure of a lawyer to answer within twenty (20) days after service of the grievance (or recital of facts or allegations), or such further time as may be granted by the General Counsel, shall be grounds for discipline. The General Counsel shall make such further investigation of the grievance and response as the General Counsel may deem appropriate before taking any action.
- (17) Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, is the same person as Alexander Louis Bednar, who is the subject of the Oklahoma Order, described above.
 - (18) On September 19, 2019, Respondent was served by certified mail, delivery to an individual, with the Second Amended Petition, which included a copy of the Board's Internal Procedural Rules, notice of the hearing set for October 23, 2020, and the Board's order that he show cause within thirty days why reciprocal discipline would be unwarranted. *See* TEX. R. DISCIPLINARY P. R. 9.02.

- (19) At 4:41 p.m. on October 16, 2020, one week before the hearing date, the Board received Respondent's "Motion for Extension of Time to Respond." In that motion, Respondent sought "an extension of time in order to prepare the massive defense work and to continue to seek counsel." Petitioner did not oppose the motion. However, the motion for Extension did not indicate an agreement from Petitioner to extend the answer deadline, nor did the Respondent expressly request an extension of the answer deadline under the Board's show-cause order, Internal Procedural Rule 7.03, and Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 9.02. On October 20, 2020, the Board issued an order granting the motion, continuing the hearing to January 29, 2021, and ordering the parties to appear for a pretrial conference at 11:00 a.m. on January 7, 2021. The Board's order further stated that "[f]urther continuance requests shall be disfavored."
- (20) On December 31, 2020, the Board sent the parties a letter regarding the pretrial conference. In it, the Board noted that since its order granting the continuance, no answer, pleadings, or other papers had been filed. The Board instructed that the parties should be prepared to address during the conference "the extent to which Respondent may present a case at the hearing" under the rules governing reciprocal discipline cases.
- (21) At 10:51 a.m. on January 7, 2021, just minutes before the pretrial conference, Respondent filed an "answer and request for clarification and for good faith extension of time." In it, Respondent "requests that he be allowed to present this Answer at this time [and] that he be allowed to supplement it." Respondent also made a second continuance request.
- (22) A panel of the Board conducted a pretrial conference on January 7, 2021. Respondent appeared pro se, and Petitioner appeared through counsel. In response to the Chair's question about Respondent not having filed an answer until that day, Respondent replied that he was under the impression that he could simply present defenses without having to file an answer, but after reading the rules, he realized that he should probably file an answer. Respondent argued that the Board should accept his answer based on "equitable principles." Respondent did not claim at that time that he believed the Board had granted him an extension of the answer deadline.
- (23) On January 8, 2021, the Board issued an order finding that Respondent's January 7, 2021 answer was untimely and that Respondent failed to establish that he used due diligence to prepare his case in the time extended to him through the continuance granted on October 20, 2020. The Board's order denied Respondent's request to consider his untimely answer, denied his continuance request, and denied Respondent's request for a discovery control plan, but explained that the Chair would exercise discretion to allow Respondent to testify at the hearing as to the merits of the petition, pursuant to Internal Procedural Rule 7.03.

- (24) On January 20, 2021, the deadline the Board had set for parties to submit potential hearing exhibits to the Board, Respondent filed a “motion to strike December 31, 2020 letter, January 7, 2021 pretrial proceeding in its entirety, January 8, 2021 ‘pretrial order’ for inaccuracy and irregularity, ‘trial’ and for other relief.” Respondent argued that his January 7, 2021 answer had been timely filed because the Board’s October 20, 2020 order had granted the requested and agreed time of three months to extend the answer deadline, thus resetting the answer deadline to January 20, 2021. In that motion, Respondent made a third request for continuance.
- (25) The Board denied Respondent’s January 20, 2021 motion by order dated January 22, 2021. In that order, the Board reiterated its finding that Respondent failed to file a timely answer and stated that because Part IX of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure limits the scope of the proceeding, the Board would not entertain any attempts to relitigate the merits of the underlying disciplinary action.
- (26) On January 27, 2021, two days before the hearing date, Respondent filed a notice of appearance stating that he retained counsel, and an emergency motion for continuance. For the first time in this proceeding or the underlying Oklahoma Supreme Court proceeding, Respondent asserted the possible existence of disability, suggesting that Respondent’s ability to participate meaningfully in the preparation of his defense may be impaired. Respondent made a fourth continuance request, this time asking for the hearing to be reset to allow his counsel time to prepare for the hearing and allowing either for the Board to forward the matter to a District Disability Committee or to have Respondent submit to a mental health examination. Respondent also argued that the Board’s orders as to Respondent’s answer and the scope of the hearing violated Respondent’s due process rights.
- (27) On January 28, 2021, the Board issued an order denying Respondent’s request for continuance. The order clarified that because Respondent failed to respond timely to the Board’s show-cause order, defenses listed under Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 9.04 are not at issue in this proceeding. However, the order again explained that the Chair would exercise discretion under Internal Procedural Rule 7.03 to allow Respondent provide testimony relating to the merits of the petition, *i.e.*, testimony relevant to whether Petitioner meets its burden of proof as to the merits of its reciprocal discipline case.
- (28) At 4:59 p.m. on January 28, 2021, the day before the hearing, Respondent filed an “objection and motion to strike the Board’s January 8, 2021, January 22, 2021, and January 28, 2021 orders.” The motion again raised issues of potential disability and due process, arguing that if the hearing were to proceed as scheduled and in accordance with the Board’s prior orders, Respondent would be deprived of an opportunity to be meaningfully heard. Respondent again argued that the Board erroneously found that Respondent’s answer was untimely and challenged the Board’s conclusion that the Chair lacked discretion to allow Respondent to present defenses or other witnesses at the hearing. For the first time in this proceeding or the underlying Oklahoma Supreme Court proceeding, Respondent argued that the

underlying disciplinary action violated the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and that the Board's failure to reconsider its orders and grant a continuance also violates Respondent's rights under the ADA. The motion contained a fifth request for continuance.

- (29) At the January 29, 2021 hearing, the Board chair announced that the Board had considered Respondent's motion and that it was denied. Respondent's counsel requested that he be allowed to argue the motion for purposes of appeal, and that request was granted. Respondent orally re-urged the motion, requesting that the Board reconsider its prior ruling. Respondent again requested that the hearing be set for a later date—a sixth request for continuance.
- (30) At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board issued a written order on January 29, 2021, denying Respondent's January 28, 2021 motion and denying the oral motion for reconsideration and request for continuance.

Conclusions of Law

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the Board of Disciplinary Appeals makes the following conclusions of law:

- (1) The Board has jurisdiction to hear and determine this matter. TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 7.08(H).
- (2) Respondent's objection to the Board taking official notice of the potential exhibit submitted to the Board as Respondent's Exhibit 96, which was not offered into evidence at the hearing, is **SUSTAINED**.
- (3) As the Board's orders explain, Respondent's answer tendered to the Board on January 7, 2021 did not respond timely to the Board's show-cause order or timely raise defenses in accordance with Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure 9.02–.04, and the Board's October 20, 2020 order did not extend the answer deadline.
- (4) Because Respondent failed to answer timely, Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure 9.03 requires that the Board enter a judgment imposing reciprocal discipline.
- (5) Although Internal Procedural Rule 7.03 gives the Chair discretion to receive testimony from a respondent who has failed to file a timely answer, that discretion is limited and extends only to the respondent's own testimony and testimony that relates to the merits of the petition. In this case, the Board Chair did not have discretion to allow Respondent to present testimony of other witnesses or to present defenses under Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 9.04, which were not timely raised.

- (6) Respondent seeks to relitigate the issue of whether Respondent was improperly disciplined in Oklahoma because he suffered from a disability—an issue that has already been considered and determined by the Oklahoma Supreme Court and is conclusive for purposes of the Board’s inquiry. *See* TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 9.01. In 2013, following an evidentiary hearing concerning the status of Respondent’s mental health, the Oklahoma Supreme Court declined to convert the matter to what amounts to a disability proceeding under the Oklahoma RGDP and instead issued a reciprocal discipline order. In the underlying proceeding, the OBA raised the question of Respondent’s mental health and requested information relevant to that inquiry; because Respondent refused to provide the requested information, however, the Oklahoma Supreme Court held that Respondent foreclosed the possibility of a disability proceeding. The Respondent has pointed to no authority, and the Board has found none, indicating that the Board has authority to disturb the Oklahoma Supreme Court’s decisions as to any potential disability or as to the basis for imposing discipline under the RGDP.
- (7) Likewise, Respondent has provided no authority, and the Board has found none, indicating that the Board has authority to initiate a disability proceeding sua sponte, or at Respondent’s request. In fact, pursuant to Title XII of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, disability matters are referred to the Board by either the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, with authorization or direction from the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, or by an Evidentiary Panel. *See* TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 12.02–.03; 4.06(I).
- (8) Respondent has identified no authority that would support the position that the ADA prohibits the Board from hearing or deciding a reciprocal discipline proceeding against Respondent. Respondent has presented no evidence that he suffers from a disability as defined by the ADA, nor has Respondent established any other element of a claim under Title II of the ADA.
- (9) Reciprocal discipline identical to that imposed by the Oklahoma Supreme Court is warranted in this case. *See* TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 9.03.

It is, accordingly, **ORDERED**, **ADJUDGED**, and **DECREED** that Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, State Bar Card No. 24044456, be and hereby is **DISBARRED** from the practice of law in the State of Texas and his license to practice law in this state be and hereby is revoked.

It is further **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, 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.”

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent shall immediately notify each of his current clients in writing of this disbarment. In addition to such notification, Respondent is **ORDERED** to return any files, papers, unearned monies, and other property, which belong to clients and former clients and are in the Respondent’s possession or control, 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 Board, 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** that Respondent shall, on or before thirty (30) days from the signing of this judgment by the Board, 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 Respondent 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) Respondent 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 Board, 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.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Alexander Louis Bednar, immediately surrender both his Texas law license and permanent State Bar Card to the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711, for transmittal to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas.

It is further **ORDERED** that a certified copy of the Second Amended Petition for Reciprocal Discipline on file herein, along with a copy of this Judgment, be sent to the Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711.

Signed this 5th day of February 2021.



CHAIR PRESIDING
BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS