

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

<b>IN THE MATTER OF</b>	§	
<b>PATRICK MICHAEL MEGARO</b>	§	<b>CAUSE NO. 65568</b>
<b>STATE BAR CARD NO. 24091024</b>	§	

**AGREED JUDGMENT OF SUSPENSION**

On this day the above-styled and numbered reciprocal disciplinary action was called for hearing before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals. Petitioner appeared by attorney and Respondent appeared in person as indicated by their respective signatures below and announced that they agree to the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and orders set forth below solely for the purposes of this proceeding which has not been fully adjudicated. Respondent waives any and all defenses that could be asserted under Rule 9.04 of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure. The Board of Disciplinary Appeals, having reviewed the file and in consideration of the agreement of the parties, is of the opinion that Petitioner is entitled to entry of the following findings, conclusions, and orders:

**Findings of Fact.** The Board of Disciplinary Appeals finds that:

- (1) Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, Bar Card No. 24091024, is an attorney licensed and authorized to practice law in the State of Texas.
- (2) On or about October 11, 2019, an Amended Complaint was entered in the State of North Carolina Wake County, in a matter styled, *The North Carolina State Bar, Plaintiff v. Patrick Michael Megaro, Attorney, Defendant*, Before the Disciplinary Hearing Commission of the North Carolina State Bar, 18 DHC 41.
- (3) On or about April 27, 2021, an Order of Discipline was entered by Tate[sic] of North Carolina Wake County, in a matter styled *The North Carolina State Bar, Plaintiff v. Patrick Michael Megaro, Attorney, Defendant*, Before the Disciplinary Hearing Commission of the North Carolina State Bar, 18 DHC 41, which states in pertinent part:

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1) All parties are properly before the Hearing Panel and the panel has jurisdiction over Defendant, Patrick Michael Megaro, and over the subject matter.
- 2) Megaro's conduct, as set forth in the Findings of Fact above, constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 84-28(b)(2) in that Defendant violated the Rules of Professional Conduct as follows:
  - a) By claiming an irrevocable interest in McCollum and Brown's potential financial payments from the state, Defendant charged an improper fee in violation of Rule 1.5(a) and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c);
  - b) By entering into a representation agreement with his clients when he knew they did not have the capacity to understand the agreement, Defendant engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c) and engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice in violation of Rule 8.4(d);
  - c) By having McCollum sign off on a settlement agreement and representing to a court that McCollum had consented to the settlement when Defendant knew McCollum did not have the capacity to understand the agreement, Defendant made a false statement to a tribunal and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation that was prejudicial to the administration of justice in violation of Rule 3.3(a), Rule 8.4(c), and Rule 8.4(d);
  - d) By charging and collecting one-third of McCollum and Brown's Industrial Commission award when his role in that process was minimal and *pro forma*, Defendant charged and collected an excessive fee in violation of Rule 1.5(a);
  - e) By misrepresenting to the United States District Court in his proposed settlement of the Civil Suit that some of his work and costs in that action were for actions for which he had already been paid by McCollum and Brown's Industrial Commission award, Defendant made a false statement to a tribunal and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation that was prejudicial to the

administration of justice in violation of Rule 3.3(a), Rule 8.4(c), and Rule 8.4(d);

- f) By signing various Attorney Acknowledgements of Explanation of Terms to Plaintiff, Of Irrevocable Lien and Assignment to Multi Funding, Inc., claiming to Multi Funding, Inc. that he had explained the terms of the loan agreements to McCollum and Brown when they were not competent to understand those terms or enter into those agreements, Defendant made a material misrepresentation to Multi Funding, Inc. and thereby engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c);
- g) By lending McCollum and Brown money, both directly and/or through Derrick Hamilton, Defendant entered into a business transaction with his clients in violation of Rule 1.8(a) and Rule 1.8(e);
- h) By helping Geraldine get a \$25,000.00 loan from Multi Funding, Inc. against any future recovery made by Brown, with the loan proceeds sent directly to Geraldine for Brown's rent when Geraldine was not Brown's guardian, Defendant misused entrusted funds in violation of Rule 1.15-2 and failed to represent Brown with competence or diligence in violation of Rule 1.1 and Rule 1.3;
- i) By not promptly disbursing from his trust account \$10,000.00 to which he was entitled as proceeds of a loan from Derrick Hamilton, Defendant failed to properly maintain and disburse fiduciary funds in violation of Rule 1.15-2(a) and failed to withdraw the amounts to which Defendant was entitled in violation of Rule 1.15-2(g);
- j) By advancing money to McCollum and Brown for living expenses, and by guaranteeing repayment of various loans for McCollum and Brown, Defendant provided financial assistance to clients in connection with pending litigation in violation of Rule 1.8(e); and
- k) By entering into a retainer agreement with McCollum that was invalid due to McCollum's lack of competency and then arguing that McCollum was competent in an effort to protect his fee despite such arguments potentially harming McCollum's then-current claims against Robeson County, the Red Springs Police Department, and the State of North

Carolina, Defendant engaged in a conflict of interest, as Defendant's representation of McCollum was materially limited by Defendant's personal interest in defending his fee, in violation of Rule 1.7.

- 3) The Hearing Panel concludes that the remaining rule violations alleged in the Complaint in the First Claim for Relief and the entirety of the Second Claim for Relief are not established by the facts set forth in the Findings of Fact above.

Based upon the pleadings, all other filings in the record, the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and the evidence presented at the hearing in this matter, the Hearing Panel hereby finds by clear, cogent, and convincing evidence the following additional

#### FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING DISCIPLINE

- 1) The findings of fact in paragraphs 1 through 130 above are reincorporated as if set forth herein.
- 2) In 2015, Defendant was reprimanded by the North Carolina State Bar's Grievance Committee for assisting in the unauthorized practice of law and making misleading statements about his legal services.
- 3) Defendant's course of misconduct set forth in this order began in February 2015 and continued through August 2017. During that period, Defendant not only engaged in a pattern of repeated similar acts of misconduct, but also engaged in a wide variety of Rule violations.
- 4) McCollum and Brown were exceptionally vulnerable to the type of manipulation, deception, and exploitation perpetrated by Defendant. These clients had intellectual deficits and a history of trauma during their lengthy wrongful incarceration. Evaluating clinicians repeatedly described them as susceptible to manipulation and undue influence. Defendant was aware of his clients' vulnerabilities. Instead of protecting them, he capitalized on their naivete and inability to understand.
- 5) By charging and collecting clearly excessive amounts of McCollum and Brown's Industrial Commission awards based on a fee agreement he knew the clients could not understand, and in a proceeding where his actual work was *de minimis* and there was little or no risk that his clients would not receive the maximum allowed by statute, Defendant financially exploited McCollum and

Brown causing significant harm to his clients. Likewise, by arguing that McCollum was mentally competent in an effort to preserve his fee in the civil case, Defendant acted for his own financial benefit to the detriment of his client's legal interests.

- 6) Defendant used the attorney-client relationship as a foundation for obtaining money he had not earned from clients who lacked the knowledge and sophistication to question his actions or suspect his selfish motive. By elevating his own interests above the interests of McCollum and Brown, Defendant compromised the fiduciary relationship and caused significant harm to his clients.
- 7) Clients are entitled to attorneys they can trust to act with commitment and dedication to their interests, Defendant violated the trust inherent in the attorney-client relationship by prioritizing his own financial benefit over the best interests of his clients. By repeatedly deceiving and exploiting McCollum and Brown, Defendant has shown himself to be untrustworthy.
- 8) Defendant's willingness to deceive third parties and the court, as established by paragraphs (c), (e), and (f) in the Conclusions of Law above, further demonstrates that Defendant is untrustworthy.
- 9) By deceiving McCollum and Brown, collecting an unjustified amount of the funds they received as compensation for their wrongful incarceration, and allowing a third party to obtain a loan secured by Brown's potential settlement, Defendant intentionally created a foreseeable risk of significant harm to his clients.
- 10) There has been substantial media coverage of Defendant's conduct. Publicity surrounding a lawyer deceiving and exploiting mentally disabled clients debases the legal profession and demeans the justice system in the eyes of the public.
- 11) Defendant's conduct caused significant harm to the profession by reinforcing the negative stereotype that lawyers are greedy, selfish, and dishonest, and by diminishing the public's expectation that attorneys can be trusted to protect vulnerable clients.
- 12) Societal order depends in large measure on respect for the rule of law and deference to the decisions of our courts. To maintain this respect and deference, litigants and the general public must have faith in the integrity of our system of justice.
- 13) Defendant intentionally engaged in conduct that foreseeably undermines public faith in the legal system by deceiving and

exploiting clients with diminished intellectual capacity in a case that had already drawn public attention because it involved the mistreatment of vulnerable people.

- 14) An attorney's duty to persuasively advocate for his client is qualified by his duty of candor towards the tribunal. Accordingly, lawyers must always be honest and forthright with the tribunal. It is unacceptable for a lawyer to be anything less than completely candid with the court. As indicated in paragraphs (c) and (e) in the Conclusions of Law above, Defendant made false statements to the tribunal in violation of this fundamental duty.
- 15) Attorneys as officers of the court must avoid conduct that undermines the integrity of the adjudicative process. When an attorney makes false statements to the court, it foreseeably causes significant harm to the profession and the administration of justice by eroding judges' and lawyers' ability to rely on another attorney's word.
- 16) Defendant cooperated in the disciplinary process and gave extensive testimony before the Hearing Panel.
- 17) Defendant's testimony during the disciplinary hearing, however, reflects a pervasive tendency to blame others for his misconduct rather than acknowledging wrongdoing. Specifically, Defendant claimed that the allegations of misconduct against him arose due to the animosity of other lawyers who had also represented McCollum and/or Brown, rather than his own intentional acts.
- 18) There is no indication that Defendant has taken ownership of his misconduct or its consequences. With a few minor exceptions<sup>1</sup> he has not acknowledged violating the Rules of Professional Conduct. Defendant has not expressed remorse or shown any insight regarding the ways in which he betrayed his clients' trust.
- 19) Defendant has not refunded any of the excessive fees he collected from McCollum and Brown, insisting that he is entitled to \$500,000.00 for his participation in the *proforma* Industrial Commission proceedings. The evidence in this matter establishes that, at minimum, Defendant should be required to refund \$250,000.00 of that money because he did not earn it. This proceeding was not designed or intended to calculate the precise

---

<sup>1</sup> Though Defendant denied committing any rule violations in his Answer to the Amended Complaint, he admitted at trial to engaging in technical trust account violations and to having inaccurate language in his fee agreement. He did not admit- either at trial or in any pleading - to any of the more substantive misconduct that reflects adversely on his capacity for honesty and loyalty to his clients.

value of the legal services Defendant provided. The finding herein regarding the amount of fees that were unearned should not be interpreted as a conclusive valuation of services rendered by Defendant. It is merely a determination that - at minimum - half of the fees Defendant collected from the Industrial Commission award were unearned and should be refunded,

- 20) Some of Defendant's former clients and friends believe that Defendant is a person of honesty, integrity, and good character.
- 21) Defendant's misconduct resulted in other sanctions, in that the U.S. District Court voided his representation agreement with McCollum and removed him, as counsel in McCollum's case.

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Findings of Fact Regarding Discipline, the Hearing Panel makes the following

#### CONCLUSIONS REGARDING DISCIPLINE

- 1) The Hearing Panel considered all of the factors enumerated in 27 N.C.A.C. 1B §.0116(f) of the Discipline and Disciplinary Rules of the North Carolina State Bar.
- 2) The Hearing Panel concludes that the following factors from §.0116(f)(1), which are to be considered in imposing suspension or disbarment, are present in this case:
  - a) Intent of Defendant to commit acts where the harm or potential harm is foreseeable;
  - b) Circumstances reflecting Defendant's lack of honesty, trustworthiness, or integrity;
  - c) Elevation of Defendant's own interests above that of the client;
  - d) Negative impact of Defendant's actions on client's or public's perception of the profession;
  - e) Negative impact of Defendant's actions on the administration of justice; and
  - h) [sic]Acts of dishonesty, misrepresentation, deceit, or fabrication.

- 3) The Hearing Panel concludes that the following factor from §.0116(f)(2), which requires consideration of disbarment, is present in this case: Acts of dishonesty, misrepresentation, deceit, or fabrication.
- 4) The Hearing Panel concludes that the following factors from §.0116(f)(3), which are to be considered in all cases, are present in this case:
  - a) Prior disciplinary offenses;
  - b) Dishonest or selfish motive;
  - c) Indifference to making restitution;
  - d) Multiple offenses;
  - e) Refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of conduct;
  - f) Character or reputation;
  - g) Vulnerability of victim;
  - h) Full and free disclosure to the hearing panel or a cooperative attitude toward the proceedings; and
  - i) Imposition of other penalties or sanctions.
- 5) The Hearing Panel has carefully considered all of the different forms of discipline available to it, including admonition, reprimand, censure, suspension, and disbarment.
- 6) Defendant's course of misconduct involving the manipulation and exploitation of vulnerable clients reflects that Defendant is either unwilling or unable to conform his behavior to the requirements of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Defendant has refused to acknowledge the wrongfulness of his conduct and there is no evidence suggesting that he intends to modify his behavior. Accordingly, if Defendant were permitted to continue practicing law, he would pose a significant and unacceptable risk of continued harm to clients, the profession, the public, and the administration of justice.
- 7) The Hearing Panel finds that admonition, reprimand, or censure would not be sufficient discipline because of the gravity of the harm to Defendant's clients, the administration of justice and the legal



profession in the present case. Furthermore, the Panel finds that any sanction less than suspension would fail to acknowledge the seriousness of the offenses committed by Defendant, would not adequately protect the public, and would send the wrong message to attorneys and the public regarding the conduct expected of members of the Bar in this State.

- 8) Pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter I, Subchapter B, §.0129(d), the Hearing Panel finds and concludes that the public can only be adequately protected by an active suspension of Defendant's law license with reinstatement to practice conditioned upon compliance with reasonable requirements designed to protect the public and deter future misconduct by Defendant.
- 9) Nothing can remedy the injustices inflicted upon McCollum and Brown, or their further betrayal by the very lawyer who they trusted to seek redress for those injustices. The harm to McCollum and Brown would be mitigated, however, if Defendant returned a portion of the excessive fee he improperly collected from them. Accordingly, Defendant's ability to practice law in the future should be conditioned upon his reimbursing McCollum and Brown for a portion of the amount of unearned fees he collected.

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Findings of Fact Regarding Discipline, and Conclusions of Law Regarding Discipline, the Hearing Panel hereby enters the following:

### **ORDER**

- 1) Defendant's license to practice law in the State of North Carolina is suspended for five years, beginning 30 days from the date of service of this order upon Defendant.
- 2) Defendant shall submit his license and membership card to the Secretary of the North Carolina State Bar no later than 30 days following service of this order upon Defendant.
- 3) Defendant shall comply with the wind down provisions contained in 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, §.0128. As provided in §.0128(d), Defendant shall file an affidavit with the Secretary of the North Carolina State Bar within 10 days of the effective date of this order, certifying his compliance with the rule.
- 4) The administrative fees and costs of this action, including deposition costs and expert witness costs, are taxed to Defendant. Defendant

shall pay the costs of this action within 30 days of service upon him of the statement of costs by the Secretary.

- 5) After serving three years of the active suspension of his license, Defendant may apply for a stay of the remaining period of suspension upon filing a verified petition pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, §.0118(c) with the Secretary of the North Carolina State Bar demonstrating by clear, cogent, and convincing evidence that Defendant has complied with the following conditions:
  - a) That Defendant paid the costs and the administrative fees of this action within 30 days of service upon him of the statement of costs by the Secretary;
  - b) That Defendant reimbursed McCollum and Brown \$250,000.00 for the excessive fees he collected from them: \$125,000.00 shall be payable to McCollum or any legal guardian, trustee, or other fiduciary with lawful authority to manage McCollum's financial affairs at the time the restitution is paid. \$125,000.00 shall be paid to Brown or any legal guardian, trustee, or other fiduciary with lawful authority to manage Brown's financial affairs at the time the restitution is paid;
  - c) That Defendant completed 10 hours of Continuing Legal Education (CLE) accredited by the North Carolina State Bar on the topic of ethics and professionalism. This requirement is in addition to the general CLE requirements for reinstatement after two or more years of suspension set forth in 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, §.0129(b)(3)(I);
  - d) That Defendant has arranged for an active member in good standing of the North Carolina State Bar who has been approved by the Office of Counsel and practices in the county of Defendant's practice to serve as Defendant's practice monitor. Before Defendant applies for a stay of the suspension, he must supply the Office of Counsel with a letter from the approved practice monitor confirming his or her agreement to:
    - i) Meet in person, not over the phone or video, with Defendant monthly for a period of two years to review Defendant's cases;

- ii) Provide supervision to ensure that Defendant timely and completely handles client matters; and
  - iii) Provide written quarterly reports of this supervision to the Office of Counsel on the following dates as they occur during the two years following the stay of the suspension: January 30, April 30, July 30, and October 30. Defendant will be responsible for the cost, if any, charged by the practice monitor for this supervision;
- e) That Defendant kept the North Carolina State Bar Membership Department advised of his current business and home addresses and notified the Bar of any change in address within ten days of such change;
  - f) That Defendant responded to all communications from the North Carolina State Bar within thirty days of receipt or by the deadline stated in the communication, whichever is sooner, and participated in good faith in the State Bar's fee dispute resolution process for any petition received after the effective date of this Order;
  - g) That Defendant did not engage in the unauthorized practice of law during the period of suspension;
  - h) That Defendant did not violate the Rules of Professional Conduct of any jurisdiction in which he is licensed or the laws of the United States or any state or local government during his suspension, other than minor traffic violations;
  - i) That Defendant properly wound down his law practice and complied with the requirements of 27 N.C.A.C. 1B §.0128; and
  - j) That Defendant satisfied all of the requirements for reinstatement set forth in of 27 N.C.A.C. IB §.0129(b).
- 6) If Defendant successfully petitions for a stay, the suspension of Defendant's law license shall be stayed as long as Defendant complies and continues to comply with the following conditions:
- a) Defendant must cooperate with the practice monitor as described in paragraph 5(d) above for two years following the stay of the suspension. The practice monitor must provide quarterly reports to the Office of Counsel as

described in paragraph 5(d)(3) above for the entire two-year period. It is Defendant's sole responsibility to ensure that the practice monitor completes and submits the required reports;

- b) Defendant must keep the North Carolina State Bar Membership Department advised of his current business and home addresses and notify the Bar of any change in address within ten days of such change;
  - c) Defendant must respond to all communications from the North Carolina State Bar within thirty days of receipt or by the deadline stated in the communication, whichever is sooner, and participate in good faith in the State Bar's fee dispute resolution process for any petition received during the period of the stay; and
  - d) Defendant must not violate the Rules of Professional Conduct of any jurisdiction in which he is licensed or the laws of the United States or any state or local government during the period of the stay, other than minor traffic violations.
- 7) If Defendant fails to comply with any of the conditions of the stayed suspension provided in paragraph 6 above, the stay of the suspension may be lifted pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin, Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, §.0118(a).
- 8) If Defendant does not seek a stay of the suspension of his law license or if some part of the suspension is stayed and thereafter the stay is revoked, Defendant must comply with the conditions set out in paragraph 5 above before seeking reinstatement of his license to practice law, and must provide in his petition for reinstatement clear, cogent, and convincing evidence showing his compliance therewith.
- 9) The Disciplinary Hearing Commission will retain jurisdiction of this matter pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter I, Subchapter B, §§.0118(a) and/or .0129(b)(1) throughout the period of the suspension, and any stay thereof, and until all conditions set forth in paragraph 5 above are satisfied.
- (4) Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, is the same person as Patrick Michael Megaro, who is the subject of the Order of Discipline entered by State of North Carolina, Wake County.
- (5) The Order entered before the Disciplinary Hearing Commission of the North Carolina State Bar, is final.

**Conclusions of Law.** Based upon the foregoing findings of facts, the Board of Disciplinary Appeals makes the following conclusions of law:

- (1) This Board has jurisdiction to hear and determine this matter. Tex. Rules Disciplinary P. 7.08(H).
- (2) Reciprocal discipline identical, to the extent practicable, to that imposed by the Disciplinary Hearing Commission of the North Carolina State Bar is warranted in this case.
- (3) Respondent should be actively suspended from the practice of law for a period of five (5) years.

It is, accordingly, **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, State Bar Card No. 24091024, is hereby **SUSPENDED** from the practice of law in Texas for a period of five (5) years beginning July 31, 2023, and extending through July 30, 2028.

It is further **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, during said suspension is prohibited from practicing law in Texas, holding himself out as an attorney at law, performing any legal service 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 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, Patrick Michael Megaro, within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, shall notify in writing each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, and chief justice of each and every court, if any, in which Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, has any legal matter pending, if any, of his suspension, of the style and cause number of the pending matter(s), and of the name, address, and telephone number of the client(s) Respondent is representing in that court. Respondent is also **ORDERED** to mail copies of all such notifications

to the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, shall file with the State Bar of Texas, Statewide Compliance Monitor, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711-2487 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, an affidavit stating Respondent has notified in writing each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, and chief justice of each and every court 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 in Court.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, shall notify each of his current clients and opposing counsel, if any, in writing, of his suspension. In addition to such notification, Respondent is **ORDERED** to return all files, papers, unearned fees paid in advance, and all other monies and properties which are in his possession but which belong to current or former clients, if any, to those respective clients or former clients, or to another attorney designated by such client or former client, within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, if requested.

It is further **ORDERED** Respondent shall file with the State Bar of Texas, Statewide Compliance Monitor, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711-2487 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, an affidavit stating all current clients and opposing counsel have been notified of Respondent's suspension and that all files, papers, monies and other property belonging to all current clients have been returned as ordered herein. If Respondent should be unable to return any file, papers, money or other property requested by any client or former client, Respondent's affidavit shall state with particularity the efforts made by

Respondent with respect to each particular client and the cause of his inability to return to said client any file, paper, money or other property.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Patrick Michael Megaro, within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, surrender 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 Petition for Reciprocal Discipline on file herein, along with a copy of this Judgment, be sent to the Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711.

It is further **ORDERED** that this Judgment of Suspension shall be made a matter of public record and be published in the *Texas Bar Journal*.

Signed this 31st day of July \_\_\_\_\_ 2023.

---

CHAIR PRESIDING

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kevin H.", is written over a horizontal line.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:



Patrick Michael Megaro  
State Bar No. 24091024  
RESPONDENT



Amanda M. Kates  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
State Bar No. 24075987  
ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER