



FILED
Jun 18 2024

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS
APPOINTED BY THE Appointed by the Supreme Court of Texas
SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

IN THE MATTER OF §
MANFRED MAX STERNBERG, § CAUSE NO. 69413
STATE BAR CARD NO. 24125421 §

UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND RESPONSE DATE

This is a reciprocal discipline matter. Respondent Manfred Max Sternberg, State Bar Card No. 24125421 (“Sternberg”), respectfully files this unopposed motion for a seven-day extension to respond to the Petition for Reciprocal Discipline (the “Petition”). Good cause exists for the extension as follows:

1. The present deadline for Sternberg to file his response is June 20, 2024. The Chief Disciplinary Counsel (the “CDC”) filed the Petition on May 10, 2024, and the Board of Disciplinary Appeals thereafter issued its Order to Show Cause on Petition for Reciprocal Discipline and Hearing Notice on May 20, 2024 (the “Show Cause Order”). *Exhibit 1*, Petition; *Exhibit 2*, Show Cause Order. Counsel for the CDC then served the Petition and the Show Cause Order on the undersigned counsel for Sternberg on May 21, 2024, making Sternberg’s response date under the applicable rules thirty days later, or June 20, 2024. *Exhibit 3*, May 21, 2024 Email from Amanda Kates to Allison Miller; *see also* Rule 7.03 Internal Procedural Rules, Board of Disciplinary Appeals.

2. This is Sternberg’s first request for an extension of time to file his response to the Petition.

3. The matter is set for hearing before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals on July 26, 2024. *See Exhibit 2.* Even with the brief extension, Sternberg's response will be on file approximately 30 days before the hearing date of July 26, 2024.

4. As is reflected in the Certificate of Conference below, this motion is unopposed. Further, counsel for the CDC and Sternberg previously entered a Rule 11 Agreement extending Sternberg's response date by one week, to June 27, 2024. *Exhibit 4, Rule 11 Agreement.*

5. The following grounds provide additional good cause for extending Sternberg's response date. While counsel for Sternberg has been working on the response, she has been and continues to be engaged in other litigation with imminent deadlines that have prevented and will prevent her from completing the brief before the current deadline. This includes, but is not limited to, preparing for a June 13, 2024 trial on her clients' guilt or innocence in a civil contempt proceeding in Cause No. 2018-47864; *Jing-Rirng (Homer) Chiang v. Twin Sails Technology Group, Inc. and Dennis Quan*; in the 113th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas.

6. This motion is not filed for the purpose of delay, but to allow counsel adequate time to prepare Sternberg's response.

For these reasons, Sternberg respectfully requests that the Board of Disciplinary Appeals grant this motion and extend Sternberg's date to respond to the Petition to June 27, 2024.

Dated: June 18, 2024

Respectfully submitted:

BECK REDDEN LLP

By: /s/ Allison Standish Miller

Allison Standish Miller

State Bar No. 24046440

amiller@beckredden.com

Thomas E. Ganucheau

State Bar No. 00784104

tganucheau@beckredden.com

1221 McKinney Street, Suite 4500

Houston, Texas 77010

Telephone: (713) 951-3700

Facsimile: (713) 951-3730

**ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT
MANFRED MAX STERNBERG**

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that on May 21, May 30, June 5, and June 18, 2024, I conferred via email with counsel for the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Amanda Kates, regarding the extension sought in this motion, and that Ms. Kates confirmed that she is unopposed to and in agreement with the relief sought.

/s/ Allison Standish Miller

Allison Standish Miller

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 18, 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was provided via electronic mail and/or by facsimile in compliance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and the Internal Procedural Rules of the Board of Disciplinary Appeals.

/s/ Allison Standish Miller

Allison Standish Miller

EXHIBIT 1



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

**IN THE MATTER OF
MANFRED MAX STERNBERG,
STATE BAR CARD NO. 24125421**

§
§
§

CAUSE NO. 69413

PETITION FOR RECIPROCAL DISCIPLINE

TO THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS:

Petitioner, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline (hereinafter called “Petitioner”), brings this action against Respondent, Manfred Max Sternberg, (hereinafter called “Respondent”), showing as follows:

1. This action is commenced by Petitioner pursuant to Part IX of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure. Petitioner is also providing Respondent a copy of Section 7 of this Board’s Internal Procedural Rules, relating to Reciprocal Discipline Matters.

2. Respondent is a member of the State Bar of Texas and is licensed and currently authorized to practice law in Texas. Respondent may be served with a true and correct copy of this Petition for Reciprocal Discipline at Manfred Max Sternberg, c/o Allison Standish Miller, Beck Redden, LLP, 1221 McKinney Street, Ste. 4500, Houston, Texas 77010.

3. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all intents and purposes as if the same were copied verbatim herein, is a true and correct copy of a set of documents filed with the Supreme Court of Louisiana in the Sternberg matter consisting of a an Order Per Curium dated January 17, 2024, in Cause No. 2023-B-1345, styled *In Re: Manfred Max Sternberg, Attorney Disciplinary Proceeding*; Joint Motion for Consent Discipline Pursuant to Rule XIX, § 20; Joint Stipulations of Facts; Joint Memorandum in Support of Consent Discipline; Waiver of Opportunity

to Withdraw, filed in the Supreme Court of Louisiana in a matter styled: *In Re: Confidential Party (MMS)*, Docket No. 2023-B _____, and a Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline Pursuant to Rule XIX, § 20, dated January 4, 2024, styled Supreme Court of Louisiana, *In Re Confidential Party (MMS)*, Docket No. 2023-B-1345. (Exhibit 1).

4. The Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline Pursuant to Rule XIX, § 20 filed January 4, 2024, states in pertinent part as follows:

1.

MANFRED MAX STERNBERG is a twenty-eight-year-old attorney licensed in Texas. The respondent does not have a license to practice law in Louisiana.

2.

The *Joint Stipulation of Facts* accompanying this memorandum outlines all the relevant facts about this matter. However, for ease of consideration, a summary of the facts follows.

After graduating from law school in May, during the summer of 2021, the respondent was employed as an associate in a New Orleans-based law firm. Following Hurricane Ida in August 2021, the respondent, while working out of the firm's New Orleans office, assisted Louisiana-licensed attorneys in representing a large number of Louisiana residents with property damage claims caused by the storm. The assistance provided by the respondent included actions that constitute the practice of law. The respondent has never held a license to practice law in Louisiana. The respondent's actions resulted from conversations with the firm's owner, a Louisiana-licensed lawyer, who advised the respondent that such representation was allowed under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct and authorized the respondent to engage in the unauthorized practice of law.

3.

In exchange for imposing the stated discipline, the respondent conditionally admits to having violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline freely and voluntarily. He has not been the subject of coercion or duress, and he is fully aware of the implications of submitting to the consent discipline.

5.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline because he knows that if ODC were to prosecute the formal charges, he could not successfully defend against them.

6.

Under Rule XIX, § 20, the respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly propose the following sanction as appropriate discipline for the admitted misconduct in this matter: that an injunction be issued prohibiting the respondent from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporarily or limited basis for a period of one year. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding. See La. S. Ct. Rules, Rule XIX, § 10.1.

WHEREFORE, the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG, and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly pray that the Louisiana Supreme Court favorably consider and approve this Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline and render a finding that the discipline appropriate to address this matter is an injunction prohibiting the respondent from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis for a period of one year. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding.

5. On or about January 17, 2024, an Order Per Curium was entered by the Supreme Court of Louisiana, which states in pertinent part:

Respondent is licensed to practice law only in Texas; however, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) asserts jurisdiction over him in this matter pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 6(A) and Rule 8.5 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, which together extend this court’s disciplinary authority to lawyers who provide or offer to provide legal services in Louisiana.

Respondent and the ODC submitted a joint petition for consent discipline, in which respondent acknowledges that he engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. Having reviewed the petition,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Consent Discipline be accepted and that Manfred Max Sternberg shall be enjoined for a period of one year from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis, including, but not limited to, seeking pro hac vice admission before a Louisiana court pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XVII, § 13 or seeking limited admission as an in-house counsel pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XVII, § 14.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all costs and expenses in the matter are assessed against respondent in accordance with Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 10.1, with legal interest to commence thirty days from the date of finality of this court's judgment until paid.

6. A copy of the set of documents filed with the Supreme Court of Louisiana in the Sternberg matter consisting of a an Order Per Curium in Cause No. 2023-B-1345, styled *In Re: Manfred Max Sternberg, Attorney Disciplinary Proceeding*; Joint Motion for Consent Discipline Pursuant to Rule XIX, § 20; Joint Stipulations of Facts; Joint Memorandum in Support of Consent Discipline; Waiver of Opportunity to Withdraw, filed in the Supreme Court of Louisiana in a matter styled: *In Re: Confidential Party (MMS)*, Docket No. 2023-B _____, and a Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline Pursuant to Rule XIX, § 20, filed in the Supreme Court of Louisiana styled *In Re Confidential Party (MMS)*, Docket No. 2023-B-1345, are attached hereto as Petitioner's Exhibit 1 and made a part hereof for all intents and purposes as if the same were copied verbatim herein. Petitioner expects to introduce certified copy of Exhibit 1 at the time of hearing of this cause.

7. Petitioner prays that, pursuant to Rule 9.02, Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, this Board issue notice to Respondent, containing a copy of this Petition with exhibits, and an order directing Respondent to show cause within thirty (30) days from the date of the mailing of the

notice, why the imposition of the identical discipline in this state would be unwarranted. Petitioner further prays that upon trial of this matter that this Board enter a judgment imposing discipline identical with that imposed by the Supreme Court of Louisiana and that Petitioner have such other and further relief to which it may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

Seana Willing
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Amanda M. Kates
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel
State Bar of Texas
P.O. Box 12487
Austin, Texas 78711
Telephone: 512.427.1350
Telecopier: 512.427.4253
Email: amanda.kates@texasbar.com



Amanda M. Kates
Bar Card No. 24075987
ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that upon receipt of the Order to Show Cause from the Board of Disciplinary Appeals, I will serve a copy of this Petition for Reciprocal Discipline and the Order to Show Cause on Manfred Max Sternberg, by service to the following:

Manfred Max Sternberg
c/o Allison Standish Miller
Beck Redden, LLP
1221 McKinney Street, Ste. 4500
Houston, Texas 77010



Amanda M. Kates

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 2023-B-1345

IN RE: CONFIDENTIAL PARTY

ORDER


Considering the Joint Petition for Consent Discipline filed by respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Consent Discipline be conditionally rejected. However, within thirty days of the date of this order, the parties may submit a revised petition for Consent Discipline seeking to enjoin respondent for a period of one year from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis. If no revised petition is submitted within that time, the Petition for Consent Discipline shall be rejected and the matter shall be remanded for the filing of formal charges.


NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, this 6th day of December,

2023.

FOR THE COURT:



JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA



SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA
A TRUE COPY

Edwin C. Gonzales Jr.
Deputy Clerk of Court

EXHIBIT

1


SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 2023-B-01345

IN RE: CONFIDENTIAL PARTY

Attorney Disciplinary Proceeding

DEC 06 2023

 GENOVESE, J., dissents and would accept the joint petition.

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

January 17, 2024

NO. 2023-B-1345

IN RE: MANFRED MAX STERNBERG

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDING

 JMM

PER CURIAM

Respondent is licensed to practice law only in Texas; however, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) asserts jurisdiction over him in this matter pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 6(A) and Rule 8.5 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, which together extend this court’s disciplinary authority to lawyers who provide or offer to provide legal services in Louisiana.

Respondent and the ODC submitted a joint petition for consent discipline, in which respondent acknowledges that he engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. Having reviewed the petition,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Consent Discipline be accepted and that Manfred Max Sternberg shall be enjoined for a period of one year from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis, including, but not limited to, seeking *pro hac vice* admission before a Louisiana court pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XVII, § 13 or seeking limited admission as an in-house counsel pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XVII, § 14.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all costs and expenses in the matter are assessed against respondent in accordance with Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 10.1, with legal interest to commence thirty days from the date of finality of this court’s judgment until paid.

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

IN RE: MANFRED MAX STERNBERG

No. 2023-B-01345

IN RE: Disciplinary Counsel - Applicant Other; Manfred Sternberg, Jr. - Applicant
Other; Joint Petition for Consent Discipline;

January 17, 2024

Joint petition for consent discipline accepted. See per curiam.

JBM

JLW

JDH

SJC

WJC

PDG

Genovese, J., dissents and assigns reasons.

Supreme Court of Louisiana
January 17, 2024

Katio Marjanovic
Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA No.

2023-B-01345


January 17, 2024

IN RE: MANFRED MAX STERNBERG

Attorney Disciplinary Proceeding



Genovese, J., dissents and would reject the proposed joint petition as too lenient.



CONFIDENTIAL
DUPLICATE

23 B 1345

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

DOCKET NO. 2023-B-_____

IN RE CONFIDENTIAL PARTY (MMS)

JOINT MOTION FOR CONSENT DISCIPLINE
PURSUANT TO RULE XIX, § 20

Neepost, 10/4/23
SVP
ST. LOUIS, MO

7023 OCT -6 PM 2:35

Thomas J. Keenan
CLERK OF COURT
By

NOW INTO THESE PROCEEDINGS comes the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, through the undersigned First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, and the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG (Texas Bar Roll No. 24125421), individually and through his undersigned counsel, under Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 20, the parties respectfully submit this *Joint Motion for Consent Discipline* on the following basis, to wit:

1.

MANFRED MAX STERNBERG is a twenty-eight-year-old attorney licensed in Texas. The respondent does not have a license to practice law in Louisiana.

2.

The *Joint Stipulation of Facts* accompanying this memorandum outlines all the relevant facts about this matter. However, for ease of consideration, a summary of the facts follows.

After graduating from law school in May, during the summer of 2021, the respondent was employed as an associate in a New Orleans-based law firm. Following Hurricane Ida in August 2021, the respondent, while working out of the firm's New Orleans office, assisted Louisiana-licensed attorneys in representing a large number of Louisiana residents with property damage claims caused by the storm. The assistance provided by the respondent included actions that constitute the practice of law. The respondent has never held a license to practice law in Louisiana. The respondent's actions resulted from conversations with the firm's owner, a Louisiana-licensed lawyer, who advised the respondent that such representation was allowed under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct and authorized the respondent to engage in the unauthorized practice of law.

INPUT BY: _____

3.

In exchange for imposing the stated discipline, the respondent conditionally admits to having violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline freely and voluntarily. He has not been the subject of coercion or duress, and he is fully aware of the implications of submitting to the consent discipline.

5.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline because he knows that if ODC were to prosecute the formal charges, he could not successfully defend against them.


6.

Under Rule XIX, § 20, the respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly propose the following sanction as appropriate discipline for the admitted misconduct in this matter: that an injunction be issued prohibiting the respondent from applying to sit for the Louisiana Bar Examination and prohibiting him from applying for *pro hac vice* admission in the state courts of the State of Louisiana for a minimum of five years from the date of the Court's Order accepting the proposed consent discipline. After five years, the respondent may seek relief from the injunction but must comply with the requirements outlined in Louisiana Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding. See La. S. Ct. Rules, Rule XIX, § 10.1.

WHEREFORE, the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG, and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly pray that the Louisiana Supreme Court favorably consider and approve this *Joint Motion for Consent Discipline* and render a finding that the discipline appropriate to address this matter is an injunction prohibiting the respondent from applying to sit for the Louisiana Bar Examination and prohibiting him from applying for *pro hac vice* admission in the state courts of the State of Louisiana for a minimum of five years from the date of the Court's Order

accepting the proposed consent discipline. After five years, the respondent may seek relief from the injunction but must comply with the requirements outlined in Louisiana Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding


Respectfully submitted,



Manfred Max Sternberg
RESPONDENT
TX Bar Roll No. 24125421
365 Canal Street, Suite 1170
New Orleans, LA 70130-1118
Telephone: (713) 882-8493
msternberg1996@gmail.com



Richard C. Stanley
Stanley, Reuter, Thornton, and Alford, LLC
RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL
Bar Roll No. 08487
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70112-4011
Telephone: (504) 523-1580
rcs@stanleyreuter.com



Gregory L. Tweed
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Bar Roll No. 23960
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd., Ste 607
Baton Rouge, LA 70816
(225) 293-3900
gregoryt@ladb.org

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

DOCKET NO. 2023-B-_____

IN RE CONFIDENTIAL PARTY (MMS)

JOINT STIPULATION OF FACTS

NOW INTO THESE PROCEEDINGS comes MANFRED MAX STERNBERG (Texas Bar Roll No. 24125421), individually and through the undersigned counsel, and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, through the undersigned First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, who stipulate the following facts in conjunction with the *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline*:

1.

MANFRED MAX STERNBERG is a twenty-eight-year-old attorney licensed in Texas. The respondent does not maintain a law license in Louisiana.

2.

- a. ODC received a complaint from Ruth Franklin regarding her claim for property damage following Hurricane Ida (ODC File No. 0040124).
- b. Ms. Franklin retained the firm of Egenberg Trial Lawyers in New Orleans to handle her property damage claim.
- c. Ms. Franklin's complaint arose from her confusion regarding the settlement of her property damage claim.
- d. ODC's investigation into the specific issues raised by Ms. Franklin did not establish clear and convincing evidence of a rule violation by the respondent on those issues.
- e. While investigating Ms. Franklin's complaint, ODC learned of communications between Ms. Franklin and the respondent that implicated the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.
- f. The respondent was employed as an Associate Attorney at Egenberg Trial Lawyers.
- g. The respondent graduated from Paul M. Hebert Law Center at LSU in May 2021.
- h. The respondent is licensed to practice law in Texas.
- i. The respondent was admitted to practice in Texas on October 8, 2021.
- j. The respondent is not licensed to practice law in Louisiana.

- k. Egenberg Trial Lawyers hired the respondent on August 16, 2021, to handle the firm's Texas cases.
- l. When hired, the respondent was training in the New Orleans office of Egenberg Trial Lawyers.
- m. The plan was for the respondent to eventually move to the firm's office in Houston, Texas.
- n. Following Hurricane Ida on August 29, 2021, Egenberg Trial Lawyers received a large influx of first-party property damage claims resulting from Hurricane Ida.
- o. The owner of Egenberg Trial Lawyers, Bradley Egenberg, advised the respondent that his help was required to assist in handling the claims associated with Hurricane Ida.
- p. Even though Mr. Egenberg knew that the respondent was only licensed to practice law in Texas, he advised the respondent that his assistance on these hurricane claims was permissible under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct if the representation was *temporary*.
- q. The respondent conducted his own research and believed that Mr. Egenberg's interpretation of Rule 5.5 permitted him to assist in handling Hurricane Ida claims from the New Orleans office if the representation was temporary.
- r. After completing his own independent research, the respondent once again spoke with Mr. Egenberg, who again confirmed that the respondent's assistance in these first-party hurricane claims would not violate the Rules of Professional Conduct.
- s. The respondent did not volunteer to assist with these Hurricane Ida claims.
- t. The respondent agreed to assist with these Hurricane Ida claims based on the request and subsequent representations made by his employer, Bradley Egenberg.
- u. Mr. Egenberg is a Louisiana-licensed lawyer and was the respondent's supervisor.
- v. The respondent did not consider any other Associate Attorney at Egenberg Trial Lawyers to be his supervisor.
- w. Mr. Egenberg never advised the respondent that any other Associate Attorney at the firm was to serve as his supervisor.
- x. Mr. Egenberg told the respondent it was permissible for him to meet with clients, explain the terms of the firm's contract to clients, and provide legal assistance to the firm's clients for damages sustained by Hurricane Ida.
- y. Mr. Egenberg was aware that the respondent was meeting with clients and explaining substantive issues of law with the clients, including discussion related to the terms of the retainer agreement and the client's rights under Louisiana law.

- z. The respondent also communicated directly with insurance adjusters about these property damage claims.
- aa. Between October 2021 and September 2022, the respondent assisted Louisiana-licensed lawyers in approximately 161 claims involving Louisiana residents who sustained damage from Hurricane Ida.
- bb. The respondent did not sign any pleadings or make any court appearances concerning the cases he was assisting.
- cc. After learning that his interpretation of Rule 5.5 was mistaken, the respondent immediately ceased handling any cases involving Louisiana claims.
- dd. The respondent has resigned from his position with Egenberg Trial Lawyers.
- ee. This Court has jurisdiction over the respondent in this matter pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 6(A) and Rule 8.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct, which together extend this Court's disciplinary authority to lawyers who provide or offer to provide legal services in Louisiana.
- ff. The respondent was negligent in relying on his employer's representation that his actions were permissible under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.
- gg. The respondent knowingly assisted Louisiana-licensed lawyers in providing legal services to Louisiana residents following Hurricane Ida.
- hh. The respondent acknowledges his misconduct and is remorseful.
- ii. The respondent acknowledges that his conduct violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.
- jj. The respondent's violation of Rules 5.5 violated duties owed to the clients and the profession.
- kk. The respondent's actions did not cause actual harm to any client but had the potential to cause significant harm.
- ll. There are no aggravating factors.
- mm. The mitigating factors applicable to the respondent are as follows:
 - 1. No prior discipline;
 - 2. Cooperation with ODC;
 - 3. Good character;
 - 4. Remorse; and
 - 5. Inexperience in the practice of law.

3.

The respondent stipulates to the aforementioned factual allegations. The respondent further stipulates that his conduct violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.

To bring about a final, appropriate resolution to these disciplinary proceedings, the respondent agrees with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and submits the accompanying *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline*, seeking an injunction on his applying to sit for the Louisiana Bar Examination and applying for pro hac vice status for a minimum of five years, as outlined in the accompanying *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline*.

5.

The respondent has consulted in these proceedings with counsel of his choosing.

6.

The consent given by the respondent has been freely and voluntarily given without coercion or duress. The respondent is fully aware of the implications of submitting the attached *Petition for Consent Discipline*.

7.

Each of the signatories to this *Joint Stipulation of Facts* has fully and thoroughly read each of the above-numbered paragraphs in detail and stipulates that they are entirely accurate and truthful in all respects.


Respectfully submitted,



Manfred Max Sternberg
RESPONDENT
TX Bar Roll No. 24125421
365 Canal Street, Suite 1170
New Orleans, LA 70130-1118
Telephone: (713) 882-8493
msternberg1995@gmail.com



Richard C. Stanley
Stanley, Reuter, Thornton, and Alford, LLC
RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL
Bar Roll No. 08487
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70112-4011
Telephone: (504) 523-1580
rca@stanleyreuter.com



Gregory L. Tweed
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Bar Roll No. 23960
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd., Ste. 607
Baton Rouge, LA 70816
Telephone: (225) 293-3900
gregoryt@ladb.org

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

DOCKET NO. 2023-B-_____

IN RE CONFIDENTIAL PARTY (MMS)

JOINT MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF CONSENT DISCIPLINE

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, this *Joint Memorandum in Support of Consent Discipline* is filed in these proceedings by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel through the undersigned First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, and the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG (Texas Bar Roll No. 24125421), individually and through undersigned counsel,

1.

Before formal charges were filed, the respondent expressed a desire to resolve this matter by consent discipline. Therefore, the respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel tender the attached *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline* and *Joint Stipulation of Facts* under Rule XIX, § 20 (as amended) of the Louisiana Supreme Court Rules.

2.

The parties have outlined all relevant facts related to this matter in the *Joint Stipulation of Facts* accompanying this petition; however, a summary of facts follows for ease of consideration.

In the summer of 2021, the respondent was employed as an associate in a New Orleans-based law firm. Following Hurricane Ida in August 2021, the respondent, while working out of the firm's New Orleans office, assisted Louisiana-licensed lawyers in representing a large number of Louisiana residents with property damage claims caused by the storm. The assistance provided by the respondent included actions that constitute the practice of law. The respondent has never held a license to practice law in Louisiana. The respondent's actions resulted from conversations with the firm's owner, who advised the respondent that such representation was allowed


under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct and authorized the respondent to engage in the unauthorized practice of law.

3.

This Court has previously considered the appropriate sanction for attorneys not licensed in Louisiana but violating our Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct. In the case of *In re Nguyen*, 17-0214 (La. 04/13/17), 215 So. 3d 668, the Court enjoined a Texas attorney from seeking admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking pro hac vice admission before a Louisiana Court for one year. In this deemed admitted matter, the Court's sanction arose from the respondent improperly communicating with a criminal defendant without the permission of the defendant's counsel. Mr. Nguyen also failed to cooperate with ODC's investigation.

In the consent discipline cases of *In re Marcus Spagnoletti*, 20-00605 (La. 07/02/20), 297 So.3d 732, and *In re Francis Spagnoletti*, 20-00712 (La. 07/02/20), 297 So.3d 737, the Court enjoined two Texas attorneys from seeking pro hac vice admission before a Louisiana Court for three years. In both cases, the respondents' conduct included neglect of a legal matter and lack of communication. In the case of Francis Spagnoletti, the misconduct also included the failure to promptly disburse client funds and the failure to supervise a non-lawyer employee.


WHEREFORE, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG, request that the Court favorably consider this *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline* and that MANFRED MAX STERNBERG be enjoined from applying to sit for the Louisiana Bar Examination or to apply for *pro hac vice* admission in the state courts of Louisiana for a minimum of five years. The Court should also assess the respondent for all costs of these proceedings.



Manfred Max Sternberg
RESPONDENT
TX Bar Roll No. 24125421
365 Canal Street, Suite 1170
New Orleans, LA 70130-1118
Telephone: (713) 882-8493
msternberg1995@gmail.com



Richard C. Stanley
Stanley, Reuter, Thornton, and Alford, LLC
RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL
Bar Roll No. 08487
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70112-4011
Telephone: (504) 523-1580
rca@stanleyreuter.com



Gregory L. Tyeed
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Bar Roll No. 23960
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd., Ste 607
Baton Rouge, LA 70816
(225) 293-3900
gregoryt@ladb.org

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA


DOCKET No. 2023-B-_____

IN RE CONFIDENTIAL PARTY (MMS)


WAIVER OF OPPORTUNITY TO WITHDRAW

NOW INTO THESE DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS comes the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG (Texas Bar Roll No. 24125421), who has submitted a *Joint Petition for Consent Discipline* in the above-numbered and entitled cause. As a specific material consideration for the agreement, consent, and concurrence by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, the respondent expressly and irrevocably waives any opportunity to withdraw consent before the final disposition of these consent proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



Manfred Max Sternberg
RESPONDENT
TX Bar Roll No. 24125421
365 Canal Street, Suite 1170
New Orleans, LA 70130-1118
Telephone: (713) 882-8493
msternberg1995@gmail.com



Richard C. Stanley
Stanley, Reuter, Thornton, and Alford, LLC
RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL
Bar Roll No. 08487
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70112-4011
Telephone: (504) 523-1580
rca@stanleyreuter.com



LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD

OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd.
Suite 607
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70816
(225) 293-3900 • 1-800-326-8022 • FAX (225) 293-3300

October 4, 2023

Honorable Veronica O. Koclanes, Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of Louisiana
400 Royal Street - Suite 4200
New Orleans, LA 70130

23 B 1345

Re: Confidential Party
(ODC File No. 0040124-MMS)

Dear Ms. Koclanes:

I am attaching an original and two (2) copies of the Joint Motion for Consent Discipline, Joint Stipulation of Facts, Joint Memorandum in Support of Joint Motion for Consent Discipline, and Waiver of Opportunity to Withdraw for filing in the above-referenced matter. Please date stamp the extra copy and return it to our office.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Tweed
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel

GLT/kl
Enclosure

Veronica O. Koclanes
CLERK OF COURT

2023 OCT - 6 PM 2:35




LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD
OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd.
Suite 807
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70816

NEOPOST FIRST-CLASS MAIL
10/04/2023
USPS POSTAGE \$002.79⁰⁰

ZIP 70018
041M11462691

23 B 1345



HONORABLE VERONICA O. KOCLANES
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA
400 ROYAL STREET, SUITE 4200
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130-8102

CONFIDENTIAL
DUPLICATE

23 B 1345

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

DOCKET No. 2023-B-1345

IN RE CONFIDENTIAL PARTY (MMS)

REVISED JOINT MOTION FOR CONSENT DISCIPLINE
PURSUANT TO RULE XIX, § 20

Neopost, 12/28/23
SUPREME COURT
OF LOUISIANA

2024 JAN -4 PM 3:11

Sharon K. Nelson
CLERK OF COURT
By

NOW INTO THESE PROCEEDINGS comes the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, through the undersigned First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, and the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG (Texas Bar Roll No. 24125421), individually and through his undersigned counsel, under Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 20, the parties respectfully submit this *Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline* on the following basis, to wit:

1.

MANFRED MAX STERNBERG is a twenty-eight-year-old attorney licensed in Texas. The respondent does not have a license to practice law in Louisiana.

2.

The *Joint Stipulation of Facts* accompanying this memorandum outlines all the relevant facts about this matter. However, for ease of consideration, a summary of the facts follows.

After graduating from law school in May, during the summer of 2021, the respondent was employed as an associate in a New Orleans-based law firm. Following Hurricane Ida in August 2021, the respondent, while working out of the firm's New Orleans office, assisted Louisiana-licensed attorneys in representing a large number of Louisiana residents with property damage claims caused by the storm. The assistance provided by the respondent included actions that constitute the practice of law. The respondent has never held a license to practice law in Louisiana. The respondent's actions resulted from conversations with the firm's owner, a Louisiana-licensed lawyer, who advised the respondent that such representation was allowed under the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct and authorized the respondent to engage in the unauthorized practice of law.

INPUT BY: _____

3.

In exchange for imposing the stated discipline, the respondent conditionally admits to having violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline freely and voluntarily. He has not been the subject of coercion or duress, and he is fully aware of the implications of submitting to the consent discipline.

5.

The respondent has consented to the imposition of discipline because he knows that if ODC were to prosecute the formal charges, he could not successfully defend against them.

6.


Under Rule XIX, § 20, the respondent and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly propose the following sanction as appropriate discipline for the admitted misconduct in this matter: that an injunction be issued prohibiting the respondent from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis for a period of one year. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding. See La. S. Ct. Rules, Rule XIX, § 10.1.

WHEREFORE, the respondent, MANFRED MAX STERNBERG, and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel jointly pray that the Louisiana Supreme Court favorably consider and approve this *Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline* and render a finding that the discipline appropriate to address this matter is an injunction prohibiting the respondent from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis for a period of one year. The respondent will pay all costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding.


Respectfully submitted,



Manfred Max Sternberg
RESPONDENT
TX Bar Roll No. 24125421
365 Canal Street, Suite 1170
New Orleans, LA 70130-1118
Telephone: (713) 882-8493
msternberg1995@gmail.com



Richard C. Stanley
Stanley, Reuter, Thornton, and Alford, LLC
RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL
Bar Roll No. 08487
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70112-4011
Telephone: (504) 523-1580
rcs@stanleyreuter.com



Gregory L. Tweed
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Bar Roll No. 23960
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd., Ste 607
Baton Rouge, LA 70816
(225) 293-3900
gregoryt@ladb.org



LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD

OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd.
Suite 607
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70816
(225) 293-3900 • 1-800-326-8022 • FAX (225) 293-3300

December 28, 2023

Honorable Veronica O. Koclanes, Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of Louisiana
400 Royal Street - Suite 4200
New Orleans, LA 70130

23 B 1345

Re: Confidential Party (MMS)
2023-B-1345

Dear Ms. Koclanes:

Please find enclosed an original and two (2) copies of the Revised Joint Motion for Consent Discipline for filing in the above-referenced matter. Please date stamp the extra copy and return to our office.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Tweed
First Assistant Disciplinary Counsel

GLT/kl
Enclosure

SUPREME COURT
OF LOUISIANA

2024 JAN -4 PM 3:11

CLERK OF COURT

LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD
OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
4000 S. Sherwood Forest Blvd.
Suite 607
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70816

NEOPOST FIRST CLASS MAIL
12/28/2023
USPS POSTAGE \$002.31⁹

ZIP 70818
041M11462691

23 B 1345



HONORABLE VERONICA O. KOCLANES
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA
400 ROYAL STREET, SUITE 4200
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130-8102

INTERNAL PROCEDURAL RULES

BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS

Current through June 21, 2018

Contents

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS	1
Rule 1.01. Definitions.....	1
Rule 1.02. General Powers	1
Rule 1.03. Additional Rules in Disciplinary Matters.....	1
Rule 1.04. Appointment of Panels	1
Rule 1.05. Filing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers.....	1
Rule 1.06. Service of Petition	2
Rule 1.07. Hearing Setting and Notice	2
Rule 1.08. Time to Answer.....	2
Rule 1.09. Pretrial Procedure.....	2
Rule 1.10. Decisions	3
Rule 1.11. Board of Disciplinary Appeals Opinions.....	3
Rule 1.12. BODA Work Product and Drafts	3
Rule 1.13. Record Retention.....	3
Rule 1.14. Costs of Reproduction of Records.....	3
Rule 1.15. Publication of These Rules.....	3
II. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	3
Rule 2.01. Representing or Counseling Parties in Disciplinary Matters and Legal Malpractice Cases.....	3
Rule 2.02. Confidentiality.....	4
Rule 2.03. Disqualification and Recusal of BODA Members	4
III. CLASSIFICATION APPEALS	4
Rule 3.01. Notice of Right to Appeal	4
Rule 3.02. Record on Appeal.....	4
IV. APPEALS FROM EVIDENTIARY PANEL HEARINGS	4
Rule 4.01. Perfecting Appeal.....	4
Rule 4.02. Record on Appeal.....	5
Rule 4.03. Time to File Record.....	6
Rule 4.04. Copies of the Record	6
Rule 4.05. Requisites of Briefs	6
Rule 4.06. Oral Argument.....	7
Rule 4.07. Decision and Judgment	7
Rule 4.08. Appointment of Statewide Grievance Committee.....	8
Rule 4.09. Involuntary Dismissal.....	8
V. PETITIONS TO REVOKE PROBATION	8
Rule 5.01. Initiation and Service.....	8
Rule 5.02. Hearing.....	8

VI. COMPULSORY DISCIPLINE	8
Rule 6.01. Initiation of Proceeding.....	8
Rule 6.02. Interlocutory Suspension.....	8
VII. RECIPROCAL DISCIPLINE	9
Rule 7.01. Initiation of Proceeding.....	9
Rule 7.02. Order to Show Cause.....	9
Rule 7.03. Attorney’s Response.....	9
VIII. DISTRICT DISABILITY COMMITTEE HEARINGS	9
Rule 8.01. Appointment of District Disability Committee.....	9
Rule 8.02. Petition and Answer.....	9
Rule 8.03. Discovery.....	9
Rule 8.04. Ability to Compel Attendance.....	10
Rule 8.05. Respondent’s Right to Counsel.....	10
Rule 8.06. Hearing.....	10
Rule 8.07. Notice of Decision.....	10
Rule 8.08. Confidentiality.....	10
IX. DISABILITY REINSTATEMENTS	10
Rule 9.01. Petition for Reinstatement.....	10
Rule 9.02. Discovery.....	10
Rule 9.03. Physical or Mental Examinations.....	10
Rule 9.04. Judgment.....	10
X. APPEALS FROM BODA TO THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS	11
Rule 10.01. Appeals to the Supreme Court.....	11

INTERNAL PROCEDURAL RULES

Board of Disciplinary Appeals

Current through June 21, 2018

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Rule 1.01. Definitions

- (a) “BODA” is the Board of Disciplinary Appeals.
- (b) “Chair” is the member elected by BODA to serve as chair or, in the Chair’s absence, the member elected by BODA to serve as vice-chair.
- (c) “Classification” is the determination by the CDC under TRDP 2.10 or by BODA under TRDP 7.08(C) whether a grievance constitutes a “complaint” or an “inquiry.”
- (d) “BODA Clerk” is the executive director of BODA or other person appointed by BODA to assume all duties normally performed by the clerk of a court.
- (e) “CDC” is the Chief Disciplinary Counsel for the State Bar of Texas and his or her assistants.
- (f) “Commission” is the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, a permanent committee of the State Bar of Texas.
- (g) “Executive Director” is the executive director of BODA.
- (h) “Panel” is any three-member grouping of BODA under TRDP 7.05.
- (i) “Party” is a Complainant, a Respondent, or the Commission.
- (j) “TDRPC” is the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (k) “TRAP” is the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.
- (l) “TRCP” is the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (m) “TRDP” is the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure.
- (n) “TRE” is the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Rule 1.02. General Powers

Under TRDP 7.08, BODA has and may exercise all the powers of either a trial court or an appellate court, as the case may be, in hearing and determining disciplinary proceedings. But TRDP 15.01 [17.01] applies to the enforcement of a judgment of BODA.

Rule 1.03. Additional Rules in Disciplinary Matters

Except as varied by these rules and to the extent applicable, the TRCP, TRAP, and TRE apply to all disciplinary matters before BODA, except for appeals from classification decisions, which are governed by TRDP 2.10 and by Section 3 of these rules.

Rule 1.04. Appointment of Panels

- (a) BODA may consider any matter or motion by panel,

except as specified in (b). The Chair may delegate to the Executive Director the duty to appoint a panel for any BODA action. Decisions are made by a majority vote of the panel; however, any panel member may refer a matter for consideration by BODA sitting en banc. Nothing in these rules gives a party the right to be heard by BODA sitting en banc.

- (b) Any disciplinary matter naming a BODA member as Respondent must be considered by BODA sitting en banc. A disciplinary matter naming a BODA staff member as Respondent need not be heard en banc.

Rule 1.05. Filing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers

- (a) **Electronic Filing.** All documents must be filed electronically. Unrepresented persons or those without the means to file electronically may electronically file documents, but it is not required.

- (1) Email Address. The email address of an attorney or an unrepresented party who electronically files a document must be included on the document.

- (2) Timely Filing. Documents are filed electronically by emailing the document to the BODA Clerk at the email address designated by BODA for that purpose. A document filed by email will be considered filed the day that the email is sent. The date sent is the date shown for the message in the inbox of the email account designated for receiving filings. If a document is sent after 5:00 p.m. or on a weekend or holiday officially observed by the State of Texas, it is considered filed the next business day.

- (3) It is the responsibility of the party filing a document by email to obtain the correct email address for BODA and to confirm that the document was received by BODA in legible form. Any document that is illegible or that cannot be opened as part of an email attachment will not be considered filed. If a document is untimely due to a technical failure or a system outage, the filing party may seek appropriate relief from BODA.

- (4) Exceptions.

- (i) An appeal to BODA of a decision by the CDC to classify a grievance as an inquiry is not required to be filed electronically.

- (ii) The following documents must not be filed electronically:

- a) documents that are filed under seal or subject to a pending motion to seal; and

- b) documents to which access is otherwise restricted by court order.

- (iii) For good cause, BODA may permit a party to file other documents in paper form in a particular case.

- (5) Format. An electronically filed document must:

- (i) be in text-searchable portable document format (PDF);
- (ii) be directly converted to PDF rather than scanned, if possible; and
- (iii) not be locked.

(b) A paper will not be deemed filed if it is sent to an individual BODA member or to another address other than the address designated by BODA under Rule 1.05(a)(2).

(c) **Signing.** Each brief, motion, or other paper filed must be signed by at least one attorney for the party or by the party pro se and must give the State Bar of Texas card number, mailing address, telephone number, email address, and fax number, if any, of each attorney whose name is signed or of the party (if applicable). A document is considered signed if the document includes:

- (1) an “/s/” and name typed in the space where the signature would otherwise appear, unless the document is notarized or sworn; or
- (2) an electronic image or scanned image of the signature.

(d) **Paper Copies.** Unless required by BODA, a party need not file a paper copy of an electronically filed document.

(e) **Service.** Copies of all documents filed by any party other than the record filed by the evidentiary panel clerk or the court reporter must, at or before the time of filing, be served on all other parties as required and authorized by the TRAP.

Rule 1.06. Service of Petition

In any disciplinary proceeding before BODA initiated by service of a petition on the Respondent, the petition must be served by personal service; by certified mail with return receipt requested; or, if permitted by BODA, in any other manner that is authorized by the TRCP and reasonably calculated under all the circumstances to apprise the Respondent of the proceeding and to give him or her reasonable time to appear and answer. To establish service by certified mail, the return receipt must contain the Respondent’s signature.

Rule 1.07. Hearing Setting and Notice

(a) **Original Petitions.** In any kind of case initiated by the CDC’s filing a petition or motion with BODA, the CDC may contact the BODA Clerk for the next regularly available hearing date before filing the original petition. If a hearing is set before the petition is filed, the petition must state the date, time, and place of the hearing. Except in the case of a petition to revoke probation under TRDP 2.23 [2.22], the hearing date must be at least 30 days from the date that the petition is served on the Respondent.

(b) **Expedited Settings.** If a party desires a hearing on a matter on a date earlier than the next regularly available BODA hearing date, the party may request an expedited setting in a written motion setting out the reasons for the

request. Unless the parties agree otherwise, and except in the case of a petition to revoke probation under TRDP 2.23 [2.22], the expedited hearing setting must be at least 30 days from the date of service of the petition, motion, or other pleading. BODA has the sole discretion to grant or deny a request for an expedited hearing date.

(c) **Setting Notices.** BODA must notify the parties of any hearing date that is not noticed in an original petition or motion.

(d) **Announcement Docket.** Attorneys and parties appearing before BODA must confirm their presence and present any questions regarding procedure to the BODA Clerk in the courtroom immediately prior to the time docket call is scheduled to begin. Each party with a matter on the docket must appear at the docket call to give an announcement of readiness, to give a time estimate for the hearing, and to present any preliminary motions or matters. Immediately following the docket call, the Chair will set and announce the order of cases to be heard.

Rule 1.08. Time to Answer

The Respondent may file an answer at any time, except where expressly provided otherwise by these rules or the TRDP, or when an answer date has been set by prior order of BODA. BODA may, but is not required to, consider an answer filed the day of the hearing.

Rule 1.09. Pretrial Procedure

(a) Motions.

(1) Generally. To request an order or other relief, a party must file a motion supported by sufficient cause with proof of service on all other parties. The motion must state with particularity the grounds on which it is based and set forth the relief sought. All supporting briefs, affidavits, or other documents must be served and filed with the motion. A party may file a response to a motion at any time before BODA rules on the motion or by any deadline set by BODA. Unless otherwise required by these rules or the TRDP, the form of a motion must comply with the TRCP or the TRAP.

(2) For Extension of Time. All motions for extension of time in any matter before BODA must be in writing, comply with (a)(1), and specify the following:

- (i) if applicable, the date of notice of decision of the evidentiary panel, together with the number and style of the case;
- (ii) if an appeal has been perfected, the date when the appeal was perfected;
- (iii) the original deadline for filing the item in question;
- (iv) the length of time requested for the extension;
- (v) the number of extensions of time that have been granted previously regarding the item in question; and

(vi) the facts relied on to reasonably explain the need for an extension.

(b) **Pretrial Scheduling Conference.** Any party may request a pretrial scheduling conference, or BODA on its own motion may require a pretrial scheduling conference.

(c) **Trial Briefs.** In any disciplinary proceeding before BODA, except with leave, all trial briefs and memoranda must be filed with the BODA Clerk no later than ten days before the day of the hearing.

(d) **Hearing Exhibits, Witness Lists, and Exhibits Tendered for Argument.** A party may file a witness list, exhibit, or any other document to be used at a hearing or oral argument before the hearing or argument. A party must bring to the hearing an original and 12 copies of any document that was not filed at least one business day before the hearing. The original and copies must be:

- (1) marked;
- (2) indexed with the title or description of the item offered as an exhibit; and
- (3) if voluminous, bound to lie flat when open and tabbed in accordance with the index.

All documents must be marked and provided to the opposing party before the hearing or argument begins.

Rule 1.10. Decisions

(a) **Notice of Decisions.** The BODA Clerk must give notice of all decisions and opinions to the parties or their attorneys of record.

(b) **Publication of Decisions.** BODA must report judgments or orders of public discipline:

- (1) as required by the TRDP; and
- (2) on its website for a period of at least ten years following the date of the disciplinary judgment or order.

(c) **Abstracts of Classification Appeals.** BODA may, in its discretion, prepare an abstract of a classification appeal for a public reporting service.

Rule 1.11. Board of Disciplinary Appeals Opinions

(a) BODA may render judgment in any disciplinary matter with or without written opinion. In accordance with TRDP 6.06, all written opinions of BODA are open to the public and must be made available to the public reporting services, print or electronic, for publishing. A majority of the members who participate in considering the disciplinary matter must determine if an opinion will be written. The names of the participating members must be noted on all written opinions of BODA.

(b) Only a BODA member who participated in the decision of a disciplinary matter may file or join in a written opinion concurring in or dissenting from the judgment of BODA. For purposes of this rule, in hearings in which evidence is taken, no member may participate in

the decision unless that member was present at the hearing. In all other proceedings, no member may participate unless that member has reviewed the record. Any member of BODA may file a written opinion in connection with the denial of a hearing or rehearing en banc.

(c) A BODA determination in an appeal from a grievance classification decision under TRDP 2.10 is not a judgment for purposes of this rule and may be issued without a written opinion.

Rule 1.12. BODA Work Product and Drafts

A document or record of any nature—regardless of its form, characteristics, or means of transmission—that is created or produced in connection with or related to BODA’s adjudicative decision-making process is not subject to disclosure or discovery. This includes documents prepared by any BODA member, BODA staff, or any other person acting on behalf of or at the direction of BODA.

Rule 1.13. Record Retention

Records of appeals from classification decisions must be retained by the BODA Clerk for a period of at least three years from the date of disposition. Records of other disciplinary matters must be retained for a period of at least five years from the date of final judgment, or for at least one year after the date a suspension or disbarment ends, whichever is later. For purposes of this rule, a record is any document, paper, letter, map, book, tape, photograph, film, recording, or other material filed with BODA, regardless of its form, characteristics, or means of transmission.

Rule 1.14. Costs of Reproduction of Records

The BODA Clerk may charge a reasonable amount for the reproduction of nonconfidential records filed with BODA. The fee must be paid in advance to the BODA Clerk.

Rule 1.15. Publication of These Rules

These rules will be published as part of the TDRPC and TRDP.

II. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Rule 2.01. Representing or Counseling Parties in Disciplinary Matters and Legal Malpractice Cases

(a) A current member of BODA must not represent a party or testify voluntarily in a disciplinary action or proceeding. Any BODA member who is subpoenaed or otherwise compelled to appear at a disciplinary action or proceeding, including at a deposition, must promptly notify the BODA Chair.

(b) A current BODA member must not serve as an expert witness on the TDRPC.

(c) A BODA member may represent a party in a legal malpractice case, provided that he or she is later recused in accordance with these rules from any proceeding before BODA arising out of the same facts.

Rule 2.02. Confidentiality

(a) BODA deliberations are confidential, must not be disclosed by BODA members or staff, and are not subject to disclosure or discovery.

(b) Classification appeals, appeals from evidentiary judgments of private reprimand, appeals from an evidentiary judgment dismissing a case, interlocutory appeals or any interim proceedings from an ongoing evidentiary case, and disability cases are confidential under the TRDP. BODA must maintain all records associated with these cases as confidential, subject to disclosure only as provided in the TRDP and these rules.

(c) If a member of BODA is subpoenaed or otherwise compelled by law to testify in any proceeding, the member must not disclose a matter that was discussed in conference in connection with a disciplinary case unless the member is required to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction

Rule 2.03. Disqualification and Recusal of BODA Members

(a) BODA members are subject to disqualification and recusal as provided in TRCP 18b.

(b) BODA members may, in addition to recusals under (a), voluntarily recuse themselves from any discussion and voting for any reason. The reasons that a BODA member is recused from a case are not subject to discovery.

(c) These rules do not disqualify a lawyer who is a member of, or associated with, the law firm of a BODA member from serving on a grievance committee or representing a party in a disciplinary proceeding or legal malpractice case. But a BODA member must recuse him or herself from any matter in which a lawyer who is a member of, or associated with, the BODA member's firm is a party or represents a party.

III. CLASSIFICATION APPEALS

Rule 3.01. Notice of Right to Appeal

(a) If a grievance filed by the Complainant under TRDP 2.10 is classified as an inquiry, the CDC must notify the Complainant of his or her right to appeal as set out in TRDP 2.10 or another applicable rule.

(b) To facilitate the potential filing of an appeal of a grievance classified as an inquiry, the CDC must send the Complainant an appeal notice form, approved by BODA, with the classification disposition. The form must include the docket number of the matter; the deadline for appealing; and information for mailing, faxing, or emailing the appeal notice form to BODA. The appeal notice form must be available in English and Spanish.

Rule 3.02. Record on Appeal

BODA must only consider documents that were filed with the CDC prior to the classification decision. When a notice of appeal from a classification decision has been filed, the CDC must forward to BODA a copy of the grievance and

all supporting documentation. If the appeal challenges the classification of an amended grievance, the CDC must also send BODA a copy of the initial grievance, unless it has been destroyed.

IV. APPEALS FROM EVIDENTIARY PANEL HEARINGS

Rule 4.01. Perfecting Appeal

(a) **Appellate Timetable.** The date that the evidentiary judgment is signed starts the appellate timetable under this section. To make TRDP 2.21 [2.20] consistent with this requirement, the date that the judgment is signed is the "date of notice" under Rule 2.21 [2.20].

(b) **Notification of the Evidentiary Judgment.** The clerk of the evidentiary panel must notify the parties of the judgment as set out in TRDP 2.21 [2.20].

(1) The evidentiary panel clerk must notify the Commission and the Respondent in writing of the judgment. The notice must contain a clear statement that any appeal of the judgment must be filed with BODA within 30 days of the date that the judgment was signed. The notice must include a copy of the judgment rendered.

(2) The evidentiary panel clerk must notify the Complainant that a judgment has been rendered and provide a copy of the judgment, unless the evidentiary panel dismissed the case or imposed a private reprimand. In the case of a dismissal or private reprimand, the evidentiary panel clerk must notify the Complainant of the decision and that the contents of the judgment are confidential. Under TRDP 2.16, no additional information regarding the contents of a judgment of dismissal or private reprimand may be disclosed to the Complainant.

(c) **Filing Notice of Appeal.** An appeal is perfected when a written notice of appeal is filed with BODA. If a notice of appeal and any other accompanying documents are mistakenly filed with the evidentiary panel clerk, the notice is deemed to have been filed the same day with BODA, and the evidentiary panel clerk must immediately send the BODA Clerk a copy of the notice and any accompanying documents.

(d) **Time to File.** In accordance with TRDP 2.24 [2.23], the notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days after the date the judgment is signed. In the event a motion for new trial or motion to modify the judgment is timely filed with the evidentiary panel, the notice of appeal must be filed with BODA within 90 days from the date the judgment is signed.

(e) **Extension of Time.** A motion for an extension of time to file the notice of appeal must be filed no later than 15 days after the last day allowed for filing the notice of appeal. The motion must comply with Rule 1.09.

Rule 4.02. Record on Appeal

(a) **Contents.** The record on appeal consists of the evidentiary panel clerk's record and, where necessary to the appeal, a reporter's record of the evidentiary panel hearing.

(b) **Stipulation as to Record.** The parties may designate parts of the clerk's record and the reporter's record to be included in the record on appeal by written stipulation filed with the clerk of the evidentiary panel.

(c) Responsibility for Filing Record.

(1) Clerk's Record.

(i) After receiving notice that an appeal has been filed, the clerk of the evidentiary panel is responsible for preparing, certifying, and timely filing the clerk's record.

(ii) Unless the parties stipulate otherwise, the clerk's record on appeal must contain the items listed in TRAP 34.5(a) and any other paper on file with the evidentiary panel, including the election letter, all pleadings on which the hearing was held, the docket sheet, the evidentiary panel's charge, any findings of fact and conclusions of law, all other pleadings, the judgment or other orders appealed from, the notice of decision sent to each party, any postsubmission pleadings and briefs, and the notice of appeal.

(iii) If the clerk of the evidentiary panel is unable for any reason to prepare and transmit the clerk's record by the due date, he or she must promptly notify BODA and the parties, explain why the clerk's record cannot be timely filed, and give the date by which he or she expects the clerk's record to be filed.

(2) Reporter's Record.

(i) The court reporter for the evidentiary panel is responsible for timely filing the reporter's record if:

- a) a notice of appeal has been filed;
- b) a party has requested that all or part of the reporter's record be prepared; and
- c) the party requesting all or part of the reporter's record has paid the reporter's fee or has made satisfactory arrangements with the reporter.

(ii) If the court reporter is unable for any reason to prepare and transmit the reporter's record by the due date, he or she must promptly notify BODA and the parties, explain the reasons why the reporter's record cannot be timely filed, and give the date by which he or she expects the reporter's record to be filed.

(d) Preparation of Clerk's Record.

(1) To prepare the clerk's record, the evidentiary panel clerk must:

- (i) gather the documents designated by the parties'

written stipulation or, if no stipulation was filed, the documents required under (c)(1)(ii);

(ii) start each document on a new page;

(iii) include the date of filing on each document;

(iv) arrange the documents in chronological order, either by the date of filing or the date of occurrence;

(v) number the pages of the clerk's record in the manner required by (d)(2);

(vi) prepare and include, after the front cover of the clerk's record, a detailed table of contents that complies with (d)(3); and

(vii) certify the clerk's record.

(2) The clerk must start the page numbering on the front cover of the first volume of the clerk's record and continue to number all pages consecutively—including the front and back covers, tables of contents, certification page, and separator pages, if any—until the final page of the clerk's record, without regard for the number of volumes in the clerk's record, and place each page number at the bottom of each page.

(3) The table of contents must:

(i) identify each document in the entire record (including sealed documents); the date each document was filed; and, except for sealed documents, the page on which each document begins;

(ii) be double-spaced;

(iii) conform to the order in which documents appear in the clerk's record, rather than in alphabetical order;

(iv) contain bookmarks linking each description in the table of contents (except for descriptions of sealed documents) to the page on which the document begins; and

(v) if the record consists of multiple volumes, indicate the page on which each volume begins.

(e) **Electronic Filing of the Clerk's Record.** The evidentiary panel clerk must file the record electronically. When filing a clerk's record in electronic form, the evidentiary panel clerk must:

(1) file each computer file in text-searchable Portable Document Format (PDF);

(2) create electronic bookmarks to mark the first page of each document in the clerk's record;

(3) limit the size of each computer file to 100 MB or less, if possible; and

(4) directly convert, rather than scan, the record to PDF, if possible.

(f) **Preparation of the Reporter's Record.**

(1) The appellant, at or before the time prescribed for

perfecting the appeal, must make a written request for the reporter's record to the court reporter for the evidentiary panel. The request must designate the portion of the evidence and other proceedings to be included. A copy of the request must be filed with the evidentiary panel and BODA and must be served on the appellee. The reporter's record must be certified by the court reporter for the evidentiary panel.

(2) The court reporter or recorder must prepare and file the reporter's record in accordance with TRAP 34.6 and 35 and the Uniform Format Manual for Texas Reporters' Records.

(3) The court reporter or recorder must file the reporter's record in an electronic format by emailing the document to the email address designated by BODA for that purpose.

(4) The court reporter or recorder must include either a scanned image of any required signature or "/s/" and name typed in the space where the signature would otherwise

(6¹) In exhibit volumes, the court reporter or recorder must create bookmarks to mark the first page of each exhibit document.

(g) **Other Requests.** At any time before the clerk's record is prepared, or within ten days after service of a copy of appellant's request for the reporter's record, any party may file a written designation requesting that additional exhibits and portions of testimony be included in the record. The request must be filed with the evidentiary panel and BODA and must be served on the other party.

(h) **Inaccuracies or Defects.** If the clerk's record is found to be defective or inaccurate, the BODA Clerk must inform the clerk of the evidentiary panel of the defect or inaccuracy and instruct the clerk to make the correction. Any inaccuracies in the reporter's record may be corrected by agreement of the parties without the court reporter's recertification. Any dispute regarding the reporter's record that the parties are unable to resolve by agreement must be resolved by the evidentiary panel.

(i) **Appeal from Private Reprimand.** Under TRDP 2.16, in an appeal from a judgment of private reprimand, BODA must mark the record as confidential, remove the attorney's name from the case style, and take any other steps necessary to preserve the confidentiality of the private reprimand.

¹ So in original.

Rule 4.03. Time to File Record

(a) **Timetable.** The clerk's record and reporter's record must be filed within 60 days after the date the judgment is signed. If a motion for new trial or motion to modify the judgment is filed with the evidentiary panel, the clerk's record and the reporter's record must be filed within 120 days from the date the original judgment is signed, unless

a modified judgment is signed, in which case the clerk's record and the reporter's record must be filed within 60 days of the signing of the modified judgment. Failure to file either the clerk's record or the reporter's record on time does not affect BODA's jurisdiction, but may result in BODA's exercising its discretion to dismiss the appeal, affirm the judgment appealed from, disregard materials filed late, or apply presumptions against the appellant.

(b) If No Record Filed.

(1) If the clerk's record or reporter's record has not been timely filed, the BODA Clerk must send notice to the party responsible for filing it, stating that the record is late and requesting that the record be filed within 30 days. The BODA Clerk must send a copy of this notice to all the parties and the clerk of the evidentiary panel.

(2) If no reporter's record is filed due to appellant's fault, and if the clerk's record has been filed, BODA may, after first giving the appellant notice and a reasonable opportunity to cure, consider and decide those issues or points that do not require a reporter's record for a decision. BODA may do this if no reporter's record has been filed because:

(i) the appellant failed to request a reporter's record; or

(ii) the appellant failed to pay or make arrangements to pay the reporter's fee to prepare the reporter's record, and the appellant is not entitled to proceed without payment of costs.

(c) Extension of Time to File the Reporter's Record.

When an extension of time is requested for filing the reporter's record, the facts relied on to reasonably explain the need for an extension must be supported by an affidavit of the court reporter. The affidavit must include the court reporter's estimate of the earliest date when the reporter's record will be available for filing.

(d) **Supplemental Record.** If anything material to either party is omitted from the clerk's record or reporter's record, BODA may, on written motion of a party or on its own motion, direct a supplemental record to be certified and transmitted by the clerk for the evidentiary panel or the court reporter for the evidentiary panel.

Rule 4.04. Copies of the Record

The record may not be withdrawn from the custody of the BODA Clerk. Any party may obtain a copy of the record or any designated part thereof by making a written request to the BODA Clerk and paying any charges for reproduction in advance.

Rule 4.05. Requisites of Briefs

(a) **Appellant's Filing Date.** Appellant's brief must be filed within 30 days after the clerk's record or the reporter's record is filed, whichever is later.

(b) **Appellee's Filing Date.** Appellee's brief must be filed

within 30 days after the appellant's brief is filed.

(c) Contents. Briefs must contain:

- (1) a complete list of the names and addresses of all parties to the final decision and their counsel;
- (2) a table of contents indicating the subject matter of each issue or point, or group of issues or points, with page references where the discussion of each point relied on may be found;
- (3) an index of authorities arranged alphabetically and indicating the pages where the authorities are cited;
- (4) a statement of the case containing a brief general statement of the nature of the cause or offense and the result;
- (5) a statement, without argument, of the basis of BODA's jurisdiction;
- (6) a statement of the issues presented for review or points of error on which the appeal is predicated;
- (7) a statement of facts that is without argument, is supported by record references, and details the facts relating to the issues or points relied on in the appeal;
- (8) the argument and authorities;
- (9) conclusion and prayer for relief;
- (10) a certificate of service; and
- (11) an appendix of record excerpts pertinent to the issues presented for review.

(d) Length of Briefs; Contents Included and Excluded.

In calculating the length of a document, every word and every part of the document, including headings, footnotes, and quotations, must be counted except the following: caption, identity of the parties and counsel, statement regarding oral argument, table of contents, index of authorities, statement of the case, statement of issues presented, statement of the jurisdiction, signature, proof of service, certificate of compliance, and appendix. Briefs must not exceed 15,000 words if computer-generated, and 50 pages if not, except on leave of BODA. A reply brief must not exceed 7,500 words if computer-generated, and 25 pages if not, except on leave of BODA. A computer generated document must include a certificate by counsel or the unrepresented party stating the number of words in the document. The person who signs the certification may rely on the word count of the computer program used to prepare the document.

(e) Amendment or Supplementation. BODA has discretion to grant leave to amend or supplement briefs.

(f) Failure of the Appellant to File a Brief. If the appellant fails to timely file a brief, BODA may:

- (1) dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution, unless the appellant reasonably explains the failure, and the appellee is not significantly injured by the appellant's

failure to timely file a brief;

(2) decline to dismiss the appeal and make further orders within its discretion as it considers proper; or

(3) if an appellee's brief is filed, regard that brief as correctly presenting the case and affirm the evidentiary panel's judgment on that brief without examining the record.

Rule 4.06. Oral Argument

(a) Request. A party desiring oral argument must note the request on the front cover of the party's brief. A party's failure to timely request oral argument waives the party's right to argue. A party who has requested argument may later withdraw the request. But even if a party has waived oral argument, BODA may direct the party to appear and argue. If oral argument is granted, the clerk will notify the parties of the time and place for submission.

(b) Right to Oral Argument. A party who has filed a brief and who has timely requested oral argument may argue the case to BODA unless BODA, after examining the briefs, decides that oral argument is unnecessary for any of the following reasons:

- (1) the appeal is frivolous;
- (2) the dispositive issue or issues have been authoritatively decided;
- (3) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the briefs and record; or
- (4) the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument.

(c) Time Allowed. Each party will have 20 minutes to argue. BODA may, on the request of a party or on its own, extend or shorten the time allowed for oral argument. The appellant may reserve a portion of his or her allotted time for rebuttal.

Rule 4.07. Decision and Judgment

(a) Decision. BODA may do any of the following:

- (1) affirm in whole or in part the decision of the evidentiary panel;
- (2) modify the panel's findings and affirm the findings as modified;
- (3) reverse in whole or in part the panel's findings and render the decision that the panel should have rendered; or
- (4) reverse the panel's findings and remand the cause for further proceedings to be conducted by:

- (i) the panel that entered the findings; or
- (ii) a statewide grievance committee panel appointed by BODA and composed of members selected from the state bar districts other than the district from which the appeal was taken.

(b) Mandate. In every appeal, the BODA Clerk must issue a mandate in accordance with BODA's judgment and send it to the evidentiary panel and to all the parties.

Rule 4.08. Appointment of Statewide Grievance Committee

If BODA remands a cause for further proceedings before a statewide grievance committee, the BODA Chair will appoint the statewide grievance committee in accordance with TRDP 2.27 [2.26]. The committee must consist of six members: four attorney members and two public members randomly selected from the current pool of grievance committee members. Two alternates, consisting of one attorney and one public member, must also be selected. BODA will appoint the initial chair who will serve until the members of the statewide grievance committee elect a chair of the committee at the first meeting. The BODA Clerk will notify the Respondent and the CDC that a committee has been appointed.

Rule 4.09. Involuntary Dismissal

Under the following circumstances and on any party's motion or on its own initiative after giving at least ten days' notice to all parties, BODA may dismiss the appeal or affirm the appealed judgment or order. Dismissal or affirmance may occur if the appeal is subject to dismissal:

- (a) for want of jurisdiction;
- (b) for want of prosecution; or
- (c) because the appellant has failed to comply with a requirement of these rules, a court order, or a notice from the clerk requiring a response or other action within a specified time.

V. PETITIONS TO REVOKE PROBATION

Rule 5.01. Initiation and Service

(a) Before filing a motion to revoke the probation of an attorney who has been sanctioned, the CDC must contact the BODA Clerk to confirm whether the next regularly available hearing date will comply with the 30-day requirement of TRDP. The Chair may designate a three-member panel to hear the motion, if necessary, to meet the 30-day requirement of TRDP 2.23 [2.22].

(b) Upon filing the motion, the CDC must serve the Respondent with the motion and any supporting documents in accordance with TRDP 2.23 [2.22], the TRCP, and these rules. The CDC must notify BODA of the date that service is obtained on the Respondent.

Rule 5.02. Hearing

Within 30 days of service of the motion on the Respondent, BODA must docket and set the matter for a hearing and notify the parties of the time and place of the hearing. On a showing of good cause by a party or on its own motion, BODA may continue the case to a future hearing date as circumstances require.

VI. COMPULSORY DISCIPLINE

Rule 6.01. Initiation of Proceeding

Under TRDP 8.03, the CDC must file a petition for compulsory discipline with BODA and serve the Respondent in accordance with the TRDP and Rule 1.06 of these rules.

Rule 6.02. Interlocutory Suspension

(a) **Interlocutory Suspension.** In any compulsory proceeding under TRDP Part VIII in which BODA determines that the Respondent has been convicted of an Intentional Crime and that the criminal conviction is on direct appeal, BODA must suspend the Respondent's license to practice law by interlocutory order. In any compulsory case in which BODA has imposed an interlocutory order of suspension, BODA retains jurisdiction to render final judgment after the direct appeal of the criminal conviction is final. For purposes of rendering final judgment in a compulsory discipline case, the direct appeal of the criminal conviction is final when the appellate court issues its mandate.

(b) **Criminal Conviction Affirmed.** If the criminal conviction made the basis of a compulsory interlocutory suspension is affirmed and becomes final, the CDC must file a motion for final judgment that complies with TRDP 8.05.

(1) If the criminal sentence is fully probated or is an order of deferred adjudication, the motion for final judgment must contain notice of a hearing date. The motion will be set on BODA's next available hearing date.

(2) If the criminal sentence is not fully probated:

- (i) BODA may proceed to decide the motion without a hearing if the attorney does not file a verified denial within ten days of service of the motion; or
- (ii) BODA may set the motion for a hearing on the next available hearing date if the attorney timely files a verified denial.

(c) **Criminal Conviction Reversed.** If an appellate court issues a mandate reversing the criminal conviction while a Respondent is subject to an interlocutory suspension, the Respondent may file a motion to terminate the interlocutory suspension. The motion to terminate the interlocutory suspension must have certified copies of the decision and mandate of the reversing court attached. If the CDC does not file an opposition to the termination within ten days of being served with the motion, BODA may proceed to decide the motion without a hearing or set the matter for a hearing on its own motion. If the CDC timely opposes the motion, BODA must set the motion for a hearing on its next available hearing date. An order terminating an interlocutory order of suspension does not automatically reinstate a Respondent's license.

VII. RECIPROCAL DISCIPLINE

Rule 7.01. Initiation of Proceeding

To initiate an action for reciprocal discipline under TRDP Part IX, the CDC must file a petition with BODA and request an Order to Show Cause. The petition must request that the Respondent be disciplined in Texas and have attached to it any information concerning the disciplinary matter from the other jurisdiction, including a certified copy of the order or judgment rendered against the Respondent.

Rule 7.02. Order to Show Cause

When a petition is filed, the Chair immediately issues a show cause order and a hearing notice and forwards them to the CDC, who must serve the order and notice on the Respondent. The CDC must notify BODA of the date that service is obtained.

Rule 7.03. Attorney's Response

If the Respondent does not file an answer within 30 days of being served with the order and notice but thereafter appears at the hearing, BODA may, at the discretion of the Chair, receive testimony from the Respondent relating to the merits of the petition.

VIII. DISTRICT DISABILITY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Rule 8.01. Appointment of District Disability Committee

(a) If the evidentiary panel of the grievance committee finds under TRDP 2.17(P)(2), or the CDC reasonably believes under TRDP 2.14(C), that a Respondent is suffering from a disability, the rules in this section will apply to the de novo proceeding before the District Disability Committee held under TRDP Part XII.

(b) Upon receiving an evidentiary panel's finding or the CDC's referral that an attorney is believed to be suffering from a disability, the BODA Chair must appoint a District Disability Committee in compliance with TRDP 12.02 and designate a chair. BODA will reimburse District Disability Committee members for reasonable expenses directly related to service on the District Disability Committee. The BODA Clerk must notify the CDC and the Respondent that a committee has been appointed and notify the Respondent where to locate the procedural rules governing disability proceedings.

(c) A Respondent who has been notified that a disability referral will be or has been made to BODA may, at any time, waive in writing the appointment of the District Disability Committee or the hearing before the District Disability Committee and enter into an agreed judgment of indefinite disability suspension, provided that the Respondent is competent to waive the hearing. If the Respondent is not represented, the waiver must include a statement affirming that the Respondent has been advised of the right to appointed counsel and waives that right as well.

(d) All pleadings, motions, briefs, or other matters to be filed with the District Disability Committee must be filed with the BODA Clerk.

(e) Should any member of the District Disability Committee become unable to serve, the BODA Chair must appoint a substitute member.

Rule 8.02. Petition and Answer

(a) **Petition.** Upon being notified that the District Disability Committee has been appointed by BODA, the CDC must, within 20 days, file with the BODA Clerk and serve on the Respondent a copy of a petition for indefinite disability suspension. Service must comply with Rule 1.06.

(b) **Answer.** The Respondent must, within 30 days after service of the petition for indefinite disability suspension, file an answer with the BODA Clerk and serve a copy of the answer on the CDC.

(c) **Hearing Setting.** The BODA Clerk must set the final hearing as instructed by the chair of the District Disability Committee and send notice of the hearing to the parties.

Rule 8.03. Discovery

(a) **Limited Discovery.** The District Disability Committee may permit limited discovery. The party seeking discovery must file with the BODA Clerk a written request that makes a clear showing of good cause and substantial need and a proposed order. If the District Disability Committee authorizes discovery in a case, it must issue a written order. The order may impose limitations or deadlines on the discovery.

(b) **Physical or Mental Examinations.** On written motion by the Commission or on its own motion, the District Disability Committee may order the Respondent to submit to a physical or mental examination by a qualified healthcare or mental healthcare professional. Nothing in this rule limits the Respondent's right to an examination by a professional of his or her choice in addition to any exam ordered by the District Disability Committee.

(1) **Motion.** The Respondent must be given reasonable notice of the examination by written order specifying the name, address, and telephone number of the person conducting the examination.

(2) **Report.** The examining professional must file with the BODA Clerk a detailed, written report that includes the results of all tests performed and the professional's findings, diagnoses, and conclusions. The professional must send a copy of the report to the CDC and the Respondent.

(c) **Objections.** A party must make any objection to a request for discovery within 15 days of receiving the motion by filing a written objection with the BODA Clerk. BODA may decide any objection or contest to a discovery motion.

Rule 8.04. Ability to Compel Attendance

The Respondent and the CDC may confront and cross-examine witnesses at the hearing. Compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses by subpoena, enforceable by an order of a district court of proper jurisdiction, is available to the Respondent and the CDC as provided in TRCP 176.

Rule 8.05. Respondent's Right to Counsel

(a) The notice to the Respondent that a District Disability Committee has been appointed and the petition for indefinite disability suspension must state that the Respondent may request appointment of counsel by BODA to represent him or her at the disability hearing. BODA will reimburse appointed counsel for reasonable expenses directly related to representation of the Respondent.

(b) To receive appointed counsel under TRDP 12.02, the Respondent must file a written request with the BODA Clerk within 30 days of the date that Respondent is served with the petition for indefinite disability suspension. A late request must demonstrate good cause for the Respondent's failure to file a timely request.

Rule 8.06. Hearing

The party seeking to establish the disability must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Respondent is suffering from a disability as defined in the TRDP. The chair of the District Disability Committee must admit all relevant evidence that is necessary for a fair and complete hearing. The TRE are advisory but not binding on the chair.

Rule 8.07. Notice of Decision

The District Disability Committee must certify its finding regarding disability to BODA, which will issue the final judgment in the matter.

Rule 8.08. Confidentiality

All proceedings before the District Disability Committee and BODA, if necessary, are closed to the public. All matters before the District Disability Committee are confidential and are not subject to disclosure or discovery, except as allowed by the TRDP or as may be required in the event of an appeal to the Supreme Court of Texas.

IX. DISABILITY REINSTATEMENTS

Rule 9.01. Petition for Reinstatement

(a) An attorney under an indefinite disability suspension may, at any time after he or she has been suspended, file a verified petition with BODA to have the suspension terminated and to be reinstated to the practice of law. The petitioner must serve a copy of the petition on the CDC in the manner required by TRDP 12.06. The TRCP apply to a reinstatement proceeding unless they conflict with these rules.

(b) The petition must include the information required by TRDP 12.06. If the judgment of disability suspension

contained terms or conditions relating to misconduct by the petitioner prior to the suspension, the petition must affirmatively demonstrate that those terms have been complied with or explain why they have not been satisfied. The petitioner has a duty to amend and keep current all information in the petition until the final hearing on the merits. Failure to do so may result in dismissal without notice.

(c) Disability reinstatement proceedings before BODA are not confidential; however, BODA may make all or any part of the record of the proceeding confidential.

Rule 9.02. Discovery

The discovery period is 60 days from the date that the petition for reinstatement is filed. The BODA Clerk will set the petition for a hearing on the first date available after the close of the discovery period and must notify the parties of the time and place of the hearing. BODA may continue the hearing for good cause shown.

Rule 9.03. Physical or Mental Examinations

(a) On written motion by the Commission or on its own, BODA may order the petitioner seeking reinstatement to submit to a physical or mental examination by a qualified healthcare or mental healthcare professional. The petitioner must be served with a copy of the motion and given at least seven days to respond. BODA may hold a hearing before ruling on the motion but is not required to do so.

(b) The petitioner must be given reasonable notice of the examination by written order specifying the name, address, and telephone number of the person conducting the examination.

(c) The examining professional must file a detailed, written report that includes the results of all tests performed and the professional's findings, diagnoses, and conclusions. The professional must send a copy of the report to the parties.

(d) If the petitioner fails to submit to an examination as ordered, BODA may dismiss the petition without notice.

(e) Nothing in this rule limits the petitioner's right to an examination by a professional of his or her choice in addition to any exam ordered by BODA.

Rule 9.04. Judgment

If, after hearing all the evidence, BODA determines that the petitioner is not eligible for reinstatement, BODA may, in its discretion, either enter an order denying the petition or direct that the petition be held in abeyance for a reasonable period of time until the petitioner provides additional proof as directed by BODA. The judgment may include other orders necessary to protect the public and the petitioner's potential clients.

X. APPEALS FROM BODA TO THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

Rule 10.01. Appeals to the Supreme Court

(a) A final decision by BODA, except a determination that a statement constitutes an inquiry or a complaint under TRDP 2.10, may be appealed to the Supreme Court of Texas. The clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas must docket an appeal from a decision by BODA in the same manner as a petition for review without fee.

(b) The appealing party must file the notice of appeal directly with the clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas within 14 days of receiving notice of a final determination by BODA. The record must be filed within 60 days after BODA's determination. The appealing party's brief is due 30 days after the record is filed, and the responding party's brief is due 30 days thereafter. The BODA Clerk must send the parties a notice of BODA's final decision that includes the information in this paragraph.

(c) An appeal to the Supreme Court is governed by TRDP 7.11 and the TRAP.

EXHIBIT 2



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

**IN THE MATTER OF
MANFRED MAX STERNBERG,
STATE BAR CARD NO. 24125421**

§
§
§

CAUSE NO. 69413

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE ON PETITION FOR RECIPROCAL DISCIPLINE
AND HEARING NOTICE**

Pursuant to Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure (“TRDP”) Part IX, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, Petitioner, filed its Petition for Reciprocal Discipline against Manfred Max Sternberg, Respondent, on May 10, 2024. The Petition states that on January 17, 2024, an Order Per Curium was entered by the Supreme Court of Louisiana in a matter styled, *In Re: Manfred Max Sternberg*, No. 2023-B-1345, in which the Court accepted a petition for consent discipline. Respondent was enjoined from seeking full admission to the Louisiana bar or seeking admission to practice in Louisiana on any temporary or limited basis for a period of one year. Respondent agreed that he violated Rule 5.5 of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct. A true and correct copy of the Petition for Reciprocal Discipline, which includes the Order Per Curium, is attached hereto and incorporated herein for all purposes as if set forth in full.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Respondent Manfred Max Sternberg shall, within thirty (30) days from the date of service, show cause why the imposition of identical discipline, to the extent practicable, in Texas by the Board of Disciplinary Appeals pursuant to Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 9.02, would be unwarranted. If Respondent is served by mail, Respondent shall show cause within thirty (30) days from the date of mailing of this Order to Show Cause. Respondent should consult Part IX of the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure regarding the

failure to file an answer. Failure to file a timely answer may waive Respondent's right to raise the defenses set forth in Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 9.04 and limit the scope of the hearing to exclude presentation of any such defenses. *See* TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 9.01–04; BODA INTERNAL PROCEDURAL RULES R. 7.03.

It is further **ORDERED** that this reciprocal discipline matter is set for hearing before the Board on Friday, July 26, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in the courtroom of the Supreme Court of Texas, Austin, Texas.

SIGNED this 20th day of May 2024.

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

CHAIR PRESIDING

EXHIBIT 3

From: [Tanya Galinger](#)
To: [Allison S. Miller](#)
Cc: [Amanda Kates](#)
Subject: RE: State Bar of Texas re Manfred Max Sternberg Texas Bar No. 24125421
Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 11:59:50 AM
Attachments: [Sternberg_ltr_re_Petition_052124.pdf](#)

*** This message came from outside Beck Redden LLP. ***

Dear Ms. Miller,

I was just preparing an email to you regarding the same. Attached please find the Petition for Reciprocal Discipline that has been filed with the Board of Disciplinary Appeals along with an Order to Show Cause regarding Case No. 69413, *In the Matter of Manfred Max Sternberg*.

It would be appreciated if you can reply confirming receipt so that we can notify the Board of delivery.

Thank you for your courtesies.

Sincerely,

Tanya Galinger
Legal Assistant to
Amanda M. Kates

From: Allison S. Miller <amiller@beckredde.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 11:45 AM
To: Amanda Kates <Amanda.Kates@TEXASBAR.COM>
Cc: Tanya Galinger <Tanya.Galinger@TEXASBAR.COM>
Subject: Re: State Bar of Texas re Manfred Max Sternberg Texas Bar No. 24125421

Hi, Amanda-

I hope all is well with you. Just checking in on this, and confirming that we will accept service on Max's behalf when you are ready to send us the petition.

Let me know if you need anything else from me.

Thanks so much,

Allison.

Allison Standish Miller

Beck Redden LLP

Office 713.951.6267

amiller@beckredde.com

EXHIBIT 4

May 30, 2024

Via Email: Amanda.Kates@TexasBar.com

Ms. Amanda M. Kates
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel
State Bar of Texas



FILED
Jun 11 2024

THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS
Appointed by the Supreme Court of Texas

Re: Cause No. 69413; *In the Matter of Manfred Max Sternberg, State Bar Card No. 24125412*, Before the Board of Disciplinary Appeals, Appointed by the Supreme Court of Texas.

Dear Ms. Kates,

This letter is a Rule 11 Agreement to confirm that you have graciously agreed to give my client, Manfred Max Sternberg, a one-week extension—from June 20, 2024 to June 27, 2024—to respond to Petition for Reciprocal Discipline. If this letter accurately sets forth our agreement, please sign in the space provided below. I understand that you will then file this letter with the Board of Disciplinary Appeals.

Thank you for your courtesies; they are greatly appreciated. Have a good rest of your week.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "AS" followed by a flourish.

Allison Standish Miller

Accepted:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "AK" followed by a flourish.

Amanda M. Kates
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas