

16109

NORTH CAROLINA

BEFORE THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

WAKE COUNTY

OF THE

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR

99G 1443

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR)

Petitioner)

v.)

CHRISTOPHER E. WYATT, ATTORNEY)

Respondent)

ORDER OF RECIPROCAL
DISCIPLINE PROCEEDING

Pursuant to the authority vested in me as Chair of the Grievance Committee of the North Carolina State Bar by 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, §§ .0105(a)(12) and .0116(a) of the N.C. State Bar Discipline & Disability Rules and based upon the record in this matter, the undersigned finds as follows:

1. By order dated July 12, 1999, the Supreme Court of South Carolina issued an order publicly reprimanding you.
2. On Dec. 17, 1999, a Notice of Reciprocal Discipline Proceeding was served upon you by certified mail.
3. You failed to show adequate cause that imposition of the identical discipline would be unwarranted within 30 days of service upon you of the Notice of Reciprocal Discipline.

BASED UPON THE FOREGOING FINDINGS the Chair of the Grievance Committee makes the following **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**:

1. The North Carolina State Bar has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and over the person of the respondent, Christopher E. Wyatt.
2. The procedure for imposition of reciprocal discipline pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, § .0116(a) of the N.C. State Bar Discipline & Disability Rules has been complied with.
3. The order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina found that Wyatt continued to practice law after his law license was suspended for failure to comply with South

Carolina's minimum mandatory continuing legal education requirements. The Court also found that in his response to initial inquiries by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Wyatt represented that he had not engaged in the practice of law while under suspension. Wyatt's actions constitute conduct in violation of Rules 8.1(a) and 8.4(c) and Rule 5.5 of the Revised Rules North Carolina Rules of Professional Conduct and justify the imposition of reciprocal discipline in this state.

4. The Public Reprimand imposed by the South Carolina Supreme Court should be imposed on the Respondent's right to practice law in the state of North Carolina.

THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Respondent is hereby Reprimanded.
2. Respondent is hereby taxed with the costs of this proceeding as assessed by the Secretary.

This the 7 day of August, 2000.


James K. Dorsett III, Chair
Grievance Committee