


**NOTE: THIS LINK RELATES ONLY  
TO DAVID E. DUKE OF  
YOUNGSVILLE.**

THIS LINK DOES **NOT** RELATE TO DAVID M. DUKE  
OF RALEIGH.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

WAKE COUNTY



BEFORE THE  
 DISCIPLINARY HEARING COMMISSION  
 OF THE  
 NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR  
 13 DHC 18

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR,

Plaintiff

v.

DAVID E. DUKE, Attorney,

Defendant

ORDER OF DISBARMENT

THIS MATTER coming before the undersigned Chair of the Disciplinary Hearing Commission pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0117(d) upon an affidavit of surrender of license executed by David E. Duke ("Defendant" or "Duke") dated 16 August 2013 and filed by the Clerk of the Disciplinary Hearing Commission on 16 August 2013.

Based upon the pleadings and the record, the undersigned makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Plaintiff, the North Carolina State Bar, is a body duly organized under the laws of North Carolina and is the proper party to bring this proceeding under the authority granted it in Chapter 84 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, and the rules and regulations of the North Carolina State Bar promulgated thereunder.
2. Defendant was admitted to the North Carolina State Bar on 20 March 2004.
3. During all periods relevant hereto, Defendant was engaged in the practice of law in North Carolina.
4. Defendant has indicated his consent to disbarment by filing an affidavit with the Disciplinary Hearing Commission. The affidavit meets all requirements set forth in 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0117(a)(1), (2), (3), (4) and (d).

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact the undersigned makes the following

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0108 provides that the Chair of the Disciplinary Hearing Commission has the power to enter orders disbarring members by consent.

2. Defendant's affidavit meets all requirements set forth in 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0117(a)(1), (2), (3), (4) and (d) and the facts upon which the affidavit is predicated warrant Defendant's disbarment.


3. Defendant has admitted the material facts as alleged in the State Bar's complaint, incorporated herein by reference, and the misconduct alleged in the complaint has been established.

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the undersigned Chair of the Disciplinary Hearing Commission enters the following


ORDER

1. The surrender of the license of David E. Duke is hereby accepted.
2. David E. Duke is DISBARRED from the practice of law in North Carolina effective upon the entry of this order with the Secretary of the North Carolina State Bar.
3. David E. Duke shall comply with the provisions of 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0124 of the State Bar Discipline and Disability Rules and shall surrender his license and permanent membership card to the Secretary of the North Carolina State Bar along with the affidavit required by 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0124 of the State Bar Discipline and Disability Rules.
4. The costs and administrative fees of this action are taxed against the Defendant.

This the 16 day of August, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Alexander, Chair  
Disciplinary Hearing Commission

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WAKE COUNTY



BEFORE THE  
DISCIPLINARY HEARING COMMISSION  
OF THE  
NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR  
13 DHC 18

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR,

Petitioner

v.

DAVID E. DUKE, Attorney,

Respondent

AFFIDAVIT OF  
SURRENDER OF LAW LICENSE


**TO: The Chair of the Disciplinary Hearing Commission  
of the North Carolina State Bar**

David E. Duke, being first duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

1. I desire to resign and hereby tender my license to practice law in North Carolina pursuant to State Bar Discipline and Disability Rule 27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0117(d).
2. My resignation is freely and voluntarily rendered. It is not the result of coercion or duress. I am fully aware of the implication of submitting my resignation.
3. I am aware that there is pending a formal complaint against me before the Disciplinary Hearing Commission, a copy of which is attached and incorporated herein.
4. I acknowledge that the material facts alleged in the complaint are true.
5. I am submitting my resignation because I know that I cannot successfully defend against the charges in the complaint.

This the 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2013.

*David E. Duke*  
David E. Duke



I, Randall C. Ross, Notary Public of the County of Wake, State of North Carolina, certify that David E. Duke personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the execution of the foregoing Affidavit.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 16th day of August, 2013.

*Randall C. Ross*  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 1/4/17

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA



BEFORE THE  
DISCIPLINARY HEARING COMMISSION  
OF THE  
NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR  
13 DHC 18

WAKE COUNTY

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR,

Plaintiff

v.

DAVID E. DUKE, Attorney,

Defendant

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, complaining of Defendant, alleges and says:

1. Plaintiff, the North Carolina State Bar ("Plaintiff" or "State Bar"), is a body duly organized under the laws of North Carolina and is the proper party to bring this proceeding under the authority granted it in Chapter 84 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, and the rules and regulations of the North Carolina State Bar promulgated thereunder.

2. Defendant, David E. Duke ("Defendant" or "Duke"), was admitted to the North Carolina State Bar on 20 March 2004 and is, and was at all times referred to herein, an attorney at law licensed to practice in North Carolina, subject to the rules, regulations and Rules of Professional Conduct of the North Carolina State Bar and the laws of the State of North Carolina.

3. During the times relevant herein, Duke actively engaged in the practice of law in the State of North Carolina and maintained a law office in Raleigh and Wendell, Wake County, North Carolina.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4. Paragraphs 1 through 3 are re-alleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

5. In or around June 2011, Beverly Stevens ("Stevens") retained Duke for representation concerning a traffic citation. Stevens paid Duke \$268.00 for the representation.

6. Stevens's \$268.00 payment to Duke included Duke's fee for legal services as well as any anticipated court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation.

7. Duke did not deposit Stevens's \$268.00 payment in his attorney trust account.

8. Stevens's traffic citation was scheduled for hearing on 29 June 2011.

9. In or around July 2011, Duke's law firm contacted Stevens and informed Stevens that her traffic citation had been resolved and all court costs and fines associated with the citation had been paid.

10. Duke did not pay the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation as he indicated to Stevens.

11. By letter dated 26 July 2011, Stevens was notified by the North Carolina Division of Motor Vehicles ("NCDMV") that her license was scheduled to be suspended on 24 September 2011 for her failure to pay the fine associated with her traffic citation.

12. On or about 5 August 2011, Stevens's father, John Check ("Check"), contacted Duke by phone concerning his daughter's traffic citation.

13. Duke informed Check the court costs and fines were paid and Duke did not understand why the NCDMV had sent Stevens the notice. Duke told Check to disregard the notice.

14. Duke had not paid the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation as he indicated to Check on 5 August 2011.

15. On or about 8 August 2011, Check contacted the Wake County Clerk of Court and was informed the traffic citation had not been paid. Check was also informed that a \$50.00 penalty had been added to the \$141.00 court costs and fines assessed to Stevens's traffic citation.

16. On or about 9 August 2011, Check called Duke to request a copy of the receipt showing Duke had paid the court costs and fines. Duke told Check he would go to the courthouse the next morning to make sure everything was taken care of.

17. On 10 August 2011, Check went to Duke's office to pick up a copy of the receipt reflecting the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation had been paid.

18. The receipt showed the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation had been paid on 10 August 2011.

19. On or about 15 August 2011, Check filed a grievance against Duke with the State Bar, grievance file no. 11G0964.

20. By letter dated 14 September 2011, the Tenth Judicial District Bar's Grievance Committee sent a Letter of Notice regarding grievance file no. 11G0964 to Duke at his address on record with the North Carolina State Bar.

21. Duke did not respond to the Tenth Judicial District Bar's Letter of Notice.

22. A representative of the Tenth Judicial District Bar's Grievance Committee spoke with Duke on or about 7 November 2011 and left voicemail messages with Duke on or about 17, 18, and 21 November 2011 regarding his failure to respond to the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 11G0964.

23. Duke did not respond to the Tenth Judicial District Bar's inquiries and never provided a response to the Tenth Judicial District Bar's Letter of Notice.

24. Duke subsequently did not respond to letters from State Bar investigators dated 20 December 2011, 6 January 2012, and 31 January 2012.

25. On 21 March 2012, Duke delivered Stevens's client file to the State Bar, at which time a State Bar investigator personally served Duke with the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 11G0964. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.

26. Duke did not respond to the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 11G0964 as required.

THEREFORE, the State Bar alleges that Defendant's foregoing actions constitute grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 84-28(b)(2) & (b)(3) in that he failed to answer a formal inquiry issued by the State Bar in a disciplinary matter and he violated one or more of the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect at the time of the actions as follows:

- (a) By failing to promptly pay the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation, Duke failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client in violation of Rule 1.3 and failed to promptly pay entrusted property belonging to his client to a third party as his client instructed in violation of Rule 1.15-2(m);
- (b) By failing to notify Stevens of his failure to pay the court costs and fines associated with Stevens's traffic citation, Duke failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3);
- (c) By responding to Stevens's and Check's inquiries with false representations that the court costs and fines associated with her traffic citation had been paid, Duke failed to comply with reasonable requests for information in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4) and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c);
- (d) By failing to deposit into his attorney trust account the funds Stevens provided to Duke for her court costs and fines associated with her traffic citation, Duke failed to safeguard entrusted client funds in violation of Rules 1.15-2(a) & (b); and
- (e) By failing to respond to the Tenth Judicial District Bar's inquiries, by failing to respond to the State Bar investigator's inquiries, and by failing to respond to the State Bar's Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 11G0964, Duke failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority in violation of Rule 8.1(b).

## SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

27. Paragraphs 1 through 26 are re-alleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
28. In or around September 2009, Terrisha Jones ("Jones") retained Duke for representation in a criminal matter, including having her criminal record expunged. Jones paid Duke \$750.00 for the representation.
29. On 14 December 2009, Jones's criminal case was voluntarily dismissed. Duke told Jones he would immediately file the petition for expunction.
30. In or around July 2011, Jones learned her criminal record had not been expunged.
31. On or about 5 August 2011, Jones went to Duke's office. Duke told Jones that the petition for expunction had been coded incorrectly and was rejected. Duke told Jones he would file another petition and the matter would be resolved in about 30 days. Duke provided Jones with a letter stating the same.
32. Duke did not respond to Jones's subsequent inquiries requesting an update on the status of the petition for expunction.
33. On or about 26 September 2011, Jones contacted the Wake County Clerk of Court. Jones learned that Duke had not filed a petition for expunction in her case.
34. Duke never filed a petition for expunction on Jones's behalf.
35. Jones subsequently filed a petition for expunction without Duke's assistance. Jones's petition was granted in May 2012.
36. On or about 21 October 2011, Jones filed a grievance against Duke, grievance file no. 11G1249.
37. On or about 9 November 2011, the State Bar sent Duke a Letter of Notice regarding grievance file no. 11G1249 via certified mail to Duke's address on record with the North Carolina State Bar. Duke was served with the Letter of Notice on 21 November 2011. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.
38. Duke did not respond to the Letter of Notice concerning grievance file no. 11G1249 within fifteen days as required.
39. On 21 March 2012, a State Bar investigator personally served Duke with the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 11G1249. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.
40. Duke did not respond to the Letter of Notice concerning grievance file no. 11G1249 within fifteen days as required. Duke responded to the Letter of Notice on or about 4 May 2012.

41. By letter dated 15 May 2012, the State Bar sent Duke a follow-up letter requesting additional information concerning grievance file no. 11G1249. The letter requested that Duke respond by 25 May 2012.

42. Duke did not respond to the request for additional information concerning grievance file no. 11G1249 as required.

THEREFORE, the State Bar alleges that Defendant's foregoing actions constitute grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 84-28(b)(2) & (b)(3) in that he failed to answer a formal inquiry issued by the State Bar in a disciplinary matter and he violated one or more of the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect at the time of the actions as follows:

- (a) By failing to complete the representation for which he was retained and for which he received a fee, Duke failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client in violation of Rule 1.3 and collected a clearly excessive fee in violation of Rule 1.5(a);
- (b) By failing to notify Jones that he had not filed the petition for expunction, Duke failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3);
- (c) By responding to Jones's inquiries with false representations that the petition of expunction had been filed, Duke failed to comply with reasonable requests for information in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4) and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c); and
- (d) By failing to timely respond to the State Bar's Letter of Notice and by failing to respond to a request for additional information concerning grievance file no. 11G1249, Duke failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority in violation of Rule 8.1(b).

### **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

43. Paragraphs 1 through 42 are re-alleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

44. In or around May 2011, Benita Gardner ("Gardner") retained Duke for representation concerning a traffic citation. Gardner paid Duke \$500.00 for the representation.

45. Gardner's \$500.00 payment to Duke included Duke's fee for legal services as well as any anticipated court costs and fines associated with Gardner's traffic citation.

46. Duke did not deposit Gardner's \$500.00 payment in his attorney trust account.

47. Duke did not appear on Gardner's behalf at Gardner's scheduled hearing date. As a result of Duke's failure to appear on her behalf, Gardner received a failure to appear and her driver's license was suspended.

48. Gardner made multiple inquiries to Duke requesting an update on the status of her case and requesting a refund of her \$500.00 payment.

49. Duke did not refund any portion of Gardner's \$500.00 payment.

50. Duke used Gardner's funds that were intended to pay for her court costs and fines for the benefit of someone other than Gardner without Gardner's knowledge or consent.

51. In or around December 2011, Gardner filed a fee dispute petition with the State Bar against Duke, fee dispute file no. 11FD0622.

52. By letter dated 24 January 2012, the Tenth Judicial District Bar's Fee Dispute Resolution Committee sent Duke a Notice of Mandatory Fee Dispute Resolution in file no. 11FD0622 to Duke's address on record with the North Carolina State Bar.

53. Duke did not respond to the fee dispute as required. Duke also failed to respond to subsequent letters dated 21 March 2012 and 26 April 2012 requesting Duke's response to file no. 11FD0622.

54. On or about 21 May 2012, the State Bar opened a grievance file against Duke, grievance file no. 12G0473.

55. On or about 30 May 2012, the State Bar sent Duke a Letter of Notice regarding grievance file no. 12G0473 via certified mail to Duke's address on record with the North Carolina State Bar. Duke was served with the Letter of Notice on 1 June 2012. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.

56. Duke did not respond to the Letter of Notice concerning grievance file no. 12G0473 within fifteen days as required.

THEREFORE, the State Bar alleges that Defendant's foregoing actions constitute grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 84-28(b)(2) & (b)(3) in that he failed to answer a formal inquiry issued by the State Bar in a disciplinary matter and he violated one or more of the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect at the time of the actions as follows:

- (a) By failing to take any action in Gardner's case for which he was retained and for which he received a fee, Duke failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client in violation of Rule 1.3 and collected a clearly excessive fee in violation of Rule 1.5(a);
- (b) By failing to respond to Gardner's inquiries and by failing to inform Gardner that he had not appeared in court, Duke failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) and failed to respond to reasonable requests for information from his client in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4);

- (c) By failing to deposit into his attorney trust account the funds Gardner provided to Duke for her court costs and fines associated with her traffic citation, Duke failed to safeguard entrusted client funds in violation of Rules 1.15-2(a) & (b);
- (d) By using Gardner's funds for the benefit of someone other than the beneficial owner of the funds, Duke misappropriated entrusted client funds in violation of Rule 1.15-2(j), engaged in a criminal act showing professional unfitness in violation of Rule 8.4(b), and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c);
- (e) By failing to respond to the Notice of Mandatory Fee Dispute Resolution filed by Gardner, concerning fee dispute file no. 11FD0622, Duke failed to participate in good faith in the fee dispute resolution process in violation of Rule 1.5(f); and
- (f) By failing to timely respond to the State Bar's Letter of Notice concerning grievance file no. 12G0473, Duke failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority in violation of Rule 8.1(b).

#### **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

57. Paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

58. In or around May 2011, Todd Goode ("Goode") retained Duke for representation concerning a 13-year old criminal charge of driving while intoxicated. Goode paid Duke a flat fee of \$750.00 for the representation.

59. Duke entered into a fee contract with Goode in which Duke labeled his \$750.00 fee as "non-refundable."

60. Duke never appeared on Goode's behalf in court and did not take any action to resolve Goode's matter.

61. Duke did not respond to Goode's or Goode's wife's repeated telephone calls requesting an update on the status of his case and requesting a refund of his fee. Duke did not refund any portion of the \$750.00 fee Goode paid Duke.

62. In January 2012, Goode filed a fee dispute petition with the State Bar against Duke, fee dispute file no. 12FD0010.

63. On or about 24 January 2012, the Tenth Judicial District's Fee Dispute Resolution Committee sent Duke a Notice of Mandatory Fee Dispute Resolution in file no. 12FD0010 to Duke's address on record with the North Carolina State Bar.

64. Duke did not respond to the fee dispute as required. Duke also failed to respond to subsequent letters dated 21 March 2012 and 26 April 2012 requesting Duke's response to file no. 12FD0010.

65. On 21 May 2012, the State Bar opened a grievance file against Duke, grievance file no. 12G0472.

66. On or about 30 May 2012, the State Bar sent a Letter of Notice regarding grievance file no. 12G0472. Duke was served with the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0472 on 1 June 2012. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.

67. Duke did not respond to the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0472 as required.

THEREFORE, the State Bar alleges that Defendant's foregoing actions constitute grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 84-28(b)(2) & (b)(3) in that he failed to answer a formal inquiry issued by the State Bar in a disciplinary matter and he violated one or more of the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect at the time of the actions as follows:

- (a) By failing to take any action in Goode's case for which he was retained and for which he received a fee, Duke failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client in violation of Rule 1.3 and collected a clearly excessive fee in violation of Rule 1.5(a);
- (b) By failing to respond to Goode's requests for information and by failing to provide Goode with any information concerning Goode's case, Duke failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) and failed to comply with reasonable requests for information in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4);
- (c) By failing to respond to the Notice of Mandatory Fee Dispute Resolution concerning fee dispute file no. 12FD0010, Duke failed to participate in good faith in the fee dispute resolution process in violation of Rule 1.5(f);
- (d) By entering into a contract in which he termed the flat fee for his services to be non-refundable, Defendant made a false or misleading communication about his services in violation of Rule 7.1(a); and
- (e) By failing to timely respond to the State Bar's Letter of Notice, concerning grievance file no. 12G0472, Duke failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority in violation of Rule 8.1(b).

#### **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

68. Paragraphs 1 through 67 are re-alleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

69. In or around August 2011, Duke was appointed to represent Ira Henderson ("Henderson") on a criminal charge.

70. Throughout the representation, Duke failed to respond to Henderson's requests for updates on his case and otherwise failed to provide Henderson with any information concerning his case.

71. On 13 February 2012, Henderson filed a grievance file against Duke, grievance file no. 12G0151.

72. On 21 March 2012, a State Bar investigator personally served Duke with the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0151. Duke was required to respond to the Letter of Notice within fifteen days of receiving the letter.

73. Duke did not timely respond to the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0151 as required.

74. Duke responded to the Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0151 on 23 April 2012.

75. By letter dated 15 May 2012, the State Bar requested further information from Duke regarding his response to the allegations contained in grievance file no. 12G0151.

76. Duke did not respond to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 follow-up letter.

77. On 7 June 2012, Deputy Counsel with the State Bar spoke with Duke about his failure to respond to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 follow-up letter. Duke informed Deputy Counsel that he sent his response to the 15 May 2012 letter on 6 June 2012.

78. The State Bar never received Duke's claimed 6 June 2012 response to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 follow-up letter.

79. Duke never responded to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 letter as indicated.

80. On 20 June 2012, the State Bar sent Duke another letter requesting his response to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 follow-up letter.

81. Duke failed to respond to the State Bar's 20 June 2012 letter.

THEREFORE, the State Bar alleges that Defendant's foregoing actions constitute grounds for discipline pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 84-28(b)(2) & (b)(3) in that he failed to answer a formal inquiry issued by the State Bar in a disciplinary matter and he violated one or more of the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect at the time of the actions as follows:

- (a) By failing to respond to Henderson's requests for information and by failing to provide Henderson with any information concerning Henderson's case, Duke failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) and failed to comply with reasonable requests for information in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4); and

- (b) By failing to timely respond to the State Bar's Letter of Notice in grievance file no. 12G0151, by failing to respond to the State Bar's 15 May 2012 and 20 June 2012 requests for further information concerning grievance file no. 12G0151, and by falsely indicating to the State Bar that he had previously sent a response to the State Bar's inquiries when he had not, Duke failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority in violation of Rule 8.1(b) and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that:

- (1) Disciplinary action be taken against Defendant in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. § 84-28(a) and § .0114 of the Discipline and Disability Rules of the North Carolina State Bar (27 N.C. Admin. Code 1B § .0114), as the evidence on hearing may warrant;
- (2) Defendant be taxed with the administrative fees and costs permitted by law in connection with this proceeding; and
- (3) For such other and further relief as is appropriate.

This the 15 day of July, 2013.

*Margaret M. Hunt*

---

Margaret M. Hunt, Chair  
Grievance Committee

*Brian P.D. Oten*

---

Brian P.D. Oten  
Deputy Counsel  
State Bar Number 34140  
North Carolina State Bar  
P. O. Box 25908  
Raleigh, NC 27611  
(919) 828-4620, Ext. 226