

19604

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF WAKE

BEFORE THE  
GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR  
95G0047 (IV)

---

IN THE MATTER OF	)	
	)	
ANDREW N. PATTERSON, II	)	REPRIMAND
ATTORNEY AT LAW	)	
	)	

---

On July 20, 1995, the Grievance Committee of the North Carolina State Bar met and considered the grievance filed against you by the North Carolina State Bar.

Pursuant to 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, Rule .0113(a) of the Rules and Regulations of the North Carolina State Bar, the Grievance Committee conducted a preliminary hearing. After considering the information available to it, including your response to the letter of notice, the Grievance Committee found probable cause. Probable cause is defined in the rules as "reasonable cause to believe that a member of the North Carolina State Bar is guilty of misconduct justifying disciplinary action."

The rules provide that after a finding of probable cause, the Grievance Committee may determine that the filing of a complaint and a hearing before the Disciplinary Hearing Commission are not required and the Grievance Committee may issue various levels of discipline depending upon the misconduct, the actual or potential injury caused, and any aggravating or mitigating factors. The Grievance Committee may issue an admonition, reprimand, or censure to the respondent attorney.

A reprimand is a written form of discipline more serious than an admonition issued in cases in which an attorney has violated one or more provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct and has caused harm or potential harm to a client, the administration of justice, the profession, or a member of the public, but the misconduct does not require a censure.

The Grievance Committee was of the opinion that a censure is not required in this case and issues this reprimand to you. As chairman of the Grievance Committee of the North Carolina State Bar, it is now my duty to issue this reprimand and I am certain that you will understand fully the spirit in which this duty is performed.

You were employed by Phillip Chase to file a civil action against Dan Grimes for money owed. You prepared a complaint which was to be verified by Phillip E. Chase. You had an employee in your office sign Phillip E. Chase's name on the

00744


verification. You directed another employee to affix her jurat to Chase's signature. The verification was made to appear that Phillip E. Chase himself had signed the document before your notary public employee when he had not done so. This was a misrepresentation that violated Rules 1.2(c) and (d) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

In deciding not to impose more severe discipline in this matter, the Grievance Committee took into consideration the fact that Phillip E. Chase wanted you to expedite the filing of his complaint. The Grievance Committee also considered the fact that you believed that you had a document signed by Chase authorizing you to sign his name. However, even if you had a document authorizing you to sign Chase's name, the verification should not have been prepared in such a way to represent that Chase himself had sworn to and signed the verification before your employee.

You are hereby reprimanded by the North Carolina State Bar due to your professional misconduct. The Grievance Committee trusts that you will heed this reprimand, that it will be remembered by you, that it will be beneficial to you, and that you will never again allow yourself to depart from adherence to the high ethical standards of the legal profession.

In accordance with the policy adopted October 15, 1981 by the Council of the North Carolina State Bar regarding the taxing of the administrative and investigative costs to any attorney issued a reprimand by the Grievance Committee, the costs of this action in the amount of \$50.00 are hereby taxed to you.

Done and ordered, this 28<sup>th</sup> day of August, 1995.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William O. King  
The Grievance Committee  
North Carolina State Bar

#418/sd

00745