## *People v. Jeanette Sue Snodgrass.* 14PDJ079. February 3, 2015.

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' conditional admission of misconduct and suspended Jeanette Sue Snodgrass (Attorney Registration Number 31198) for three years, effective March 10, 2015. Snodgrass may be reinstated to the practice of law only if she proves by clear and convincing evidence that she has been rehabilitated, complied with disciplinary orders, and is fit to practice.

Between 2009 and 2014, Snodgrass engaged in misconduct in six family law and bankruptcy representations. In one of the family law matters, the court ordered Snodgrass to reduce to writing an oral stipulation regarding modification of child support and to file a proposed order. Snodgrass did not do so, and she disregarded reminder calls from the court's clerk over a period of several months. She later falsely advised the court that she had ordered a transcript of the child support modification hearing, and she never did file the order as the court directed. In addition, Snodgrass disregarded her client's request that she withdraw as counsel. In this matter, she violated Colo. RPC 1.3 (a lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client); Colo. RPC 3.3(a)(1) (a lawyer shall not knowingly make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal); Colo. RPC 3.4(c) (a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of a tribunal); Colo. RPC 1.16(a)(3) (a lawyer shall withdraw if the lawyer is discharged); Colo. RPC 8.4(c) (a lawyer shall not engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation); and Colo. RPC 8.4(d) (a lawyer shall not engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

In another case, Snodgrass agreed to move for contempt against her client's ex-husband. Because Snodgrass failed to provide documents to opposing counsel, a court-ordered mediation did not occur. She disregarded communications from opposing counsel and also stopped communicating with her client. After Snodgrass failed to file a status report or settlement paperwork with the court as ordered, the court dismissed the case for lack of progress. Snodgrass did not tell her client. When Snodgrass failed to respond to a motion for attorney's fees, the court ordered her and her client to pay attorney's fees. Again, she did not tell her client. In this case, Snodgrass violated Colo. RPC 1.3; Colo. RPC 8.4(d); Colo. RPC 1.4(a)(3) (a lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of the matter); Colo. RPC 1.4(a)(4) (a lawyer shall promptly comply with reasonable requests for information); and Colo. RPC 1.16(d) (a lawyer shall protect a client's interests upon termination of the representation).

The other matters addressed in the stipulation reflect Snodgrass's general pattern of failing to file motions and petitions for her clients, disregarding client communications, and failing to refund unearned client fees. While again violating many of the rules mentioned above, she also in some instances failed to give new clients a written fee agreement (Colo. RPC 1.5(b)); failed to safeguard client funds (Colo. RPC 1.15(a) & (c)); treated fees as earned before conferring a benefit on the client or performing a legal service (Colo. RPC 1.5(f)); and failed to promptly deliver funds owed to the client and render a full accounting (Colo. RPC 1.15(b)).