

In the Matter of William F. Holt.

No. 2017-170-M.P.

O R D E R

On November 24, 2014, this Court entered an order suspending the petitioner, William F. Holt, from the practice of law in this state for three years, with an effective date of May 1, 2014. *In re Holt*, 103 A.3d 147 (R.I. 2014). His suspension was based upon findings by the Supreme Court Disciplinary Board that he had violated multiple Rules of Professional Conduct in his representation of four clients in proceedings before the Family Court. As we noted, the petitioner had repeatedly disregarded both procedural and ethical rules in pursuing a “win at all costs” strategy on behalf of his clients. *Id.* at 152.

On May 4, 2017, he filed a petition for reinstatement in accordance with Article III, Rule 16 of the Supreme Court Rules of Disciplinary Procedure. Subsection (c) of Rule 16 provides, in part, that on a petition for reinstatement the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating to this Court that he or she “has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in law required for admission to practice law in this State and that his or her resumption of the practice of law within the State will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the Bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest.”

This Court's Disciplinary Counsel has conducted an investigation to determine whether the petitioner satisfied the requirements for reinstatement, and submitted his report to the Court on September 14, 2017. Counsel has advised that he has not discovered any information regarding the petitioner's conduct since the date of his suspension that would warrant denial of the petition.

We directed the petitioner to appear before the Court at its conference on September 21, 2017. The petitioner appeared, with counsel. Having heard the representations of the petitioner, his counsel, and Disciplinary Counsel, and having reviewed the many letters of support submitted to this Court by actively practicing attorneys in this state and former clients of the petitioner, as well as correspondence in opposition thereto, we deem that the petition should be granted.

We note that, prior to his suspension, the petitioner practiced law in this state for twenty-seven years and had received no disciplinary sanctions. He was, by all accounts, a capable attorney. Moreover, he was fully cooperative in the disciplinary proceedings leading to his suspension, and he appears to have accepted responsibility for his misconduct and to be remorseful for the same.

We are not unmindful of the damage caused to the courts, parties, and the profession by the petitioner's past conduct. His lack of veracity in his representations to judges and opposing counsel gives us pause in reinstating him to the practice of law. However, he has served his period of suspension without incident. Moreover, the implementation of the Supreme Court Rules Governing Electronic Filing, now applicable in all the courts within the Rhode Island Judiciary, preclude the same type of misconduct from occurring in the future.

Accordingly, we hereby grant the petition for reinstatement, subject to the following conditions:

1. Attorney Stephen G. Linder shall monitor the petitioner's practice of law for a period of two years;
2. Attorney Linder shall submit written reports on a quarterly basis to Disciplinary Counsel regarding his review of the petitioner's practice; and,
3. The petitioner shall fully cooperate with Attorney Linder and Disciplinary Counsel regarding the monitoring of his practice.

Justice Flaherty did not participate.

Entered as an Order of this Court this 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2017.

By Order,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Clerk

**SUPREME COURT – CLERK’S OFFICE**

**ORDER COVER SHEET**

<b>Title of Case</b>	In the Matter of William F. Holt.
<b>Case Number</b>	No. 2017-170-M.P.
<b>Date Order Filed</b>	October 20, 2017
<b>Justices</b>	Suttell, C.J., Goldberg, Robinson, and Indeglia, JJ.
<b>Source of Appeal</b>	N/A – Court Order
<b>Judicial Officer From Lower Court</b>	N/A – Court Order
<b>Attorney(s) on Appeal</b>	For Petitioner:  Robert B. Jacquard, Esq.
	For Respondent:  David D. Curtin, Esq. Chief Disciplinary Counsel