

In the Indiana Supreme Court

In the Matter of: Guerino John Cento,
Respondent

Supreme Court Case No.
22S-DI-27



Published Order Finding Misconduct and Imposing Discipline

Upon review of the report of the hearing officer, the Honorable John D. Keiffner, III, who this Court appointed to hear evidence on the Indiana Supreme Court Disciplinary Commission's "Amended Verified Complaint for Disciplinary Action," the Court finds that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct and imposes discipline on Respondent.

Facts: Respondent pled guilty to two counts of invasion of privacy, both as class A misdemeanors. Both counts arose from Respondent's violations of a protective order that had been obtained by his ex-girlfriend. In one instance, Respondent sent an electronic invitation for a dance lesson to his ex-girlfriend; and in the second instance Respondent sent an email in which he apologized for having contacted her, stated he missed her, asked her not to report the contact, and indicated he would not harass or contact her again.


Violation: The Court finds that Respondent violated Professional Conduct Rule 8.4(b), which prohibits committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer.

Discipline: For Respondent's professional misconduct, the Court **suspends Respondent from the practice of law for a period of 120 days, effective immediately, with 60 days actively served and the remainder stayed subject to completion of at least one year of probation** with monitoring by the Indiana Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program (JLAP). During his probation Respondent shall continue receiving counseling as recommended by JLAP and shall comply with all other recommendations made by JLAP.

Respondent shall fulfill all the duties of a suspended attorney under Admission and Discipline Rule 23(26). Notwithstanding the expiration of the minimum term of probation set forth above, Respondent's probation shall remain in effect until it is terminated pursuant to a petition to terminate probation filed under Admission and Discipline Rule 23(16).

The costs of this proceeding are assessed against Respondent. The hearing officer appointed in this case is discharged with the Court's appreciation.

Done at Indianapolis, Indiana, on 6/23/2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Loretta H. Rush", written above a horizontal line.

Loretta H. Rush
Chief Justice of Indiana

All Justices concur.