In the Indiana Supreme Court

In the Matter of: Bruce N. Elliott, Respondent Supreme Court Case No. 19S-DI-251



Published Order Approving Statement of Circumstances and Conditional Agreement for Discipline

Pursuant to Indiana Admission and Discipline Rule 23(12.1)(b), the Indiana Supreme Court Disciplinary Commission and Respondent have submitted for approval a "Statement of Circumstances and Conditional Agreement for Discipline" stipulating agreed facts and proposed discipline as summarized below.

Stipulated Facts: Respondent represented "Wife" in a dissolution matter, and another attorney represented "Husband." The negotiated resolution reached by the parties contemplated that Husband would be awarded portions of Wife's four retirement accounts. Under the terms of the decree, Respondent was to prepare qualified domestic relations orders ("QDROs") for two of those accounts within 90 days, and opposing counsel was to prepare QDROs for the other two accounts within 90 days. Neither Respondent nor opposing counsel did so.

Violation: The parties agree that Respondent violated Indiana Professional Conduct Rule 3.2 by failing to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of his client.

Discipline: The parties propose the appropriate discipline is a public reprimand. This discipline is identical to the discipline we recently approved with respect to Husband's counsel for her similar misconduct in the underlying dissolution matter. <u>Matter of Lytle</u>, 135 N.E.3d 156 (Ind. 2019). The Court, having considered the submissions of the parties, now approves the agreed discipline and imposes a **public reprimand** for Respondent's misconduct.

The costs of this proceeding are assessed against Respondent. With the acceptance of this agreement, the hearing officer appointed in this case is discharged.

Done at Indianapolis, Indiana, on 1/23/2020

Louis A. Rush

Loretta H. Rush Chief Justice of Indiana

All Justices concur.