In the Indiana Supreme Court

In the Matter of: Adam Lenkowsky, Respondent

Supreme Court Case No. 19S-DI-541



Published Order Finding Misconduct and Imposing Discipline

Upon review of the report of the hearing officer, the Honorable Amy M. Jones, who was appointed by this Court to hear evidence on the Indiana Supreme Court Disciplinary Commission's "Disciplinary Complaint," the Court finds that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct and imposes discipline on Respondent.

Facts: In early 2019, pursuant to a guilty plea, Respondent was convicted in Hamilton County of operating a vehicle while intoxicated ("OWI") with endangerment, a level 6 felony entered as a class A misdemeanor. Respondent has a prior OWI conviction in Marion County.

Respondent has no prior discipline, has been fully cooperative with the Commission, and has voluntarily taken several measures since his arrest in Hamilton County to respond to his misconduct, including entering into a long-term monitoring agreement with the Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program.

Violation: The Court finds that Respondent violated Professional Conduct Rule 8.4(b), which prohibits committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on Respondent's 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 30 days, beginning on the date of this order, all stayed subject to completion of at least two years of probation. Respondent shall commit no violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or criminal act during his probation. Any such violation or criminal act committed by Respondent during his probation shall result in a revocation of probation and active service of the stayed suspension without automatic reinstatement. 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.

Louis A. Ruch

Loretta H. Rush

Chief Justice of Indiana

All Justices concur.