11/20/2009 "See News Release 073 for any Concurrences and/or Dissents." SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 09-OB-2227

IN RE: JOSEPH M. BRUNO

ON APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT

PER CURIAM*

This proceeding arises out of an application for reinstatement filed by

petitioner, Joseph M. Bruno, an attorney who is currently suspended from the practice

of law in Louisiana.

UNDERLYING FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In *In re: Bruno*, 06-2791 (La. 5/11/07), 956 So. 2d 577, petitioner was

suspended from the practice of law for three years, with eighteen months deferred, for

making a prohibited monetary payment to a witness and failing to correct statements

made to a tribunal by his co-counsel which he knew to be false. Petitioner

subsequently filed an application for reinstatement with the disciplinary board,

alleging that he has complied with the reinstatement criteria set forth in Supreme

Court Rule XIX, § 24(E). The Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("ODC") filed an

opposition to the application for reinstatement. Accordingly, the matter was referred

for a formal hearing before a hearing committee.

After considering the evidence presented, the hearing committee recommended

that petitioner be reinstated to the practice of law. A majority of the disciplinary

board agreed that petitioner has satisfied the requirements for reinstatement by clear

* Judge Benjamin Jones, of the Fourth Judicial District Court, assigned as Justice *Pro Tempore*,

participating in the decision.

and convincing evidence. Accordingly, the board recommended to this court that petitioner be granted reinstatement.

After considering the record in its entirety, we will adopt the disciplinary board's recommendation. Petitioner shall be reinstated to the practice of law.

DECREE

Upon review of the findings and recommendation of the hearing committee and disciplinary board, and considering the record, it is ordered that Joseph M. Bruno, Louisiana Bar Roll number 3604, be immediately reinstated to the practice of law in Louisiana. All costs of these proceedings are assessed against petitioner.