

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 2017-OB-1862

IN RE: WILLIAM A. ROE

ON APPLICATION FOR READMISSION

PER CURIAM

This proceeding arises out of an application for readmission to the practice of law filed by petitioner, William A. Roe, a disbarred attorney.

UNDERLYING FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Until 2008, petitioner served as a judge of the 25th Judicial District Court for the Parish of Plaquemines. After allegations surfaced that he “double-dipped” on expense reimbursements relating to the 2005, 2006, and 2007 Summer School for Judges in San Destin, Florida, petitioner was indicted on felony criminal charges and subsequently convicted of three counts of unauthorized use of a movable. On October 14, 2009, we placed petitioner on interim suspension based upon his conviction of a serious crime. *In re: Roe*, 09-2117 (La. 10/14/09), 22 So. 3d 867. On January 6, 2010, petitioner was sentenced to serve six months in jail with three months suspended, followed by eighteen months of active probation. He was also fined \$1,500 and ordered to perform 240 hours of community service.

On January 22, 2010, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) filed formal charges against petitioner arising out of his conviction. Following the finality of petitioner’s conviction, the parties filed a joint petition for consent discipline in this court, proposing that petitioner be disbarred, retroactive to October 14, 2009,

the date of his interim suspension. We accepted the petition for consent discipline on March 2, 2012. *In re: Roe*, 12-0264 (La. 3/2/12), 82 So. 3d 266.

On August 24, 2016, petitioner filed the instant application for readmission with the disciplinary board, alleging he has complied with the readmission criteria set forth in Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(E). The ODC filed a response to petitioner's readmission application, taking no position. Accordingly, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(F) and (G), the matter was referred for a formal hearing before a hearing committee.

Following the hearing, the hearing committee recommended that readmission be denied. Petitioner objected to this recommendation, and the matter was reviewed by the disciplinary board. The board recommended that petitioner be readmitted to the practice of law. Neither petitioner nor the ODC filed an objection to the board's recommendation.

DISCUSSION

After considering the record in its entirety, we find petitioner has met his burden of proving that he is entitled to be readmitted to the practice of law. Petitioner has demonstrated that he recognizes the wrongfulness and seriousness of the misconduct for which he was disbarred. Petitioner has also shown that he possesses the requisite competence, honesty, and integrity to be readmitted to the practice of law.

Accordingly, we will order that petitioner be readmitted 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 William A. Roe,

Louisiana Bar Roll number 11384, be immediately readmitted to the practice of law in Louisiana. All costs of these proceedings are assessed against petitioner.