

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 2019-B-1459

IN RE: SALLY HARRISON LONGMIRE HINGEL

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDING

CRICHTON, J., additionally concurs and assigns reasons:

This Court finds itself again faced with outrageous violations of our Rules of Professional Conduct by an unresponsive, uncooperative, and recalcitrant lawyer. Certainly, the violations alone warrant significant discipline, but the indifference towards one’s license to practice law is most concerning. Unfortunately, this Court has seen recent cases of the same sort. *See In re: Quiana Marie Hunt*, 19-1412 (La. 11/12/19), __ So.3d __ (Crichton, J., dissenting, finding that because respondent failed to cooperate in disciplinary proceedings, a period of actual suspension should be imposed); *In Re: Jennifer Gaubert*, 18-1980 (La. 2/11/19), 263 So.3d 408 (Crichton, J., additionally concurring, noting the troublesome nature of an attorney refusing to participate meaningfully in disciplinary proceedings); *In re: Reid*, 18-0849 (La. 12/5/18), — So. 3d —, 2018 WL 6382109 (Crichton., J., dissenting, noting that “lack of cooperation with ODC, the Hearing Committee, the Disciplinary Board, and this Court demonstrates [a] stunning indifference to this noble profession”); *In Re: Neil Dennis William Montgomery*, 18-0637 (La. 8/31/18), 251 So.3d 401 (Crichton, J., dissenting, finding disbarment appropriate where respondent made “zero effort” to respond to any of the accusations against him); and *In re: Klaila*, 18-0093 (La. 3/23/18), 238 So.3d 949 (Crichton, J., additionally concurring, emphasizing respondent’s failure to cooperate warranted the suspension imposed).

In this case, Ms. Hingel failed to respond to the Office of Disciplinary Board complaint, failed to honor a subpoena, and did not make any appearance before the

Hearing Committee. She also did not file any objection to either the reports of the Hearing Committee or the Disciplinary Board, and finally, she declined to even make an eleventh hour plea to this Court. As serious as her violations are – including the bizarre efforts to illegally purchase drugs from her client – by not producing mitigation evidence, we are unquestionably compelled to order disbarment.¹

¹ I also note that, in my view, the seriousness of respondent's misconduct in this matter toes the line of the guidelines proscribing permanent disbarment.