

LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD

IN RE: IRVIN JOSEPH CELESTINE, JR.

DOCKET NO. 22-DB-011 c/w 22-DB-032

REPORT OF HEARING COMMITTEE # 20

INTRODUCTION

This attorney disciplinary matter arises out of two sets of formal charges filed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) against Irvin Joseph Celestine, Jr. (“Respondent”), Louisiana Bar Roll Number 30871.¹ ODC alleges that Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct: 1.1(c), 1.2(a), 1.3, 1.4(a), 3.2, 8.1(b) and (c), 8.4(a) and (d).²

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The 22-DB-011 formal charges were filed on March 17, 2022. Respondent filed an answer to the charges on May 9, 2022. The 22-DB-032 formal charges were filed on July 5, 2022. Respondent failed to file an answer to the 22-DB-032 charges. Accordingly, on August 12, 2022, ODC filed a motion to deem the factual allegations admitted pursuant to Louisiana Supreme Court Rule XIX, §11(E)(3).³ By order signed August 19, 2022, the factual allegations contained in the 22-DB-032

¹ Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in Louisiana on April 26, 2007. Respondent is currently eligible to practice law.

² See the attached Appendix for the text of these Rules.

³ This rule states:

The respondent shall file a written answer with the Board and serve a copy on disciplinary counsel within twenty (20) days after service of the formal charges, unless the time is extended by the chair of the hearing committee. In the event, Respondent fails to answer within the prescribed time, or the time as extended, the factual allegations contained within the formal charges shall be deemed admitted and proven by clear and convincing evidence. Disciplinary Counsel shall file a motion with the chair of the hearing committee to which the matter is assigned requesting that the factual allegations be deemed proven with proof of service of the formal charges upon the respondent. The order signed by the hearing committee chair shall be served upon respondent as provided by Section

formal charges were deemed admitted. On September 7, 2022, Ramon J. Fonseca, Jr., enrolled as counsel for Respondent in both matters. On the motion of ODC and by order signed September 16, 2022, these two matters were consolidated. A hearing was set for February 23, 2023. On the motion of Mr. Fonseca and by order signed January 3, 2023, Mr. Fonseca withdrew as counsel for Respondent. On February 8, 2023, Mr. Fonseca filed a motion to reenroll as counsel for Respondent and a motion for continuance. The hearing was continued to June 6, 2023, and was held on that date. Deputy Disciplinary Counsel Susan C. Kalmbach appeared on behalf of ODC. Respondent appeared with counsel, Mr. Fonseca.

For the following reasons, the Committee finds that the Office of Disciplinary Counsel provided overwhelming evidence that Irvin Joseph Celestine did violate the rules listed in the complaint and that the recommendation by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel regarding the penalty of Suspension of Practice for one year and one day, was both fair and appropriate. That recommendation, after hearing testimony and reviewing the documents provided, is hereby adopted by Committee # 20 finding Mr. Celestine in violation of the rules as charged.

FORMAL CHARGES

The 22-DB-011 formal charges read, in pertinent part:

On May 21, 2021, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) received a complaint from Leah M. Penny, Bar Roll No. 29376, against Respondent, and the matter was opened for investigation as ODC 0039240.

13C. Within twenty (20) days of the mailing of the order of the hearing committee chair deeming the factual allegations contained in the formal charges proven, the respondent may move the hearing committee chair to recall the order thus issued upon demonstration of good cause why imposition of the order would be improper or would result in a miscarriage of justice.

Despite the ODC's efforts, Respondent did not submit an initial response to the disciplinary complaint or otherwise cooperate with the disciplinary investigation.

- A. On June 1, 2021, the ODC sent Respondent notice of the complaint and a request for an initial response. This correspondence, sent to Respondent's Louisiana State Bar Association ("LSBA") registered primary/secondary/preferred address (Pintail) via certified mail, was received on June 16, 2021. During his sworn statement, Respondent acknowledged signing for the correspondence. Despite acknowledging actual notice, Respondent did not submit an initial response to the complaint.
- B. On June 22, 2021, the ODC sent Respondent correspondence notifying Respondent that he had been declared ineligible to practice law. This correspondence, sent to Respondent's LSBA-registered primary/secondary/preferred address (Pintail), was not returned to the ODC, indicating receipt. Respondent did not respond to this correspondence.
- C. On July 14, 2021, the ODC sent Respondent a second notice of the complaint and a request for an initial response. The correspondence sent to Respondent's LSBA-registered primary/secondary address (Pintail) was not returned to the ODC, indicating receipt. The correspondence sent to Respondent's LSBA-registered preferred address (P.O. Box) was returned to the ODC as "undeliverable as addressed" and "unable to forward." The correspondence also was emailed to Respondent's LSBA-registered email address, with delivery and read receipts requested; however, only a delivery receipt was returned to the ODC. Respondent did not submit an initial response to the complaint.
- D. On August 24, 2021, Respondent personally was served with a subpoena for Respondent to appear at the ODC for purposes of providing a sworn statement. Respondent also was commanded to bring with him an initial response to the complaint.
- E. Respondent requested that his sworn statement be rescheduled, and on September 14, 2021, the ODC sent Respondent written confirmation of the rescheduled date of October 15, 2021. This correspondence was sent to Respondent's LSBA-registered primary/secondary address (Ludovic) and was not returned to the ODC, indicating receipt. The correspondence also was emailed to Respondent's LSBA-registered email address, with delivery and read receipts requested. Only a delivery receipt was returned to the ODC.
- F. Respondent appeared at his October 15, 2021, sworn statement; however, he did not provide the ODC with the requested initial response. During his sworn statement, Respondent assured that his initial response was forthcoming. Respondent, however, did not submit an initial response to the complaint.

The ODC disciplinary investigation reflects that Throme Lacroix and a minor child were in a November of 2017 car accident. Respondent was hired to represent their legal interests, and in November of 2018, Respondent filed suit on their behalf. *Lacroix, et al. v. Imperial Fire & Casualty Insurance Co., et al.*, 20186962, 15th J.D.C., Parish of Lafayette.

The complainant, attorney Leah M. Penny, represented the defendant Progressive Secured Insurance Company and its insureds (collectively "Progressive"). Settlement discussions ensued. In January of 2019, Respondent forwarded a settlement demand to Progressive, which Progressive accepted. On February 8, 2019, Penny emailed written confirmation of the agreement to Respondent, but Respondent did not respond. Penny's repeated efforts to communicate with Respondent were unsuccessful.

On February 26, 2019, Penny forwarded to Respondent, via certified mail, the settlement paperwork and two checks, each payable to Lacroix and Respondent. The correspondence was delivered on March 6, 2019, and Respondent confirmed that the signature on the certified mail receipt was his own. Respondent did not return the executed documents to Progressive or negotiate the disbursement checks. Repeated efforts by Penny to contact Respondent were futile.

Unable to communicate with Respondent, the district court record reflects Progressive's efforts to resolve the matter through the filing of several motions to enforce settlement. Progressive's first motion to enforce settlement was filed in September of 2019; however, Respondent failed to appear. Successive motions were filed, with accompanying hearing dates set and then re-set. Respondent could not be located for purposes of service, and Respondent did not appear in court on behalf of his client.

In a continued effort to make contact with Respondent, in mid-October of 2020, Penny asked an attorney-colleague, Kyle Landrem, to attempt to contact Respondent using Landrem's own telephone. Landrem was successful and made arrangements for Penny and Respondent to speak by telephone that day. During their telephone conversation, Respondent verbally assured Penny that the executed documents would be forthcoming. Penny, again, forwarded the settlement documents to Respondent, and Respondent confirmed receipt. Respondent also confirmed that the executed documents would be returned to Progressive on or before October 26, 2020.

Despite Respondent's assurances, the executed documents were not returned to Progressive. In late November of 2020, Penny reached Respondent by telephone, and Respondent requested that Progressive re-issue the disbursement checks. Progressive arranged for a FedEx delivery of the checks and settlement documents to Respondent. The correspondence was delivered on December 11, 2020; however, the executed documents were not returned to Progressive, and the settlement checks were not negotiated.

In January of 2021, Progressive again sought relief with the court, filing another motion to enforce the settlement agreement. Although service was perfected on Lacroix, Respondent could not be located for purposes of service. Lacroix appeared in court on February 1, 2021. After being placed under oath, and in response to questioning by the court, Lacroix confirmed that he was unaware that a settlement

agreement had been reached with Progressive. Lacroix could not remember the last time that he had spoken to Respondent. The matter was re-set for May 10, 2021, so that Respondent might be served with notice to appear.

A private process server perfected domiciliary service on Respondent; however, only Lacroix appeared in court on May 10, 2021. Lacroix, again, advised the court that he had been unable to contact Respondent. Lacroix advised the court that Respondent had sent him a \$300 check, but “never told me nothing before or after,” and Lacroix “definitely” did not know any details regarding a settlement agreement. Lacroix terminated Respondent’s legal representation in open court.

Thereafter, Progressive and Lacroix reached a settlement agreement, and checks were issued by Progressive to Lacroix. Progressive also agreed to pay all court costs associated with the dispute. A judgment of partial dismissal was signed in August of 2021.

The ODC respectfully submits that there is clear and convincing evidence that as a matter of law Respondent, Irvin Joseph Celestine, Jr., Bar Roll No. 30871, has violated the Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 1.2(a) (scope of representation; decisions regarding settlement); 1.3 (diligence); 1.4(a) (communication with client); 3.2 (expedite litigation); 8.1(b) (knowing failure to respond), (c) (failure to cooperate); and 8.4(a) (violate or attempt to violate Rules of Professional Conduct), (d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

The 22-DB-032 formal charges read, in pertinent part:

On April 2, 2022, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) received a complaint against Respondent from his client, Paul R. Kost, Jr., and the matter was opened for investigation as ODC 0039907.

The ODC has made the following efforts to place Respondent on notice of the complaint and to receive Respondent’s initial response and cooperation with this investigation.

- On April 19, 2022, the ODC sent notice of the complaint and a request for an initial response to Respondent’s Louisiana State Bar Association (“LSBA”) registered primary/secondary address (Ludovic). United States Postal Service tracking information indicates that notice was left, but the correspondence was not retrieved. The correspondence was returned to the ODC with a label indicating: “RETURN TO SENDER; UNCLAIMED; UNABLE TO FORWARD.”
- On April 19, 2022, the ODC sent notice of the complaint and a request for an initial response to Respondent’s LSBA-registered preferred address (P.O. Box) via certified mail. The correspondence was returned to the ODC with a label indicating: “RETURN TO SENDER; LAW OFFICE OF IRVIN J. CELESTIN [sic] BOX CLOSED; UNABLE TO FORWARD; RETURN TO SENDER.”

- On April 21, 2022, the ODC spoke with Respondent via telephone and advised him of the outstanding complaint and the need for an initial response. That same date, the ODC emailed to Respondent, at his LSBA-registered and confirmed email address, copies of the complaint and the April 19, 2022, letters from the ODC to Respondent. The ODC received delivery confirmation, but the requested read receipt was not returned.

Despite the ODC's efforts, Respondent did not submit an initial response to the complaint or otherwise cooperate with this disciplinary investigation.

The ODC investigation reflects that Kost was arrested in July of 2021, and on September 13, 2021, Kost was charged by bill of information. *State v. Paul Robert Kost, Jr.*, 2021-CR181773, 15th J.D.C., Parish of Lafayette. In September of 2021, the District Defender's Office was appointed to represent Kost, and attorney Errin Green was assigned to the representation.

On or about January 19, 2022, Kost was sent notice that the representation had been reassigned from Green to Respondent. Kost and his sister began efforts to contact Respondent to discuss Kost's pending legal matter. Repeated telephone calls and emails were unsuccessful, and on April 19, 2022, Kost filed a written complaint with the District Defender's Office. Kost had a court date set for May 19, 2022, and Respondent appeared at court that day. Respondent and Kost spoke for the first time, and after their brief discussion, Kost entered a plea of guilty.

The ODC respectfully submits that there is clear and convincing evidence that as a matter of law Respondent, Irvin Joseph Celestine, Jr., Louisiana Bar Roll number 30871, has violated the Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 1.1(c) (registration information; see La. S. Ct. Rule XIX, §8C); 1.3 (diligence); 1.4(a) (communication); 8.1(b) (knowing failure to respond), (c) (failure to cooperate); and 8.4(a) (violate or attempt to violate Rules of Professional Conduct).

EVIDENCE

In regard to **22-DB-011**, the evidence submitted by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel was both sufficient and extensive with no objection raised to admissibility. Additionally, there was no submission of any real rebuttal evidence by Mr. Celestine. Though Celestine, through counsel, alleged mental health issues as "mitigating factors"⁴; no medical reports or other documents from any medical provider were provided either in advance of or at trial.

⁴ See lines 5-7 page 15 of hearing transcript.

This was a perplexing fact for the Committee. Respondent, as an attorney, would have known of the importance of providing this information in advance to his attorney and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel so it could be utilized at trial.⁵ This raises the question, if Respondent cannot, for whatever reason, take the steps to properly defend himself and assist his counsel at this important hearing, how can we expect him do any better for a potential client?

Every allegation made by ODC, as well as the timeline of events, was documented with exhibits and testimony. In fact, the Respondent in his testimony endorsed the authenticity of virtually all the exhibits ODC tendered. Testimony further corroborating the exhibits and the allegations of ODC were elicited in the form of testimony by Leah Penny.

In regard to **22-DB-032**, the factual allegations were deemed admitted, again because of a lack of participation by Respondent. It is possible Mr. Fonseca (Respondent's Counsel) might have had more luck rebutting these allegations if given a chance, but his client's negligence in handling his own legal affairs prevented the attempt. It is no secret that many public defenders are loaded down with heavy caseloads that makes it impossible to sometimes be as responsive to a client as one might like. However, no evidence of this kind was submitted, and no exhibits presented.

FINDINGS OF FACT

First, and the Committee wanted to make sure this was mentioned in our opinion, Mr. Celestine's total lack of cooperation and/or participation in the defense of this matter was both apparent and disturbing. During the hearing Counsel for the Respondent, was clearly at a disadvantage because

⁵ See page 24, lines 7 – 11 of the hearing transcript.

of the lack of cooperation of his client. It is to be noted that during the proceedings that preceded the hearing, Respondent never participated, and his counsel confessed when asked by the Chair that he was not sure his client would be present at the hearing. This indicated Respondent's attorney was having trouble contacting him, which is consistent with the factual allegations contained in both of ODC's cases against Mr. Celestine.

It also must be said that though the charges that were deemed admitted were a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct, they were less serious in the eyes of the Committee charged with hearing the evidence. The workload of a Public Defender in virtually every parish in our state would, in and of itself, have been a mitigating factor for our consideration. However, again, it was Respondent's avoidance of the issue and his repeated refusal to engage with ODC and participate in the proceedings that prevents this from being considered. These charges, though serious, could have likely been defended, at least to some degree, if Respondent had participated. It is this inability or refusal to act, coupled with a complete and total lack of cooperation in these proceedings that causes great concern.

In regard to **22-DB-011**, we find that Respondent neglected his duties to his client. He failed to stay in touch with his client and he settled the case without the knowledge or consent of his client. It is very telling that during the hearing, Respondent was evasive when asked by ODC and the Committee about whether his client knew about the settlement. At first, he said he knew he was negotiating a settlement, but not the exact amount of the settlement. This begs the question; how can Respondent consummate a settlement before he discusses it with his client? ⁶

⁶ See pages 48 -53 of the transcript. Respondent refuses to answer a clear and unambiguous question on this topic.

Additionally, and this was the most glaring and apparent fact ascertained at the hearing, Respondent avoided and intentionally did not cooperate or participate properly with ODC when these charges were brought to his attention. This finding is the most egregious since cooperation on the front end might have mitigated much of the situation and perhaps another solution could have been found.

In regard to **22-DB-032** we find that the facts as alleged by ODC were properly deemed admitted when Respondent, essentially, ignored the allegations and ODC's efforts to investigate the allegations. Respondent's client sat in jail for four months without ever hearing from his appointed lawyer, despite the repeated attempts of family to contact Respondent to visit with his client. Perhaps the caseload of a public defender is a mitigating factor, but that was not properly proven or argued by Respondent and, sadly, the total lack of communication received by his client uncannily mirrors the attention ODC, and to a degree this committee, received from Respondent during these proceedings.

In conclusion, the Committee found Respondent to be a likeable and intelligent young man who would seem to be capable of being a fine attorney. However, his lack of attention to his duties, whatever the cause, inhibited his ability to effectively represent his clients and himself.

RULES VIOLATED

In regard to **22-DB-011**, the Committee finds Respondent to be in violation of the following Rules of Professional Conduct: Rules 1.2(a) (scope of representation; decisions regarding settlement) 1.3

(diligence); 1.4(a) (communication with client); 3.2 (expedite litigation); 8.1(b) (knowing failure to respond), (c) (failure to cooperate); and 8.4(a) (violate or attempt to violate Rules of Professional Conduct), (d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

The evidence discussed previously overwhelming establishes Respondent failed to give this matter the proper attention. It is clear his efforts lacked true diligence and that he misrepresented his authority with the attorney for the insurer. This behavior paints our profession in a poor light and undoubtedly adversely affects the public's confidence in the court system as whole.

In regard to **22-DB-032** the facts were deemed admitted. We find Respondent in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 1.1(c) (registration information; see La. S. Ct. Rule XIX, §8C); 1.3 (diligence); 1.4(a) (communication); 8.1(b) (knowing failure to respond), (c) (failure to cooperate); and 8.4(a) (violate or attempt to violate Rules of Professional Conduct). It has not been discussed previously herein, but evidence was admitted by ODC that indicated Respondent failed to keep his registration current. At some points during the hearing, it seemed this lack of a reliable address was, in a perverse way, relied upon by Respondent as a defense for his lack of participation. A lack of participation in not only these disciplinary proceedings, but also the court proceedings associated with both complaints submitted by ODC.

SANCTION

Louisiana Supreme Court Rule XIX, §10(C), states that when imposing a sanction after a finding of lawyer misconduct, a committee shall consider the following factors:

- (1) Whether the lawyer has violated a duty owed to a client, to the public, to the legal system, or to the profession;

- (2) Whether the lawyer acted intentionally, knowingly, or negligently;
- (3) The amount of the actual or potential injury caused by the lawyer's misconduct; and
- (4) The existence of any aggravating or mitigating factors.

Here, Respondent violated duties owed to Thomas Lacroix and Jamie Barfield (**22-DB-011**) and Paul R. Kost Jr. (**22-DB-032**). He acted in a negligent manner and a somewhat knowingly manner when he failed to give his client's cases the attention they deserved and misrepresented facts to opposing counsel. There is no question he intentionally failed to cooperate with ODC and LADB in the investigation and prosecution of these complaints.

It is hard to say if Respondent's misconduct caused harm to his clients. In regard to **22-DB-011**, no evidence of harm was introduced, but one can reasonably assume his client would have wanted his money sooner as opposed to later. In fact evidence was submitted that the client negotiated an increase to the settlement previously agreed to on his behalf without his knowledge. Clearly there was a "potential" for harm when he negotiated a settlement without getting approval and input from his client. Luckily, the client was able to address some inadequacies in the settlement once the court removed Respondent from the case.

In regard to **22-DB-032**, we will never know, but if Respondent had visited his client in jail and the decision to plead had been discussed and agreed to, perhaps the plea could have been taken up sooner and the client's time in jail reduced.

The *ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions* suggest that Suspension is the baseline sanction for Respondent's misconduct. Standard 4.42 states, Suspension is generally appropriate when: (a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or potential

injury to a client, or (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or a potential injury to a client.

There is no question that Respondent violated various duties to multiple clients and that these violations, at the very least, could have caused injury to the clients, though it does not appear enough evidence was introduced to make a finding of "actual injury". At the same time, it is clear there was potential injury to clients. For example, his lack of diligence in the civil matter could have led to the case being abandoned and his client would have lost all compensation. Luckily for Respondent, opposing counsel wanted to enforce the settlement and pressed the issue. If she had allowed it to sit, after three years the case could have been dismissed with prejudice.

In regard to the criminal case, it is very possible that had the client been consulted with immediately, he might have been able to plead guilty at an earlier date and served less time in jail.

Regarding the mental state of Respondent, this is closely tied in with the aggravating and mitigating factors discussion, so we will address all three here.

First, we find no mitigating factors. Prior to hearing, based on a total lack of submissions by Respondent, the parties were warned by the Chair that any last-minute exhibits would be looked upon unfavorably. Other than the self-serving testimony of Respondent, the only potential evidence of a mitigating factor was a letter written by his mother that was not properly produced

prior to hearing.⁷ This letter contained information that could have been developed by Respondent's counsel, but it was not given to him timely. The letter and the testimony of Respondent indicated issues with depression, but no exhibits, no reports from doctors, and no medical records of any kind were presented. Tellingly, nothing was provided that indicated the alleged issues of depression were the cause of Respondent's violations. Furthermore, evidence was introduced by ODC that indicated that treatment or monitoring by JLAP was offered to Respondent in the very beginning of the process and he refused to cooperate. So, even if there is a mental health issue, and we suspect there is, Respondent's refusal to seek treatment until the day before the hearing begs the question of whether he is truly, sincerely, willing to accept treatment.

The Committee finds the lack of cooperation in these proceedings, the apparent lack of cooperation of Respondent with his counsel and his refusal to seek help for the mental health problems he alleged in his own testimony, to be aggravating factors.

We know it has been stated herein numerous times, but if Respondent cannot pull himself together to properly cooperate with these proceedings and his own attorney, how can we expect him to properly defend the rights of the clients who place their trust in him? If he can't accept treatment for the problems he alleges, how can we be assured the problems will not persist?

⁷ Though, out of respect for an accomplished and retired jurist and a mother who was and is concerned for her son, the letter was accepted, but its' weight is greatly diminished by Respondent's failure to provide it in advance of the hearing.

CONCLUSION

The Committee believes Respondent has the ability to be an effective counsel but cannot overlook the well-established facts that he has failed, for whatever reason, to properly administer his duties as an attorney to more than one client. We find no mitigating factors, which oddly, in this situation, becomes an aggravating factor. There very well may be mitigating factors, but Respondent's total lack of cooperation prevents us from knowing for sure. Given the totality of the facts in this matter, or lack thereof, the Committee concludes that Respondent should be required to prove his fitness to return to the practice of law by being required to petition for reinstatement pursuant to Rule XIX, §24.

Accordingly, we accept the recommendation of ODC and recommend suspension from the practice of law for one year and one day. We recommend that in compliance with Rule XIX, §10.1. Respondent be assessed with the costs and expenses of these proceedings.


This opinion is unanimous and has been reviewed by each committee member, who fully concur and have authorized the Chair of the Committee, Robert C. McCorquodale, to sign on their behalf.

Lake Charles, Louisiana, this 10 day of August, 2023.

**Louisiana Attorney Disciplinary Board
Hearing Committee # 20**

**Robert C. McCorquodale, Committee Chair
Timothy A. Maragos, Lawyer Member
Douglas A. Cochrane, Public Member**

BY:


**Robert C. McCorquodale, Committee Chair
For the Committee**

APPENDIX

Rule 1.1. Competence

...

(c) A lawyer is required to comply with all of the requirements of the Supreme Court's rules regarding annual registration, including payment of Bar dues, payment of the disciplinary assessment, timely notification of changes of address, and proper disclosure of trust account information or any changes therein.

Rule 1.2. Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer

(a) Subject to the provisions of Rule 1.16 and to paragraphs (c) and (d) of this Rule, a lawyer shall abide by a client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation, and, as required by Rule 1.4, shall consult with the client as to the means by which they are to be pursued. A lawyer may take such action on behalf of the client as is impliedly authorized to carry out the representation. A lawyer shall abide by a client's decision whether to settle a matter. In a criminal case, the lawyer shall abide by the client's decision, after consultation with the lawyer, as to a plea to be entered, whether to waive jury trial and whether the client will testify.

...

Rule 1.3. Diligence

A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

Rule 1.4. Communication

(a) A lawyer shall: (1) promptly inform the client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(e), is required by these Rules; (2) reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished; (3) keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter; (4) promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; and (5) consult with the client about any relevant limitation on the lawyer's conduct when the lawyer knows that the client expects assistance not permitted by the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.

...

Rule 3.2. Expediting Litigation

A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client.

Rule 8.1. Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters

An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer in connection with a bar admission application or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

...

(b) Fail to disclose a fact necessary to correct a misapprehension known by the person to have arisen in the matter, or knowingly fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or

(c) Fail to cooperate with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel in its investigation of any matter before it except for an openly expressed claim of a constitutional privilege.

Rule 8.4. Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

(a) Violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;

...

(d) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

...