

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

IN RE: WREN'NEL M. GIBSON

No. 2023-B-00075

IN RE: Office of Disciplinary Counsel - Applicant Other; Wren'nel M. Gibson -
Applicant Other; Joint Petition for Consent Discipline;

March 07, 2023

Joint petition for consent discipline accepted. See per curiam.

JLW

JDH

JTG

WJC

JBM

PDG

Crichton, J., dissents and assigns reasons.

Supreme Court of Louisiana

March 07, 2023



Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

03/07/2023

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 2023-B-0075

IN RE: WREN'NEL M. GIBSON

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDING

PER CURIAM

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) commenced an investigation into allegations that respondent failed to timely disburse settlement funds owed to a client and the client’s medical providers, failed to adequately communicate with the client, converted or allowed the conversion of client funds, failed to timely provide the client with her file upon written request, and failed to cooperate with the ODC in two investigations. Following the filing of formal charges, respondent and the ODC submitted a joint petition for consent discipline. Having reviewed the petition,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Consent Discipline be accepted and that Wren’nel M. Gibson, Louisiana Bar Roll number 33853, be suspended from the practice of law for a period of three years.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all costs and expenses in the matter are assessed against respondent in accordance with Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 10.1, with legal interest to commence thirty days from the date of finality of this court’s judgment until paid.

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 2023-B-00075

IN RE: WREN'NEL GIBSON

Attorney Disciplinary Proceeding

CRICHTON, J., dissents and assigns reasons:

Because I find the three year suspension is unduly lenient in light of the seriousness of respondent's misconduct, I dissent and would reject the petition for consent discipline. The undisputed facts of this case establish that respondent violated numerous provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct, including Rules 1.1(a) (failure to provide competent representation to a client), 1.3 (failure to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client), 1.4 (failure to communicate with a client), 1.15(a),(e) (safekeeping property of clients or third persons), 1.15(d) (failure to timely remit funds to a client or third person), 1.16(d) (obligations upon termination of the representation), 5.3 (failure to properly supervise a non-lawyer assistant), 8.1(b) (knowing failure to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority), 8.1(c) (failure to cooperate with the ODC in its investigation, 8.4(c) (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation), and 8.4(d) (engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). Such disregard for the sanctity of our profession and a stunning failure to cooperate with the disciplinary process warrant nothing less than disbarment. *See, e.g., In re: Jerome M. Volk, Jr.*, 21-489 (La. 9/27/21), 323 So.3d 863 (mem.) (Crichton, J., dissenting, finding three year suspension unduly lenient and would impose disbarment for failure to timely remit funds to a third party, failure to make restitution, and complete indifference toward the disciplinary process).