



**BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**  
of the  
**SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE**

**LANCE B. BRACY**  
CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

**LAURA L. CHASTAIN**  
DEPUTY CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

**BEVERLY P. SHARPE**  
CONSUMER COUNSEL DIRECTOR

1101 KERMIT DRIVE, SUITE 730  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37217  
TELEPHONE: (615) 361-7500  
(800) 486-5714  
FAX: (615) 367-2480  
E-MAIL: [ethics@tbpr.org](mailto:ethics@tbpr.org)

**WILLIAM W. HUNT, III**  
**CHARLES A. HIGH**  
**SANDY GARRETT**  
**JESSE D. JOSEPH**  
**JAMES A. VICK**  
**THERESA M. COSTONIS**  
DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

**RELEASE OF INFORMATION**  
**IN RE: MARY FORRESTER KING, BPR #11267**  
**CONTACT: JESSE D. JOSEPH**  
**BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**  
**615-361-7500**

July 6, 2004

**MEMPHIS LAWYER PUBLICLY CENSURED**

Mary Forrester King, of Memphis, was publicly censured by the Board of Professional Responsibility on June 30, 2004.

Disciplinary Counsel, acting on the authority of the Board, filed a Petition for Discipline against King. The petition alleged that King entered into corporate business transactions with long-standing former clients beginning in 2000 where her interests clearly differed from those of her former clients in such transactions, and where it was clear that the former clients still considered her to be their lawyer and expected her to exercise her professional judgment for their protection. The Board also alleged in the petition that King did not make full disclosures to these former clients that she was not acting as their lawyer or that the exercise of her professional judgment on their behalf might reasonably be affected by these differing interests. Further, the petition alleged that King represented one of her own family members regarding these corporate transactions in a fashion adverse to the interests of her former clients.

Disciplinary Counsel and King entered into a Settlement Agreement whereby King agreed to the imposition of a public censure. The Board found that King represented multiple persons with differing interests without any full disclosures to all of them that the exercise of her professional judgment on behalf of all might reasonably be affected by the differing interests, that she improperly entered into corporate business transactions with long-standing former clients and allowed her own property, business or personal interests to prevail over the interests of her former clients.

The Board found mitigating King's lack of a prior disciplinary history, the fact that she did not understand the applicability of the disciplinary rules to her entry into business transactions with former clients, her remorse and good faith cooperation with Disciplinary Counsel, and the dismissal of a Chancery Court suit (and countersuit) between King and her former clients relative to the dissolution of the corporation which was created. The Board also found mitigating King's agreement to obtain in 2004 six (6) hours of Ethics Continuing Legal Education in the area of recognition of conflicts of interests (as to business and individual

clients) in addition to her annual requirements, and her agreement to attend and complete the Board's Ethics Workshop in August of 2004.

JDJ:mw

King 1421 rel.doc