



**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

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: EDWARD A. SLAVIN, JR., BPR #012341**  
**CONTACT: LAURA L. CHASTAIN**  
**BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**  
**615-361-7500**

September 27, 2004

**LAW LICENSE OF EDWARD A. SLAVIN, JR. SUSPENDED**

On August 27, 2004, the Supreme Court of Tennessee entered an Order suspending the law license of Edward A. Slavin, Jr., for a period of two years. The Supreme Court heard the case on direct appeal pursuant to Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 9, Section 1.3, from an order of the Chancery Court suspending Edward A. Slavin, Jr., Esquire, from the practice of law for three years. Slavin appealed, raising the following issues:

1. Whether Chancellor Richard E. Ladd erred in refusing to recuse himself;
2. Whether Slavin's in-court speech is protected by the First Amendment; and
3. Whether the sanctions imposed by the Chancellor were excessive.

The Court found "upon careful review of the record and applicable authority, we conclude that Chancellor Ladd did not abuse his discretion in refusing to recuse himself and that the speech at issue does not fall within the protective ambit of the First Amendment. After a thorough examination of the sanctions, we impose a two years suspension. Slavin may, however, apply for reinstatement pursuant to Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 9, Section 19.3, at the expiration of one year from the date of this opinion."

Three judicial officers, a fellow attorney, and several clients, lodged complaints against Slavin with the Board of Professional Responsibility which were the subject of the disciplinary matter. Chancellor Ladd found and the Supreme Court affirmed ethical violations by Slavin in accusing Judge Workman in pleadings among other things that "the trial court's lifestyle choice and personal opinion should not be permitted to deny Miss Campbell a fair trial"; Judge Collier's complaint that Slavin's conduct and speech during the trial of Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc. vs. Slavin, which included the filing of a seventeen page response "replete with unnecessary, baseless, irrelevant, and frivolous claims, defenses, and legal contentions.", and in Slavin's attack on opposing counsel and "even in the face of very serious sanctions and a direct order from the court," Slavin's lack of respect for the court and its authority. The Supreme Court affirmed Chancellor Ladd's findings that Judge Vittone's complaint that Slavin had been

unprofessional in appearances before the Court and had used the peer review process to harass judges went beyond criticism of the judiciary and were “transparent attempts to use the legal process to harass and/or punish judges who issued adverse rulings.”

The Court also affirmed Chancellor Ladd’s finding of ethical violations by Slavin based on the complaint of Judge Rudolf Jansen who granted summary judgment in a matter in which Slavin failed to timely respond to a motion for summary judgment. Thereafter Slavin appealed to the Administrative Review Board and his pleadings contained comments regarding Judge Jansen found by the Administrative Review Board to be offensive.

Slavin made false statements regarding a client’s illness, had made false statements during a deposition with regard to a client’s identity as an Investigator, and had failed to communicate with clients and return their records.

The Supreme Court affirmed the finding of Chancellor Ladd regarding the complaint of a fellow attorney who stated that Slavin had made disparaging comments about her. Chancellor Ladd found Slavin’s “actions would serve merely to harass another person or a fellow lawyer.”

Section 18 of Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 9 requires Mr. Slavin to notify by registered or certified mail all clients being represented in pending matters, all co-counsel and opposing counsel of the Supreme Court’s order suspending his license. Section 18 also requires Slavin to deliver to all clients any papers or property to which they are entitled.

This disciplinary matter was held pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 8 and 9. Slavin may after the passage of one year apply for reinstatement of his law license. However, to succeed Slavin must carry his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that his reinstatement will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice or subversive to the public interest.

LLC:mw

Slavin 1185 rel.doc