IN DISCIPLINARY DISTRICT 0
OF THE
BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBLITY
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE

BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE
Cital Liell
Exocutiva Secretary

IN RE: GLENN ERIKSON,
An Attorney Licensed to
Practice Law in Tennessee

DOCKET NO. 2008-1725-0-JV

## JUDGMENT OF THE HEARING PANEL

This cause came to be heard by a Hearing Panel of the Board of Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of Tennessee on August 12, 2008. After reviewing all the evidence, the comparable cases of discipline, and the applicable ABA standards, the Hearing Panel announced its findings and judgment on the record, at which time the hearing was recessed pending submission of a transcript. A copy of the transcript of the August 12, 2008, hearing is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set out fully herein. The hearing now being concluded, this Hearing Panel makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and enters Judgment in accordance therewith.

## **FINDINGS OF FACTS**

- 1. This matter originated before the Tennessee Supreme Court in January of 2008 at which time Mr. Erikson was temporarily suspended from practicing law.
- 2. By order of the Supreme Court on January 23, 2008, the Supreme Court found that Mr. Erikson had entered a guilty plea in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida to one count of wire fraud affecting a financial institution,

- 3. The Supreme Court also found that the crime of wire fraud affecting a financial institution constituted a serious crime as contemplated in Section 14.2 of Rule 9 of the rules of the Supreme Court.
- 4. Subsequently, by Order entered on February 12, 2008, the Tennessee Supreme Court referred this matter to a hearing panel of the Board of Professional Responsibility to determine the extent of the final discipline to be imposed as a result of the conviction.
- Following the filing of a Petition for Final Discipline on February 20, 2008 (the "Petition"), this Hearing Panel was appointed.
  - 6. Subsequently, disciplinary counsel filed a motion for default judgment.
- 7. The Hearing Panel conducted a preliminary case management conference on May 22, 2008, and by order entered on May 28, 2008 required that the disciplinary counsel file an amended or supplemental motion for default judgment to include the specific final discipline requested and any authority in support of such request.
- 8. The Hearing Panel further required the respondent to file any response to the motion for default judgment no later than July 15, 2008, and specifically recited in the order that failure to file a response would result in a finding that the allegations contained in the Petition are deemed admitted and that there is no opposition to the imposition of final discipline by the Hearing Panel.
- 9. The Respondent did not file a response by the July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008 deadline required in the May 28<sup>th</sup> preliminary case management order; however, again, Mr. Erikson participated in the August 12, 2008, hearing by telephone and indicated that he did not have any opposition to either the allegations raised in the Petition or the discipline of disbarment requested by the disciplinary counsel.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

10. For all of the reasons set forth above, the Hearing Panel finds that the motion for default was unopposed and is therefore appropriately granted. Additionally, the Panel further finds that on the merits of the Petition and the request for final discipline, the Board satisfactorily demonstrated grounds for the requested discipline in this matter under Section 3 of Rule 9 of the Tennessee Rules of the Supreme Court.

- 11. The Hearing Panel finds that the appropriate discipline in this matter is disbarment pursuant to Section 4.1 of Rule 9.
- 12. The Hearing Panel does note that Mr. Erikson acknowledged fault. He appeared at the hearing and accepted responsibility for his actions and apologized for his misconduct.
- 13. This disbarment shall require of Mr. Erikson that he comply in all respects with Rule 9, specifically Section 18 regarding disbarred lawyers, which was also previously ordered by the Supreme Court on February 12, 2008.
  - 14. Mr. Erikson shall also pay all costs associated with this proceeding.

## JUDGMENT

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Hearing Panel that the Respondent should be disbarred.

THIS THE AND OF OCTOBER, 2008.

and and a

Barbara D. Holmes, Chair

Lela/M. Hollabaugh

W. Neal McBraver