IN RE: CHRISTIAN A. PAHL

NO. BD-2010-073

S.J.C. Order of Term Suspension entered by Justice Botsford on March 30, 2011, with an effective date of April 29, 2011. [1]

SUMMARY[2]

Christian A. Pahl, the respondent, was admitted to the bar of the commonwealth on December 17, 1997. Between 2000 and 2010 he was convicted as defined by S. J. C. Rule 4:01, § 12(1), of the following crimes:

a. On July 13, 2000, the respondent admitted to sufficient facts in Cambridge District Court operating an uninsured motor vehicle in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 34J. The case was continued without a finding and dismissed on September 8, 2000.

b. On July 5, 2006, the respondent admitted to sufficient facts in Waltham District Court to operation with a suspended motor vehicle license in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 23. The case was continued without a finding and dismissed that day.

c. On January 28, 2010, the respondent admitted to sufficient facts in Waltham District Court to operating under the influence, second offense, in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 24(1)(a)(1); possession of a Class D drug in violation of G.L. c. 94C, § 34; and possession of a Class C drug in violation of G.L. c. 94C, § 34. These cases were continued without a finding until January 25, 2012, with conditions that the respondent abstain from alcohol and submit to random alcohol screens, enter a fourteen-day inpatient program, and attend two AA meetings each week.

The 2010 convictions arose from an event on July 19, 2008, when the respondent was observed to be operating an automobile with no tires on the passenger side of the vehicle. Marijuana and hashish were discovered during an inventory search. After his arrest, the respondent pursued treatment for alcoholism.

The respondent violated S. J. C. Rule 4:01, § 12(8), by not reporting these convictions to bar counsel within ten days of the conviction. His failure to report the convictions also violated Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(d). The criminal conduct violated Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(b) and (h).

Bar counsel filed a petition for discipline on November 9, 2010. On March 14, 2011, the parties filed a stipulation with the Board of Bar Overseers in which they recommended a suspension from the practice of law for sixty days. Due to the respondent's demonstrated commitment to treatment, the parties agreed that special conditions upon reinstatement were not necessary.

On March 14, 2011, the Board of Bar Overseers voted to adopt the stipulation of the parties and their recommendation for sanction. On March 30, 2011, the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County entered an order suspending the respondent for sixty days, effective thirty days after the date of entry of the order.

---

[1] The complete Order of the Court is available by contacting the Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County.

[2] Compiled by the Board of Bar Overseers based on the record filed with the Supreme Judicial Court.