WILLIAM J. BOUGIOUKAS

Public Reprimand No: 2015-13

Order (public reprimand) entered by the Board on November 24, 2015.

SUMMARY[1]

The respondent was admitted to the Bar of the Commonwealth on June 18, 1992. He received a public reprimand following his convictions in two separate criminal matters.

On August 18, 2006, the respondent admitted to sufficient facts in Barnstable District Court to operating under the influence or .08% in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 24(1)(a)(1). The case was continued without a finding until August 17, 2007, when the respondent was discharged. On March 24, 2011, the respondent moved to set aside the admission and for a new trial. The motion was allowed on May 27, 2011. On December 8, 2011, the respondent was convicted after trial by jury of operating under the influence or .08%. He was placed on probation until December 7, 2012, subject to conditions.

On October 3, 2012, the respondent admitted to sufficient facts in Lawrence District Court to operating under the influence or .08%, first offense, in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 24(1)(a)(1), and leaving the scene of property damage in violation of G.L. c. 90, § 24(2)(a). The case was continued without a finding until April 3, 2014, with conditions including no consumption of alcohol, random screens, mental health evaluation, pursuing recommended treatment, and participation in Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers.

S.J.C. Rule 4:01, § 12(8), required the respondent to report each conviction to bar counsel within ten days of the conviction. The respondent violated the rule by not reporting these convictions to bar counsel.

On March 20, 2013, bar counsel filed a petition for discipline with the Board of Bar Overseers charging that the respondent's convictions and his failure to report them violated Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(b), (d) and (h). Further proceedings were deferred pending the respondent's appeal of the Barnstable conviction. After the conviction was affirmed, the parties filed a stipulation in which the respondent admitted the allegations of the petition. The parties agreed in mitigation that the respondent's criminal conduct was not related to his

[1] Compiled by the Board of Bar Overseers based on the record of proceedings before the board.

representation of a client and that he complied with all probationary conditions imposed in both matters.

This matter came before the board on the parties' stipulation and joint recommendation that a sanction of public reprimand be imposed. On November 9, 2015, the board voted to accept the stipulation of the parties and to administer a public reprimand to the respondent.