

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY
JUDGE**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

BRADLEY G. A. CLOUD,
Bar No. 015001

Respondent.

PDJ-2015-9064

FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER

[State Bar No. 15-0334]

FILED JULY 24, 2015

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, having reviewed the Agreement for Discipline by Consent filed on July 20, 2015, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., hereby accepts the parties' proposed agreement. Accordingly:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent, **Bradley G. A. Cloud**, is hereby reprimanded for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents, effective the date of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Mr. Cloud shall be placed on Probation for a period of one (1) year from the date of this Final Judgment and Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED in completing his probation, Mr. Cloud shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, within ten (10) days from the date of service of this Order. Respondent shall submit to a LOMAP examination of his office procedures. Respondent shall sign terms and conditions of participation, including reporting requirements, which shall be incorporated herein. The probation period will begin at the time this Order is served on Mr. Cloud and will conclude one

(1) year from that date. Mr. Cloud will be responsible for any costs associated with LOMAP.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$1,200 within thirty (30) days from the date of service of this Order. There are no costs or expenses incurred by the disciplinary clerk and/or Presiding Disciplinary Judge's Office in connection with these disciplinary proceedings.

DATED this 24th day of July, 2015

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this 24th day of July, 2015, to:

Bradley G. A. Cloud
4771 East Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85712-1256
Email: cloud-law@att.net
Respondent

Hunter F. Perlmeter
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

by: JAlbright

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY
JUDGE**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE
STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

BRADLEY G. A. CLOUD,
Bar No. 015001

Respondent.

No. PDJ-2015-9064

**DECISION ACCEPTING
CONSENT FOR DISCIPLINE**

[State Bar File No. 15-0334]

FILED JULY 24, 2015

An Agreement for Discipline by Consent ("Agreement") was filed July 20, 2015, and submitted under Rule 57(a)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct.¹ Rule 57(a) authorizes filing consent agreements with the presiding disciplinary judge ("PDJ") after authorization by the Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee to file a complaint. A Probable Cause Order was filed June 23, 2015, however no formal complaint has been filed. Rule 57(a)(3)(B), specifically provides:

If the agreement is reached before the authorization to file a formal complaint and the agreed upon sanction includes a reprimand or suspension, or if the agreement is reached after the authorization to file a formal complaint, the agreement shall be filed with the disciplinary clerk to be presented to the presiding disciplinary judge for review. The presiding disciplinary judge, in his or her discretion or upon request, may hold a hearing to establish a factual basis for the agreement and may accept, reject, or recommend the agreement be modified.

¹ Unless otherwise stated, rules references are to the Arizona Supreme Court Rules.

Upon filing such Agreement, the presiding disciplinary judge, "shall accept, reject or recommend modification of the agreement as appropriate."

Rule 57(a)(2) requires admissions be tendered solely "...in exchange for the stated form of discipline..." Under that rule, the right to an adjudicatory hearing is waived only if the "...conditional admission and proposed form of discipline is approved..." If the agreement is not accepted those conditional admissions are automatically withdrawn and shall not be used against the parties in any subsequent proceeding. Pursuant to Rule 53(b)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct, notice was provided to the complainant by letter on June 15, 2015 providing five business days to object to the Agreement. No objection was received. The admitted misconduct is as follows:

Mr. Cloud was licensed as an Arizona lawyer on October 23, 1993. He conditionally admits his conduct violated Rule 42, ERs 5.5 and 8.4(d). Mr. Cloud was summarily suspended effective February 28, 2014, for his failure to file a mandatory continuing legal education affidavit. While summarily suspended, Mr. Cloud engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and his misconduct was prejudicial to the administration of justice. Specifically, he filed pleadings with the complaining court including a Statement of Informal Probate of Will and Appointment of Personal Representative in Pima County. The court issued an order processing and approving the probate, but removed Mr. Cloud from the case due to his suspended bar membership status. He further continued to give legal information and counsel to his existing clients during the period of suspension. Mr. Cloud was ultimately reinstated by the Board of Governors on March 10, 2015. For his misconduct, the parties agree to a sanction of reprimand and one year of probation (LOMAP).

ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (Standard)

In assessing sanctions, the PDJ is guided by the American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions* ("Standards") (2005). *In re Phillips*, 226 Ariz. 112, 117, ¶ 29, 244 P.3d 549, 554 (2010) (citing *In re Van Dox*, 214 Ariz. 300, 303, 152 P.3d 1183, 1186 (2007)). In submitting a consent agreement the parties, under Rule 57(a)(2)(E), must include in their agreement a discussion of the American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions*, and an analysis of the proposed sanction, which includes a discussion of why a greater or lesser sanction would not be appropriate under the circumstances. The parties agree that *Standard 7.2*,² *Violations of Other Duties Owed As A Professional*, is most applicable under these circumstances. *Standard 7.2* provides:

Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

Mr. Cloud conditionally admits he knowingly violated his duty to his client, the profession, and the legal system and caused actual harm to the legal system.

Aggravating and Mitigating Factors

The parties assert the following aggravating factor is present: 9.22(i) (substantial experience in the practice of law). Mitigating factors include: 9.32(a) (absence of prior disciplinary record), 9.32(b) (absence of dishonest or selfish motive), and 9.32(e), (full and free disclosure to the disciplinary board). The parties agree that upon application of the aggravating and mitigating factors, a reduction in the presumptive sanction is justified. The PDJ agrees.

Accordingly:

² The Agreement inadvertently listed *Standard 7.3* as the applicable standard.

IT IS ORDERED Mr. Cloud is hereby reprimanded and placed on one year of probation (LOMAP) effective the date of the Decision Accepting Consent to Discipline (Decision) and final Judgment and Order (Order).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED incorporating by this reference the Agreement and any supporting documents by this reference. Respondent agrees to pay costs associated with the disciplinary proceedings in the amount of \$1,200.00.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the Agreement is accepted. Costs as submitted are approved. Now therefore, the final Judgment and Order is signed this date.

DATED 24th day of July, 2015.

William J. O'Neil

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this 24th day of July, 2015.

Hunter F. Perlmeter
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6266
Email: lro@staff.azbar.org

Bradley G. A. Cloud
4771 East Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, AZ 85712-1256
Email: cloud-law@att.net
Respondent

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6266
Email: lro@staff.azbar.org

by: JAlbright

Hunter F. Perlmeter, Bar No. 024755
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Telephone (602)340-7278
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Bradley G. A. Cloud, Bar No. 015001
4771 E. Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85712-1256
Telephone 520-444-0082
Email: cloud-law@att.net
Respondent

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY
JUDGE**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE
STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

**BRADLEY G. A. CLOUD,
Bar No. 015001**

Respondent.

PDJ 2015

State Bar File Nos. **15-0334**

**AGREEMENT FOR DISCIPLINE BY
CONSENT**

The State Bar of Arizona, through undersigned Bar Counsel, and Respondent, Bradley G A Cloud, who has chosen not to seek the assistance of counsel, hereby submit their Agreement for Discipline by Consent, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. A probable cause order was entered on June 23, 2015, but no formal complaint has been filed in this matter. Respondent voluntarily waives the right to an adjudicatory hearing, unless otherwise ordered, and waives all motions, defenses, objections or requests which have been made or raised, or could be asserted thereafter, if the conditional admission and proposed form of discipline is approved.

The Complainant in this matter has been notified of his right to object to this agreement, pursuant to Rule 53(b)(3), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. A letter was sent to

Complainant on June 15, 2015, providing him five business days to object. To date, no objection has been received.

Respondent conditionally admits that his conduct, as set forth below, violated Rule 42, ERs 5.5 and 8.4(d). Upon acceptance of this agreement, Respondent agrees to accept imposition of the following discipline: Reprimand with one year Probation. Respondent also agrees to pay the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding, within 30 days from the date of this order, and if costs are not paid within the 30 days, interest will begin to accrue at the legal rate.¹ The State Bar's Statement of Costs and Expenses is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

FACTS

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent was licensed to practice law in Arizona on October, 23, 1993.

COUNT ONE (File no. 15-0334/ Judicial Referral)

2. On February 28, 2014, Respondent was summarily suspended for his failure to file an MCLE affidavit for the year 2012-2013.
3. A letter from Bar CEO, John Phelps was sent to Respondent on March 3, 2014, informing him of the suspension and the procedures for reinstating his license. Respondent claims that he did not receive the notification.
4. State Bar call records indicate that on October 23, 2014, Respondent called the State Bar stating he had just learned of his suspension from a client and

¹ Respondent understands that the costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceeding include the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona, the Disciplinary Clerk, the Probable Cause Committee, the Presiding Disciplinary Judge and the Supreme Court of Arizona.

that he had never received notice from the Bar. Staff explained to Respondent the steps necessary to have his license reinstated.

5. Respondent completed his required CLE and, according to Respondent mailed a package documenting the same to the State Bar on January 16, 2015. The State Bar, however, did not receive the package allegedly mailed on that date.

6. On January 29, 2015, Respondent, believing he had been reinstated, filed a Statement of Informal Probate of Will and Appointment of Personal Representative in Pima County.

7. According to Respondent, he was thereafter informed by the Probate Registrar that there was a problem with his bar status. He then called the State Bar and was told the package of materials he allegedly submitted on January 16, 2015, had not been received and that he should re-submit the materials electronically. Respondent did so and on February 27, 2015, traveled to the State Bar's Southern Arizona Office and paid all required fees and penalties.

8. In the underlying case, the Court issued an order processing and approving the probate, but removed Respondent from the case.

9. On March 10, 2015, Respondent received an email from State Bar employee Mona Fontes, indicating that he had been reinstated to practice.

10. Respondent continued to practice law at all times during the period of his suspension.

11. Bar counsel emailed Respondent in April of 2015 and asked whether Respondent practiced law between the date on which he allegedly learned of his suspension in October of 2014, and the date of his reinstatement in March of 2015. Respondent responded as follows:

After I was informed by SBA representatives that I needed to apply for reinstatement I continued to provide legal information and counsel to already existing clients who sought my services.

12. Respondent now understands that such conduct constitutes the unauthorized practice of law.

CONDITIONAL ADMISSIONS

Respondent's admissions are being tendered in exchange for the form of discipline stated below and are submitted freely and voluntarily and not as a result of coercion or intimidation.

Respondent conditionally admits that his conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., specifically ERs 5.5 and 8.4(d).

SANCTION

Respondent and the State Bar of Arizona agree that based on the facts and circumstances of this matter, as set forth above, the following sanctions are appropriate: Reprimand and one year probation.

If Respondent violates any of the terms of this agreement, further discipline proceedings may be brought.

PROBATION (LOMAP)

Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, within 10 days from the date of service of this Agreement. Respondent shall submit to a LOMAP examination of his office procedures. Respondent shall sign terms and conditions of participation, including reporting requirements, which shall be incorporated herein. The probation period will begin at the time this agreement is

served on Respondent and will conclude one year from that date. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with LOMAP.

NON-COMPLIANCE LANGUAGE

In the event that Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing probation terms, and information thereof, is received by the State Bar of Arizona, Bar Counsel shall file a notice of noncompliance with the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The Presiding Disciplinary Judge may conduct a hearing within 30 days to determine whether a term of probation has been breached and, if so, to recommend an appropriate sanction. If there is an allegation that Respondent failed to comply with any of the foregoing terms, the burden of proof shall be on the State Bar of Arizona to prove noncompliance by a preponderance of the evidence.

LEGAL GROUNDS IN SUPPORT OF SANCTION

In determining an appropriate sanction, the parties consulted the American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (Standards)* pursuant to Rule 57(a)(2)(E). The *Standards* are designed to promote consistency in the imposition of sanctions by identifying relevant factors that courts should consider and then applying those factors to situations where lawyers have engaged in various types of misconduct. *Standards* 1.3, Commentary. The *Standards* provide guidance with respect to an appropriate sanction in this matter. *In re Peasley*, 208 Ariz. 27, 33, 35, 90 P.3d 764, 770 (2004); *In re Rivkind*, 162 Ariz. 154, 157, 791 P.2d 1037, 1040 (1990).

In determining an appropriate sanction consideration is given to the duty violated, the lawyer's mental state, the actual or potential injury caused by the

misconduct and the existence of aggravating and mitigating factors. *Peasley*, 208 Ariz. at 35, 90 P.3d at 772; *Standard 3.0*.

The parties agree that *Standard 7.3 is the appropriate Standard. Standard 7.3 provides that Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional, and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.*

The duty violated

For purposes of this agreement only, the parties agree that Respondent's conduct violated his duty to his client, the profession and the legal system.

The lawyer's mental state

For purposes of this agreement only, the parties agree that Respondent knowingly provided legal advice to existing clients while administratively suspended from the practice of law and that his conduct was in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The extent of the actual or potential injury

For purposes of this agreement only, the parties agree that there was actual harm to the legal system as Respondent had to be removed from a probate case by the court.

Aggravating and mitigating circumstances

The presumptive sanction in this matter is suspension. The parties conditionally agree that the following aggravating and mitigating factors should be considered.

In aggravation:

Standard 9.22(i): substantial experience in the practice of law.

In mitigation:

Standard 9.22(a): absence of prior disciplinary record

Standard 9.22(b): absence of a dishonest or selfish motive

Standard 9.22(e): full and free disclosure to the disciplinary board.

Discussion

The parties have conditionally agreed that, upon application of the aggravating and mitigating factors to the facts of this case, the presumptive sanction should be mitigated to Reprimand with one year probation. The parties have conditionally agreed that a greater or lesser sanction would not be appropriate under the facts and circumstances of this matter.

Based on the *Standards* and in light of the facts and circumstances of this matter, the parties conditionally agree that the sanction set forth above is within the range of appropriate sanction and will serve the purposes of lawyer discipline.

CONCLUSION

The objective of lawyer discipline is not to punish the lawyer, but to protect the public, the profession and the administration of justice. *Peasley, supra* at ¶ 64, 90 P.3d at 778. Recognizing that determination of the appropriate sanction is the prerogative of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, the State Bar and Respondent believe that the objectives of discipline will be met by the imposition of the proposed sanction of Reprimand with one year Probation to LOMAP and the imposition of costs and expenses. A proposed form order is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATED this 20th day of July, 2015.

STATE BAR OF ARIZONA



Hunter F. Perlmeter
Staff Bar Counsel

This agreement, with conditional admissions, is submitted freely and voluntarily and not under coercion or intimidation.

DATED this _____ day of July, 2015.

Bradley G.A. Cloud
Respondent

Approved as to form and content



Maret Vessella
Chief Bar Counsel

DATED this _____ day of July, 2015.

STATE BAR OF ARIZONA

Hunter F. Perimeter
Staff Bar Counsel

This agreement, with conditional admissions, is submitted freely and voluntarily and not under coercion or intimidation.

DATED this 17th day of July, 2015.



Bradley G.A. Cloud
Respondent

Approved as to form and content

Maret Vessella
Chief Bar Counsel

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk of
the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this 20th day of July, 2015.

Copies of the foregoing mailed/emailed
this 20th day of July, 2015, to:

Bradley G.A. Cloud
4771 East Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85712-1256
Email: cloud-law@att.net
Respondent

Copy of the foregoing emailed
this 20th day of July, 2015, to:

William J. O'Neil
Presiding Disciplinary Judge
Supreme Court of Arizona
Email: officepdj@courts.az.gov

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered
this 20th day of July, 2015, to:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266


by: 
HFP: sml

EXHIBIT A

Statement of Costs and Expenses

In the Matter of a Member of the State Bar of Arizona,
Bradley G. A. Cloud, Bar No. 015001, Respondent

File No(s). 15-0334

Administrative Expenses

The Supreme Court of Arizona has adopted a schedule of administrative expenses to be assessed in lawyer discipline. If the number of charges/complainants exceeds five, the assessment for the general administrative expenses shall increase by 20% for each additional charge/complainant where a violation is admitted or proven.

Factors considered in the administrative expense are time expended by staff bar counsel, paralegal, secretaries, typists, file clerks and messenger; and normal postage charges, telephone costs, office supplies and all similar factors generally attributed to office overhead. As a matter of course, administrative costs will increase based on the length of time it takes a matter to proceed through the adjudication process.

***General Administrative Expenses
for above-numbered proceedings***


\$1,200.00

Additional costs incurred by the State Bar of Arizona in the processing of this disciplinary matter, and not included in administrative expenses, are itemized below.

Staff Investigator/Miscellaneous Charges

Total for staff investigator charges \$ 0.00

TOTAL COSTS AND EXPENSES INCURRED \$1,200.00


Sandra E. Montoya
Lawyer Regulation Records Manager

7-16-15
Date

EXHIBIT B

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY
JUDGE**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

Bradley G. A. Cloud,
Bar No. 015001,

Respondent.

PDJ

FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER

State Bar No. 15-0334

The undersigned Presiding Disciplinary Judge of the Supreme Court of Arizona, having reviewed the Agreement for Discipline by Consent filed on _____, pursuant to Rule 57(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., hereby accepts the parties' proposed agreement. Accordingly:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent, **Bradley G. A. Cloud**, is hereby Reprimanded for his conduct in violation of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, as outlined in the consent documents, effective 30 days from the date of this order or _____.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be placed on Probation for a period of one year from the date of the judgment and order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED in completing his probation Respondent shall contact the State Bar Compliance Monitor at (602) 340-7258, within 10 days from the date of service of this Order. Respondent shall submit to a LOMAP examination of his office procedures. Respondent shall sign terms and conditions of participation, including reporting requirements, which shall be incorporated herein. The probation period will begin at the time this Order is served on Respondent and will conclude one

year from that date. Respondent will be responsible for any costs associated with LOMAP.

NON-COMPLIANCE

In the event that Respondent fails to comply with any of the foregoing probation terms, and information thereof, is received by the State Bar of Arizona, Bar Counsel shall file a notice of noncompliance with the Presiding Disciplinary Judge, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The Presiding Disciplinary Judge may conduct a hearing within 30 days to determine whether a term of probation has been breached and, if so, to recommend an appropriate sanction. If there is an allegation that Respondent failed to comply with any of the foregoing terms, the burden of proof shall be on the State Bar of Arizona to prove noncompliance by a preponderance of the evidence.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent pay the costs and expenses of the State Bar of Arizona in the amount of \$1,200 within 30 days from the date of service of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall pay the costs and expenses incurred by the disciplinary clerk and/or Presiding Disciplinary Judge's Office in connection with these disciplinary proceedings in the amount of _____, within 30 days from the date of service of this Order.

DATED this _____ day of July, 2015

William J. O'Neil, Presiding Disciplinary Judge

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk of
the Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
this _____ day of July, 2015.

Copies of the foregoing mailed/mailed
this _____ day of July, 2015, to:

Bradley G. A. Cloud
4771 East Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85712-1256
Email: cloud-law@att.net
Respondent


Copy of the foregoing emailed/hand-delivered
this _____ day of July, 2015, to:

Hunter F. Perlmeter
Staff Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
Email: LRO@staff.azbar.org

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered
this _____ day of July, 2015 to:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

by: _____



**BEFORE THE ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE
PROBABLE CAUSE COMMITTEE
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA**

**IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,**

**BRADLEY G. A. CLOUD
Bar No. 015001**

Respondent.

No. 15-0334

PROBABLE CAUSE ORDER


The Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee of the Supreme Court of Arizona ("Committee") reviewed this matter on June 12, 2015, pursuant to Rules 50 and 55, Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., for consideration of the State Bar's Report of Investigation and Recommendation and Respondent's Response.

By a vote of 8-0-1¹, the Committee finds probable cause exists to file a complaint against Respondent in File No. 15-0334.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED pursuant to Rules 55(c) and 58(a), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., authorizing the State Bar Counsel to prepare and file a complaint with the Disciplinary Clerk.

Parties may not file motions for reconsideration of this Order.

DATED this 23 day of June, 2015.



Judge Lawrence F. Winthrop, Chair
Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee
of the Supreme Court of Arizona

¹ Committee member Bill J. Friedl did not participate in this matter.

Original filed this 13th day
of June, 2015, with:

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

Copy mailed this 14th day
of June, 2015, to:

Bradley G. A. Cloud
4771 E. Camp Lowell Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85712-1256
Respondent

Copy emailed this 14th day
of June, 2015, to:

Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee
of the Supreme Court of Arizona
1501 West Washington Street, Suite 104
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
E-mail: ProbableCauseComm@courts.az.gov

Lawyer Regulation Records Manager
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266
E-mail: LRO@staff.azbar.org

by: 