

**SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA**

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,	)	Supreme Court No. SB-10-0110-D
	)	
	)	Disciplinary Commission Nos. 06-1086, 06-1848
<b>HAROLD HYAMS,</b>	)	
<b>Bar No. 003731</b>	)	
	)	
RESPONDENT.	)	<b>JUDGMENT AND ORDER</b>
<hr style="width: 35%; margin-left: 0;"/>	)	<b>FILED 11/03/2010</b>

This matter having come before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona, it having duly rendered its decision, and there having been no discretionary or *sua sponte* review occurring,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that **HAROLD HYAMS**, a member of the State Bar of Arizona, is hereby censured for conduct in violation of his duties and obligations as a lawyer, as disclosed in the Disciplinary Commission Report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **HAROLD HYAMS** shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years. The terms of probation are as follows:

1. Respondent shall complete 20 hours of CLE approved by bar counsel regarding appellate procedure.
2. Respondent shall report to the State Bar any case that is pending on appeal or which goes on appeal.
3. Respondent shall associate with experienced appellate counsel for any case on appeal.
4. Respondent shall complete the State Bar's Professionalism Course during the period of probation.
5. Respondent shall refrain from engaging in any conduct that would violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.
6. 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 imposing entity, pursuant to Rule 60(a)(5), Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. The imposing entity may refer the matter to a hearing officer to conduct a hearing at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than thirty (30) days after receipt of notice, 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 shall be assessed costs and expenses of the disciplinary proceedings as provided in Rule 60(b).

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November, 2010.

---

Suzanne D. Bunnin  
Clerk of the Court

TO:

Harold Hyams, Respondent

Peter Akmajian, Respondent's Counsel

Ryan W. Redman, Respondent's Counsel

David L. Sandweiss, Bar Counsel

Hon. Michael Wilkinson, Hearing Officer 6T

Nancy Swetnam, Acting Disciplinary Clerk

Sandra Montoya, Lawyer Regulation Records Manager, State Bar of Arizona

Molly Dwyer, Clerk, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Attn: Don Lewis

Richard Weare, Clerk, United States District Court, District of Arizona

Attn: Beth Stephenson

West Publishing Company (Jode Ottman)

Lexis/Nexis

chj