

FILE NO. _____

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

In Re Petition for Disciplinary Action
against CHARLES E. MEADEN,
an Attorney at Law of the
State of Minnesota.

**PETITION FOR
DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

The Director of the Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility, hereinafter Director, files this petition seeking reciprocal discipline pursuant to Rule 12(d), Rules on Lawyers Professional Responsibility (RLPR). The Director alleges:

The above-named attorney, hereinafter respondent, was admitted to practice law in Minnesota on August 1, 1984. Respondent most recently practiced law in Tenafly, New Jersey. Respondent is suspended for non-payment of attorney registration fees in Minnesota, and respondent is on CLE restricted status.

On July 13, 2000, respondent was publicly disciplined by the Supreme Court of New Jersey, as more fully set forth below:

1. On May 6, 1997, New Jersey disciplinary counsel filed a two-count complaint, based upon certain criminal charges against respondent. Exhibit 1.
2. On June 26, 1997, respondent, through counsel, filed an answer to the complaint. Exhibit 2.
3. On March 4, 1998, a hearing was held before a panel of a New Jersey disciplinary district ethics committee. Exhibit 3.
4. On April 20, 1998, New Jersey disciplinary counsel filed an additional two-count complaint against respondent. Exhibit 4.

5. On June 2, 1998, respondent, through counsel, filed an answer to the complaint. Exhibit 5.

6. The matter was argued to the New Jersey Disciplinary Review Board on May 13, 1999, and again on October 14, 1999. On April 12, 2000, the Disciplinary Review Board issued its decision, recommending that respondent be suspended from the practice of law for three years. Exhibit 6.

7. By order dated July 13, 2000, the New Jersey Supreme Court suspended respondent for three years effective August 11, 2000. Exhibit 7.

8. Respondent's conduct, as set out in Exhibits 1-7 above, violated Rules 8.4 (b) and (c), Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct (MRPC).

WHEREFORE, the Director respectfully prays for an order of this Court directing that respondent and the Director inform the Court within thirty days of its order whether either or both believe the imposition of identical discipline by the Minnesota Supreme Court would be unwarranted and the reasons for that claim.

Dated: September 20, 2000.



EDWARD J. CLEARY
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF LAWYERS
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
Attorney No. 17267
25 Constitution Avenue, Suite 105
St. Paul, MN 55155-1500
(651) 296-3952

and



MARTIN A. COLE
SENIOR ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
Attorney No. 148416