STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

#48784

In the Matter of the Application for the Disbarment of Ronald Everett Wills, an Attorney at Law of the State of Minnesota.

ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION OF DISBARMENT

The above entitled matter having come before the court on the petition of Ronald Everett Wills for an order (1) reconsidering the order of March 30, 1979 disbarring him from the practice of law in Minnesota; (2) furnishing him informa pauperis a full transcript of the proceedings before the referee; (3) dismissing all of the complaints against him and reinstating him as a member of the bar; and (4) granting the relief prayed for in his motion of August 17, 1978,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition be and the same is hereby in all respects denied.

Dated: August 3, 1979.

BY THE COURT

Associate Justice

SUPREME COURT
FILED
AUG 3 1979
JOHN McCARTHY
CLERK

M E M O R A N D U M

Respondent, Ronald Everett Wills, was disbarred by order of this court on March 30, 1979, on the basis of findings made by an experienced trial judge that he was guilty of the most serious misconduct, including fraud, misrepresentation, conversion, obstruction of judicial process and harassment. Our duty to protect the public and the administration of justice permitted no lesser sanction. However, Respondent strenuously contends that he has not been treated fairly and has never had an opportunity to develop or present his case. Specifically, he claims that he was forced at the hearing before the referee to conduct his own defense -- apparently while suffering from a broken leg -- without adequate preparation because the referee refused his counsel's request for a continuance; that he was moving at the time and did not receive notice of the referee's findings in time to challenge them by securing a transcript, and lacked the funds to do so in any case; that the press of his business activities prevented his submitting a brief to the court; and that he was denied adequate time to prepare for the hearing on March 22, 1979, or to obtain counsel, and was refused a continuance. Because of these claims, the disbarment order allowed Respondent 60 days to petition for reconsideration, which was to be granted, however, only if he could show "error on the Board's part and a likelihood that reconsideration will result in a reversal of the Board's decision."

Respondent has submitted a petition for reconsideration and a request for a full transcript. Of the 13 charges against him, he has chosen to discuss two which he considers to be the most serious and has submitted transcripts of some of the testimony which he believes exonerate him. We assume that he has chosen the charges which he is best able to refute and that he has submitted transcripts which most effectively impeach the referee's findings. However, they do not in any respect support the claims of innocence on which he relies.

Respondent has now had ample opportunity to present his defense and has failed to bring into question the propriety of our disposition. Accordingly the petition for reconsideration is denied and respondent is unconditionally disbarred from the practice of law in the State of Minnesota.