



Arkansas Supreme Court Committee on Professional Conduct

2025 Annual Report

Office of Professional Conduct
Multi-Agency Complex (MAC) Building
1 Capitol Mall, Suite 3D-101
Little Rock, AR 72201-1049

(501) 376-0313 Telephone
(800) 506-6631 Toll Free
(501) 376-3438 Facsimile

Arkansas Judiciary Homepage
<https://www.arcourts.gov/>

Arkansas Attorney Discipline Homepage
<https://www.arcourts.gov/professional-conduct>

I. Introduction

Authority: Pursuant to the Procedures of the Arkansas Supreme Court Regulating Professional Conduct of Attorneys at Law (“Procedures”), the Committee on Professional Conduct (“Committee”) is granted the authority to investigate all complaints alleging violation of the Arkansas Model Rules of Professional Conduct and impose any sanctions permitted and deemed appropriate. During 2002, major revisions to the Procedures adopted by *Per Curiam* Order of the Arkansas Supreme Court on July 9, 2001, effective on January 1, 2002, were implemented. The Committee again submitted major proposed revisions of the Procedures to the Court on December 15, 2010, which were adopted by the Court in its *Per Curiam* issued and effective May 26, 2011, found at 2011 Ark. 242.

History: Amendment 28 to the Arkansas Constitution was adopted by the voters in 1938. The amendment placed with the Arkansas Supreme Court the authority to regulate the practice of law in Arkansas and to regulate, and thereby discipline, attorneys. In 1939, the Bar Rules Committee, an entity of the Arkansas Bar Association and the forerunner of the present Committee on Professional Conduct, was established. In 1940, the Canons for Professional Conduct of Lawyers was approved. The Arkansas version of the American Bar Association’s Model Code of Professional Responsibility was first adopted by the Arkansas Supreme Court in 1970. A revised version of the Code became effective July 1, 1976. The Arkansas version of the American Bar Association’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct was adopted by the Arkansas Supreme Court and became effective January 1, 1986. Various revisions have been made to the Arkansas version of the Model Rules since 1986. Comprehensive revisions became effective May 1, 2005, as the Arkansas Rules of Professional Conduct, now found at pages 409-537 of the 2025 Court Rules, Volume 2, of the Arkansas Code. The attorney discipline Procedures implementing these Rules are in the same Volume 2, at pages 357-407. On May 26, 2011, the Supreme Court adopted and made effective significant revisions to the Procedures, in a *Per Curiam* found at 2011 Ark. 242.

Mission: The purpose of lawyer discipline and disability proceedings is to maintain appropriate standards of professional conduct in order to protect the public and the administration of justice from lawyers who have demonstrated by their conduct that they are unable or are likely to be unable to properly discharge their professional duties. Standard 1.1 of the ABA’s 1979 Standards for Lawyer Discipline and Disability Proceedings.

II. Structure

1. COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

For the year 2025, the Committee continued to operate in the model of four Panels authorized by the Supreme Court as of January 1, 2002, designated Panels A, B, C, and D. Each panel is composed of seven members appointed by the Arkansas Supreme Court. Five members are lawyers, with one lawyer appointed from each Congressional District and one from the State at large. The remaining two positions are filled by persons who are not lawyers and are selected by the Court from the state at large. Panel membership in 2025 was as follows:

Panel A: Don R. Etherly, Helena, Attorney, First Congressional District
Larry Jegley, Little Rock, Attorney, Second Congressional District
Marshall S. Ney, Rogers, Attorney, Third Congressional District
Jim F. Andrews, Jr., El Dorado, Attorney, Fourth Congressional District
Erin E. Cassinelli, Little Rock, Attorney at Large
Paul W. Hoggard, Piggott, Non-attorney at Large
Megan Beeson Turner, Little Rock, Non-attorney at Large

Panel B: Mark W. Rees, Jonesboro, Attorney, First Congressional District
David P. Glover, Little Rock, Attorney, Second Congressional District
Wendy R. Howerton, Attorney, Third Congressional District
LeAnne P. Burch, Monticello, Attorney, Fourth Congressional District
Katie W. Branscum, Little Rock, Attorney, Attorney at Large
Elmer Ritchie, Little Rock, Non-attorney at Large
Carlton Saffa, Little Rock, Non-attorney at Large

Panel C: Robert Bridewell, Lake Village, Attorney, First Congressional District
JaNan Arnold Thomas, Little Rock, Attorney, Second Congressional District
Candice A. Settle, Van Buren, Attorney, Third Congressional District
Jackie B. Harris, Pine Bluff, Attorney, Fourth Congressional District
Susan Keller Kendall, Springdale, Attorney, At Large
Mark F. Smith, Marianna, Non-attorney at Large
Judith Humphries, Little Rock, Non-attorney at Large

Panel D: James Gregory Crumpton, Cabot, Attorney, First Congressional District
Scott S. Hilburn, Little Rock, Attorney, Second Congressional District
Shane M. Wilkinson, Bentonville, Attorney, Third Congressional District
Walter W. Barton, Monticello, Attorney, Fourth Congressional District
Angela S. Cole Lowther, Little Rock, Attorney at Large
Joe Jett, Success, Non-attorney at large
William A. Finer, Fayetteville, Non-attorney at large

The **2025 Executive Committee** consisted of:

LeAnne P. Burch, Monticello, Panel B, Committee Chair
Marshall S. Ney, Rogers, Panel A, Committee Secretary
Don R. Etherly, Helena, Panel A Chair
Wendy R. Howerton, Fayetteville, Panel B Chair
Robert Bridewell, Lake Village, Panel C Chair

The **2026 Executive Committee** will consist of:

Jim F. Andrews, Jr., El Dorado, Panel A, Committee Chair
Thomas W. Haynes, Jonesboro, Panel B, Committee Secretary
Don R. Etherly, Helena, Panel A Chair
Wendy R. Howerton, Fayetteville, Panel B Chair
JaNan Arnold Thomas, Little Rock, Panel C Chair

Panel C primarily serves: (1) as the review panel for dismissals of grievances by the staff, (2) as a fourth hearing panel as needed, and (3) individual Panel C members are used as substitute panel members when a member of Panel A, B, or D is not available or has disqualified in any case on a ballot vote or a hearing.

COMMITTEE MEETING CALENDAR:

Panel A meets on the third Friday of the months of January, March, May, July, September, and November.

Panel B meets on the third Friday of the months of February, April, June, August, October, and the second Friday of December.

Panel D meets on the second Friday of the months of February, April, June, August, October, and the first Friday of December.

Panel C meets “on call” for special settings of hearings.

2. OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

The Committee employs an attorney Executive Director and staff who function as the Office of Professional Conduct, which is housed in offices at the Multi-Agency Complex (MAC) Building, One Capitol Mall, Suite 3D-101, Little Rock, AR 72201. The Office of Professional Conduct receives all grievances involving attorneys licensed to practice law in the State of Arkansas, investigates the grievances, provides assistance in the preparation of formal complaints, and processes formal complaints for submission to the Committee. The budget of the Committee and Office for 2025-2026 is about \$1,136,498 (allocated as: \$650,702 for personnel and \$485,660 for operations), completely funded by the Supreme Court by a portion of the annual license fee paid by Arkansas-licensed attorneys to the Arkansas Supreme Court. No state or taxpayer funds are directly provided to support the office and committee.

The Office of Professional Conduct is staffed by four staff attorneys, a law clerk, a paralegal, an investigator, and one grievance coordinator. The staff attorneys perform all duties and possess such authority of the Executive Director as the Executive Director may delegate, except for the final determination of sufficiency of formal complaints. In addition to Executive Director, Robert Brech, the Office staff attorneys during 2025 were Charlene Fleetwood - Deputy Director, Vicki Lucas - Senior Staff Attorney, and Diana Aguirre - Staff Attorney.

In 2025, as in previous years, the staff presented several “continuing legal education” programs or speeches on law-related topics across the state.

The Arkansas Supreme Court has not authorized the Office of Professional Conduct to give advice or legal opinions, formal or informal, on legal or ethical issues to anyone.

The Office of Professional Conduct also provides staff support for the Supreme Court’s Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee and the Client Security Fund Committee.

III. Administration

The Office of Professional Conduct receives telephone calls, letters, e-mails and faxes from individuals across the country requesting information on how to initiate grievances against attorneys licensed to practice law in the State of Arkansas. During the 2025 calendar year, the Office opened 728 new grievance files on alleged attorney misconduct. This number was an increase from 635 new files opened in 2024. See attached Appendix A.

In 2025, 1,042 grievance files were closed, up from 300 files closed in 2024. For additional statistical information, see attached Appendix B.

IV. 2025 Formal Actions Initiated

In 2025, there were forty (40) new formal Complaint cases opened, up from the eleven (11) new formal Complaint cases opened in 2024. In 2025, twenty-two (22) formal Complaint cases were closed, compared to seventeen (17) closed in 2024.

V. 2025 Final Committee Actions

Final action was taken in twenty-two (22) formal Complaint cases involving Arkansas attorneys during the 2025 calendar year by the Office and the Committee on Professional Conduct. There are five primary forms of action, or sanction, that the Committee on Professional Conduct may take. The lowest sanction, a warning, is non-public. The other forms of sanction - caution, reprimand, license suspension, and disbarment - are public sanctions. In 2025, twelve (12) attorneys received at least one public sanction, up from eight (8) in 2024.

VI. 2025 - Most Common Rule Violations

In 2025, the most common rule violations involved Arkansas Rules 1.1 (competence), 1.3 (acting with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client), 1.4(a) (client communication), 3.2 (expediting litigation), and 8.4(d) (engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). A list containing the Arkansas Rule alleged and the number of times the Committee found the rule to have been violated in 2025 is attached as Appendix “C”.

VII. “Practice Aging” of Attorneys Disciplined (2025)

Of the 2025 final disciplinary actions by the Committee, based on number of years licensed in Arkansas, twelve (12) attorneys were publicly sanctioned as follows. (Attorney age information is not available):

Years Licensed	No. of Attorneys Publicly Sanctioned	Percentage
01-10 (2016-2025)	1	8.33%
11-20 (2006-2015)	3	25.00%
21-30 (1996-2005)	7	58.34%
31-40 (1986-1995)	0	0.00%
41+ (before 1986)	1	8.33%
Total	12	100%

(Some attorneys were publicly sanctioned more than once in 2025.)

VIII. 2025 Fines, Restitution & Costs

Type	Amount Imposed (2025)	Amount Collected (2025)
FINES:	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 0.00
RESTITUTION:	\$ 25,250.00	\$ 5,750.00
COSTS:	\$ 800.00	\$ 350.00
TOTALS:	\$ 27,050.00	\$ 6,100.00

(Note: Some of the collections in 2025 were assessed in cases finalized in earlier years.)

IX. 2025 Trust Account “Overdraft” Reporting

There were seven (7) notices received in 2025 from all banks and reporters, compared to thirteen (13) in 2024. All of these files were closed after a summary investigation and explanation by the attorney involved. None of the 2025 files resulted in filing a formal Complaint.

The overwhelming majority of overdraft reports are due to some form of “attorney/firm error” such as bookkeeping math mistakes, failure to make timely deposits of settlement funds, release of settlement checks to clients and third parties before settlement funds were available in the trust account, depositing checks into the wrong account, failure to account for IOLTA interest withdrawals or bank service fees, client fee and expense checks bouncing, etc. Some admitted bank errors are reported.

X. Summaries of 2025 Public Sanctions – Appendix “D”

	Number	Designation	Description	Annual Total
2		Attorney		
3	001	A-A/C	Attorney Conduct	59
4	002	A-A/S	Advertisement / Solicitation	0
5		Criminal		
6	003	CR-D	Criminal Defense	136
7	004	CR-P	Criminal Prosecution	69
8	005	CR-A	Criminal Appeal	28
9		Domestic Relations		
10	006	DR-D	Divorce	52
11	007	DR-C	Custody	48
12	008	DR-C/S	Child Support	13
13	009	DR-QDRO	Qualified Domestic Relations Order	0
14	010	DR-V	Visitation	9
15	011	DR-DA/OP	Domestic Abuse / Order of Protection	8
16	012	DR-P	Paternity	4
17		Juvenile		
18	013	J-DHS	Department of Human Services	9
19	014	J-FINS	Families in Need of Services	0
20		Probate		
21	015	PR-E	Estate	50
22	016	PR-T	Trust	11
23	017	PR-W	Will	2
24	018	PR-POA	Power of Attorney	0
25	019	PR-G	Guardianship	18
26	020	PR-A	Adoption	2
27	021	PR-CC	Civil Commitment	0
28		Bankruptcy		
29	022	BNK-7	Chapter 7	4
30	023	BNK-11	Chapter 11	3
31	024	BNK-13	Chapter 13	3
32		Civil		
33	025	CV-A	Appeal	3
34	026	CV-C	Contract	22
35	027	CV-DC	Debt Collection	14
36	028	CV-F	Foreclosure	2
37	029	CV-J	Judgment	2
38	030	CV-LL/TN	Landlord / Tenant	2
39	031	CV-MM	Medical Malpractice	3
40	032	CV-MVA	Motor Vehicle Accident	28
41	033	CV-FED	Civil - Federal	0
42	034	CV-PI	Personal Injury	5
43	035	CV-PR	Property	18
44	036	CV-T	Tort	4
45	037	CV-UD	Unlawful Detainer	3

APPENDIX "B"

Category	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Files opened	804	819	859	861	888	735	794	716	744	657	725	616	697	607	559	569	620	689	635	728
Closed by staff	1137	784	786	742	845	806	646	478	732	595	663	550	549	557	675	796	684	540	300	1042
Complaints filed	156	140	114	144	119	97	85	67	51	57	52	34	33	44	30	32	35	33	11	40
Appellate Referrals	39	50	33	41	18	17	40	7	14	7	14	3	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	14
Judicial Referrals	19	6	4	4	6	10	18	3	8	11	7	13	13	4	9	9	4	13	3	6
Attorney Referrals	16	9	15	15	7	14	38	37	28	33	14	9	16	2	13	2	22	14	15	33
Complaints closed	173	182	122	128	119	106	74	78	63	45	53	47	41	26	21	16	24	37	17	22
Withdrawn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	0	0	1
No Actions	19	13	10	11	10	7	4	4	5	2	3	5	2	0	1	2	5	1	2	0
Warnings	53	41	37	46	26	20	13	8	10	17	14	10	6	2	1	12	5	1	2	6
Cautions	29	34	20	28	15	24	8	10	17	10	7	6	9	3	4	8	2	1	1	3
Reprimands	30	26	14	14	19	20	11	11	5	7	7	11	9	2	5	10	5	4	2	2
Disc. Inactive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Probation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Suspensions	12	23	12	10	10	11	9	12	4	3	5	13	14	6	4	3	9	9	6	2
Surrenders	7	1	6	5	3	14	8	3	2	6	6	1	0	9	5	3	0	5	3	0
Merge / surrender	4	0	6	18	6	9	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Deemed Surrendered (Rule 7)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	0	0	0	1	0	41	31	27
Disbarment initiated	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1
Disbarments	2	2	2	4	3	0	0	5	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Reinstated	11	6	0	6	2	2	5	9	7	11	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	4	3	3
Consents	64	49	45	50	28	29	18	7	8	13	13	14	7	4	6	7	4	0	4	4
Refer to ArJLAP	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No. of Attys Publicly Sanctioned*	68	67	49	44	44	60	29	30	27	25	21	18	23	20	18	17	14	16	8	12

* Some attorneys were publicly sanctioned more than once.

Alleged	No.	Alleged	No.	Found	No.	Found	No.
1.1	21	1.16(a)(1)	1	1.1	4	1.16(a)(1)	
1.1(d)		1.16(a)(2)		1.1(d)		1.16(a)(2)	
1.2		1.16(c)	3	1.2		1.16(c)	2
1.2(a)	2	1.16(d)	8	1.2(a)		1.16(d)	2
1.2(b)		1.18(b)	1	1.2(b)		1.18(b)	
1.2(d)		1.19(a)		1.2(d)		1.19(a)	
1.3	34	1.19(b)	1	1.3	14	1.19(b)	
1.4(a)		2.1		1.4(a)		2.1	
1.4(a)(1)		3.1	1	1.4(a)(1)		3.1	1
1.4(a)(2)		3.2	14	1.4(a)(2)		3.2	6
1.4(a)(3)	13	3.3	1	1.4(a)(3)	4	3.3	
1.4(a)(4)	7	3.3(a)(1)	3	1.4(a)(4)		3.3(a)(1)	1
1.4(a)(5)		3.3(a)(3)		1.4(a)(5)		3.3(a)(3)	
1.4(c)	1	3.4(a)		1.4(c)		3.4(a)	
1.5		3.4(b)		1.5		3.4(b)	
1.5(a)	1	3.4(c)	6	1.5(a)		3.4(c)	3
1.5(a)(5)		3.4(d)		1.5(a)(5)		3.4(d)	
1.5(b)(2)		3.7(a)		1.5(b)(2)		3.7(a)	
1.5(c)	1	4.1(a)		1.5(c)		4.1(a)	
1.5(d)		4.1(b)		1.5(d)		4.1(b)	
1.6(a)		4.2		1.6(a)		4.2	
1.6(c)		4.3		1.6(c)		4.3	
1.7(a)		4.4		1.7(a)		4.4	
1.7(a)(2)		4.4(a)		1.7(a)(2)		4.4(a)	
1.8(a)		5.3(b)		1.8(a)		5.3(b)	
1.8(b)		5.4(a)		1.8(b)		5.4(a)	
1.8(c)		5.4(a)(2)		1.8(c)		5.4(a)(2)	
1.8(e)		5.5(a)		1.8(e)		5.5(a)	
1.8(i)		5.7		1.8(i)		5.7	
1.8(j)		7.1		1.8(j)		7.1	
1.9(a)		7.1(b)		1.9(a)		7.1(b)	
1.9(b)		7.2(e)		1.9(b)		7.2(e)	
1.14(a)		7.3(a)		1.14(a)		7.3(a)	
1.14(b)		7.5(d)		1.14(b)		7.5(d)	
1.15(a)(1)	1	8.1		1.15(a)(1)	1	8.1	
1.15(a)(2)		8.1(a)		1.15(a)(2)		8.1(a)	
1.15(a)(4)		8.1(b)	2	1.15(a)(4)		8.1(b)	1
1.15(a)(5)	4	8.2(a)		1.15(a)(5)		8.2(a)	
1.15(a)(6)		8.3(a)		1.15(a)(6)		8.3(a)	
1.15(b)(1)	1	8.4(a)		1.15(b)(1)		8.4(a)	
1.15(b)(2)	1	8.4(b)		1.15(b)(2)	1	8.4(b)	
1.15(b)(3)	1	8.4(c)	13	1.15(b)(3)		8.4(c)	4
1.15(b)(9)	1	8.4(d)	30	1.15(b)(9)		8.4(d)	11
1.16(a)		8.4(e)		1.16(a)		8.4(e)	
Subtotal	89	Subtotal	84	Subtotal	24	Subtotal	31
		TOTAL*	173			TOTAL**	55

*Total **alleged** may include pending allegations that haven't been found yet.

Total **found may include alleged rule violations from previous years resolved in 2025.

Appendix “D” – 2025 Cases

DISBARRED:

BLOODMAN, TERESA L., of Maumelle, Arkansas, ABN: 2005055, was disbarred by the Arkansas Supreme Court in its Opinion and Order of Disbarment issued May 29, 2025, in Case No. D-16-301. The Petition for Disbarment was filed April 1, 2016, and the Special Judge found that 121 of the 176 counts alleging violations of the Rules were proven by a preponderance of the evidence. By an Order of Interim Suspension and a Findings & Order filed March 21, 2016, Bloodman was suspended throughout the duration of the disbarment proceedings. In its Per Curiam Opinion, the Arkansas Supreme Court expressed that Bloodman’s misconduct was troubling and evidenced a pattern of making false statements to courts and disobeying court orders, failing to return unearned fees, mishandling and prolonging criminal appeals, continuing to practice law after her license was suspended, and counseling her client to arrange for adverse witnesses in his case to be killed as a means of improving his chances of prevailing at trial. Finally, the Court agreed that Bloodman did not acknowledge the wrongful nature of her conduct, accepted the Special Judge’s recommendation, and entered an Order of Disbarment.

COLLINS, MICHAEL DAVID, of Fort Smith, Arkansas, ABN: 97078, was disbarred by the Arkansas Supreme Court in its Per Curiam Opinion issued July 17, 2025, in Case No. D-25-229. The Petition for Reciprocal Disbarment was filed April 21, 2025, pursuant to Section 14 of the Procedures, and personally served on Collins on April 28, 2025. Collins did not file any response to the petition and was therefore in default under Ark. R. Civ. P. 55. The Court deemed the allegations of the petition admitted and ordered that the proper sanction was reciprocal disbarment. Collins was disbarred by Oklahoma for his failure to report disciplinary actions in other jurisdictions to the Oklahoma Bar, failure to cooperate in the Oklahoma Bar’s investigation, and failure to participate in the disciplinary proceedings.

INITIATE DISBARMENT:

HUTCHINSON, WILLIAM ASA, III, of Bentonville, Arkansas, ABN: 2001115, in Committee Case No. CPC-2023-009, on a referral from Judge Chris Griffin, by Findings & Order filed August 20, 2025, pursuant to Section 15(C) of the Procedures of the Arkansas Supreme Court Regulating Professional Conduct of Attorneys at Law (Procedures), was referred for disbarment proceedings to be initiated by the Office of Professional Conduct (OPC). Hutchinson entered a negotiated plea of guilty on the charge of possession of a controlled substance, a Class D Felony, in violation of A.C.A. § 5-64-419(a)(b)(1)(A). Hutchinson was sentenced pursuant to A.C.A. § 16-93-301 and given thirty-six (36) months of probation.

INTERIM SUSPENSION:

CRAWLEY, JUSTIN LEE, of Bentonville, Arkansas, ABN: 2016105, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-009, on a petition before the Committee, by Order of Interim Suspension issued May 16, 2025, was placed on Interim Suspension for allegations of criminal conduct, detailed in

Washington County Circuit Court records, and posed a substantial threat of serious harm to the public and to his clients. Crawley executed an agreement consenting to the interim suspension.

[MODIFIED] INTERIM SUSPENSION:

COPELIN-NEELEY, PRISCILLA, of Dumas, Arkansas, ABN: 2005242, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-011, on a petition before the Committee, by Order of (Modified) Interim Suspension issued June 13, 2025, was placed on a Modified Interim Suspension in the Tenth (10th) Judicial District for allegations of significant misconduct reported by three (3) circuit judges and two (2) prosecuting attorneys, and posed a substantial threat of serious harm to the public and to her clients. Neeley executed an agreement consenting to the modified interim suspension.

[STAYED] SUSPENSION:

MAY, QUENTIN ELLERY, of Little Rock, AR, ABN: 2006034, in Committee Case No. CPC-2022-019, on a complaint by Hayley Ford, by consent agreement and Order of Modified Interim Suspension [with Stayed Suspension] filed September 19, 2025, was ordered to serve a two-year **STAYED SUSPENSION**, wherein May will be under attorney supervision until the stayed suspension is dissolved on September 16, 2027. May violated Rules 1.15(a)(5), 1.4(a)(3), 8.4(c), and 8.1(b).

[SUPERVISED] PROBATION:

MARTIN, JONATHAN PHILLIP, of North Little Rock, AR, ABN: 2006034, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-014, on a referral from U.S. District Judge Brian Miller, by Findings and Order filed October 20, 2025, was ordered to serve twelve (12) months on **PROBATION**, wherein Martin will be under attorney supervision until October 20, 2026, for violations of AR Rules 1.16(c), 1.16(d), and 3.4(c). Martin abandoned his client without justification and failed to timely respond to the Court's Order to Show Cause.

REPRIMAND:

OLSEN, KENNETH A., of Little Rock, AR, ABN: 83139, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-003, on a complaint by Keith Lamont Harper, by Consent Findings & Order filed July 18, 2025, was **REPRIMANDED** and assessed costs of \$150.00, for violations of AR Rules 1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 3.1, 8.4(c), and 8.4(d). Olsen missed the statute of limitations in his client's workers' compensation case, failed to communicate that with his client, failed to perfect the appeal, and then was not forthcoming with the OPC's investigation.

SHOWALTER, HUGH BROCK, of Rogers, AR, ABN: 2001061, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-024, on a complaint by Aaron Widzinski, by Findings and Order filed December 16, 2025, was **REPRIMANDED**, assessed a fine of \$1,000.00, assessed costs of \$150.00, and ordered to

pay restitution of \$2,250.00, for violations of AR Rules 1.15(b)(2) and 8.4(c). Showalter failed to keep unearned fees in his trust account and then retained and converted those funds.

CAUTION:

HURST, JOSH QUINCY, of Hot Springs, Arkansas, ABN: 2004016, in Committee Case No. CPC-2019-042, on a complaint by Darlene Carvin, by Consent Findings & Order filed April 21, 2025, was **CAUTIONED**, assessed costs of \$50.00, and ordered to continue \$800.00 monthly payments to Carvin until the \$45,000.00 judgment is paid in full, for violations of AR Rules 1.1, 1.3, 3.3(a)(1), 8.4(c), and 8.4(d). Hurst failed to timely file Carvin's pre-trial brief, which caused Carvin to suffer a second dismissal of her claims and eventually lose on appeal a judgment against a third party in the amount of \$166,231. Hurst executed a consent judgment in the amount of \$45,000.00 with Carvin and then ceased making payments after paying approximately \$25,000.00 of the judgment.

SHEPPARD, OLIVIA ANN, of Ashdown, Arkansas, ABN: 2016204, in Committee Case No. CPC-2024-008, on a complaint by Laif Poulton, by Amended Findings & Order filed June 6, 2025, was **CAUTIONED**, assessed costs of \$150.00, and ordered to pay restitution to Poulton in the amount of \$3,000.00, for violations of AR Rules 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(4), 1.16(d), 3.2, and 3.4(c). Sheppard failed or refused to communicate with her client, take action on his behalf, or return unearned fees.

BRANCH, TABATHA SHEREE, of Conway, AR, ABN: 2002155, in Committee Case No. CPC-2025-005, on a referral from the Arkansas Court of Appeals, by Findings and Order filed November 6, 2025, was **CAUTIONED**, and assessed costs of \$150.00, for violations of AR Rules 1.3, 3.2, and 8.4(d). Branch failed to timely file her client's brief and failed to take corrective action for eight (8) months subsequent to the missed deadline.
