

**IN THE MATTER OF PART 3 OF THE
LEGAL PROFESSION ACT, RSA 2000, c. L-8**

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING
THE CONDUCT OF THOMAS GLENN
A MEMBER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF ALBERTA**

Single Bencher Hearing Committee

Grant Vogeli, KC – Chair

Appearances

Will Cascadden, KC – Counsel for the Law Society of Alberta (LSA)

Thomas Glenn – Self-represented

Hearing Date

March 5, 2026

Hearing Location

Virtual Hearing

HEARING COMMITTEE REPORT - SANCTION

Overview

1. The following citations were directed to hearing by a Conduct Committee Panel on April 15, 2025:
 - 1) It is alleged that Thomas Glenn failed to provide legal services undertaken on a client's behalf to the standard of a competent lawyer, including failing to perform all functions competently, conscientiously and in a diligent matter and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.
 - 2) It is alleged that Thomas Glenn failed to act in accordance with his client's express instructions and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.
2. Mr. Glenn has practiced law in Alberta since being admitted as a member of the LSA on June 20, 1979.
3. The two citations resulted from complaints from two clients. The first complaint related to litigation over a builders' lien matter. There were communication issues between Mr.

Glenn and his client and Mr. Glenn failed to provide legal services to his client to the standard of a reasonably competent lawyer.

4. The second complaint related to a matrimonial matter. Mr. Glenn was acting for the husband in a divorce and division of matrimonial property case. Mr. Glenn failed to act in accordance with his client's express instructions.
5. Mr. Glenn provided an undertaking to the LSA to become an inactive member prior to the hearing. Mr. Glenn abided by the undertaking. He also provided an undertaking to the LSA that if he ever wants to return to active membership, he will apply to the LSA to vary the undertaking prior to applying for reinstatement as a practicing lawyer. At the hearing, Mr. Glenn stated that he has no intention of returning to active practice.
6. Mr. Glenn submitted a Statement of Admitted Facts and Admission of Guilt (Agreed Statement). The Agreed Statement, which is appended to this Report as Appendix A, sets out the relevant facts in detail and admissions of guilt.
7. The Hearing Committee (Committee) found the Agreed Statement acceptable. Accordingly, pursuant to section 60(4) of the *Legal Profession Act (Act)*, it is deemed to be a finding of this Committee that Mr. Glenn's conduct is deserving of sanction in relation to both of the citations set out in paragraph 1 above.
8. On March 5, 2026, the Committee convened a hearing into the appropriate sanction.
9. After reviewing all of the evidence and hearing the submissions of the LSA and Mr. Glenn, for the reasons set out below, the Committee determined that the appropriate sanction is a reprimand. Mr. Glenn was also ordered to pay costs of \$1,500.00 by June 6, 2026.

Preliminary Matters

10. As provided by section 60(3) of the *Act*, when an Agreed Statement is accepted, the hearing into the appropriate sanction can be conducted by a single Bencher.
11. There were no objections to the constitution of the Committee or its jurisdiction, and a private hearing was not requested, so a public hearing proceeded as a single-Bencher hearing.

Agreed Facts

12. The following is a high level summary of the facts set out in the Agreed Statement relating to the two citations.

13. Citation 1 relates to a builders' lien litigation matter where Mr. Glenn did not properly keep his client informed. He failed to advise his client that his opinion regarding prospects of success in the case had changed. Mr. Glenn admitted that he should have discussed a court application with his client in greater detail and should have told his client that he required documentation from his client sooner than he did. Mr. Glenn also admitted that he should have discussed the option of settling with his client prior to a court application.
14. Mr. Glenn also admitted that he should have taken more care in reporting to his client what happened in court and that he should have taken more care in responding to opposing counsel's communications.
15. Citation 2 relates to a divorce case where Mr. Glenn represented the husband. In preparing minutes of settlement, Mr. Glenn's client expressly instructed him not to include specific language about remarriage. In spite of those instructions, Mr. Glenn knowingly included that language in the minutes of settlement. Mr. Glenn acknowledged that he acted contrary to the instructions of his client and inappropriately substituted his judgment for the judgement of his client.

Submissions on Sanction

16. Counsel for the LSA and Mr. Glenn presented a joint submission on sanction. The Committee is not bound by a joint submission on sanction, but a hearing committee is required to give significant deference to a joint submission. *Law Society of Alberta v Saleem*, 2023 ABL 3 at paragraph 22 states as follows:

The Committee is not bound by the joint submission. However, we must give it significant deference unless we are satisfied that it is contrary to the public interest. In the criminal law context, the Supreme Court of Canada in *R v Anthony-Cook*, [2016 SCC 43](#) has set out a test for assessing joint submissions:

- a) Is the joint submission so markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the offence and the offender that the joint submission would be viewed as a break down in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system?
- b) Would the joint submission cause an informed and reasonable public to lose confidence in the institution of the courts?
- c) Is the joint submission so unhinged from the circumstances of the offence and the offender that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the justice system had broken down?

17. The joint submission on sanction was that Mr. Glenn should receive a reprimand and no further sanction. In support of that submission, counsel for the LSA referred to the following three cases:

Law Society of Alberta v. Leonard, 2016, ABLS 3: The member was sanctioned with only a reprimand. He was found guilty of failing to competently and diligently serve a client and failing to respond to communications from opposing counsel. The member delayed submitting a discharge of mortgage for a period of 14 months and failed to discharge encumbrances from title.

Law Society of Alberta v. Sobol, 2020, ABLS 33: The member was found guilty of failing to provide competent, conscientious, and diligent services when acting on the purchase of residential property. He failed to note an encroachment on title to the property that was being purchased and did not ask for a real property report. He then proceeded without client instructions to close the purchase transaction with a small holdback related to the encroachment. He did not tell his client about the encroachment, did not advise his client to obtain a real property report and closed the transaction with a small holdback without client instructions. The member was sanctioned with only a reprimand.

Law Society of Alberta v. Galbraith 2024, ABLS 13: The member was found guilty of failing to conscientiously and diligently serve his client. The quality of his services to his client was grossly inadequate and he failed to respond to communications from opposing counsel. He was sanctioned with only a reprimand.

18. Counsel for the LSA pointed out the following mitigating factors in relation to Mr. Glenn's conduct:

- He has been respected counsel in Alberta for over for 40 years
- He freely admitted guilt and took responsibility for his actions
- He cooperated fully with the LSA discipline process
- He was extremely remorseful
- He did not try to deflect blame
- He agreed to retire from active practice

19. Mr. Glenn advised the Committee that he was extremely embarrassed and remorseful about his conduct. It was apparent to the Committee that Mr. Glenn was, in fact, remorseful and embarrassed.

Decision on Sanction

20. The Committee was satisfied that the joint submission on sanction was appropriate and therefore delivered an oral reprimand. A transcript of the oral reprimand is attached to this decision as Appendix B.

Costs

21. The LSA costs of the proceeding were \$3,864.00 using the LSA's standard, low hourly rates. Considering the principles set out in *Charkhandeh v. College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258, the Committee decided that Mr. Glenn should pay costs of \$1,500.00 by June 6, 2026.

Concluding Matters

22. Mr. Glenn received the oral reprimand and was ordered to pay costs in the amount of \$1,500.00 by June 6, 2026.
23. Notice to the Attorney General is not required.
24. A Notice to the Profession is not required.
25. The exhibits, other hearing materials, and this report will be available for public inspection, including the provision of copies of exhibits for a reasonable copy fee, except that identifying information in relation to persons other than Mr. Glenn will be redacted and further redactions may be made to preserve client confidentiality and solicitor-client privilege (Rule 98(3)).

Dated April 30, 2026.

Grant Vogeli, KC

Appendix A – Statement of Admitted Facts and Exhibits, and Admissions of Guilt

IN THE MATTER OF THE *LEGAL PROFESSION ACT*
-AND-
IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF
THOMAS GLENN
A MEMBER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF ALBERTA

HEARING FILE HE20250082

STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS AND EXHIBITS, AND ADMISSIONS OF GUILT

INTRODUCTION

1. This hearing arises from two complaints [complaint numbers] and relates to the following citations:
 - a. It is alleged that Thomas Glenn failed to provide legal services undertaken on a client’s behalf to the standard of a competent lawyer, including failing to perform all functions competently, conscientiously and in a diligent matter (sic) and that such conduct is deserving of sanction **[the “[C] complaint” – [complaint number]**.
 - b. It is alleged that Thomas Glenn failed to act in accordance with his client’s express instructions and that such conduct is deserving of sanction **[the “[T] Complaint” – [complaint number]**.

ADMITTED FACTS

Professional Background

2. Mr. Glenn was admitted as a member of the Law Society of Alberta (the “**LSA**”) on June 20, 1979.
3. Mr. Glenn’s present status with the LSA is Active/Practicing.
4. Mr. Glenn was disciplined by the LSA in April 1995 for breach of an undertaking. Mr. Glenn received a fine and a reprimand. Mr. Glenn has received no other discipline from the LSA.

Substantive Facts

The [C] Complaint [complaint number]

5. In June 2020, the LSA received a complaint from [RC] about Mr. Glenn.

6. The LSA subsequently conducted an investigation, and, on April 15, 2025, a panel of the Conduct Committee directed that the citation set out in paragraph 1, above, be dealt with by a Hearing Committee.
7. [RC] and his brothers own [YRL]. YRL often hired [HVS] as a subcontractor on its projects to provide irrigation system services and materials. HVS often sourced or obtained materials and supplies from [EMCO].
8. In 2017, YRL and HVS worked on at least four different projects together: one for Brookfield, one for the City of Calgary, one for Mount Royal University and one for the City of Lethbridge (collectively, the “Four Projects”).
9. Prior to the completion of the Four Projects, YRL terminated its relationship with HVS because of HVS’ poor workmanship and failure to meet deadlines.
10. As a result of YRL not paying HVS, HVS failed to pay EMCO. As a further result of this, EMCO registered builder’s liens against the Four Projects and commenced lawsuits against YRL and HVS.
11. During litigation, money was paid into Court as security for costs and the builder’s liens were discharged from the Four Projects.
12. Mr. Glenn and his office previously assisted YRL with some other legal matters. When the builder’s liens dispute arose with EMCO, Mr. Glenn agreed to represent YRL.
13. [RC] takes issue with Mr. Glenn’s conduct during his representation of YRL. Specifically, [RC] alleges in his complaint that:
 - a. He provided Mr. Glenn with documents to refute the validity of the builder’s liens that Mr. Glenn did not use and / or use effectively;
 - b. Mr. Glenn failed, neglected or refused to inform him that YRL was unsuccessful at the application by the opposing parties seeking to declare their builder’s liens valid; and
 - c. Mr. Glenn told him that there was no way that the Court would also award interest to the opposing parties on the valid builder’s liens, which turned out to be untrue.

Document Usage

14. In the lawsuits, YRL took the position that EMCO inflated the invoices used to calculate the amount of its builder’s liens. Additionally, some of the material listed in the invoices

was not used or installed and some of the repairs listed in the invoices were not completed.

15. In September 2018, Mr. Glenn began to prepare the affidavits of records for YRL in each action commenced by EMCO relating to the builder's liens.
16. Mr. Glenn's email to [RC] on September 14, 2018 about the affidavits of records is as follows:
 - a. Any materials that you have in regards to your contract with [HVS] should also be produced. This would include your bid tenders, quotes, accepted quotes which may form a contract or a contract, progress reports, invoices, cheques, etc. Those should be produced.
 - b. Because our damages arise from [HVS'] inability or refusal to carry out the contract properly, any correspondence that you have in regards to the defects, reports from turning on the water, explosions, bad values, incorrectly installed equipment, etc. All that should also be produced.
17. Mr. Glenn's email to [RC] on September 26, 2018 about the affidavits of records is as follows:

These would include any contracts at the beginning, force accounts or equipment purchases during the job, and assessments, complaints, correspondence with the City of Calgary or the City of Lethbridge, etc. after completion of the jobs. It is necessary that this be provided as soon as possible.
18. [RC] appears not to have responded to these emails.
19. Mr. Glenn invited [RC] to his office to swear the affidavits of records once they were compiled in October 2018, however they were not sworn until December 13, 2018.
20. On November 19, 2018, [JF], counsel for EMCO, contacted Mr. Glenn to advise that he received instructions to put EMCO's previously filed applications back on the list to have the builder's liens, in all four actions, declared valid and to have them paid out from the security for costs.
21. [JF] stated that he intended to make the application for each of the Four Projects in two parts. The first part would be to set the statutory 10% lien fund and obtain payment of that from the security for costs. The second part, which would proceed at a later date, would be to set the portion of the lien fund in excess of the statutory 10%.
22. [JF] told Mr. Glenn that all the details necessary to set the statutory 10% lien fund were in previously filed affidavits. He asked Mr. Glenn if he would like to work on scheduling

the application or proceeding by way of a Consent Order. Mr. Glenn did not respond to this email, nor did he respond to the four subsequent emails that [JF] sent.

23. On November 30, 2018, Mr. Glenn forwarded [JF]'s most recent email (which simply requested that Mr. Glenn confirm he was receiving [JF]'s correspondence) to his assistant, [TF]. [TF] emailed [JF] on December 5, 2018:

[JF],

Apologies for the delay. Tom is receiving your emails and has forwarded majority of them to me including your recent email with copies of the Applications. Kindly include me on the emails and we will hopefully respond to you faster.

Tom is in examinations December 10-12 and requests an adjournment of the Applications to December 13 or 14 (he will already be in Masters this day)?

24. The application to set the statutory 10% lien fund proceeded on December 17, 2018, and [JF] was successful (the "December 2018 Application"). Master Robertson ordered that each builder's lien filed by EMCO was declared valid, the statutory 10% lien fund was set in each action and it was directed that EMCO be paid from the security for costs (collectively, the "December Orders"). The total amount payable to EMCO was around \$180,000.
25. Mr. Glenn asked [RC] to "mark up the invoices" that EMCO was relying on to calculate their builder's liens in December 2018.
26. [RC] emailed the marked-up invoices to Mr. Glenn on December 17, 2018 at 9:10 AM - approximately one hour before the December 2018 Application began. Mr. Glenn did not use them as part of YRL's defence at the December 2018 Application.
27. Only one of the marked-up invoices provided by [RC] on the morning of the December 2018 Application was included in the affidavits of records sworn on December 13, 2018.
28. Mr. Glenn did not file anything on behalf of YRL in defence of the December 2018 Application. Mr. Glenn did not bring the marked-up invoices he received that morning to the December 2018 Application and did not attempt to rely on them as part of YRL's defence.
29. As Mr. Glenn had all the marked-up invoices by April 2019, he included them in an affidavit that he filed and relied upon at a later application.

Outcome of the December 2018 Application

30. [RC] claims that he did not find out what happened at the December 2018 Application until March 2019, when Mr. Flanagan contacted Liberty Mutual requesting payment

pursuant to the December Orders. Mr. Caputo forwarded the correspondence he received from Liberty Mutual to Mr. Glenn within 10 minutes of receipt stating, "Can you please advise?"

31. Mr. Glenn denies that he failed to advise Mr. Caputo of the outcome of the December 2018 Application. He believes that he and Mr. Caputo had a telephone conversation

Interest Award

32. In the order granted on December 17, 2018, in the action involving the City of Lethbridge, the Court directed that EMCO had leave to seek interest from the lien fund.
33. [JF] told Mr. Glenn that he would be making that application in April 2019.
34. Mr. Glenn prepared an affidavit for [RC] to swear in defence of that application. This affidavit, which was sworn on April 3, 2019, contained the marked-up invoices that were at issue as set out above (the "April 2019 Affidavit").
35. The application seeking interest proceeded on April 12, 2019, and [JF] was successful (the "April 2019 Application"). Master Prowse ordered that EMCO was awarded approximately \$38,000 in interest from the lien fund and directed that EMCO be paid same from the security for costs. EMCO was also awarded costs of \$750.
36. [RC] states that Mr. Glenn told him that there was "no way" that the Court would also award interest to the opposing parties on the valid builder's liens.
37. Mr. Glenn states that he told [RC] that it was unlikely the Court would grant interest to EMCO if the statutory 10% lien fund was exhausted.
38. Mr. Glenn wrote an email to [RC] stating that if the statutory 10% lien fund was less than \$90,000, EMCO would have no further claim.
39. The statutory 10% lien fund was ultimately calculated at more than \$150,000. Mr. Glenn states that once he became aware of this, his conclusion and advice regarding interest in this matter changed. He says that he made an offer to settle the interest dispute with [JF] for a lesser amount, but that offer was refused and the April 2019 Application proceeded.
40. Mr. Glenn did not inform [RC] that Mr. Glenn's opinion regarding EMCO's chances of success at the April 2019 Application had changed. Mr. Glenn and [RC] also did not discuss settlement of the interest dispute prior to, or in an effort to avoid, the April 2019 Application.

41. Mr. Glenn admits that he should have discussed the December 2018 Application with [RC] in greater detail. He should have told [RC] that he required copies of the marked-up invoices sooner than they were sent and advised why it would be difficult to discuss and/ or rely on them at the December 2018 Application. He also should have discussed whether [RC] was open to settling one or more of the lawsuits and/ or proceeding by way of Consent Order, as [JF] proposed in November 2018, instead of opposing the December 2018 Application.
42. Mr. Glenn's failure to communicate with [RC] as aforesaid created misunderstanding and caused [RC] to become frustrated with Mr. Glenn's representation of YRL.
43. Mr. Glenn further admits that he should have also taken more care in reporting what happened at the December 2018 Application to [RC].
44. Mr. Glenn further admits that he should have also taken more care in responding to [JF]. [JF] sent five emails to Mr. Glenn between November 19 and 25, 2018, regarding his representation of YRL and requesting his availability to attend Court to move the lawsuits forward. Mr. Glenn did not respond to these emails. [JF] only received a response to these emails from [TF] on December 5, 2018.
45. In March of 2025, YRL settled a civil claim that it had issued against Mr. Glenn in relation to his representation of YRL as set out above. The settlement consisted of a payment to YRL of \$10,000 in exchange for a comprehensive Release of Mr. Glenn, his firm and his professional corporation.

The [T] Complaint [complaint number]

46. [MT] and [JT] were married in 1990.
47. [MT and JT] separated in 2016 and commenced divorce proceedings in 2019. [MT] hired Mr. Glenn in May 2020 to represent him.
48. The parties first resolved the issue of spousal support, which left the issue of ownership of the Matrimonial Home and the Rental Property. This was going to be addressed at an Early Intervention Case Conference ("EICC") that was scheduled to take place in April 2021.
49. Prior to the EICC, the parties agreed to sever the corollary relief so they could immediately apply for a Divorce Judgment.
50. At all times throughout the progression of proceedings, the parties attempted to resolve their outstanding issues. Between April and September 2021, they exchanged several draft Minutes of Settlement.

51. Regarding what would constitute a "substantial change" that would permit the parties to revisit and revise spousal support payments in the future, the following paragraph was drafted:

2.0 The parties agree that [MT] shall pay to [JT] spousal support as follows:

...

f) [MT] shall continue to pay spousal support until there is a substantial change in circumstance in the means, needs and lives of the parties, included but not limited to job loss, retirement, reduction in income, cohabitation, short-term or long-term disability, **remarriage of either party** and based on either a written agreement between the parties or further Order by the Court. [Emphasis added]

52. [MT] was adamant regarding the wording, "remarriage of either party" in the draft Minutes of Settlement. He instructed Mr. Glenn this wording was not to be deleted or removed from the Minutes of Settlement.

53. [JT] objected to the wording, "remarriage of either party". She took the position that it would only matter or constitute a "substantial change" if she remarried, not if [MT] remarried.

54. [MT] repeated his instructions to Mr. Glenn on several occasions that the subject clause of the Minutes of Settlement continue to reflect "either party" - not just [JT].

55. On September 24, 2021, [MT] sent an email to Mr. Glenn expressing frustration at the situation and the delay in concluding the proceedings. [MT] indicated he had conceded on every other matter and that Mr. Glenn should "put his foot down and justify why it remains 'either party' and get [the Minutes of Settlement] signed".

56. On September 27, 2021, Mr. Glenn sent four copies of the Minutes of Settlement, which had been signed by [MT], to counsel for [JT]. The copies were sent on the trust condition that there be no changes made to the documents. The signed version sent to counsel for [JT] included the subject "remarriage of either party" wording.

57. [JT] did not immediately sign the Minutes of Settlement. Instead, Mr. Glenn and [JT]'s counsel discussed the wording "remarriage of either party" at length over the next few days. [JT]'s counsel invited Mr. Glenn to bring an application if he felt this dispute justified Court intervention but said that he did not think it was worth the Court's time or further legal fees by either party.

58. Ultimately, on September 29, 2021, Mr. Glenn told [JT]'s counsel that "... if the offending paragraph is regarding the remarriage or either party, we are prepared to take out that

part altogether". Mr. Glenn said this to [JT]'s counsel without [MT]'s knowledge or consent.

59. [MT] was not aware that "remarriage of either party" wording had been removed had been removed from the Minutes of Settlement or that his instructions to Mr. Glenn had not been followed until after he received a copy of the Minutes of Settlement signed by [JT] on October 1, 2021.
60. On October 3, 2021, [MT] told Mr. Glenn that he was dissatisfied with the outcome of this matter. Mr. Glenn prepared a Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record three days later.
61. Mr. Glenn said that notwithstanding his withdrawal, his office was prepared to complete the registration of the Transfers of Land and the corresponding mortgages. [MT] however gave him instructions that he was no longer to act and appointed other counsel.
62. Mr. Glenn admits that he allowed the "remarriage of either party" wording to be removed from the executed version of the Minutes of Settlement without the knowledge of or instructions from [MT].

Mr. Glenn's Future Plans

63. Mr. Glenn is currently in the process of transferring his practice to another lawyer. He currently expects that the transfer of his practice will be completed by November 2025, following which Mr. Glenn will remain with the practice for an anticipated period of two months to ensure a smooth transfer of all clients and files.
64. Following the completion of the process of transferring his practice, Mr. Glenn intends to become an inactive Member of the LSA. Mr. Glenn currently expects to become an inactive Member of the LSA on or before December 31, 2025.

ADMISSIONS OF FACT

65. Mr. Glenn admits as facts the statements in this Statement of Admitted Facts the purposes of these proceedings.

ADMISSIONS OF GUILT

66. Mr. Glenn admits that he failed to provide legal services undertaken on a client's behalf to the standard of a competent lawyer, including failing to perform all functions competently, conscientiously and in a diligent matter and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.
67. Mr. Glenn admits that he failed to act in accordance with his client's express instructions and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

68. Mr. Glenn unequivocally admits guilt to the essential elements of the citations describing the conduct deserving of sanction.
69. Mr. Glenn has signed this statement freely and voluntarily, without compulsion or duress.
70. Mr. Glenn understands the nature and consequences of these admissions.
71. Mr. Glenn understands that if there is a joint submission on sanction or any other matters, the Hearing Committee will show deference to it but is not bound by it.
72. Mr. Glenn has had the opportunity to consult with legal counsel.
73. Mr. Glenn acknowledges that pursuant to Rule 92(4) of the Rules of the Law Society of Alberta, this Statement will be published, and the Application or Hearing for which this Statement has been endorsed will be heard in public before the Benchers or a panel constituted by the Benchers.

THIS STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS AND ADMISSIONS OF GUILT IS MADE THIS 19th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2025.

THOMAS GLENN

Appendix B – Oral Reprimand Delivered at Hearing

Mr. Glenn, you have admitted guilt to the two citations here. I distill them down to, one, failure to appropriately serve your client and, the second, failure to appropriately follow instructions from a client.

These sorts of issues are cause for concern within the Law Society. As a member of the Law Society, you have a responsibility to the member of the public and the Law Society to represent their best interests, and you failed to do so in this case specifically in relation to two clients. This failure represents what the Law Society strives to avoid and the confidence we need to instill in the public to ensure that they believe and know that they will receive competent, conscientious, and diligent services.

That said, Mr. Glenn, I applaud you for acknowledging your failures and facing the consequences of them. It is very easy to deflect or not acknowledge, and you did not take that route. Thank you for that, and I compliment you for that. I certainly understand that this is stressful and embarrassing, and I understand your long and good service to the profession and your family history in the profession and thank you for your long service to the profession.

With your transfer to nonpracticing, I wish you all the best in your future years moving past the practice of law into other hopefully fruitful and positive endeavours.