

Failing to respond to Law Society

PHILIP GORDON NERLAND

Vancouver, B.C.

Called to the Bar: September 10, 1982

The Law Society wrote to the member on March 6, 1991 requesting his explanation of a complaint.

The member retained counsel who wrote to the Society on April 3 stating he would provide an answer shortly. The Society sent another letter to the member's counsel on April 10 asking for a response before the end of the month.

Counsel replied on May 6, 1991; he noted he had not yet prepared a letter of response, and asked for a deferral of the matter. The Society sent follow-up letters on May 14, June 11 and July 9. The Society wrote again on July 16 and counsel replied the same day, stating the member would be retaining another lawyer.

The Law Society wrote to counsel on September 3 requesting the name of the member's new lawyer, and was subsequently informed the file had been returned to the member. Ten days later the member provided the name of his new counsel.

After receiving another letter from the Law Society in early October, the member requested that the Society's investigation be held in abeyance while he and the complainant participated in a fee review before the Registrar. The Standing Discipline Committee rejected the member's request on October 30 and directed he respond by December 5. He did not comply.

The member was cited on January 27, 1992. He sent the Society a letter of explanation on the complaint on February 17.

The member admitted to the Standing Discipline Committee on March 18 that he had professionally misconducted himself in failing to respond promptly to Law Society correspondence. The Committee rescinded the citation and directed that the admission be recorded on the member's professional conduct record.