

## **Elizabeth Darlene Bryson**

Vancouver, BC

Called to the bar: August 31, 1990

**Discipline hearing** : June 23, 2011

**Panel** : Joost Blom, QC, Chair, Satwinder Bains and Gregory Petrisor

**Report issued** : July 25, 2011 (2011 LSBC 19)

**Counsel** : Carolyn Gulabsingh and Jaia Rai for the Law Society and Alistair Wade for Elizabeth Darlene Bryson

### **Facts**

In January 2011, the Law Society sent a letter to Elizabeth Darlene Bryson requesting a response to specific questions concerning its investigation of a complaint from one of her clients. Further requests were forwarded to Bryson via email, mail and phone, which included a deadline of March 8 to reply, otherwise disciplinary action would be considered for failure to respond to the Law Society's correspondence.

On March 17 Bryson contacted the Law Society and advised that she was working on a reply. On June 22, the day before the present discipline hearing, Bryson provided her written response to the questions initially asked by the Law Society.

### **admission and Disciplinary Action**

Bryson admitted that she failed to provide a substantive response promptly to communications from the Law Society and did not dispute the Law Society's submission that her conduct constituted professional misconduct.

The panel considered a number of factors. Bryson did not have a disciplinary record, and her misconduct did not appear to have given her any benefit. She acknowledged her misconduct. During her practice as a lawyer, she had contributed significantly to the legal profession and the public as a volunteer.

The panel also took into account that Bryson eventually provided a response to the request for information originally made by the Law Society. As this was done at the last possible moment, it was impossible to determine prior to the hearing if her response was satisfactory. The panel advised Bryson that she may be required to provide the Law Society with a more substantive response if deemed necessary.

The panel accepted Bryson's admission and ordered that she:

1. pay a \$1,000 fine;
2. provide a substantive response within 30 days of a request from the Law Society for further information arising from her June 22 response; and
3. pay \$1,500 in costs.

