

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a Regular Term of the Supreme Court of Appeals continued and held at Charleston, Kanawha County, on the 26th day of November, 1991, the following order was made and entered:

The Committee on Legal Ethics of The
West Virginia State Bar, Complainant

vs.) No. 20527

Harvey D. Peyton, an active member of
The West Virginia State Bar, Respondent

On a former day, to-wit, November 20, 1991, came the respondent, Harvey D. Peyton, by Leo Catsonis, his attorney, and presented to the Court his motion in writing for leave to waive the filing of a brief and oral argument scheduled for Tuesday, the 3rd day of December, 1991, for the entry of an order suspending the respondent's license to practice law in the State of West Virginia for a period of six months commencing on December 22, 1991, with a credit of four months, and directing the respondent to reimburse the Committee on Legal Ethics for costs incurred in the investigation of the above-captioned matter.

Thereafter, on the 25th day of November, 1991, came the petitioner, the Committee on Legal Ethics of The West Virginia State Bar, by Sherri D. Goodman, its attorney, and presented to the Court its written response thereto requesting the entry of an order suspending the respondent's license to


practice law in the State of West Virginia for a period of four months and five days for the reasons stated therein.

It is therefore considered and ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in the State of West Virginia be, and it hereby is, suspended for a period of four months effective on the 1st day of January, 1992, at the end of which period of time the respondent's license to practice law in the State of West Virginia shall be automatically reinstated.

It is finally considered and ordered that the respondent reimburse the Committee on Legal Ethics of The West Virginia State Bar for the costs incurred in the investigation of the above-captioned proceeding. Justices McHugh and Neely would have imposed a two-month suspension.

Service of a copy of this order upon the respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, shall constitute sufficient notice of the contents hereof.

A True Copy

Attest: 
Clerk, Supreme Court of Appeals