

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a Regular Term of the Supreme Court of Appeals continued and held at Charleston, Kanawha County, on the 28th of February, 2007, the following order was made and entered:

Lawyer Disciplinary Board, Petitioner

vs.) No. 33070

John W. Askintowicz, a member of The
West Virginia State Bar, Respondent

On a former day, to-wit, January 25, 2007, came the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board, by David A. Jividen, its chairperson, pursuant to Rule 3.10 of the Rules of the Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, and presented to the Court its written recommended disposition in this matter, recommending that: (1) the respondent's law license be annulled; (2) the respondent be ordered to legally satisfy the August 31, 2005 judgment obtained by William Gavin in its entirety; (3) the respondent be ordered to pay restitution to the following clients: Wendy Sorrell \$1,500.00; Stacy L. Hawkins \$2,500.00; Justin T. Mitchell \$800.00; Robert J. O'Connor \$1,000.00; Robert Mullenax \$1,400.00; Aretha Valaszuez-Gomez \$1,600.00; (4) the respondent be ordered to reimburse the Lawyer Disciplinary Board the costs of these proceedings pursuant to Rule 3.15 of the Rules of the Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure.

Upon consideration whereof, the Court is of opinion to and doth hereby concur with the stipulated written recommended disposition of the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board. It is therefore ordered that: (1) the respondent's law license be annulled; (2) the respondent be ordered to legally satisfy the August 31, 2005 judgment

obtained by William Gavin in its entirety; (3) the respondent be ordered to pay restitution to the following clients: Wendy Sorrell \$1,500.00; Stacy L. Hawkins \$2,500.00; Justin T. Mitchell \$800.00; Robert J. O'Connor \$1,000.00; Robert Mullenax \$1,400.00; Aretha Valaszuez-Gomez \$1,600.00; (4) the respondent be ordered to reimburse the Lawyer Disciplinary Board the costs of these proceedings pursuant to Rule 3.15 of the Rules of the Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure.

Service of an attested copy of this order shall constitute sufficient notice of its contents.

A True Copy

Attest:


Clerk, Supreme Court of Appeals