## STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a Regular Term of the Supreme Court of Appeals continued and held at Charleston, Kanawha County, on the 11th of May, 2000, the following order was made and entered:

E

In the Matter of:

Steven M. Askin, a former member of

The West Virginia State Bar

No. 30724

On a former day, to-wit, August 12, 2002, came the petitioner, Steven M. Askin, pro se, and presented to the Court, pursuant to Rule 3.33 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, and presented to the Court his petition for reinstatement of his license to practice law in the State of West Virginia.

Thereafter, on February 23, 2006, came the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board, by Joyce Helmick Morton, its chairperson, pursuant to Rule 3.33 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, and presented to the Court its written recommended disposition in this matter recommending that the petitioner be reinstated to the practice of law under the following conditions: (1) the petitioner comply with the rulings of the Court in Nos. 22684 and 23313 prior to reinstatement; (2) the petitioner make restitution to Alan Hewitt in the amount of \$1,277.37 plus 10 percent interest calculated from May 1, 1994; (3) the petitioner reimburse the Lawyer Disciplinary Board for costs and expenses in the amount of \$6,133.78 in Case No. 22685; (4) the petitioner reimburse the Lawyer Disciplinary Board for the costs and expenses in Case No. 23313 in the amount of \$310.63; (5) the petitioner's law practice be supervised for a period of two years; (6) that during the period of supervised practice, petitioner undergo random

drug screens, at his own expense, as requested by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel and that copies of the results of such testing be forwarded to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel; (7) the petitioner reimburse the Client Security Fund in the amount of \$16,750.00, with interest at the legal rate of 10% annum from the date of the reinstatement of petitioner's law license until paid in full; and (8) the petitioner pay all costs and expenses incurred relating to the reinstatement proceedings.

Upon consideration whereof, the Court is of opinion to and doth refuse said written recommended disposition of the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board and the petition for reinstatement is denied..

A True Copy

Attest:

Clerk, Suppeme Court of Appeals