

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii.

Dated, at: OCT 12 2012  
Honolulu, Hawaii

*M. M. M. M.*  
Clerk, Appellate Courts, State of Hawaii

Electronically Filed  
Supreme Court  
SCAD-12-0000608  
12-OCT-2012  
08:38 AM

NO. SCAD-12-0000608

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

---

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, Petitioner,

vs.

JOAN PALMER DAVIS, Respondent.

---

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING  
(ODC 12-025-9041)

ORDER OF DISBARMENT

(By: Recktenwald, C.J., Nakayama, Acoba, and McKenna, JJ.,  
and Intermediate Court of Appeals Associate Judge Reifurth,  
assigned by reason of vacancy)

Upon consideration of the Office of Disciplinary Counsel's petition for issuance of a reciprocal discipline notice to Respondent Joan P. Davis, the memorandum, affidavit, and exhibits appended thereto, the materials submitted by Respondent Davis on September 20, 2012, and the record, it appears the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia disbarred Respondent Davis from the practice of law in that state on February 27, 2012; this court, on July 30, 2012, issued a notice and order requiring

Respondent Davis, in accordance with Rule 2.15(c) of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i (RSCH), to show cause within 30 days of the service of the order as to why the same or substantially equivalent discipline should not be imposed in the State of Hawai'i and, in her response, Respondent Davis did not establish any of the four grounds available under RSCH Rule 2.15(c) (1) - (4) to avoid reciprocal discipline in this jurisdiction. It further appears Respondent Davis neglected client matters, failed to reasonably communicate with clients, failed to properly withdraw from representation, made false statements of material fact in connection with a disciplinary matter, and engaged in professional conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation, thereby violating the Hawai'i Rules of Professional Conduct (HRPC) Rules 1.3, 1.4, 1.16, 8.1(b), and 8.4(d). Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, pursuant to RSCH Rule 2.15(c), that Respondent Davis is disbarred from the practice of law in the State of Hawai'i, effective thirty days after the date of entry of this order, pursuant to RSCH Rule 2.16(c).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in addition to any other requirements for reinstatement imposed by the Rules of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i, Respondent Davis shall pay all costs of these proceedings as approved upon timely submission

of a bill of costs and an opportunity to respond thereto, as prescribed by RSCH Rule 2.3(c).

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, October 12, 2012.

/s/ Mark E. Recktenwald

/s/ Paula A. Nakayama

/s/ Simeon R. Acoba, Jr.

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

/s/ Lawrence M. Reifurth

