

Electronically Filed  
Supreme Court  
SCAD-13-0000725  
01-JUL-2013  
12:57 PM

SCAD-13-0000725

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

---

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, Petitioner,

vs.

THOMAS FRANCIS FEENEY, Respondent.

---

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING  
(ODC 13-017-9087)

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

(By: Recktenwald, C.J., Nakayama, Acoba, McKenna, and Pollack, JJ.)

Upon consideration of the petition for issuance of a reciprocal discipline notice to Respondent Thomas Francis Feeny, filed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC), pursuant to Rule 2.15(b) of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i (RSCH), the memorandum, affidavit, and exhibits appended thereto, the timely June 19, 2013 response submitted to this court by Respondent Feeny, and ODC's subsequent June 20, 2013 statement of no opposition filed with this court, it appears, on March 8, 2013, the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, suspended Respondent Feeny for one year and one day, effective April 8, 2013, for mishandling client funds, altering evidence submitted to Bar Counsel in the resulting disciplinary investigation, and failing to keep proper financial records of client trust fund monies, in

I do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original as filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii.  
Dated at Honolulu, Hawaii, 01 JUL - 1 2013

  
Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii

violation of Rules 1.15(b) (1), 1.15(e) (3), 1.15(e) (4), 1.15(f) (1) (C), 1.15(f) (1) (E), 3.4(a), 3.4(b), 8.1(a), 8.1(b), 8.4(c), 8.4(d), and 8.4(h) of the Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct, and that Respondent Feeney does not contest the findings, conclusions or discipline of the Massachusetts authorities, or the imposition of reciprocal discipline in this jurisdiction. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent Feeney is suspended from the practice of law in this jurisdiction for one year, effective *nunc pro tunc* to April 8, 2013.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent Feeney's reinstatement to the practice of law, in addition to the requirements set forth in RSCH Rule 2.17(b), shall be contingent upon his submission to this court of proof of his unconditional reinstatement to the practice of law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that Respondent Feeney shall bear any costs of these proceedings incurred by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, upon the timely submission of a verified bill of costs, as authorized by RSCH Rule 2.3(c).

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, July 1, 2013.

/s/ Mark E. Recktenwald

/s/ Paula A. Nakayama

/s/ Simeon R. Acoba, Jr.

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

/s/ Richard W. Pollack

