



**FILED**

Jun 29, 2022

STATE BAR OF NEVADA

BY:   
OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL

**STATE BAR OF NEVADA  
SOUTHERN NEVADA DISCIPLINARY BOARD**

STATE BAR OF NEVADA,

Complainant,

vs.

MARK P. CHAKSUPA,  
Nevada Bar No. 10537

Respondent.

**PUBLIC REPRIMAND**

TO: MARK P. CHAKSUPA  
4455 S. Jones Blvd., Unit 1  
Las Vegas, NV 89103

On May 5, 2022, a Breach Hearing Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board considered the above-referenced grievance. Based on the evidence presented, the Panel concluded that you failed to comply with, and materially breached, the terms of your Diversion Program Consent Agreement and shall be issued a Public Reprimand in violation of RPC 1.4 (Communication) and RPC 8.1 (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters).

On or about September 16, 2019, R.F. (hereinafter "Grievant") retained you to substitute in as the attorney of record in his criminal case. On September 18, 2019, you confirmed as Grievant's counsel. On, about, or between September 18, 2019, and June 11, 2020, Grievant had one conversation with you regarding his case. Grievant, his wife, and his friends attempted unsuccessfully to communicate with

1 you over one hundred times. Based on his inability to reach you, Grievant learned from the Clark County  
2 Public Defender's Office that the court vacated his calendar call and trial due to COVID-19. Moreover,  
3 on August 5, 2020, Grievant appeared for a status check at 11:30 am only to learn from the clerk that the  
4 court moved it up to 10:20 am. The clerk informed Grievant that you appeared at the hearing and told  
5 the Court that you attempted to contact Grievant, but to no avail.

6 On July 31, 2020, the State Bar of Nevada (hereinafter "State Bar") sent you a letter of  
7 investigation ("LOI") to your SCR 79 email address. You did not respond. On August 31, 2020, the  
8 State Bar sent you another LOI to your SCR 79 email address and your SCR 79 address. Still, you did  
9 not respond. On September 21, 2020, an investigator with the State Bar emailed a third LOI to your SCR  
10 79 email address, as well as a second email in the State Bar's records. Although the State Bar received  
11 delivery receipts for both emails, you did not respond. On October 8, 2020, an investigator with the State  
12 Bar left messages on two of your phone numbers.<sup>1</sup> You failed to return the investigator's phone calls.  
13 On October 14, 2020, the State Bar sent a fourth LOI to your SCR 79 address, as well as an alternate  
14 address. The postal service confirmed delivery of both, but again you failed to respond to the State Bar.  
15 On November 12, 2020, the State Bar left another message on the phone number with your voicemail  
16 message. You did not return the State Bar's phone call.

17 RPC 1.4 (Communication) states, in pertinent part, that a lawyer shall "[k]eep the client  
18 reasonably informed about the status of a matter" and "explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary  
19 to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation." You failed to keep  
20 Grievant informed about the status of his matter. Moreover, you failed to respond to Grievant's multiple  
21 attempts to contact you. Under ABA Standard 4.43, reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> One phone number had a voicemail greeting that the number belonged to you.  
25

1 is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes injury or  
2 potential injury to a client. This type of ethical breach caused injury to Grievant.

3 RPC 8.1 (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters) states, in pertinent part, that “a lawyer in  
4 connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not [ . . . ] knowingly fail to respond to a lawful demand for  
5 information from an admissions or disciplinary authority.” You failed to respond to multiple letters of  
6 investigation the State Bar sent you. You also failed to return any of the State Bar’s phone calls. Under  
7 ABA Standard 7.3, reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer negligently engages in conduct that  
8 is a violation of a duty owed as a professional, and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public,  
9 or the legal system. This type of ethical breach caused injury to the public and/or the legal system.

10 **DISCIPLINE IMPOSED**

11 In light of the foregoing, you are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED for violating RPC 1.4  
12 (Communication) and RPC 8.1 (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters). In addition, pursuant to SCR  
13 120(3), you shall pay a \$1,500 fee plus the hard costs of the instant proceedings. You shall make such  
14 payment no later than thirty (30) days after receiving a billing from the State Bar.

15  
16 DATED this 29 day of June 2022.

17  
18  
19   
20 Franklin J. Katschke (Jun 29, 2022 15:36 PDT)

21 **FRANKLIN J. KATSCHKE, Esq.**  
22 Panel Chair  
23 Southern Nevada Disciplinary Panel  
24  
25

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 The undersigned hereby certifies a true and correct copy of the **PUBLIC REPRIMAND** was  
3 electronically served upon:

- 4 1. Franklin Katschke, Esq. (Panel Chair): [fkatschke@katschkelaw.com](mailto:fkatschke@katschkelaw.com)  
5 2. Mark Chaksupa, Esq. (Respondent): [chaksupa@ymail.com](mailto:chaksupa@ymail.com) ; [markchaksupa@yahoo.com](mailto:markchaksupa@yahoo.com)  
6 3. Gerard Gosioco, Esq. (Assistant Bar Counsel): [gerardg@nvbar.org](mailto:gerardg@nvbar.org)

7  
8 DATED this 29th day of June 2022.

9 *Sonia Del Rio*

10 Sonia Del Rio an employee of  
11 the State Bar of Nevada.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25