

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Case Number: SBN21-99198



FILED

OCT 27 2022

STATE BAR OF NEVADA  
BY [Signature]  
OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL

STATE BAR OF NEVADA

NORTHERN NEVADA DISCIPLINARY BOARD

STATE BAR OF NEVADA,

Complainant,

vs.

STEVE ENVENSON, ESQ.

STATE BAR NO. 4596

Respondent.

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

TO: Steve Evenson, Esq.  
P.O. Box 1023  
Lovelock, NV 89419

Courtroom Decorum

In multiple matters you engaged in conduct that exceeded the bounds of advocacy, thereby violating Rule 3.5 (Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal) and Rule 8.4 (d) (Misconduct- prejudicial to the administration of justice) of the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct ("RPC"). This included instances when you called the opposing party derogatory names in open court and, without sufficient supporting information, accused opposing counsel of coaching a witness. You acknowledged at the time you engaged in this conduct that it was inappropriate.

1 A courtroom is a place for intellectual and orderly resolution of conflicts. Decorum  
2 and civility are required to “maintain respect for the institution of the court and the rule of  
3 law so that people need not feel that they must resort to brute force, mob action, street  
4 brawls, or domestic disturbances in order to seek and obtain justice.” *Office of Disciplinary  
5 Counsel v. Breiner*, 89 Haw. 167, 173, 969 P.2d 1290 (Haw. 1999). Lawyers are entrusted,  
6 as officers of the court, to advocate on behalf of their clients zealously, yet civilly. Lawyers  
7 should assist clients in asserting how the law applies to their particular facts without  
8 reducing the discussion to the equivalent of the barroom brawl.

9 Your misconduct in the aforementioned matters did not advance your client’s  
10 position in the litigation, thus potentially injuring your client. Your conduct injured the  
11 integrity of the profession by implying that lashing out with name-calling and unfounded  
12 accusations is appropriate in a judicial proceeding. Your conduct also injured the efficiency  
13 of the judiciary by requiring the court to address the obstreperous behavior instead of  
14 focusing on resolving your clients’ disputes.

#### 15 Failure to Abide by Court Directions

16 In more than ten separate instances between 2018 and 2021, you failed to timely  
17 submit a proposed Order to the Court in pending matters. This failure resulted in many  
18 subsequent directives from the Court seeking submission of the requested Order. At times,  
19 the Court turned to the other party for the proposed Order. In one instance, your client’s  
20 request for relief was granted and you failed to submit the proposed Order. The Court  
21 directed the opposing party to submit the Order. The Court included an additional ruling,  
22 which technically extended the time for your client to file an Answer in the matter, and you  
23 objected to the entire Order arguing that your client was denied her right to appeal that  
24 order in which she prevailed and which stated that your client needed to file an Answer.

25

1 Your conduct violated RPC 8.4(d) and was prejudicial to the administration of  
2 justice. Your clients were injured by the delay in resolution of their proceedings. Your  
3 misconduct also injured the efficiency of the judiciary by requiring the court to repeatedly  
4 seek to finalize matters which had already been decided.

5 Application of the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions

6 Standard 6.22 of the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions states:

7 Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows that he or she is  
8 violating a court order or rule, and causes injury or potential injury to a client  
9 or a party, or causes interference or potential interference with a legal  
10 proceeding.

11 Your knowing violation of RPC 3.5 and RPC 8.4(d) caused injury, or potential injury to  
12 your clients, and caused interference, in the form of distraction and delay, with the legal  
13 proceeding.

14 The Panel finds that your lack of prior discipline over a 30-year career practicing  
15 law and your acceptance of responsibility for your misconduct warrant a downward  
16 deviation from the baseline sanction of suspension to issuance of a Public Reprimand.

17 PUBLIC REPRIMAND

18 In light of the foregoing, you violated Rule of Professional Conduct ("RPC") 3.5  
19 (Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal) and RPC 8.4(d) (Misconduct- prejudicial to the  
20 administration of justice) and are hereby PUBLICLY REPRIMANDED.

21 You are also ordered to pay SCR 120 Costs in the amount of \$1,500 plus the hard  
22 costs of this proceeding no later than the 30<sup>th</sup> day after the Panel's Order issues.

23 DATED this 27<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2022.

24 By: 

25 RICHARD WILLIAMSON, ESQ.  
Formal Hearing Panel Chair  
Northern Nevada Disciplinary Board