



December 13, 2018

**LETTER OF REPRIMAND**

Joseph Iarussi, Esq.  
1416 Santa Margarita Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89416

RE: Grievance File OBC17-1578/Adam Madi

Dear Mr. Iarussi:

3100 W. Charleston Blvd.  
Suite 100  
Las Vegas, NV 89102  
phone 702.382.2200  
toll free 800.254.2797  
fax 702.385.2878

9456 Double R Blvd., Ste. B  
Reno, NV 89521-5977  
phone 775.329.4100  
fax 775.329.0522

[www.nvbar.org](http://www.nvbar.org)

On September 26, 2018, a Formal Hearing Panel of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board considered the above-referenced grievance. The Panel concluded that you violated the Rules of Professional Conduct and should be reprimanded. This letter shall constitute delivery of that reprimand.

Adam Madi ("Madi") retained you to represent him in a divorce and custody matter in the Eighth Judicial District Court. You charged Madi \$1,500, with \$750 paid at the onset of representation and the remainder due at the conclusion of the case.

In May 2017, Madi contacted your office twice to determine the status of his case. Both times he was told you were working on it. Thereafter, Madi was arrested and charged with domestic violence against his ex-wife. A temporary protection order ("TPO") was imposed, with a hearing to extend set for June 5, 2017. You appeared for Madi at that hearing after agreeing to represent him in the matter at no additional charge.

Madi informed you of evidence he believed would exonerate him in the form of surveillance video from Smith's Food Market ("Smith's"). You informed Madi you would obtain the video, and sent a process server to Smith's with a subpoena duces tecum. The video was never obtained.

On June 29, 2017, attorney Scott Steinhoff appeared at Madi's arraignment at your request and confirmed to the Court that you were retained counsel. The case was set for trial on September 5, 2017.

You failed to appear at Madi's trial on September 5, 2017. The Court made multiple attempts to reach you without success. As a result, the Court assessed witness fees against you and issued an Order to Show Cause for September 12, 2017. When you failed to appear on September 12, 2017, the hearing was reset for the following day.

On September 13, 2017, you appeared at the Order to Show Cause hearing and indicated you were still representing Madi. The trial was continued to September 26, 2017. You were present on that date and opposed the prosecution's motion to continue. The motion was granted, and the trial rescheduled for October 16, 2017. You were present on that date and Madi was found guilty, with sentencing scheduled for the following day.

On October 17, 2017, you failed to appear for Madi's sentencing hearing. Your office contacted chambers and asked that the matter be trailed to a later calendar, as you were in another department. The matter was continued to the following day, but your office was informed Madi was going to be remanded at that time. You appeared on October 18, 2017, but the Court noted you did not appear to be in an appropriate state of mind to appear on Madi's behalf and a public defender was appointed. The sentencing was again continued to the following day. Madi, then represented by the Public Defenders' Office, received a suspended sentence and a release order was issued. You were not present at the sentencing.

A letter of investigation was mailed to your Supreme Court Rule ("SCR") 79 address on January 2, 2018, via certified mail. The signed receipt was received by the State Bar on January 8, 2018. You failed to respond. On January 25, 2018, the State Bar sent a second letter via certified mail enclosing a copy of the January 2, 2018, advising you that your continued failure to respond would be pursued as a separate violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct under SCR 8.1(b). The letter was signed for on February 1, 2018. Again, you failed to respond.

The State Bar, as part of its investigation of this matter, reviewed court records for other proceedings in which you were retained counsel. On September 6, 2017, there was a Motion to Continue in *The State of Nevada v. Ronnie Withers*. You had been retained to Withers, but you failed to appear in court on that date. As a result, the Court set an Order to Show Cause hearing for September 11, 2017 to determine why you should not be held in contempt for failing to appear. You claimed he had been ill and was subsequently sanctioned.

On January 11, 2018, there was an Unconditional Waiver hearing held in *The State of Nevada v. Daniel Rodriguez*. You failed to appear at the hearing despite being retained as Rodriguez's counsel. The District Attorney noted prior instances in which you failed to appear for your client and requested that another attorney be appointed to represent Rodriguez.

Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3 (Diligence) requires you to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing your clients. Your failure to appear in court falls below this standard.

Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4 (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel) prohibits a lawyer from knowingly disobeying an obligation of the tribunal. Your failure to appear in court violates this Rule.

Mr. Joseph Larussi, Esq.  
December 13, 2018  
Page 3 of 3

Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1 (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters) prohibits a lawyer from knowingly failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from the State Bar. Your repeated failure to respond to the State Bar's investigation into these matters violates this Rule.

Accordingly, you are hereby **REPRIMANDED** for having violated Rules of Professional Conduct 1.3 (Diligence), 3.4 (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel) and 8.1 (Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters).

We trust that this reprimand will serve as a reminder to you of your ethical obligations, and that no such problems will arise in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "O.J. Pancheri", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Oliver J. Pancheri, Esq.,  
Chair, Formal Hearing Panel