



BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
of the
SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE

LANCE B. BRACY
CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

LAURA L. CHASTAIN
DEPUTY CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

BEVERLY P. SHARPE
CONSUMER COUNSEL/DIRECTOR

1101 KERMIT DRIVE, SUITE 730
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37217
TELEPHONE: (615) 361-7500
(800) 486-5714
FAX: (615) 367-2480
E-MAIL: ethics@tbor.org

WILLIAM W. HUNT, III
CHARLES A. HIGH
SANDY GARRETT
JESSE D. JOSEPH
JAMES A. VICK
THERESA M. COSTONIS
DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

RELEASE OF INFORMATION
RE: JOHN THOMAS MARCH, BPR NO. 17648
CONTACT: THERESA M. COSTONIS
BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

December 20, 2002

LaFOLLETTE LAWYER SUSPENDED BY SUPREME COURT

By order of the Tennessee Supreme Court entered December 17, 2002, John Thomas March, formerly a LaFollette attorney now residing in Illinois, was suspended from the practice of law in this state for a period of two years effective August 31, 2002.

A Petition for Discipline had been filed against Mr. March by the Board of Professional Responsibility. Mr. March entered into a Conditional Plea of Guilty with the Board of Professional Responsibility to resolve the Petition for Discipline in exchange for a stated form of discipline. Mr. March plead guilty to engaging in conduct that involved dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, that was prejudicial to the interests of justice and that adversely reflected on his fitness to practice law, and to depositing funds belonging, in part, to a client into an account which contained funds belonging to Mr. March, in violation of his obligation to preserve the identify of funds belonging to a client.

Mr. March agreed and the Court further ordered that Mr. March pay the costs of the disciplinary proceedings in the amount of \$3,250.88 before he can be reinstated and to comply in all respects with Supreme Court Rule 9 regarding the obligations and responsibilities of suspended attorneys.

Mr. March may be reinstated to the practice of law at the expiration of the two-year period only upon filing a Petition for Reinstatement, as required in Section 19 of Supreme Court Rule 9, and producing clear and convincing evidence that he should be reinstated to the practice of law.