

VIRGINIA:

BEFORE THE THIRD DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR

IN THE MATTERS OF  
BERNICE MARIE STAFFORD TURNER

VS B Docket Nos. 06-032-2194 [Haley]  
06-032-3244 [VSB]  
06-032-4117 [Ward]  
07-032-0520 [Grant]  
07-032-2543 [Jackson]

SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINATION  
(PUBLIC REPRIMAND WITHOUT TERMS)

On February 11, 2010, a hearing in this matter was held before a duly convened Third District Subcommittee consisting of Coral C. Gills, Lay Member; Martin D. Wegbreit, Esq.; and Cliona M. B. Robb, Esq., Vice Chair, presiding.

Pursuant to Part 6, Section IV, Paragraph 13-15.E. of the Rules of the Virginia Supreme Court, the Third District Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar hereby serves upon the Respondent the following Public Reprimand:

1. At all times relevant hereto the Respondent, Bernice Marie Stafford Turner [Turner], has been an attorney licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

VS B Docket No. 06-032-2194 [Haley]:

I. Findings of Facts:

2. Turner was retained to represent Complainant Quinton Haley [Haley] on charges including receiving stolen property, brandishing a firearm and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, which were pending in the Lynchburg General District Court. Turner also pursued bond for Haley.

3. An order was entered on August 30, 2005, in the Lynchburg General District Court substituting Turner for the Public Defender who previously represented Haley.

4. On September 9, 2005, a hearing was held in the Lynchburg Circuit Court on an appeal of bond. Bond was denied. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify that bond was denied upon the finding by the court that Haley was a danger to society.

5. On October 11, 2005, the charge of receiving stolen property was reduced to the misdemeanor of unauthorized use of a vehicle to which Haley pled guilty and was sentenced to twelve months, eleven months suspended with credit for time served. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify this resulted after a number of back and forth negotiations, in which Turner repeatedly visited with Haley in lockup.

6. On November 1, 2005, the charges of brandishing a firearm and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon were set for hearing at 10:00 a.m. in the Lynchburg General District Court. Turner failed to appear until 11:45 a.m. Haley was convicted of the charge of brandishing a firearm and the felony possession of a firearm by a convicted felon was certified to the grand jury. Turner filed an appeal of the conviction for brandishing a firearm. Were this matter to be tried, Turner would testify she appeared at court and advised the clerk that she had a potential conflict with a hearing in the Bankruptcy court at 9:00 a.m. which might cause her to be late; she also visited Haley in lockup and advised him of the same; and Haley made it clear that he did not want a continuance.

7. On November 7, 2005, a grand jury issued an indictment on the charge of felony possession of a firearm by a convicted felon.

8. The next docket call was November 7, 2005, when Turner was expected to appear before Judge Perrow in Circuit Court. Turner failed to appear and Judge Perrow issued a written show cause, and the cases were continued to November 21, 2005 for a bench trial.

9. On November 21, 2005, both the brandishing case and the possession of a firearm case were set for trial in Circuit Court. Turner failed to appear until "after some time," and the cases were continued to the December 2005 term to be reset for trial. When Turner failed to appear timely, Judge Mosby issued a second show cause for Turner. Later that day, Turner appeared before Judge Mosby and told the court that she had been sitting in the wrong courtroom. Judge Mosby then rescinded the show cause. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify she was scheduled to be in front of both Judge Perrow and Judge Mosby of the Lynchburg Circuit Court at the same time; Turner appeared first before Judge Perrow and while there, Judge Mosby issued a show cause for Turner; the cases were continued to the December 2005 term to be reset for trial following Haley's request that he be appointed a public defender to represent him; later that day, Turner appeared before Judge Mosby and advised the court that she had been before Judge Perrow and Judge Mosby then rescinded the show cause.

10. On November 21, 2005, Turner also appeared before Judge Perrow, and the show cause he had initiated earlier was dismissed. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify Judge Perrow, dismissed the show cause he had initiated earlier upon Turner's explanation that her

office had previously contacted the Commonwealth Attorney's office regarding the setting of the cases and had received the forms to be executed by her client waiving a jury trial.

11. The next docket call was December 5, 2005, when Turner was expected to appear before Judge Perrow in Circuit Court. Turner failed to appear. Without objection from Haley, the court appointed the Public Defender to represent Haley, relieved Turner and continued the cases to December 9, 2005, for Haley to sign a waiver, and to January 10, 2006, for a bench trial. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify she did not appear on that date because Judge Mosby had previously informed Turner that he was going to honor Haley's request for appointment of a public defender and substitution of counsel.

12. On December 9, 2005, Turner filed a motion to withdraw.

13. Haley filed a bar complaint which was received by the Virginia State Bar on December 28, 2005.

14. Upon receipt of the bar complaint filed by Haley, the bar sent Turner a letter dated January 11, 2006, demanding a response to the complaint within 21 days. The letter stated, *inter alia*, that pursuant to Rule 8.1(c), Turner had a duty to comply with the bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6. Turner did not respond to the letter as required, and the complaint was referred to the Third District Committee for investigation.<sup>1</sup>

## II. Nature of Alleged Misconduct:

Such conduct by Bernice Marie Stafford Turner constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct:

### RULE 1.3     Diligence

- (a) A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

### RULE 1.16     Declining Or Terminating Representation

- (a) Except as stated in paragraph (c), a lawyer shall not represent a client or, where representation has commenced, shall withdraw from the representation of a client if:
  - (1) the representation will result in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law;

### RULE 8.1     Bar Admission And Disciplinary Matters

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 8.1(c) and Rule 1.6 stated in the Allegations of Facts refer to the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct.

An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer already admitted to the bar, in connection with a bar admission application, any certification required to be filed as a condition of maintaining or renewing a license to practice law, or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

- (c) fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or

VSB Docket No. 06-032-3244 [VSB]:

I. Findings of Facts:

A. Logan:

15. Turner represented Logan in three Chapter 13 bankruptcy cases in the U.S. District Court, Western District of Virginia (Lynchburg). The petition in case number 05-65103 was filed on November 21, 2005. The petition in case number 06-60067 was filed on January 20, 2006. The petition in case number 06-60461 was filed on April 7, 2006.

16. Herbert L. Beskin, Esq. [Beskin] was the trustee in all three cases.

Logan Case Number 06-60067

17. On January 23, 2006, an order was entered by the court indicating the matter was deficient because the petition was filed without a certification that the debtor had received an approved credit counseling briefing as required. The court further ordered, *inter alia*, that upon failure to cure the deficiency within 15 days of the petition filing date or to request a hearing, the case may be dismissed without further notice or hearing.

18. The certificate of credit counseling was due to be filed by February 6, 2006. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify she directed her client to attend the credit counseling class and return to her the certificate; although the class was attended by Turner's client on November 18, 2005, it was not certified until February 24, 2006.

19. On February 24, 2006, Beskin issued an initial trustee's report and objections following meeting of creditors and a notice to dismiss or convert case and show cause. The report and notice included a list of conditions including, *inter alia*, a certificate of credit counseling.

20. The court dismissed the case on February 28, 2006, upon failure to file a certificate of credit counseling.

21. On February 28, 2006, Turner filed a certificate of credit counseling. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify she filed the certificate of credit counseling upon receipt.

22. Subsequently, Beskin filed a trustee's final report and the case was closed.

B. Jennings

23. Turner represented Jennings in two Chapter 13 bankruptcy cases in the U.S. District Court, Western District of Virginia (Lynchburg). The petition in case number 06-60027 was filed on January 12, 2006. The petition in case number 06-60462 was filed on April 7, 2006.

24. Beskin was the trustee in both cases.

Jennings Case Number 06-60027:

25. On January 13, 2006, an order was entered by the court indicating the matter was deficient since the petition was filed without certain required schedules, a statement of financial affairs, a means test calculation form and a credit counseling certification. The court further ordered, *inter alia*, that upon failure to cure the deficiency within 15 days of the petition filing date or to request a hearing, the case may be dismissed without further notice or hearing. Were this case to be tried, Turner would testify she called Jennings and directed her come to Turner's office to sign the certificate, however Jennings was gravely ill and ultimately indicated that she did not wish to take further actions to pursue the bankruptcy, as she was then working with the mortgage company.

26. The schedules, statement of financial affairs, means test calculation form and credit counseling certification were due to be filed by January 27, 2006.

27. On February 8, 2006, Beskin filed an initial trustee's report and objections following meeting of creditors and notice to dismiss or convert case and show cause, with a list of conditions, to be heard on March 9, 2006.

28. On February 23, 2006, the case was dismissed.

29. One or more of the conditions required by the trustee were not met.

II. Nature of Alleged Misconduct:

Such conduct by Bernice Marie Stafford Turner constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct:

RULE 1.1 Competence

A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

RULE 1.3 Diligence

(a) A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

VSB Docket No. 06-032-4117 [Ward]:

I. Findings of Facts:

30. In or about the summer of 2005, Complainant Ivy Ward [Ward] contacted Turner about real estate in her family located in or about Prince Edward County, Virginia. Ward's mother, a widow, had passed away survived by Ward and Ward's siblings, who had decided to sell the property which Ward's mother apparently owned at the time of her death. Ward had been told by a real estate agent that she needed to search the deed in order to sell the property.

31. Ward paid Turner the sum of \$75.00 for an initial consultation. According to Ward, she sought from Turner clarification of certain documents and procedures.

32. On September 23, 2005, Ward met again with Turner and asked that Turner search the deed to the property. Turner quoted a fee of \$300.00 for the representation, which Ward paid to Turner that date by check number 2722. On the check in the memo line were written the words, "Preparing of deed to 202."

33. According to Turner, she was hired to determine whether there were any liens on the property, any liens against the surviving children and change the title from the parent's names to the children's names by what Turner called a "reflective deed."

34. According to Ward, her check was cashed on October 3, 2005.

35. Ward called Turner's office to speak to Turner and left a message for Turner to return the call. No return call was received.

36. Ward went to Turner's office and spoke to a receptionist, informing that person that she had not received a return call from Turner, she had paid Turner \$300.00, her mother's house had been sold and Ward had received nothing from Turner indicating any work had been done. Turner did not call Ward.

37. Ward sent Turner a letter dated March 23, 2006, in which she summarized the situation and asked for a refund of the \$300.00.

38. On May 5, 2006, Turner called Ward indicating she would send a check.

39. On May 23, 2006, Ward sent Turner a second letter in which Ward stated that as the executor of her mother's estate, she could not allow Turner to keep the \$300.00 because she had a fiduciary responsibility for the proper use of the estate's funds.

40. On June 16, 2006, Ward filed her bar complaint.

41. Turner responded to the bar complaint by letter dated July 12, 2006, and enclosed a copy of a money order of the same date by which Turner stated she refunded the \$300.00 to Ward.

42. In Turner's response letter to the bar complaint, she indicated, *inter alia*, she had discussed with Ward the preparation of a "reflective deed" since Ward had requested that "...a deed be drafted, listing the heirs, her and her siblings as the owners of the said property." According to Turner, she drafted a deed and sent it to Ward. Turner did not include with her response letter a copy of the deed.

43. The bar served Turner with a subpoena *duces tecum* which sought, *inter alia*, Turner's files and trust account records relating to her representation of Ivy R. Ward, regarding Ivy Rawlins. In response, Turner submitted to the bar a cover letter with a document entitled, "client ledger sheet"; a copy of a SunTrust personal money order in the amount of \$300.00 dated July 12, 2006, payable to Ms. Ivy Rawlins Ward, with the word "refund" written on the check; and a copy of Ward's check number 2722. Were this matter to be tried, Turner would testify that at the time Turner was unable to locate a copy of other documents including the draft of the Deed that she had prepared, or the June 23, 2005 fax from Shirley Reed, sister of Ivy Rawlins and alternate executrix, who sent to Turner a draft copy of a sales agreement related to the property for the family; in telephone conversations with Reed and Rawlins, Turner explained the terms "per stirpes" and other issues of concern; that she failed to clearly establish the attorney-client relationship with members of the family.

44. The client ledger sheet was in the name of Ivy Rawlins. At the top of the sheet were several blanks. The "type of case" blank contained the words, "prepare deed." The "hourly rate" blank was empty. The "flat fee" blank was filled in with "300.00." There were four dated entries in the ledger sheet as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Debits</u>	<u>Balance</u>
9/23	Paid	\$300.00		
9/26	File work			
10/1	Deed prepar			
10/3	Fee Earned		\$300.00	
	<Refunded>			
	\$300.00			

45. During the bar investigation of the complaint, Investigator Robert Heinzman [Heinzman] interviewed Turner in the presence of her attorney twice. During the first interview, Turner stated she had already earned the \$300.00 when it was paid to her on September 23, 2005, and therefore

did not deposit the funds in her trust account. Turner was asked how she had earned the funds upon payment since her client ledger sheet indicated work done after the payment, and the fee having been earned on October 3. Turner told Heinzman she charged \$200.00 per hour for her services, had worked one-half hour on June 21, 2005, and two hours on June 23, 2005, thus earning the fee.

46. In the first bar interview, Turner explained to Heinzman that a reflective deed reflects the name of the owners of the property and can be prepared when the deed is in the name of a deceased, there has been a name change, or there has been an addition to the deed.

47. Ward did not receive the draft deed. According to Ward, prior to seeing Turner's response letter to the bar, Turner had not mentioned that she had sent anything to Ward and Ward had not received any work product from Turner.

48. Turner never provided the bar with a copy of a deed either with her response to the bar complaint or in her production pursuant to the subpoena *duces tecum*.

49. Based upon her client ledger sheet entries, Turner charged Ward a "flat fee" and not an hourly rate. Turner had not earned the \$300.00 fee upon payment, and the funds should have been deposited into a trust account.

## II. Nature of Alleged Misconduct:

Such conduct by Bernice Marie Stafford Turner constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct:

### RULE 1.1 Competence

A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

### RULE 1.4 Communication

(a) A lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.

### RULE 1.15 Safekeeping Property

(a) All funds received or held by a lawyer or law firm on behalf of a client, other than reimbursement of advances for costs and expenses, shall be deposited in one or more identifiable escrow accounts maintained at a financial institution in the state in which the law office is situated and no funds belonging to the lawyer or law firm shall be deposited therein except as follows:

- (1) funds reasonably sufficient to pay service or other charges or fees imposed by the financial institution may be deposited therein; or
- (2) funds belonging in part to a client and in part presently or potentially to the lawyer or law firm must be deposited therein, and the portion belonging to the lawyer or law firm must be withdrawn promptly after it is due unless the right of the lawyer or law firm to receive it is disputed by the client, in which event the disputed portion shall not be withdrawn until the dispute is finally resolved.

VSB Docket No. 07-032-0520 [Grant]:

I. Findings of Facts:

50. On November 30, 2004, a vehicle owned by Grant, Complainant [Grant], now deceased, was seized by the Cumberland County Sheriff's Office, because the truck was involved in or represented proceeds from violation of certain Virginia drug laws.

51. On January 27, 2005, an information was filed in the Cumberland County Circuit Court by Patricia Scales, Commonwealth's Attorney [Scales] seeking condemnation and forfeiture of the vehicle and issuance of a show cause to those concerned or interested in the truck.

52. On January 27, 2005, the information and notice of show cause were personally served on Grant.

53. The notice stated the property would be subject to forfeiture unless thirty days after service of the notice, an answer under oath was filed setting forth the basis for defending against the forfeiture. The notice also was for a proceeding on March 7, 2005 for all concerned persons to appear and show cause why the truck should not be forfeited.

54. On February 25, 2005, Grant filed, *pro se*, a timely sworn letter in answer to the notice.

55. The forfeiture case was heard on May 31, 2005, by the Cumberland County Circuit Court. Grant appeared, *pro se*. The court issued its resulting order of forfeiture on June 1, 2005.

56. On June 17, 2005, Turner filed on behalf of Grant a Motion to Rehear and/or Notice of Appeal and Motion to Stay Execution of Order. The last paragraph of the pleading ending with the following:

WHEREFORE we ask this Court to rehear the case or in the alternative Notice of Appeal [sic] and Defendant prays that the Court would stay the forfeiture Order entered June 1, 2005, **considering the fact the twenty-one day period might expire before Defendant can be heard.** [Emphasis added].

57. The twenty-one day time period from the June 1, 2005, entry of the order of forfeiture ran on June 22, 2005. Pursuant to Rule of Court 1:1, the order of forfeiture was thereafter final. If this matter were to be tried, Turner would testify that her office received a telephone call from the clerk of the Circuit Court indicating that her motion had been granted and the matter would be set down for hearing, however, unknown to Turner, the court did not enter an order staying the execution of the order.

58. On June 25, 2005, Turner wrote a letter to Grant, *inter alia*, asking Grant to schedule an appointment and bring any documentation she had regarding the vehicle.

59. On July 5, 2005, Turner wrote a letter to Scales enclosing an order for endorsement by Scales and insertion of an agreed trial date. The order would have granted the motion to rehear.

60. On July 25, 2005, Turner wrote a letter to Grant indicating Turner would have to withdraw because Grant had not kept her appointments nor paid fees. Turner asked Grant to schedule an appointment to discuss the case and pay the balance of her fee.

61. On September 30, 2005, the Clerk of Court sent a memorandum to Scales and Turner indicating Judge Lemmond had asked that they send written available dates, starting in October, to the Clerk immediately so that she could forward them to the judge to schedule a hearing date as soon as possible.

62. By letter dated October 5, 2005, Turner wrote to the Clerk indicating, "it was my understanding that Judge Lemmond had granted the Motion to Rehear and that we need to set a date to have the actual hearing. Please advise." A copy of the letter was not included in the copy of the file which the bar received from the Clerk of Court.

63. By letter dated January 25, 2006, Scales wrote to the Clerk of Court asking that a hearing be scheduled as expeditiously as possible on whether the court will allow a rehearing. By copy of the letter, Scales also requested Turner's available dates. Scales noted that Judge Lemmond would sit in Cumberland County on three stated dates, and Scales was available on all three dates. One of the stated dates was April 7, 2006.

64. By letter to Turner of January 26, 2006, the Clerk of Court asked Turner which of the three stated dates Turner was available for a hearing before Judge Lemmond.

65. In response, Turner wrote to the Clerk of Court on February 9, 2006, indicating she was available on April 6, 2006.

66. By letter to Turner dated February 22, 2006, the Clerk of Court indicated she had received Turner's letter dated February 9, 2006, on February 21, 2006. The Clerk noted Turner did not provide her availability for one of the previously stated three dates for a hearing on the motion to rehear, and asked her to do so.

67. By letter dated February 28, 2006, to the Clerk of Court, Turner stated she was available on April 7, 2006, which was one of the previously stated dates. Turner also indicated she would be in another county that date in the morning and asked that the hearing be set in the evening.

68. By letter dated March 2, 2006, to Turner, copied to Judge Lemmond and the Clerk of Court, Scales sent Turner a notice of a hearing to be held on April 7, 2006 at 10:30 a.m., on the defendant's motion for a rehearing of the asset forfeiture case.

69. The notice of hearing was personally served on both Grant and Turner.

70. On July 10, 2006, Turner's Memorandum and in the Alternative Notice of Appeal was filed in the Circuit Court [second pleading]. According to the Certificate of Service, Turner mailed the pleading on July 2, 2006, which was a Sunday.

71. In the second pleading Turner stated, *inter alia*, that the Clerk of Court had notified her that the motion to rehear had been granted, but no order had been entered. A copy of the second pleading was not included in Turner's file materials submitted to the Virginia State Bar pursuant to a subpoena *duces tecum*.

72. The file of the Clerk of Court of the forfeiture case contains a letter dated July 14, 2006, from the Clerk of Court to Judge Shelton. In the letter, the Clerk stated she enclosed a copy of the second pleading. She stated on June 21, 2006, Judge Shelton had given Turner 15 days to submit case law that would allow the court to grant her motion to rehear since the 21 day period had run. The Clerk also stated that Turner had mailed the pleading on July 7<sup>th</sup> and the clerk's office did not receive it until July 10<sup>th</sup>.

73. On August 14, 2006, the court entered an order denying the motion to rehear.

## II. Nature of Alleged Misconduct:

Such conduct by Bernice Marie Stafford Turner constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct:

### RULE 1.1 Competence

A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

### RULE 1.3 Diligence

- (a) A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

I. Findings of Facts:

74. The Virginia Supreme Court refused a petition for appeal of a criminal conviction of Complainant Calvin Jackson [Jackson] on November 29, 2005. Jackson was represented by another attorney both at trial and on appeal in the case.

75. Thereafter, Jackson began to correspond with Turner requesting that she review his case to determine whether any further action might be taken. Thereafter, on April 27, 2006, Turner was paid \$500.00 in cash by Jackson's mother, Rosa Jackson.

76. Turner required the payment before initially visiting Jackson at Greensville Correctional Center to discuss the case.

77. Turner gave Mrs. Jackson a handwritten receipt for the \$500.00 payment.

78. Turner did not visit Jackson until June 14, 2006.

79. During the bar investigation of this matter, Turner was interviewed by Investigator Robert Heinzman, Jr. in the presence of her attorney. In the interview, Turner indicated the \$500.00 payment was not spent until she had visited Jackson.

80. Turner failed to deposit the \$500.00 payment of unearned fees to a trust account.

81. Upon receipt of the bar complaint filed by Jackson, the bar sent Turner a letter dated February 27, 2007, demanding a response to the complaint within 21 days. The letter stated, *inter alia*, that pursuant to Rule 8.1(c), Turner had a duty to comply with the bar's lawful demands for information not protected from disclosure by Rule 1.6. Turner did not respond to the letter as required, and the complaint was referred to the Third District Committee for investigation.

II. Nature of Alleged Misconduct:

Such conduct by Bernice Marie Stafford Turner constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Virginia Rules of Professional Conduct:

RULE 1.15 Safekeeping Property

- (a) All funds received or held by a lawyer or law firm on behalf of a client, other than reimbursement of advances for costs and expenses, shall be deposited in one or more identifiable escrow accounts maintained at a financial institution in the state in which the law office is situated and no funds belonging to the lawyer or law firm shall be deposited therein except as follows:

- (1) funds reasonably sufficient to pay service or other charges or fees imposed by the financial institution may be deposited therein; or
- (2) funds belonging in part to a client and in part presently or potentially to the lawyer or law firm must be deposited therein, and the portion belonging to the lawyer or law firm must be withdrawn promptly after it is due unless the right of the lawyer or law firm to receive it is disputed by the client, in which event the disputed portion shall not be withdrawn until the dispute is finally resolved.

RULE 8.1 Bar Admission And Disciplinary Matters

An applicant for admission to the bar, or a lawyer already admitted to the bar, in connection with a bar admission application, any certification required to be filed as a condition of maintaining or renewing a license to practice law, or in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not:

- (c) fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority, except that this Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6; or

III. PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Accordingly, it is the decision of the subcommittee to impose a Public Reprimand and the Respondent is hereby so reprimanded.

Pursuant to Paragraph 13-9.E. the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall assess costs.

THIRD DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR

By Cliona M. B. Robb  
Cliona M. B. Robb  
Vice Chair

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 15, 2010, I caused to be mailed by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, a true and correct copy of the Subcommittee Determination (Public

Reprimand Without Terms) to Bernice Marie Stafford Turner, Esquire, Respondent, at, PO Box 25034, Richmond, VA 23260, her last address of record with the Virginia State Bar, and by regular mail to Thomas Hunt Roberts, Esq., Respondent's Counsel, at 105 South First Street, Richmond, VA 23219-3718.



---