

IN RE APPLICATION OF SABINO.

[Cite as *In re Application of Sabino* (1998), ___ Ohio St.3d ____.]

Attorneys at law — Application to register as candidate for admission to the practice of law — Application denied when applicant fails to cooperate with Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness of the Supreme Court, maintain a current address with the board, and establish good character by clear and convincing evidence, and abandons his application to take the bar examination and his appeal of the disapproval of his application — Applicant precluded from reapplying for admission to the bar of Ohio.

(No. 97-1927 — Submitted November 4, 1997 — Decided February 18, 1998.)

ON REPORT by the Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness of the
Supreme Court, No. 147.

On October 25, 1995, William Sabino (“applicant”) applied to take the February 1996 bar examination. His application was referred to the Columbus Bar Association for a character and fitness evaluation. Two members of the Admissions Committee of the bar association (“committee”) interviewed applicant and recommended that his application be disapproved. Two other committee members then interviewed him and also recommended disapproval. The entire committee then voted for disapproval, and the applicant appealed.

When a panel of the Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness of the Supreme Court (“board”) attempted to notify appellant at his last known telephone number in Columbus, Ohio, of the hearing scheduled on his appeal, it was unable to contact applicant. At the bar association’s request, the panel continued its hearing on the appeal and secured an order requiring applicant to

submit to a psychological examination. Applicant failed to appear for the examination.

The chairperson of the panel then contacted applicant by telephone in New Jersey, where applicant had resided at the time of his original application. Applicant informed the chairperson that he did not intend to continue his efforts to be admitted to the Ohio bar. Subsequent attempts to contact applicant by certified mail have been returned “unclaimed,” and subsequent notices sent to applicant by regular mail have not been returned.

The panel recommended disapproval of applicant’s request to take the Ohio Bar Examination for (1) failure to cooperate, (2) failure to maintain a current address with the board, (3) failure to establish good character by clear and convincing evidence, (4) abandonment of his application to take the bar examination, and (5) abandonment of his appeal. The board adopted the findings and conclusions of the panel, recommended that he not be approved to take the bar examination, and further recommended that he not be permitted to reapply for admission to the bar of Ohio. On September 22, 1997, we issued an order to applicant to show cause why we should not adopt the findings and recommendation of the board. Applicant has not responded to that order.

Carl B. Fry and Barry A. Waller, for Columbus Bar Association.

Per Curiam. We adopt the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the board. Applicant’s request to take the Ohio bar examination is denied, and he is not permitted to reapply for admission to the bar of Ohio.

Judgment accordingly.

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER, COOK and
LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., concur.