

ORIGINAL

Louisiana Attorney Disciplinary Board	
FILED by: <i>Donna P. Burgeon</i>	
<u>Docket#</u>	<u>Filed-On</u>
15-DB-008	11/6/2015

LOUISIANA ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD

IN RE: GREGORY PAUL HARDY

DOCKET NO.: 15-DB-008

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE

The Application for Reinstatement filed by GREGORY PAUL HARDY was heard by Hearing Committee 20 on September 24, 2015 by at Acadian Legal Services, 1020 Surrey Street, Lafayette, Louisiana.

The Hearing Committee consisted of Burton E. Cestia, Jr., Panel Chair; Ian Alexander Macdonald, Lawyer Member; and Carolyn R. Bruder, Public Member.

Present were Charles B. Plattsmier on behalf of Office of Disciplinary Counsel and Julie Brown White and Leslie J. Schiff on behalf of Gregory Paul Hardy.

Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) provides the criteria for reinstatement. The party requesting reinstatement bears the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that he or she is entitled to reinstatement. Rule XIX Sec. 18(D)

Without opposition, the requirements for Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) were introduced as exhibits at the hearing and shown by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Hardy has complied with requirements seven thru eleven.

A number of individuals testified on behalf of Mr. Hardy with regard to criteria one thru six. They included his father, Mr. Paul Hardy; his physician, Dr. Michael Berard; and a number of other gentlemen. Mr. Gregory Paul Hardy testified at length on his own

behalf. Mr. Hardy did not attempt to be reinstated immediately after the term of his suspension had expired. It should be noted that testimony and exhibits filed in the record show that Mr. Hardy made a valiant effort to make positive changes to restore his life and love, protect and care for his child.

Exhibits filed in the record and testimony show by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Hardy complied fully with prior disciplinary orders. Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) criteria one.

Testimony by Mr. Hardy and his father showed by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Hardy did not engage nor attempt to engage in the unauthorized practice of law during his suspension. Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) criteria two.

Testimony by Dr. Michael Berard showed by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Hardy is physically and mentally competent to practice law. Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) criteria three.


By clear and convincing testimony, Mr. Hardy accepted full responsibility for his prior wrongful actions and realized the seriousness of his wrongful actions. Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) criteria four.

The overall record of the hearing shows clearly and convincingly that Mr. Hardy has not engaged in any other professional misconduct during his suspension and that he possesses the requisite honesty and integrity to practice law. Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E) criteria five and six.

Panel chair and committee members were impressed with Mr. Hardy's humbleness and sincerity and is of the opinion that he has borne the burden of proof and shown by clear and convincing evidence that he has fulfilled all of the criteria of Supreme Court Rule XIX Sec. 24(E).

Hearing Committee 20 recommends that Mr. Gregory Paul Hardy be reinstated to the practice of law.

November 2, 2015.


BURTON E. CESTIA, JR. PANEL CHAIR