


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF
REINSTATEMENT OF JASON L.
LOPEZ, BAR NO. 7796

No. 86236

FILED

JUN 09 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING REINSTATEMENT

This is an automatic review of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's recommendation to deny suspended attorney Jason L. Lopez's petition for reinstatement.

In 2018, we suspended Lopez for two years, with all but the first six months and one day stayed, *In re Discipline of Lopez*, No. 73894, 2018 WL 1129809 (Nev. Feb. 23, 2018) (Order Approving Conditional Guilty Plea), and later imposed the remainder of the suspension following his failure to comply with the conditions of the stayed suspension, *see In re Discipline of Lopez*, No. 78511, 2019 WL 5109623 (Nev. Oct. 11, 2019) (Order of Suspension). We also previously denied Lopez's first petition for reinstatement. *In re Reinstatement of Lopez*, No. 82172, 2021 WL 2328476 (Nev. June 7, 2021) (Order Denying Reinstatement). Based on our de novo review, we agree with the hearing panel that Lopez has not met his burden in seeking reinstatement. *See* SCR 116(2); *Application of Wright*, 75 Nev. 111, 112-13, 335 P.2d 609, 610 (1959) (reviewing a petition for reinstatement de novo).

Like the hearing panel, we conclude that Lopez failed to meet his burden to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he complied with the terms of his prior disciplinary order as he failed to pay the ordered costs. SCR 116(2)(a). Lopez also did not show that he “has abstained from the use of alcohol” for the past year as he was convicted of DUI in February 2021, and one of his witnesses at the reinstatement hearing testified that Lopez continued to drink. SCR 116(2)(c) (generally requiring an attorney seeking reinstatement to prove that they have “abstained from the use of [drugs or] alcohol” for a year if drugs or alcohol were a factor in the misconduct).

We also conclude that Lopez did not demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he recognizes the wrongfulness and seriousness of his misconduct, SCR 116(2)(d), or that he “has the requisite honesty and integrity to practice law,” SCR 116(2)(f). His testimony at the reinstatement hearing minimized certain actions that led to his suspension and evinced a continued disregard of the law. He also failed to demonstrate that he did not commit any other professional misconduct during his period of suspension as he failed to report his DUI conviction to the State Bar as required by SCR 111(2). SCR 116(2)(e). And Lopez does not assert that he has “present[ed] good and sufficient reason why [he] should nevertheless be reinstated.” SCR 116(2).

We therefore approve the panel’s recommendation and deny Lopez’s petition for reinstatement.¹ Lopez shall pay the costs of the


¹We decline to adopt the hearing panel’s recommendation to impose additional requirements before Lopez can reapply for reinstatement. See SCR 116(6) (providing that an attorney must wait one year after an adverse decision before filing a successive petition for reinstatement).

reinstatement proceeding, including \$2,500 under SCR 120, within 30 days from the date of this order, if he has not done so already.

It is so ORDERED.



Stiglich, C.J.



Cadish, J.


Pickering, J.


Herndon, J.


Lee, J.


Parraguirre, J.


Bell, J.

cc: Chair, Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board
Jason L. Lopez
Bar Counsel, State Bar of Nevada
Executive Director, State Bar of Nevada