

**People v. Laura Davies. 14PDJ029. September 3, 2014.**

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' conditional admission of misconduct and suspended Laura Davies (Attorney Registration Number 23679) for sixty days, with the requirement that Davies petition for reinstatement under C.R.C.P. 251.29(c). As part of any reinstatement hearing, Davies will bear the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that she has been rehabilitated, has complied with disciplinary orders and rules, and is fit to practice law. Davies's suspension took effect September 3, 2014.

In January 2013, Davies, who was under the influence of alcohol, was involved in an automobile accident. Davies refused any testing of her blood, breath, saliva, or urine. She was arrested and charged. After her arrest, Davies checked into a thirty-day inpatient treatment program. Intake notes from the program indicate that Davies had not achieved any lengthy period of sobriety since 2008, even though she had earlier told investigators for the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel that she was sober from 2008 until late 2012.

In June 2013, Davies pleaded guilty to one charge of driving while ability impaired. This was Davies's third DUI-related conviction; she also had been convicted of DUI in 1995 and 2008. Davies was sentenced to 180 days' work release; mental health evaluation and treatment; a complete victim impact panel; no alcohol or drugs; substance abuse monitoring; payment of fees and costs; and education and therapy. Davies was permitted to complete her work release through Boulder Community Treatment Center. In December 2013, however, Davies refused to participate in a scheduled independent medical examination, and her work release was revoked when she violated the terms and conditions of her residency at the Center by failing to take certain prescribed medicines. She was jailed, only to be released in mid-March 2014.

Through this misconduct, Davies violated Colo. RPC 8.4(b) (a lawyer shall not commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects).