

ENTRY ORDER

2024 VT 22

SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 24-AP-070

MARCH TERM, 2024

In re Eva P. Vekos, Esq.	}	Original Jurisdiction
(Office of Disciplinary Counsel)	}	
	}	Professional Responsibility Board
	}	
	}	

In the above-entitled cause, the Clerk will enter:

¶ 1. Respondent was placed on interim suspension status on March 27, 2024, based on her failure to cooperate with Disciplinary Counsel “in connection with a disciplinary matter.” V.R.Pr.C. 8.1(b). See generally In re Vekos, 2024 VT 18, __ Vt. __, __ A.3d __ (mem.). The Court found that respondent “knowingly fail[ed] to respond to a lawful demand for information from . . . [a] disciplinary authority” in violation of Rule 8.1(b), and that, due to her noncooperation, she “presently pose[d] a substantial threat of serious harm to the public.” A.O. 9, Rule 22(A); see Vekos, 2024 VT 18, ¶¶ 11-15.

¶ 2. Respondent now moves for dissolution of the interim-suspension order under Administrative Order 9, Rule 22(D). She asserts that she has cooperated with Disciplinary Counsel’s requests for information and no longer presents a risk of harm to the public. Disciplinary Counsel agrees that respondent has replied to his prior inquiries about the reasons, nature, and causes of her now-concluded medical leave. Consequently, Disciplinary Counsel does not oppose respondent’s request to dissolve the interim suspension.

¶ 3. We grant the respondent’s motion given her recent cooperation with Disciplinary Counsel. As nothing remains pending in this Court, this matter is closed.

The motion for dissolution of respondent’s interim-suspension order is granted.

BY THE COURT:

Paul L. Reiber, Chief Justice

Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice

Karen R. Carroll, Associate Justice

William D. Cohen, Associate Justice

Nancy J. Waples, Associate Justice