State of New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division Third Judicial Department

Decided and Entered: June 15, 2017 D-117-17 In the Matter of ATTORNEYS IN VIOLATION OF JUDICIARY LAW § 468-a. COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, Now Known as ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, Detitioner; HOLLY A. NELSON, Respondent.

(Attorney Registration No. 2040384)

Calendar Date: May 30, 2017

Before: Peters, P.J., Garry, Clark, Mulvey and Aarons, JJ.

Monica A. Duffy, Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department, Albany, for petitioner.

Holly A. Nelson, Plymouth, Minnesota, respondent pro se.

Per Curiam.

Respondent was admitted to practice by this Court in 1986 and lists a business address in Plymouth, Minnesota with the Office of Court Administration. This Court suspended respondent from the practice of law in New York in 2009 due to conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice arising from her failure to comply with the attorney registration requirements of Judiciary Law § 468-a and Rules of the Chief Administrator of the Courts (22 NYCRR) § 118.1 (65 AD3d 1447, 1470 [2009]; <u>see</u> Judiciary Law § 468-a [5]; Rules of Professional Conduct [22 NYCRR 1200.0] rule 8.4 [d]). Respondent moves for her reinstatement (<u>see</u> Uniform Rules for Attorney Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] § 1240.16 [a]; Rules of App Div, 3d Dept [22 NYCRR] § 806.16 [a]), and petitioner advises, by correspondence from its Chief Attorney, that it does not oppose the motion.

Respondent has self-certified as retired from the practice of law since 1992 (see Rules of Chief Admin of Cts [22 NYCRR] § 118.1 [g]), and her application demonstrates that she has otherwise complied with the order of suspension and this Court's Further, upon reading respondent's affidavit and the rules. correspondence in response by petitioner's Chief Attorney, we are satisfied that respondent has the requisite character and fitness for the practice of law, and that it would be in the public's interest to reinstate her to practice in New York (see Uniform Rules for Attorney Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] § 1240.16 [a]). Accordingly, mindful that respondent would need to relinguish her retired status and fulfill certain continuing legal education requirements as a precondition to actually practicing law in New York (see Rules of App Divs [22 NYCRR] §§ 1500.22 [n] [3]; 1500.23 [b]), her motion for reinstatement is granted, and she is reinstated to the practice of law in New York, effective immediately.

Peters, P.J., Garry, Clark, Mulvey and Aarons, JJ., concur.

ORDERED that the motion for reinstatement by respondent is granted; and it is further

D-117-17

ORDERED that respondent is reinstated as an attorney and counselor-at-law in the State of New York, effective immediately.

ENTER:

obut 27 aybugen

Robert D. Mayberger Clerk of the Court