

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

Decided and Entered: June 13, 2024

PM-119-24

In the Matter of ATTORNEYS
IN VIOLATION OF
JUDICIARY LAW § 468-a.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE
COMMITTEE FOR THE
THIRD JUDICIAL
DEPARTMENT,

DECISION AND ORDER
ON MOTION

Petitioner;

JOHN THOMAS SHABAN,
Respondent.

(Attorney Registration No. 2672046)

Calendar Date: May 6, 2024

Monica A. Duffy, Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department, Albany (Alison M. Coan of counsel), for Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department.

John Thomas Shaban, Redding, Connecticut, respondent pro se.

Respondent moves for his reinstatement to the practice of law following his suspension by September 2022 order of this Court (*Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a*, 208 AD3d 1421, 1441 [3d Dept 2022]; *see* Rules for Atty Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] § 1240.16; Rules of App Div, 3d Dept [22 NYCRR] § 806.16). The Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department (hereinafter AGC) opposes the motion and respondent has been heard in reply.

Upon reading respondent's affidavit sworn to January 5, 2024 and the responsive correspondence by AGC dated February 9, 2024 and May 7, 2024, we find that respondent has substantially met the requirements for reinstatement (*see* Rules for Atty Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] § 1240.16 [a]); *Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a [Sossner]*, 221 AD3d 1131, 1131 [3d Dept 2023]; *Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a [Stone]*, 195 AD3d 1226, 1228 [3d Dept 2021]).¹ Accordingly, we grant respondent's motion for reinstatement.

ORDERED that respondent's motion for reinstatement is granted; and it is further

ORDERED that respondent is reinstated as an attorney and counselor-at-law, effective immediately.

Aarons, J.P., Lynch, Ceresia, McShan and Mackey, JJ., concur.

ENTER:



Robert D. Mayberger
Clerk of the Court

¹ At this time, we decline to weigh in on the substantive issues raised within AGC's opposition papers. However, by the same token, we also decline respondent's request that he be reinstated *nunc pro tunc* to September 1, 2022, the date of this Court's suspension order.