IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF JONATHAN R. PATTERSON, BAR NO. 9644.

No. 56939

PLED

NOV 1 5 2010 ACIN K. LINDEMAN UPREME COURT ORDER OF TEMPORARY SUSPENSI

Bar counsel for the State Bar of Nevada filed an SCR 111 petition asking this court to refer attorney Jonathan R. Patterson for formal disciplinary proceedings and/or to temporarily suspend Patterson from the practice of law. On October 22, 2010, we issued an order referring Patterson to the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board for commencement of formal disciplinary proceedings and directing Patterson to show cause why he should not be temporarily suspended from the practice of law pending resolution of the formal disciplinary proceedings against him. Patterson filed a timely response to our order.

Patterson first contends that he has not sustained a conviction pursuant to SCR 111. We disagree. For purposes of the rule, "a 'conviction' shall include a plea of guilty." SCR 111(1). Patterson admits that, even if he complies fully with the conditions of his stayed adjudication, he will still be guilty of a crime. Accordingly, he has sustained a "conviction" for purposes of SCR 111(1).

Patterson next contends that he has demonstrated good cause why he should not be temporarily suspended. We disagree. Receiving treatment, lack of client contact, and financial obligations are insufficient

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA to overcome the fact that the crime to which he pleaded guilty reflects adversely on his fitness to practice law.

Accordingly, pursuant to SCR 111(9), we hereby temporarily suspend attorney Jonathan R. Patterson from the practice of law in Nevada.

It is so ORDERED.¹

J. Saitta J. Gibbons

cc: Rob W. Bare, Bar Counsel
Jeffrey Albregts, Esq., Chair, Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board
Kimberly K. Farmer, Executive Director
Jonathan R. Patterson, Esq.
Robert M. Draskovich, Jr., Esq.
Perry Thompson, Admissions Office, United States Supreme Court

¹This order constitutes our final disposition of this matter. Any further proceedings concerning Patterson shall be docketed as a new matter.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

No. 56939

CHERRY, J., dissenting:

I would not issue an order temporarily suspending Jonathan R. Patterson from the practice of law in the State of Nevada.

I base my dissent on the following factors: Patterson's argument that he has good cause why he should not be temporarily suspended during the pendency of his disciplinary proceedings has merit. Specifically, Patterson is under treatment for sex addiction, including psychological therapy, participation in Sex Addicts Anonymous for over one year where he now sponsors two other addicts, attendance at a religious-based pornography addiction group, regular church attendance, and voluntary sex offender treatment. Further his present employment situation—answering calls over the phone at a prepaid legal services organization—does not require him to physically interact with clients, and likewise a suspension would be a financial hardship because Patterson's court-ordered child and spousal support of \$2,200 per month requires that he continue to work

For the above reasons, I would not temporarily suspend Jonathan R. Patterson

J. Cherry

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA