

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINE OF  
MARK ROBERT STARR, BAR NO.  
14765.

No. 89143

**FILED**

DEC 11 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER APPROVING CONDITIONAL GUILTY PLEA AGREEMENT*

This is an automatic review of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's recommendation that this court approve, pursuant to SCR 113, a conditional guilty plea agreement in exchange for a stated form of discipline for attorney Mark Robert Starr. Under the agreement, Starr admitted to two violations of RPC 8.4(c) (misconduct). Starr has agreed to a 6-month actual suspension, followed by a 24-month probationary period.

Starr has admitted to the facts and violations as part of the guilty plea agreement. The record therefore establishes that while employed by his previous law firm, Starr failed to keep the firm and a corporate client apprised of Starr's progress in obtaining state licensing for the client to become a sports betting vendor or marketing affiliate. Starr further lied about gaming license applications and approvals in different states and provided the firm and the client with fictitious gaming license documents purportedly granting approval from governmental authorities in various jurisdictions.

Because Starr has admitted to the facts and violations as set forth above, the issue for this court is whether the agreed-upon discipline

sufficiently protects “the public, the courts, and the legal profession.” *In re Discipline of Arabia*, 137 Nev. 568, 571, 495 P.3d 1103, 1109 (2021) (stating the purpose of attorney discipline). In determining the appropriate discipline, we weigh four factors: “the duty violated, the lawyer’s mental state, the potential or actual injury caused by the lawyer’s misconduct, and the existence of aggravating or mitigating factors.” *In re Discipline of Lerner*, 124 Nev. 1232, 1246, 197 P.3d 1067, 1077 (2008).

Starr admitted to knowingly violating RPC 8.4(c) (misconduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation) twice. He admitted that the misconduct resulted in injury or potential injury to the client and Starr’s former law firm. The baseline sanction for Starr’s misconduct, before considering the aggravating or mitigating circumstances, is suspension. See Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, *Compendium of Professional Responsibility Rules and Standards*, Standard 4.62 (Am. Bar Ass’n 2023) (providing that suspension is appropriate “when a lawyer knowingly deceives a client, and causes injury or potential injury to the client”); Standard 7.2 (providing that suspension is appropriate when a lawyer “knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system”).

The record supports two aggravating circumstances (dishonest or selfish motive and pattern of misconduct) and nine mitigating circumstances (absence of a prior disciplinary record, personal or emotional problems, timely good faith effort to rectify misconduct consequences, full and free disclosure to disciplinary authority, inexperience in the practice of law, character or reputation, mental disability, interim rehabilitation, and remorse). SCR 102.5(3)-(4) (listing aggravating and mitigating

