NO. 22927

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAI'I

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, Petitioner

vs.

PETER E. ROBERTS, Respondent

(ODC 00-033-6379, 00-034-6380, 00-035-6381, 03-339[illegible]7939)

ORDER OF SUSPENSION

(By: Acoba, Acting C.J., Duffy, J., First Circuit Judges Waldorf, Chang, and Ayabe, in Place of Moon, C.J., Levinson, J., and Nakayama, J., Respectively, Recused)

Upon consideration of the Disciplinary Board's Report and Recommendation for the Suspension of Peter E. Roberts From the Practice of Law for a Period of One Year and One Day, the exhibits thereto, the record, and Respondent Roberts' lack of objection thereto, it appears Respondent Roberts failed to provide competent representation, failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his clients, failed to keep clients reasonably informed about the status of matters and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information, failed to explain matters to the extent reasonably necessary to permit clients to make informed decisions regarding the representation; failed to take step to the extent practicable to protect clients' interests upon termination of representation, failed to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation, knowingly disobeyed obligations under the rules of a tribunal, failed to respond to

Disciplinary Counsel's lawful demands for information, and failed to cooperate during the course of the ethics investigations in violation of Rules 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a), 1.4(b), 1.16(d), 3.2, 3.4(e), 8.1(b), 8.4(a), and 8.4(d) of the Hawai'i Rules of Professional Conduct. It further appears that there were multiple acts of unethical behavior, a pattern of misconduct, bad faith obstruction on the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency, and vulnerable clients. Respondent Roberts also refuses to acknowledge the wrongful nature of his conduct despite his substantial experience in the practice of law. Finally, Respondent Roberts has prior discipline involving similar professional misconduct (a five year suspension in 1999 and informal admonitions in 1994 and 1995). Finally, it appears from our record that Respondent Roberts was suspended effective January 12, 2000 and has not been reinstated. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Peter E. Roberts is immediately suspended from the practice of law in this jurisdiction for one year and one day.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in addition to any other requirements for reinstatement imposed by our Rules, Respondent Roberts shall pay for all costs relating to this proceeding, as recommended by the Board.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that Respondent Roberts shall, within ten (10) days after the date of this order, file with this court an affidavit in full compliance with RSCH 2.16(d).

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, June 28, 2006.