


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINE OF
CHARLES D. HOPPER, BAR NO. 6346

No. 89343

FILED

JUN 06 2025

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

ORDER APPROVING CONDITIONAL ADMISSION AGREEMENT

This is an automatic review of a Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board hearing panel's recommendation that this court approve, under SCR 113(1), a conditional admission agreement in exchange for a stated form of discipline for attorney Charles D. Hopper. Under this agreement, Hopper admitted to violating RPC 1.16(a)(1) (declining or terminating representation), RPC 1.16(d) (declining or terminating representation), RPC 5.5(a)(1) (unauthorized practice of law), RPC 8.1(b) (bar admission and disciplinary matters), and RPC 8.4(d) (misconduct). Hopper agreed to a six-month-and-one-day suspension, retroactive to June 30, 2022, when Hopper was administratively suspended.

Hopper has admitted to the facts and violations alleged in the complaint. The record therefore establishes that Hopper violated the above-listed rules by failing to file required annual disclosures; failing to withdraw from a client's case after being administratively suspended; failing to timely inform the client and the prosecuting attorney of the administrative suspension; failing to appear for a court-ordered status check, which resulted in the district court issuing a bench warrant for the client's arrest; failing to refund the client's retainer upon demand after

termination of representation; and failing to respond to the State Bar's lawful demand for information.

The issue for this court is whether the agreed-upon discipline sufficiently protects the public, the courts, and the legal profession. *See In re Discipline of Arabia*, 137 Nev. 568, 571, 495 P.3d 1103, 1109 (2021) (explaining 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).


Hopper admitted to knowingly violating duties owed to the legal system and the profession. Hopper's misconduct resulted in injury or potential injury to a client. Hopper further admitted that his actions resulted in injury or potential injury to the legal system by engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice and to the profession by failing to withdraw from representation after an administrative suspension, failing to take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect his client's interests; engaging in the unauthorized practice of law; and failing to respond to the State Bar's lawful demands for information.


The baseline sanction before considering aggravating or mitigating factors is suspension. *See Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, Compendium of Professional Responsibility Rules and Standards*, Standard 7.2 (Am. Bar Ass'n 2023) ("Suspension is generally 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 three of the panel's findings of aggravating factors (pattern of misconduct, multiple


offenses, and substantial experience in the practice of law) and three mitigating factors (absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, personal or emotional problems, and remorse). The record does not support the panel's finding that Hopper had prior disciplinary offenses, and thus, we do not consider that aggravating factor. Considering all the factors, we conclude that the agreed-upon discipline sufficiently protects the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

Accordingly, we suspend attorney Charles D. Hopper for six months and one day retroactive to June 30, 2022. Hopper shall pay restitution in the amount of \$1,000 to the client identified in the conditional admission agreement. Hopper shall remit payment of this restitution to the Clients Security Fund under RPC 1.15(f). Hopper shall also pay the actual costs of the disciplinary proceedings, including \$2,500 under SCR 120, within 30 days of the date of this order. The parties shall comply with SCR 115 and SCR 121.1.


It is so ORDERED.


_____, C.J.
Herndon



_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Bell


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Lee

cc: Chair, Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board
Charles D. Hopper
Bar Counsel, State Bar of Nevada
Executive Director, State Bar of Nevada
Admissions Office, U.S. Supreme Court