

CONCLUSION OF STATEMENT OF FACTS

The sum and totality of the many acts of unethical misconduct more specifically covered in the Statement of Facts Supporting Grievance Violations clearly reflects on Fleisher's total lack of fitness to practice law.

RULE 8.4(H) ENGAGE IN ANY OTHER CONDUCT THAT ADVERSELY REFLECTS ON A LAWYER'S FITNESS TO PRACTICE LAW.

Fleisher entered the Hamilton County judicial system from his office in Dayton, Butler, Ohio under the pretense of being thoroughly able to represent Schwartz in all areas of his legal concerns. He was paid in advance.

For Fleisher to properly practice law in Cincinnati, he was required to disregard the distance he had to travel from Dayton to the Cincinnati area and to overcome any personal inconveniences. He was required to obtain expert assistance from other, perhaps local, counsel to make up for his lack of specialized expertise. He must be governed by the same ethical responsibilities as a local and experienced Cincinnati attorney to provide professionally diligent legal services. Any shortcomings or ethical violations are subject to the same strict scrutiny and review as a locally based attorney.

This multiple account of grievances is not intended to revisit any of the criminal or civil claims against Schwartz. This is not intended to claim unfairness by any tribunal or reconsider any matter that has already been determined. The purpose of this presentation is to demonstrate the unethical violations by James Fleisher in sufficient detail and consequences to permit review of the importance of Fleisher's violations of the Code of Professional Responsibility and Disciplinary Rules.

The in-depth and detailed claims of ethical violations by Fleisher throughout the cases of Schwartz are unfortunately voluminous and complex. The effects were devastating. Those characteristics should justify why this matter should go forward to the absolute disbarment of James Fleisher and a full refund.