



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
JUDICIAL BRANCH

STATEWIDE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Michael P. Bowler, *Statewide Bar Counsel*

287 Main Street
Second Floor – Suite Two
East Hartford, CT 06118-1885
(860) 568-5157 Fax (860) 568-4953
Judicial Branch Website: www.jud.ct.gov

Attorney Patricia King
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
100 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Attorney Ralph C. Crozier
7 Wakeley Street
Seymour, CT 06483

RE: Grievance Complaint #07-0140, Arroyo v. Crozier

Dear Assistant Disciplinary Counsel and Respondent:


Pursuant to Practice Book §2-82(g), the undersigned, duly-appointed reviewing committee of the Statewide Grievance Committee, have reviewed the *Agreement to Order of Presentment* (hereinafter "*Agreement*"), filed on May 2, 2007, and submitted for approval in the above-referenced matter. After careful consideration of the *Agreement*, the undersigned hereby APPROVE the *Agreement*, a copy of which is attached hereto. Accordingly, the Respondent is hereby ordered presented to the Superior Court upon the terms set forth in the *Agreement* and said presentment is to be consolidated with the matter presently pending before the court.

So ordered.

(8)
(asc)

DECISION DATE: 06/11/07

Grievance Complaint #07-0140
Decision
Page 2




Attorney Howard M. Gould

Grievance Complaint #07-0140
Decision
Page 3



Attorney Hugh Cuthbertson

Grievance Complaint #07-0140
Decision
Page 4


Mr. Peter Jenkins

STATEWIDE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

GRIEVANCE NO. 07- 0140

RENE ARROYO
Complainant

Vs.

RALPH CROZIER
Respondent

AGREEMENT TO ORDER OF PRESENTMENT


Pursuant to Practice Book § 2-82(g), the undersigned Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel stipulate and agree as follows:

1. This matter was instituted by grievance complaint filed by the Complainant Statewide Grievance Committee on February 6, 2007.
2. On April 20, 2007, the local Grievance Panel for the Ansonia Milford Judicial District found probable cause that the Respondent had violated Rule 1.7, Conflict of Interest, Rule 1.16 Improper Termination, and Rule 8.4(4) Conduct prejudicial to the administration of Justice, of the Rules of Professional Conduct arising from his representation of the Complainant in a real estate closing.
3. Respondent is the subject of another presentment pending before the court, Docket No. CV-06-04011999, Disciplinary Counsel v. Crozier, in the Judicial District of Waterbury.
4. Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel and Respondent agree that an order of presentment may enter in the present matter.
5. Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel agree that pursuant to Practice Book § 2-82 (g) that this order of presentment is agreed to for the purpose of consolidating this matter with the presentment currently pending before the court.


6. Respondent's counsel agrees to accept service on the Respondent's behalf of the presentment related to the present matter.

WHEREFORE, this matter will be submitted to the court for further proceedings in accordance with Practice Book § 2-82.

5/1/07
Date

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
By: 
Patricia King
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel

4/26/07
Date

Respondent, Ralph Crozier
By: 
William F. Dow, his attorney