



IAPD Report

ERIC STEVEN SMITH

CRD# 2894648

<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
Report Summary	1
Qualifications	2 - 3
Registration and Employment History	4
Disclosure Information	5



When communicating online or investing with any professional, make sure you know who you're dealing with. [Imposters](#) might link to sites like BrokerCheck from [phishing](#) or similar scam websites, or through [social media](#), trying to steal your personal information or your money.

Please contact FINRA with any concerns.



IAPD Information About Representatives

IAPD offers information on all current-and many former representatives. Investors are strongly encouraged to use IAPD to check the background of representatives before deciding to conduct, or continue to conduct, business with them.

What is included in a IAPD report?

IAPD reports for individual representatives include information such as employment history, professional qualifications, disciplinary actions, criminal convictions, civil judgments and arbitration awards.

It is important to note that the information contained in an IAPD report may include pending actions or allegations that may be contested, unresolved or unproven. In the end, these actions or allegations may be resolved in favor of the representative, or concluded through a negotiated settlement with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

Where did this information come from?

The information contained in IAPD comes from the Investment Adviser Registration Depository (IARD) and FINRA's Central Registration Depository, or CRD, (see more on CRD below) and is a combination of:

- information the states require representatives and firms to submit as part of the registration and licensing process, and
- information that state regulators report regarding disciplinary actions or allegations against representatives.

How current is this information?

Generally, representatives are required to update their professional and disciplinary information in IARD within 30 days.

Need help interpreting this report?

For help understanding how to read this report, please consult NASAA's IAPD Tips page
<http://www.nasaa.org/IAPD/IARReports.cfm>

What if I want to check the background of an Individual Broker or Brokerage Firm?

To check the background of an Individual Broker or Brokerage firm, you can search for the firm or individual in IAPD. If your search is successful, click on the link provided to view the available licensing and registration information in FINRA's BrokerCheck website.

Are there other resources I can use to check the background of investment professionals?

It is recommended that you learn as much as possible about an individual representative or Investment Adviser firm before deciding to work with them. Your state securities regulator can help you research individuals and certain firms doing business in your state. The contact information for state securities regulators can be found on the website of the North American Securities Administrators Association <http://www.nasaa.org>



Report Summary

ERIC STEVEN SMITH (CRD# 2894648)

The report summary provides an overview of the representative's professional background and conduct. The information contained in this report has been provided by the representative, investment adviser and/or securities firms, and/or securities regulators as part of the states' investment adviser registration and licensing process. The information contained in this report was last updated by the representative, a previous employing firm, or a securities regulator on **05/22/2025**.

CURRENT EMPLOYERS

	Firm	CRD#	Registered Since
IA	TRUSTEE EMPOWERMENT & PROTECTION, INC.	CRD# 108249	04/27/2010

QUALIFICATIONS

This representative is currently registered in **0** SRO(s) and **1** jurisdiction(s).

Is this representative currently Inactive or Suspended with any regulator? **No**

Note: Not all jurisdictions require IAR registration or may have an exemption from registration.

Additional information including this individual's qualification examinations and professional designations is available in the Detailed Report.

REGISTRATION HISTORY

This representative was previously registered with the following firm(s):

FIRM	CRD#	LOCATION	REGISTRATION DATES
No information reported.			

For additional registration and employment history details as reported by the individual, refer to the Registration and Employment History section of the Detailed Report.

DISCLOSURE INFORMATION

Disclosure events include certain criminal charges and convictions, formal investigations and disciplinary actions initiated by regulators, customer disputes and arbitrations, and financial disclosures such as bankruptcies and unpaid judgments or liens.

Are there events disclosed about this representative? **Yes**

The following types of events are disclosed about this representative:

Type	Count
Regulatory Event	3



Qualifications

REGISTRATIONS

This section provides the SRO, states and U.S. territories in which the representative is currently registered and licensed, the category of each registration, and the date on which the registration becomes effective. This section also provides, for each firm with which the representative is currently employed, the address of each location where the representative works. This individual is currently registered with **1** jurisdiction(s) and **0** SRO(s) through his or her employer(s).

Employment 1 of 1

Firm Name: **TRUSTEE EMPOWERMENT & PROTECTION, INC.**

Main Address: 755 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD
SUITE 101
TROY, MI 48084-4904

Firm ID#: 108249

Regulator	Registration	Status	Date
IA Michigan	Investment Adviser Representative	Approved - Pending IAR CE	01/01/2026

Branch Office Locations

TRUSTEE EMPOWERMENT & PROTECTION, INC.

755 W. BIG BEAVER
SUITE 150
TROY, MI 48084



Qualifications

PASSED INDUSTRY EXAMS

This section includes all industry exams that the representative has passed. Under limited circumstances, a representative may attain registration after receiving an exam waiver based on a combination of exams the representative has passed and qualifying work experience. Likewise a new exam requirement may be grandfathered based on a representative's specific qualifying work experience. Exam waivers and grandfathering are not included below.

This individual has passed 0 principal/supervisory exams, 0 general industry/product exams, and 1 state securities law exam.

Principal/Supervisory Exams

Exam	Category	Date
No information reported.		

General Industry/Product Exams

Exam	Category	Date
No information reported.		

State Securities Law Exams

Exam	Category	Date
IA Uniform Investment Adviser Law Examination (S65)	Series 65	02/14/2000

PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS

This section details that the representative has reported **0** professional designation(s).

No information reported.



Registration & Employment History

PREVIOUSLY REGISTERED WITH THE FOLLOWING FIRMS

This representative held registrations with the following firms:

No information reported.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Below is the representative's employment history for up to the last 10 years.

Employment Dates	Employer Name	Position	Investment Related	Employer Location
01/1998 - Present	CONSULTING SERVICES SUPPORT CORPORATION	CHAIRMAN & CEO	N	TROY, MI, United States
01/1998 - Present	CSSC INV. ADV. SERV., INC. / Trustee Empowerment & Protection, I	REGISTERED INVESTMENT ADVISORY REPRESENTATIVE	Y	TROY, MI, United States

OTHER BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

This section includes information, if any, as provided by the representative regarding other business activities the representative is currently engaged in either as a proprietor, partner, officer, director, employee, trustee, agent, or otherwise. This section does not include non-investment related activity that is exclusively charitable, civic, religious, or fraternal and is recognized as tax exempt.

SOLE PROPRIETOR OF MARIC FARMS, A REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT HOLDING COMPANY.

ADDRESS: 2203 SCOTT LAKE ROAD, WATERFORD, MI 48328

NATURE OF BUSINESS: HOLDS DIRECT INVESTMENTS IN REAL ESTATE.

MY POSITION: SOLE PROPRIETOR

START DATE: 1983

SOLE MEMBER OF ESS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY, WHICH IS A MEMBER OF A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY WHICH IS DEVELOPING A MULTIPLE-USE REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT IN KENTUCKY.

ADDRESS: 2203 SCOTT LAKE ROAD, WATERFORD, MI 48328

NATURE OF BUSINESS: THE ENTITY HOLDS A MINORITY INTEREST IN MALLARD POINT, LLC.

MY POSITION: SOLE MANAGING MEMBER

START DATE: 05/1998

DIRECTOR AND EXECUTIVE VP OF THE SHAOLIN DO ASSOCIATION, INC. A MARTIAL ARTS TRADE ASSOCIATION

ADDRESS: 282 GOLD RUSH ROAD, LEXINGTON, KY 40503

NATURE OF BUSINESS: AN ASSOCIATION OF MARTIAL ARTS PRACTITIONERS.

MY POSITION: DIRECTOR AND EXECUTIVE VP.

FORMED: MARCH 1995

CSSC PHILANTROPIC SERVICES, INC. - DIRECTOR; Decision Technologies Corporation, non investment related, 755 W. Big Beaver Suite 2000 Troy MI 48084, Decision Assistance Software, Chairman and CEO, 08-12-2015, 80 hours/month, management and overall operations



Disclosure Summary

Disclosure Information

What you should know about reported disclosure events:

(1) Certain thresholds must be met before an event is reported to IARD, for example:

- A law enforcement agency must file formal charges before an Investment Adviser Representative is required to report a particular criminal event.;
- A customer dispute must involve allegations that an Investment Adviser Representative engaged in activity that violates certain rules or conduct governing the industry and that the activity resulted in damages of at least \$5,000.

(2) Disclosure events in IAPD reports come from different sources:

As mentioned in the "About IAPD" section on page 1 of this report, information contained in IAPD comes from Investment Adviser Representatives, firms and regulators. When more than one of these sources reports information for the same disclosure event, all versions of the event will appear in the IAPD report. The different versions will be separated by a solid line with the reporting source labeled.

(3) There are different statuses and dispositions for disclosure events:

- A disclosure event may have a status of *pending*, *on appeal*, or *final*.
 - A "pending" disclosure event involves allegations that have not been proven or formally adjudicated.
 - A disclosure event that is "on appeal" involves allegations that have been adjudicated but are currently being appealed.
 - A "final" disclosure event has been concluded and its resolution is not subject to change.
- A final disclosure event generally has a disposition of *adjudicated*, *settled* or *otherwise resolved*.
 - An "adjudicated" matter includes a disposition by (1) a court of law in a criminal or civil matter, or (2) an administrative panel in an action brought by a regulator that is contested by the party charged with some alleged wrongdoing.
 - A "settled" matter generally represents a disposition wherein the parties involved in a dispute reach an agreement to resolve the matter. Please note that Investment Adviser Representatives and firms may choose to settle customer disputes or regulatory matters for business or other reasons.
 - A "resolved" matter usually includes a disposition wherein no payment is made to the customer or there is no finding of wrongdoing on the part of the Investment Adviser Representative. Such matters generally involve customer disputes.

(4) You may wish to contact the Investment Adviser Representatives to obtain further information regarding any of the disclosure events contained in this IAPD report.



DISCLOSURE EVENT DETAILS

When evaluating this information, please keep in mind that some items may involve pending actions or allegations that may be contested and have not been resolved or proven. The event may, in the end, be withdrawn, dismissed, resolved in favor of the Investment Adviser Representative, or concluded through a negotiated settlement with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

This report provides the information exactly as it was reported to the Investment Adviser Registration Depository. Some of the specific data fields contained in the report may be blank if the information was not provided.

The following types of events are disclosed about this representative:

Type	Count
Regulatory Event	3

Regulatory Event

This disclosure event may include a final, formal proceeding initiated by a regulatory authority (e.g., a state securities agency, a federal regulator such as the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, or a foreign financial regulatory body) for a violation of investment-related rules or regulations. This disclosure event may also include a revocation or suspension of an Investment Adviser Representative's authority to act as an attorney, accountant or federal contractor.

Disclosure 1 of 3

Reporting Source:	Regulator
Regulatory Action Initiated By:	Michigan
Sanction(s) Sought:	Other: Notice of Intent to Revoke Investment Adviser Representative Registration
Date Initiated:	05/26/2021
Docket/Case Number:	343385
URL for Regulatory Action:	www.michigan.gov/securities

Employing firm when activity occurred which led to the regulatory action:

Product Type:	No Product
Allegations:	The Administrator intends to revoke the investment adviser representative registration of Eric Smith under section 412(2) of the Securities Act, MCL 451.2412(2), because he is subject to an order from a self-regulatory organization suspending him from membership; he is the subject of a cease and desist order issued by a state; and, because he engaged in dishonest or unethical business practices in the securities industry within the previous 10 years, all of which support the revocation of the investment adviser representative registration under the Michigan Uniform Securities Act (2002), 2008 PA 551, MCL 451.2101 et seq.
Current Status:	Final
Resolution:	Stipulation and Order Approving Conditional Registration



Does the order constitute a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct?

No

Resolution Date:

05/15/2025

Sanctions Ordered:

Other: The Parties agree to this Stipulation, enabling the Administrator to conditionally register Respondent as an investment adviser representative by Order, subject to Respondent's and TEP's compliance with conditions stipulated in this Order.

Disclosure 2 of 3

Reporting Source: Regulator

Regulatory Action Initiated By: FINRA

Sanction(s) Sought: Other: n/a

Date Initiated: 08/04/2017

Docket/Case Number: [2015043646501](#)

Employing firm when activity occurred which led to the regulatory action: CSSC Brokerage Services, Inc.

Product Type: Other: bridge loan offering

Allegations: Smith was named a respondent in a FINRA complaint alleging that he, with his member firm, defrauded investors by offering and selling securities through a bridge loan offering designed to keep their floundering parent company afloat after more than three years of failed deals, significant business losses and mounting debts that the parent company could not pay. The complaint alleges that Smith, who is also the CEO of the parent company and the individual that controlled the firm and its affiliates, knew of the parent company's precarious financial condition, yet misrepresented and failed to disclose material information to potential and actual investors in the bridge loan offering. In connection with the bridge loan offering, Smith and the firm made misrepresentations and omissions of material facts to prospective investors. The firm and Smith did this by intentionally: failing to disclose that the parent company could not make interest payments to existing bondholders and investors without raising additional capital; failing to disclose that the parent company was in default to existing bondholders and investors and was unable to repay more than \$3 million that would eventually become due; misrepresenting that the parent company had earned, was receiving and would continue to receive millions of dollars in revenue from its development of a "special purpose bank" that ultimately failed to materialize and generate any revenue; touting a significant "revenue event" resulting from the parent company's purported association with a trust company, when no such relationship existed or ever occurred; and misrepresenting the firm and its owner's relationship with the City of Jacksonville, Florida, including that that relationship would increase the firm's assets under management by nearly \$1 billion, and generate "significant revenue," when there was no basis in fact to make any such claims. Each of the firm and Smith's statements and representations were material, false and misleading, and they knew they were false and misleading at the time that they prepared and distributed the offering documents to investors. As a result of Smith's conduct, he willfully violated Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule



10b-5 and violated FINRA Rule 2020. In the alternative, Smith violated FINRA Rule 2010 by contravening Section 17 (a)(2) and (a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933. The complaint also alleges that Smith and the firm engaged in unethical conduct by obtaining money from the public for four different investments and the bridge loan offering, by making material misrepresentations and omissions of fact regarding those investments while registered with FINRA. The complaint further alleges that Smith, and the firm through Smith, knew that he was not registered as a representative or principal during the time period May 2010 through December 2015. By and through Smith's conduct, however, Smith was acting in capacities that required his registration as a representative, including the solicitation of firm customers to invest in private placement offerings in the parent company. Smith and the firm knew or should have known that Smith was engaged in this conduct, despite the fact he was not registered in any capacity with the firm. In addition, by and through Smith's conduct, control and ownership in connection with the firm, Smith was acting in capacities that required his registration as a principal. He was intimately engaged in firm operations and its securities business, including the hiring and retaining of registered representatives, and the management of all firm subsidiaries' finances. Smith and the firm knew or should have known that Smith was engaged in this conduct, control and ownership of the firm, despite the fact that he was not registered in any capacity with the firm.

Current Status:

On Appeal

Limitation Details:

The bar is in effect on September 18, 2020.

ActionAppealed To:

Federal Court

Date Appeal filed:

10/21/2024

Appeal Limitation Details:

The bar is in effect on September 18, 2020.

Resolution:

Pending Appeal

Does the order constitute a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct?

Yes

Resolution Date:

08/19/2024

Sanctions Ordered:

Bar (Permanent)

If the regulator is the SEC, CFTC, or an SRO, did the action result in a finding of a willful violation or failure to supervise?

Yes



(1) willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any of such Acts, or any of the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, or to have been unable to comply with any provision of such Act, rule or regulation?

Yes

(2) willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured the violation by any person of any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any of such Acts, or any of the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board? or

No

(3) failed reasonably to supervise another person subject to your supervision, with a view to preventing the violation by such person of any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any of such Acts, or any of the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board?

No

Sanction 1 of 1

Sanction Type: Bar (Permanent)

Capacities Affected: All Capacities

Duration: Indefinite

Start Date: 09/18/2020

**End Date:****Regulator Statement**

Hearing Panel decision rendered 01/02/19, wherein Smith was barred from association with any FINRA member in all capacities, ordered to pay \$130,000, plus interest, jointly and severally, in restitution, and ordered to pay costs, jointly and severally with his firm, of \$12,107.09. The sanctions were based on findings that Smith and his member firm willfully violated Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 and violated FINRA Rule 2020 by defrauding investors by offering and selling securities through a bridge loan offering designed to keep their floundering parent company afloat after years of failed deals, significant business losses and mounting debts that the parent company could not pay. The findings stated that in connection with the bridge loan offering, Smith and the firm made misrepresentations and omissions of material facts to prospective investors. The firm and Smith did this by intentionally: failing to disclose that the parent company could not make interest payments to existing bondholders and investors without raising additional capital; failing to disclose that the parent company was in default to existing bondholders and investors and was unable to repay more than \$3 million that would eventually become due; misrepresenting that the parent company had earned, was receiving and would continue to receive millions of dollars in revenue from its development of a special purpose bank that ultimately failed to materialize and generate any revenue; touting a significant revenue event resulting from the parent company's purported association with a trust company, when no such relationship existed or ever occurred; and misrepresenting the firm and its owner's relationship with the City of Jacksonville, Florida, including that that relationship would increase the firm's assets under management by nearly \$1 billion, and generate significant revenue, when there was no basis to make such claims. The findings also stated that Smith and the firm engaged in unethical conduct by obtaining money from the public for investments and the bridge loan offering by making material misrepresentations and omissions of fact regarding those investments while registered with FINRA. The findings also included that Smith, and the firm through Smith, knew that he was not registered as a representative or principal. By and through Smith's conduct, however, Smith was acting in capacities that required his registration as a representative, including the solicitation of firm customers to invest in private placement offerings in the parent company. Smith and the firm knew or should have known that he was engaged in this conduct, despite the fact he was not registered in any capacity with the firm. In addition, by and through Smith's conduct, control and ownership in connection with the firm, he was acting in capacities that required his registration as a principal. Smith was intimately engaged in firm operations and its securities business, including the hiring and retaining of registered representatives, and the management of all firm subsidiaries' finances. Smith and the firm knew or should have known that he was engaged in this conduct, control and ownership of the firm, despite the fact that he was not registered in any capacity with the firm. On 01/29/19, Smith appealed the decision to the NAC. NAC decision rendered 09/18/20, wherein the findings made are affirmed and the sanctions modified in part. In light of the bar, we assess but do not impose additional sanctions for Smith's registration violations. The NAC also affirm the Hearing Panel's order that Smith pay hearing costs, jointly and severally, of \$12,107.09 and impose appeal costs of \$1,283. On 10/19/2020, Smith appealed the NAC decision to the SEC. SEC Decision rendered 08/19/24 held findings and the sustained sanctions. On 10/21/24, Smith appealed the SEC decision to the USCA. Sanctions except for bar are not in effect pending appeal.

Reporting Source:

Individual

Regulatory Action Initiated By:

Financial Industry Regulatory Authority



Sanction(s) Sought:	Bar Restitution
Date Initiated:	08/04/2017
Docket/Case Number:	2015043646501
Employing firm when activity occurred which led to the regulatory action:	Consulting Services Support Corporation, which is NOT a FINRA member firm and is not engaged in the securities business.
Product Type:	Debt-Corporate Other: Bridge Loan Offering
Allegations:	Alleged violations of NASD Rule 1031 and 1021, FINRA Rule 2010, 2020, 2210(D)(1)(A-B), SEC Exchange Act Rule 10B-5 and SEC Section 17(a)(2)-(3).
Current Status:	On Appeal
Limitation Details:	Eric Smith is Banned from FINRA firm affiliation pending the results of the Federal Court Appeal
ActionAppealed To:	Federal Court
Date Appeal filed:	10/08/2024
Appeal Limitation Details:	Bar from associating with any FINRA member firm became effective on September 18, 2020. This sanction is currently subject to appellate review by the SEC of the request that the bar be vacated and the action against Mr. Smith be dismissed in its entirety.
Resolution:	Decision
Does the order constitute a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct?	Yes
Resolution Date:	08/19/2024
Sanctions Ordered:	Bar (Permanent) Restitution
Sanction 1 of 1	
Sanction Type:	Bar (Permanent)
Capacities Affected:	All capacities
Duration:	Permanent
Start Date:	09/18/2020
End Date:	
Monetary Sanction 1 of 1	
Monetary Related Sanction:	Restitution
Total Amount:	\$130,000.00
Portion Levied against individual:	\$130,000.00
Payment Plan:	None
Is Payment Plan Current:	Yes

**Date Paid by individual:****Was any portion of penalty waived?**

No

Amount Waived:**Broker Statement**

In October 2020 a notice was filed with the SEC seeking its review and ruling on the FINRA action. Briefing was completed in March 2021 yet, in violation of its own Rules, the SEC by March of 2024 still had not scheduled oral argument nor issued any decision. Its Rules require that appeals from FINRA be decided within no more than ten months after completion of briefing, even in the most complex cases. Instead, it issued itself nine 90-day extensions, with explanation or justification . . . an over 3-year delay.

This led the New Civil Liberties Alliance to become involved in the case (see their published case Summary: In re Eric S. Smith - New Civil Liberties Alliance (nclalegal.org). They took the lead in representing me in the filing of the Petition for Mandamus (linked) with the U.S. 6th Circuit Court of Appeals asking the Court to compel the dismissal of the case or order the SEC to rule on the appeal.

However, instead of ruling after the filing of the Petition for Mandamus, the SEC (without explanation) granted itself another two 90-day extensions (a total of 11), again without explanation. This led the Court of Appeals, on August 5, 2024, to issue an Order (linked) requiring the SEC to respond to the Petition.

The SEC did not directly respond to the Petition or to the Court's Order. Instead, on August 19, 2024 (in just two weeks after a delay of over three years), it issued an Opinion and Order rubber-stamping the FINRA action against me.

The next step in our fight against this flawed result is to file a Petition for Review to the same U.S. 6th Circuit Court of Appeals whose Order resulted in an end to the long and unexplained SEC delay. This will provide us with the first opportunity to argue the merits of our case before a panel of true, independent judges and not paid employees of FINRA or the SEC, whose "loyalty" may well be to the agency that pays them (and its protection and interests) and not to any principled search for truth and an objectively just result. We're looking forward to this new forum and to the opportunity for a what we believe will be a fairer process - a process that we trust will result in the FINRA action being completely set aside.

Disclosure 3 of 3**Reporting Source:**

Individual

Regulatory Action Initiated By:

Kentucky Bar Association

Sanction(s) Sought:

Suspension

Date Initiated:

10/12/1983

Docket/Case Number:

CASE NO. 83-SC-144-KB

Employing firm when activity occurred which led to the regulatory action:

MR. Smith was engaged in full-time practice of law when activity occurred.

Product Type:

No Product

Allegations:

This 37+ year old case was based on an alleged conflict of interest arising from a loan by one of Mr. Smith's clients to the business of another of his clients, in which



Mr. Smith had a contingent interest. The matter was controversial and sharply contested, with evidence that the complaint was filed for non-grievable reasons. Mr. Smith was represented pro bono by a former Governor of Kentucky and by a former President of the KY Bar. Further, an Amicus Curiae Brief was filed on behalf and in support of Mr. Smith by a local Bar Association and local attorneys. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and two stays of execution were ordered, pending action on a Motion for Certiorari. Ultimately, Certiorari was denied and the state court Order became final.

Current Status:	Final
Resolution:	Decision
Does the order constitute a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct?	No
Resolution Date:	01/21/1988
Sanctions Ordered:	Suspension
Sanction 1 of 1	
Sanction Type:	Suspension
Capacities Affected:	License To Practice Law In KY State Courts
Duration:	18 Months
Start Date:	10/12/1983
End Date:	01/21/1988
Broker Statement	Mr. Smith's license to practice law before the State Courts of KY was suspended for 18 months and was reinstated, without restriction, by Order of the Kentucky Supreme Court, dated January 21, 1988. The KY Bar Association filed a similar action in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of KY seeking a similar suspension in the Federal Courts. After a hearing on the matter, in which an Amicus Brief was filed by a local Bar Association and local attorneys, the Federal Court dismissed the action against Mr. Smith, in its entirety, and he retained his license to practice law in the Federal Court system, without restriction.



End of Report

This page is intentionally left blank.