

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

IN RE: WILLIAM FRANCIS HENDERSON

No. 2022-OB-00216

IN RE: Disciplinary Counsel - Applicant Other; Findings and Recommendations
(Readmission);

March 15, 2022

Readmission granted with conditions. See per curiam.

JLW
JTG
WJC
JBM
PDG

Hughes, J., dissents and would deny conditional readmission.
Crichton, J., dissents and would deny conditional readmission.

Supreme Court of Louisiana
March 15, 2022


Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

NO. 2022-OB-0216

IN RE: WILLIAM FRANCIS HENDERSON

ON APPLICATION FOR READMISSION

PER CURIAM

This proceeding arises out of an application for readmission to the practice of law filed by petitioner, William Francis Henderson, a disbarred attorney.

UNDERLYING FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner pleaded guilty in the 9th Judicial District Court for the Parish of Rapides to one felony count of unauthorized use of a movable valued in excess of \$1,000, a violation of La. R.S. 14:68(A), stemming from his conversion of client funds. Petitioner and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) then filed with this court a joint petition for consent discipline, proposing that petitioner be disbarred. We accepted the petition and disbarred petitioner on August 30, 2013, retroactive to March 31, 2010, the date he was placed on interim suspension. *In re: Henderson*, 13-1301 (La. 8/30/13), 123 So. 3d 160.

In November 2020, petitioner filed an application for readmission with the disciplinary board, alleging he has complied with the readmission criteria set forth in Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(E). The ODC took no position regarding the application for readmission. Accordingly, the matter was referred for a formal hearing before a hearing committee, which was conducted on November 15, 2021.¹

¹ Previously, the matter had been set for hearing on March 21, 2021; however, a hearing was not actually conducted on that date because the public member of the hearing committee was not present. Rather, the hearing committee made a recommendation based solely on a written record consisting of documentary evidence submitted by the parties. On September 27, 2021, we

Following the hearing, the committee recommended that petitioner be readmitted to the practice of law. The committee also recommended that petitioner be appointed a practice monitor for one year to ensure that he engages in sound practices when handling client funds. Finally, the committee recommended petitioner be assessed with the costs and expenses of this proceeding.² Neither petitioner nor the ODC objected to the committee's recommendation.

DISCUSSION

After considering the record in its entirety, we find petitioner has met his burden of proving that he should be readmitted to the practice of law. Nevertheless, further precautions are warranted to insure that the public will be protected upon petitioner's return to practice. See Supreme Court Rule XIX, § 24(J).

Accordingly, we will order that petitioner be conditionally readmitted to the practice of law, subject to a one-year period of supervised probation.

DECREE

Upon review of the recommendation of the hearing committee, and considering the record, it is ordered that William Francis Henderson, Louisiana Bar Roll number 21291, be immediately readmitted to the practice of law in Louisiana, subject to a one-year period of supervised probation. The probationary period shall commence from the date petitioner, the ODC, and the probation monitor execute a formal probation plan. Should petitioner fail to comply with the conditions of probation, or should he commit any misconduct during the period of probation, his

remanded the matter to the hearing committee with instructions to conduct a formal hearing as required by Supreme Court Rule XIX, §§ 24(F) and (G).

² The committee recommended that petitioner not be assessed with the costs of the March 21, 2021 hearing that could not be held through no fault of his own.

conditional right to practice may be terminated immediately, or he may be subjected to other discipline pursuant to the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement, as appropriate. All costs of these proceedings are assessed against petitioner, less the costs and expenses associated with the March 21, 2021 hearing.