

People v. Eudoxie Dickey. 20PDJ049. August 10, 2020.

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' conditional admission of misconduct and suspended Eudoxie Dickey (attorney registration number 49395) for one year and one day, with sixty days to be served and the remainder to be stayed upon the successful completion of a two-year period of probation. The suspension took effect August 10, 2020.

Dickey failed to inform her client about many developments in the client's federal employment discrimination lawsuit, including the scheduling of a discovery dispute hearing, the discovery hearing, a court order to attend a scheduled appointment with a forensic specialist, the appointment with that specialist, a motion for attorney's fees, an order to show cause, and a show cause hearing. Dickey failed to timely respond to several of these matters and did not appear at the show cause hearing. She did, however, timely file an objection to the magistrate judge's recommendation that the district court dismiss the client's claim for failure to prosecute. In the objection, Dickey accepted full responsibility for her failure to prosecute the client's case; she attributed her failure to personal problems she had been experiencing. The court ultimately found that no sanction short of dismissal was appropriate. Dickey did not respond to calls or texts from her client for the last several months of the representation, and she never informed her client that the case had been dismissed or that costs had been awarded against her.

Through this conduct, Dickey violated Colo. RPC 1.3 (a lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client); Colo. RPC 1.4(a)(3) (a lawyer shall keep a client reasonably informed about the status of the matter); Colo. RPC 1.4(a)(4) (a lawyer shall promptly comply with reasonable requests for information); Colo. RPC 1.16(d) (a lawyer shall protect a client's interests upon termination of the representation, including by giving reasonable notice to the client); and Colo. RPC 8.4(d) (providing that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

The case file is public per C.R.C.P. 251.31.