

*In re Bedor*, 5 ROP Intrm. 116 (1995)  
**IN THE MATTER OF J. ROMAN BEDOR, T.C.**  
**Respondent.**

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDING NO. 1-95

Supreme Court, Disciplinary Tribunal  
Republic of Palau

Decision

Decided: May 16, 1995

Disciplinary Counsel: Jon Hinck, Office of the Attorney General

BEFORE: JEFFREY L. BEATTIE, Associate Justice; LARRY W. MILLER, Associate Justice;  
PETER T. HOFFMAN, Associate Justice

PER CURIAM:

This disciplinary proceeding arises out of a complaint signed by six members of the Idis Clan alleging that Respondent failed to notify them of adverse decisions in two civil actions in which he represented them until after their opportunity for appealing such decisions had passed.<sup>1</sup> A hearing was held at which three members of the Clan and Respondent testified to varying recollections of the pertinent facts.

Based on the record before us, we cannot say that the charges against Respondent have been proven by the requisite clear and convincing evidence. See Disciplinary Rule 5(e) ("The standard of proof for establishing allegations of misconduct shall be clear and convincing evidence."). The complaint against him is therefore DISMISSED.

It is plain that much of this controversy could have been averted had Respondent kept his clients apprised of the status of the cases through written communication at every critical stage of the litigation. We encourage all Bar members to establish such a practice if they have not done so already.

---

<sup>1</sup>No notice of appeal was filed in the first civil action; Respondent filed a notice of appeal in the second civil action, but the appeal was dismissed by the Appellate Division for failure to file an opening brief.