

DOCKET NO: UWY-CV14-6076193

SUPERIOR COURT

OFFICE OF CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

J.D. OF NEW HAVEN

V.

AT NEW HAVEN

LAWRENCE DRESSLER

APRIL 3, 2025

**DISSENT FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATION
FOR ADMISSION TO THE BAR FOR HARTFORD COUNTY**

Exception is taken to the conclusion reached by the majority (6-1) of the Standing Committee for Admission to the Bar for Hartford County that the Applicant, Lawrence Dressler, does not meet the criteria found in Statewide Grievance Committee v. Ganum 430, 454-455 (2014) for readmission to the Bar. I disagree. In reading its conclusion the Committee concludes that the applicant has not demonstrated qualities of honesty, candor and trustworthiness. Further, in reaching these conclusions they find that he has not demonstrated sufficient "respect for and obedience to the law." (Page 9. Opinion of the Majority.) However, this seems contradicted by other findings in the decision. It notes that the Applicant is as rehabilitated as he is capable of being; this strongly suggests that he has in fact demonstrated maximum effort towards rehabilitation. The committee notes that the applicant's conduct following his release from prison "seems appropriate." It should be noted that this period amounts to almost a decade of good conduct. The Committee goes on to

confirm that the Applicant appears to be "mentally competent to engage in the practice of law."

(Page 10, Opinion of the Majority.)


Given that the Committee concedes that the Applicant is as rehabilitated as he could be; that his conduct over the last nine or ten years has been appropriate; and he appears to be mentally competent, one might wonder why is this third application for readmission submitted years after the wrongdoing, to which he admitted and was sentenced, did not receive a positive response. In part it seems that the majority was unhappy because he made several errors on his application. In addition the Committee stated that it "...was very concerned over the "Larry Noodles blog" which was apparently some blogs he wrote over a decade ago while incarcerated that the Committee found offensive and purportedly cast dispersions upon the judicial system; at least in their opinion. (pp. 5-6 of Decision). Really. We are going to keep an attorney out of the Bar because he made errors in his application and we don't like what he wrote years ago. Who decided that such writings criticizing our judicial system are grounds for rejecting an application for readmission? Apparently the First Amendment need not be respected in the readmission process just because some blogs somewhere on the internet long ago offends us.

The majority goes on to claim that aside from the Applicants writings from prison, they are not convinced that the Applicant has demonstrated qualities of honesty, candor and trustworthiness nor demonstrated appropriate respect for the law. Yet, the same majority found elsewhere in the

decision (Pages 9-10) that his conduct was appropriate; well, if that is true how are these findings reconciled? It is submitted that what the majority really is saying is that the applicant simply has not been solacious enough to toward the majority; he has not apologized enough; he has not renounced his past behavior enough; and he has not condemned his past writings enough.

There is no question that the Applicant's misconduct justified disbarment; however this disbarment was not for life, although it is turning into a de facto life sentence, notwithstanding the majority's findings that he has applied maximum effort at rehabilitation, that he has engaged in good conduct since his release from prison and is mentally competent to engage in the law profession. But how much time banned from practicing law is enough is the real question. We let those lawyers who commit one of the Bar's worst sins, stealing from a client, reapply after twelve years (See Section 2-53 (c) P.B.) Yet in the instant matter where the applicant's crimes occurred more than 15 years ago, apparently it is still not enough for the majority. I find that the applicant has met his burden and I find that he has met all the conditions set out in Ganum, Id., and he now should be readmitted with conditions. For the first two years of his practice, he should not practice as a solo in private practice.

He should not be able to access directly any client security fund for a year. He should have an attorney mentor him, who after said attorney is approved by the Chief Disciplinary Counsel or an assigned council member, monitor the applicant's practice for a year with written quarterly reviews submitted to the Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel.

By 
Richard R. Brown
Member Hartford County
Standing Committee