CLERK, SI

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA (Before a Referee)

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

CONFIDENTIAL

v.

CASE NO. 67,518

STANLEY L. SELIGMAN,

The Florida Bar Case

No. 17A85F90

Respondent.

REPORT OF REFEREE

Summary of Proceedings: The undersigned has been duly I. appointed as referee to conduct disciplinary proceedings herein according to Florida Bar Integration Rule, article XI. The Respondent has submitted a Conditional Guilty Plea. Designated Reviewer of The Florida Bar has approved Respondent's Guilty Plea. I approve the Guilty Plea.

The following attorneys appeared as counsel for the parties:

For The Florida Bar:

Jacquelyn Plasner Needelman

For the Respondent:

Nicholas R. Friedman and

Scott K. Tozian

Findings of Fact as to Each Item of Misconduct of Which II. the Respondent is Charged:

After considering the Respondent's Consent Judgment, I find:

The Respondent, Stanley L. Seligman, is and at all times hereinafter mentioned, was a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction and disciplinary rules of the Supreme Court of Florida.

- 2. On or about April 27, 1984, an Information was issued in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Case No. 84-62-CR-T-17, against Stanley L. Seligman for the offense of willfully, unlawfully and feloniously combining, confederating and agreeing with others to obstruct, delay and affect commerce by extortion by obtaining and attempting to obtain approximately \$7,000 from Daniel Kowart, with his consent, induced by the wrongful use of fear of economic loss, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a).
- 3. On July 9, 1984, Stanley L. Seligman, Respondent, entered a plea of guilty in Case No. 84-62-CR-T-17 to the felony charge of interference by threats or violence, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a), in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida. The Court accepted the Respondent's guilty plea and adjudicated Stanley L. Seligman guilty of this felony charge.
- 4. On December 12, 1984, the Supreme Court of Florida, in Case Number 66,194, automatically suspended Stanley L. Seligman, Respondent, based upon his felony conviction concerning the instant facts, pursuant to Florida Bar Integration Rule, article XI, Rule 11.07(3).

III. Recommendations as to Whether or Not the Respondent Should be Found Guilty:

As to the complaint, I make the following recommendations as to guilt or innocence:

I recommend that the Respondent be found guilty and specifically that he be found guilty of violating the following Florida Bar Integration Rules and/or Disciplinary Rules of the Code of Professional Responsibility, to wit:

Florida Bar Integration Rule, article XI, Rules 11.02(3)(a) and (b), and Disciplinary Rules 1-102(A)(1), (3), (4) and (6) of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

IV. Recommendation as to Disciplinary Measures to be Applied:

I recommend that the Respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of Florida pursuant to Florida Bar Integration Rule, article XI, Rule 11.10(5) for a period of three (3) years from the date of the Supreme Court of Florida's Order in this case.

V. Personal History and Past Disciplinary Record:

Age: 53

Date admitted to The Florida Bar: November 6, 1958

Prior Disciplinary Convictions and Disciplinary Measures

Imposed Therein:

On December 12, 1984, the Supreme Court of Florida, in Case Number 66,194, automatically suspended Stanley L. Seligman, Respondent, based upon his felony conviction concerning the instant facts, pursuant to Florida Bar Integration Rule, article XI, Rule 11.07(3).

VI. Statement of Costs and Manner in Which Cost Should be Taxed:

I find the following costs were reasonably incurred by The Florida Bar and should be taxed against the Respondent:

Administrative Costs \$150.00

Photocopies 79.00

Total Costs \$229.00

DATED this 16 day of July, 1986

F. DENNIS ALVAREZ

Referee

Copies to:

Jacquelyn Plasner Needelman, Bar Counsel John T. Berry, Staff Counsel Nicholas R. Friedman, Attorney for Respondent Scott K. Tozian, Attorney for Respondent