

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA
(Before a Referee)

THE FLORIDA BAR,
Complainant,

Supreme Court Case
No. SC22-162

v.

The Florida Bar File
No. 2021-00,391(2B)

STEVEN KONSTANTINOS
DIMOPOULOS,

Respondent.

REPORT OF REFEREE ACCEPTING CONSENT JUDGMENT

I. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Pursuant to the undersigned being duly appointed as referee to conduct disciplinary proceedings herein according to Rule 3-7.6, Rules of Discipline, the following proceedings occurred:

On February 3, 2022, The Florida Bar filed its Complaint against Respondent as well as its Request for Admissions in these proceedings. All of the aforementioned pleadings, responses thereto, exhibits received in evidence, and this Report constitute the record in this case and are forwarded to the Supreme Court of Florida.

Received, Clerk, Supreme Court

JUL 22 2022

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Jurisdictional Statement. Respondent is, and at all times mentioned during this investigation was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction and disciplinary rules of the Supreme Court of Florida. In addition to membership in The Florida Bar, respondent is a member of the Nevada Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board.

B. Narrative Summary Of Case.

1. This is a reciprocal discipline action, based on respondent's March 15, 2021, notice to The Florida Bar of a Letter of Reprimand dated November 20, 2020, by the Southern Nevada Disciplinary Board, which imposed a Letter of Reprimand.

2. The letter of reprimand was based on the following conduct:

a. On June 9, 2019, Kiara Williams, and other members of her family, were in a car accident.

b. On June 10, 2019, they retained respondent's office to represent them.

c. On October 7, 2019, Yoselyn Segundo, respondent's non-lawyer case manager, communicated with the opposing insurance

company, Farmers Insurance (Farmers), about the property damage claim related to the accident.

d. January 7, 2020, Deanna Kope, Farmers' adjustor, sent Ms. Segundo an email that she did not have a demand letter on Ms. Williams.

e. On January 27, 2020, a demand letter signed by respondent's associate attorney, Jennifer Tang, was sent to Farmers.

f. Subsequently, on February 4, 2020, Segundo sent an email to Ms. Tang advising that Farmers offered \$2,150.90, to settle Ms. Williams's case.

g. Respondent provided interoffice emails between David Torres, respondent's non-lawyer claims supervisor, Ms. Segundo and Ms. Tang discussing a counteroffer to Farmers and the range where the settlement should fall.

h. Mr. Torres suggested with Ms. Tang in agreement, that Ms. Segundo propose a counteroffer of \$6,000 and that she try to resolve the case between \$3,500-\$4,000. Ms. Segundo replied "Okay, I will keep that in mind with negotiating."

i. Ms. Segundo had also exchanged emails with Ms. Kope in April and May with counteroffers for other members of the Williams family.

j. In respondent's response to the Nevada State Bar, he stated that his office policy is that an attorney should be cc'd on all negotiation emails sent by his staff to an opposing insurance company.

k. However, respondent admitted that this was not done in the Williams case.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO GUILT

Rule 3-4.6, Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, the Letter of Reprimand shall be considered as conclusive proof of such misconduct in this disciplinary proceeding.

IV. STANDARDS FOR IMPOSING LAWYER SANCTIONS

I considered the following Standards prior to recommending discipline:

[2.6] Admonishment. Admonishment is the lowest form of discipline which declares the conduct of the lawyer improper but does not limit the lawyer's right to practice.

[2.9] Reciprocal Discipline. Reciprocal discipline is the imposition of a disciplinary sanction on a lawyer who has been disciplined in another jurisdiction.

V. CASE LAW

I considered the following case law prior to recommending discipline:

The Florida Bar v. Fernando Martin Socol, SC20-1257 [2018-70,557(11C)]
By Court order dated March 18, 2021, the Court publicly reprimanded Socol. Respondent failed to properly supervise a disbarred attorney who was employed as a paralegal in respondent's law firm and had direct contact with a client. The disbarred attorney informed the client that in exchange for a \$150,000 loan to a clinic, he would be sponsored for an L-1 Visa. Almost immediately, the borrower defaulted. Respondent denies knowledge of or involvement in the loan. Restitution is a component of the discipline sanction. Rules violated: 3-6.1 and 4-5.3.

The Florida Bar v. Alfred Myles Roush, SC16-1512 – By order dated February 16, 2017, pursuant to a consent judgment, the court admonished Roush. Respondent admits he did not properly supervise his non-lawyer assistant to ensure that a whistleblower-related complaint was drafted, filed, or properly retained by the law firm, and that a copy had been provided to the client.

The Florida Bar v. Craig Anthony Huffman, SC15-2329 (Fla. Jan. 7, 2016) [TFB #s 2013-10,760 (13D), 2014-10,061 (13D)] - Admonishment. In the first case, respondent represented clients on claims related to their real property, including a title insurance claim. Respondent delegated most of the work to his paralegal. Respondent's supervision of his paralegal's work was not entirely adequate and contributed to the issues that arose with the clients who believed the paralegal was engaging in the unlicensed practice of law. After a fee dispute arose, the client relationship broke down. Rather than resolving the problem or properly withdrawing from the representation, respondent allowed the matter to sit idle. In the second case, respondent assisted a client with regard to a business dispute against a former principal of the client's company. Respondent exchanged unprofessional e-mails with the opposing party who, although he was unrepresented, was an attorney and sophisticated businessman. The opposing party also engaged in unprofessional communication with respondent. Respondent received an admonishment in 2006 for dissimilar misconduct. In mitigation, there was

no dishonest or selfish motive, respondent took the necessary steps to better supervise his paralegal and was remorseful.

The Florida Bar v. James Socrates Strouss, III, SC15-943 - By Court order dated November 19, 2015, respondent received a public reprimand for failing to adequately supervise his non-lawyer employee. Respondent's employee held himself out as an attorney and gave legal advice. The non-lawyer employee was the subject of a UPL investigation and subsequently agreed to sign a Cease-and-Desist Affidavit. Respondent had no prior discipline.

VI. RECOMMENDATION AS TO DISCIPLINARY MEASURES TO BE APPLIED

I recommend that Respondent be found guilty of misconduct justifying disciplinary measures, and that he be disciplined by: (a) admonishment for minor misconduct to be administered by service of the final order of the Supreme Court of Florida in this proceeding; and (b) payment of The Florida Bar's costs.

VII. PERSONAL HISTORY AND PAST DISCIPLINARY RECORD

Prior to recommending discipline pursuant to Rule 3-7.6(m)(1)(D), I considered the following personal history of Respondent, to wit:

Age: 38

Date admitted to the Bar: April 25, 2011

Prior Discipline: None

Had this case gone to trial the following aggravating and mitigating factors would have been considered.

Mitigating Factors

1. [3.3(b)(1)] Absence of a prior disciplinary record.

Respondent has not been sanctioned or disciplined by The Florida Bar or The Florida Supreme Court.

2. [3.3(b)(2)] Absence of a dishonest or selfish motive.

3. [3.3(b)(5)] Full and free disclosure to the bar or cooperative attitude toward the proceedings. Respondent through counsel has been ready and willing to communicate with The Florida Bar in having this matter finalized.

VIII. STATEMENT OF COSTS AND MANNER IN WHICH COSTS SHOULD BE TAXED

the following costs were reasonably incurred by The Florida Bar:

Administrative Costs	\$1,250.00
TOTAL	\$1,250.00

It is recommended that such costs be charged to Respondent and that interest at the statutory rate shall accrue and that should such cost judgment not be satisfied within thirty days of said judgment becoming final,

Respondent shall be deemed delinquent and ineligible to practice law, pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 1-3.6, unless otherwise deferred by the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar.

Dated this 15th day of July, 2022.

/s/ Anthony B. Miller
Anthony B. Miller, Referee
Circuit Judge
301 S. Monroe Street, Suite 330
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1861

Original To:

Clerk of the Supreme Court of Florida; Supreme Court Building; 500 South Duval Street, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-1927

Conformed Copies to:

Joseph Arnold Corsmeier, 2999 Alt 19 Ste. A, Palm Harbor, FL 34683-1938, jcorsmeier@jac-law.com

Rose L. Garrison, Tallahassee Branch Office, 651 East Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300, rgarrison@floridabar.org

Staff Counsel, Patti Savitz, The Florida Bar, 651 E Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-2300, psavitz@floridabar.org