

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, : No. 2532 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
Petitioner : No. 104 DB 2018  
: :  
v. : Attorney Registration No. 36817  
: :  
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE : (Dauphin County)  
: :  
Respondent :

ORDER

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2018, upon consideration of the Recommendation of the Three-Member Panel of the Disciplinary Board, the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent is granted, and Robert B. MacIntyre is suspended on consent from the Bar of this Commonwealth for a period of one year and one day. He shall comply with all the provisions of Pa.R.D.E. 217. Respondent shall pay costs to the Disciplinary Board pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 208(g).

A True Copy Patricia Nicola  
As Of 11/02/2018

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. ____ Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner,	:	
	:	No. 104 DB 2018
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 36817
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE,	:	
Respondent	:	(Dauphin County)

JOINT PETITION IN SUPPORT OF DISCIPLINE ON CONSENT  
PURSUANT TO Pa. R.D.E. 215(d)

Petitioner, Office of Disciplinary Counsel (thereafter "ODC") by Paul J. Killion, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, and Kristin A. Wells, Disciplinary Counsel, and Respondent, Robert B. MacIntyre, file this Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent under Rule 215(d) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement (hereinafter "Pa.R.D.E.") and in support thereof state:

1. ODC, whose principal office is located at the Pennsylvania Judicial Center, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 2700, P.O. Box 62485, Harrisburg, PA 17106, is invested, pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, with the power and the duty to investigate all matters involving alleged misconduct of an attorney admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to prosecute all disciplinary proceedings brought in accordance with the various provisions of the aforesaid Rules.

2. Respondent, Robert B. MacIntyre, was born on January 7, 1958, and was admitted to practice law in Pennsylvania on October 25, 1982. Respondent is on retired status. His registered address is 6860 Cornell Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17112.

3. Respondent is subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of

FILED 8/22/2018 The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
--

the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

**SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ADMITTED**

4. Respondent's misconduct involves his failure to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing two clients, failure to appear at multiple court proceedings, failure to comply with various court orders, failure to timely pay court-ordered sanctions, and failure to respond to ODC's inquiries.

**Karen Roush**

5. Respondent was counsel of record for Ms. Roush in her divorce action, docketed at *Karen L. Roush v. Robert J. Roush*, No. FC-FD-2016-00027 (Perry C.P.).

6. By Order dated April 13, 2016, the Court directed, in relevant part: (1) "Husband and Wife agree to timely execute all Affidavits of Consent and Waiver of Notice forms to get a No-Fault Divorce. **Those documents will be prepared by Attorney MacIntyre, and he will obtain his client's execution of those. Attorney MacIntyre will forward said documents to Attorney Howell for his client,** and Attorney Howell will timely file the documents. **Attorney MacIntyre will then file a Praecepto to obtain the Divorce Decree**"; and (2) "Husband shall provide Attorney Howell with a check for \$2,500.00 payable to Attorney Robert MacIntyre within thirty (30) days. Attorney Howell, upon receipt of the check, will forward it to Attorney MacIntyre and then Attorney MacIntyre will disperse it in accordance with the agreement between him and his client." (emphasis added)

7. Respondent failed to prepare and forward the documents as directed by the Court.

8. Respondent further failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Court's Order and his failure to act in accordance therewith.

9. On or about January 19, 2017, Attorney Howell filed a Motion to Enforce

Agreement Between Parties and Hold Wife in Contempt of the April 13, 2016 Order, alleging, in relevant part, that: (1) on or about May 4, 2016, Attorney Howell mailed Respondent a check for \$2,500.00, in accordance with the Court's April 13, 2016, Order; (2) after several months, Attorney Howell called Respondent in the summer of 2016 and left a message inquiring as to when the Affidavit of Consent and Notice of Waiver Forms that Respondent was required to draft and have Ms. Roush sign would be provided; (3) Respondent failed to respond or provide the requested documents; (4) on or about August 5, 2016, Attorney Howell drafted, and his client signed, Affidavit of Consent and Notice of Waiver forms, which were filed on or about August 10, 2016; (5) on August 12, 2016, copies of these documents were sent to Respondent; (6) Respondent failed to respond or file the required Affidavit of Consent and Notice of Waiver forms for Ms. Roush; (7) in the fall of 2016, Attorney Howell called Respondent and left a message inquiring when the divorce would be finalized; and (8) Respondent failed to respond or file the required documents.

10. As a result of Respondent's inaction, Attorney Howell requested counsel fees and costs.

11. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Motion or explain to her its impact on her case.

12. On or about February 1, 2017, the Court issued a Rule to Show Cause providing Respondent with 20 days to respond to the requested relief.

13. Respondent failed to file a response or take any other action on Ms. Roush's behalf.

14. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Rule to Show Cause and his failure to respond thereto.

15. On or about March 9, 2017, Attorney Howell filed a Motion to Make Rule Absolute based on Respondent's failure to respond to the Rule to Show Cause.

16. Therein, Attorney Howell noted that, on or about March 6, 2017, during a telephone call with the Prothonotary's office, he was informed that Ms. Roush had called at least once inquiring why her divorce was not yet finalized.

17. By Order dated March 16, 2017, the Court directed Respondent to: (1) within 15 days, file an executed Affidavit of Consent and Notice of Waiver Form; (2) within 15 days of the filing of the executed Affidavit of Consent and Notice of Waiver Form, file with the Prothonotary a Praecipe to Transmit the Record and all other documents necessary to obtain a divorce decree; and (3) within 90 days, pay \$600.00 to Attorney Howell.

18. Respondent received the Order, but failed to take any action in accordance therewith or otherwise on Ms. Roush's behalf.

19. By Rule to Show Cause dated April 27, 2017, the Court set a rule returnable hearing for May 12, 2017.

20. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Rule to Show Cause, the scheduled hearing, or explain the impact of the Rule to Show Cause on her case.

21. By Order dated May 12, 2017, following a telephone conference with Respondent and Attorney Howell, and with the agreement of both attorneys, the Court directed Respondent to: (1) by May 15, 2017, provide Attorney Howell with \$1,000.00 for attorney fees; and (2) within two weeks, file all paperwork necessary to finalize the divorce.

22. Respondent thereafter hand-delivered a \$1,000.00 check to Attorney Howell's office.

23. However, Respondent failed to file any documents on Ms. Roush's behalf or otherwise take action necessary to finalize the divorce.

24. Respondent further failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Court's Order and his failure

to act in accordance therewith.

25. On or about July 27, 2017, Attorney Howell filed a Motion for Contempt of March 10, 2017 Order and May 12, 2017 Order, noting that “nothing ha[d] been filed to conclude the divorce case and no word ha[d] been heard from [Respondent].”

26. Attorney Howell further requested attorney fees and costs.

27. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Motion or explain its impact on her case.

28. By Rule to Show Cause dated July 31, 2017, the Court set a rule returnable hearing for August 16, 2017.

29. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Rule to Show Cause, the scheduled hearing, or explain the impact on her case.

30. Respondent thereafter failed to appear for the August 16, 2017, hearing.

31. By Order dated August 16, 2017, the Court noted Respondent’s and Ms. Roush’s absence and directed Respondent’s appearance on September 29, 2017, to show cause why he should not be held in contempt and why he failed to appear in court on that date.

32. Respondent failed to inform Ms. Roush of the Order.

33. Respondent appeared for the September 29, 2017, hearing.

34. By Order dated September 29, 2017, the Court found Respondent in contempt of the August 16, 2017, Order and ordered him to pay \$600.00 to Attorney Howell within 45 days and file whatever documents were necessary to finalize the divorce within seven days.

35. At the Judge’s request, Attorney Howell accompanied Respondent to the Prothonotary’s Office, where Respondent utilized the “self-help” forms to complete and file the remaining divorce documents, whereupon a divorce decree was entered.

36. However, Respondent failed to make the ordered payment to Attorney Howell.
37. On or about December 4, 2017, Attorney Howell filed a Motion for Contempt of the September 29, 2017, Order.
38. By Order dated December 7, 2017, the Court scheduled a hearing for January 9, 2018.
39. Respondent received the Order.
40. Respondent failed to appear for the January 9, 2018, hearing.
41. By Order dated January 9, 2018, the Court re-scheduled the hearing for February 6, 2018, noting that a warrant would issue for Respondent if he failed to appear.
42. Respondent failed to appear for the February 6, 2018, hearing.
43. By Order dated February 6, 2018, the Court issued a bench warrant for Respondent's arrest.
44. By Order dated February 14, 2018, the bench warrant was lifted and the contempt hearing was continued until May 14, 2018.
45. Respondent failed to appear for the May 14, 2018, hearing or make payment to Attorney Howell.
46. By Order dated May 14, 2018, the Court issued a second bench warrant for Respondent's arrest.
47. On or about May 18, 2018, Respondent, through a private detective, Robert Dash, delivered a \$600.00 official check to Attorney Howell.

**Robert Marley**

48. In or about October 2014, Mr. Marley retained Respondent for representation relative to his criminal matters, docketed at *Commonwealth v. Robert Marley*, CP-21-CR-

0000886-2015, CP-21-CR-0001019-2015, and CP-21-CR-0001154-2015 (Dauphin C.P.).

49. Mr. Marley's father paid Respondent's initial retainer fee for the representation.

50. In or about March 2015, Respondent and Mr. Marley orally agreed that further payments for Respondent's services would be made using Mr. Marley's bank card.

51. On or about October 15, 2015, Mr. Marley entered a guilty plea in 886 CR 2015 and a *nolo contendere* plea in 1154 CR 2015, which was also in full satisfaction of 1019 CR 2015.

52. On or about December 28, 2015, Mr. Marley filed a *pro se* Notice of Appeal in 886 CR 2015 and 1154 CR 2015, docketed at 12 MDA 2016, Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

53. At this time, Respondent was still counsel of record.

54. By Order dated February 9, 2016, the Superior Court directed Respondent to comply with Pa.R.A.P. 3517, requiring the filing of a docketing statement, by February 19, 2016.

55. Respondent failed to thereafter file the required docketing statement, take any further action on Mr. Marley's behalf, or withdraw from the representation.

56. By Order dated March 2, 2016, the Superior Court remanded the matter for the trial court to determine whether Respondent had abandoned representation of Mr. Marley due to his failure to file a docketing statement.

57. By Order dated March 4, 2016, the Superior Court vacated its March 2<sup>nd</sup> Order and directed Respondent to inform the Court of any address updates and file the required docketing statement within 14 days.

58. Respondent failed to thereafter file a docketing statement.

59. By Order dated March 21, 2016, the trial court removed Respondent as Mr. Marley's counsel.

60. On or about March 29, 2016, Mr. Marley filed a Praecipe for Discontinuance with



the Superior Court, and the appeal was discontinued.

### **Disciplinary Investigation**

61. On or about September 22, 2017, ODC sent Respondent a DB-7 Request for Statement of Respondent's Position letter (hereinafter "DB-7 letter") regarding the Roush matter.

62. His response was due on or before October 22, 2017.

63. On or about September 26, 2017, Respondent accepted the certified mailing.

64. When no response was received, on or about November 9, 2017, ODC sent Respondent a letter noting his failure to respond and requesting a response within 10 days.

65. When no response was received, Auditor-Investigator Lowell Kratzer contacted Respondent *via* telephone and arranged to meet Respondent at his home.

66. On or about November 30, 2017, Auditor-Investigator Kratzer personally served Respondent with ODC's September 22, 2017, DB-7 letter and a second letter requesting that Respondent respond thereto within 10 days.

67. When no response was received, on or about February 8, 2018, Auditor-Investigator Kratzer and the undersigned disciplinary counsel contacted Respondent *via* telephone.

68. During this conversation, Respondent stated that he had ceased practicing law around September 2017 and was now working in retail.

69. Respondent claimed that he had emailed a response to the DB-7,<sup>1</sup> but stated that he would resend it by the following day.

70. Upon the conclusion of the telephone call, Auditor-Investigator Kratzer sent Respondent an email, to an address that Respondent had provided, summarizing the conversation

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither Auditor-Investigator Kratzer nor undersigned disciplinary counsel have ever received any emails from Respondent.

and requesting that Respondent provide his response to the DB-7 letter.

71. Respondent failed to communicate further with ODC or otherwise provide a response to the DB-7 letter.

72. On or about March 8, 2018, ODC sent Respondent a DB-7 letter regarding the Marley matter.<sup>2</sup>

73. His response was due on or before April 7, 2018.

74. On or about March 19, 2018, Respondent accepted the certified mailing.

75. When no response was received, on or about April 16, 2018, ODC sent Respondent a letter noting his failure to respond and requesting a response within 10 days.

76. Respondent thereafter failed to respond.

77. On or about June 19, 2018, ODC filed a Petition for Discipline.

78. On or about July 6, 2018, Auditor-Investigator Kratzer personally served Respondent with a copy of the Petition for Discipline.

79. On or about July 18, 2018, Respondent filed an Answer to Petition for Discipline, wherein he admitted to the majority of the allegations.

#### **SPECIFIC RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT VIOLATED**

80. By his conduct as alleged in paragraphs 5 through 79, above, Respondent violated the following Rules:

- a. RPC 1.1, which states, "A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation."

---

<sup>2</sup> In addition to sending the DB-7 letter by first class and certified mail, ODC also sent a copy by email to Respondent's registered email address and the email address he provided to Auditor-Investigator Kratzer.

b. RPC 1.3, which states, “A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.”

c. RPC 1.4(a)(2)-(4), which states, “A lawyer shall ... reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client’s objectives are to be accomplished; keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter; [and] promptly comply with reasonable requests for information[.]”

d. RPC 1.4(b), which states, “A lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.”

e. RPC 1.15(e), which states, “Except as stated in this Rule or otherwise permitted by law or by agreement with the client or third person, a lawyer shall promptly deliver to the client or third person any property, including but not limited to Rule 1.15 Funds, that the client or third person is entitled to receive and, upon request by the client or third person, shall promptly render a full accounting regarding the property; Provided, however, that the delivery, accounting and disclosure of Fiduciary Funds or property shall continue to be governed by the law, procedure and rules governing the requirements of Fiduciary administration, confidentiality, notice and accounting applicable to the Fiduciary entrustment.”

f. RPC 1.16(d), which states, in relevant part, “Upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client’s interests, such as ... refunding any advanced payment of fee or expense that has not been earned or incurred.”

g. RPC 3.2, which states, “A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client.”

h. RPC 8.1(b), which states, in pertinent part, “A[] ... lawyer ... in connection with a disciplinary matter, shall not ... fail to respond to a lawful demand for information from ... disciplinary authority[.]”

i. RPC 8.4(d), which states, “It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.”

j. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7), which states, “The following shall also be grounds for discipline: Failure by a respondent-attorney without good cause to respond to Disciplinary Counsel’s request or supplemental request under Disciplinary Board Rules § 87.7(b) for a statement of the respondent-attorney’s position.”

#### **SPECIFIC JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCIPLINE**

Petitioner and Respondent jointly recommend that the appropriate discipline for Respondent is a one-year and one-day license suspension. This recommendation is consistent with prior decisions.

In *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Michael P. Halcovage*, No. 93 DB 2017 (S.Ct. Order 1/5/18), the Supreme Court approved a one-year and one-day license suspension on consent. Respondent Halcovage neglected an estate matter, including failing to timely file an inheritance tax return, misused estate assets, and made misrepresentations to the estate beneficiaries. Respondent Halcovage thereafter failed to respond to numerous rule to show cause orders and failed to file an accounting at the court’s request. In another estate matter, Respondent Halcovage took an excessive fee, failed to make disbursement to the heir, and ultimately escheated the funds to the State. Respondent Halcovage further failed to respond to ODC’s inquiries regarding these matters. In mitigation, Respondent had no prior record of discipline and demonstrated his belated

acceptance of responsibility by consenting to discipline.

In *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Michael J. Viscuso*, No. 108 DB 2016 (S.Ct. Order 4/27/17), the Supreme Court approved a one-year and one-day license suspension on consent. Respondent Viscuso failed to satisfy a settlement obligation despite his client providing \$2,500.00 with which to do so. Respondent Viscuso thereafter failed to respond to his client's repeated requests for an update regarding the matter. Approximately nine months later, a Petition to Enforce Settlement was filed and granted. Respondent Viscuso received the Petition and Order, but failed to respond or to advise his client of the filings. Respondent Viscuso further failed to comply with the Order. Due to Respondent Viscuso's repeated failures to comply, two Motions for Sanctions were filed and granted, imposing a total \$1,000.00 sanction. Respondent Viscuso failed to advise his client of the Motions for Sanctions, the resulting Court Orders, or his failure to comply therewith. Respondent Viscuso further failed to cooperate with ODC's investigation by failing to respond to a DB-7 letter or the Petition for Discipline and by failing to appear for the Pre-Hearing Conference. In mitigation, Respondent had no prior record of discipline and demonstrated acceptance of responsibility by consenting to discipline

Respondent MacIntyre practiced law for 35 years. In or about the fall of 2017, Respondent voluntarily retired from the practice of law. He does not intend to return to active practice. By entering into this Joint Petition, Respondent has expressed recognition of his violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and understanding of the need for discipline. Respondent has a history of discipline, in that he received an informal admonition in July of 2016. That discipline was predicated upon Respondent's neglect of five client matters over the course of a two year period, which included his failure to appear at hearings in two matters. It is respectfully submitted that a one-year and one-day license suspension is sufficient to protect the public, as Respondent

will be required to petition for reinstatement and prove his fitness to practice if he wishes to resume active status in the future.


Respondent hereby consents to the discipline being imposed upon him. Attached to this Petition is Respondent's executed Affidavit required by Pa.R.D.E. 215(d), stating that Respondent consents to the recommended discipline and including the mandatory acknowledgements contained in Pa.R.D.E. 215(d)(1) through (4).

WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Respondent respectfully request that your Honorable Board:


- (a) Review and approve this Joint Petition and recommend that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania enter an Order imposing a one-year and one-day license suspension; and
- (b) Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(i), enter an order for Respondent to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/22/18

By:   
Kristin A. Wells  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration No. 312080  
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 5800  
P.O. Box 62675  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2675  
Telephone (717) 772-8572

Date: 8-22-18

By:   
Robert B. MacIntyre  
Respondent  
Attorney Registration No. 36817  
6860 Cornell Road  
Harrisburg, PA 17112  
Telephone: (717) 497-0464

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA


OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, : No. \_\_\_\_ Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
Petitioner, :  
 : No. 104 DB 2018  
v. :  
 : Attorney Reg. No. 36817  
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE, :  
Respondent : (Dauphin County)

VERIFICATION


The statements made in the foregoing Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d) are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. This statement is made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/22/18

By:   
Kristin A. Wells  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration No. 312080  
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 5800  
P.O. Box 62675  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2675  
Telephone (717) 772-8572

Date: 8-22-18

By:   
Robert B. MacIntyre  
Respondent  
Attorney Registration No. 36817  
6860 Cornell Road  
Harrisburg, PA 17112  
Telephone: (717) 497-0464

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. ____ Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner,	:	
	:	No. 104 DB 2018
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 36817
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE,	:	
Respondent	:	(Dauphin County)

RESPONDENT'S AFFIDAVIT UNDER RULE 215(d) OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA RULES OF DISCIPLINARY ENFORCEMENT

I, Robert B. MacIntyre, Respondent in the above-captioned matter, hereby consent to the imposition of a one-year and one-day license suspension, as jointly recommended by the Petitioner, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, and myself, in a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent and further state:

1. My consent is freely and voluntarily rendered; I am not being subjected to coercion or duress; I am fully aware of the implications of submitting the consent;
2. I am aware there is presently pending a proceeding involving allegations that I have been guilty of misconduct as set forth in the Joint Petition;
3. I acknowledge that the material facts set forth in the Joint Petition are true;
4. I consent because I know that if the charges continued to be prosecuted in the pending proceeding, I could not successfully defend against them; and
5. I acknowledge that I am fully aware of my right to consult and employ counsel to represent me in the instant proceeding.



Date: 8-22-10

By: \_\_\_\_\_



**Robert B. MacIntyre**  
**Respondent**  
**Attorney Registration No. 36817**  
**6860 Cornell Road**  
**Harrisburg, PA 17112**  
**Telephone: (717) 497-0464**

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. ____ Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner,	:	
	:	No. 104 DB 2018
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 36817
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE,	:	
Respondent	:	(Dauphin County)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am this day serving the foregoing document upon all parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of Disciplinary Board Rules and Procedures § 89.22 (service by a participant).

First Class Mail as follows:

Robert MacIntyre  
6860 Cornell Road  
Harrisburg, PA 17112

Date: 8/22/18

By: Kristin A. Wells  
Kristin A. Wells  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration No. 312080  
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 5800  
P.O. Box 62675  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2675  
Telephone (717) 772-8572

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. ____ Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner,	:	
	:	No. 104 DB 2018
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 36817
ROBERT B. MACINTYRE,	:	
Respondent	:	(Dauphin County)

ORDER

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018, upon consideration of the Recommendation of the Three-Member Panel of the Disciplinary Board, the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent is granted, and Robert B. MacIntyre is suspended on consent from the Bar of this Commonwealth for a period of one year and one day.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Submitted by: Office of Disciplinary Counsel

Signature: Kristin A. Wells

Name: Kristin A. Wells

Attorney No. (if applicable): 312080