In the Indiana Supreme Court

In the Matter of: Alison K. Devis, Respondent Supreme Court Case No. 23S-DI-310



Published Order Revoking Probation and Imposing Suspension

On January 12, 2024, this Court entered an order approving a conditional agreement under which Respondent was suspended from the practice of law for a period of 90 days, with 30 days actively served and the 60-day balance conditionally stayed subject to completion of at least two years of probation with monitoring by the Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program (JLAP). Consistent with the parties' conditional agreement, our order provided that if Respondent violated her probation, "the stay of her suspension may be vacated and the balance of the stayed suspension may be actively served without automatic reinstatement."

On April 11, 2024, the Commission filed a verified motion to revoke Respondent's probation, averring that Respondent declined to sign a JLAP monitoring agreement and was not participating in JLAP services. Respondent has filed no response to the Commission's motion, and her failure to do so is deemed an admission of the Commission's allegations. *See* Admis. Disc. R. 23(16)(c)(2).

Being duly advised, the Court GRANTS the Commission's motion and revokes Respondent's probation. **Respondent shall be suspended from the practice of law for a period of not less than 60 days, without automatic reinstatement, beginning July 5, 2024.** Respondent shall not undertake any new legal matters between service of this order and the effective date of the suspension, and Respondent shall fulfill all the duties of a suspended attorney under Admission and Discipline Rule 23(26). At the conclusion of the minimum period of suspension, Respondent may petition this Court for reinstatement to the practice of law in this state, provided Respondent pays the costs of this proceeding, fulfills the duties of a suspended attorney, and satisfies the requirements for reinstatement of Admission and Discipline Rule 23(18). Reinstatement is discretionary and requires clear and convincing evidence of the attorney's remorse, rehabilitation, and fitness to practice law.

The costs of this proceeding are assessed against Respondent.

Done at Indianapolis, Indiana, on <u>5/24/2024</u>

Loretta H. Rush Chief Justice of Indiana

All Justices concur.