

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JUL 19 2016

**Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia**

Ty Clevenger,)	
Respondent,)	Attorney Grievance
Member of the Bar of the)	Docket No. 15-19
United States District Court)	
For the District of Columbia)	
)	

**ORDER TO CONDUCT HEARING ON
CHARGE OF IMPROPER PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

This matter comes before the Disciplinary Panel of this Court to consider the Charge of Improper Professional Conduct (“Charge”) against Respondent Ty Clevenger. The Committee on Grievances of this District Court filed the Charge against Respondent on December 3, 2015. Respondent has filed an Answer thereto. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 83.16(d)(8), it is

ORDERED that this matter shall be set down for a hearing to be held in Courtroom 11 on Tuesday, August 30, at 10 a.m.; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the hearing shall be held for a period of one hour, with each side having thirty minutes to present their respective cases through the presentation of documentary evidence and argument; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the Committee’s Representative shall collect the Committee’s evidence, have it pre-marked and served upon Respondent at least thirty days prior to the scheduled hearing, along with four copies to the Clerk of the

RECEIVED
JUL 17 2016
DEPT. OF JUSTICE
RECEIVED
COURT REPORTERS
AND INTERPRETERS
BOARD


Disciplinary Panel; and that Respondent shall collect his evidence and have it pre-marked and served upon the Committee's Representative at least fourteen days prior to the scheduled hearing, along with four copies to the Clerk of the Disciplinary Panel; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that motions filed by either side shall be considered by the Disciplinary Panel on the papers filed, unless oral argument is deemed necessary.


SO ORDERED, this 18 day of July 2016.



Judge Christopher R. Cooper



Judge Randolph D. Moss



Judge Amit Mehta

1

¹ Judges Mehta and Moss, the two alternate members of the Disciplinary Panel previously appointed by the Chief Judge, are participating in this matter due to the recusals of two of the Panel's standing members.