

in her ward's best interest); NGA Standard 9 (violating M.P.'s right to self-determination); and NGA Standard 13 (failing to visit with M.P. and consult with her care team with a regularity required by the standards). She was removed as M.P.'s guardian. These are all serious breaches of professional conduct and, after briefing and review of the record by the New Hampshire Supreme Court, were found supportable. See In re Guardianship of M.P., No. 2014-0655 at 4 (Sept. 14, 2015).

At the hearing, Ms. Marino testified to her view of the events. When reminded that it was inappropriate to re-litigate the Probate Division's findings, counsel stated that the testimony was relevant to her state of mind and thus the scope of any appropriate sanction(s). Although I agree, I also note that the Probate Division made findings lying within the realm of her state of mind, for example, that "Ms. Marino demonstrated a callous disregard for the needs and requests of [M.P.]." Id. Consequently, her testimony was allowed and is credited to the extent that it explains her "callous disregard" in a manner that might mitigate any sanction(s) recommended.

Ms. Marino testified that she believed that the team was aware of her plan to move M.P. to a new facility. She stated, however, that she now recognizes that she "could have handled it better" by requesting a team meeting. The undersigned was troubled by Ms. Marino's testimony that she felt "blindsided" by the fact that the abrupt transfer of M.P. was not well received by her care team. It is apparent that she did not adequately or directly communicate with the executive director and important members of the care team before the move. Indeed, she admitted that it was her responsibility to have better communicated to them her plan to move M.P. It finds her attribution for the