

authorization of the payment of attorney's fees, and subsequent lack of reporting, raises at best competency concerns, and at worse concerns about her professional ethics.

Finally, during the hearing, Ms. Marino addressed the attempt to bill a \$1,100 flat fee for what the trial court had discerned to be services as guardian over the person. See Exh. 37. According to Judge King's Order on Guardian's Third Motion for Reconsideration at 5-6 (Index #60) and the court file, *see Motion for Reconsideration* ¶28 (Index #57), Ms. Marino reported that the entry was a "typo" and she meant to charge for "mileage" rather than a "monthly fee" as recited. Judge King did not find that offering credible. See Order on Third Motion for Reconsideration at 5 (Index #60). At the disciplinary hearing Ms. Marino initially attempted to explain the asserted "typo" differently. Initially she attributed it to erroneously typing "con" that prompted her QuickBooks billing program to print "consulting" rather "copying," which would have been printed if the correct typing prompt of "cop" had been entered. Yet, when queried further by the undersigned for clarification given my then present inability to locate exhibit admitted documentation and what struck me as a rather large charge for copies, Ms. Marino responded by offering that it was her erroneous typing of the wrong prompt for "mileage" that caused the billing program to print "monthly fee." Wholly apart from the finality of the trial court's ruling on her credibility based on her pled explanation, the absence of any explication for how the prompts "con" or "cop," for that matter should cause "mileage" to be entered on the invoice, the inconsistency between what she pled in her *Motion for Reconsideration* and testimony at the disciplinary hearing leaves the undersigned dubious of her proffer. In addition, the undersigned is disturbed that the invoice included in Exhibit 37 "was only produced at the insistence of the [trial] court" in