

IN THE SUPREME COURT, STATE OF WYOMING

2026 WY 113

October Term, A.D. 2026

October 21, 2026

**BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL
RESPONSIBILITY, WYOMING
STATE BAR,**

Petitioner,

v.

**CORRIE LYNN LAMB, WSB
#7-5923,**

Respondent.

D-26-0004

ORDER OF PUBLIC CENSURE

[¶1] **This matter** came before the Court upon a Report and Recommendation for Public Censure, filed herein October 8, 2026, by the Board of Professional Responsibility for the Wyoming State Bar. The Report and Recommendation was filed pursuant to Rule 12 of the Wyoming Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, which governs stipulated discipline. The Court, after a careful review of the Board of Professional Responsibility's Report and Recommendation and the file, finds that the Report and Recommendation should be approved, confirmed and adopted by the Court, and that Respondent Corrie Lynn Lamb should be publicly censured for her conduct. It is, therefore,

[¶2] **ADJUDGED AND ORDERED** that the Board of Professional Responsibility's Report and Recommendation for Public Censure, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein, shall be, and the same hereby is, approved, confirmed, and adopted by this Court; and it is further

[¶3] **ADJUDGED AND ORDERED** that, as a result of the conduct set forth in the Report and Recommendation for Public Censure, Corrie Lynn Lamb shall be publicly censured; and it is further;

[¶4] **ORDERED** that, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Wyoming Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, Ms. Lamb shall reimburse the Wyoming State Bar the amount of \$50.00, representing the costs incurred in handling this matter, as well as pay the administrative fee of \$750.00. Ms. Lamb shall pay the total amount of \$800.00 to the Wyoming State Bar on or before November 2, 2026. If Ms. Lamb fails to make payment in the time allotted, execution may issue on the award; and it is further

[¶5] **ORDERED** that the Wyoming State Bar may issue the agreed press release contained in the Report and Recommendation for Public Censure; and it is further

[¶6] **ORDERED** that the Clerk of this Court shall docket this Order of Public Censure, along with the incorporated Report and Recommendation for Public Censure, as a matter coming regularly before this Court as a public record; and it is further

[¶7] **ORDERED** that, pursuant to Rule 9(b) of the Wyoming Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, this Order of Public Censure, along with the incorporated Report and Recommendation for Public Censure, shall be published in the Wyoming Reporter and the Pacific Reporter; and it is further

[¶8] **ORDERED** that the Clerk of this Court cause a copy of this Order of Public Censure to be served upon Respondent Corrie Lynn Lamb.

[¶9] **DATED** this 21st day of October, 2026.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

LYNNE BOOMGAARDEN
Chief Justice

BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT

STATE OF WYOMING

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WYOMING
FILED

OCT - 8 2026

SHAWNA GOETZ, CLERK
Carol M. Lamb
by DEPUTY

In the matter of
CORRIE LYNN LAMB,
WSB # 7-5923,

Respondent.

Docket No. 2025-109

D-26-0004

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC CENSURE

THIS MATTER came before a Review Panel of the Board of Professional Responsibility comprised of Hon. W. Thomas Sullins (chair), Hon. John C. Brooks and Brett McPeak for consideration of the parties' Stipulation for Public Censure pursuant to Rules 9 and 12 of the Wyoming Rules of Disciplinary Procedure. The Review Panel having reviewed the Stipulation, the supporting Affidavit and being fully advised in the premises, finds, concludes and recommends:

Findings

1. Corrie Lynn Lamb ("Respondent") was admitted to the Wyoming State Bar on September 11, 2017. She practiced law with various Gillette firms until 2022, when she and her husband, Dallas Lamb, formed Shepherd Law, LLC.

2. In late October 2025, Bar Counsel was copied on a letter to Respondent from the four district court judges in the Sixth Judicial District admonishing her for failing to appear in court, being late to hearings and being unprepared. Bar Counsel initiated an investigation for possible violations of Rules 1.1 (competence), 1.3 (diligence), 3.1 (meritorious claims and contentions) and 3.4(c) (failure to abide by the rules of the tribunal (OBC 002) and requested a written response by November 10, 2025.

3. Respondent failed to timely respond to Bar Counsel's inquiry. On November 17, 2025, Bar Counsel wrote to Respondent again, reminding her of her duty under Rule of Profes-

sional Conduct 8.1(b) and Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 8(a) to cooperate with Bar Counsel's investigation.

4. On November 18, 2025, Respondent's written response was received essentially denying any misconduct on her part and blaming any lapses on a myriad of issues, including problems with support staff. Bar Counsel forwarded Respondent's response to the four district court judges and asked for their thoughts on the matter.

5. Bar Counsel received a response from District Court Judge Stuart Healy, the first paragraph of which encapsulates the problem:

Thank you for sharing this. I suspected that Ms. Lamb would try to say that all of this is due to a change in personnel at her office because that is what she has told our JA's (they know better). That is not true. The court's issues with her have been going on almost since I started as a judge here in December of 2020. She is frequently (and, incredibly, even since receiving our letter of concern) late for hearings or fails to show up. There is always an excuse, e.g., new calendaring software (I have heard that on at least two occasions - and before she lost the employee she complains of), sick children, lack of babysitter, car issues, getting lost on the way to court in Newcastle two days in a row (ask Judge Castano about that one), etc. On multiple occasions I have had to pause court to allow her to confer with her client because they have not discussed a primary issue. There was a time last year when, at a break during a divorce trial, she thought it was appropriate to vape in the courtroom - a choice that was captured on Teams and observed by my staff attorney. At one point we judges were so concerned about what she was wearing to court, we had to have Judge Bartlett discuss with her what appropriate dress is. It's simply issue after issue.

6. Bar Counsel received a response from District Court Judge Michael McGrady, who concluded his comments with, "Something needs to change, but I am concerned that the executive functioning deficiencies are baked in the cake. I don't see how a calendaring tool or software program can fix an attorney who is not capable of being in charge of her office and cases."

7. On November 24, 2025, Bar Counsel wrote to Respondent, providing Respondent with copies of the judges' feedback and sharing the conclusion that Bar Counsel's investigation

revealed clear and convincing evidence of violations of Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3 (diligence):

Taken together, these responses document a troubling pattern of multiple violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct by you. Your tardiness for court, failure to prepare your clients for court appearances and multiple failures to even show up for court evidence violation of Rule 1.3 (diligence).

Bar Counsel proposed a stipulated resolution of the pending investigation and requested a response from Respondent by the close of business December 1, 2025. Respondent failed to respond.

8. On December 9, 2025, Bar Counsel received an email from Circuit Court Judge Gregory Steward regarding something that happened that morning, when Respondent failed to appear for a hearing in circuit court. Bar Counsel provided a copy of Judge Steward's report to Respondent and informed Respondent that Bar Counsel was going to request authority to file a formal charge from the Review and Oversight Committee.

9. On December 22, 2025, the Review and Oversight Committee issued an order of finding of probable cause, authorizing Bar Counsel to file a formal charge against Respondent. On January 2, 2026, Bar Counsel filed a formal charge against Respondent with the Board of Professional Responsibility (BPR).

10. Respondent conditionally admits, and the Review Panel finds, that Respondent engaged in a pattern of conduct that constitutes a violation of Rule 1.3, W.R.Prof.Cond., including:

- Being late for court appearances or failing to appear;
- Being unprepared for court appearances;
- Filing incorrect or incomplete documents; and
- Failing to timely respond to questions/requests from court personnel.

Determination of the Appropriate Sanction

11. Rule 15(b)(3)(D) of the Wyoming Rules of Disciplinary Procedure (WR.DP) provides that in imposing a sanction for professional conduct, the BPR shall apply the ABA Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (the “ABA Standards”). Pertinent to the present Stipulation, it is necessary to apply the ABA standards relevant to the duty violated by Respondent as well as aggravating and mitigating factors.

12. ABA Standard 4.4 sets forth the sanction guidelines for lawyers who breach a duty of diligence as required by Rule 1.3. Standard 4.4 provides:

Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in Standard 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving a failure to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client:

- 4.41 Disbarment is generally appropriate when:
 - (a) a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or
 - (b) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and cause serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or
 - (c) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client.
- 4.42 Suspension is generally appropriate when:
 - (a) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or potential injury to a client, or
 - (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes injury or potential injury to a client.
- 4.43 Reprimand [i.e., “public censure” under Rule 9(a)(3) of the Rules of Disciplinary Procedure] is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes injury or potential injury to a client.
- 4.44 Admonition [i.e., “private reprimand” under Rule 9(a)(4) of the Rules of Disciplinary Procedure] is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a client.

The parties agree, and the Review Panel so finds that in Respondent’s case, before weighing aggravating and mitigating factors, the presumptive sanction is a suspension.

13. Aggravating and mitigating factors. ABA Standard 9.0, entitled “Aggravation and Mitigation,” provides as follows:

9.1 *Generally*

After misconduct has been established, aggravating and mitigating circumstances may be considered in deciding what sanction to impose.

9.2 *Aggravation*

9.21 *Definition.* Aggravation or aggravating circumstances are any considerations or factors that may justify an increase in the degree of discipline to be imposed.

9.22 *Factors which may be considered in aggravation.* Aggravating factors include:

- (a) prior disciplinary offenses;
- (b) dishonest or selfish motive;
- (c) a pattern of misconduct;
- (d) multiple offenses;
- (e) bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency;
- (f) submission of false evidence, false statements, or other deceptive practices during the disciplinary process;
- (g) refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct;
- (h) vulnerability of the victim;
- (i) substantial experience in the practice of law;
- (j) indifference in making restitution; and
- (k) illegal conduct, including that involving the use of controlled substances.

9.3 *Mitigation.*

9.31 *Definition.* Mitigation or mitigating circumstances are any considerations or factors that may justify a reduction in the degree of discipline to be imposed.

9.32 *Factors which may be considered in mitigation.* Mitigating factors include:

- (a) absence of a prior disciplinary record;
- (b) absence of a dishonest or selfish motive;
- (c) personal or emotional problems;
- (d) timely good faith effort to make restitution or to rectify consequences of misconduct;
- (e) full and free disclosure of disciplinary board or cooperative attitude toward proceedings;
- (f) inexperience in the practice of law;
- (g) character or reputation;
- (h) physical disability;
- (i) mental disability or chemical dependency including alcoholism or drug abuse when:

- (1) there is medical evidence that the respondent is affected by a chemical dependency or mental disability;
- (2) the chemical dependency or mental disability caused the misconduct;
- (3) the respondent's recovery from the chemical dependency or mental disability is demonstrated by a meaningful and sustained period of successful rehabilitation; and
- (4) the recovery arrested the misconduct and recurrence of that misconduct is unlikely.
- (j) delay in disciplinary proceedings;
- (k) imposition of other penalties or sanctions;
- (l) remorse; and
- (m) remoteness of prior offenses.

9.4 *Factors Which Are Neither Aggravating nor Mitigating.*

The following factors should not be considered as either aggravating nor mitigating:

- (a) forced or compelled restitution;
- (b) agreeing to the client's demand for certain improper behavior or result;
- (c) withdrawal of complaint against the lawyer;
- (d) resignation prior to completion of disciplinary proceedings;
- (e) complainant's recommendation as to sanction; and
- (f) failure of injured client to complain.

The parties agree, and the Review Panel so finds that in Respondent's case, the only aggravating factor is a pattern of misconduct. Respondent has implemented sensible measures to guard against a recurrence of such misconduct. The parties further agree that other mitigating factors include absence of a prior disciplinary record, personal problems and remorse. In addition, the parties agree, and the Review Panel so finds that taken together, these mitigating factors justify reducing the presumptive sanction for Respondent's misconduct from a suspension to a public censure.

13. Respondent and Bar Counsel agree and stipulate, and the Review Panel so finds that a public censure is an appropriate sanction for Respondent's misconduct. If the Court issues an Order of Public Censure in accordance herewith, Bar Counsel and Respondent have agreed to the following press release:

The Wyoming Supreme Court has issued an order of public censure of Gillette attorney Corrie Lynn Lamb. The order stems from Ms. Lamb's conduct in failing to appear at multiple hearings as well as other violations of Wyoming Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3, which requires that attorneys act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client. Following Bar Counsel's investigation of reports received from a number of Gillette judges, the parties reached a stipulation that Ms. Lamb had committed multiple violations of her obligation of diligence and agreed that a public censure was the appropriate sanction for such conduct. The parties' stipulated resolution was approved by the Board of Professional Responsibility (BPR) of the Wyoming State Bar and was submitted to the Wyoming Supreme Court. In adopting the BPR's recommendation for a public censure, the Court ordered Ms. Lamb to pay an administrative fee of \$750.00 and costs in the amount of \$50.00 to the Wyoming State Bar.

Recommendation

In consideration of the foregoing findings, the Review Panel recommends as follows:

1. That Respondent receive a public censure for violations of Rule 1.3, W.R.Prof.Cond.
2. That, upon issuance of the order of public censure, the foregoing press release may be issued.
3. That Respondent be required to pay an administrative fee of \$750.00 and costs of \$50.00 to the Wyoming State Bar within 10 days of such order.

Dated this 30th day of September, 2026.



W. Thomas Sullins, Chair
Review Panel of the Board of Professional
Responsibility
Wyoming State Bar