


circumstances of the nature of the offense, the time that has transpired since, the incidences of lapsed conduct, the addictive nature of the offense, the unknown risk of re-offending, for which no specific evidence was offered, all militate in favor of its decision, given the applicant's burden of proof.

As applicant's counsel observed in argument, the determination of what constitutes good moral character is a difficult one for which there are relatively few helpful precedents, and which is necessarily extremely fact-specific. It is likewise highly dependent on personal judgments of credibility, sincerity and intent. While concluding that the applicant does not, at this juncture, meet the standard necessary for admission, the Board notes that the applicant may seek an enlargement of time for admission from a Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court pursuant to 4 M.R.S.A. §805-A(3), and the Board will accept reapplication for admission a year from the date of this decision. During the intervening period the Board would encourage the applicant to continue to address the issues discussed at the hearing. Expanded treatment by appropriate professionals is likewise encouraged, and the applicant is invited to submit regular reports to the Board from psychiatric or psychological professionals with appropriate expertise in support of such reapplication.

Ms. Connors dissented.

Dated at Augusta, Maine this 9th day of February, 2007.


MAINE BOARD OF BAR EXAMINERS
By: Thomas J. Quinn, Esq., Chairperson

cc: Bruce M. Merrill, Esq.
William R. Fisher, Assistant Attorney General