

UW bomber David Fine loses Oregon law bid

By Mary Frances Schjonberg
Courts reporter

Convicted Sterling Hall bomber David Fine has only the Oregon Supreme Court left to appeal to in his effort to become a lawyer in Oregon.

On Wednesday a three-lawyer panel appointed by that court to review Fine's application for permission to practice law in Oregon said Fine's request should be denied. The recommendation is automatically reviewed by the state Supreme Court, according to George Riemer, Oregon State Bar chief attorney.

² The portrait that emerges from the evidence is of an applicant prone to self-serving statements and actions (and) whose acknowledgement of guilt or wrongdoing is always tempered by disclaimers of full responsibility and whose candor is suspect," the panel wrote in its 46-page recommendation.

Fine engaged in "ongoing criminal activity which would have continued if he had not been caught," the panel concluded.

Fine became a fugitive after the

Turn to Page 2, Col. 1

Fine loses law bid

Continued from Page 1

early-morning bombing of the Army Math Research Center in August 1970 which killed researcher Robert Fasnacht and caused about \$2.5 million in damage. Fine was 18 at the time.

He was arrested in California in 1976, pleaded guilty to his role in the bombing, including a charge of third-degree murder, and spent slightly more than 36 months in federal prison.

Since being paroled in 1979, Fine, 33, has graduated from the University of Oregon Law School and passed the bar examination. The Oregon State Bar opposed his request for permission to practice law, questioning his moral character.

The panel said it considered the testimony of others but paid particular attention to Fine's appearance and testimony both to it and on other occasions. It also considered Fine's writings before and after his arrest.

Fine "has changed only when he



David Fine

has been made to change or when it has been to his advantage to do so," the panel wrote.

He makes decisions based not on what is right or wrong but "on what is good for him," the panel wrote.

The panel decided that Fine had not provided "clear and convincing evidence" that he had "good moral character."