

MEMBERS
WILLIAM J. DANHOF
CHAIRPERSON
THOMAS G. KIENBAUM
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
SECRETARY
WILLIAM L. MATTHEWS
ANDREA L. SOLAK
CARL E. VER BEEK
CRAIG H. LUBBEN
JAMES M. CAMERON, JR.
SYLVIA P. WHITMER, Ph.D

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



JOHN F. VAN BOLT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARK A. ARMITAGE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

JENNIFER M. PETTY
LEGAL ASSISTANT

211 WEST FORT ST.
SUITE 1410
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236
PHONE: 313-963-5553
FAX: 313-963-5571

WWW.ADBMICH.ORG

NOTICE OF REVOCATION AND RESTITUTION

Case No. 10-52-GA

Notice Issued: November 15, 2010

Shelley Stasson, P 30259, West Bloomfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #67.

1. Revocation
2. Effective November 12, 2010¹

The respondent appeared at the public hearing, but was found to be in default for her failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. Based on that default, the panel found that respondent failed to notify her clients and tribunals of her suspension from the practice of law; failed to file proof of compliance with the order of discipline; and practiced law and held herself out as an attorney after the effective date of her suspension.

Additionally, respondent was found to have failed to keep her clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters and to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; failed to communicate with her clients to the extent reasonably necessary for the clients to make informed decisions regarding their representation; charged an illegal and excessive fee; failed to communicate with her clients regarding the basis or rate of her fee; neglected a legal matter; failed to seek the lawful objectives of one of her clients; failed to provide an accounting upon request; failed to surrender papers to a client after termination of the representation; failed to respond to the Grievance Administrator's lawful demand for information; failed to provide competent representation to a client; handled a legal matter which the lawyer knows or should know that the lawyer is not competent to handle, without associating with a lawyer who is competent to handle it; brought a proceeding in which there was no basis for doing so that was not frivolous; failed to withdraw from representation; and knowingly disobeyed an obligation under the rules of a tribunal.

Respondent's conduct was in violation of Michigan Court Rules 9.104(A)(1)-(4) and (9); and 9.119(A)-(C) and (E); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1; 1.1(a) and (c); 1.4(a) and (b); 1.2(a); 1.5(a) and (b); 1.15(b)(3); 1.16(d); 3.1; 3.4(c); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a)-(c).

The hearing panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be revoked and that she pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$20,795.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$2,014.81.


John F. Van Bolt

NOV 15 2010

Dated: _____

¹ Respondent has been continuously suspended from the practice of law in Michigan since December 18, 2008. Please see Final Notice of Suspension and Restitution with Conditions issued April 21, 2009.