

MEMBERS
WILLIAM J. DANHOF
CHAIRPERSON
THOMAS G. KIENBAUM
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
WILLIAM L. MATTHEWS, CPA
SECRETARY
ANDREA L. SOLAK
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
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 REPRIMAND AND RESTITUTION
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 08-187-GA; 09-55-GA

Notice Issued: February 18, 2010

Sheldon M. Scharg, P 27718, West Bloomfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #81.

1. Reprimand
2. Effective February 18, 2010

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5) which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Respondent pleaded no contest to the allegations that, in one matter, he failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and failed to comply promptly with reasonable requests for information; failed to explain the matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions about the representation; knowingly failed to respond to the lawful demands for information from a disciplinary agency during the investigation of a Request for Investigation. In a second matter, respondent pleaded no contest to the allegations that he neglected the legal matter; failed to seek the client's objectives; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his client; failed to refund the advance payment of a fee that was not earned upon termination of the representation; failed to timely answer the Request for Investigation; and knowingly failed to respond to lawful demands for information from a disciplinary agency during the investigation of a Request for Investigation.

Respondent's conduct was alleged to be in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1)-(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a) and (b); 1.16(d); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a) and (c).

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and pay restitution in the amount of \$2,000.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$824.73.

John F. Van Bolt

FEB 18 2010

Dated: _____