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



FINAL NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

Case No. 07-89-JC

Notice Issued: December 6, 2010

Walter L. Baumgardner, Jr., P.28935, St. Clair Shores, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board increasing Tri-County Hearing Panel #102's order of suspension from 30 days to a suspension of 180 days.

- 1. Suspension 180 Days (with credit given for 30 days)
- 2. Effective November 16, 2010

Based on respondent's conviction, the hearing panel found that he was convicted of criminal contempt of court, in violation of MCL 600.1701, et. seq. Respondent's conduct was also in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(5).

The hearing panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 30 days, with credit given for six days for time served in the Oakland County jail. The Grievance Administrator filed a petition for review. During the review period, the respondent did not request a stay of discipline and the suspension went into effect on October 13, 2009, and was terminated on November 6, 2009, upon respondent's filing of an affidavit in compliance MCR 9.124(A) with the Michigan Supreme Court Clerk.

After review, the Attorney Discipline Board issued an order on October 18, 2010, increasing discipline from a 30 day suspension to a 180 day suspension, with credit given for the time already served by respondent (six days for time served in the Oakland County jail, and 24 days for the suspension served in accordance with the hearing panel's order).

Respondent filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court, along with a motion for stay of discipline. On December 1, 2010, the Court denied respondent's application for leave to appeal. The motion for stay was denied as moot. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,892.15.

Johr -62010Dated: