NOTICE OF REVOCATION AND RESTITUTION

Case No. 03-50-GA

Notice Issued: August 11, 2003

Darryl L. Orr, P-26481, Saginaw, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Genesee County Hearing Panel #4.

- 1. Revocation
- 2. Effective April 30, 2003¹

The hearing panel found, by default, that respondent, in a real estate matter, took money from his clients after he had been suspended from the practice of law; and failed to return the money. In an adoption matter, respondent failed to initiate any adoption proceeding although he represented to this clients that he had done so; lied to his clients by telling them that hearing dates were scheduled in the adoption action although he knew there were no hearing dates scheduled; failed to advise that he would not handle the matter; failed to maintain reasonable communications with his clients or keep them advised of the true status of their legal matter; and failed to make the client file available to his clients.

In an employment matter, respondent filed a complaint without first conducting a proper investigation, research or providing competent counsel regarding the viability of the cause of action; failed to advise his client to exhaust his administrative and union remedies before proceeding to civil litigation; failed a complaint which failed to comply with applicable court rules and because of its nonsensical content, was stricken, by the court. Respondent also failed to maintain reasonable communications with his client; and lied to his client regarding the status of his case.

In the real estate and adoption matters, respondent continued to hold himself out as an attorney; failed to notify his clients that he was suspended; and failed to file the requisite affidavit of compliance concerning notification of his suspension from the practice of law to his clients with the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Attorney Discipline Board. Finally, respondent failed to file an answer to three requests for investigation served by the Grievance Administrator.

Respondent's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1)-(4), (7), and (9); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and MCR 9.119(A)-(E); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(a)-(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a) and (b); 1.16(d); 5.5(a); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a)-(c). The panel issued an order revoking respondent's license to practice law in Michigan and ordering him to pay restitution in the amount of \$2,000.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,725.01.

¹ Respondent has been continuously suspended from the practice of law since September 12, 2001. Please see Notice of Suspension dated September 25, 2001.