

**NOTICE OF SUSPENSION**  
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 99-175-GA; 00-31-GA

Issued: June 20, 2000

Craig W. Sloan, P-43937, Portage, Michigan, by Attorney Discipline Board Kalamazoo County Hearing Panel #2.

- 1) Suspension - 180 Days;
- 2) Effective October 1, 1999.

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator submitted a stipulation for a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5). The stipulation was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by a hearing panel. Respondent offered a plea of no contest to charges of professional misconduct in two formal complaints, to wit: respondent's neglect of a probate matter resulted in his removal as attorney for the estate, his arraignment on a bench warrant and a finding of contempt; respondent failed to appear at two scheduled hearings in another probate matter, failed to close the estate and failed to communicate with his client; respondent's failure to show cause why he should not be held in contempt for failing to account promptly for the settlement proceeds in a wrongful death action resulted in the issuance of a bench warrant for his arrest; respondent neglected a potential personal injury claim on behalf of another client and failed to inform that client, prior to the expiration of the statute of limitations, that he would not be instituting a lawsuit on the client's behalf; respondent failed to promptly investigate a potential employment discrimination claim, failed to advise his client of the applicable statute of limitations and otherwise failed to keep his client reasonably informed concerning the status of the matter; respondent failed to promptly investigate a potential employment discrimination matter on behalf of another client, failed to inform his client he would not be filing a complaint on her behalf and otherwise failed to keep the client reasonably informed concerning the status of the matter; respondent failed to notify a client of his suspension from the practice of law as the result of a prior discipline proceeding. Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104(1)-(4) and (9); MCR 9.119(A); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4; 3.2; 3.4(c); 5.5(a); and 8.4(a)-(c).

The parties stipulated that respondent's license to practice law should be suspended for a period of 180 days, retroactive to October 1, 1999. [Note: Respondent's license was suspended for 90 days effective January 19, 1999 and was suspended for 30 days effective March 10, 1999. Those suspensions remain in effect.] Costs were assessed in the amount of \$190.50.