

## NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS

Case No. 96-170-GA

Frenonia Walls, P-45757, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board affirming Tri-County Hearing Panel #16's Order of Reprimand and modifying conditions.

- 1) Reprimand;
- 2) Effective May 28, 1998.

Respondent represented a debtor in bankruptcy proceedings. Bankruptcy schedules listed \$500 in jewelry, but failed to disclose the debtor's ownership of a Rolex watch. Respondent later attended a creditor's hearing, at which the debtor was questioned under oath. After the hearing, the debtor told respondent that she had dropped her watch at the hearing and asked respondent to retrieve it for her. Respondent pled no contest to allegations that she left two messages with the bankruptcy trustee's office in which she falsely represented that she had lost her Rolex watch in the hearing room; and, in a return telephone call from the trustee, she falsely represented to him that the watch belonged to her and that she had received it from her mother's estate. After the trustee demanded proof of ownership, she confessed that the watch belonged to her client and that she said the watch was hers at her client's request. Respondent pled no contest to allegations that her conduct violated MCR 9.104(1)-(4); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.2(c); 4.1; and 8.4(a)-(c). The panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded with conditions relevant to the established misconduct, including community service and continuing legal education. The panel further ordered that should respondent violate those conditions, she may be suspended from the practice of law for 120 days. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$584.48.

The Grievance Administrator filed a petition for review. In an order issued July 2, 1997, the Attorney Discipline Board affirmed the reprimand and two conditions, and modified the condition regarding continuing legal education to successful completion of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. The Board further modified the panel's order by directing that should respondent violate the conditions, she may be suspended from the practice of law for 180 days.

The Grievance Administrator filed an application for leave to appeal, which was denied by the Michigan Supreme Court on May 28, 1998.

