

## NOTICE OF SUSPENSION WITH CONDITIONS

Case No. 95-240-GA

Glenn R. Stevens, P-36197, Grand Blanc, MI, by the Attorney Discipline Board affirming Genesee County Hearing Panel #2's Order of Suspension With Conditions.

- 1) Suspension - 180 Days;
- 2) Effective May 28, 1997.

Respondent was retained to represent the first complainant in claims against her employer. The panel found that respondent engaged in conduct which prejudiced her interests, and made misrepresentations to her and another attorney making an inquiry on her behalf. Respondent was retained to represent the second complainant in a divorce action her husband filed in Ohio. The panel found that respondent failed to inform her of opposing counsel's post-judgment offer to negotiate a property settlement or to make a settlement proposal on her behalf; filed a complaint for divorce in Michigan, failing to indicate the existence of the Ohio matter; although he repeatedly assured her that he would seek temporary support and continued health insurance on her behalf, failed to do so; twice failed to have the summons and complaint for the Michigan divorce action served on the defendant, resulting in two dismissals for non-service; and failed to inform her of the dismissals. Respondent was retained by the third complainant to bring land contract forfeiture proceedings. The panel found that respondent neglected the matter; failed to adequately communicate with the complainant; and made a misrepresentation in his answer to the Request for Investigation. Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4), (6) and (7); MCR 9.113(A); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 3.1; 3.2; 3.3(a)(2); 3.4(c); 4.1; 8.1(a); and 8.4(a)-(c). The panel ordered that respondent be suspended for 180 days, implement an appropriate office management system, and complete a course in attorney-client ethics.

Respondent filed petitions for review and stay of discipline. The stay was granted. In an order and opinion entered May 5, 1997, the Attorney Discipline Board affirmed the panel's order. Respondent filed an application for leave to appeal and motion for stay of discipline, which were both denied by the Michigan Supreme Court in an order entered June 10, 1997. The Grievance Administrator filed a cross-application for leave to appeal, which was denied in an order entered November 18, 1997. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$2271.59.

