

## NOTICE OF RECIPROCAL SUSPENSION

Case No. 96-209-RD

Lawrence E. Shinnick, P-20377, Dallas, Texas, by Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #13

- 1) Suspension - Six (6) Months;
- 2) Effective July 25, 1996.

On July 25, 1996, the Minnesota Supreme Court entered an opinion ordering that respondent be "[i]ndefinitely suspended from the practice of law without right to petition for reinstatement prior to a date 6 months after the date of this opinion." The Minnesota suspension was based on findings that respondent committed misconduct which arose not from professional activity, but from a series of corporate transactions involving respondent in his personal capacity or as a corporate officer or board member. The Court concluded that respondent's conduct in those transactions constituted deceit and fraud under Minnesota Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4(c).

The Grievance Administrator filed a Petition for Order to Show Cause seeking reciprocal discipline in Michigan. The Attorney Discipline Board thereafter entered an Order to Show Cause directing respondent to show cause why a reciprocal order of discipline should not be entered. The panel found that respondent failed to show cause why an order of reciprocal discipline should not be entered; respondent was afforded due process of law in the course of the original proceedings; and imposition of identical discipline in Michigan would not be clearly inappropriate. The panel ordered that respondent be suspended from the practice of law in Michigan for a period of six months from July 25, 1996 to January 25, 1997 and until further order of the Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board or a hearing panel, and until respondent complies with the requirements of MCR 9.123(B) and MCR 9.124.

Costs were assessed in the amount of \$318.50.

NOTE: Respondent has been on inactive status with the State Bar of Michigan since October 1, 1990.