

## **NOTICE OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION**

Case Nos. 00-46-GA; 00-75-FA; 00-89-GA

Issued: November 9, 2000

Karen R. Hammond a/k/a Karen R. Hammond-Nash, P-40878, South Bend, Indiana, by the Attorney Discipline Board Kalamazoo County Hearing Panel #1.

1. Suspension - 179 days.
2. Effective November 9, 2000.

With regard to Formal Complaints 00-46-GA and 00-75-FA, the hearing panel found, by default, that respondent had committed professional misconduct, specifically: In a civil matter, respondent failed to file an appearance resulting in a default being entered against her client; failed to file a motion to set aside that default; failed to protect her client's interests; failed to respond to her client's numerous inquiries regarding the status of her matter; abandoned her client's representation; and failed to promptly refund unearned fees. In a criminal matter, respondent failed to comply with the prosecution's discovery demand; and caused the court to declare a mistrial due to respondent's representation after the jury trial had commenced. Respondent also failed to file an answer to the request for investigation or the formal complaint served by the Grievance Administrator. Respondent's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(a)-(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 1.5(a); 1.16(d); 3.2; 8.1(b); and 8.4(a) and (c).

With regard to Formal Complaint 00-89-GA, the panel found, unanimously, that respondent had committed professional misconduct, to wit: In an annulment proceeding, respondent failed to file for annulment on behalf of her client; hired a private investigator, without authorization, to verify the address of her client's husband despite having been given the current address of the husband; failed to respond to her client's inquiries as to the status of her matter; abandoned her client's representation; failed to promptly refund unearned fees; and failed to answer the request for investigation served by the Grievance Administrator. Respondent's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(a)-(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4; 1.5(a); 1.16(d); 8.1(b); and 8.4(a) and (c).

The hearing panel ordered that respondent's license be suspended for 179 days and that she pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$750.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$881.37.