

## NOTICE OF REPRIMAND AND RESTITUTION

Case No. 94-180-GA

Timothy S. Crawford, P-35730, Detroit, Michigan, by Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #3.

- 1) Reprimand;
- 2) Effective April 21, 1995.

Respondent was retained to represent a defendant charged in two separate criminal matters and was paid \$4,250 for both matters. In the first matter, respondent appeared at a preliminary examination at which his request for a forensic examination of the defendant was granted. The court entered an order for examination on criminal responsibility and competency, and respondent was notified that an appointment had been scheduled for his client. Respondent pled nolo contendere to allegations that, in the first matter, he failed to inform his client of that appointment; failed to have the appointment rescheduled; failed to secure the re-issuance of orders for examination; failed to take any further action on his client's behalf other than to file a Notice to Prosecutor of Defense of Insanity; failed to keep in reasonable communication with his client or keep him informed of the status of the case; failed to notify his client of his suspension from the practice of law; failed to notify both courts of his suspension; failed to notify both prosecutors of his suspension; allowed himself to remain counsel of record in both matters; failed to advise his client of the location of his files; and failed to refund the unearned portion of the \$4,250 fee.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(9); MCR 9.119(A)and(B); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.3; 1.4; 1.5(a); 1.15(b) 1.16(d); 3.2; and 8.4(a)and(c).

Based the recommendation of the parties, the panel reprimanded respondent and ordered him make restitution in the amount of \$2,500. The panel further concluded that should respondent fail to make restitution within the time prescribed, the nolo contendere plea should stand, and respondent should be ordered to show cause why further discipline should not be imposed. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$87.44.

NOTE: Respondent has been suspended from the practice of law in Michigan since August 15, 1994.