

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

Case Nos. 91-214-GA; 91-262-FA; 92-150-GA

Vincent W. Dent, P-36828, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board vacating a hearing panel Order of Revocation in Case Nos. 91-214-GA; 91-262-FA and adopting the findings and recommendations of the Master.

- 1) Suspension - two (2) years;
- 2) Effective May 25, 1994.

Respondent failed to answer Formal Complaints 91-214-GA and 91-262-FA, but appeared at the hearing held in Bloomfield Hills on August 11, 1992. Respondent's default were entered, and the panel determined that the defaults established the allegations of the Formal Complaints.

Respondent was retained to bring an action for restoration of a client's driver's license and was paid a \$500 retainer fee, but failed to file the action; failed to respond to his client's inquiries; failed to refund the unearned portion of the retainer fee; and failed to timely answer the Request for Investigation.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(7); MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 1.15(b); 1.16(d); 8.1(b); and 8.4(a)and(c).

On October 28, 1992, Tri-County Hearing Panel #81 entered an Order of Revocation and Restitution. Restitution was ordered in the amount of \$500. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$237.08. Respondent filed a petition for review, which was held in abeyance pending the outcome of Case No. 92-150-GA.

Respondent admitted the allegations in Formal Complaint 92-150-GA, as follows: Respondent was retained to institute an appeal from a criminal conviction, but failed to take any action on his client's behalf and failed to answer the Request for Investigation. Respondent was retained to represent the defendant in a criminal matter, but failed to take any action on his client's behalf and failed to answer the Request for Investigation.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(7); MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 3.2; 8.1(b); and 8.4(a)-(c).

In its report filed on May 13, 1993. Tri-County Hearing Panel #54 recommended that the Attorney Discipline Board appoint a Master

to conduct a hearing on the imposition of discipline and the consideration of probation under MCR 9.121(C) both Case No. 92-150-GA and Case Nos. 91-214-GA; 91-262-FA. The Attorney Discipline Board entered an Order Appointing Master on May 13, 1993.

Following a hearing, the Master concluded that respondent did not qualify for probation under MCR 9.121(C) and recommended that his request for probation be denied. The Master further recommended that in light of respondent's efforts to overcome his cocaine addiction, discipline in the consolidated matters be reduced to a two-year suspension, to run consecutive to the three-year suspension imposed by the Attorney Discipline Board which became effective on May 24, 1991.

Following objections filed by both parties and oral arguments, the Attorney Discipline Board adopted the findings and recommendations of the Master, and ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for two years commencing May 25, 1994. Additional costs were assessed in the amount of \$1083.61.

NOTE: Respondent's license to practice law in Michigan has been suspended continuously since May 24, 1991.