

## NOTICE OF REVOCATION AND RESTITUTION

Case Nos. 92-196-GA; 93-154-GA; 93-188-FA; 93-201-GA

Norman C. Farhat, P-13293, Farmington Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board increasing Tri-County Hearing Panel #67's order of suspension for two years.

- 1) Revocation;
- 2) Effective April 27, 1994.

Respondent was retained to represent a corporation in an offer to purchase a liquor license. The client issued respondent a \$10,000 check to be held in escrow pursuant to the offer to purchase. He pled no contest to allegations that he misappropriated the proceeds of the check.

A \$40,000 cashier's check was tendered to respondent pursuant to an escrow agreement, by which the \$40,000 was to be held in his trust account. He pled no contest to allegations that he misappropriated the proceeds of the check.

Respondent served as the escrow agent for over \$100,000 in proceeds from the sale of property. He pled no contest to allegations that he failed to maintain the funds in escrow and misappropriated approximately \$45,000.

Respondent represented the buyer in the purchase of property, and was entrusted with the purchase money, from which one seller was due \$50,000. He pled no contest to allegations that he failed to maintain the funds in trust and misappropriated approximately \$50,000.

Respondent was retained to represent a client in the transfer of a liquor license and was paid \$1,500 toward his fees. He pled no contest to allegations that he failed to complete the transfer of the liquor license; and failed to refund the unearned portion of the fee.

Respondent served as the escrow agent for \$10,000 for the anticipated purchase of a liquor license from his client. He pled no contest to allegations that he failed to maintain the funds in escrow and misappropriated the \$10,000; and failed to make prompt, full restitution; and failed to answer two Requests for Investigation.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(7); MCR 9.113(A)and(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(a)-(c); 1.3; 1.5; 1.15(a)-(c); 1.16(d); 4.3; 8.1(b); and 8.4(a)-(c).

The panel ordered that respondent be suspended from the practice of law for two years and make restitution to one complainant in the amount of \$1,000. The panel noted respondent's prior unblemished record, his genuine remorse and his compensation to his victims.

The Grievance Administrator filed a petition for review. On September 8, 1994, the Attorney Discipline Board increased discipline to revocation. Respondent filed a motion for reconsideration, which was denied by the Board on October 21, 1994. Respondent filed an application for leave to appeal, which was denied by the Michigan Supreme Court on July 18, 1995.

Costs were assessed in the total amount of \$812.70.