

NOTICE OF SUSPENSIONS AND RESTITUTION

Case Nos. 90-99-GA; 91-135-GA; 91-189-RD

Sandra S. Schultz, P-30269, Carrollton, Michigan (formerly of Ironwood, Michigan), by Attorney Discipline Board Upper Peninsula Hearing Panel #1.

- 1) Suspension - three years (Case No. 90-99-GA);
- 2) Suspension - 60 days (Case No. 91-135-GA);
- 3) Suspension - 120 days (Case No. 91-189-RD);
- 4) All effective September 10, 1993.

The above-captioned matters were consolidated for hearing before Attorney Discipline Board Upper Peninsula Hearing Panel #1.

Case No. 90-99-GA

The panel found misconduct on two counts of failing to safeguard a client's assets; one count of conflict of interest; and two counts of failure to respond to requests for investigation. The panel concluded that respondent's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(7); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.15(a) and 8.4(a)-(c). The panel ordered that respondent's license be suspended for three years, that she make restitution to one client in the amount of \$23,966.42, and that she participate in mental health counselling.

Case No. 91-135-GA

The panel found misconduct on two counts of failing to respond to requests for investigation. The panel concluded that respondent's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.104(1)-(4)and(7); MCR 9.113(B)(2); and Michigan Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(b). The panel ordered that respondent's license be suspended for sixty days.

Case No. 91-189-RD

The panel found misconduct by virtue of the imposition of discipline against respondent in the State of Wisconsin. The charges in the Wisconsin proceedings involved neglect of a legal matter. The panel ordered that respondent be suspended in Michigan for a period of 120 days, the same discipline imposed in Wisconsin.

Costs were assessed in the amount of \$2917.73.

Respondent filed a petition for review. She did not request a stay of discipline, and all three suspensions are deemed to be effective September 10, 1993. The petition for review was dismissed for respondent's failure to file the required brief.

NOTE: Respondent's license to practice law in Michigan has been continuously suspended since September 14, 1991.