

NOTICE OF REVOCATION

Case Nos. 93-48-GA; 93-67-FA

David M. Blake, P-30637, Southfield, Michigan, by Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #64.

- 1) Revocation;
- 2) Effective June 12, 1993. (Retroactive to date of prior revocation of respondent's license in Case No. 93-16-GA. See Notice of Revocation dated June 14, 1993.)

Respondent failed to answer the formal complaint and failed to appear at a hearing conducted on May 24, 1993. The panel determined that the respondent's default established the allegations in the complaint that respondent was retained to represent a client in a personal injury action but failed to obtain service on the defendant; abandoned his client's case without notice; failed to keep his clients reasonably informed; 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); MCR 9.113(A)and(B)(2); and the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(c); 1.3; 1.4; 3.2; 8.1(b); and 8.4(a)and(c). In its report, the panel concluded that the respondent's license to practice law should be revoked.

Prior to the filing of the panel's report, the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan was revoked by another hearing panel effective June 12, 1993 in an unrelated case, Matter of David M. Blake, 93-16-GA. On June 23, 1993, the Attorney Discipline Board entered a notice of discontinuance without prejudice on the grounds that the prior order of revocation terminated the respondent's status as an "attorney" within the meaning of MCR 9.101(5). On October 31, 1994, the Michigan Supreme Court issued its memorandum opinion in Grievance Administrator v Attorney Discipline Board, #99015 vacating the Board's notice of discontinuance, ruling that the Board retains jurisdiction to consider misconduct committed during the period of licensure by attorneys whose licenses were later revoked and directing the Board to determine whether discontinuance without prejudice is the appropriate resolution in the particular circumstances of each case. On remand, the Board directed the hearing panel to enter an order of revocation in accordance with its report filed June 23, 1993. The revocation is deemed to be effective June 12, 1993. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$143.46.

NOTE: Respondent has been ineligible to practice law in Michigan since June 25, 1992.