

## NOTICE OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION

Case Nos. 91-195-GA; 91-224-FA

D. Lee Williams (a/k/a Douglas L. Williams), P24728, Jackson, Michigan, by Attorney Discipline Board Washtenaw County Hearing Panel #4.

- 1) Suspension - 120 days;
- 2) Effective October 6, 1992.

The hearing panel found that the allegations of professional misconduct contained in the formal complaints were established by the respondent's admissions.

Respondent was retained by the plaintiff/husband in a pending divorce matter, but failed to familiarize himself with the court file causing him to fail to appear for the divorce trial; failed to keep his client informed concerning the status of the matter; failed to timely answer the request for investigation; filed an incomplete answer to the request for investigation; and failed to file a response to further correspondence from the Attorney Grievance Commission.

Respondent was retained by the defendant in a criminal matter to file a delayed application for leave to appeal, but failed to file a delayed application for leave to appeal; failed to keep his client informed concerning the status of the appeal; failed to appear for scheduled appointments with his client; twice falsely advised his client that the delayed application for leave to appeal had been mailed to the Court of Appeals; and failed to refund the unearned portion of the \$1,500 retainer fee.

Respondent was retained to represent a client in a child support matter, but failed to timely respond to a past-due notice, failed to request an administrative hearing concerning the past-due notice; failed to advise his client to seek an attorney licensed to practice law in Virginia to assist him in an administrative hearing; failed to keep his client informed concerning the status of the matter; falsely advised his client that he had written a letter to the Virginia Department of Social Services concerning the past-due notice; falsely advised the Virginia Department of Social Services that his client denied paternity of the child; failed to refund the unearned portion of the \$150 retainer fee; wrote the above-mentioned letter to the Virginia Department of Social Services after the client terminated respondent's services; filed an incomplete answer to the request for investigation; and failed to respond to further correspondence from the Attorney Grievance Commission.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104 (1-4,7); MCR 9.113(A)and(B)(2); and the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, 1.1(c); 1.3; 1.4; 1.16(a)(3)and(d); 4.1; 8.1(b); 8.4(a-c). Costs were assessed in the amount of \$512.92.

Respondent filed a timely petition for review, creating an automatic stay of discipline pursuant to MCR 9.115(K). In an order issued on September 14, 1992, the Attorney Discipline Board dismissed respondent's petition for review due to his failure to file a brief as ordered and his failure to appear personally at the review hearing on September 10, 1992. The Board's order further directed that the automatic stay of discipline would remain in effect for twenty-one days following the date of the order, and that the suspension would become effective on October 6, 1992.