

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 91-264-GA; 92-3-FA

Raymond V. Ruemenapp, P35094, Roseville, Michigan, by Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #102.

- 1) Suspension - 30 days;
- 2) Effective March 15, 1992.

The hearing panel found that the allegations of Formal Complaint 91-264-GA were established by respondent's admissions. Formal Complaint 92-3-FA was dismissed by agreement of the parties. The panel accepted the on-the-record agreement of the parties that respondent be suspended from the practice of law for a period of thirty days commencing March 15, 1992.

Respondent was appointed to represent six separate defendants in post-judgment proceedings, but failed to timely file five appellate briefs; failed to respond to numerous "no progress" warning letters issued by the Court of Appeals; failed to advise one defendant of his appointment; failed to answer numerous letters from two defendants; failed to visit two defendants in prison; failed to timely file one claim of appeal; failed to bring any post-judgment proceedings on behalf of one defendant; failed to file one proof of service with the Court of Appeals; failed to comply with three orders of the Court of Appeals; and failed to communicate with or respond to telephone inquiries from one defendant.

Respondent's conduct was found to be in violation of MCR 9.104 (1-4); and the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, 1.1(a-c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 3.2; 8.4(a,c). Costs were assessed in the amount of \$241.44.