

## NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

ADB 180-88; 205-88

John J. Goldpaugh, P-30758; Birmingham, MI, by the Attorney Discipline Board increasing a hearing panel order of reprimand to a suspension of thirty days.

- 1) Suspension - thirty days;
- 2) Effective December 22, 1989.

The respondent failed to file an answer to the complaint but appeared before the panel to admit the allegations that he neglected a workers' compensation case and failed to communicate with his client regarding the status of that case. The hearing panel concluded that his neglect of that legal matter and his failure to answer the client's Request for Investigation warranted a reprimand and constituted violations of MCR 9.104(1-4,7); MCR 9.103(C); MCR 9.113(B)(2) and Canons 1, 6 and 7 of the Code of Professional Responsibility, DR 1-102(A)(1,5,6); DR 6-101(A)(3) and DR 7-101(A)(1,3).

On appeal, the Attorney Discipline Board affirmed the reprimand for respondent's neglect of a legal matter but increase discipline to a suspension of thirty days for the respondent's failure to answer a Request for Investigation, citing prior opinions warning that the lawyer who ignores the duty imposed by court rule to answer requests for investigation does so at his or her peril and may expect a discipline greater than a reprimand. Discipline in this case was stayed pending resolution of the respondent's motion for reconsideration. By stipulation, the respondent and the Grievance Administrator requested that the stay be vacated and that the thirty-day suspension run concurrently with a forty-five day suspension imposed in an unrelated case. (ADB 37-89; 48-89). Costs were assessed in the amount of \$244.04.