



JOHN F. VAN BOLT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & GENERAL COUNSEL

SUITE 1260 333 W FORT STREET DETROIT. MICHIGAN 48226 Area Code 313 963-5553

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

File Nos. DP 121/84; DP 130/85

John C. Mouradian, P 18040, 285 Whims Court, Rochester, MI by an Order of the Michigan Supreme Court denying Application for Leave to Appeal an Order of the Attorney Discipline Board dated November 3, 1986.

- 1) Suspension 60 days;
- 2) Effective January 26, 1987.

The Formal Complaints consolidated for hearing charged that Respondent had failed to comply with the provisions contained in three prior discipline orders requiring the payment of costs to the State Bar of Michigan as reimbursement for expenses incurred in the investigation and trial of those cases. It was further alleged that Respondent had not filed timely Requests for Investigation served by answers to the the Administrator and that he failed to answer the Formal Complaint which was served on August 30, 1985. The Panel concluded that Respondent's failure to discharge his obligations to comply with three orders of discipline or his obligation to answer Requests for Investigation and a Formal Complaint constituted misconduct in violation of MCR 9.104(1,2,4 & 8) and Canon 1 of the Code of Professional Responsibility, to wit: DR 1-102(A)(1,5, & 6).

Upon consideration of a Petition for Review filed by Respondent, the Attorney Discipline Board affirmed the Panel's findings. By a majority, the Board reduced the discipline imposed to a suspension of sixty days. The effect of that Order was automatically stayed upon Respondent's filing of an Application for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court. The discipline ordered by the Board became effective upon the entry of the Court's Order dated January 26, 1987 denying Respondent's Application.

NOTE: Respondent's license to practice was suspended for a period of 120 by an Order of the Attorney Discipline Board which became effective October 31, 1986 (DP 82/86, DP 149/86, see Notice of Suspension dated December 12, 1986). The sixty day suspension order in this case runs concurrently with the prior discipline. In accordance with the provisions of the earlier Order, the Respondent will be required to establish his eligibility for reinstatement in accordance with MCR 9.123(B) and MCR 9.1247

FEB 0.5 '987