

NOTICE OF DISBARMENT AND RESTITUTION

Case No. 23-56-GA

Notice Issued: December 18, 2023

George D. Gostias, P 73774, Livonia, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board
Tri-County Hearing Panel #10

Disbarment, Effective December 12, 2023¹

After proceedings conducted pursuant to MCR 9.115, the panel found, by default, that respondent committed professional misconduct as alleged in three-count formal complaint. Specifically, with regard to Count One, the panel found that respondent accepted legal fees to represent a client in a criminal matter pending before Wayne County Circuit Court although his license to practice law in Michigan was suspended for 180 days, effective May 27, 2022, in a separate, unrelated disciplinary matter. The panel further found that respondent never notified his client of his suspension, advised his client that he would attend court hearings scheduled in his matter, but did not in fact attend any of the hearings, and abandoned the representation.

With regard to Count Two, the panel found that respondent failed to answer a Request for Investigation served on him by the Grievance Administrator on December 16, 2022. Finally, with regard to Count Three, the panel found that respondent failed to provide notice of his 180 day suspension, effective May 27, 2022, to his clients and all tribunals and parties in every matter in which he was representing a client in litigation, failed to file an affidavit of compliance, as required by MCR 9.119(C) with the Grievance Administrator and the Attorney Discipline Board, and held himself out as authorized to practice law on his Facebook and Twitter social media accounts.

¹ Respondent has been continuously suspended from the practice of law in Michigan since May 27, 2022. See, Notice of Suspension & Restitution, issued May 27, 2022, in *Grievance Administrator v George D. Gostias*, 22-7-GA.

Based on respondent's default and the evidence presented by the Grievance Administrator, the panel found that respondent committed misconduct as alleged in the formal complaint in its entirety. Specifically, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c) (Count One); failed to seek the lawful objectives of the client, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a) (Count One); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3 (Count One); failed to keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and to comply with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a) (Count One); failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b) (Count One); failed to timely refund an unearned fee, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d) (Count One); failed to expedite litigation, in violation of MRPC 3.2 (Count One); practiced law while not licensed to do so, in violation of MRPC 5.5(a) (Count One); kept a public social media site holding himself out as an attorney, after being suspended pursuant to Order(s) of Discipline, in violation of MRPC 7.1(a) (Count Three); knowingly failed to respond to or cooperate with a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2) (Counts Two and Three); engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b) (Count One); engaged in conduct that violates the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4) (Counts One and Two); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1) (Counts One and Two); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2) (Counts One-Three); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3) (Counts One and Two); failed to answer a Request for Investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7), MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2) (Count Two); engaged in conduct in violation of an Order(s) of Discipline, in violation of MCR 9.104(9); failed to notify his client of his suspension from the practice of law, in violation of MCR 9.119(A) (Counts One and Three); failed to file with the tribunal and all parties a notice of the attorney's disqualification from the practice of law, in violation of MCR 9.119(B) (Count Three); failed to file affidavits of compliance with the Grievance Administrator and the Attorney Discipline within 14 days of the Order(s) of Suspension, in violation of MCR 9.119(C) (Count Three); engaged in the practice of law, in violation of MCR 9.119(E)(1) (Count One); had contact with clients, in violation

of MCR 9.119(E)(2) (Count One); and, held himself out as an attorney, in violation of MCR 9.119(E)(4) (Count One).

The panel ordered that respondent be disbarred, and that he pay restitution in the total amount of \$11,950.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,715.08.