STATE OF MICHIGAN

FILED ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

2019 DEC 19 PM 3: 10

Attorney Discipline Board

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR, Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner/Appellee,

Case Nos. 19-65-JC; 19-66-GA

۷

NORMAN HYMAN, P 15319,

Respondent/Appellant.

ORDER VACATING ORDER OF SUSPENSION WITH CONDITIONS AND GRANTING REQUEST TO TRANSFER RESPONDENT <u>TO INACTIVE STATUS PURSUANT TO MCR 9.121(B)</u> (By Consent)

Issued by the Attorney Discipline Board 333 W. Fort St., Ste. 1700, Detroit, MI

On October 7, 2019, Tri-County Hearing Panel #72 issued an Order of Suspension with Conditions, suspending respondent's license to practice law in Michigan for a period of 180 days, effective October 29, 2019. Respondent filed a petition for review and request for stay of discipline on October 28, 2019. On November 15, 2019, the Board issued an order denying respondent's request for a stay. On November 27, 2019, respondent and petitioner filed a joint Request and Stipulation to Transfer Respondent Norman Hyman to Inactive Status under MCR 9.121(B) and to Vacate Order of Suspension with Conditions under MCR 9.118(D).

The Attorney Discipline Board has considered the pleadings and positions of the parties, as referenced above, and is otherwise fully advised;

NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that the parties' joint request to vacate the October 7, 2019 Order of Suspension with Conditions under MCR 9.118(D) is **GRANTED** and the order is **VACATED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint request to transfer respondent to inactive status pursuant to MCR 9.121(B) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent, Norman Hyman, is **TRANSFERRED TO INACTIVE STATUS** pursuant to MCR 9.121(B) for an indefinite period, effective the date of this order and until further order of the Attorney Discipline Board, in accordance with MCR 9.121(E).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent will be ineligible to resume the practice of law until such time as he has complied with the requirements of MCR 9.121(E) and the Board has entered an order of reinstatement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent may not file a petition for reinstatement until such time as he receives a report from his treating physician(s), verifying that in the physician's opinion(s), respondent is again fit to practice law. The report from respondent's physician(s) must determine that respondent is both mentally and physically capable of practicing law and can be safely recommended to the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the hearing panel's determination whether respondent may again practice law in the State of Michigan shall be based, in part, upon its review and consideration of the report of respondent's treating physician(s).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon seeking reinstatement, respondent shall agree to the release of the physician's report to the Grievance Administrator and his staff; the Attorney Discipline Board and its staff; and the hearing panel as soon as the report is available.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon seeking reinstatement, respondent shall sign all necessary waivers allowing his treating physician(s) to obtain records necessary for the physician(s) thorough evaluation of respondent's fitness to practice law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's petition for review, filed October 28, 2019, is **DISMISSED**. The Board's order to show cause is **VACATED** and the review hearing scheduled for February 19, 2020, is **CANCELLED**.

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

By:

E. Lauderbach, Chairperson

Dated: December 19, 2019

Board members Jonathan E. Lauderbach, Michael B. Rizik, Jr., Barbara Williams Forney, James A. Fink, John W. Inhulsen, Karen O'Donoghue, Linda S. Hotchkiss, M.D., Anna Frushour, and Michael S. Hohauser concur in this decision.