

STATE OF MICHIGAN
Attorney Discipline Board

FILED
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

2018 JAN 25 PM 1:30

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,
Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner/Appellee,

v

Case No. 16-101-GA

RONALD THOMAS BRUCE, JR., P 62579

Respondent/Appellant.

**ORDER REDUCING SUSPENSION FROM 18 MONTHS TO
270 DAYS AND AFFIRMING RESTITUTION AND CONDITION**

Issued by the Attorney Discipline Board
211 W. Fort St., Ste. 1410, Detroit, MI

On August 14, 2017, Tri-County Hearing Panel #3 of the Attorney Discipline Board issued an order suspending respondent's license to practice law in Michigan for a period of 18 months, effective June 30, 2017, the date of the Attorney Discipline Board's Order Reducing Suspension from 179 Days to 60 Days, ADB Case No. 15-122-GA. Respondent filed a petition for review and request for stay of discipline on August 25, 2017. The Board issued an order August 30, 2017, denying respondent's request for a stay. The Attorney Discipline Board has conducted review proceedings in accordance with MCR 9.118, including review of the record, and consideration of the briefs filed by the parties, and the oral arguments presented to the Board at a review hearing conducted on October 18, 2017, and is otherwise fully advised,

NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that, for the reasons set forth in the attached opinion, discipline imposed by the hearing panel is **REDUCED** from a suspension of 18 months to a **SUSPENSION OF RESPONDENT'S LICENSE TO PRACTICE LAW IN MICHIGAN FOR 270 DAYS EFFECTIVE JUNE 30, 2017**, the effective date of the hearing panel's imposed suspension, and until further order of the Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board or a hearing panel, and until respondent complies with the requirements of MCR 9.123(B) and MCR 9.124.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the restitution and condition imposed by the hearing panel is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that from the effective date of this order and until reinstatement in accordance with the applicable provisions of MCR 9.123, respondent is forbidden from practicing law in any form; appearing as an attorney before any court, judge, justice, board, commission or other public authority; or holding himself out as an attorney by any means.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in accordance with MCR 9.119(A), respondent shall, within seven days after the effective date of this order, notify all of his active clients, in writing, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, of the following:

1. the nature and duration of the discipline imposed;
2. the effective date of such discipline;
3. respondent's inability to act as an attorney after the effective date of such discipline;
4. the location and identity of the custodian of the clients' files and records which will be made available to them or to substitute counsel;
5. that the clients may wish to seek legal advice and counsel elsewhere; provided that, if respondent was a member of a law firm, the firm may continue to represent each client with the client's express written consent;
6. the address to which all correspondence to respondent may be addressed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in accordance with MCR 9.119(B), respondent must, on or before the effective date of this order, in every matter in which respondent is representing a client in litigation, file with the tribunal and all parties a notice of respondent's disqualification from the practice of law.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, respondent shall, within 14 days after the effective date of this order, file with the Grievance Administrator and the Attorney Discipline Board an affidavit of compliance as required by MCR 9.119(C).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's conduct after the entry of this order but prior to its effective date, shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in MCR 9.119(D); and respondent's compensation for legal services shall be subject to the restrictions described in MCR 9.119(F).

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

DATED: January 25, 2018

By:



Louann Van Der Wiele, Chairperson

Board members Louann Van Der Wiele, James A. Fink, Jonathan E. Lauderbach, Barbara Williams Forney, Karen D. O'Donoghue, and Michael B. Rizik, Jr., concur in this decision.

Board members Rev. Michael Murray, John W. Inhulsen, and Linda M. Hotchkiss, M.D. were absent and did not participate.