

STATE OF MICHIGAN

FILED
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

Attorney Discipline Board

2021-Jul-27

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,
Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner,

v

Case No. 18-130-GA

JAMES LAWRENCE, P 33664,

Respondent.

_____ /

ORDER OF REINSTATEMENT

Issued by Attorney Discipline Board
333 W. Fort St., Detroit, Michigan 48226

On May 20, 2020, Tri-County Hearing Panel #101 entered an Order of Suspension and Restitution With Condition, effective June 11, 2020, that suspended respondent's license to practice law for a period of 100 days, ordered that he pay restitution in the total amount of \$2,000, and that he be subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. The Grievance Administrator filed a timely petition for review, seeking an increase in discipline. Virtual review proceedings before the Attorney Discipline Board were conducted in accordance with General Order ADB 2020-1 and MCR 9.118 on August 26, 2020. On September 29, 2020, the Board issued an opinion and order increasing the discipline imposed from a 100-day suspension to disbarment and restitution and vacating the condition imposed by the hearing panel. Thereafter, respondent filed a timely application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court. In lieu of granting leave to appeal, the Court issued an order on June 18, 2021, reversing the Board's September 29, 2020 opinion, and reinstating the May 20, 2020 Order of Suspension and Restitution With Condition issued by Tri-County Hearing Panel #101.

On June 24, 2021, respondent filed an affidavit of compliance in accordance with MCR 9.123(A), attesting that he has fully complied with all requirements of the hearing panel's suspension order. The Grievance Administrator did not file an objection within seven days after respondent filed his affidavit, but did file with the Supreme Court a motion to stay the order reversing the Board order of disbarment on June 29, 2021, and a motion for reconsideration on June 30, 2021, which are both pending decisions by the Court. Thereafter, the Board requested the parties to address the question whether an order of reinstatement should issue pursuant to MCR 9.123(A). Respondent, relying upon MCR 7.311(G), which provides that: "The filing of a motion for reconsideration does not stay the effect of the order addressed in the motion," responded that it should. The Board has not been otherwise apprised of a basis to conclude that respondent has failed to comply with the suspension order.

NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that respondent, James Lawrence, P 33664, is **REINSTATED** to the practice of law in Michigan effective July 27, 2021.

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

By: /s/ Mark A. Armitage
Executive Director

Dated: July 27, 2021