Notice of Hearings on Petitions for Reinstatement 66

PETITIONER

ACHLA B. KARNANI

Notice is given that Achla B. Karnani, P66174, has filed a petition in the Michigan Supreme Court seeking reinstatement as a member of the State Bar and restoration of her license to practice law.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator submitted a stipulation for a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5). The stipulation was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contains the petitioner's admission to the allegations of misconduct contained in the grievance administrator's notice of filing of judgment of conviction, filed in accordance with MCR 9.120(B)(2), showing that on May 20, 2013, the respondent was convicted by guilty plea of the misdemeanor offense of retail fraud, second degree, in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(5).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 180 days, beginning April 30, 2014, and that she be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$781.24.

The reinstatement hearing is scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on October 8, 2015, at the office of Hearing Panel Chairperson Andrew M. Eggan, 1349 S. Huron St., Ste. 1, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

Any interested person may appear at the hearing and be heard in support of or in



opposition to the petition for reinstatement. Any person having information bearing on the petitioner's eligibility for reinstatement should contact:

> **Cynthia C. Bullington** Assistant Deputy Administrator **Attorney Grievance Commission** 535 Griswold, Ste. 1700 Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 961-6585

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PETITIONER

Pursuant to MCR 9.123(B), to be reinstated to the practice of law, the petitioner is required to establish the following by clear and convincing evidence:

1. She desires in good faith to be restored to the privilege of practicing law in Michigan.

2. The term of the suspension ordered has elapsed or five years have elapsed since her disbarment or resignation.

3. She has not practiced or attempted to practice law contrary to the requirement of her suspension or disbarment.

4. She has complied fully with the order of discipline.

5. Her conduct since the order of discipline has been exemplary and above reproach.

6. She has a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards that are imposed on members of the Bar and will conduct herself in conformity with those standards.

7. Taking into account all of the attorney's past conduct, including the nature of the misconduct that led to the revocation or suspension, she nevertheless can safely be recommended to the public, the courts, and the legal profession as a person fit to be consulted by others and to represent them and otherwise act in matters of trust and confidence, and, in general, to aid in the administration of justice as a member of the Bar and as an officer of the court.

8. If she has been suspended for three years or more, she has been or will be recertified by the Board of Law Examiners.

9. She has reimbursed the Client Protection Fund or has agreed to an arrangement satisfactory to the fund to reimburse any money paid from the fund as a result of her conduct.

PETITIONER

FRANCIS N. SOAVE

Notice is given that Francis N. Soave, P41167, has filed a petition in the Michigan Supreme Court and with the Attorney Grievance Commission seeking reinstatement as a member of the State Bar and restoration of his license to practice law.

Effective February 22, 2014, the panel issued an order of interim suspension of the petitioner's license, effective October 3, 2013, based on his failure to appear at a hearing scheduled for September 24, 2013. The petitioner appeared at the subsequent hearing, but was found to be in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint.

Based on the petitioner's default, the panel found that he neglected three legal matters, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to act with diligence in his representation of three clients, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep his clients reasonably informed regarding the status of their matters and reply promptly with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to return an unearned attorney fee paid in advance in two matters, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); and failed to answer four requests for investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7) and MCR 9.113(A) and (B). The panel also found that the petitioner violated MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(2)-(4).

The hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for one year, to run consecutive to the previously ordered interim suspension. The panel also ordered that the petitioner pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$1,950 and be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct.

A hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, October 13, 2015, beginning at 9:30 a.m., at the office of Hearing Panel Chairperson Paul T. Garvey, 24825 Little Mack, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080.

In the interest of maintaining the high standards imposed on the legal profession as conditions for the privilege to practice law in this state, and of protecting the public, the judiciary, and the legal profession against conduct contrary to such standards, the petitioner will be required to establish his eligibility for reinstatement by clear and convincing evidence.

Any interested person may appear at the hearing and be heard in support of or in opposition to the petition for reinstatement. Any person having information bearing on the petitioner's eligibility for reinstatement should contact:

> John K. Burgess Senior Associate Counsel Attorney Grievance Commission 535 Griswold, Ste. 1700 Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 961-6585

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PETITIONER

The petitioner is required to establish the following by clear and convincing evidence:

1. He desires in good faith to be restored to the privilege to practice law in this state.

2. The term of the suspension ordered has elapsed or five years have elapsed since revocation of the license.

3. He has not practiced or attempted to practice law contrary to the requirement of his suspension or revocation

4. He has complied fully with the terms of the order of discipline.

5. His conduct since the discipline has been exemplary and above reproach.

6. He has a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards that are imposed on members of the Bar and will conduct himself in conformity with those standards.

7. He can safely be recommended to the public, the courts, and the legal profession as a person fit to be consulted by others and to represent them and otherwise act in matters of trust and confidence, and, in general, to aid in the administration of justice as a member of the Bar and as an officer of the court.

8. If he has been suspended for three years or more, he has been recertified by the Board of Law Examiners.

9. He has reimbursed or has agreed to reimburse the Client Protection Fund any money paid from the fund as a result of his conduct. Failure to fully reimburse as agreed is grounds for revocation of a reinstatement.

SBM MONEY JUDGMENT INTEREST RATE

MCL 600.6013 governs how to calculate the interest on a money judgment in a Michigan state court. Interest is calculated at six-month intervals on January and July of each year, from when the complaint was filed, and is compounded annually.

For a complaint filed after December 31, 1986, the rate as of July 1, 2015 is 2.468 percent. This rate includes the statutory 1 percent.

But a different rule applies for a complaint filed after June 30, 2002 that is based on a written instrument with its own specified interest rate. The rate is the lesser of:

- (1) 13 percent a year, compounded annually; or
- (2) the specified rate, if it is fixed—or if it is variable, the variable rate when the complaint was filed if that rate was legal.

For past rates, see http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/ other/interest.pdf.

As the application of MCL 600.6013 varies depending on the circumstances, you should review the statute carefully.

Claims Against Stockbrokers

ANTHONY TROGAN, ESQ.

35 YEARS EXPERIENCE

248-737-2150 avtrogan@aol.com

