

PETITIONER

MICHAEL SKLADD

Notice is given that **Michael Skladd**, P36705, 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.

The petitioner's initial suspension arose out of his failure to adhere to a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel effective December 22, 2004, in *Grievance Administrator v Skladd*, ADB Case Nos. 04-43-GA.

The petitioner pled no contest to allegations that, in a criminal matter, he accepted the representation of a client in a jurisdiction to which he was not admitted; and failed to take appropriate steps to become admitted to the jurisdiction in which the criminal action was pending. Additionally, the petitioner pled no contest to allegations that, in three separate matters, he failed to keep his clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters; and failed to comply promptly with reasonable requests for information in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1) and (4); and MRPC 1.4(a); 5.5; and 8.4(a) and (c).

Based on the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel issued a notice of reprimand, two-year probation, and restitution in the aggregate amount of \$9,000, with conditions relative to the alleged misconduct, effective December 22, 2004. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,124.93.

The petitioner failed to pay costs associated with *Grievance Administrator v Michael Skladd*, Case No. 04-43-GA as ordered. In accordance with MCR 9.128(D), the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan was automatically suspended on July 26, 2005. The petitioner then paid the past due costs on November 27, 2005, but because he was not in compliance with MCR 9.119 and MCR 9.123(A), his suspension from the practice of law remained in effect.

The grievance administrator filed a petition on May 1, 2006, seeking entry of an order increasing the petitioner's discipline for

his failure to comply with the hearing panel's order of December 22, 2004, and a subsequent order issued June 10, 2005, modifying the petitioner's discipline. *Grievance Administrator v Skladd*, ADB Case No. 05-41-MZ.

Pursuant to the prior order and the stipulation between the parties, the petitioner was to make restitution payments and file written proof of payment of restitution with the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Attorney Discipline Board. The petitioner failed to fully comply with monthly restitution payments and was not in compliance with conditions. On March 7, 2007, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law be suspended for 179 days, retroactive to July 21, 2006, the date of the first hearing in this matter. The panel also ordered that the petitioner's eligibility to file an affidavit for automatic reinstatement would be conditioned upon his compliance with MCR 9.128(E) and his filing of written proof with the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Attorney Discipline Board that he has made full restitution as previously ordered.

On January 9, 2009, another formal complaint, *Grievance Administrator v Michael Skladd*, ADB Case No. 09-2-GA, was filed against the petitioner. The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The petitioner pled no contest to allegations that he neglected two legal matters; failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients through reasonably available means; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his clients; and failed to refund the unearned portion of the retainers upon termination of the representation. The petitioner also pled no contest to practicing law while suspended; appearing as an attorney before the Worker's Compensation Board of Magistrates and the 41-B District Court; holding himself out as an attorney while suspended; and failing to file answers to two requests for investigation served upon him by the grievance administrator. The petitioner was charged with

violations of MCR 9.104(A)(1)–(4) and (7); 9.113(A) and (B)(2); 9.119(E)(1)–(3); and MRPC 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.16(d); 5.5(a); and 8.4(a)–(c). The parties agreed that the petitioner should be suspended for four years, retroactive to July 26, 2005, and pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$3,000.

A hearing is scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2016, beginning at 9:30 a.m. at the Macomb Video Conference Center, 48 S. Main, Lower Level, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043, (313) 567-8100.

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:

Charise L. Anderson
Associate Counsel
Attorney Grievance Commission
535 Griswold, Ste. 1700
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 961-6585

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PETITIONER

Pursuant to MCR 9.123(B) and in the interest of maintaining the high standards imposed on the legal profession as conditions for the privilege of practicing law in this state, and of protecting the public, the judiciary, and the legal profession against conduct contrary to those standards, 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 disbarment or resignation.
3. He has not practiced or attempted to practice law contrary to the requirement of his suspension or disbarment.
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. Taking into account all of the attorney's past conduct, including the nature of the misconduct that led to the disbarment or suspension, he 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 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.

PETITIONER

ROBERT E. SLAMEKA

Notice is given that **Robert E. Slameka**, P20567, 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 May 1, 2015, the petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which 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 27, 2014, the petitioner was convicted by guilty plea of the misdemeanor offenses of larceny between \$200 and \$1,000 and breaking and entering without permission, in violation of MCR 9.104(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, effective

May 1, 2015, as stipulated by the parties. The panel further ordered that the petitioner pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$7,800.

A hearing is scheduled for Friday, April 1, 2016, beginning at 9:30 a.m., at the office of the Attorney Discipline Board, 211 W. Fort St., Ste. 1410, Detroit, MI 48226.

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:

Cynthia C. Bullington
Assistant Deputy Administrator
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.



Landex Research, Inc.

PROBATE RESEARCH

**Missing and Unknown Heirs Located
 With No Expense to the Estate**

Domestic & International Service for:

- Courts
- Trust Officers
- Lawyers
- Executors & Administrators

1345 Wiley Road, Suite 121, Schaumburg, Illinois 60173

Phone: 800-844-6778 FAX: 800-946-6990

www.landexresearch.com