

3. The order of the Maryland Court of Appeals found that Hitselberger neglected two client matters, failed to communicate with his clients, misrepresented the status of the case to one client and failed to respond to the Maryland Attorney Grievance Commission which constitutes conduct in violation of Rules 1.3, 1.4 and 8.1, 8.4 of the Revised Rules North Carolina Rules of Professional Conduct and Rules 6(b)(1) and (3), 1.1(b) and 1.2 of the former Rules of Professional Conduct and which justifies the imposition of reciprocal discipline in this state.

4. The suspension of license imposed by the Maryland Grievance Commission and affirmed by the Maryland Court of Appeals should be imposed on the Respondent's right to practice law in the state of North Carolina.

THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:


1. The Respondent is hereby suspended from the practice of law in North Carolina until such time, if ever, that he is reinstated by the Maryland Grievance Commission or equivalent licensing entity.

2. Respondent shall forthwith surrender his North Carolina license certificate and membership card to the Secretary of the N.C. State Bar.

3. Respondent is hereby taxed with the costs of this proceeding as assessed by the Secretary.

4. Respondent shall comply with the wind down provisions of 27 N.C. Admin. Code Chapter 1, Subchapter B, § .0124 of the N.C. State Bar Discipline & Disbarment Rules.

This the 19 day of November, 1999.


James K. Dorsett III, Chair
Grievance Committee