

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND

Petitioner

v.

MALIK JAMES TUMA

Respondent

* IN THE
*
* COURT OF APPEALS
*
* OF MARYLAND
*
* Misc. Docket AG
*
* No. 102
*
* September Term, 2012
*
*

ORDER

The Court of Appeals of Maryland, having considered the Joint Petition of the Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland and the Respondent, Malik James Tuma, to reprimand the Respondent, it is this 22nd day of July, 2013;

ORDERED, that the Joint Petition be, and it is hereby GRANTED, and the Respondent, Malik James Tuma, is reprimanded by consent for violating Maryland Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct 8.1(b).

/s/ Glenn T. Harrell, Jr.
Senior Judge

JUL 18 2013

**Bessie M. Decker, Clerk
Court of Appeals
of Maryland**

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND
100 Community Place, Ste. 3301
Crownsville, MD 21032

Petitioner

v.

MALIK JAMES TUMA
3047 Murdock Road
Kensington, MD 20895

Respondent

* IN THE
*
* COURT OF APPEALS
*
* OF MARYLAND
*
* Misc. Docket AG
*
* No. 102
*
* September Term, 2012
*
*
*

JOINT PETITION FOR REPRIMAND BY CONSENT

Petitioner, the Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland, by its attorneys, Glenn M. Grossman, Bar Counsel, and Dolores O. Ridgell, Assistant Bar Counsel, and Respondent, Malik Tuma, Esquire, *pro se*, pursuant to Maryland Rule 16-772, jointly petition this Court as follows:

1. Respondent was admitted to the Bar of this Court on December 21, 1983.
2. Between August 2011 and August 2012, Respondent maintained an office for the practice of law in Chicago, Illinois. Respondent transitioned his practice to Kensington, Maryland in February of 2013.
3. Respondent is also admitted to practice law in the District of Columbia.
4. A proceeding is presently pending before the Petitioner which involves allegations that, during the period August 2011 through August 2012, Bar Counsel sent Respondent a series of letters which contained requests for information concerning a complaint received by Bar Counsel that alleged the Respondent

engaged in professional misconduct. Respondent knowingly failed to respond in a timely manner to these requests, in violation of Maryland Lawyers' Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(b).


5. Respondent provided a response to the underlying complaint in July 2012; it was not received by Bar Counsel in a timely manner.
6. On or about September 20, 2010, Respondent consented to a reprimand from the Attorney Grievance Commission for failing to timely respond to requests for information from Bar Counsel, in violation of Maryland Lawyers' Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(b).
7. In the instant matter, the underlying complaint was subsequently determined to be meritless.
8. Prior to the filing of public charges in this matter, the parties have agreed the proper sanction to be imposed on the Respondent by this Court is a reprimand for violating Maryland Lawyers' Rule of Professional Conduct 8.1(b).
9. Respondent consents to the issuance of a reprimand by the Court of Appeals.
10. Respondent's consent is freely and voluntarily rendered pursuant to the provisions of Maryland Rule 16-772(b)(2) and he is not being subjected to coercion or duress.
11. Respondent is fully aware of the implications of submitting his consent to the reprimand.
12. Respondent submits his consent because he knows that, if a hearing were held, sufficient evidence could be produced to sustain the allegation of his failure to timely respond to the inquiry of Bar Counsel.


13. Respondent agrees to comply with Maryland Rule 16-760.

WHEREFORE, the parties pray this Honorable Court:


- A. Reprimand the Respondent for violating Maryland Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct 8.1(b); and,
- B. Grant such other and further relief as the nature of the cause may require.


GLENN M. GROSSMAN *by: DOR*
Bar Counsel


DOLORES O. RIDGELL
Assistant Bar Counsel
Attorney Grievance Commission
Of Maryland
100 Community Place, Suite 3301
Crownsville, MD 21032-2027
(410) 514-7051


MALIK JAMES TUMA
3047 Murdock Road
Kensington, MD 20895
Respondent

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM THAT THE CONTENT OF THE FOREGOING JOINT PETITION FOR REPRIMAND BY CONSENT IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE INFORMATION AND BELIEF.


MALIK JAMES TUMA
7/10/2013
DATE