## STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a Regular Term of the Supreme Court of Appeals continued and held a Charleston, Kanawha County, on the 26th of January, 2006, Hielfshwigh Hary Countries and entered:

Lawyer Disciplinary Board, Petitioner

vs.) No. 32598

Michael C. Farber, a member of The West Virginia State Bar, Respondent

On a former day, to-wit, September 16, 2005, came the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board, by David A. Jividen, its chairperson, pursuant to Rule 3.10 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, and presented to the Court its written recommended disposition in this matter, stipulated to by the parties, recommending that: (1) the respondent's license to practice law be suspended indefinitely or until he provides an answer as to why he did not appear or answer these charges; (2) the respondent undergo psychological counsel in order to determine that he is fit to continue with the practice of law; and (3) pursuant to Rule 3.15 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, respondent shall pay the costs of this disciplinary proceeding.

Upon consideration whereof, the Court is of opinion to and doth hereby adopt the stipulated written recommended disposition of the Hearing Panel Subcommittee of the Lawyer Disciplinary Board. It is therefore ordered that: (1) the respondent's license to practice law in the State of West Virginia, be, and it hereby is, suspended indefinitely; (2) the respondent must provide an answer to why he did not appear or answer these charges and undergo psychological counseling in order to determine that he is fit to continue with

the practice of law prior to reinstatement; and (3) pursuant to Rule 3.15 of the Rules of Lawyer Disciplinary Procedure, respondent shall pay the costs of this disciplinary proceeding. Justice Starcher does not agree with recommendations numbered 2 and 3 because respondent is no longer practicing law.

Service of an attested copy of this order shall constitute sufficient notice of its contents.

A True Copy

Attest:

Clerk, Supreme Court of Appeals