



OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of Wisconsin

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WI 53701-1688

TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880

FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640

Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

February 10, 2009

To:

Robert G. Krohn
Roethe, Krohn, Pope, LLP
P.O. Box 151
Edgerton, WI 53534-0151

Michael D. Mandelman
12753 NE Shoreland Dr
Mequon, WI 53092-2402

David V. Meany
DeWitt, Ross & Stevens, SC
13935 Bishops Dr., #300
Brookfield, WI 53005-6605

William J. Weigel
Office of Lawyer Regulation
110 E. Main Street, Suite 315
Madison, WI 53703

Jonathan V. Goodman
Goodman Law Offices
135 W. Wells St., Ste 340
Milwaukee, WI 53203-1807

Carol Kornstedt
Office of Lawyer Regulation
110 E. Main St., STE 315
Madison, WI 53703-3383

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

No. 2007AP2653-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Michael D. Mandelman

On November 20, 2007, the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) filed a complaint against Attorney Michael D. Mandelman, seeking a one year suspension of Attorney Mandelman's license to practice law. On September 16, 2008, the OLR and Attorney Mandelman filed a stipulation and no contest plea. On October 28, 2008, the referee filed his report and recommendation accepting the parties' stipulation, which stipulates to the fact allegations of counts 1 through 6 of the OLR's complaint, and calls for a one year license suspension retroactive to April 1, 2007.

IT IS ORDERED that the parties are directed to show cause, in writing, on or before March 2, 2009, why a one year retroactive license suspension is appropriate discipline in light of Attorney Mandelman's disciplinary history, why the supervision should be retroactive, and why Attorney Mandelman should not be required to obtain additional continued legal education regarding his ethical responsibilities as a condition of reinstatement.

Page Two

February 10, 2009

No. 2007AP2653-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Michael D. Mandelman

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are directed to address whether, in the event the court rejects the stipulated discipline, SCR 22.12(3) requires the appointment of a referee with directions to proceed as a complaint filed without a stipulation.

David R. Schanker
Clerk of Supreme Court