

## PETITIONERS

## KAREN K. PLANTS

Notice is given that **Karen K. Plants**, P43616, 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 her license to practice law.

Effective March 2, 2011, the petitioner was disbarred from the practice of law until further order of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board (ADB), or a hearing panel.

The petitioner pled guilty in the Wayne County Circuit Court to one count of misconduct in office, a felony, under MCL 750.505. Based on the petitioner's conviction, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for two years, retroactive to March 2, 2011, the date of her felony conviction.

The grievance administrator filed a petition for review and, on March 20, 2012, the ADB issued an order increasing discipline from a two year suspension to disbarment. The petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration, which was denied by the ADB on April 16, 2012. The petitioner then filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court, which was denied on October 31, 2012.

A hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, October 30, 2018, beginning at 9:30 a.m., at 1760 S. Telegraph Rd., Ste. 300, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302, (248) 335-5000.

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

## STUART L. SHERMAN

Notice is given that **Stuart L. Sherman**, P44301, 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 July 28, 2017, the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan was suspended for one year and until further order of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, or a hearing panel.

As alleged in the formal complaint and established by the evidence and testimony submitted, the hearing panel found that the petitioner committed professional misconduct based on his representation to the probate court and his conduct immediately after, at a hearing held on December 3, 2012, at the Oakland County Probate Court.

The panel found that the petitioner knowingly disobeyed an obligation under the rules of a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.4(c); and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or violation of a criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, contrary to MRPC 8.4(b). The petitioner was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)-(4) and MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

The panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law be suspended for one year.

A hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, November 13, 2018, beginning at 9:30 a.m. at the office of the Attorney Discipline Board, 311 W. Fort Street, Ste. 1410, Detroit, MI 48226 (corner of Fort St. and Washington).

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:

**Emily A. Downey**  
Senior Associate Counsel  
Attorney Grievance Commission  
535 Griswold, Ste. 1700  
Detroit, MI 48226  
(313) 961-6585

## ANDREW K. WILKINS

Notice is given that **Andrew K. Wilkins**, P56559, 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 June 17, 2006, the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan was revoked until further order of the Michi-

gan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, or a hearing panel.

The petitioner was found to be in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. The petitioner also failed to appear at the public hearing. Based on the default, the panel found that the petitioner, in 12 matters, neglected those matters; failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness; failed to keep his clients reasonably informed regarding the status of their matters; failed to refund the unearned portion of fees; failed to hold property of his clients or third persons separate from his own and in an IOLTA; misappropriated those funds; knowingly disobeyed an obligation under the rules of a tribunal in one matter; failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit three of his clients to make informed decisions regarding the representation; knowingly failed to respond to the lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority; engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach; engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals; and failed to answer 14 requests for investigation.

The petitioner's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1)-(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and MRPC 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.2; 1.4(a) and (b); 1.15 (d); 1.16(d); 3.4(c); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a)-(c).

The panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law be revoked, effective June 17, 2006, the date he was suspended for nonpayment of the costs assessed in *Grievance Administrator v Andrew K. Wilkins*, Case No. 05-144-GA. The panel also ordered that the petitioner pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$28,770.

Effective June 24, 2006, the petitioner was suspended for 179 days, and until further order of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, or a hearing panel.

The petitioner did not file an answer to the formal complaint but did appear at the hearing, and the hearing panel subsequently granted the petitioner's oral motion to set aside the default.

The hearing panel found that the petitioner neglected a legal matter; failed to refund the unearned portion of two fees; and failed to respond to two requests for investigation served upon him by the grievance administrator. The petitioner's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1)–(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and MRPC 1.1(c); 1.16(d); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a) and (c).

The panel ordered that the petitioner be suspended for 179 days, effective June 24, 2006. The panel also ordered that the petitioner pay restitution in the amount of \$150.

Effective August 1, 2006, the petitioner was suspended for 120 days, and until further order of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, or a hearing panel.

The petitioner did not file an answer to the formal complaint but did appear at the hearing. However, the hearing panel denied the petitioner's oral motion to set aside the default. Based on the petitioner's default, the hearing panel found that the petitioner handled a legal matter which the petitioner knew or should have known he was not competent to handle; neglected five separate client matters; failed to seek the lawful objectives for those five clients; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness; failed to keep his clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters; failed to refund unearned fees to four clients; engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach; engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals; failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority; and failed to answer three requests for investigation served upon him by the grievance administrator.

The petitioner's misconduct was in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1), (2), (4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and MRPC 1.1(a); 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 1.16(d); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a) and (c).

The panel ordered that the petitioner be suspended for 120 days, effective August 1, 2006. The panel also ordered that the petitioner pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$11,700 and that he be subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. The condition was that the peti-

tioner shall work with a mentor to monitor his practice for a period of one year, beginning from the effective date of the petitioner's active reinstatement to the practice of law.

Effective June 22, 2007, the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan was revoked until further order of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, or a hearing panel.

The petitioner was found to be in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. The petitioner also failed to appear at the public hearing. Based on the default, the panel found that the petitioner neglected a legal matter; failed to seek the lawful objectives of a client; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter; failed to refund an unearned fee; failed to return client property; failed to hold property of his clients or third persons separate from his own and in an IOLTA; and misappropriated funds.

The petitioner's conduct was in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1)–(4) and (7); MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2); and MRPC 1.1(c); 1.2(a); 1.3; 1.4(a); 1.15(b) and (d); 1.16(d); 8.1(a)(2); and 8.4(a) and (c).

The panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law be revoked and that he pay restitution in the aggregate amount of \$3,200.

A hearing is scheduled for Thursday, November 8, 2018, 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:

**Emily A. Downey**  
**Senior Associate Counsel**  
**Attorney Grievance Commission**  
**535 Griswold, Ste. 1700**  
**Detroit, MI 48226**  
**(313) 961-6585**

## REQUIREMENTS OF THE PETITIONERS

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 such standards, the petitioners are required to establish the following by clear and convincing evidence:

1. They desire in good faith to be restored to the privilege of practicing law in this state.
2. The terms of the suspensions ordered have elapsed or five years have elapsed since their disbarments or resignations.
3. They have not practiced or attempted to practice law contrary to the requirements of their suspensions or disbarments.
4. They have complied fully with the terms of the orders of discipline.
5. Their conduct since the discipline has been exemplary and above reproach.
6. They have a proper understanding of and attitude toward the standards that are imposed on members of the Bar and will conduct themselves in conformity with those standards.
7. Taking into account all of their past conduct, including the nature of the misconduct that led to their suspensions or disbarments, they nevertheless can safely be recommended to the public, the courts, and the legal profession as persons 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 members of the Bar and as officers of the court.
8. If they have been suspended for three years or more, they have been recertified by the Board of Law Examiners.
9. They have reimbursed or have agreed to reimburse the Client Protection Fund any money paid from the fund as a result of their conduct. Failure to fully reimburse as agreed is grounds for revocation of a reinstatement.



**Get a Tax Break...**  
**Donate Your Vehicle!**  
**Call (800) 678-LUNG**  
 Help fight the #3 killer...lung disease  
 AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION  
of Michigan