

PETITIONERS

BART R. FRITH

Notice is given that **Bart R. Frith**, P39541, has filed a petition with the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, and the Attorney Grievance Commission seeking reinstatement as a member of the State Bar and restoration of his license to practice law in accordance with MCR 9.124(A). *In the Matter of the Reinstatement Petition of Bart R. Frith (P39541)*, ADB Case No. 18-103-GA.

The petitioner has been suspended from the practice of law since November 1, 2018.

1. Effective March 12, 2016, the petitioner was suspended with conditions by consent for 30 days.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based on the petitioner's admissions, the panel found that the petitioner neglected his client's legal matter, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to consult with his client upon knowing that he expected assistance "not permitted by the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law," in violation of MRPC 1.2(d); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in the representation of his client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of his matter and to comply promptly with his reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions regarding the representations, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); failed to timely seek the court's permission to withdraw from the representation of his client when the petitioner had determined that he did not have a good-faith basis for filing an application for leave to appeal and doing so would be in violation of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, contrary to MRPC 1.16(a)(3); failed to timely seek the court's permission to withdraw before October 2014, on the basis that the petitioner had a good cause for doing so and to allow his client a more

timely option of obtaining new counsel, in violation of MRPC 1.16(b)(6); and failed to take reasonable steps to protect his client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to his client that he had (1) concluded that he would not file an application for leave to appeal and/or (2) had stopped actively representing him notwithstanding the court's order appointing the petitioner to serve as his client's appellate counsel, so as to allow time for the appointment of employment of other counsel, or for self-representation, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d). Additionally, the panel found that the petitioner violated MCR 9.104(2) and (3) based on his plea of no contest.

In accordance with the stipulation, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 30 days, effective March 12, 2016, as stipulated by the parties. The petitioner shall be subject to a condition relevant to the admitted misconduct.

2. Effective November 1, 2018, the petitioner was suspended by consent for one year.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based on the petitioner's admissions, the panel found that the petitioner committed professional misconduct during his representation of numerous indigent criminal defendants in appeals of their criminal convictions contrary to certain standards of practice imposed by the Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System (MAACS).

Specifically, the panel found that the petitioner neglected legal matters that were entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in the representation of his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.3; and violated Minimum Standard for Indigent Criminal Appellate Defense Services Standard 5, as adopted by the Michigan Supreme Court, by abandoning client appeals. The petitioner was also found to have violated MCR 2.104(1)–(3).

The Attorney Discipline Board has assigned the reinstatement petition to Tri-County Hearing Panel #2. A hearing is scheduled for January 31, 2020, beginning at 10 a.m. at the office of the State Bar of Michigan, 306 Townsend Street, Hudson Room, Lansing, Michigan 48933.

In the interest of maintaining the high standards imposed on the legal profession as conditions for the privilege to practice law in this state, and of protecting the public, the judiciary, and the legal profession against conduct contrary to such standards, the petitioner is required to establish his eligibility for reinstatement by clear and convincing evidence.

Any interested person may appear at the hearing and request to 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:

Jordan D. Pattera
Associate Counsel

Attorney Grievance Commission
535 Griswold St., Ste. 1700
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 961-6585

LISA M. LONDER

Notice is given that **Lisa M. Londer**, P64672, 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.

Based on the petitioner's conviction in the Oakland County Circuit Court of Retail Fraud 1st Degree, a felony, in violation of MCL 750.356(c), Tri-County Hearing Panel #74 found that the petitioner had committed professional misconduct in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(5).

The panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be revoked, effective June 28, 2006, the date of her felony conviction.

The petitioner filed a petition for review, and, upon review, the Attorney Discipline Board issued an order affirming the hearing panel's order of revocation.

Effective June 28, 2006, a Final Notice of Revocation was issued by the hearing panel

of the Attorney Discipline Board, which ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law be revoked in violation of MCL 750.356(c), and until further order of the Board.

A hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, February 18, 2020, beginning at 9:30 a.m., at the office of Hearing Panel Member Barry M. Feldman, 25800 Northwestern Hwy., 10th Fl., Maccabees Center, Southfield, MI, 48075.

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:

Kimberly L. Uhuru
Senior Associate Counsel
Attorney Grievance Commission
535 Griswold, Ste. 1700
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 961-6585

DERRICK N. OKONMAH

Notice is given that **Derrick N. Okonmah**, P68221, has filed a petition with the Michigan Supreme Court, the Attorney Discipline Board, and the Attorney Grievance Commission seeking reinstatement as a member of the State Bar and restoration of his license to practice law in accordance with MCR 9.124(A). *In the Matter of the Reinstatement Petition of Derrick N. Okonmah (P68221)*, ADB Case No. 19-113-RP.

The petitioner has been suspended from the practice of law since June 23, 2019.

1. Effective January 10, 2013, the petitioner was reprimanded with conditions by consent.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator submitted a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5). The stipulation was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contains the petitioner's admission that he was convicted in the 65A District Court of the misdemeanor offense of reckless driving because he was operating his vehicle while possessing a blood alcohol content of .13%.

The stipulation was approved by the hearing panel and, in accordance with the agreement of the parties, the panel ordered that the petitioner be reprimanded and be

subject to conditions relevant to the admitted misconduct.

2. Effective June 10, 2014, the petitioner was suspended with conditions by consent for 179 days.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contained the petitioner's admission that he was convicted of operating while intoxicated—third or subsequent offense, a felony, in violation of MCR 257.625. Based on the petitioner's conviction and his admission, the panel found that the petitioner engaged in conduct that violated the criminal laws of the state of Michigan, contrary to MCR 9.104(5).

The hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 179 days, effective June 10, 2014, as stipulated by the parties. Additionally, the panel ordered that the petitioner be subject to conditions relevant to the admitted misconduct.

3. Effective November 3, 2015, the petitioner was suspended for 180 days with conditions by consent.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based on the petitioner's admission that he pled guilty to operating while intoxicated, 3rd, a felony; and driving while license suspended, 2nd, a misdemeanor; as well as his admission of a guilty plea to the misdemeanor of disorderly person, the panel found that the petitioner had engaged in conduct that violated the criminal law of the state, contrary to MCR 9.104(5).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 180 days, effective November 3, 2015, the date of the petitioner's automatic interim suspension (as stipulated by the parties). The panel further ordered that the petitioner shall be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct.

4. Effective December 19, 2017, the petitioner was suspended for 18 months with conditions by consent.

The petitioner and the grievance administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contained the petitioner's admission that he was convicted in a matter titled *People of the State of Michigan v Derrick Nnabuiife Okonmah*, Oakland County Circuit Court Case No. 17-265385-FH, of Operating While Impaired per se, 3rd Offense, a felony, in violation of MCL 257.625(1) and (9)(c); and Driving While License Suspended, 2nd Offense, or Subsequent Offense, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCR 257.904(3)(a) and (b). Based on the petitioner's conviction and the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel found that the petitioner committed professional misconduct by engaging in conduct that violated a criminal law of the state of Michigan, contrary to MCR 9.104(5).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 18 months and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct.

5. Effective June 23, 2019, the petitioner was suspended for 60 days.

A show cause hearing was held in this matter on the grievance administrator's petition for an order to show cause why discipline should not be increased for the petitioner's failure to comply with Tri-County Hearing Panel #1's November 15, 2018 Amended Order of Suspension With Conditions (By Consent). The hearing panel found that based on the petitioner's admissions and the evidence presented, the petitioner violated an order of discipline, which constituted misconduct under MCR 9.104(9).

The hearing panel ordered that the petitioner's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 60 days, effective retroactively to June 23, 2019, for the good cause listed in the panel's report.

The Attorney Discipline Board has assigned the reinstatement petition to Tri-County Hearing Panel #71. A hearing is

scheduled for January 29, 2020, beginning at 9:30 a.m. at the office of the hearing panel chairperson, Jeffrey T. Stewart, 30445 Northwestern Highway, Ste. 250, in Farmington Hills, MI 48334.

In the interest of maintaining the high standards imposed on the legal profession as conditions for the privilege to practice law in this state, and of protecting the public, the judiciary, and the legal profession against conduct contrary to such standards, the petitioner will be required to establish his eligibility for reinstatement by clear and convincing evidence.

Any interested person may appear at the hearing and request to 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:

Jordan D. Pattera
Associate Counsel

Attorney Grievance Commission
535 Griswold St., Ste. 1700
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 961-6585

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PETITIONERS

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 to practice law in this state.
2. The term of the suspension or revocation of their licenses, whichever is applicable, has elapsed.
3. They have not practiced or attempted to practice law contrary to the requirement of their suspension or revocation.
4. They have complied fully with the terms of the order of discipline.
5. Their conduct since the order of 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. They can safely be recommended to the public, the courts, and the legal profes-

sion 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 out of the practice of law 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.



<http://tinyurl.com/SBMmembers-LinkedIn>



twitter.com/SBMNews



<http://www.facebook.com/sbm.news>



<http://sbmblog.typepad.com>

smart lawyers

socialize

for

friends • contacts • business • information • news

