Disbarments

Constance Y. Ross, P28094, East Lansing, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Ingham County Hearing Panel #3, effective October 20, 2016.

The respondent filed an answer to the formal complaint and appeared at the hearing, which proceeded with a quorum of two panel members. Based on the evidence presented by the parties at the hearing held in this matter, the hearing panel found that the respondent committed professional misconduct in her fiduciary and legal responsibilities as attorney-in-fact for her clients in relation to a pour-over revocable trust.

The panel found that the respondent failed to promptly notify her client when funds or property was received, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(1); failed to preserve complete records of account funds for a period of five years after representation, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(2); failed to promptly pay or deliver funds that her client was entitled to receive and failed to promptly render a full account of such property when requested, in violation of MRPC 1.5(b)(3); and failed to disclose a fact necessary to correct a misapprehension known to her to have arisen in the matter, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)–(4) and MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

The panel ordered that the respondent be disbarred from the practice of law. Costs were assessed in the amount of $2,985.73.

Charles D. Septowski, P34065, St. Louis, Missouri, by the Attorney Discipline Board, effective October 8, 2016.

In a reciprocal discipline proceeding under MCR 9.120(C), the grievance administrator filed a certified copy of a judgment of disbarment entered by District 9 Grievance Committee Evidentiary Panel 9-3 of the State Bar of Texas on March 3, 2015, effective retroactively to February 27, 2015, Commission for Lawyer Discipline v Charles D. Septowski, Case No. 201400356.

An order regarding imposition of reciprocal discipline was served on the respondent on June 17, 2016. The 21-day period referenced in MCR 9.120(C)(2)(b) expired without objection by either party and the respondent was deemed to be in default. Based on that default, the Attorney Discipline Board ordered that the respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in Michigan. Costs were assessed in the amount of $1,500.

1. The respondent filed an objection to the imposition of reciprocal discipline 10 days late and failed to provide an affidavit of meritorious defense or establish good cause for setting aside the default.

Disbarment and Restitution

David J. Gorosh, P53134, Bloomfield Hills, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #59, effective October 12, 2016.

The respondent was in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. The respondent appeared at the April 13, 2016 hearing and, based on his default and admissions, the hearing panel found that he committed professional misconduct in his representation of two separate clients in their criminal matters by neglecting a legal matter entrusted to him and abandoning the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failing to seek the lawful objectives of the client through reasonably available means permitted by law, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failing to adequately communicate with a client, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a) and (b); failing to surrender papers or property or to refund the advance payment of a fee that had not been earned upon termination of the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); failing to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of his client, in violation of MRPC 3.2; knowingly disobeying an obligation under the rules of a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.4(c); failing, in pretrial procedure, to make reasonably diligent efforts to comply with a legally proper discovery request by an opposing party, in violation of MRPC 3.4(d); and failing to answer two requests for investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7), MCR 9.113(A), and MCR 9.113(B)(2). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)–(3); and MRPC 8.4(a) and (c).

The respondent failed to appear for a sanction hearing on May 31, 2016, and the panel ordered that the respondent be disbarred from the practice law in Michigan. The panel also ordered the respondent to pay restitution in the total amount of $15,000. Costs were assessed in the amount of $2,118.07.
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Gary D. Siegel, P28599, Waterford, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #69, effective July 16, 2016.

The respondent 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 contains the respondent’s admissions and plea of no contest that he committed professional misconduct in his representation of five clients in their bankruptcy matters by accepting attorney and court filing fees; not filing the bankruptcy petitions on his clients’ behalf; failing to refund any money to his clients; failing to promptly pay or deliver funds to the bankruptcy court; and knowingly making a false statement of material fact to a tribunal.

Based on the respondent’s admissions, plea of no contest, and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that the respondent failed to promptly pay or deliver funds to the bankruptcy court in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3); failed to hold property of clients in connection with a representation separate from his own property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); failed to deposit legal fees and expenses paid in advance into a client trust account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(g); failed to refund the payment of a fee and cost that had not been earned, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); and knowingly made a false statement of material fact to a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1). The respondent was also found to have violated MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in Michigan, effective July 16, 2016, and that he pay restitution in the total amount of $5,595. Costs were assessed in the amount of $809.93.

Disbarment and Restitution (With Condition)

**John C. Schultes**, P33463, Detroit, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #28, effective November 2, 2016.

The respondent was in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. The respondent appeared at the July 1, 2016 hearing and, based on his default, the hearing panel found that he committed professional misconduct in his capacity as trustee of the Dante Joseph D’Alessandro Revocable Living Trust by misappropriating approximately $204,365 between May 2013 and April 2014, and failing to timely file tax returns for the trust. The panel further found that the respondent breached his fiduciary duties under the Estates and Protected Individuals Code as a trustee, in violation of MCL 700.1308, 700.1502, 700.1506; MCL 700.7801; and MCL 700.7802; and engaged in conduct that violated a criminal law of a state or of the United States, contrary to MCR 9.104(5), including but not limited to MCL 750.174 (embezzlement), and MCL 750.362 (larceny by conversion). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(2) and (3); and MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

The panel ordered that the respondent be disbarred from the practice law in Michigan. The panel also ordered that the respondent be required to pay restitution to the Dante Joseph D’Alessandro Revocable Living Trust, as ordered by the Macomb County Probate Court, unless there was a different amount agreed to by the Probate Court or by complainant and trustee Richard J. Gianino, and that he would not be eligible to petition for reinstatement until payment is made in full. In addition, before petitioning for reinstatement, the respondent is required to submit an evaluation from the Lawyers and Judges Assistance Program. Costs were assessed in the amount of $2,019.82.

Automatic Reinstatements

**Lisa Clarke**, P69639, Southfield.

The respondent was suspended from the practice of law in Michigan for 30 days, effective October 1, 2016. In accordance with MCR 9.123(A), the suspension was terminated with the respondent’s filing of an affidavit with the clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court.

**Mark W. Stepek**, P40976, Clinton Township, effective October 10, 2016.

The respondent was suspended from the practice of law in Michigan for 30 days, effective September 8, 2016. In accordance with MCR 9.123(A), the suspension was terminated with the respondent’s filing of an affidavit of compliance with the Michigan Supreme Court on October 10, 2016.

**Kelly D. Watson**, P58080, Redford.

The respondent was suspended from the practice of law in Michigan for 179 days with conditions, effective March 3, 2016. In accordance with MCR 9.123(A), the suspension was terminated with the respondent’s...
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**Final Reprimand**

**Joseph Edward Ernst.** P69274, Holt, by the Attorney Discipline Board, affirming Ingham County Hearing Panel #3’s order of reprimand, effective October 1, 2015.

The respondent appeared at the hearing and filed an answer to the formal complaint. The hearing panel found that the respondent committed acts of professional misconduct while representing a criminal defendant by telling his client that he had hired an investigator, and that the investigator had performed services in furtherance of his case. The respondent admitted that he knew the statement to be false at the time he made it. Accordingly, the hearing panel found that the respondent’s false statement to his client violated MRPC 8.4(a) and (b) and MCR 9.104(2)–(4).

The hearing panel ordered that the respondent be reprimanded. The grievance administrator filed a petition for review, seeking an increase in discipline. Upon review, the Board issued its order and opinion affirming the hearing panel’s order of reprimand on September 19, 2016. Total costs were assessed in the amount of $1,909.30.

---

**Reprimands With Conditions (By Consent)**

**Marvin D. Wilder.** P53871, Redford, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #6, effective October 21, 2016.

The respondent 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 respondent’s admissions to the allegations that he committed professional misconduct as the result of his improper use of an IOLTA account.

Based on the respondent’s admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that he held funds other than client or third-person funds in an IOLTA, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3); and deposited his own funds in an IOLTA in an amount more.
than reasonably necessary to pay financial institution charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that the respondent be reprimanded, along with the condition that he must attend the seminar entitled “Lawyer Trust Accounts: Management Principles and Record Keeping Resources” offered by the State Bar of Michigan, scheduled for October 18, 2016, or the next available seminar if the respondent is unable to attend the October 18 seminar. Costs were assessed in the amount of $764.36.

Catherine L. Wolfe, P37148, Honor, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Grand Traverse County Hearing Panel #1, effective October 6, 2016.

The respondent 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 respondent’s admissions to the allegations that she committed professional misconduct in her representation of two clients, as well as in her communications with a third potential client. The alleged misconducts included frivolous filings, lack of candor with the court, and abusive conduct.

Based on the respondent’s admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that the respondent failed to communicate with the client, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to provide sufficient information to the client so that the client could make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); filed frivolous pleadings asserting issues that lacked merit, in violation of MRPC 3.1; failed to expedite litigation by filing frivolous claims, in violation of MRPC 3.2; engaged in undignified or discourteous conduct toward the tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.5(d); and engaged in conduct that is discourteous and disrespectful to persons involved in the legal process, in violation of MRPC 6.5(a). The panel also found that the respondent violated MCR 9.104(1) and (2); and MRPC 8.4(c).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that the respondent be reprimanded. The panel also ordered that the respondent be subject to conditions relevant to the admitted misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of $771.98.

Suspension and Restitution

Robert A. Szwitwer, P74724, Lincoln Park, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #25, for three years and one day, effective October 7, 2016.1

The respondent did not attend the public hearing and was in default for his failure to file an answer to the formal complaint. Based on the respondent’s default, the hearing panel found that he committed professional misconduct in his representation of three separate clients by neglecting their legal matters, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failing to keep his clients reasonably informed about the status of their legal matters and respond promptly to reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failing to explain the legal matters to the extent necessary for the clients to remain reasonably informed regarding the status of their matters, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); failing to refund unearned attorney fees paid in advance, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); knowingly disobeying his duties under the rules of a court or tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.4(c); and failing to answer four requests for investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7) and MCR 9.113(A) and (B). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1), (2), and (4); and MRPC 8.1(a) (2); and 8.4(b) and (c).

The panel ordered that the respondent’s license to practice law be suspended for three years and one day. The panel also ordered the respondent to pay restitution in the total amount of $3,275. Costs were assessed in the amount of $1,803.84.

1. On May 23, 2016, the hearing panel issued an order suspending the respondent from the practice of law based on his failure to appear at the public hearing. That suspension went into effect on May 31, 2016. Please see Notice of Interim Suspension Pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(1), issued May 31, 2016.

Suspension and Restitution (By Consent)

James E. Hall, P41704, Temperance, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #14, for 45 days, effective November 4, 2016.

The respondent and the grievance administrator filed an amended stipulation for 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 contains the respondent’s admissions to the allegations that he committed professional misconduct in his representation of clients in Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceedings and by misusing his IOLTA account.

Based on the respondent’s admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel...
found that the respondent failed to provide competent representation to his clients and handled a legal matter without preparation adequate in the circumstances, in violation of MRPC 1.1 and 1.1(b); failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients through reasonably available means permitted by the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct and the Electronic Case Filing requirements of the United States Bankruptcy Court, Eastern District of Michigan, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); held funds other than client or third-person funds in an IOLTA account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3) and 1.15(f); used his IOLTA account to reimburse a personal expenditure that was unrelated to client or third-person funds, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3); and knowingly made a false statement of material fact to a tribunal (by virtue of the electronic filing without original signatures) and failed to take reasonable remedial measures, including disclosure to the trustee and/or tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1) and (b). The respondent was also found to have violated MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 45 days. In accordance with MCR 9.106(5), discipline in this case is deemed to include restitution, as ordered by United States Bankruptcy Court Judge Marci McIvor, which the respondent has already paid. Costs were assessed in the amount of $757.57.

Suspension and Restitution With Condition (By Consent)

Marc J. Hollingsworth, P65319, Oak Park, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #79, for three years, effective December 3, 2017.

The respondent 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 contains the respondent's admissions to the allegations that he committed professional misconduct in his representation of two clients in pursuit of first-party and third-party claims relating to injuries from a vehicle accident either on their behalf or that of a minor child; and that he failed to respond to the lawful demands for information from the grievance administrator.

Based on the respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that the respondent neglected his client's legal matter, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to keep his clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters and comply with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain the matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the clients to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); failed to communicate regarding the basis or rate of the fee, in violation of MRPC 1.5(b); failed to have a written contingent fee agreement, in violation of MRPC 1.5(c); failed to promptly notify his clients or third persons when funds in which the clients or third persons had an interest were received, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(1); failed to preserve complete records of account funds and other property of a client or third person for a period of five years after termination of the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(2); failed to promptly pay or deliver any funds or other property that his clients or third persons were entitled to receive, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3); failed to promptly render a full accounting regarding funds or property in which the clients or third persons had an interest, upon request by the clients or third persons, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3); failed to hold property of clients or third persons in connection with the representation separate from the lawyer's property and in an IOLTA or non-IOLTA account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); and knowingly failed to respond to the lawful demands for information from the grievance administrator, in violation of MRPC 8.1a(2). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)–(4) and MRPC 8.4(a) and (b).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for three years, effective December 3, 2017, as well as subject to the condition that, upon issuance of the order of discipline, the respondent would promptly request that the State Bar of Michigan reclassify his membership status to inactive and maintain the inactive status of his license through December 3, 2017. In addition, the parties stipulated, and the panel agreed, that the respondent pay restitution in the amount of $2,866.66 to Falonda Wright and $5,000 to Beverly Lewis, or enter into a payment plan with each of them. The parties further agreed that, in the event the respondent fails to promptly transfer to inactive status or fails to substantially comply with his Lawyers and Judges Assistance Program contract, the grievance administrator may file the executed stipulation for an order of disbarment, along with a motion and affidavit attesting to the respondent’s failure to comply with the order.
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of discipline. Costs were assessed in the amount of $1,001.74.

Amended Suspension
(As to Effective Date)
(Pending Review)

Richard A. Meier, P38204, Novi, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #80, for two years, effective October 20, 2016.

The respondent filed an answer to the formal complaint and appeared at the hearing. Based on the evidence presented by the parties at the hearings held in this matter, the hearing panel found that the respondent committed professional misconduct in his representation of three separate clients pursuing claims against their respective employers.

The panel found that the respondent handled two legal matters without preparation adequate in the circumstances, in violation of MRPC 1.1(b); neglected three legal matters, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness on behalf of three separate clients, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep three clients reasonably informed as to the status of their legal matters and respond promptly to reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain a legal matter to three separate clients to the extent necessary for the clients to make informed decisions, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); and failed to respond to a legally proper discovery request in pre-trial procedure in one matter, in violation of MRPC 3.4(d). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(B)(1), the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan was automatically suspended on the date of his felony conviction.

The panel ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for two years. The respondent filed a petition for review and a petition for stay on September 27, 2016. The respondent's request for a stay pending review was granted on an interim basis pending further consideration by the Board on October 7, 2016. After further consideration, the Board denied the respondent's request for stay on October 13, 2016, and the order of suspension became effective October 20, 2016. The review hearing in this matter is scheduled for December 14, 2016.

Automatic Interim Suspensions

Eric Allan Buikema, P58379, Troy, effective October 6, 2016.

On October 6, 2016, the respondent entered a plea of no contest to operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated, 3rd offense, in violation of MCL 257.625, in the Sixth Circuit Court. In accordance with MCR 9.120(B)(1), the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan was automatically suspended on the date of his felony conviction.

Upon the filing of a judgment of conviction, this matter will be assigned to a hearing panel for further proceedings. The interim suspension will remain in effect until the effective date of an order filed by a hearing panel.

James Anthony Catipay, P63876, Southfield, effective October 25, 2016.

On October 25, 2016, the respondent entered a plea of guilty to conspiracy to commit securities fraud, in violation of 18 USC 371, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California. In accordance with MCR 9.120(B)(1), the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan was automatically suspended on the date of his felony conviction.

Upon the filing of a judgment of conviction, this matter will be assigned to a hearing panel for further proceedings. The interim suspension will remain in effect until the effective date of an order filed by a hearing panel.

Suspension (By Consent)

Janet Ann Williamson, P72697, Royal Oak, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #63, for 30 days, effective October 12, 2016.

The respondent 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 respondent's acknowledgment that she was convicted of operating while intoxicated, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 257.6256B, in People of the State of Michigan v Janet Ann Williamson, 44th District Court Case No. 13-80896-SD; and that she subsequently violated the terms of her sentence in that matter.

Based on the respondent's conviction and her acknowledgment in the stipulation,
it was established that the respondent engaged in conduct that violated the criminal laws 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 respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 30 days. Costs were assessed in the amount of $793.65.

Final Suspension

Robin H. Kyle, P33330, Detroit, by the Attorney Discipline Board, affirming Tri-County Hearing Panel #28's order of suspension for 60 days, effective October 18, 2016.

The respondent appeared at the hearings and filed an answer to the formal complaint. The hearing panel found that the respondent committed acts of professional misconduct as the result of his improper use of an IOLTA account. The panel specifically found that the respondent held funds other than client or third-person funds in an IOLTA account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3); and deposited his own funds into an IOLTA account in excess of an amount reasonably necessary to pay financial institution service charges or fees or to obtain a waiver of service charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f). The respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(2) and (4).

The hearing panel ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 60 days. The respondent filed a petition for review and request for stay, and the discipline ordered by the hearing panel was automatically stayed pursuant to MCR 9.115(K). The grievance administrator filed a cross-petition for review. Upon review, the Board affirmed the hearing panel's order of suspension on April 6, 2016. The respondent filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court, which was denied on September 27, 2016. Total costs were assessed in the amount of $3,992.96.

Amended Interim Suspension Pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(1)


The respondent failed to appear at the October 20, 2016 hearing. After satisfactory proofs were entered that the respondent possessed actual notice of the proceedings, the hearing panel, in accordance with MCR 9.115(H)(1), issued an order of suspension October 21, 2016, effective October 28, 2016, and until further order of the panel or the Board.

Interim Suspensions Pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(1)

Susan F. Reed, P26897, Detroit, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Tri-County Hearing Panel #10, effective October 20, 2016.

After being properly served with the formal complaint, discovery demand, and notice of hearing, the respondent failed to personally appear at the October 6, 2016 hearing. After satisfactory proofs were entered that the respondent possessed actual notice of the proceedings, the hearing panel, in accordance with MCR 9.115(H)(1), determined that the respondent's failure to appear warranted an interim suspension from the practice of law until further order of the panel.

On October 13, 2016, the panel issued an order of suspension pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(1), effective October 20, 2016, and until further order of the panel or the Board.


The respondent failed to appear at the October 24, 2016 hearing. After satisfactory proofs were entered that the respondent possessed actual notice of the proceedings, the hearing panel, in accordance with MCR 9.115(H)(1), issued an order of suspension that day, effective October 31, 2016, and until further order of the panel or the Board.

Suspension (With Condition)

Susan G. Graham, P55509, Petoskey, by the Attorney Discipline Board, Emmet County Hearing Panel #2, for 4 years and 11 months, effective March 3, 2016.1

The respondent pleaded guilty to operating a vehicle with the presence of a controlled substance, in violation of MCL 257.6258; and operating under the influence of liquor, per se, 3rd offense, a felony, in violation of MCL 257.6256D, in People of the State of Michigan v Susan Gail Graham, 57th Circuit Court Case No. 15-4271-FH. Based on the respondent's conviction, the panel found that she committed professional misconduct that violated a criminal law of a state or of the United States, contrary to MCR 9.104(5).

The panel ordered that the respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 4 years and 11 months, retroactive to March 3, 2016 (the date the respondent's guilty plea was entered and she was automatically suspended from the practice of law), with the condition that she abstain from the use of alcohol and nonprescription controlled substances. Total costs were assessed in the amount of $2,306.17.

1. The respondent has been continuously suspended from the practice of law in Michigan since December 28, 2013. Please see Notice of Suspension With Conditions [By Consent], issued January 9, 2014.