MEMBERS
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES
SECRETARY
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT
ALAN GERSHEL
LINDA M. ORLANS

JASON M. TURKISH

## STATE OF MICHIGAN ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



333 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1700 DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3147 PHONE: 313-963-5553 MARK A. ARMITAGE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WENDY A. NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

KAREN M. DALEY ASSOCIATE COUNSEL

SHERRY MIFSUD OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR

ALLYSON M. PLOURDE CASE MANAGER

OWEN R. MONTGOMERY
CASE MANAGER

JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY

www.adbmich.org

## NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS (By Consent)

Case Nos. 18-133-RD; 18-134-GA

Notice Issued: September 21, 2022

S. Garrett Beck, P 27668, Petoskey, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Emmet County Hearing Panel #1

Reprimand, Effective September 20, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Reprimand With Conditions, pursuant to MCR 9.115(F)(5), that was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based upon respondent's plea of no contest as set forth in the parties' stipulation, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent engaged in frivolous litigation, as he asserted issues and brought proceedings that had no basis in law or fact, in violation of MRPC 3.1 (Count I); brought or defended a proceeding or issue for which there was no basis for doing so, in violation of MRPC 3.1 (Count II); violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) (Counts I and II); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1) (Counts I and II); and, engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2) (Counts I and II).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,006.21.