MEMBERS
JAMES M. CAMERON, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
LAWRENCE G. CAMPBELL
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
DULCE M. FULLER
SECRETARY
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
SYLVIA P. WHITMER, Ph.D
LOUANN VAN DER WIELE
MICHAEL MURRAY
JAMES A. FINK
JOHN W. INHULSEN

STATE OF MICHIGAN ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



211 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1410 DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236 PHONE: 313-963-5553 | FAX: 313-963-5571 MARK A ARMITAGE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WENDY A NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

SHERRY I MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR

JENNIFER M. PETTY
PARALEGAL

KATHLEEN PHILLIPS
CASE MANAGER

ALLYSON M. PLOURDE
CASE MANAGER

JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST

WWW.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION

Case Nos. 14-79-GA; 15-21-GA

Notice Issued: August 26, 2015

David K. Wenger, II, P 23078, Grosse Pointe Park, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #23.

- 1. Suspension 180 Days
- 2. Effective August 26, 2015

Respondent appeared at the hearing and filed answers to the formal complaints. The hearing panel found, by a preponderance of the evidence, that respondent failed to hold property of clients or third persons in connection with a representation separate from his own property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); failed to deposit legal fees paid in advance of services rendered into a client trust account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(g); violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, contrary to MRPC 8.4(a); engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); and, engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3).

The hearing panel, by a majority, ordered that respondent's license to practice law be suspended for 180 days, effective August 26, 2015. A dissenting panelist concluded that disbarment would have been the more appropriate sanction. However, the panel was unanimous in ordering respondent to pay restitution in the amount of \$2,600.00. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$3,199.78.

Mark A. Armitage

Aub 2 6 2015