MEMBERS THOMAS G. KIENBAUM CHAIRPERSON JAMES M. CAMERON, JR. VICE-CHAIRPERSON SYLVIA P. WHITMER, Ph.D. SECRETARY ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D. CARL E. VER BEEK CRAIG H. LUBBEN LAWRENCE G. CAMPBELL DULCE M. FULLER LOUANN VAN DER WIELE

STATE OF MICHIGAN ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MARK A. ARMITAGE DEPUTY DIRECTOR JENNIFER M. PETTY LEGAL ASSISTANT

211 WEST FORT ST. SUITE 1410 DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236 PHONE: 313-963-5553 FAX: 313-963-5571 WWW.ADBMICH.ORG

EY DISCIPLIN

NOTICE OF DISBARMENT

Case No. 12-10-GA

Notice Issued: January 28, 2013

Brent S. Hunt, P 30711, Allen Park, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board, increasing discipline from a reprimand to disbarment.

- 1. Disbarment
- 2. Effective January 26, 2013

Respondent appeared at the hearing but was found to be in default for failing to timely file an answer to the formal complaint. Based on respondent's default, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and to comply with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to promptly pay or deliver funds or other property that a client or third person is entitled to receive and promptly render a full accounting regarding such property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3); failed to hold property of clients or third persons in connection with a representation separate from a lawyer's own property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b); engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional responsibility adopted by the Supreme Court, contrary to MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4); and engaged in conduct that violated the criminal law of a state or of the United States, contrary to MCR 9.104(5).

The hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and also be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. The Grievance Administrator filed a petition for review and, on July 11, 2012, respondent filed a cross-petition for review.

The Attorney Discipline Board, upon review, vacated the hearing panel's order of reprimand with conditions and increased discipline to disbarment. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$2,204.09.

John F. Van Bolt Dated: JAN 2 8 2013