


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



JOHN F. VAN BOLT
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

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITION
(By Consent)


Case No. 12-97-GA

Myles B. Hoffert, P 15031, Farmington Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #65.

1. Reprimand
2. Effective January 30, 2013

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator submitted a stipulation for consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5). The stipulation was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contains respondent's plea of *nolo contendere* to the allegations that he used or participated in a form of public communication that was false, fraudulent, misleading, or deceptive, in violation of MRPC 7.1; used or participated in a form of public communication that contained a material misrepresentation of fact or law, or omit a fact necessary to make the statement considered as a whole not materially misleading, in violation of MRPC 7.1(a); used or participated in a form of public communication that was likely to create an unjustified expectation about results the lawyer can achieve, or state or imply that the lawyer can achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law, in violation of MRPC 7.1(b); engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); and engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional responsibility adopted by the Supreme Court, contrary to MCR 9.104(4).

Based on the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and be subject to a condition relevant to the alleged misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$882.43.



John F. Van Bolt
JAN 31 2013
Dated: _____