


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 DISBARMENT

Case No. 13-11-RD

Notice Issued: May 2, 2013

Martha D. Finn, P 34023, Ketchikan, Alaska, by the Attorney Discipline Board.


1. Disbarred
2. Effective November 21, 2012

On November 14, 2012, the Supreme Court of Washington disbarred respondent from the practice of law in Washington for failing to file dissolution petitions for two clients; converting a client's funds for her own personal use and failing to keep them separate from her own property; falsely advising her client that she had deposited the funds into her "attorney account," and falsely advising the Washington State Bar Association (Association) that she had called her client after May, 2010, to obtain additional information; and failing to promptly respond to requests made by the Association for information relevant to the investigation of a grievance.

Pursuant to MCR 9.120(C)(1), proof of the adjudication of misconduct in a disciplinary proceeding in another state or a United States court is conclusive proof of misconduct in disciplinary proceedings in Michigan and will result in comparable discipline being imposed under subchapter 9.100 of the Michigan Court Rules, unless it is established that respondent was not afforded due process of law in the course of the original proceeding, or that the imposition of comparable discipline in Michigan would be clearly inappropriate.

On January 30, 2013, respondent was ordered to show cause why she should not be subject to a reciprocal order of discipline in Michigan. Pursuant to MCR 9.120(C)(2)(b), no objections were filed by either party in response to the order to show cause and respondent was found to be in default, with the same effect as a default in a civil action.

The Attorney Discipline Board ordered that respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in Michigan and that she pay costs in the amount of \$1,533.55.


John F. Van Bolt

Dated: **MAY - 2 2013**