

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

**DISMISSAL**

Case No. 11-111-GA

Michael E. Tindall, P 29090, Mt. Clemens, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board, reversing Tri-County Hearing Panel #101's findings of misconduct and dismissing the formal complaint.

1. Dismissal
2. Effective November 8, 2012

Respondent was alleged to have committed professional misconduct by making false statements to a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1); failing to disclose a material fact to a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(2); making false statements to a disciplinary authority, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(1); knowingly making a false statement of material fact or law to a third person, in violation of MRPC 4.1; unlawfully obstructing another party's access to evidence, in violation of MRPC 3.4(a); and failing to hold property in which an interest is claimed by two or more people separate from the lawyer's own property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d). The formal complaint also alleged that respondent engaged in conduct that involved dishonesty, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation, or a violation of the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, contrary to MRPC 8.4(b); was prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(A)(1); exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(2); and was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(3).

Respondent filed a motion for summary disposition which was denied by the hearing panel. The hearing panel also found, by a majority, that respondent had committed misconduct and scheduled the matter for a hearing to determine sanctions.

Prior to the sanction hearing, respondent filed a motion for interlocutory review by the Attorney Discipline Board. The motion was granted and, after review, the Board issued its order vacating the hearing panel's findings of misconduct and dismissing the formal complaint. No costs were assessed against respondent.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Van Bolt

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**NOV 12 2012**