

MEMBERS
WILLIAM J. DANHOF
CHAIRPERSON
THOMAS G. KIENBAUM
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
WILLIAM L. MATTHEWS, CPA
SECRETARY
BILLY BEN BAUMANN, M.D.
ANDREA L. SOLAK
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
CARL E. VER BEEK
CRAIG H. LUBBEN

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. 08-84-GA

James K. Champion, P 59188, Portage, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board
Kalamazoo County Hearing Panel #1.

1. Dismissal
2. Effective December 9, 2008

In this matter, respondent was charged with failing to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions regarding the representation; representing a client where the representation of that client may be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client; violation the Rules of Professional Conduct; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(A)(1) and (4); and Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.4(b); 1.7(b); and 8.4(a) and (c).

During the hearing, the Grievance Administrator withdrew a majority of the allegations, leaving the allegation that respondent represented a client where the representation of that client may be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, in violation of MRPC 1.7(b).

The panel found that while respondent's representation of the daughter of his partner's client might be materially limited, the charges against the father at the initial point of representation were separate and distinct, involving Federal criminal charges, while the daughter's representation only involved her relationship with Child Protective Services and the Family Courts and threats through the Portage Police investigator. The panel also found that respondent had discussed the potential conflict with his client and that she did not have separate interests from her father, as she was claiming he was innocent. Finally, the panel concluded that while respondent could and probably should have gone further in explaining the risks and dangers of this representation, the panel concluded that respondent's conduct was not a violation such as to subject him to formal discipline.

No costs were assessed against respondent.


John F. Van Bolt

Dated: DEC 9 2008