

MEMBERS
JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH
CHAIRPERSON
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
BARBARA WILLIAMS FORNEY
SECRETARY
JAMES A. FINK
JOHN W. INHULSEN
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
ANNA FRUSHOUR
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



333 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1700
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3147
PHONE: 313-963-5553 | FAX: 313-963-5571

MARK A. ARMITAGE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
—
WENDY A. NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
—
KAREN M. DALEY
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL
—
SHERRY MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR
—
ALLYSON M. FLOURDE
CASE MANAGER
—
OWEN R. MONTGOMERY
CASE MANAGER
—
JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY
—
www.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case No. 19-118-GA

Notice Issued: January 7, 2020

Daniel I. Weberman, P 41644, West Bloomfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board
Tri-County Hearing Panel #103.

Reprimand, Effective December 31, 2019

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contained respondent's admissions to the factual statements contained in the formal complaint that in his representation of a client in a medical malpractice matter, respondent failed to file a Notice of Intent before filing a malpractice complaint or include an affidavit of merit with the complaint. Respondent pled no contest to the allegations that he committed acts of professional misconduct.

Based upon respondent's admissions, plea of no contest and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent handled a legal matter without preparation adequate in the circumstances, in violation of MRPC 1.1(b); failed to seek the lawful objective of a client through reasonably available means, in violation of MRPC 1.2; failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed regarding the status of a matter, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); and failed to explain a matter to a client to the extent reasonably necessary for a client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(2) and (3).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$800.00.


Mark A. Armitage
Executive Director