

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case No. 99-33-GA

Notice Issued: October 15, 2001

Hon. Christopher C. Brown, P-11267, Pontiac, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #59.

1. Reprimand;
2. Effective May 30, 2001.

On February 8, 1999, the Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission filed its recommendation to the Supreme Court that the respondent, a judge in the 50th District Court, Pontiac, should be suspended without pay from the discharge of all judicial and administrative responsibilities for a period of 15 judicial working days. Under MCR 9.116(B), the Attorney Grievance Commission may not take action against a judge unless and until the Judicial Tenure Commission recommends a sanction. In accordance with that rule, the Grievance Administrator filed a complaint with the Attorney Discipline Board which alleged that respondent was involved in an automobile accident in April 1996; that respondent knowingly and intentionally made a false statement to the responding police officers that the other driver was traveling at a speed of 85 miles per hour; and that respondent made this false statement to support his demand that the police officers cite the other driver for a traffic violation. The complaint charged that respondent's conduct constituted an abuse of the prestige and authority of the respondent's judicial office and was professional misconduct in violation of MCR 9.104(1)-(4); MCR 9.205(4); the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, to wit: 3.4(b); 8.4(a), (b) and (c); and the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct, Canons 1, 2A, 2B, and 2C.

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5) in which the respondent offered his plea of no contest to the charges in the formal complaint and the parties agreed to the entry of an order of reprimand¹, subject to the condition that the reprimand was not to go into effect unless and until the Michigan Supreme Court acted on the Judicial Tenure Commission's recommendation. On May 30, 2001, the Supreme Court entered its order and opinion directing that respondent be suspended from the discharge of all judicial and administrative duties, without pay, for a period of 15 days. The consent order of reprimand which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel was deemed effective that date. No costs were assessed.

¹ Under MCR 9.106(2), a hearing panel may not suspend a license to practice law for a period of less than 30 days.