

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

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 L. MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR
ALLYSON M. PLOURDE
CASE MANAGER
OWEN R. MONTGOMERY
CASE MANAGER
JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY

www.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case No. 19-51-GA

Notice Issued: July 24, 2019

Joshua L. Moore, P 71021, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #27.

Reprimand, Effective July 20, 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 allegations that he committed acts of professional misconduct when he negligently filed the same form-type brief in a number of client matters, which included sparse statements of facts unsupported by citations to the record, relied on nearly identical legal authority, and made boiler point arguments. The court described respondent's pleadings as "one-size fits all" filings filed notwithstanding prior warnings from the court expressing its concerns and the unacceptable nature of respondent's pleadings.

Based upon respondent's admissions 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 objectives of a client through reasonably available means permitted by law and the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; and, in legal proceedings, made assertions or controverted issues therein without a basis for doing so that was not frivolous, in violation of MRPC 3.1. Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1); and MRPC 8.4(c).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$765.50.

Mark A. Armitage
Executive Director