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 WITH CONDITIONS (By Consent)

Case No. 19-27-GA

Notice Issued: July 25, 2019

D. Michael Cherry, P 23882, Mt. Clemens, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #103.

Reprimand, Effective July 19, 2019

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 by engaging in conduct involving a violation of the criminal law.

Based on respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct when he engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct involving violation of a the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on respondent's fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); engaged in conduct that violates the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(3) and MRPC 8.4(a); and engaged in conduct that violates a criminal law of a state, in violation of MCR 9.104(5).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$757.75.

Mark A. Armitage

**Executive Director**