

MEMBERS  
**MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.**  
CHAIRPERSON  
**LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD**  
VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**  
SECRETARY  
**KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE**  
**MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER**  
**PETER A. SMIT**  
**ALAN GERSHEL**  
**LINDA M. ORLANS**  
**JASON M. TURKISH**

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD**



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

**MARK A. ARMITAGE**  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
—  
**WENDY A. NEELEY**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
—  
**KAREN M. DALEY**  
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL  
—  
**SHERRY MIFSUD**  
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR  
—  
**ALLYSON M. PLOURDE**  
CASE MANAGER  
—  
**OWEN R. MONTGOMERY**  
CASE MANAGER  
—  
**JULIE M. LOISELLE**  
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY  
—  
[www.adbmich.org](http://www.adbmich.org)

**NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITION**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 22-9-GA

**Notice Issued: September 30, 2022**

Ethan D. Baker, P 73588, Troy, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #81

Reprimand, Effective September 29, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, pursuant to MCR 9.115(F)(5), that was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based upon respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct by improperly using his IOLTA account held at JP Morgan Chase Bank from July 2018 through November 2018.

Specifically, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent held funds other than client or third person funds in an IOLTA, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3); deposited his own funds into an IOLTA in an amount more than reasonably necessary to pay financial institution service charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f); and engaged in conduct that was in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$772.79.