

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 CONDITIONS**

Case No. 21-8-GA

**Notice Issued: June 10, 2022**

Paul G. Valentino, P 34239, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #55

Reprimand, Effective June 10, 2022

After proceedings conducted pursuant to MCR 9.115, the hearing panel found that in the course of representing an individual in a first-party automobile accident claim, respondent failed to have an executed contingent fee agreement in writing and provided to the client; charged and attempted to collect an illegal fee; and represented a client where the representation was materially limited by respondent's responsibilities to another client.

The panel specifically found that respondent entered into an agreement for, charged, or collected an illegal fee, in violation of MRPC 1.5(a); failed to have an executed contingent fee agreement in writing and provided to the client, in violation of MRPC 1.5(c) and MCR 8.121(F); and, represented a client where the representation may be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, or to a third person, or by the lawyer's own interest, in violation of MRPC 1.7(b).

The panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and comply with conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$3,138.15.