

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**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 21-71-GA

**Notice Issued: April 29, 2022**

David A. Chasnick, P 57097, Novi, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #68

Reprimand, Effective April 28, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed an Amended Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline and Waiver, 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 as set forth in the parties' amended stipulation, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct during his representation of a client for whom he was retained to domesticate a 2012 Nevada parenting agreement in Michigan and to file a motion to enforce custody.

Specifically, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and comply promptly with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); and failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$757.96.