

MEMBERS  
**LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD**  
CHAIRPERSON  
**ALAN GERSHEL**  
VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**  
SECRETARY  
**PETER A. SMIT**  
**LINDA M. ORLANS**  
**JASON M. TURKISH**  
**ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD**  
**KATIE STANLEY**  
**TISH VINCENT**

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  
—  
**OWEN R. MONTGOMERY**  
CASE MANAGER  
—  
**JULIE M. LOISELLE**  
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY  
—

[www.adbmich.org](http://www.adbmich.org)

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

Case No. 22-80-GA

**Notice Issued: February 21, 2023**

Paul S. Clark, P 39164, Ferndale, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #65

Reprimand, effective February 16, 2023

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Reprimand 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' stipulation, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct when a settlement check was presented by a client of respondent's for payment against his IOLTA, and there were insufficient funds in the IOLTA to cover the check, and when he inappropriately maintained personal funds in his IOLTA while the account also contained client funds. The panel also accepted the representation set forth in the parties' stipulation that respondent now regularly reconciles his IOLTA and communicates with his accountant before issuing checks, so that no more overdrafts issue, and that his IOLTA no longer contains personal funds.

Based upon respondent's admission and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent failed to promptly deliver funds that a client or third party was entitled to receive, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3); commingled personal funds in a client trust account beyond an amount reasonably necessary to pay financial institution service charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f); and, engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$758.30.