

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

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 22-84-JC; 22-85-GA

Notice Issued: June 1, 2023

Toi Jasmin Thomas, P 82295, Southfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #55

Reprimand, effective June 1, 2023

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, after the parties provided additional information in further support of the stipulation at two separate virtual status conferences held before the panel in January and March 2023. The stipulation contained respondent's admissions that she was convicted on September 3, 2019, by a jury verdict, of Operating While Intoxicated (2nd), a misdemeanor in *People v Toi Jasmin Thomas*, 46th District Court, Case No. 19-S-00215, and that she failed to comply with the terms of a stipulation for contractual probation that she entered into with the Grievance Administrator on December 13, 2019, and failed to comply with a monitoring agreement she entered into with the Lawyers and Judges Assistance Program (LJAP) on January 21, 2020.¹ Both the stipulation for contractual probation and the monitoring agreement with LJAP resulted from the Attorney Grievance Commission's investigation into respondent's criminal conviction.

Based on respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent engaged in conduct that violated a criminal law of a state or of the United States, an ordinance, or tribal law pursuant to MCR 2.615, in violation of MCR 9.104(5); 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 that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); and engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Michigan Supreme Court, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,128.80.

¹ In March 2022, respondent advised the Grievance Administrator that she was not going to continue with LJAP. On April 12, 2022, the Commission terminated respondent's contractual probation agreement.