

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND

(By Consent)

Case No. 23-78-JC; 23-79-GA

Notice Issued: December 8, 2023

Martin M. Holmes, P 24240, North Muskegon, MI, by the Attorney Discipline Board
Muskegon County Hearing Panel #1

Reprimand - Effective November 28, 2023

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The parties' stipulation contained respondent's admissions that he was convicted on April 22, 2022, by guilty plea of operating while intoxicated, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 257.625(1)(A), in a matter titled *People v Martin Holmes*, 60th District Court (City of Muskegon, County of Muskegon, State of Michigan), Case No. 22-220522-SD, and that his conduct in that regard constituted professional misconduct. The stipulation also contained respondent's no contest plea to the factual allegations and the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in paragraphs 7-10 of the formal complaint - that he did not give notice of his conviction to the Grievance Administrator and the Attorney Discipline Board.

Based on respondent's admissions, no contest plea and 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) and 8.4(b). The panel also found that respondent failed to notify the Grievance Administrator and Attorney Discipline Board of his conviction, in violation of MCR 9.120(A) and (B), and MRPC 8.1(a)(2); engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); 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 violates the standards and rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$780.47.