

MEMBERS
LOUANN VAN DER WIELE
CHAIRPERSON
REV. MICHAEL MURRAY
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
BARBARA WILLIAMS FORNEY
SECRETARY
JAMES A. FINK
JOHN W. INHULSEN
JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



211 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1410
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236
PHONE: 313-963-5553 | FAX: 313-963-5571

MARK A. ARMITAGE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
WENDY A. NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
KAREN M. DALEY
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL
SHERRY L. MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR
ALLYSON M. PLOURDE
CASE MANAGER
OWEN R. MONTGOMERY
CASE MANAGER
JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY

www.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND AND RESTITUTION WITH CONDITION
(By Consent)

Case No. 17-90-GA

Notice Issued: December 7, 2017

Wright W. Blake, P 37259, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #9.

Reprimand, Effective December 6, 2017.

The Grievance Administrator filed a formal complaint alleging that respondent failed to notify his client of crucial appellate dates in his post-conviction criminal matter. The parties 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.

Based upon respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent handled a legal matter without preparation adequate under the circumstances, in violation of MRPC 1.1(b); neglected a matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of his client, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep his client informed of the status of the matter and comply promptly with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); and failed to explain the matter to the client to the extend reasonably necessary to permit the client to make an informed decision regarding the matter and representation, in violation of 1.4(b). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)-(3).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and be subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Respondent was also ordered to pay restitution totaling \$1,000.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$757.50.


Mark A. Armitage
Executive Director