

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 WITH CONDITION**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 22-20-GA

**Notice Issued: May 27, 2022**

Brian M. Ellison, P 64090, Southfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #51

Reprimand, Effective May 27, 2022

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. Based upon respondent's admissions as set forth in the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct during his representation of a client in a divorce proceeding in 2018. Specifically, the complaint alleged that respondent knew that his client provided false testimony during a hearing to take the necessary proofs for a consent judgment of divorce, but failed to correct the record or to otherwise take remedial action.

In accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent offered evidence that the lawyer knew to be false, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(3); failed to take remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal, after becoming aware that his client's testimony was false, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(3); engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); 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 and subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$750.00.