


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

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 WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case No. 16-119-JC


Notice Issued: December 29, 2016

Michael A. Knoblock, P 77544, Royal Oak, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #65.

Reprimand - Effective December 28, 2016

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a stipulation for a 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 stipulation contained respondent's admission that he was convicted in *State of Michigan v Michael August Knoblock*, 73B District Court Case No. U214657A, of operating while visibly impaired by liquor, in violation of MCL 257.6253-A; and in *State of Michigan v Michael August Knoblock*, 74th District Court Case No. 1610319FY1, of attempted possession of analogues of a controlled substance, in violation of MCL 333.7408a [A]; possession of a controlled substance - marijuana, in violation of MCL 333.7403(2)(d); and operating while impaired, second offense, in violation of MCL 257.6256B. Based on respondent's convictions and his admission in the Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, it was established that respondent engaged in conduct that violated the criminal laws of the State of Michigan, in violation of MCR 9.104(5).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Additionally, the panel ordered that respondent be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$831.43.


Mark A. Armitage