

STATE OF MICHIGAN

# Attorney Discipline Board

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,  
Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner/Appellee,

v

Case No. 23-84-GA

ERNEST FRIEDMAN, P 26642,

Respondent/Appellant.

---

## ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Issued by the Attorney Discipline Board  
333 W. Fort St., Ste. 1700, Detroit, MI

On May 6, 2025, Respondent filed a motion seeking reconsideration of the Attorney Discipline Board's April 17, 2025 Order Affirming, In Part, and Vacating, In Part, Findings of Misconduct and Affirming 180-day Suspension. On May 7, 2025, Respondent filed an addendum to his motion for reconsideration. On May 22, 2025, the Grievance Administrator filed his response to respondent's motion for reconsideration.

The Board has considered respondent's motion, his addendum to his motion, and the response filed by the Grievance Administrator, and is otherwise fully advised;

**NOW THEREFORE,**

**IT IS ORDERED** that respondent's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** for the reason that respondent's motion presents the same arguments that he previous made on review, and has otherwise failed to demonstrate palpable error by which the Board has been misled or to

otherwise demonstrate that the decision of the Board was entered erroneously.<sup>1</sup>

**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD**

By: /s/ Alan Gershel, Chairperson

Dated: July 2, 2025

Board Members Alan Gershel, Peter A. Smit, Rev. Dr. Louis J. Prues, Linda M. Orlans, Jason M. Turkish, Andreas Sidiropoulos, MD, Katie M. Stanley, Tish Vincent, and Kamilia Landrum concur in this decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondent points out that the Board's Order incorrectly states that Attorney Mattson "did not file a substitution of counsel in the case." The Board's statement in this regard was inartful, but was little more than scrivener's error, as the Board was aware then, and is aware now, that respondent testified that Attorney Mattson did file a substitution of counsel that was ultimately rejected by the Court.