

STATE OF MICHIGAN

Attorney Discipline Board

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,
Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner/Appellee,

Case No. 24-89-GA

AMINE R. BEYDOUN,

Complainant/Appellant,

v

ISSA FAWAZ, P 83664,

Respondent/Appellee.

**AMENDED¹ ORDER DENYING COMPLAINANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF AND MOTIONS FOR OTHER RELIEF FROM THE BOARD**

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

Complainant filed a timely petition for review in accordance with MCR 9.118(A) of the Order of Reprimand with Conditions and Restitution issued on June 16, 2025 by Tri-County Hearing Panel

#6. Review proceedings were held on September 10, 2025, in accordance with MCR 9.118.

On September 16, 2025, complainant filed a motion for leave, asking permission to submit a supplemental memorandum to the Board regarding an issue that was raised during oral argument. On September 23, 2025, both respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed responses objecting to the motion for leave.

On September 29, 2025, complainant filed a second motion for leave, asking the Board to "correct and strike 'Petitioner's Response to Complainant's Motion for Leave.'" On the same day, the Grievance Administrator filed a response objecting to the motion for leave.

On October 13, 2025, complainant filed a third motion for leave, this time asking the Board to strike the stipulation for consent discipline and grant a rehearing. On the same day, counsel for the Grievance Administrator filed a response objecting to the motion for leave. Respondent also filed a response objecting to the motion on October 17, 2025.

¹ Amended to correct a scrivener's error where complainant was referred to as respondent.

The Board has considered complainant's motions for leave as well as respondent's and the Grievance Administrator's responses; and is otherwise fully advised;

NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that complainant's September 16, 2025 motion for leave is **DENIED**. The parties have fully briefed and argued their respective positions, and no further briefing is warranted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that complainant's September 29, 2025 motion for leave is **DENIED**. The motion is improper and not authorized under the Michigan Court Rules.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that complainant's October 13, 2025 motion for leave is **DENIED**. The motion is improper and not authorized under the Michigan Court Rules.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no further motions shall be permitted until a decision regarding complainant's petition for review has been issued in this matter.

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

By: /s/ Alan Gershel, Chairperson

Dated: October 29, 2025

Board members Alan Gershel, Peter A. Smit, Rev. Dr. Louis J. Prues, Linda M. Orlans, Andreas Sidiropoulos, MD, and Tish Vincent concur in this decision.

Board Member Jason M. Turkish concurs in the denial of complainant's motions for leave, but rather than prohibit the filing of additional motions before the issuance of the Board's decision, would impose sanctions if any additional filings are determined to be frivolous.

Board members Katie M. Stanley and Kamilia Landrum did not participate in this decision.