

MEMBERS
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
CHAIRPERSON
ALAN GERSHEL
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES
SECRETARY
PETER A. SMIT
LINDA M. ORLANS
JASON M. TURKISH
ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD
KATIE STANLEY
TISH VINCENT

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

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITION

Case No. 22-11-GA

Notice Issued: November 10, 2022

Travis Michael, P 71526, Redford, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #20

Reprimand, Effective November 8, 2022

After proceedings conducted pursuant to MCR 9.115, the hearing panel found that after respondent filed an appearance on behalf of a client in a criminal matter, he thereafter failed to take any further action in the matter, and specifically failed to file any motions to address issues related to restitution despite multiple notices to appear and other communications from the court. As a result of respondent's neglect, a default judgment was entered against his client as restitution, which she later had to retain substitute counsel to resolve. The panel also found that respondent failed to answer a Request for Investigation within 21 days of service, as required by MCR 9.113(A).

The panel specifically found that respondent neglected a legal matter, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of the client, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and to comply with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); failed to refund an unearned fee, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); knowingly failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2); and, failed to answer a Request for Investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7) and MCR 9.113(A). The panel also found that respondent violated MRPC 8.4(a) and (c); and MCR 9.104(1)-(4).

The panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and comply with a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,893.45.