

MEMBERS  
**JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH**  
CHAIRPERSON  
**MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.**  
VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
**BARBARA WILLIAMS FORNEY**  
SECRETARY  
**KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE**  
**LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD**  
**MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER**  
**PETER A. SMIT**  
**ALAN GERSHEL**  
**LINDA M. ORLANS**

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 AND RESTITUTION WITH CONDITION**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 19-123-GA

**Notice Issued: March 17, 2021**

Michael C. Hyde, P 42440, Mount Pleasant, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Kent County Hearing Panel #2.

Reprimand, Effective March 12, 2021

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed an Amended Stipulation for Consent Order of a Reprimand, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based upon respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct in his representation of a husband and wife who requested respondent advise them of available options to protect their assets as part of their move from California to Michigan in April of 2016.

Specifically, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and comply promptly 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); and entered into a business transaction with a client without disclosing adverse interests or getting consent in writing, in violation of MRPC 1.8(a). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)-(3) and MRPC 8.4(b)-(c).

In accordance with the amended stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. In addition, the panel accepted the parties' statement that respondent already voluntarily paid \$4,000 in restitution to his clients. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,226.49.

/s/ Mark A. Armitage  
Executive Director