

MEMBERS
JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH
CHAIRPERSON
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
BARBARA WILLIAMS FORNEY
SECRETARY
JAMES A. FINK
JOHN W. INHULSEN
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT

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
(By Consent)

Case No. 20-22-GA

Notice Issued: September 14, 2020

Benjamin F. VanGelderren, P 78972, Southfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #56.

Reprimand, Effective September 10, 2020

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for 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 admissions, in Count One of the Formal Complaint, that he was retained by a client to file a civil suit against National Property Restoration Services (NPRS) for the return of funds which the client deposited with NPRS for restoration work that was never done. Although respondent filed a complaint and obtained a default judgment against NPRS, thereafter he neglected and abandoned his client's matter. Respondent admitted, in Count Two, that he was retained by a separate client to represent her in a civil matter against her former business partner. Respondent thereafter neglected and abandoned the matter, which ultimately resulted in the dismissal of the civil action.

Based upon respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent neglected legal matters entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3; and failed to keep his clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)-(4); and MRPC 8.4(a) and (c).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,115.22.

/s/ Mark A. Armitage
Executive Director