

MEMBERS
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES
SECRETARY
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT
ALAN GERSHEL
LINDA M. ORLANS
JASON M. TURKISH

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 SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case No. 21-62-GA

Notice Issued: May 2, 2022

Carl M. Woodard, P37502, Dansville, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Ingham County Hearing Panel #2

Suspension - One Year, Effective November 1, 2021¹

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline and Waiver, 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, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct as alleged in the twelve-count formal complaint. Specifically, during his representation of seven separate, unrelated clients; by failing to answer requests for investigation filed by five of the clients; by making a false statement in his answer to a request for investigation filed by one of the clients; by soliciting representation from a person with whom he had no prior professional relationship; by failing to notify his current clients that his license to practice law was suspended on May 4, 2021, in a separate, unrelated matter, *Grievance Administrator v Carl M Woodard, 20-74-GA*, and by failing to file the required affidavit showing he notified his clients within 14 days of the effective date of his order of suspension in *Grievance Administrator v Carl M. Woodard, 20-74-GA*.

Based upon respondent's admissions as set forth in the parties' stipulation, the panel finds that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c) (Counts One-Three, Five, Eight, and Ten); failed to seek the lawful objectives of a client, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a) (Counts One-Three, Five, Eight, and Ten); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3 (Counts One-Three, Five, Six, Eight, and Ten); failed to promptly comply with a client's reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a) (Counts One-Three, Six, Eight, and Ten); failed to explain a matter to a client to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions about the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b) (Counts One and Two); failed to take reasonable steps to protect a client's interests upon termination of representation, such as failing to surrender papers and property to

¹ Respondent has been continuously suspended from the practice of law in Michigan since May 4, 2021. See Notice of Suspension & Restitution With Condition (By Consent), issued May 4, 2021, *Grievance Administrator v Carl M. Woodard, 20-74-GA*.

which the client is entitled and/or failing to refund any advance payment of fee that has not been earned, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d) (Counts One-Three, Five, Six, Eight, and Ten); failed to respond to a lawful demand for information, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2) (Counts Four, Seven, Nine, and Eleven); engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or violation of the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b) (Counts Three, Five, Eight, and Ten); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c) (Counts Five, Six, Eight, and Ten); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2) (Counts One-Twelve); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3) (Counts One-Twelve); engaged in conduct that violates the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4) (Counts One-Twelve); failed to answer a request for investigation, in violation of MCR 9.104(7), MCR 9.112(A), and MCR 9.113(B)(2) (Counts Four, Seven, Nine, and Eleven); and, failed to notify his client pursuant to the provisions of MCR 9.119(A)(1) through (6) within seven days of the effective date of his order of suspension, in violation of MCR 9.104(9) and MCR 9.119(A) (Counts Eight and Ten).

In accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law be suspended for a period of one year, to run consecutively to the 180-day suspension ordered by the hearing panel in *Grievance Administrator v Carl M. Woodard*, 20-74-GA, that he pay restitution totaling \$14,995, and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,131.13.