

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](http://www.adbmich.org)

**NOTICE OF REPRIMAND**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 19-27-GA

**Notice Issued: January 12, 2022<sup>1</sup>**

D. Michael Cherry, P 23882, Mt. Clemens, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board

Reprimand, Effective July 19, 2019

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 admission that he committed professional misconduct by engaging in conduct involving a violation of the criminal law and the parties agreed that respondent be reprimanded and subject to conditions as set forth in the stipulation.

Based on respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct when he engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct involving violation of a the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on respondent's fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); engaged in conduct that violates the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4) and MRPC 8.4(a); and engaged in conduct that violates a criminal law of a state, in violation of MCR 9.104(5).

On December 8, 2020, in response to a motion to modify filed by respondent, Tri-County Hearing Panel #103 issued an order that modified the conditions and extended the time frames set forth in the panel's original order. Respondent filed a petition for review and after proceedings held in accordance with MCR 9.118, the Board issued an order that affirmed the hearing panel's order modifying conditions in its entirety. Thereafter, respondent filed a motion for reconsideration. On December 14, 2021, the Board issued an order granting respondent's motion for reconsideration to the extent that the conditions set forth in the panel's original order of reprimand with conditions (by consent) and order modifying those conditions were vacated. The panel's order of reprimand, effective July 19, 2019, was ordered to remain in effect. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$899.25.

---

<sup>1</sup> This notice supersedes all previous notices.