

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. 21-64-GA

**Notice Issued: April 18, 2022**

David R. Heyboer, P 27975, Fort Gratiot, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Genesee County Hearing Panel #4.

Reprimand, Effective April 14, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline and Waiver, pursuant to MCR 9.115(F)(5), that was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based upon the stipulation and respondent's admissions, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct during his handling of a client's post-divorce judgment matter. After his client's divorce was finalized in July 2016, respondent agreed to prepare two Qualified Domestic Relations Orders (QDRO), as required by the judgment of divorce, to ensure his client received her share of her ex-husband's pension and annuity funds. Thereafter, respondent issued subpoenas to obtain the values of the pension and annuity funds to the wrong entity, and failed to respond to several inquiries his client made in 2017 as to the status of her matter. In July 2018, in response to a request for investigation filed by his client, respondent stated that he still intended to prepare the QDROs. Beginning in October 2018 and continuing to May 2021, respondent made several promises to the Grievance Administrator that he planned to complete and file the QDROs, but as of the filing of the formal complaint, he still had not done so.

In accordance with the parties' stipulation and respondent's admissions, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to the lawyer, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3; 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); violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation in MRPC 8.4(a); engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); and engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2).

The panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded, as set forth in the parties' stipulation. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$765.03.