

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. 21-85-GA

**Notice Issued: March 11, 2022**

Thomas R. Quartz, P 77177, Grosse Ile, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #15

Reprimand, Effective March 11, 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 respondent's admissions as set forth in the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct in his capacity as the owner of Michigan Accident Associates (MAA) when his appearance for the plaintiff in a case pending with the United States District Court was electronically filed, after the original MAA attorney assigned to handle the case left MAA in 2017, and he thereafter failed to adequately represent his client to the extent that his client's case was dismissed with prejudice, he was ordered to pay costs and sanctions totaling \$9,172.50, as well as the defendant's costs and attorney fees, and, he was ordered to attend the new lawyer seminar hosted by the Federal Bar Association.

Specifically, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent handled a matter which he knew or should have known that he was not competent to handle, without associating with a lawyer who was competent to handle it, in violation of MRPC 1.1(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm in which he was a partner had in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conformed to the rules of professional conduct, in violation in MRPC 5.1(a); failed to make reasonable efforts to ensure that a lawyer over whom he had direct supervisory authority conformed to the rules of professional conduct, in violation in MRPC 5.1(b); failed to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm in which he was a partner had in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that the conduct of non-lawyers in the firm was compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer, in violation in MRPC 5.3(a); failed to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the conduct of non-lawyers in the firm over whom he had direct supervisory authority was compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer, in violation of MRPC 5.3(b); 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).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$750.00.