

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 REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case No. 21-65-GA

Notice Issued: January 31, 2022

Adam J. Gantz, P 58558, Farmington Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #61

Reprimand, Effective January 28, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, 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 when he neglected his representation of clients in a Chapter 13 bankruptcy matter to the extent that the bankruptcy trustee had to release funds intended for the clients' mortgage to their unsecured creditors.

Specifically, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent handled a legal matter without preparation adequate in the circumstances, in violation of MRPC 1.1(b); failed to provide competent representation to his client by neglecting a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); and, failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(2)-(4) and MRPC 8.4(a).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$772.00.