

MEMBERS

**ALAN GERSHEL**

*CHAIRPERSON*

**PETER A. SMIT**

*VICE-CHAIRPERSON*

**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**

*SECRETARY*

**LINDA M. ORLANS**

**JASON M. TURKISH**


**ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD**

**KATIE STANLEY**

**TISH VINCENT**

**KAMILIA K. LANDRUM**

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD**



333 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1700  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3147  
PHONE: 313-963-5553

**WENDY A. NEELEY**  
*EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR*

**KAREN M. DALEY**  
*ASSOCIATE COUNSEL*

**SHERRY MIFSUD**  
*OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR*

**OWEN R. MONTGOMERY**  
*CASE MANAGER*

**JODIE GROH**  
*CASE MANAGER*

**JULIE M. LOISELLE**  
*RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY*

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

**NOTICE OF SUSPENSION WITH CONDITIONS**

Case No. 20-54-GA

**Notice Issued: June 3, 2024**

Raymond Guzall, III, P 60980, Farmington Hills, Michigan

Suspension - 90 Days, Effective April 20, 2024

Based on the evidence presented at hearings held in this matter in accordance with MCR 9.115, Tri-County Hearing Panel #62 found that respondent committed professional misconduct, originally arising from a dispute with his former law partner, as set forth in a three-count formal complaint filed by the Administrator.

The panel found that, as to Count One, respondent engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); and engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

As to Count Two, the panel found that respondent knowingly disobeyed an obligation under the rules of a tribunal except for an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation exists, in violation of MRPC 3.4(c); engaged in undignified or discourteous conduct toward a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.5(d); engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1); engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); and engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

As to Count Three, the panel found that respondent brought a frivolous proceeding and/or controverted asserting a frivolous issue, in violation of MRPC 3.1; engaged in undignified or discourteous conduct toward a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.5(d); engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1); engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in

violation of MCR 9.104(3); and engaged in conduct that violated the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

The panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law be suspended for a period of 179 days and that he be subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Respondent timely petitioned for review and for a stay, and the panel's order of discipline was stayed pursuant to MCR 9.115(K). After conducting review proceedings according to MCR 9.118, the Board reduced the discipline imposed by the hearing panel from a 179-day suspension to a 90-day suspension, and modified the condition. On October 20, 2023, respondent filed a motion for reconsideration of the Board's order pursuant to MCR 9.118(E), which was denied on November 28, 2023.

On December 18, 2023, respondent filed a timely application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court, pursuant to MCR 9.122(A) and a motion to supplement on February 20, 2024. On March 29, 2024, the Court issued an order granting respondent's motion to supplement and denying his application for leave to appeal. On April 15, 2024, respondent filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's March 29, 2024 order. On May 29, 2024, the Court denied respondent's motion. Costs were assessed in the total amount of \$5,672.05.