

MEMBERS

PETER A. SMIT

CHAIRPERSON

TISH VINCENT

VICE-CHAIRPERSON

REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES

SECRETARY

JASON M. TURKISH

ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD

KATIE STANLEY


KAMILIA K. LANDRUM

MAUREEN T. KRASNER

ELIZABETH M. ROGERS

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

JOHN K. BURGESS
DEPUTY 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

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS

Case No. 25-49-GA

Notice Issued: October 20, 2026

Lisa Marie Muhleck, P 69374, West Bloomfield, Michigan

Reprimand, Effective October 14, 2026

After proceedings conducted pursuant to MCR 9.115, and based on the evidence presented by the parties at the hearings held in this matter, Tri-County Hearing Panel #57 found that respondent committed professional misconduct when withdrawals from her IOLTA trust account resulted in the account being overdrawn, prompting an investigation by the Attorney Grievance Commission. The panel also found that respondent committed additional misconduct when she failed to answer the request for investigation resulting from the overdrafts.

Specifically, the panel found that respondent: failed to, upon receipt of a Request for Investigation from the Grievance Administrator, provide a full and fair explanation of the cause of the Notice of Overdraft and how it was corrected, in violation of MRPC 1.15A(f); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1); 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 that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); knowingly failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2); failed to answer the Request for Investigation in conformity with MCR 9.113(A) and (B)(2), and in violation of MCR 9.104(7); failed to provide a full and fair explanation of the cause of the overdrafts and how they were corrected upon receipt of Requests for Investigation from the Grievance Administrator, in violation of MRPC 1.15A(f); engaged in conduct that is a violation of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); and, engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3). The panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Conditions were imposed relevant to the misconduct established.

The Grievance Administrator filed a timely petition for review. After review proceedings in accordance with MCR 9.118, on September 15, 2026, the Board issued an Opinion and Order affirming the hearing panel's imposition of a reprimand with conditions. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$2,393.56.