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
(By Consent)

Case No. 26-68-GA

Notice Issued: November 5, 2026

Suzan Gabbara, P 76633, Troy, MI

Reprimand - Effective November 5, 2026

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by Tri-County Hearing Panel #66. The stipulation contained respondent's admissions to all of the factual allegations and allegations of professional misconduct set forth in the formal complaint. Specifically, that respondent committed professional misconduct when she filed an Objection to a Friend of the Court Recommendation on behalf of her client using an artificial intelligence tool that included citations to numerous non-existent cases, or cases that otherwise did not support her client's position.

Based on respondent's admissions and the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent: failed to provide competent representation to a client, in violation of MRPC 1.1(b); 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, and/or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); and, 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).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of $762.76.