

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

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. 26-19-GA

Notice Issued: July 2, 2026

Eric H. Clark, P 31126, Livonia, Michigan

Reprimand, Effective July 2, 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 #3. The stipulation contained respondent's admissions to all of the factual allegations, as well as the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in subparagraphs 27(e)-(h) of the formal complaint. Specifically, that respondent accepted \$1,500 to deliver legal documents to an inmate at Lakeland Correctional Facility on two occasions in 2023. The documents, which respondent did not prepare or review, were intercepted by prison staff and law enforcement and tested positive for controlled substances. The stipulation further contained the parties' agreement to dismiss the professional misconduct allegations set forth in subparagraphs 27(a)-(d).

Based upon respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent 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); and, engaged in conduct that violates the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$912.42.