

MEMBERS  
**MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.**  
CHAIRPERSON  
**LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD**  
VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
**KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE**  
**MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER**  
**PETER A. SMIT**  
**ALAN GERSHEL**  
**LINDA M. ORLANS**  
**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**  
**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](http://www.adbmich.org)

**NOTICE OF DISBARMENT AND RESTITUTION**

Case No. 21-4-GA

**Notice Issued: January 26, 2022**

Lukasz Wietrzynski, P 77039, Rochester Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board affirming Tri-County Hearing Panel #61's Order of Disbarment and Restitution

Disbarment - Effective October 14, 2021

After proceedings conducted pursuant to MCR 9.115, the panel found, by default, that respondent committed professional misconduct as charged in a nine-count formal complaint. The panel found (Counts I-VIII) that between June 2013 and November 2017, respondent, his sister, and his then girlfriend/fiancee engaged in a number of fraudulent actions/transactions with the intent to deprive respondent's employer and the employer's clients of fees and funds to which they were entitled; (Count VIII) that in 2015 respondent engaged in a conflict of interest with a litigation funding company; and, knowingly provided false testimony during his February 11, 2019, sworn statement taken by the Administrator's counsel (Count IX).

The panel specifically found that respondent collected an illegal or clearly excessive fee, in violation of MRPC 1.5(a) (Counts I-V); engaged in a representation of a client that was directly adverse to another client and he could not reasonably believe the representation would not adversely affect the client, in violation of MRPC 1.7(a) (Count VIII); engaged in a representation of a client when that representation was materially limited by respondent's responsibilities to a third person, in violation of MRPC 1.7(b) (Count VIII); failed to promptly notify a client when funds or property in which a client has an interest in is received, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(1) (Counts I-VII); failed to promptly pay or deliver funds to which a client was entitled, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3) (Counts I-VII); knowingly made a false statement of material fact in connection with a disciplinary matter, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(1) (Count IX); failed to disclose a fact necessary to correct a misapprehension known by the person to have arisen in the matter, in connection with a disciplinary matter, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2) (Count IX); engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or violation of the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b) (Counts I-IX); and, engaged in conduct that violated a criminal law of a state or of the United States, in violation of MCR 9.104(5) (Counts I-VI). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(2)-(4) and MRPC 8.4(a) (Counts I-IX).

On June 3, 2021, respondent filed a timely petition for review and stay of discipline pursuant to MCR 9.118. The Board granted an interim stay of discipline. After review proceedings held in accordance with MCR 9.118, the Board issued an order on September 15, 2021, that affirmed the hearing panel's order of disbarment and restitution in its entirety.

Respondent filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court on November 19, 2021. The Court denied respondent's application for leave on January 4, 2022.

Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$3,602.84.