

MEMBERS
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES
SECRETARY
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT
ALAN GERSHEL
LINDA M. ORLANS
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

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case No. 21-53-GA

Notice Issued: February 11, 2022

Hussein N. Rahal, P 79471, Dearborn, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #16

Suspension - 90 Days, Effective February 10, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a First Amended Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline With Conditions, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contained respondent's plea of no contest to the factual statements contained in the formal complaint and his admission that he committed professional misconduct, as charged in the complaint, during his representation of a client in a personal injury matter and by filing a late answer to a request for investigation and failing to respond to the Grievance Administrator's request for additional information and documents relating to the request for investigation.

Based on respondent's no contest plea, admissions, and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of a client through reasonably available means permitted by law, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and comply with reasonable requests for information and by failing to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); and, failed to respond to a lawful demand for information from the Attorney Grievance Commission, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1)-(4) and MRPC 8.4(a)-(c).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 90 days with conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$750.00.