

STATE OF MICHIGAN

Attorney Discipline Board

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,
Attorney Grievance Commission,

Petitioner/Appellee,

v

Case No. 25-2-GA

ROBERT A. PASIONEK, P 33173,

Respondent/Appellant.

**ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE STAY AND
MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE RESTORATION OF LAW LICENSE**

Issued by the Attorney Discipline Board
333 W. Fort St., Ste. 1700, Detroit, MI

On March 12, 2026, Ingham County Hearing Panel #3 of the Attorney Discipline Board issued an Order of Suspension Pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(2), suspending respondent's license to practice law effective immediately, after he failed to appear at an in-person hearing that same day claiming a physical incapacity as the reason for his nonappearance. Thereafter, on March 20, 2026, the hearing panel issued its report and an order of disbarment, effective April 11, 2026.

On March 24, 2026, respondent filed a "Combined Petition for Review, Motion for Immediate Stay, and Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief," and then shortly thereafter filed an "Amended Petition for Review, Motion for Immediate Stay, Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief (if Applicable), and Motion for Immediate Restoration of Law License." On March 25, 2026, the Grievance Administrator filed a response to respondent's motion for immediate stay, objecting to respondent's request. On March 26, 2026, respondent filed a reply to the Administrator's response reiterating his request for a stay of the hearing panel's orders.

The Attorney Discipline Board has considered respondent's request for a stay of the discipline imposed and for a stay of the interim suspension issued pursuant to MCR 9.115(H)(2), the Administrator's objection, respondent's reply, and respondent's request for the immediate restoration of his law license; and the Board is otherwise fully advised;

NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that respondent's motion for an immediate stay of discipline pursuant to MCR 9.115(K), respondent's request for an immediate stay of the hearing panel's March 12, 2026 Order of Suspension Pursuant to 9.115(H)(2), and respondent's request for the immediate restoration of his law license are **DENIED** for the reason that respondent has not established good

cause for the granting of that relief. The substantive issues raised by respondent, including his lack of due process argument, will be considered by the Board following the submission of the parties' briefs and the completion of the review proceeding.

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

By: /s/ Alan Gershel, Chairperson

DATED: April 2, 2026

Board Members Alan Gershel, Peter A. Smit, Rev. Dr. Louis J. Prues, Linda M. Orlans, Andreas Sidiropoulos, MD, Katie Stanley, and Tish Vincent concur in this decision.

Member Jason M. Turkish dissents and would grant a stay of the hearing panel's order of discipline. He would have approved respondent's request to appear remotely, considering the medical note provided to the panel. Furthermore, he notes that the panel's refusal to grant the requested accommodation – without any evidence of undue burden, prejudice to another party, or compromise to the integrity of the proceeding – appears arbitrary and antithetical to the objectives of the disciplinary process.

Member Kamilia Landrum did not participate in this decision.