

MEMBERS  
**LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD**  
CHAIRPERSON  
**ALAN GERSHEL**  
VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**  
SECRETARY  
**PETER A. SMIT**  
**LINDA M. ORLANS**  
**JASON M. TURKISH**  
**ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD**  
**KATIE STANLEY**  
**TISH VINCENT**

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 REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS**  
**(By Consent)**

Case Nos. 22-58-JC; 22-59-GA

**Notice Issued: October 11, 2022**

James A. Murray, III, P 85490, Southfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #52

Reprimand, Effective October 8, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Revised Stipulation for Consent Order of Reprimand 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 admission that he was convicted by guilty plea of impaired driving, second offense, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 257.6256B, in *People v James Arthur Murray*, Oakland County Circuit Court Case No. 2280129-FH.

Based on respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent engaged in conduct that violated a criminal law of a state or of the United States, an ordinance, or tribal law pursuant to MCR 2.615, in violation of MCR 9.104(5); engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); exposed 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, violated the standards or rules of professional responsibility adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

In accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$759.41.