

MEMBERS
JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH
CHAIRPERSON
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
BARBARA WILLIAMS FORNEY
SECRETARY
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT
ALAN GERSHEL
LINDA M. ORLANS

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

AMENDED¹ NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 21-39-JC; 21-40-GA

Notice Issued: September 8, 2021

Richard A. Dietz, P 31940, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #15.

Reprimand, Effective September 1, 2021

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Reprimand, 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 admissions that he was convicted of operating while impaired, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 257.6253-A, in *City of Novi v Richard Arthur Dietz*, 52-1 District Court Case No. 20-002275-OD, and his admission that he failed to provide notice of his conviction to the Attorney Grievance Commission and Attorney Discipline Board, as set forth in the Administrator's combined Notice of Filing of a Judgment of Conviction and Formal Complaint filed on June 25, 2021.

Based on respondent's conviction, admissions and the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent engaged in conduct that was in violation of 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); failed to report his conviction, in violation of MCR 9.120(A) and (B); engaged in conduct that violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a); engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); and engaged in conduct that violated 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 hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$750.00.

¹ Amended as to respondent's conviction description. Changed from operating while intoxicated to operating while impaired.