

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](http://www.adbmich.org)

**NOTICE OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION WITH CONDITION**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 20-74-GA

**Notice Issued: May 4, 2021**

Carl M. Woodard, P 37502, Dansville, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Ingham County Hearing Panel #3.

Suspension - 180 Days, Effective May 4, 2021

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based on respondent's admissions and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct in his representation of five separate clients in their various legal actions and his failure to appear and provide a statement to a Attorney Grievance Commission investigative subpoena, as set forth in the formal complaint in its entirety.

The panel found that respondent neglected legal matters, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his clients, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a legal matter, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain a matter to a client to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); charged or collected a clearly excessive fee, in violation of MRPC 1.5(a); failed to refund unearned fees, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); failed to refund unearned advance fees upon termination, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); failed to surrender papers and property to which the clients are entitled upon termination, in violation of MRPC 1.16(d); brought or defended a frivolous proceeding, or asserted a frivolous issue therein, in violation of MRPC 3.1; knowingly failed to respond to lawful demands for information from a disciplinary authority, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2); engaged in conduct that involved dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or violation of the criminal law, where such conduct reflected adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b); and engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(1), (2) and (4).

In accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law be suspended for a period of 180 days, that he pay restitution in the total amount of \$7,275.00, and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$980.75.