

MEMBERS

**ALAN GERSHEL**

CHAIRPERSON

**PETER A. SMIT**

VICE-CHAIRPERSON

**REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES**

SECRETARY

**LINDA M. ORLANS**

**JASON M. TURKISH**

**ANDREAS SIDIROPOULOS, MD**


**KATIE STANLEY**

**TISH VINCENT**

**KAMILIA K. LANDRUM**

STATE OF MICHIGAN

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



333 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1700  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3147  
PHONE: 313-963-5553

**WENDY A. NEELEY**  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**JOHN K. BURGESS**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

**KAREN M. DALEY**  
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL

**SHERRY MIFSUD**  
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR

**OWEN R. MONTGOMERY**  
CASE MANAGER

**JODIE GROH**  
CASE MANAGER

**JULIE M. LOISELLE**  
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY

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

**NOTICE OF REPRIMAND**  
**(By Consent)**

Case No. 26-20-GA

**Notice Issued: August 31, 2026**

Ahmed D. Faraj, P 84059, Detroit, Michigan

Reprimand - Effective August 20, 2026

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 Tri-County Hearing Panel #10. The stipulation contains respondent's no contest pleas to all of the factual allegations in the formal complaint and the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in subparagraphs 27(c) and (d)-(g) of the formal complaint. The stipulation further contains the parties' agreement that the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in subparagraphs 27(a), (b), and (h) of the formal complaint be dismissed. Based on respondent's no contest pleas, it was found that respondent engaged in prohibited client solicitation and engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice when he made direct contact with a prospective client after she had been in an automobile accident.

Specifically, the hearing panel found that respondent: engaged in improper solicitation by soliciting professional employment from a person with whom the lawyer has no family or prior professional relationship when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain, in violation of MRPC 7.3(a); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.102(2); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.103; and, engaged in conduct that is a violation of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and 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 \$761.87.