

MEMBERS
THOMAS G. KIENBAUM
CHAIRPERSON
JAMES M. CAMERON, JR.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
SECRETARY
ANDREA L. SOLAK
CARL E. VER BEEK
CRAIG H. LUBBEN
SYLVIA P. WHITMER, Ph.D
LAWRENCE G. CAMPBELL
DULCE M. FULLER

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



JOHN F. VAN BOLT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARK A. ARMITAGE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

JENNIFER M. PETTY
LEGAL ASSISTANT

211 WEST FORT ST.
SUITE 1410
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236
PHONE: 313-963-5553
FAX: 313-963-5571

WWW.ADBMICH.ORG

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case No. 12-71-GA

Notice Issued: September 5, 2012

Elaine R. Carlis, P 41495, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #72.

1. Reprimand
2. Effective September 1, 2012

The respondent and the Grievance Administrator submitted a stipulation for consent order of discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5). The stipulation was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was accepted by the hearing panel. The stipulation contains respondent's plea of *nolo contendere* to allegations that she failed to keep her clients reasonably informed about the status of their matters and failed to comply promptly with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to preserve complete records of client funds for a period of five years after termination of the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(2); failed to keep the lawyer's own property separate from property of clients or third persons in connection with a representation, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); failed to deposit legal fees and expenses that have been paid in advance into a client trust account, in violation of MRPC 1.15(g); violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a); engaged in conduct which exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); and violated the standards or rules of professional responsibility adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

The stipulation was approved by the hearing panel and, in accordance with the agreement of the parties, the panel ordered that the respondent be reprimanded and be subject to a condition relevant to the alleged misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$756.60



John F. Van Bolt

Dated: **SEP - 5 2012**