

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

Case No. 24-74-GA

**Notice Issued: June 26, 2025**

Jonathan D. Abrahams, P 46642, Farmington Hills, Michigan

Reprimand, Effective June 13, 2025

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 #104. Respondent pled no contest to the factual allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-19 and 27-51, and to the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in subparagraphs 52(c), (d), (f), (h), and (k) of the formal complaint, namely that during his representation of a family who had been in an automobile accident in Florida, he did not tell the clients that he was not licensed to practice in Florida, failed to adequately communicate with the automobile insurance company or his clients, failed to inform his client of developments or settlement offers, and missed critical correspondence and requests for independent medical exams, which ultimately led the insurance company to close the PIP claims and later reduce the value of the third-party claims.

Based on respondent's no contest plea and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep the client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and comply promptly with reasonable requests for information, in violation of MRPC 1.4(a); failed to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); failed to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client, in violation of MRPC 3.2; and engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and required him to comply with a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,235.76.