

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION WITH CONDITIONS
(By Consent)

Case Nos. 24-102-JC; 24-103-GA; 25-14-JC

Notice Issued: July 10, 2025

Daren Wiseley, P 85220, Hillsdale, Michigan

Suspension - 180 Days, effective July 9, 2025

The Grievance Administrator filed a combined Notice of Filing of Judgment of Conviction and Formal Complaint against respondent. The matter was assigned to Washtenaw County Hearing Panel #3.

The notice, filed in accordance with MCR 9.120(B)(3), advised that respondent 1) was found in criminal contempt on March 24, 2023, in the matter titled *In Re Contempt of Daren A. Wiseley, People of the State of Michigan v Justin Ray Mason*, Presque Isle County, 53rd Judicial Circuit Court, Case No. 21-93168-FC; 2) was found in criminal contempt on April 3, 2023, in the matter titled *In Re Contempt of Daren A. Wiseley, People of the State of Michigan v Justin Ray Mason*, Presque Isle County, 53rd Judicial Circuit Court, Case No. 21-93168-FC; 3) was convicted on February 12, 2024, of failure to report an accident to fixtures, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 257.621, in the matter titled *State of Michigan v Daren Wiseley*, 3-A District Court, Case No. 2023-0696-ST; and, 4) was convicted on March 26, 2024, of battery, a misdemeanor, in violation of F.S.S. 784.03(1)(a)(1), in the matter titled *State of Florida v Daren Andrew Wiseley*, Ninth Judicial Circuit Court for Osceola County, Florida, Case No. 22-CF-002308.

Count One of the formal complaint alleged that, after respondent was convicted of the offenses set forth above, respondent failed to notify the Attorney Discipline Board and the Attorney Grievance Commission of the convictions. Count Two involves respondent's conduct that lead to the contempt proceedings against him. Specifically, respondent represented Justin Mason in a criminal jury trial in Presque Isle County, Michigan. On March 23, 2023, while the jury deliberated, the court ordered both the prosecuting attorney and respondent to remain at

the courthouse. However, when the jury submitted a question to the court, respondent was found to be absent, being located later asleep in an apartment nearby. Following the jury's verdict, the court initiated a contempt proceeding, during which the court questioned respondent regarding his frame of mind, and respondent answered that he was merely tired but not under the influence but merely tired. The court found him in contempt for violating its order and sentenced him to 24 hours in jail. During booking, respondent's breath test registered a blood alcohol content of 0.15, prompting a second contempt hearing. At that hearing, despite admitting to drinking, respondent denied being impaired. The court found him in criminal contempt for lying about his intoxication during the earlier proceeding and ordered another 24-hour jail term, to run concurrently with the first, with credit for time already served.

On February 18, 2025, the Grievance Administrator filed a second notice of filing of judgment of conviction, Case 25-14-JC, showing that respondent was convicted by guilty plea of Domestic Violence, a misdemeanor, in violation of MCL 750.812, in *People v Daren Andrew Wiseley*, 3A District Court - Branch County, Case No. 2024-00669-FY. Case 25-14-JC was consolidated before Washtenaw County Hearing Panel #3 with 24-102-JC and 24-103-GA.

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 Washtenaw County Hearing Panel #3. The stipulation contained respondent's admissions to the convictions identified in the judgments of conviction and that these convictions constituted professional misconduct, as well as his no contest pleas to the factual allegations and allegations of professional misconduct set forth in Counts One and Two of the formal complaint.

Based on respondent's admission, no contest pleas, and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent made a knowingly false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal or failed to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1) [Count Two]; knowingly disobeyed an obligation under the rules of a tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.4(c) [Count Two]; failed to provide notice of his convictions, in violation of MRPC 8.1(a)(2) and MCR 9.120(A) and (B) [Count One]; engaged in

conduct that is a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4) [Counts One and Two]; engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or violation of the criminal law, where such conduct reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer, in violation of MRPC 8.4(b) [Judgments of Conviction and Count Two]; engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1) [Counts One and Two]; engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2) [Counts One and Two]; engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3) [Counts One and Two]; and, engaged in conduct that violated a criminal law of a state of the United States, an ordinance, or tribal law, in violation of MCR 9.104(5) [Judgments of Conviction].

The panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 180 days, as agreed to by the parties, effective July 9, 2025, and that he be subject to conditions relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,079.76.