

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND
(By Consent)

Case No. 25-5-GA

Notice Issued: July 14, 2025

Deborah J. Davis, P 70843, Centreville, Michigan

Reprimand, Effective July 12, 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 Kalamazoo County Hearing Panel #3. The stipulation contained the parties' agreement that the charges contained in subparagraphs 27(c) and 27(f) of the formal complaint shall be dismissed. The stipulation further contains respondent's no contest plea to the factual allegations and remaining allegations of professional misconduct set forth in the formal complaint, specifically that respondent advised a complaining witness in a criminal matter to leave the courthouse while the witness was still under subpoena, and made misleading statements to the Court as to why the witness had left. Ultimately, the witness not being present resulted in the bond-hearing being rescheduled for another day, resulting in the defendant spending additional time in jail before bond was set.¹

Based upon respondent's no contest plea and the stipulation of the parties, the panel

¹ The stipulation further explains that, regarding the investigation and report referenced in paragraphs 22-25 of the formal complaint, "while Respondent is pleading no contest to the factual allegations, the parties also agree that Respondent disputes the accuracy and propriety of the report and investigation even if she does not disagree that the investigation and report occurred as alleged in the formal complaint." The parties further acknowledge that subsequent to the conduct outlined in the formal complaint, respondent was elected and currently serves as Prosecuting Attorney for St. Joseph County. Moreover, the stipulation states that "with respect to paragraphs 8-9 of the Formal Complaint, the parties stipulate that the statements Respondent made to the Court were not themselves untrue, but rather they were misleading because certain facts were omitted that the Court considered to be material."

found that respondent knowingly made a 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 the tribunal by the lawyer, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1); violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, or knowingly assisted or induced another to do so, or did so through the acts of another, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a); engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, in violation of MCR 9.104(1) and MRPC 8.4(c); engaged in conduct that exposes the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); and engaged in conduct that violates the standards or rules of professional conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, in violation of MCR 9.104(4).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,081.70.