

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

Case No. 23-84-GA

Notice Issued: August 1, 2025

Ernest Friedman, P 26642, Farmington Hills, Michigan

Suspension - 180 Days, Effective October 18, 2024

Based on the evidence presented to Tri-County Hearing Panel #57 at hearings held in this matter in accordance with MCR 9.115, the hearing panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct in two separate and unrelated counts, one pertaining to management of an IOLTA and the other relating to respondent's suspension for misconduct found in *Grievance Administrator v Ernest Friedman*, 18-37-GA.

Specifically, the panel found that respondent failed to promptly pay or deliver any funds or other property that the client or third person is entitled to receive, except as stated in this rule or otherwise permitted by law or by agreement with the client or third person, and, upon request by the client or third person, promptly render a full accounting regarding such property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(b)(3) [Count One]; failed to hold property of clients or third persons in connection with a representation separate from his own property, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d) [Count One]; deposited funds into the IOLTA in an amount in excess of the amount reasonably necessary to pay financial institution service charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f) [Count One]; failed to notify all active clients, in writing, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, of his suspension, in violation of MCR 9.119(A) [Count Two]; failed to file with the tribunal and all parties a notice of his disqualification from the practice of law, in violation of MCR 9.119(B) [Count Two]; and, filed a false reinstatement affidavit, in violation of MCR 9.123(A) [Count Two]. The panel also found respondent's conduct to have violated MCR 9.104(1) [Count One]; MCR 9.104(2) [Counts One and Two]; MCR 9.104(3) [Count Two]; MCR 9.104(4) [Counts One and Two]; MRPC 8.4(a) [Counts One and Two]; and MRPC 8.4(c) [Count Two].

The panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended

for 180 days. On October 10, 2024, respondent timely filed a petition for review pursuant to MCR 9.118 and a petition for stay pursuant to MCR 9.115(K). Respondent's petition for a stay was denied by the Board on October 17, 2024. After proceedings in accordance with MCR 9.118, the Board affirmed, in part, and vacated, in part, the panel's findings of misconduct and affirmed the 180-day suspension of respondent's license to practice law in Michigan. Total costs were assessed in the amount of \$3,598.59.