

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITION

(By Consent)

Case No. 24-112-GA

Notice Issued: August 12, 2025

Terri T. Macklin, P 38785, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Reprimand, Effective August 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 Muskegon County Hearing Panel #3. The stipulation contained respondent's no contest pleas to the factual allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-52 of the formal complaint, that involved a trust, estate planning and eventual probate court matter involving respondent's client, with the exception of the allegations in paragraph 18, which the parties agreed, for purposes of the stipulation, that respondent did not personally have a client sign a mortgage or promissory note referenced in Count One, although she was aware of the contents of the mortgage and promissory note during the representation. The stipulation further contained respondent's no contest plea to the allegations of professional misconduct set forth in paragraph 54 of the formal complaint, with the exception of 54(g), which the parties agreed to dismiss.

Based on respondent's no contest pleas and the stipulation of the parties, the panel found that respondent entered into an agreement for, charged, and/or collected an illegal or clearly excessive fee, in violation of MRPC 1.5(a); failed to adequately communicate the basis or rate of the fee to her client, in violation of MRPC 1.5(b); entered or attempted to enter, into a business transaction with a client or knowingly acquire an ownership, possessory, security, or other pecuniary interest adverse to a client, where (1) the transaction and terms on which the lawyer acquired the interest were not fair and reasonable to the client and were not fully disclosed and transmitted in writing to the client in a manner that could be reasonably understood by the client, (2) the client was not given a reasonable opportunity to seek the advice of independent counsel in the transaction, and/or (3) the client did not consent in writing thereto, in violation of MRPC 1.8(a); 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 she previously made to the tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1); offered evidence that she knew was false, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(3); 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); engaged in conduct that is contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); 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 and required her to comply with a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,500.65.