

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION

(By Consent)

Case Nos. 25-48-GA; 25-67-GA

Notice Issued: October 22, 2025

Roger M. Maceroni, P 45744, Shelby Township, Michigan

Suspension - 185 Days, Effective October 22, 2025

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed an amended 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 #5. The amended stipulation contained respondent's admissions to the factual allegations and allegations of professional misconduct set forth in the consolidated formal complaints (25-48-GA and 25-67-GA). Specifically, in Formal Complaint 25-48-GA, while representing a client on misdemeanor charges of driving while license suspended and subject to a bench warrant, respondent falsely informed the magistrate that he had personally transported his client to court. In Formal Complaint 25-67-GA, while representing a client on multiple traffic violations, respondent received \$200 from the client to cover court costs but failed to remit the payment to the court, resulting in a default judgment, late fees, and reinstatement costs. Respondent also admitted that he failed to timely respond to a request for investigation.

Based upon respondent's admissions, the default, and the parties' amended stipulation, the panel found that, in Formal Complaint 25-48-GA, respondent knowingly made false statements of material fact or law to both a tribunal and a third person, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1) and MRPC 4.1. Further, in Formal Complaint 25-67-GA, based upon respondent's admissions and the parties' amended stipulation, the panel found that respondent neglected a legal matter entrusted to him, in violation of MRPC 1.1(c); failed to seek the lawful objectives of the client, in violation of MRPC 1.2(a); failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, in violation of MRPC 1.3; failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter, 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 about the representation, in violation of MRPC 1.4(b); and failed to knowingly answer a request for investigation or demand for information in conformity with MCR 9.113(A)-(B)(2), in violation of MCR 9.104(7) and MRPC 8.1(a)(2). In both Formal Complaints 25-48-GA and 25-67-GA, the panel found that respondent violated or attempted to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of

MRPC 8.4(a) and MCR 9.104(4); 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); engaged in conduct prejudicial to the proper administration of justice, in violation of MRPC 8.4(c) and MCR 9.104(1); 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 contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3).

In accordance with the amended stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent's license to practice law in Michigan be suspended for 185 days, effective October 22, 2025, and that he pay restitution totaling \$512.00. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$1,169.84.