



FILED VIA U.S. MAIL

January 12, 2026

Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission
755 W. Big Beaver Rd. - Suite 2100
Troy MI 48084

RE: Complaint regarding Attorney General Dana Nessel potential violation of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct

To Whom it May Concern,

This complaint addresses potential violations of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct by Attorney General Dana Nessel. We ask that you initiate an investigation into Nessel based upon our findings outlined below.

I. Who We Are

The Center to Advance Security in America (CASA) is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving the safety and security of the American people. CASA educates and informs the American people about the actions of their government and its officials that impact their safety; peace and security; democracy, civil rights, and civil liberties; and privacy.

II. Background

Based upon information and belief, Dana M. Nessel is a licensed attorney in the State of Michigan and, as of this submission, is in good standing with the Michigan Bar, license number P51346.¹ She is currently, among other things, Attorney General of Michigan.

On December 16, 2025, Michigan House Speaker Matt Hall announced findings that resulted from a months long investigation conducted by Oversight Committee Chair Jay DeBoyer.² Hall announced that Nessel had committed at least two separate instances of ethics violations involving an individual who worked on her transition team and also her spouse.³

¹ State Bar of Michigan, “Dana M. Nessel,” accessed December 23, 2025, <https://sbm.reliaguide.com/lawyer/48226-MI-Dana-Nessel-50345>.

² Jerry Dunleavy, “Michigan AG Under Fire for ‘Clear Ethics Violation’ in Handling of Cases Tied to Wife and Democrats,” Just the News, December 18, 2025, <https://justthenews.com/government/state-houses/michigan-ag-under-fire-clear-ethics-violation-handling-cases-tied-wife-and>; The Midwesterner, “House Speaker Matt Hall press Conference—December 16, 2025,” posted December 16, 2025, Youtube, 1 hour, 18 min., 44 sec., <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zABysmljr6k>.

³ Dunleavy.



Both instances involved a failure to honor “isolation” or “conflict” walls that were put up due to Nessel’s personal relationships with cases ongoing at the Attorney General’s Office. She reportedly circumvented those walls by contacting people involved in the cases.⁴

In the first instance, an individual, Traci Kornak, from Nessel’s transition team was being investigated for defrauding an elderly individual. Documents were uncovered that show that Nessel was in communication with her about the case, even after the wall was implemented. “The only individual they spoke to was Traci Kornak, the potential individual who committed a crime, then only to close the case, by the way after the attorney general violated the firewall.”⁵

The second case involved Fair & Equal Michigan (FEM), a campaign co-chaired by Nessel’s spouse. The inquiry was over campaign finance violations from donations, numbering in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, from Bipartisan Solutions to FEM.⁶ A criminal referral was made by the Secretary of State to the Attorney General’s Office. Again, only a cursory “investigation” occurred. As a result, the case was closed and given back to the Secretary of State. Documents reportedly show that Nessel personally contacted Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson about the case, even after the conflict wall.⁷

III. Ethics Standards

In Michigan, a lawyer “shall not represent a client if the representation of that client may be materially limited by the lawyer’s responsibilities to another client or to a third person, or by the lawyer’s own interests.”⁸ “The lawyer’s own interests should not be permitted to have adverse effect on representation of a client.”⁹ “The question is often one of proximity and degree.”¹⁰ “Relevant factors in determining whether there is potential for adverse effect include duration and intimacy of the lawyer’s relationship with the client or clients involved, the functions being performed by the lawyer, and the likelihood actual conflict will arise, and the likely prejudice to the client from the conflict if it does arise.”¹¹

⁴ Steven Bohner, “Michigan House Oversight Committee Investigates Attorney General Dana Nessel for Alleged Ethics Violations,” ABC 13, December 16, 2025, updated December 16, 2025, <https://www.wzzm13.com/article/news/politics/michigan-politics/michigan-house-oversight-committee-investigates-attorney-general-dana-nessel-alleged-ethics-violations/69-3c056b9d-8515-40e4-a403-a60406bdcf9c>.

⁵ Dunleavy.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bohner.

⁸ Rule 1.7(b).

⁹ Rule 1.7 Comments.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.



IV. Analysis

Here, Nessel's office was tasked with investigating both her spouse's organization and someone with whom she has strong political ties to. While these are not former clients, they both are most certainly a "third person" who "materially limit[s] [her] responsibilities to another client," the client being the state of Michigan. Nessel's "own interests" were too strong, in both instances, for her to fairly represent the interests of the State. Indeed, it would be nearly impossible to ask a lawyer to not have clouded judgement in being asked to investigate her own spouse for potential criminal prosecution. Additionally, a close political advisor is akin to a business relationship. There are strong parallels between proprietary interests and political interests, in that, both have to do with professional development and ambition.

For both investigations, if the subject of the investigation were to be criminally prosecuted, Nessel stood to lose something. She would be motivated to not prosecute for her own personal gain. It is for these reasons that she was walled off from these investigations. Someone else had agreed with this assessment and took measures to prevent the personal conflicts of interests of Nessel from clouding the investigations.

If Nessel did, indeed, place phone calls to affected or interested individuals and/or exerted influence over the Attorney General's office to not pursue criminal prosecution of either her spouse or her political advisor, she would certainly have violated Rule 1.7. She should be investigated accordingly.

V. Conclusion

Recently, the House Oversight Committee conducted hearings over this matter. Michigan Representative Penelope Tsernoglou stated during a committee hearing that, "if their goal was to preserve the integrity of the system and the law in Michigan, that [a bar complaint] would have been the appropriate step."¹² She is correct. It is appropriate for a bar complaint. The Michigan bar should investigate these allegations and impose discipline, if substantiated.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Curtis Schube
Director of Research and Policy
Center to Advance Security in America
www.advancing-america.org
@SecureUSA

¹² "Nessel Found in Contempt of House Oversight Panel," Michigan Information & Research Service, Inc., December 17, 2025, <https://home.mirs.news/post/nessel-found-in-contempt-of-house-oversight-panel>.