

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD  
OF THE  
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION  
AND  
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

NEJLA K. LANE,

Attorney-Respondent

No. 6290003.

Commission No. **2019PR00074**

**TO:** Administrator  
Attorney Registration and Disciplinary  
Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois  
[ARDCeService@iadc.org](mailto:ARDCeService@iadc.org)

Attorney for the Administrator  
Christopher Heredia  
[cheredia@iadc.org](mailto:cheredia@iadc.org)

**NOTICE OF FILING**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of **September, 2019**, the undersigned caused to be filed ***RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE***, via the e-file IL System, with the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois Administrator, copies of which are attached and hereby served upon you.

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

The undersigned, being duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that he served a copy of the above Notice, together with said documents, upon the above-named parties via Electronic Mail from Chicago, Illinois on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.

Joseph A. Bosco  
(ARDC No. 6182545)  
LaRose & Bosco, Ltd.  
200 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2810  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
[jbosco@laroseboscowlaw.com](mailto:jbosco@laroseboscowlaw.com)  
Tel. (312) 642-4414

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Joseph A Bosco  
Attorney for Respondent  
Nejla K. Lane

FILED  
9/26/2019 4:21 PM  
ARDC Clerk

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD  
OF THE  
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION  
AND  
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

NEJLA K. LANE,

Attorney-Respondent

No. 6290003.

Commission No. **2019PR00074**

**RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT**

NOW COMES the Respondent, Nejla K. Lane, by and through her attorney, Joseph A. Bosco of LaRose & Bosco, Ltd., denying the allegation of the prefatory paragraph to the effect that she engaged in any conduct that subjects her to discipline pursuant to rule 770, and states, as follows for her answer to the Administrator's Complaint:

**RESPONDENT'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 231**

A. Respondent is licensed to practice law in Illinois (admitted in 2006), Michigan (2005) and Texas (2015). Respondent is admitted to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the U.S. District Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, and the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

B. Respondent has also been a licensed Private Detective/Private Detective Agency since 2011.

## **ANSWER**

*(Conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal, false or reckless statements about a judge, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice)*

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent owned and operated the law firm of Lane Legal Services, P.C., later known as the law firm of Lane Keyfli Law, Ltd. (collectively, "Respondent's law firm").

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 1.**

2. At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent maintained and used the email addresses of [nejlane@gmail.com](mailto:nejlane@gmail.com) and [nejla@lanekeyfli.com](mailto:nejla@lanekeyfli.com).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 2.**

3. On May 23, 2011, Paula Epstein ("Paula") filed a petition in the Circuit Court of Cook County seeking to dissolve her marriage to Barry Epstein ("Epstein"). The matter was captioned *Paula Epstein v. Barry Epstein*, and was assigned case number 11 D 5245.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 3.**

4. In or around August 2012, Respondent and Epstein agreed that Respondent would represent Epstein in the dissolution of marriage matter against Paula pending in the Circuit Court of Cook County. The parties agreed that Respondent's legal fee for her representation would be an hourly fee agreement, with a \$10,000 security retainer, to be paid by Epstein at the outset of representation, and an hourly rate of \$300 per hour for office work, and \$350 per hour for time and work out of the office in court.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 4.**

5. In or around October 2014, while the domestic relations matter was still pending, Respondent and Epstein agreed that Respondent would also represent Epstein in a federal action related to the dissolution of marriage matter, alleging multiple violations of the federal

Wiretap Act under Title 18, Section 2520, of the United States Code. The parties agreed that Respondent's legal fee for her representation in relation to this federal action would be an hourly fee agreement, at an hourly rate of \$400 per hour for office work, and \$450 per hour for time and work out of the office in court.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 5. Further, Respondent affirmatively states that among other counts Epstein alleged: violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2511, Violation of the United States Stored Communications Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2701 *et seq.* (the “SCA”), Unreasonable Intrusion Upon the Seclusion of Another, Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Trespass to Chattels and Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2520(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 2707(b).**

6. On October 27, 2014, Respondent filed a complaint on Epstein's behalf against Paula and Jay Frank ("Frank"), Paula's attorney in the domestic relations matter, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. The matter was captioned *Barry Epstein v. Paula Epstein and Jay Frank*, case number 1:14-cv-08431, and assigned to Hon. Thomas M. Durkin ("Judge Durkin"), and Magistrate Judge Sheila Finnegan ("Judge Finnegan").

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 6. Further, Respondent affirmatively states that the Magistrate Judge Sheila Finnegan was initially assigned to conduct a settlement conference between the parties and later she was assigned to supervise the discovery. [DE56 & 63 & 75 & 82].**

7. In relation to case number 14-cv-08431, attorney Scott Schaefer ("Schaefer") represented Paula, and attorney Norman Barry ("Barry") represented Frank, who was later dismissed as a co-defendant to the complaint.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 7. Further, Respondent affirmatively states that Jay Frank's dismissal was also affirmed by the Seventh Circuit, which enraged Barry Epstein, who then unsuccessfully appealed the Seventh Circuit dismissal in the U. S. Supreme Court.**

8. In the complaint, described in paragraph 6, above, Epstein alleged that Paula and Frank violated the federal Wiretap Act by intercepting, accessing, downloading, and printing Epstein's private emails, without Epstein's authorization, in furtherance of Paula's interests in the then-pending state dissolution of marriage matter, described in paragraph 3, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 8. Further, Respondent affirmatively states Epstein alleged more than only what is described in paragraph 8. See answer to paragraph 5, which is incorporated herein.**

9. During the pendency of case number 14-ev-08431, Judge Finnegan maintained an email account, known as the proposed order email account ("proposed order account"), with an email address of [Proposed\\_Order\\_Finnegan@ilnd.uscourts.gov](mailto:Proposed_Order_Finnegan@ilnd.uscourts.gov). Judge Finnegan maintained the proposed order account to allow the parties to communicate with the court regarding the submission of proposed orders, pre-settlement conference letters, scheduling issues, and other logistical matters. In maintaining the proposed order account, Judge Finnegan sent and received emails from the proposed order account, which was monitored by and accessible only to Judge Finnegan and members of her staff. Under Judge Finnegan's written case procedures and standing orders, the proposed order account was maintained and used, when appropriate, in all matters assigned to her docket.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 9 with regard to Judge Finnegan maintaining a proposed order account with an email address of**

**Proposed\_Order\_Finnegan@ilnd.uscourts.gov. Respondent does not have sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 9.**

10. April 17, 2017, Respondent filed an emergency motion on Epstein's behalf in case number 14-cv-08431 seeking an extension of time to complete Paula's deposition.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 10.**

11. On April 18, 2017, Judge Finnegan entered an order in case number 14-cv-08431 denying Respondent's emergency motion, referred to in paragraph 10, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent makes no response to the allegation of Paragraph 11. The document speaks for itself. Respondent denies the allegations of Paragraph 11 to the extent that Paragraph 11 is inconsistent with the document it refers to.**

12. On that same date, in response to an email Judge Finnegan sent to the parties regarding the denial of Respondent's emergency motion, Respondent wrote an email addressed to Judge Finnegan, and sent it to the proposed order account, Schaefer and Scott White ("White"), Judge Finnegan's courtroom deputy, via their individual work email addresses.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 12.**

13. In her April 18, 2019 email to Judge Finnegan, referred to in paragraph 12, above, Respondent stated, in part, the following:

"Thank you for this quick response, Judge Finnegan. BUT ... Today in court no matter what I said to you, you had already made up your mind..."

\* \* \*

"... yet since the beginning you never seem to doubt anything he says, as you appear to doubt me."

\* \* \*

"Still, I stated to you in open court that 'I don't want to be hated' for doing my job, but it sure seems that way, as I never get a break, Scott [Schaefer] is the lucky guy who senses same as he can just pick up the

phone to call you knowing he will get his way...or for so-called the Posner Defense."

\* \* \*

"Still, it's not fair that my client (and I) is [sic] being treated badly for suing his wife/ex wife, and everyone is protecting Paula - why? Since when does 'two' wrongs make a 'right'? How am I to prove my case if I am not given a fair chance to do my work, properly?"

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 13. Respondent further states that the information set forth in Paragraph 13 contains selected quotes but is not complete and taken out of context. Respondent further states that the use of "[sic]" is grammatically incorrect because Respondent was referring to "... my client is being treated badly ..."**

14. On April 19, 2017, Judge Finnegan responded by email to Respondent's April 18, 2017 email, described to in paragraphs 12 and 13, above. Judge Finnegan, in her April 19, 2017 email sent to Respondent, Schaefer, and White, admonished Respondent for Respondent's use of the proposed order account, and stated that Respondent was prohibited from sending any emails to the proposed order account in the future in order to argue the merits of a motion, share feelings about past rulings, or discuss the case generally. Judge Finnegan also stated that in the event that Respondent sent additional emails similar to her April 18, 2017 email, she would enter an order barring all emails to the proposed order account without leave of the court.

**ANSWER: Respondent makes no response to the allegations in Paragraph 14. The document speaks for itself. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 14 to the extent that Paragraph 14 is inconsistent with the document it refers to.**

15. On June 15, 2017, Respondent filed a motion on Epstein's behalf in case number 14-cv-08431 seeking an extension of time to complete discovery and for leave to depose Frank, who had already been dismissed as a co-defendant.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 15.**

16. On June 23, 2017, Judge Finnegan entered an order in case number 14-cv-08431 denying Respondent's motion, described in paragraph 15, above. On the same date, Allison Engel ("Engel"), Judge Finnegan's law clerk, emailed a copy of Judge Finnegan's June 23, 2017 order to Respondent and Schaefer.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 16.**

17. On that same date, in response to Engel's June 23, 2017 email, described in paragraph 16, above, Respondent wrote an email addressed to Engel, and sent it to the proposed order account, Engel, and Schaefer, via their individual work email addresses.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 17. Further, Respondent affirmatively states that said ORDER of Paragraph 17 was not yet uploaded to the docket until the following Monday, and Respondent's quick response was done to have the errors corrected prior to Monday.**

18. In her June 23, 2017 email to Engel, referred to in paragraph 17, above, Respondent stated, in part, the following:

"I'm very upset, I do not agree with Judge Finnegan's order and I will depose the former co-defendant, Jay Frank, despite the fact this court is protecting him and his co-conspirer! Scott Schaefer had no standing to challenge my subpoena to depose Jay Frank! I'm entitled to depose him! And I will call him to testify [sic] at trial to show the world what a corrupt lawyer he is! And the judges who protect this criminal by squeezing the discovery deadlines!!! No no no! This is outrageous order of Judge Finnegan and it will be addressed accordingly! Judges are helping the criminal to escape punishment by forcing to shorten all deadlines!!! This Judge is violating my client's rights first by the truncated discovery deadlines and now helping Plaintiff to escape punishment for wrongs she



committed! I'm outraged by the miscarriage of justice and judges are in this to delay and deny justice for my client! I'm sickened by this Order!!!"

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 18.**

19. On June 26, 2017, also in response to Engel's June 23, 2017 email, Respondent wrote another email addressed to Engel, and sent it to the proposed order account, Engel, and Schaefers, via their individual work email addresses.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 19.**

20. In her June 26, 2017 email to Engel, referred to in paragraph 19, above, Respondent described what she perceived to be errors in Judge Finnegan's June 23, 2017 order, characterized the order as "flawed", accused Judge Finnegan of engaging in *ex parte* communications, and stated, in part, the following:

"Plaintiff's motion is not late just because this court decided not to extend discovery deadlines, to protect the Defendant! I have asked this court numerous times for an extension of all cutoff deadlines, without avail. Take this into account when drafting your flawed order."

\* \* \*

"For anyone to insult me in this degree calls questions [sic] this court's sincerity and veracity. How dare you accuse me of not having looked at the SC docket regularly."

\* \* \*

"How do you know I did not see the SC order???? Where do you get this information? Ex Parte communications with Defendant's attorney, Scott? smearing dirt behind my back?"

\* \* \*

"The more I read this order, again and again, I am sick to my stomach, and I get filled with anger and disgust over this 'fraudulent' order by this court!"

\* \* \*

"You both, Allison and J. Finnegan, have done me wrong, and depicted me very poorly in your public order. How dare you do that to me?! What goes around comes around, justice will be done at the end! I wonder

how you people sleep at night? Including Scott! Thank you Allison!  
Great job!"

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 20. Respondent further states that the information set forth in Paragraph 20 contains selected quotes which are excerpts and only portions of the paragraphs quoted and is not complete, and does not contain other portions of Respondent's e-mail which attempted to correct errors and misstatements contained in the Court's Order.**

21. At the time Respondent wrote and sent the emails described in paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above, Respondent's conduct was disruptive and was intended to disrupt the court. At the time Respondent sent the emails described in paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above, Respondent knew or should have known that her statements to Judge Finnegan and her staff members would unnecessarily prolong the proceeding, and disparage the court and its process.

**ANSWER: Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 21. Further, Respondent affirmatively states that the proceedings were not prolonged. The trial date set by the District Judge Durkin and Judge Finnegan's discovery supervision and discovery deadlines were not changed or delayed. [DE82 – no extension granted to complete discovery].**

22. At the time Respondent wrote and sent the emails described in paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above, Respondent's statements about Judge Finnegan's integrity and impartiality were false.

**ANSWER: Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 22.**

23. At the time Respondent wrote and sent the emails described in paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above, Respondent knew that her statements about Judge Finnegan's integrity and impartiality were false or made with reckless disregard as to their truth or falsity.

**ANSWER: Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 23.**

24. On June 27, 2017, Judge Finnegan entered an order in case number 14-cv-08431 admonishing Respondent for violating her directives regarding the proposed order account in her April 19, 2017 email, referred to in paragraph 14, above, and for making statements in her emails which Judge Finnegan described as "highly inappropriate." Judge Finnegan ordered Respondent to immediately cease all email communications with her and her staff, ordered Respondent to address any scheduling issues by contacting only the courtroom deputy, and that additional action would be taken to address Respondent's conduct.

**ANSWER: Respondent makes no response to the allegations in Paragraph 24, as the document speaks for itself. The Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 24 to the extent Paragraph 24 is inconsistent with the document it refers to.**

25. On October 31, 2017, after the conclusion of Epstein's federal action and state dissolution of marriage proceeding, Judge Finnegan submitted a complaint to the Executive Committee of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois ("Executive Committee") based on Respondent's conduct, described in paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent makes no response to the allegations in Paragraph 25, as the document speaks for itself. The Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 25 to the extent Paragraph 25 is inconsistent with the document it refers to.**

26. On November 14, 2017, the Executive Committee issued a citation ordering Respondent to respond to Judge Finnegan's submission, and inform the court why the imposition of discipline against her would be unwarranted.

**ANSWER: Respondent makes no response to the allegations in Paragraph 26, as the document speaks for itself. The Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 26 to the extent Paragraph 26 is inconsistent with the document it refers to.**

27. On January 22, 2018, following Respondent's citation response and the Executive Committee's review of the matter, the Executive Committee entered an order Finding that Respondent engaged in the conduct described paragraphs 13, 18, and 20, above, in violation of Rules 3.5(d) and 8.4(d) of the Rules of Professional Conduct. In imposing discipline on Respondent for her conduct, the Executive Committee's order suspended Respondent from practicing before the General Bar for a period of six months from, and the Trial Bar for a period of 12 months, and prohibited her from serving as lead counsel in any trial for at least one year. The order also required that, as part of any reinstatement petition, Respondent must demonstrate having sought professional assistance in her compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct and anger management.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 27. Respondent further states that she complied with all of the requirements for reinstatement and is now fully reinstated and in good standing to both the General Bar and Trial Bar. (Orders of Reinstatement attached as Exhibit D).**

28. By reason of the conduct described above, Respondent has engaged in the following misconduct:

- a. engaging in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal, by conduct including sending emails on April 18, 2017, June 23, 2017 and June 26, 2017 to Judge Finnegan, Allison Engel, and Scott White, through the Proposed Order email account, which were disruptive and were intended to disrupt the court, in violation of Rule 3.5(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. making a statement that a lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, by conduct including drafting and sending emails which questioned Judge Finnegan's integrity and impartiality by stating, in part: "Scott is the lucky gay who senses same as he can just pick up the phone to call you knowing he will get his way..." in

her April 18, 2017 email; "And I will call him to testify [sic] at trial to show the world what a corrupt lawyer he is! And the judges who protect this criminal by squeezing the discovery deadlines!!!" and "Judges are helping the criminal to escape punishment by forcing to shorten all deadlines!!! This Judge is violating my client's rights first by truncated discovery deadlines and now helping Plaintiff to escape punishment for wrongs she committed!" in her June 23, 2017 email; and "For anyone to insult me in this degree calls questions [sic] this court's sincerity and veracity," "Where do you get this information? Ex Parte communications with Defendant's attorney, Scott? - smearing dirt behind my back?" and "The more I read this order, again and again, I am sick to my stomach, and I get filled with anger and disgust over this 'fraudulent' order by this court!" in her June 26, 2017 email, in violation of Rule 8.2(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and

- c. engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, by conduct including sending emails on April 18, 2017, June 23, 2017 and June 26, 2017 to Judge Finnegan through the Proposed Order email account, which necessitated additional actions taken by Judge Finnegan and caused the expenditure of additional court resources, including Judge Finnegan's April 18, 2017 email to the parties limiting Respondent's future use of the proposed order email account, the entry of Judge Finnegan's June 27, 2017 court order prohibiting Respondent from sending any emails to her or her staff, and Judge Finnegan's referral of Respondent's conduct to the Executive Committee of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, in violation of Rule 8.4(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: The allegations in Paragraph 28 state legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 28, including sub-sections a-c.**

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO COMPLAINT**

The actions of Respondent as described in this Complaint were made in the midst of an extremely demanding, emotionally-charged suit involving allegations of violations of federal

wiretapping laws and store communication act, which arose out of a six-year, extremely contentious divorce case in Illinois state court and the divorce trial lasted from November 19, 2015 through October 4, 2016. Respondent had represented Mr. Barry Epstein in the divorce litigation for five of the six years it was pending. In the course of this litigation, Respondent developed type-2 diabetes, and was treated for anxiety, inability to sleep and panic attacks. By the time of Respondent's alleged incidents of misconduct as described in this Complaint, Respondent was experiencing physical and emotional problems on a number of levels due to the pending federal and underlying state divorce litigation. In addition, Respondent was dealing with a client who was extremely demanding blaming Respondent for every negative ruling against him. Additionally a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) was put in place in the divorce proceeding preventing Epstein from paying attorney's fees and Respondent ultimately financed Epstein's divorce and Federal litigation by paying for out-of-pocket expenses and the entire staff's salaries for months and years to fight Epstein's bitter causes of actions in the state and federal courts. This added to Respondent's trouble paying her staff and properly working this complex federal case. During this time, defense counsel was peppering Respondent with motions, which pushed Respondent to her breaking point. This series of events ultimately culminated in the April 2017 e-mails to Judge Finnegan's proposed order e-mail account, and then another e-mail on June 26, 2017 sent to Judge Finnegan's law clerk, Allison Engel, again complaining about the ruling and containing emotional outbursts, which in hindsight, Respondent fully acknowledges were inappropriate.

During the ARDC's investigation to date, Respondent has repeatedly acknowledged the inappropriateness of her actions in sending the emotionally charged e-mails, which resulted in Judge Castillo's Order and sanctions. Since the January 2018 Order by Judge Castillo, Respondent has provided a sincere apology to both Judge Finnegan and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and she has also taken proactive steps, including seeking assistance through the

Illinois Lawyers Assistance Program to effectively deal with her anger management issues and to ensure that a similar situation not happen again. In Respondent's submissions to the ARDC she had included the attached letter from Mr. Tony Pacione from the Illinois Lawyers Assistance Program ("LAP"). This letter affirms and verifies that Respondent was diagnosed with acute stress disorder, panic disorder, and general anxiety disorder, and that she continued to be treated for all of these issues with Mr. Pacione on a regular basis up until December 2018, but kept checking in with him regularly to-date, and she still occasionally meets with him. (Letter attached as Exhibit A). Respondent has also been on medication in compliance with Mr. Pacione's recommendations to date. Mr. Pacione's letter referred to an additional misconduct by the client to wit: "this client behaved inappropriately towards her" which until now Respondent did not want to elaborate on. Respondent was under further extreme pressure by attempting to kindly reject Epstein's constant advances and invitations to accompany him to weddings and to travel with him for six days to Pittsburgh in April 2016, midst of his own divorce trial. Respondent attempted to "kindly" reject him without jeopardize her firm's outstanding legal fees. Only per Mr. Pacione's recent insistence to bring this client's additional improper conduct to the ARDC's attention, is Respondent making a mention of this at this time.

In addition, Respondent has also publicly apologized for her conduct in a Law 360 article dated June 30, 2018. In that article Respondent discusses how the Epstein divorce and federal litigation had been very difficult and emotionally draining, and publicly stated "I take full responsibility for my conduct. I violated the Judge's order asking me not to send emotionally charged e-mails, and I shouldn't have . . . " (Article attached as Exhibit B).

Since sending these emotionally charged e-mails in 2017, Respondent has completed in excess of 30 Continuing Legal Education credits, which included subjects on professionalism, civility and legal ethics. Respondent has also now had time to reflect on her conduct and, in her

June 7, 2019 Sworn Statement to the ARDC, Respondent testified at great length regarding the intense pressure and emotional upheaval she had gone through during the combined five-year Epstein divorce/federal litigation – which affected her health and physical well-being, culminating in 2016 with the development of type-2 diabetes, an ER visit for a panic attack, and treatment for anxiety, frequent panic attacks and an inability to sleep. At the time of her alleged misconduct, while dealing with this all-consuming litigation, severe stress, and anxiety; in addition to her health issues, Respondent was faced with Epstein's inappropriate conduct and advances who was also an extremely demanding and critical client, who demanded Respondent protract/intensify her litigation activities and repeatedly refused Respondent's advice to reasonably settle the matter. At the time of the actions described in the Complaint, Respondent was also faced with formidable adversaries who were constantly peppering her with motions, practicing hard-ball litigation tactics, as well as a protracted/expensive divorce trial and an impending complex federal trial (after a successful appeal to the Seventh Circuit, and then Petitions for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court). Respondent testified that because her client was no longer funding her efforts at these critical phases of this litigation, she was also having severe problems paying her staff, experts, and litigation costs, which also in turn affected her ability to work the complex divorce and federal litigation, and caused even more pressure, anxiety and stress.

At the time of Respondent's emotional outburst and e-mails, the ruling by Judge Finnegan in denying her the opportunity to depose Jay Frank (which her client was demanding she accomplish) was the breaking point for her, and caused her to lose control of her emotions and engage in the conduct described in this Complaint. This culminated in the April 17, 2017 e-mails to Judge Finnegan's Proposed Orders e-mail account, as well as the June 26, 2017 e-mail sent to Judge Finnegan's law clerk, Allison Engel. As Respondent stated in her Sworn Statement, in hindsight, she should have withdrawn from this litigation, but she felt not only duty-bound to



weather the storm and see this case through to resolution but was unable to withdraw. Respondent expressed her desire to Epstein in wanting to withdraw from Epstein's Federal case, but the client wouldn't allow her. In addition, because this case was immediately set for a jury trial on June 5, 2017, it was impossible to withdraw because no attorney would be able to take over to a fast tracked trial without being granted adequate time to prepare and Judge Durkin made clear there would be no extension to this trial date. [DE55].

Respondent has repeatedly acknowledged that she made a mistake in sending these e-mails, and that she is reticent and apologetic for her actions.

Since, Respondent has not only had time to reflect, but also to account for her actions. Respondent has complied with all of Judge Castillo's recommendations and has since been re-admitted to the General and Trial Bars for the Northern District of Illinois. She still continues to reduce her stress levels in her practice by severely reducing her caseload and her overhead and attempting to now confine her practice to criminal defense and immigration law.

Since the 2017 actions described in this Complaint, Respondent has not had any other emotional outbursts or been cited for any other inappropriate conduct. Respondent avers that this conduct will not be repeated. Respondent has taken full responsibility for her actions and has paid dearly for her isolated misconduct through the Federal Court sanctions and public humiliation, and she has taken proactive steps with the LAP program to ensure that this not happen again.

Recently, Respondent not only continued to see Mr. Pacione, but has also started psychological therapy with Dr. Michael L. Fields, who has and will attest to the Respondent's emotional pain and open admittance of errors. Dr. Fields will further attest that Respondent is suffering from acute stress disorder, and that Respondent is a very honorable and hard-working individual who, in his opinion, is not deserving of any further sanctioning by the ARDC. (Letter from Dr. Fields attached as Exhibit C).

In conclusion, Respondent is remorseful and apologetic for the actions as described in this Complaint and believes she deserves second chance.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joseph A Bosco  
Joseph A. Bosco  
Attorney for Respondent  
Nejla K. Lane

Joseph A. Bosco  
LaRose & Bosco, Ltd.  
Attorney No. 37346  
200 North LaSalle Street  
Suite 2810  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(312) 642-4414  
[jbosco@laroseboscowlaw.com](mailto:jbosco@laroseboscowlaw.com)