

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

In the Matter of:

**JAMES GREGORY LAS COLA,**

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6256256.

Commission No. 2024PR00025

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEARING BOARD**

**DEFAULT PROCEEDING**

The hearing in this matter was held by videoconference on February 18, 2025, before a Hearing Board Panel consisting of Carl (Carlo) E. Poli, Chair, John L. Borovicka, IV, and James W. Kiley. Matthew D. Lango appeared on behalf of the Administrator. Respondent appeared and represented himself. The Administrator requested that Respondent be suspended for one year and until further order of the Court. We agree with the Administrator's request and recommend that Respondent be suspended for one year and until further order of the Court.

We have considered the Administrator's four-count First Amended Complaint, filed on July 31, 2024, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1, as well as the Order entered on October 4, 2024, deeming the allegations and charges of the First Amended Complaint admitted, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 2. Respondent filed his appearance in this matter on June 7, 2023, but he failed to file an Answer to the Complaint or First Amended Complaint, or a response to the Administrator's Motion to Deem the Allegations of the First Amended Complaint Admitted Pursuant to Commission Rule 236.

**FILED**

March 07, 2025

**ARDC CLERK**

The allegations deemed admitted establish that, in one client matter, Respondent failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness, failed to keep his client reasonably informed, and failed to refund the unearned portion of a fee paid in advance. In another client matter, Respondent failed to keep his client reasonably informed and failed to refund the unearned portion of a fee paid in advance. In a third client matter, Respondent failed to refund an unearned fee. Respondent also knowingly made a false statement of material fact to the Administrator and failed to respond to lawful demands for information from the Administrator.

By the foregoing conduct, Respondent violated Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct 1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.16(d), 8.1(a), and 8.1(b). In mitigation, Respondent has no prior misconduct. In aggravation, he was an experienced practitioner at the time of his misconduct, and he engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving three client matters over the course of two years. In addition, while he did not completely ignore the proceedings, he also did not fully participate in the disciplinary process, in that he failed to file an answer even after being given an extension of time to do so; failed to respond to the Administrator's motion to deem the allegations of the First Amended Complaint admitted; and filed a motion to vacate any defaults, but did not attach an answer to his motion and gave no valid reasons for not timely answering the First Amended Complaint. Most significantly, at his hearing, Respondent showed no recognition of the wrongfulness of his conduct nor any remorse for it. Instead, he used his testimony to rationalize his conduct and deny that any of it was wrongful, notwithstanding that the allegations and charges of the First Amended Complaint already had been deemed admitted. He stated that he did not "feel that there was harm that was done to the [clients] except the harm that was caused by their decision to go in a different direction" by terminating his representation. (Tr. 87-88.) He also made excuses for his lackluster participation in his disciplinary proceedings. His hearing testimony did not instill

us with confidence that he will refrain from engaging in similar misconduct in the future; rather, it caused us to doubt whether he is able or willing to conduct himself ethically.

Accordingly,

1. Respondent was personally served with the initial Complaint on May 2, 2024. In addition, he did not object to the Administrator's motion seeking leave to file the First Amended Complaint, and, at a pre-hearing conference on August 14, 2024, he requested and was granted an extension of time to file his answer to the First Amended Complaint. Copies of the Affidavit of Personal Service Pursuant to Commission Rule 214(a) and August 15, 2024, Order are attached as Exhibit 3.

2. The allegations and charges of the First Amended Complaint were deemed admitted in an Order entered on October 4, 2024. A copy of that Order is attached as Exhibit 2.

3. In consideration of the Order deeming the allegations and charges of the Complaint admitted, this Panel finds that Respondent committed the misconduct charged in the Complaint.

4. Given Respondent's misconduct, the serious aggravation and minimal mitigation present, and relevant case law, including In re Oltman, 2023PR00058, M.R. 32211 (May 23, 2024), and In re Kefalos, 2018PR00020, M.R. 29691 (March 19, 2019), we recommend that Respondent be suspended for one year and until further order of the Court.

5. The Panel has concluded that this report format will adequately and appropriately communicate its recommendation to the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl (Carlo) E. Poli  
John L. Borovicka, IV  
James W. Kiley

## CERTIFICATION

I, Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois and keeper of the records, hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true copy of the Report and Recommendation of the Hearing Board, approved by each Panel member, entered in the above entitled cause of record filed in my office on March 7, 2025.

/s/ Michelle M. Thome

Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the  
Attorney Registration and Disciplinary  
Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois

4911-9082-3205, v. 1

# **Exhibit 1**

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

In the Matter of:

JAMES GREGORY LAS COLA,  
Attorney-Respondent,  
No. 6256256.

Commission No. 2024PR00025

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, by her attorney, Matthew D. Lango, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 753(b), complains of Respondent, James Gregory Las Cola, who was licensed to practice law in Illinois on November 5, 1998, and alleges that Respondent has engaged in the following conduct which subjects Respondent to discipline pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 770:

COUNT I

*(Lack of Diligence, Failure to Communicate,  
and Failure to Return an Unearned Fee – Coleman Estate Planning Matter)*

1. At all times related to this complaint, Respondent was a solo practitioner, with a general practice in estate planning, business law, and litigation.

2. On or about November 5, 2021, Respondent met with Arthur and Rosie Coleman, and their daughter, Vetrice Coleman, at his office in Orland Park. At that time, Respondent and the Colemans agreed that Respondent would represent Arthur and Rosie Coleman in the preparation of their estate planning documents.

3. On November 5, 2021, Respondent gave the Colemans a retainer agreement to review and told them that in order to complete their estate planning documents, he required a

**FILED**

July 31, 2024

**ARDC CLERK**

retainer of \$1,750. On that date, Vetrice Coleman, using the digital payment platform Zelle, paid Respondent \$1,015.

4. After leaving Respondent's office, the Colemans reviewed Respondent's retainer agreement and determined it contained errors, including the name of a different client. Vetrice Coleman emailed Respondent and informed him that his retainer agreement contained information for another client. Respondent then offered to go to the Coleman's home and have them sign a corrected retainer agreement.

5. The next day, on November 6, 2021, Respondent went to Arthur and Rosie Coleman's home. On that date, Respondent brought a new retainer agreement with the Colemans' names listed as the clients. Vetrice Coleman was present for that meeting. After Arthur and Rosie Coleman signed Respondent's retainer agreement, Vetrice Coleman made a second payment via Zelle to Respondent in the amount of \$735.

6. Shortly after the meeting on November 6, 2021, Respondent emailed to the Colemans a questionnaire and estate planning forms, such as a will and power of attorney, with no specific information as to the Colemans on the documents. Respondent told the Colemans that he would work with them to incorporate their information into the documents to achieve their estate planning goals.

7. On or about November 10, 2021, the Colemans sent Respondent documents and information that they believed were necessary to complete their estate plan.

8. At no time after November 10, 2021, did Respondent complete or take any further actions with respect to the Colemans' estate planning documents.

9. Between November 10, 2021, and March 2022, the Colemans called Respondent approximately thirteen times and sent Respondent numerous emails regarding the status of their estate plan. Respondent did not respond to the Colemans' communications.

10. In or about December 2021, after not having received a response from Respondent, the Colemans requested the return of the \$1,750 retainer paid to Respondent.

11. At no time did Respondent return the Colemans' retainer or complete their estate planning documents.

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

- a. failure to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client, by conduct including failing to complete Arthur and Rosie Coleman's estate planning documents, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. failure to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter, by failing to respond to requests for information from the Colemans between November 2021 and March 2022, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- c. failure to surrender property to refund an unearned fee, by conduct including failing to refund any unearned portion of the \$1,750 fee the Colemans paid to Respondent in connection with Respondent's agreement to complete estate planning documents for the Colemans, in violation of Rule 1.16(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

## COUNT II

*(Failure to Communicate and Failure to Return an Unearned Fee – Robertson Eviction Matter)*

13. On or about September 30, 2022, Brandon Robertson ("Robertson") retained Respondent to represent his company, Resilient Realty Group, in a residential eviction matter to be filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County. On that date, Robertson paid Respondent a retainer



of \$2,500. Later, on November 11, 2022, Robertson gave Respondent an additional retainer of \$525 for filing fees and other costs.

14. On or about November 14, 2022, Respondent, on Robertson's behalf, filed an eviction case in the Circuit Court of Cook County, captioned as *Resilient Realty Group v. Joyce E. Robertson*, and assigned Cook County case number 20226009436. On or about that date, Respondent tendered the eviction complaint and summons to the Cook County Sheriff's Office for service of process.

15. Between November 14, 2022, and December 16, 2022, Robertson frequently contacted Respondent for updates concerning the status of the eviction case, though often received no response from Respondent. On December 16, 2022, Robertson emailed Respondent, terminating his legal services for lack of adequate communication. Robertson also requested Respondent to return any unused portion of his retainer and send him an accounting of all time spent on the eviction case.

16. Between the date Robertson hired Respondent to represent Resilient Realty Group in the eviction case, September 30, 2022, and December 19, 2022, the only substantive action Respondent took in the matter was to prepare and file a residential eviction complaint and tender a copy of the complaint and summons to the Cook County Sheriff's Office.

17. On December 19, 2022, Respondent replied to Robertson's December 16, 2022, email, described above, stating that he had attempted to reach Robertson via telephone, without success, and that he withdrew from the case. Robertson replied to this email requesting whatever remained of his retainer, as well as an itemized invoice. Respondent did not reply to this email.

18. During his representation of Resilient Realty Group and Robertson, Respondent did not perform sufficient work on the eviction matter to justify his retention of Robertson's \$2,500 retainer.

19. On January 6, 2023, Robertson emailed Respondent, again inquiring about his refund and itemized accounting of funds. Respondent replied to this email stating that a statement of account would be sent within the next ten days.

20. On or about January 23, 2023, Robertson emailed Respondent, again inquiring about the refund and statement of account because the ten-day period had passed. Respondent did not reply to this email or to any further communications from Robertson.

21. On January 26, 2023, Robertson emailed Respondent again, informing him that a complaint would be filed with the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission if a statement of account and return of any unused portion of the retainer was not sent to him. Respondent did not reply to this email.

22. At no time did Respondent send Robertson a statement of account or any itemization of the time allegedly spent on the eviction matter to justify his retention of Robertson's \$2,500 fee retainer.

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

- a. failure to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter, by failing to respond to Robertson's repeated requests for a statement of account, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- b. failure to surrender property to refund an unearned fee, by conduct including failing to refund any unearned portion of the \$2,500 fee Robertson paid to Respondent in connection with Respondent's representation of Resilient Realty Group in a

resident eviction matter, in violation of Rule 1.16(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

### COUNT III

*(Failure to Cooperate with a Disciplinary Investigation and False Statements to the Administrator)*

24. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs 13 through 23 above.

25. On February 23, 2023, the Administrator received a charge from Robertson alleging Respondent's lack of adequate communication, failure to return unearned fees, and failure to send him a statement of account. After reviewing the charge, the Administrator docketed investigation number 2023IN00660 into Respondent's alleged conduct.

26. On March 22, 2023, counsel for the Administrator emailed Respondent a copy of Robertson's charge and requested a written response from Respondent within fourteen days.

27. On April 13, 2023, after receiving no response from Respondent, counsel for the Administrator sent a second letter, requesting a response within seven days and informing Respondent that his failure to respond would result in a subpoena being served on him and his being required to appear for a sworn statement. Respondent did not respond to that letter.

28. On May 31, 2023, an investigator for the Administrator served Respondent via email with a subpoena to appear for a sworn statement on June 23, 2023, via Zoom, to answer questions under oath regarding the Robertson matter. Respondent did not respond to the May 31, 2023, email. Subsequently, an investigator for the Administrator left a copy of the subpoena for Respondent's sworn statement at his home.

29. On June 22, 2023, Respondent appeared via Zoom to provide sworn testimony related to matters described in this complaint. Approximately thirteen minutes after the scheduled start time of his sworn statement, Respondent emailed to counsel for the Administrator a PDF

document purporting to be a statement of account in the Robertson eviction matter described in Count II above.

30. The first page of the purported statement of account indicated that the document was created on January 2, 2023, though later pages indicated a date of January 16, 2023. The minimum billing increment used by Respondent on the statement of account was .25 hours. The statement of account contained eleven entries totaling 5.25 hours of time spent on the matter before the engagement took place. Additionally, according to the statement of account, with each email Respondent received from Robertson, regardless of whether Respondent replied, he claimed to have spent .25 hours reviewing the email. Respondent also claimed to have spent 5.75 hours withdrawing from the eviction case.

31. During the sworn statement, Counsel for the Administrator asked Respondent if he ever sent the statement of account to Robertson. Respondent repeatedly stated that he sent the statement of account to Robertson on January 16, 2023, via U.S. Post.

32. Respondent's statements in his sworn statement that Respondent mailed Robertson a statement of account was false. Respondent knew his statement was false because he knew that Robertson followed up with him multiple times to determine the status of his refund and statement of account, which Respondent never sent, and Robertson never received.

33. On June 22, 2023, after the sworn statement, Counsel for the Administrator sent Respondent an email at the email address Respondent registered with the ARDC. The email requested a Word version of the statement of account for Robertson. At no time did Respondent reply to counsel for the Administrator's June 22, 2023, email.

34. On June 23, 2023, counsel for the Administrator sent Respondent a second email at his registered email address. The email again requested a Word version of the statement of

account for Robertson before the close of the business day. At no time did Respondent reply to the Administrator's June 23, 2023, email.

35. On June 27, 2023, the Administrator served Respondent via email with a subpoena *duces tecum* to produce the Word version of the Statement of Account for Robertson on or before July 6, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

36. As of the date of this Complaint, Respondent has not produced the requested document and has failed to comply with the Administrator's subpoena.

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

- a. knowingly making false statements of material fact in connection with a disciplinary proceeding, by conduct including making a false statement in sworn testimony on June 22, 2023, that he mailed a copy of the statement of account to Robertson, in violation of Rule 8.1(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- b. failure to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, by conduct including failing to respond to the Administrator's June 22, 2023, and June 23, 2023, emails and failing to produce documents on or before July 6, 2023, in compliance with the Administrator's subpoena requiring the production of information and documents, in violation of Rule 8.1(b) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

#### COUNT IV

*(Failure to Return an Unearned Fee – Laurell Richey Chancery Matter)*

38. On or about October 5, 2023, Laurell Richey contacted Respondent regarding representation in a pending matter in the Chancery Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County in which Richey was a defendant. The case, which had been pending since 2018, was docketed as *Dennis Toeppen v. Laurell Richey*, and assigned case number 2018CH1676 (hereafter "the Chancery matter"). The matter involved claims by Dennis Toeppen, who is Ms. Richey's brother,

for replevin and other actions concerning the disposition of their mother's estate. At the time of her initial contact with Respondent, Richey was represented by another attorney in the Chancery matter.

39. After Richey's initial contact with Respondent on October 5, 2023, Respondent emailed Richey a draft retainer agreement, which did not include a signature page, as well as instructions for Richey to pay Respondent an initial retainer of \$7,500 to file his appearance and begin his representation of her in the Chancery matter.

40. Between October 5 and October 27, 2023, Richey and Respondent exchanged emails concerning his fee agreement and Richey provided Respondent with updates on the status of her representation by her then-attorney. On October 27, 2023, Richey informed Respondent that she wished to engage his services. She asked Respondent to email her a complete retainer agreement with signature pages.

41. On October 30, 2023, Richey paid Respondent \$7,500 via Zelle. At that time, Respondent did not provide Richey with a complete retainer agreement and at no time did Richey and Respondent fully execute a written agreement.

42. At the outset of their communications, Richey informed Respondent of various upcoming deadlines in the Chancery matter. In email and text communications throughout October and early November 2023, Richey repeatedly stressed to Respondent the importance of his filing an appearance and immediately beginning work on the Chancery matter.

43. Beginning on October 30, 2023, and continuing through November 5, 2023, Richey repeatedly requested a meeting with Respondent to discuss his plan for representing her in the Chancery matter. In addition, Richey repeatedly asked Respondent to send her a retainer agreement with a signature page.

44. At no time did Respondent and Richey meet to discuss Respondent's plan for his representation of Richey and at no time did Respondent file an appearance on Richey's behalf in the Chancery matter.

45. On November 6, 2023, Richey informed Respondent that she was terminating his services due to his poor communication and demanded the return of her \$7,500 retainer. On that date, Respondent emailed Richey a complete retainer agreement and told her that he was willing to represent her in the Chancery matter. Richey reiterated that she did not wish to engage Respondent's services and again asked for the return of her \$7,500 retainer.

46. Shortly thereafter, in November 2023, Richey retained new counsel to represent her in the Chancery matter. Between November 6, 2023, and December 11, 2023, both Richey and her new counsel made repeated demands of Respondent for the return of her retainer.

47. To date, Respondent has not responded to such demands and has not returned any portion of Richey's retainer to her. Respondent provided no services to justify his retention of any portion of Richey's \$7,500 retainer.

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

- a. Failure to refund an unearned fee, by conduct including failing to refund any portion of the \$7,500 fee Laurell Richey paid to Respondent in connection with Respondent's agreement to represent her in a pending lawsuit in the Chancery Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County, in violation of Rule 1.16(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

WHEREFORE, the Administrator requests that this matter be referred to a panel of the Hearing Board of the Commission, that a hearing be conducted, and that the Hearing Panel make findings of fact, conclusions of fact and law, and a recommendation for such discipline as is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

Lea Gutierrez, Administrator  
Attorney Registration and  
Disciplinary Commission

By: /s/ Matthew D. Lango  
Matthew D. Lango

Matthew D. Lango  
Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission  
One Prudential Plaza  
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (312) 565-2600  
Email: [mlango@iadc.org](mailto:mlango@iadc.org)



# **Exhibit 2**

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

In the Matter of:

**JAMES GREGORY LAS COLA,**

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6256256.

Commission No. 2024PR00025

**ORDER**

The Chair having considered Respondent’s Motion to Vacate Technical Defaults and for an Expansion of Time (“Motion”), the Administrator’s objection to Motion and the Administrator’s Motion to Deem the Allegations of the First Amended Complaint Admitted Pursuant to Commission Rule 236 (“Motion to Deem”),

**IT IS ORDERED:**

1. Respondent’s Motion is denied; and
2. The Administrator’s Motion to Deem is granted. No further proof of the allegations of the Complaint is required. The evidence presented at the hearing in this matter shall be limited to evidence of matters in aggravation and mitigation.

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois and keeper of the records, certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the order, approved by the Hearing Board Chair, entered in the above entitled cause of record filed in my office on October 4, 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Michelle M. Thome  
Michelle M. Thome,  
Clerk of the Attorney Registration and  
Disciplinary Commission of the  
Supreme Court of Illinois

**FILED**

October 04, 2024

**ARDC CLERK**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Cynthia Cerino, hereby certify that I served a copy of this Order on the Attorney-Respondent listed at the e-mail address shown below on October 4, 2024, at or before 5:00 p.m. At the same time, a copy of this Order was sent to Counsel for the Administrator by e-mail service.

James Gregory Las Cola  
Attorney-Respondent  
jgllaw@gmail.com

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that she verily believes the same to be true.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Cynthia Cerino  
Cynthia Cerino

# **Exhibit 3**

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

---

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
James Gregory Las Cola,	)	Commission No. 2024PR00025
	)	
Attorney-Respondent,	)	
	)	
No. 6256256.	)	
	)	

---

AFFIDAVIT OF PERSONAL SERVICE  
PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 214(a)

I, EDGAR A. LEON (“Affiant”), being duly sworn, hereby state:

1. Affiant is over 18 years of age, possesses firsthand knowledge of the facts presented in this Affidavit and, if called as a witness, Affiant will testify to the truth of the facts as presented in this Affidavit.

2. Affiant is an Investigator for the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois (“the Commission”) and, as such, is authorized to serve process.

3. On May 2, 2024, at approximately 9:04 A.M., Affiant was assigned to serve Respondent a Complaint and accompanying documents in person.

4. On May 2, 2024, at approximately 1:46 P.M., Affiant appeared at the Respondent’s known residence, which is located at 2677 Tanaga Basin, New Lenox, Illinois 60451, and handed Respondent the Complaint and accompanying documents, which Respondent accepted.

5. Further Affiant sayeth not.

FILED  
5/3/2024 10:44 AM  
ARDC Clerk

CERTIFICATION

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that he verily believes the same to be true.

/s/ Edgar A. Leon

Edgar A. Leon

Dated: May 3, 2024

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

**FILED**

August 15, 2024

**ARDC CLERK**

In the Matter of:

**JAMES GREGORY LAS COLA,**

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6256256.

Commission No. 2024PR00025

**ORDER**

A telephonic pre-hearing conference was held in this matter on August 14, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. Participating were Carl E. Poli, Chair; Matthew D. Lango, Counsel for the Administrator; and Respondent, *pro se*. The parties advised the Chair as to the status of the matter. Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED:**

1. The Administrator's Motion to Deem the Allegations of the Complaint Admitted is denied as moot in light of the filing of the First Amended Complaint;
2. With no objection from the Administrator, Respondent's oral motion for an extension of time to file his answer to the First Amended Complaint and report pursuant to Commission Rule 253 is granted;
3. Respondent shall file his answer to the First Amended Complaint and his report pursuant to Commission Rule 253 on or before September 18, 2024;
4. The parties shall disclose the identity of any opinion witnesses on or before December 9, 2024;
5. All opinion witness reports/written opinions shall be produced on or before

December 23, 2024;

6. Depositions of opinion witnesses shall be completed on or before January 21, 2025;

7. The parties shall complete all discovery on or before January 21, 2025;

8. All motions *in limine* shall be filed on or before January 28, 2025, with responses due on or before February 4, 2025;

9. Any stipulations of fact shall be filed with the Clerk of the Commission on or before February 4, 2025;

10. Any joint motion for approval to file petition to impose discipline on consent shall be filed on or before February 4, 2025;

11. A final pre-hearing conference is scheduled for February 11, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., and will be conducted by telephone. Counsel for the Administrator and Respondent shall be available at that time and are responsible for calling in. The Clerk of the Commission shall provide the parties with the call-in information;

12. On or before February 11, 2025, the parties shall exchange the exhibits they intend to offer at hearing along with lists of their exhibits and witnesses they intend to call;

13. The hearing in this matter is scheduled for February 18 and February 19, 2025, commencing each day at 9:30 a.m., at the Chicago offices of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, located at One Prudential Plaza, 130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500; and

14. In conformance with the Clerk of the Commission's procedures for submitting exhibits electronically, prior to the hearing each party shall submit electronic copies of the documentary exhibits to be uploaded on the Commission's iPads. Alternatively, each party shall appear at the hearing with five (5) paper copies of all documentary exhibits prepared in



conformance with Commission Rule 276. Regardless of whether exhibits are submitted electronically or in paper form, each party shall provide paper copies of that party's table of exhibits to the Chair and opposing counsel at the commencement of the hearing.

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois and keeper of the records, certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the order, approved by the Hearing Board Chair, entered in the above entitled cause of record filed in my office on August 15, 2024.

/s/ Michelle M. Thome  
Michelle M. Thome,  
Clerk of the Attorney Registration and  
Disciplinary Commission of the  
Supreme Court of Illinois

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Michelle M. Thome, hereby certify that I served a copy of this Order on the Attorney-Respondent listed at the e-mail address shown below on August 15, 2024, at or before 5:00 p.m. At the same time, a copy of this Order was sent to Counsel for the Administrator by e-mail service.

James Gregory Las Cola  
Attorney-Respondent  
jgllaw@gmail.com

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that she verily believes the same to be true.

/s/ Michelle M. Thome  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle M. Thome