

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

In the Matter of:

MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER BURR,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6255568.

Commission No. 2021PR00004

TO: Richard Gleason
Counsel for the Administrator
rgleason@iadc.org
ARDCeService@iadc.org

NOTICE OF FILING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 9, 2021, I filed Respondent's Answer to the Complaint and Report Pursuant to Commission Rule 253 with the Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission in Chicago, Illinois, a copy of which is hereby served upon you.

/s/ Stephanie Stewart
Stephanie Stewart

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that she served the above Notice of Filing and attached Respondent's Answer and Report Pursuant to Commission Rule 253 on the above person listed above by causing them to be emailed to the email addresses listed above on April 9, 2021.

/s/ Stephanie Stewart
Stephanie Stewart

Stephanie Stewart
Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke LLC
321 S. Plymouth Ct., 14th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 782-5102
sstewart@rsmdlaw.com

FILED
4/9/2021 4:05 PM
ARDC Clerk

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

In the Matter of:

MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER BURR,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6255568.

Commission No. 2021PR00004

RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT

Now comes the Respondent, Michael C. Burr, by his attorney, Stephanie Stewart of Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke LLC, denying the allegation of the prefatory paragraph to the effect that he engaged in any conduct that subjects him to discipline pursuant to Rule 770, and states, as and for his answer to the Administrator's Complaint:

RESPONDENT'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 231

- A. Respondent has been admitted to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois since 1995. He has never been disciplined by the Court.
- B. Respondent has never held any other type of professional license.

ANSWER

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, bankruptcy proceedings in the Northern District of Illinois were heard by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois ("Bankruptcy Court"). Cases pending in the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District were governed by the Bankruptcy Code (11 U.S.C., *et seq.* (2018)), the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("federal rules"), and the Local Rules of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois ("local rules").

ANSWER: Admitted.

FILED
4/9/2021 4:05 PM
ARDC Clerk

2. At all times alleged in this complaint, Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code permitted individuals and businesses with limited income and without the ability to pay all or some of their debts, to liquidate their assets in order to discharge those debts.

ANSWER: Admitted.

3. At all times alleged in this complaint, Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code required that the Bankruptcy Court automatically issue an “Order for Relief” upon a petitioner filing a bankruptcy petition. The Order for Relief stayed any collection efforts initiated by creditors, including but not limited to repossession of a debtor’s vehicle and garnishment of a debtor’s wages, for as long as the bankruptcy petition was pending. The stay provided for by the Order for Relief applied to collection efforts that were initiated or that could have been initiated prior to the Order for Relief but did not apply to debts incurred after the Order for Relief.

ANSWER: Admitted.

4. At all times alleged in this complaint, Section 727(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provided for the discharge of debt incurred by a petitioner prior to the Order for Relief entered in the petitioner’s bankruptcy proceeding. The Bankruptcy Code did not provide for the discharge of debt incurred by the petitioner after the Order for Relief.

ANSWER: Admitted.

5. At all times alleged in this Complaint, Bankruptcy Rule 1007 (“Rule 1007”) required a debtor to file the following documents (collectively, “schedules and statements”) within fourteen days of the bankruptcy petition being filed:

- a. a schedule of assets and liabilities (“Schedule A”); A&B
- b. a schedule of current income and expenditures (“Schedule B”); I&J
- c. a schedule of executory contracts and unexpired leases (“Schedule C”); G
- d. a statement of financial affairs;
- e. a statement of intention;
- f. a statement of compliance with credit counseling; and
- g. a statement of current monthly income.

ANSWER: Admitted.

6. At all times alleged in this complaint, Bankruptcy Rule 1008 required that a debtor certify the accuracy of all petitions, schedules, statements, and amendments filed on the debtor’s behalf in the bankruptcy proceeding.

ANSWER: Admitted.

7. At all times alleged in this complaint, the Bankruptcy Code required that a debtor file an official bankruptcy form called a 106Dec (“106 Declaration”) whenever the debtor filed schedules or amended schedules. The 106 Declaration provided that a debtor declare, under penalty of perjury, that the debtor had read the summary and schedules filed with the 106 Declaration, and that the summary and schedules were true and correct.

ANSWER: Admitted.

COUNT I
(Directing Johnson to Commit Fraud)

8. On December 1, 2017, Tina Johnson (“Johnson”) met in person with Respondent for the first time about the possibility of discharging her consumer debt through bankruptcy. Based on Johnson’s limited income and inability to pay all or most of her debts, Respondent counseled Johnson that it would be in her interests to file for bankruptcy pursuant to Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code (“Chapter 7 bankruptcy”).

ANSWER: Admitted. In further answering, prior to December 1, 2017 others with Fairmax had discussed Ms. Johnson’s situation with her. Ms. Johnson had previously assembled some documents necessary for preparation of the bankruptcy schedules.

9. During Respondent’s December 1, 2017 meeting with Johnson, Respondent prepared a bankruptcy petition to file on Johnson’s behalf, and Johnson signed the bankruptcy petition certifying that the information contained in the petition was true and correct.

ANSWER: Admitted.

10. Respondent also prepared incomplete drafts of Johnson’s schedules and statements, defined in paragraph 5, above.

ANSWER: Denied. Johnson’s schedules and statements were substantially complete on December 1, 2017.

11. Respondent was not able to complete Johnson’s schedules and statements during the December 1, 2017 meeting, because Johnson was not able to provide Respondent with a complete list of her debts and creditors.

ANSWER: Denied. All schedules were substantially completed on December 1, 2017. Approximately 2 or 3 creditors were missing so the filing of the case was delayed for a few

days to allow Ms. Johnson to obtain the creditor information, which she did and approved the addition of that information to her schedules and statements.

12. During the December 1, 2017 meeting, Respondent also presented Johnson with a 106 Declaration for her to sign which purported to certify that the yet-to-be-completed schedules and statements, described in paragraph 5, above, were true and correct. At Respondent's direction, Johnson signed the 106 Declaration without dating it, even though Respondent had not yet completed the schedules and statements on Johnson's behalf which Johnson, by her signature, was purporting to certify as truthful and accurate.

ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent presented Ms. Johnson with a 106 Declaration to sign on December 1, 2017. The remaining allegations are denied. The schedules were substantially completed and reviewed by Ms. Johnson. They were truthful and accurate. Furthermore, the 106 Declaration was provided to Ms. Johnson for her signature on December 1, 2017, as a courtesy to Ms. Johnson, because she did not want to have to drive back to the office on a later date.

13. On December 5, 2017, Respondent filed Johnson's Chapter 7 bankruptcy petition in the Bankruptcy Court. The clerk of the court docketed the matter *In re Tina Johnson*, and assigned the matter case number 17-82868.

ANSWER: Admitted.

14. On January 3, 2018, Respondent filed Johnson's schedules and statements, and the 106 Declaration Johnson executed on December 1, 2017, as described in paragraphs 10 through 12, above.

ANSWER: Admitted that on January 3, 2018 Respondent filed Johnson's schedules and statements, and the 106 Declaration Johnson executed on December 1, 2017. Denied that it was "as described" in paragraphs 10 through 12 except as admitted therein.

15. At no time prior to filing Johnson's completed schedules and statements on January 3, 2018 did Respondent provide the completed set of those documents to Johnson for her to review and certify as truthful and correct. Instead, Respondent filed the undated 106 Declaration he had directed Johnson to execute during Respondent's December 1, 2017 meeting with Johnson, as described in paragraph 12, above.

ANSWER: Denied. Documents were provided and reviewed by Ms. Johnson on December 1, 2017, and were substantially complete as described above.

16. At the time Respondent filed the undated 106 Declaration as described in paragraph 14, above, the declaration was false, because Johnson had not reviewed the completed schedules and statements before they were filed.

ANSWER: Denied. The Declaration was executed by Ms. Johnson following her review of substantially completed documents and approval of the additional information that she provided thereafter.

17. At the time Respondent filed the undated 106 Declaration with the Bankruptcy Court as described in paragraph 14, above, Respondent knew the declaration was false, because Respondent had instructed Johnson to execute the declaration before Respondent completed Johnson's schedules and statements, and then filed Johnson's schedules and statements and Johnson's declaration without first providing Johnson the completed schedules and statements to review for truthfulness and accuracy.

ANSWER: Denied. The Declaration was executed by Ms. Johnson following her review of substantially completed documents and approval of the additional information that she provided thereafter.

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

a. Counseling and assisting a client to commit fraud, by conduct including Respondent's direction to Johnson to execute an undated declaration in which Johnson certified the truthfulness and accuracy of schedules and statements filed with the Bankruptcy Court which Respondent had not yet completed at the time Johnson executed the declaration, and which Johnson had not reviewed, in violation of Rule 1.2(d) and of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);

ANSWER: Denied.

and

b. Making a false statement to a tribunal, by conduct including Respondent's representation to the Bankruptcy Court, through Respondent's filings, that Johnson had certified the truthfulness and accuracy of documents Respondent filed on Johnson's behalf, knowing that the representation was false, in violation of Rule 3.3(a)(1) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Denied.

COUNT II
(False Statements to Bankruptcy Trustee)

19. The Administrator realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs one through 17 above.

ANSWER: Respondent realleges his answers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-17 above as if fully set forth herein.

20. On January 3, 2018, Respondent filed with the Bankruptcy Court a disclosure of his fees, pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2016(b). On January 30, 2018, Respondent filed an amended disclosure of his fees.

ANSWER: Admitted.

21. On February 9, 2018, the United States Bankruptcy Trustee (“the Trustee”) filed a motion to compel against Respondent, seeking Respondent’s production of time records reflecting the time spent by Respondent pertaining to his work on Johnson’s bankruptcy case, as well as any record of fees paid by Johnson. The Trustee explained in the motion that it was seeking the information in order to assess the reasonableness of Respondent’s fees, pursuant to the Trustee’s statutory duties in Section 344 of the Bankruptcy Code.

ANSWER: Admitted.

22. In response to the Trustee’s motion, Respondent personally prepared an itemization of his and his staff’s time records.

ANSWER: Admitted.

23. On February 16, 2018, Respondent emailed the Trustee the itemization Respondent personally prepared, described in paragraph 22, above.

ANSWER: Admitted. In further answering, the itemization was never filed with the Court.

24. The itemization said that on December 10, 2017, December 29, 2017, and December 30, 2017, Respondent emailed Johnson to remind her that her signature was required on certain documents related to the bankruptcy. The itemization further said that on January 2, 2018, Respondent reviewed a fax of Johnson’s final signed papers, and that Respondent approved of filing the remaining papers following his review of the papers.

ANSWER: Admitted that the December 10 and December 29 entries on the itemization indicated Ms. Johnson was emailed about “signatures needed” or “need for everything to be signed.” Denied that December 30 entry stated anything about her signature. Denied that the last sentence accurately reflects the January 2, 2018 entry on the itemization. The itemization is the best evidence of its contents and the entries therein speak for themselves.

25. Respondent’s description in the itemization of his time spent on December 10, 2017 was false and intentionally misleading because Respondent’s email described in the entry for December 10, 2017 did not pertain to Respondent’s requests for any schedules or statements or certifications from Johnson. Rather, Respondent’s email to Johnson asked that Johnson return to Respondent Johnson’s executed fee agreement and payment authorization.

ANSWER: Admitted that the entry for December 10, 2017 was unclear and thus potentially misleading. The remaining allegations are denied. In further answering, the entry states “[s]ent email to client about post filing papers and signatures needed.”

26. Respondent knew that the description in the itemization of his time spent on December 10, 2017 was false and intended it to be misleading, because at the time of his December 10, 2017 email to Johnson, Respondent already possessed the 106 Declaration from Johnson purporting to certify the accuracy of the schedules and statements.

ANSWER: Admitted that the description in the December 10, 2017 entry on the itemization was unclear and thus potentially misleading. The remaining allegations are denied.

27. Respondent’s description in the itemization of his time spent on December 29, 2017 was false and intentionally misleading because Respondent’s email to Johnson on December 29, 2017 did not pertain to Respondent’s requests for any schedules or statements or certifications from Johnson. Rather, Respondent’s email to Johnson asked that Johnson return to Respondent Johnson’s executed fee agreement and payment authorization.

ANSWER: Admitted that the description in the December 29, 2017 entry on the itemization was a misstatement and thus potentially misleading. In further answering, the entry states “[e]mailed client about need for everything to be signed.”

28. Respondent knew that the description in the itemization of his time spent on December 29, 2017 was false and intended it to be misleading, because at the time of his December 29, 2017 email to Johnson, Respondent already possessed the 106 Declaration from Johnson purporting to certify the accuracy of the schedules and statements.

ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent knew that the description in the December 29, 2017 entry on the itemization was a misstatement and thus potentially misleading. Denied that the 106 Declaration “purport[ed]” to certify the accuracy of the schedules and statements.

29. Respondent’s description in the itemization of his time spent December 30, 2017 was false and intentionally misleading because Respondent’s email to Johnson on December 30, 2017 did not pertain to Respondent’s requests for any schedules and statements or certifications from Johnson. Rather, Respondent’s email to Johnson asked that Johnson return to Respondent Johnson’s executed fee agreement and payment authorization.

ANSWER: Admitted that the description in the December 30, 2017 entry on the itemization was unclear and potentially misleading. The remaining allegations are denied. In further answering, the entry states “[f]ollow up email and phone call about need for papers to be returned.”

30. Respondent knew that the description in the itemization of his time spent on December 30, 2017 was false and intended it to be misleading, because at the time of his December 30, 2017 email to Johnson, Respondent already possessed the 106 Declaration from Johnson purporting to certify the accuracy of the schedules and statements.

ANSWER: Admitted that the description in the December 30, 2017 entry on the itemization was unclear and potentially misleading. The remaining allegations are denied.

31. Respondent’s description in the itemization of his time spent on January 2, 2018 was false and intentionally misleading because Respondent was not reviewing papers to be filed in Johnson’s bankruptcy case. Rather, Respondent was reviewing Johnson’s executed fee agreement and payment authorization.

ANSWER: Admitted that the entry for January 2, 2018 was a misstatement and potentially misleading. Denied that the entry states that Respondent was reviewing papers to be filed in Johnson’s bankruptcy case. The entry states “[r]eviewed fax from staff with final papers, okay to proceed with filing remaining papers.”

32. Respondent knew that the description in the itemization was false and intended it to be misleading, because on January 2, 2018 Respondent already possessed all of the completed schedules and statements he intended to file on Johnson’s behalf the following day, and on January 3, 2018 filed the undated 106 Declaration he previously directed Johnson to sign on December 1, 2017, before Respondent had completed Johnson’s schedules and statements.

ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent knew that the January 2, 2018 entry on the itemization was a misstatement and potentially misleading. Denied that Respondent had not substantially completed Ms. Johnson's schedules and statements by December 1, 2017.

33. By providing the false and intentionally misleading itemization, Respondent intended to convince the Trustee that Respondent's work preparing Johnson's schedules and statements was performed after the bankruptcy petition had been filed on Johnson's behalf December 5, 2017. Respondent intended that upon review of the itemization, the Trustee would believe that Respondent's fees were generated after the bankruptcy petition was filed and were thus not dischargeable debt pursuant to Section 727(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, as described in paragraph four, above.

ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent knew that the December 29 and January 2 entries contained misstatements and were potentially misleading, so that it would appear that Respondent's work preparing Johnson's schedules and statements was performed after the bankruptcy petition had been filed on Johnson's behalf on December 5, 2017, and thus was not dischargeable debt. Respondent deeply regrets his actions in that regard. On May 16, 2018, Respondent spoke to the Trustee and informed her that the itemization contained misstatements.

34. Respondent knew the itemization described in paragraphs 23 through 26, above, was false and intentionally misleading because he personally participated in the communications with Johnson described in the itemization, personally prepared the itemization, and then provided the itemization to the Trustee.

ANSWER: Respondent admits that the itemization he prepared and provided to the Trustee contained misstatements as to the December 29, 2017, and January 2, 2018 entries and was potentially misleading. Respondent deeply regrets his actions in that regard. On May 16, 2018, Respondent spoke to the Trustee and informed her that the itemization contained misstatements. The remaining allegations are denied.

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

- a. Engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including Respondent's dishonest preparation of an itemization of his time spent on case no. 17-82868 and providing the false and intentionally misleading itemization to the Trustee, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Respondent admits that the itemization he prepared and provided to the trustee contained misstatements as to the December 29, 2017 and January 2, 2018 entries and was potentially misleading. Respondent deeply regrets his actions in that regard. On

May 16, 2018, Respondent spoke to the Trustee and informed her that the itemization contained misstatements. Respondent denies that he engaged in any fraud.

WHEREFORE, Respondent requests that the Panel make a recommendation for a just and fair resolution in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL C. BURR

/s/ Stephanie Stewart

Stephanie Stewart

Stephanie Stewart
Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke LLC
321 S. Plymouth Court, 14th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 782-5102
sstewart@rsmdlaw.com