

In re Oscar Antonio Gonzalez
Petitioner

Supreme Court No. M.R. 32093
Commission No. 2024PR00009

Synopsis of Hearing Board Report and Recommendation
(July 2025)

Petitioner, who was suspended in 2021 for one year and until further order of the Court, filed a petition seeking reinstatement of his license to practice law. The Administrator did not object to the petition but requested that Petitioner be required to comply with certain conditions if he is reinstated. After considering the factors set forth in Supreme Court Rule 767 to determine Petitioner's rehabilitation, good character and current knowledge of the law, the Hearing Board found that Petitioner met his burden of proof and recommended that the petition for reinstatement be granted, subject to conditions.

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

In the Matter of:

OSCAR ANTONIO GONZALEZ,

Petitioner,

No. 6309106.

Supreme Court No. M.R. 32093

Commission No. 2024PR00009

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEARING BOARD

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

Petitioner seeks reinstatement following his suspension in 2021 for one year and until further order of the Court. The Administrator does not object to the petition for reinstatement but asks that certain conditions be attached if the Court allows Petitioner to resume the practice of law. We find that Petitioner met his burden of establishing that he meets the requirements for reinstatement and recommend that his petition be granted, subject to conditions.

INTRODUCTION

The hearing in this matter was held on May 14, 2025, before a Panel of the Hearing Board consisting of Carol A. Hogan, Chair, Hal R. Morris, and Michael J. Friduss. Petitioner was present and was represented by James A. Doppke. Kate E. Levine and Matthew D. Lango represented the Administrator.

PETITION AND RESPONSE

Petitioner filed his petition for reinstatement on February 13, 2024. On March 10, 2025, the Administrator filed a response requesting that reinstatement, if granted, be subject to conditions.

FILED

July 30, 2025

ARDC CLERK

EVIDENCE

Petitioner testified on his own behalf and presented testimony from three witnesses. Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 7 were admitted into evidence. (Tr. 10). The Administrator's Exhibits 1 through 3 were admitted (Tr. 6), and the Administrator called one witness.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

An attorney seeking reinstatement to the practice of law bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that he or she meets the requirements for reinstatement. In re Richman, 191 Ill. 2d 238, 244 (2000). While less stringent than the criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, the clear and convincing standard requires a firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition at issue is true. In re Czarnik, 2016PR00131, M.R. 29949 (Sept. 16, 2019).

The objectives in a reinstatement matter include safeguarding the public, maintaining the integrity of the profession, and protecting the administration of justice from reproach. In re Mills, 2021PR00099, M.R. 031068 (March 21, 2023). There is no presumption in favor of reinstatement, and the mere passage of time is not a sufficient basis for granting the petition. Richman, 191 Ill. 2d at 247-48.

The focus of this proceeding is on Petitioner's rehabilitation, good character, and current knowledge of the law, with rehabilitation being the most important consideration. In re Martinez-Fraticelli, 221 Ill. 2d 255, 270 (2006). We consider the following factors as well as any additional factors we deem appropriate: 1) the nature of the misconduct for which Petitioner was disciplined; 2) Petitioner's maturity and experience at the time discipline was imposed; 3) whether Petitioner recognizes the nature and seriousness of the misconduct; 4) when applicable, whether Petitioner

has made restitution; 5) Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed; and 6) Petitioner's candor and forthrightness in presenting evidence in support of the petition. Ill. S.Ct. R. 767(f).

I. Nature of misconduct for which petitioner was disciplined

A. Evidence Considered

In 2016, Petitioner became the president of the Puerto Rican Bar Association. (Tr. 37). As president, he had access to the bar association's bank account and credit and debit cards linked to that account. Between November 2016 and July 2017, he withdrew more than \$16,000 from the bar association's bank account and used the funds for personal purposes, without authorization. (Adm. Ex. 3). He admitted to his misconduct when members of the bar association confronted him. (Tr. 39-41, 45).

After the misappropriation came to light, the Administrator filed a disciplinary complaint against Petitioner on August 23, 2018. In connection with that proceeding, Stafford C. Henry, M.D. evaluated Petitioner and diagnosed him with multiple substance abuse disorders and a history of major depressive disorder. Dr. Henry concluded that Petitioner had not made an active effort to enter recovery and was at a significant risk for relapse. Petitioner and the Administrator entered into an agreement for discipline on consent, in which Petitioner admitted to the misconduct. (Adm. Ex. 3 at 5). The Court allowed the petition to impose discipline on consent and suspended Petitioner for one year and until further order of the Court. In re Gonzalez, 2018PR00066, M.R. 030659 (March 16, 2021).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Petitioner engaged in serious misconduct by acting dishonestly for his own personal gain. The fact that his misconduct did not involve a client does not make it any less serious. See In re Chandler, 161 Ill. 2d 459, 473 (1994) ("The fraudulent act of an attorney acting on his own behalf in which he seeks personal gain, directly or indirectly, to the detriment of honesty, is no less

reprehensible than when he acts on behalf of his client.”). That said, we find that the misconduct was not so egregious as to bar reinstatement. Other attorneys who engaged in serious misconduct have been allowed to return to practice. Mills, 2021PR00099 (reinstatement following purchase and use of illegal drugs while an assistant State’s Attorney); In re Hayes, 2018PR00090, M.R. 29589 (Nov. 19, 2019) (reinstatement following disorderly conduct and battery against police officers); In re Glasson, 2011PR00087, M.R. 24762 (May 20, 2013) (reinstatement following conversion of \$8,700 from attorney’s law firm and writing \$2,880 in bad checks).

II. Maturity and experience when discipline was imposed

A. Evidence Considered

Petitioner was licensed to practice law in Illinois in 2012. (Tr. 25). Before his suspension, he worked as a Cook County assistant public defender for approximately four years and then opened a solo practice in 2017. (Pet. for Reinstmt at 12-13; Tr. 27, 28). At the time of the misconduct, he was approximately 36 years of age and had been licensed for 4 years. At the time discipline was imposed, he was 40 years old and had been practicing law for 8 years. (Pet. for Reinstmt. at 9).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Youth and lack of experience are relevant considerations in a reinstatement proceeding because either may explain an attorney’s lack of good judgment in committing misconduct. In re Juliano, 2011PR00032, M.R. 24589 (Sept. 12, 2013) (Hearing Bd. at 20). Although it was fairly early in Petitioner’s career when his misconduct began, the prohibition on using funds belonging to others was a fundamental one that did not require maturity or legal experience to understand. Even though this factor does not mitigate the misconduct, we give some weight to Petitioner’s impairment during the time of the misconduct and the resulting effect on his judgment. See Hayes, 2018PR00090 (Hearing Bd. at 5). We further note that mature and experienced attorneys have

been reinstated when they have successfully demonstrated their rehabilitation. Martinez-Fraticelli, 221 Ill. 2d at 275, 281-82.

III. Recognition of the nature and seriousness of the misconduct

A. Evidence Considered

Petitioner testified that his conduct was unethical and wrong because he deceived the members of the Puerto Rican Bar Association, broke their trust, and wrongfully used money that did not belong to him. He recognizes that he did not fully take responsibility or feel remorse for his behavior at the time due to his addictions. He was not thinking clearly and was “so deep into using” that he did not consider the repercussions of his actions. Looking back after being in recovery, his conduct is embarrassing and humiliating. (Tr. 40-42).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Whether a petitioner recognizes the nature and seriousness of past misconduct is an important factor in assessing whether reinstatement is warranted. In re Sosman, 2012PR00150, M.R. 25693 (Sept. 12, 2014). Expressions of remorse and acknowledgements of wrongdoing may establish this factor. In re Wexler, 2017PR00071, M.R. 28878 (March 16, 2021).

We find Petitioner sincerely regrets his misconduct and accepts responsibility for it. His attitude and perspective have changed significantly since his disciplinary proceeding. He has squarely taken accountability for his actions without making excuses or seeking to minimize his wrongdoing. Accordingly, we find that this factor weighs in Petitioner’s favor.

IV. Restitution

A. Admitted Facts and Evidence Considered

Before discipline was imposed, Petitioner repaid the Puerto Rican Bar Association with a loan he obtained from the Chicago Patrolmen’s Credit Union (credit union). (Adm. Ex. 3 at 1; Tr. 72). Petitioner had financial difficulties after he was suspended and could not pay his debts, but he

wanted to avoid filing for bankruptcy. (Tr. 73, 103-104). In 2025, the credit union obtained a judgment against him due to nonpayment of the loan and began garnishing his wages. Petitioner testified he did not receive notice of the credit union's lawsuit. However, he acknowledges that he owes the amount of the judgment, does not object to the garnishment, and expects the judgment will be paid in 18 months. (Tr.73-75).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Both parties take the position that Petitioner has made restitution. It is undisputed that he paid back the Puerto Rican Bar Association for the funds he misappropriated. However, he did not make payments on his credit union loan, without which he could not have repaid the bar association. Because Petitioner still owes a debt that resulted from his misappropriation of funds, we are not completely in agreement with the parties' position. We acknowledge that Petitioner recognized his obligation to pay back the bar association and was not in a financial position to repay the loan. We question whether it was meaningful restitution, though, for Petitioner to substitute his financial obligation to the bar association for an obligation to the credit union and then fail to pay the credit union. Were it not for the garnishment of Petitioner's wages, we would be inclined to find that this factor has not been met. Nonetheless, based on the garnishment and Petitioner's testimony that the judgment in favor of the credit union will be paid in approximately 18 months, we find that restitution has been satisfactorily addressed.

V. **Conduct since discipline was imposed**

A. Evidence Considered

Health and Sobriety

Petitioner has a long history of drug and alcohol use, spanning from age 14 or 15 through approximately age 40. He attended intensive outpatient treatment during law school, but it was unsuccessful. (Tr. 91-92).

In 2004, Petitioner suffered a spinal cord injury that caused him to be paralyzed from the neck down for over two months. Over the course of a three-year recovery, he was able to regain his ability to use his limbs. He still has some limitations on his right side. (Tr. 22-24).

In 2016, Petitioner's cousin and uncle committed suicide. Petitioner had been close to both of them. Their deaths sent Petitioner into a downward spiral. (Tr. 31, 33).

At the time of his disciplinary proceeding, Petitioner was still using unprescribed drugs and alcohol. (Tr. 45-46). After he was suspended, he hit rock bottom and checked himself into an inpatient detoxification program in October 2021. He completed that program, followed by intensive outpatient treatment. (Pet. Ex. 7; Tr. 47-52). He has participated in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) since he was discharged from inpatient treatment, and it has been integral to his recovery. He attended 120 meetings in 120 days. (Tr. 61-62). He has not used alcohol or unprescribed drugs since October 2021. (Tr. 135).

In 2022, Petitioner began receiving behavioral therapy focused on substance abuse, addiction, PTSD, anxiety, and other cognitive behavioral issues. He maintained this treatment until he lost his healthcare insurance in 2024. He now has healthcare insurance and was scheduled to meet with a new therapist the week following this hearing. (Tr. 61). Before Petitioner was in recovery, he did not think individual therapy was valuable. He now understands its benefits and views it as part of his life going forward. (Tr. 100, 172, 176).

Petitioner also regularly sees his primary care physician, who oversees his prescription medication. He takes medication for attention deficit disorder, which is under control. He follows his physician's recommendations and intends to continue to do so. (Tr. 57-58).

Petitioner welcomes any conditions that are placed upon his reinstatement and will continue to be abstinent, participate in AA and therapy, and follow his doctor's treatment recommendations regardless of whether he is required to do so. (Tr. 71, 176).

Evaluation by Dr. Henry

Stafford Henry, M.D., who is board-certified in general, forensic, and addiction psychiatry, evaluated Petitioner in connection with his disciplinary proceeding and this reinstatement proceeding. In evaluating Petitioner between 2019 and 2021, Dr. Henry's diagnoses included major depressive disorder, multiple substance use disorders, and post-traumatic stress disorder. (Tr. 118-120). During those evaluations, Petitioner falsely told Dr. Henry that he was not using alcohol or unprescribed drugs. When he underwent drug testing, the test results revealed that he had been using those substances. (Tr. 44, 166-67, 169). At the time of the disciplinary proceeding, Dr. Henry concluded that Petitioner did not have the ability to consistently adhere to the Rules of Professional Conduct. (Tr. 122-23).

Dr. Henry evaluated Petitioner again in December 2024 and January 2025. (Adm. Ex. 2). Immediately upon seeing Dr. Henry, Petitioner apologized for having lied to him about his substance use. (Tr. 127, 129). Dr. Henry found that Petitioner's apology was genuine and demonstrated that he was making amends and changing his behaviors. (Tr. 128). Dr. Henry opined that Petitioner's completion of the detoxification and outpatient chemical dependency programs, his participation in AA, and his individual therapy, led to stable recovery and mental health. Dr. Henry had recommended that Petitioner attend 90 AA meetings in 90 days, but Petitioner exceeded that number of his own volition. (Tr. 130-33).

When Dr. Henry and Petitioner met in December 2024, Dr. Henry asked Petitioner to do some additional work including attending AA meetings in person instead of virtually and following a certain structure with respect to the AA steps. (Tr. 124). When Petitioner returned to see Dr.

Henry in January 2025, he had done what Dr. Henry asked of him. (Tr. 138). Dr. Henry opined that Petitioner's recovery and general approach to life have been "not only remarkable, but represent the kind of fundamental paradigm shift seen in genuine and solid recovery." (Adm. Ex. 2).

Dr. Henry's most recent diagnoses of Petitioner are that his substance use disorders and post-traumatic stress disorder are in sustained remission. His major depressive disorder is in remission. (Adm. Ex. 2; Tr. 141-43). Petitioner has attention deficit disorder, which is well-controlled with his current medication. Dr. Henry has no concerns about Petitioner's candor or forthrightness. (Tr. 138). He has done everything that can be done to put into place a solid and comprehensive recovery program. (Tr. 144). From a mental health standpoint, Dr. Henry is of the opinion that Petitioner would be able to consistently adhere to the Rules of Professional Conduct. (Tr. 117).

Dr. Henry recommends the following conditions if Petitioner is reinstated: continued participation in a twelve-step program at least two to three times per week with at least one meeting being in-person; continued contact with his AA sponsor; remaining abstinent; complying with all of his physician's treatment recommendations; and engaging in service work. (Tr. 144-45). When asked how long the conditions should remain in place, Dr. Henry testified they should continue indefinitely. (Tr. 147).

Employment and Finances

In 2022 and 2023, Petitioner's primary source of income was driving for ride-share services. He drove for ten to eleven hours per day, with half a day off per week. Driving for long periods was physically and mentally difficult due to Petitioner's prior injuries and lack of regular sleep. (Tr. 65, 102).

In 2023, Petitioner began working for Casa Michoacan, a community service organization. He initially worked with the City/Key program, which helps provide people in the immigrant community with identification cards. (Tr. 66). In October 2024, he began a position as a healthcare navigator, to educate people on access to healthcare. (Tr. 68, 102).

Petitioner currently owes a significant amount in student loans and the loan from the Chicago Patrolmen's Credit Union. As discussed in the restitution section above, his wages are being garnished to pay the judgment in favor of the credit union. (Tr. 75). Petitioner plans to supplement his income with ride-share driving so he can make ends meet until the judgment is paid. (Tr. 73). He has been communicating with the Department of Education about a payment plan for his student loan debt. (Tr. 76).

Petitioner did not file tax returns in 2019, 2020, and 2023. (Tr. 105).

Current Knowledge of the Law

Petitioner's efforts to keep abreast of the law consist primarily of watching YouTube videos by lawyers who discuss high profile cases and interesting evidentiary and procedural issues. He also listens to discussions about immigration issues with coworkers at Casa Michoacan. (Tr. 69-70, 180-81).

Character Testimony

Attorney Mark Broaddus met Petitioner in 2021 through AA and became Petitioner's sponsor in March 2024. (Tr. 79-81). Broaddus testified that Petitioner has been very engaged and committed to working through the twelve-step process. (82). He has candidly shared the circumstances that led to his suspension and the mistakes he made. (Tr. 83-84). Based on Broaddus's observations, Petitioner is stable in his recovery, has changed his way of life, and is able to exhibit the honesty required of lawyers. (Tr. 85-86).

Luis Fuentes has been a friend of Petitioner's since college and is the director of the CityKey program for the City of Chicago. (Tr. 151-52). Fuentes recommended Petitioner for his position with Casa Michoacan, and they see each other two to three times a week. (Tr. 154). After Petitioner lost his law license, he told Fuentes he had substance abuse issues that led him to take money from an organization. (Tr. 153). In Fuentes' view, Petitioner has become a different person since his suspension. (Tr. 156).

Amanda Rivera, Petitioner's sister, testified that Petitioner has been candid with his family about his misconduct and never shied away from taking responsibility for his actions. (Tr. 161). She observed his recovery efforts and his journey to becoming sober. She has no doubts as to his character, integrity, and honesty. (Tr. 162).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Rehabilitation involves a return to a beneficial, constructive, and trustworthy role in society. In re Wigoda, 77 Ill. 2d 154, 159 (1979). Petitioner's activity since discipline was imposed, including his employment, charitable or volunteer work, and overall responsibility, provides insight into these issues. Wexler, 2017PR00071 (Hearing Bd. at 16). Character evidence is also relevant. Id. We find that Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed supports reinstatement.

Petitioner is to be commended for achieving and maintaining his sobriety and addressing his mental health. Dr. Henry's testimony and opinions satisfy us that Petitioner's substance use disorders are in sustained remission and there is no mental health reason that would inhibit his ability to practice law. Petitioner's character witnesses provided credible and impactful testimony regarding his commitment to his recovery and return to a position of trustworthiness. By all accounts, Petitioner has made significant changes to his life and has the tools and support he will need if he is allowed to return to practice.

The evidence pertaining to Petitioner's employment further supports our determination that he has returned to a constructive and trustworthy role. Until he was able to obtain employment with Casa Michoacan, Petitioner supported himself by working as a ride-share driver despite the physical challenges that work posed for him. In his current job, Petitioner provides valuable services to the immigrant community. His financial situation appears to be stabilizing now that he has regular employment. While he has debt, indebtedness is not necessarily fatal to reinstatement if the petitioner has demonstrated financial responsibility and has made attempts to reduce the debt. See In re Smith, 2017PR00105, M.R. 28983 (Sept. 21, 2020) (Hearing Bd. at 12). We find that Petitioner's efforts to avoid bankruptcy, his monthly garnishment payments toward the credit union judgment, and his undisputed testimony that he is working on a payment plan for his student loans demonstrate his efforts to reduce his debt. We are confident that Petitioner will make further progress toward financial security if he is reinstated and able to return to practicing law.

The one area where we found Petitioner's evidence lacking was his current knowledge of the law. We do not find that his viewing of YouTube videos established this factor by clear and convincing evidence. That said, this insufficiency does not preclude us from recommending reinstatement. We find that Petitioner can sufficiently refresh his knowledge of the law by completing his continuing legal education requirements as required by Supreme Court Rule 791(f). See Mills, 2021PR00099 (Hearing Bd. at 13); In re Kipnis, 2012PR00142, M.R. 25660 (Nov. 20, 2013).

Overall, we find that Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed supports reinstatement.

VI. Candor in presenting the petition

A. Admitted Facts and Evidence Considered

The Administrator represented that her investigation of this matter revealed no concerns as to Petitioner's candor. (Adm. Resp. at 4).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

In presenting a petition for reinstatement, an attorney is expected to act with a high level of care, candor, and judgment. In re Howard, 2010PR00067, M.R. 23910 (Sept. 25, 2013). This obligation encompasses both the written petition and the petitioner's testimony. See In re Salem, 2019PR00035, M.R. 029861 (Sept. 23, 2021) (Hearing Bd. at 26). We find that Petitioner was forthright and open in his testimony and presentation of his petition. He testified honestly about his addictions and their effects on his life, the misconduct that led to his suspension, his treatment and recovery, and his conduct since he was suspended. Accordingly, we find that this factor weighs in Petitioner's favor.

VII. Petitioner's plans if reinstated

A. Evidence Considered

If reinstated, Petitioner would like to represent clients who have sustained traumatic injuries. (Tr. 76-77). He recognizes he will not be ready to handle this type of case by himself immediately upon returning to practice. He would take CLE and contact attorney friends for guidance. (Tr. 179).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 767(f), we may consider any other factors that we deem appropriate. In the interest of protecting the public and the profession, we find it appropriate to consider Petitioner's plans for returning to practice if reinstated. Petitioner has not been away from the practice of law for a long period of time but, if reinstated, he intends to practice in an area

where he has limited experience. In light of this new practice area, we believe he should be required to work with a mentor. In addition, Petitioner was impaired throughout law school and his prior years in practice, and a mentor will ensure he is practicing with the requisite level of skill and legal knowledge. Because the foregoing concerns may be adequately addressed with appropriate conditions, this factor does not preclude us from recommending reinstatement.

RECOMMENDATION

In a reinstatement proceeding, the focus is on the petitioner's rehabilitation and character, with rehabilitation being the most important factor. In re Martinez-Fraticelli, 221 Ill. 2d 255. Our objective is to safeguard the public, maintain the integrity of the profession, and protect the administration of justice from reproach. In re Berkley, 96 Ill. 2d 404, 410 (1983).

Having considered all of the relevant factors, we find that Petitioner established his rehabilitation and good character by clear and convincing evidence. Most importantly, he has been sober for over three years, is in sustained remission, and is committed to maintaining the practices, including participating in AA and individual therapy, that have benefited him. He appreciates the severity of his misconduct and expressed remorse for it. He has no mental health impairment that would prevent him from practicing law ethically and competently. We observed his honesty, trustworthiness, and changed attitudes through his testimony, and his character witnesses testified to these qualities as well. Although he has debts, he is gainfully employed and working toward reducing those debts. For these reasons, we find that Petitioner has established by clear and convincing evidence that he should be reinstated to the practice of law.

We agree with the Administrator that reinstatement should be conditioned upon Petitioner's compliance with conditions focused his health and oversight of his law practice. In the interest of protecting the public, it is appropriate to recommend conditional reinstatement when

certain circumstances are present, such as a history of substance abuse. See In re Hildebrand, 2015PR00015, M.R. 27265 (Sept. 22, 2016). We accept Dr. Henry's recommendations that Petitioner remain abstinent, continue with AA and individual therapy, maintain contact with his AA sponsor, and continue regular visits with his primary care physician and follow all treatment recommendations. In addition, we recommend that Petitioner submit to random substance testing to assure he remains sober. We decline to adopt the recommendation that Petitioner be required to engage in community service, as that is not a condition typically placed upon reinstated attorneys. We also decline to recommend the Administrator's requested conditions that Petitioner be required to submit proof he has filed tax returns from prior years and proof of loan payment plans, as we find those conditions unrelated to the misconduct or Petitioner's rehabilitation.

In addition to complying with MCLE requirements for reinstated attorneys, we further recommend that Petitioner work with a supervising attorney, complete a law office management program, and submit to periodic audits of his client trust account in the event he establishes a solo practice. These conditions will provide Petitioner with support for practice-related issues in addition to protecting the public and the profession.

With respect to the time frame for the recommended conditions, we do not believe they should be in place indefinitely as Dr. Henry stated. Petitioner recognizes the need for lifelong abstinence and the benefits of continuing with AA and his current treatment. We have no reason to doubt that he will continue on the path he has established for himself. Therefore, we determine that a two-year period of conditions is sufficient to ensure that Petitioner successfully reacclimates to the practice of law.

Having carefully considered the relevant evidence and the factors set forth in Rule 767, we recommend that Oscar Antonio Gonzalez be reinstated to the practice of law subject to the following conditions in effect for the first two (2) years after entry of the Court's final order:

- a. Petitioner shall comply with Article VII of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules on Admission and Discipline of Attorneys and the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct and shall timely cooperate with the Administrator in providing information regarding any investigations relating to his conduct;
- b. Petitioner, upon reinstatement, shall comply, or document that he has complied, with the Minimum Continuing Legal Education requirements for reinstated attorneys set out in Supreme Court Rule 791(f);
- c. Petitioner shall attend meetings as scheduled by the Commission probation officer. He shall submit quarterly written reports to the Commission probation officer concerning the status of his practice of law and the nature and extent of his compliance with the conditions of his reinstatement;
- d. Petitioner shall notify the Administrator within fourteen (14) days of any change of address;
- e. Petitioner shall abstain from using alcohol, cannabis, and any unprescribed controlled substance. He shall report to the Administrator any lapse in his sobriety or usage of any unprescribed controlled substances, alcohol, or cannabis within seventy-two (72) hours of that usage;
- f. Petitioner shall, as required by the Administrator, submit to random substance testing by a qualified mental health professional or facility approved by the Administrator within eight (8) hours of receiving notice from the Administrator that he shall submit to the testing. The results of the tests shall be reported to the Administrator. Petitioner shall pay all costs of such testing;
- g. Petitioner shall continue his participation in Alcoholics Anonymous by attending at least two meetings per week, with at least one meeting per week being in person. Petitioner shall keep a log of his attendance and submit it to the Administrator with his quarterly reports;
- h. Petitioner shall maintain an Alcoholics Anonymous sponsor and meet with the sponsor in person at least two times per month and as needed via telephone or other electronic communication. Petitioner shall authorize his sponsor to communicate with the Administrator in writing no less than every three (3) months regarding Petitioner's participation and status;
- i. Petitioner shall engage in a course of individual therapy on at least a monthly basis with a qualified mental health provider. Petitioner shall authorize the mental health provider to communicate with the Administrator in writing no

less than every three (3) months regarding Petitioner's participation and progress. Sessions may occur by phone or video conferencing;

- j. Petitioner shall continue treatment with his current primary care physician or another licensed primary care physician. Petitioner shall promptly advise the Administrator of any change in primary care physician. Petitioner shall comply with all treatment recommendations and the taking of medications as prescribed;
- k. Petitioner shall provide the Administrator and any approved primary care physician with an appropriate release authorizing him or her to (1) disclose to the Administrator, on at least a quarterly basis, information pertaining to the nature of Petitioner's compliance with any treatment plan established with respect to Petitioner's condition; (2) promptly report to the Administrator Petitioner's failure to comply with any part of an established treatment plan; and (3) respond to any inquiries by the Administrator regarding Petitioner's treatment and compliance with any established treatment plan;
- l. Within 60 days of reinstatement, Petitioner shall enroll in a law office management program acceptable to the Administrator and report to the Administrator his completion of that program;
- m. Upon return to practice, Petitioner shall be supervised by a licensed attorney approved by the Administrator. Petitioner shall notify the Administrator of the names and addresses of any and all attorneys with whom he establishes a supervisory relationship and shall provide notice to the Administrator of any change in supervising attorneys within fourteen days of the change. Petitioner shall authorize the supervising attorney to meet with a representative of the Administrator to create a supervision plan, which shall include the attorney meeting with Petitioner on a weekly basis and the attorney submitting a quarterly written report to the Administrator regarding the nature of Petitioner's practice, the number of cases being handled by Petitioner, and the attorney's general appraisal of Petitioner's continued fitness to practice. Meetings may occur by phone or video conferencing;
- n. If Petitioner establishes a solo law practice, he shall submit to an audit of his client trust account every six (6) months by an accountant acceptable to the Administrator. Petitioner shall bear the cost of said audits;
- o. Petitioner shall promptly report any violation of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct to the Administrator; and

- p. If Petitioner is found to have violated any of the conditions of reinstatement, his conditional reinstatement shall be revoked and he shall be suspended from the practice of law until further order of the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Hogan
Hal R. Morris
Michael J. Friduss

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 July 30, 2025.

/s/ Michelle M. Thome

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

4898-0715-9129, v. 1