

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

FILED  
5/21/2026 3:23 PM  
ARDC Clerk

In the Matter of:

TODD WILLIAM SIVIA,

No. 6285179,

v.

HANNAH ELIZABETH SHORES,

No. 6333700,

Attorney-Respondents.

Commission No.: 2026PR00033

Commission No.: 2026PR00034

**HANNAH ELIZABETH SHORES' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO  
ADMINISTRATOR'S COMPLAINT AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND  
INFORMATION**

NOW COMES Attorney-Respondent, Hannah E. Shores (Hereinafter "Respondent"), by and through her attorneys, Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker LLP, and for her Professional Background, Answer and Affirmative Defenses to the Administrator's Complaint, states as follows:

**ANSWER**

**COUNT I**

1. Respondent admits to the allegations contained in Paragraph 1.
2. Respondent admits that a Judgment of Dissolution of Marriage was entered on February 28, 2017, in the matter of *Elizabeth A. Blassingame v. John T. Blassingame*, St. Clair County No. 16-D-691, and that the judgment incorporates a Settlement Agreement and Parenting Plan. Respondent further admits that the Settlement Agreement provides that J.B. shall maintain the current life insurance policies on his life and name the parties' children as the sole irrevocable equal beneficiaries until the youngest child graduates from high school or reaches age 24, after

which J.B. may name other beneficiaries and remove the children as beneficiaries. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 2.

3. Respondent lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 3.

4. Respondent admits that an Ohio National Life Insurance Designation of Beneficiary form for policy number 6717446 was signed and dated October 2, 2020, identified J.B. as the insured and owner, and named S.R. as 100% primary beneficiary. Respondent admits that a beneficiary-designation change was requested and that Ohio National correspondence dated October 5, 2020 states that the beneficiary had been recorded as instructed based on form 3116, signed and dated October 2, 2020. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny who submitted the beneficiary-designation form to Ohio National or the date on which Ohio National received or processed that form. Respondent denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 4, including any legal conclusion that the alleged conduct was in “contravention of the judgment for dissolution of marriage and marital settlement agreement.”

5. Respondent admits that she met with S.R. regarding proposed estate-planning documents for J.B. Respondent denies that, at the time of the October 23, 2020, consultation, she knew or learned the contents of the marital settlement agreement or any provision concerning the designation of beneficiaries on J.B.'s life insurance policy. Respondent admits that she later received information concerning J.B.'s and E.S.'s dissolution of marriage, the marital settlement agreement, and the Ohio National life insurance policy. Respondent admits that she discussed issues concerning the representation with Co-Respondent Sivia. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining precise contents of the October 23, 2020 consultation, whether Co-Respondent Sivia attended that consultation, any conversation

Respondent had with Co-Respondent Sivia pertaining to the consultation, or whether Respondent billed J.B. \$94 for a 0.4-hour meeting on October 23, 2020.

6. Respondent admits that she prepared draft estate-planning documents for J.B. and sent a trust package to J.B. and S.R. for review on November 6, 2020. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6, including the precise October 26 agreement, the hourly rate, the no-retainer instruction, and the billing entries.

7. Respondent admits that she drafted estate-planning documents for J.B. under Co-Respondent Sivia's supervision. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7, including the precise dates and content of any discussions with Co-Respondent Sivia and the billing entries.

8. Respondent admits that the trust package included a revocable living trust, pour-over will, financial power of attorney, medical power of attorney, HIPAA authorization, and living will. Respondent admits that J.B. executed a living trust on November 12, 2020. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 8.

9. Respondent denies that, on or before November 12, 2020, she knew that the marital settlement agreement required J.B. to maintain his minor children as the sole beneficiaries of the Ohio National life insurance policy. Respondent further denies that she provided, or could have provided, any counseling to J.B. or S.R. regarding the marital settlement agreement on or before November 12, 2020. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 9.

10. Respondent admits that J.B. and S.R. married on November 14, 2020. Respondent admits that J.B. received hospice care, but lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or

deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 10, including the precise date J.B. began hospice care or the details of his medical condition.

11. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegation pertaining to Ms. Wilson's knowledge prior to November 17, 2020. Respondent admits to the remaining allegations of Paragraph 11.

12. Respondent admits that S.R. contacted Respondent on November 20, 2020, about Sivia Law taking over the post-dissolution litigation matter, that Respondent stated the firm would represent J.B. only, and that Respondent sent a legal-services agreement and credit-card authorization. Respondent admits that S.R. later stated she could not afford the \$2,000 retainer without knowing when the life insurance would disburse through the accelerated benefit. Respondent admits that she then told S.R. that she would speak with Co-Respondent Sivia and later informed S.R. that Co-Respondent Sivia had agreed to a lower retainer so long as the agreement included a clause for payment from the distribution. Respondent admits that S.R. agreed to proceed on that basis. Respondent states that, with respect to the lower-retainer/payment-from-distribution arrangement, it was solely Co-Respondent Sivia and S.R. that determined that payment arrangement, and that her communications with S.R. concerning that arrangement conveyed and implemented Co-Respondent Sivia's direction. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 12.

13. Respondent admits that Ohio National records reflect that a policyholder could apply for accelerated benefits, which were life insurance policy proceeds paid to the policyholder before the policyholder died. Under the accelerated death benefit rider, any benefits paid in advance of death would reduce the remaining cash value and death benefit of the policy by the amount advanced. However, Respondent did not fully understand how this worked at this time. Respondent admits that S.R. contacted Respondent on November 20, 2020, about Sivia Law taking over the post-dissolution matter, that Respondent stated the firm would represent J.B.

only, and that Respondent sent a legal-services agreement and credit-card authorization. Respondent admits that S.R. later stated she could not afford the \$2,000 retainer at that time and asked if J.B. could pay the remainder of the retainer from an accelerated benefit. Respondent admits that she then told S.R. that she would speak with Co-Respondent Sivia and later informed S.R. that Co-Respondent Sivia had agreed to a lower retainer so long as the agreement included a clause for payment from the distribution. Respondent admits that S.R. agreed to proceed on that basis. Respondent denies that she understood the mechanism of any anticipated accelerated benefit or how any accelerated benefit would affect the remaining policy proceeds. Respondent states that, with respect to the lower-retainer/payment-from-distribution arrangement, it was solely Co-Respondent Sivia and S.R. that determined that payment arrangement, and that her communications with S.R. concerning that arrangement conveyed and implemented Co-Respondent Sivia's direction. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 13.

14. . Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny whether S.R. paid Sivia Law \$500 on November 27, 2020, whether the funds were deposited into the firm's client trust account, who submitted any accelerated-benefit request, or the precise amount requested.

15. Respondent denies the allegations against her contained in Paragraph 15. Respondent lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations pertaining to Co-Respondent Sivia.

16. Respondent admits that she appeared on behalf of J.B. at the December 1, 2020, hearing and that Judge Mejias entered an order directing that the policy be removed from the trust, that the parties' children be named sole irrevocable equal beneficiaries with no named custodian, and that policy documentation be provided to Ms. Wilson. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 16.

17. Respondent denies that, before the December 21, 2020 hearing, she knew that a \$250,000 accelerated benefit had been received by S.R. or that substantial proceeds had been placed in the trust account. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 17, including the billing entry.

18. Respondent denies that, as of December 10, 2020, she knew S.R. had received the accelerated benefit or that any payment to the firm came from that benefit. Respondent lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 18.

19. Respondent admits that the record reflects that a motion to reconsider Judge Mejias's December 1, 2020 order was filed on behalf of J.B. on December 10, 2020. The motion is a document that speaks for itself and Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 19 to the extent that they are inconsistent with the content of that motion.

20. Respondent admits that, before the December 21, 2020 hearing, Ms. Wilson's office requested life insurance policy documentation and threatened to seek sanctions if the documentation was not provided. Respondent admits that the December 21, 2020 transcript and order reflect a hearing on Ms. Wilson's emergency motion for sanctions concerning alleged noncompliance with prior life-insurance orders. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the precise filing date of the emergency motion for sanctions. Respondent denies that, as of December 17, 2020, she knew J.B. and S.R. had received a \$236,000 accelerated benefit payment, and therefore, that she could have told Judge Majias that J.B. and S.R. had requested and received the accelerated benefit payment of \$236,000. Respondent lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations pertaining to Co-Respondent Sivia.

21. Respondent admits to the allegations contained in Paragraph 21.

22. Respondent admits to the allegations contained in Paragraph 22.

23. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 23.

24. Respondent admits to the allegations contained in Paragraph 24.

25. Respondent admits that the email exchange substantially occurred. Respondent states that she did not know during the December 21, 2020 hearing that the accelerated benefit had been received or that substantial proceeds had been placed in the trust account, and she learned additional information only after the hearing through these communications with S.R. Respondent admits that she discussed these communications with Respondent Sivia. Respondent lacks knowledge and information to admit or deny the remaining parts of Paragraph 25.

26. Respondent admits that, on January 4, 2021, she filed a memorandum in support of the motion to reconsider at Co-Respondent Sivia's direction and that Co-Respondent Sivia reviewed the memorandum before it was filed. Respondent admits that the memorandum stated that the Ohio National life insurance policy was worth approximately \$500,000 and included the quoted language concerning preservation of the policy value. Respondent admits that Respondent Sivia reviewed the document prior to filing. Respondent denies that she understood that the receipt of the accelerated benefit changed the value of the policy. Respondent denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 26, including the allegations concerning Respondent's knowledge. Respondent lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations pertaining to Co-Respondent Sivia.

27. Respondent admits that Ohio National records reflect that an accelerated benefit had been paid and that the stated amount of the policy was later reduced from \$500,000 to \$236,188 effective December 1, 2020. Respondent denies that Respondent knowingly made any false statement. Respondent states that she understood the \$500,000 reference to refer to the policy's face/stated amount, and that the memorandum's preservation language was made in the context of its argument for trust administration of the proceeds for the children's benefit. Respondent denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 27.

28. Respondent denies that she knew the memorandum statements identified in Paragraph 26 were false when made. Respondent denies that she knowingly made any false statement to the Court. Respondent further states that the January 5, 2021 hearing transcript does not reflect that Respondent orally argued or repeated that the policy was worth \$500,000. Respondent denies that the policy-value statement was material to the motion's legal argument or necessary to the relief requested, and states that the motion and memorandum argued, in substance, that the policy was an asset of the marital estate subject to property-division/property-settlement principles rather than a modifiable child-support provision. Respondent admits that, after the December 21, 2020 hearing, S.R. informed her that money from the life insurance had been placed in the trust account and that \$163,000 remained in that account. Respondent denies that the retainer arrangement or S.R.'s December 21, 2020 communications gave her knowledge that any statement in the memorandum was false, and denies that she then understood how any accelerated benefit affected the remaining death benefit or the "value" of the policy. Respondent denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 28 concerning S.R.'s alleged use or assertion of ownership of the funds.

29. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 29, and therefore denies those allegations.

30. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 30, including all subparagraphs (a) through (c).

31. Paragraph 31 is directed to Co-Respondent Sivia and alleges no separate misconduct by Respondent. To the extent a response is required, Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations directed to Co-Respondent Sivia and therefore denies those allegations.

WHEREFORE, Respondent Hannah Elizabeth Shores respectfully requests that this Hearing Board dismiss Count I of the Complaint with prejudice and grant such other and further relief as the Hearing Board deems just and proper.

## COUNT II

32. Respondent incorporates her responses to paragraphs 1 through 29 herein.

33. Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 33.

34. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 34. While Judge Mejias conducted a January 5, 2021 hearing on the motion to reconsider, and during that hearing, Respondent stated, “we just put the life insurance proceeds into it,” that statement was in response to the court’s question of whether Respondent had been given a copy of the original policy when setting up the trust. Respondent’s statement had nothing to do with any accelerated benefit.

35. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 35.

36. Respondent admits to the allegations contained in Paragraph 36.

37. Respondent admits that she communicated with S.R. regarding outside counsel and that Ms. Bradley was involved in communications with S.R. by January 1, 2021. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 37.

38. Respondent admits that S.R. informed Respondent by text that J.B. died on January 14, 2021. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 38, including whether anyone at Sivia Law communicated with J.B. during the alleged period.

39. Respondent admits that the January 12, 2021 order granted Respondent's oral motion to stay and required a \$500,000 appeal bond by January 15, 2021. Respondent lacks

sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 39, including whether a bond was obtained and the contents of any later sanctions motion.

40. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 40.

41. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 41.

42. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 42.

43. Paragraph 43 is directed to Co-Respondent Sivia and alleges no separate misconduct by Respondent Shores. To the extent a response is required, Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations directed to Respondent Sivia.

WHEREFORE, Respondent Hannah Elizabeth Shores makes no prayer with respect to this Count as it is not directed to her.

### **COUNT III**

44. Respondent incorporates her responses to paragraphs 32 through 42 herein.

45. Respondent denies that she independently selected or recommended Ms. Bradley to S.R. for purposes of appealing the December 1, 2020 order, and states that Co-Respondent Sivia made that recommendation and Respondent conveyed it to S.R.

46. Respondent admits that S.R. sent Respondent an email on January 7, 2021, containing the quoted language. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny whether the same communication was sent to Ms. Bradley.

47. Respondent admits that Charles Pierce filed a lawsuit against her and others. The lawsuit is a document that speaks for itself and Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 47 to the extent that they are inconsistent with the content of that document.

48. Respondent admits that documents reflect a January 22, 2021 temporary restraining order addressing any benefits S.R. had filed for or received. The order is a document that speaks for itself and Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 48 to the extent that they are inconsistent with the content of that document.

49. Respondent admits that on January 25, 2021, she emailed S.R. that there would be a meeting to discuss the "plan of action." Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 49.

50. Respondent admits that documents reflect that she appeared at the February 1, 2021 preliminary-injunction hearing. Respondent lacks sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the precise wording of any question asked by Judge Katz absent an opportunity to review the transcript. Respondent further denies that the lack of any affirmative statement by Respondent that may be reflected in that transcript constitutes a dishonest omission to the Court.

51. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 51.

52. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 52, including all subparagraphs (a) through (b).

WHEREFORE, Respondent Hannah Elizabeth Shores respectfully requests that this Hearing Board dismiss Count III of the Complaint with prejudice and grant such other and further relief as the Hearing Board deems just and proper.

### **AFFIRMATIVE MATTERS**

NOW COMES the Respondent Hannah Shores (Hereinafter "Respondent"), through her attorneys, Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker LLP, and asserts the following affirmative matters in defense of the allegations in the Complaint:

### **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent was an associate at Sivia Law and worked under Co-Respondent Sivia's supervision, direction, review, and coaching. Respondent had limited experience in estate

planning, no meaningful experience in family law, and no prior experience handling substantive contested court hearings. Respondent relied on Co-Respondent Sivia's experience and guidance in addressing the disputed legal and factual issues in the J.B. matter, and her conduct should be evaluated in light of her limited experience, subordinate role, good-faith reliance on supervision, and absence of any dishonest motive.

### **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent states that J.B. was a client of Sivia Law and was not Respondent's personal client. Respondent understood S.R. to be a client contact and source of information, not Respondent's personal client in the post-dissolution proceedings. Respondent denies that she adopted S.R.'s personal interests or knowingly participated in any effort by S.R. to violate a court order.

### **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

The October 2, 2020 beneficiary-designation form was signed and dated before Respondent's first documented meeting with S.R. concerning J.B.'s proposed estate plan. Respondent denies that she advised J.B. or S.R. to make that beneficiary change, caused that change to occur, or participated in submitting or processing the beneficiary-designation form. Respondent further denies that she had the requisite experience in family law or life insurance to make any meaningful recommendation to this client, and relied upon Respondent Sivia's experience and expertise in dealing with these client issues.

### **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent did not know on or before November 12, 2020 that the marital settlement agreement required J.B. to maintain his minor children as the sole beneficiaries of the Ohio National life insurance policy. Respondent had no real experience with marital settlement agreements at the time and any arguments she made regarding the nature of the marital estate came from other lawyers at Sivia Law.

#### **FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent understood that some form of life-insurance advance or distribution was being pursued to assist with J.B.'s legal and medical expenses, but she did not understand the accelerated-benefit mechanism, the amount of any anticipated or approved benefit, or how any accelerated benefit would affect the remaining death benefit, the policy proceeds, or the value of the life insurance policy. For instance, Respondent did not know or understand that the \$500,000 life insurance policy was no longer a \$500,000 life insurance policy with the receipt of the accelerated benefit. Respondent denies that she knew before the December 21, 2020 hearing that a \$250,000 accelerated benefit had been paid or that substantial life-insurance proceeds had been taken by S.R.

#### **SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent's statement at the December 21, 2020 hearing concerning J.B.'s assets reflected her actual understanding at the time. Respondent learned additional information about the receipt of the accelerated benefit funds only after the hearing, when she asked S.R. what money was in the trust and whether the money came from life insurance.

#### **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent attempted to secure compliance with the court's directives and orders regarding the Ohio National policy. For example, on December 8, 2020, Respondent notified S.R. that the judge had directed that the life insurance be changed to the children's names and that the policy had to be forwarded to opposing counsel. On December 11, 2020, after S.R. expressed concern about completing the beneficiary form without naming a custodian, Respondent advised S.R. that, according to the court order, the beneficiary form had to be completed so that the children were the beneficiaries and no custodian was named. After the December 21, 2020 order, Respondent expressly told S.R. to "please follow the court order," including by naming the two children as the only beneficiaries and listing E.S. as custodian.

### **EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent did not have the full Ohio National life insurance policy during the relevant court proceedings and relied on information supplied by S.R. concerning efforts to obtain the policy. Respondent denies that she knowingly misrepresented the status, possession, production, or contents of the policy to any court.

### **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

In the January 4, 2021 memorandum, the reference to the Ohio National policy as worth approximately \$500,000 was understood by Respondent as a reference to the policy's face or stated amount. The memorandum's preservation language appeared in the context of a legal argument that any proceeds should be administered through a trust for the children's benefit. Moreover importantly, the policy-value reference was not material to the memorandum's legal argument or to the relief requested it was simply a background statement about the value of the policy, as Respondent understood it. There was no intention to mislead the court by including this statement in the memorandum. This point is supported by the fact that the January 5, 2021 hearing transcript does not reflect that Respondent orally argued or repeated that the policy was worth \$500,000. Respondent's January 4, 2021 memorandum advanced a legal argument that the Ohio National policy was an asset of the marital estate subject to property-division/property-settlement principles rather than a modifiable child-support provision. The value of the policy is irrelevant to the argument. These circumstances negate any inference that Respondent knowingly made a false statement concerning the policy's value in the January 4, 2021 memorandum.

### **TENTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent received no personal financial benefit from the outcome of the J.B. litigation or from any disposition of the Ohio National policy proceeds. Respondent did not have any

motive to deceive any tribunal, opposing counsel, or any party concerning the policy, the accelerated benefit, or the trust.

#### **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent's statements to the tribunals were made in good faith based on her then-existing understanding of the facts, the information provided to her, and the procedural posture of the underlying matters. Respondent did not knowingly make any false statement of fact or law to any tribunal as asserted by the Administrator. To the extent any statement by Respondent is alleged to have been incomplete, ambiguous, imprecise, or later shown to be inaccurate, any such issue resulted from mistake, inexperience, misunderstanding, limited information, or the context of the questioning, and not from dishonesty, deceit, or intentional misrepresentation to any Court.

#### **TWELVETH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent did not knowingly remain silent in response to any tribunal inquiry for the purpose of omitting a material fact. Respondent denies that any silence, if shown, was intended to mislead a tribunal or conceal information Respondent knew was material. Respondent was an inexperienced attorney who was guided by the example of the much more senior attorneys who were at the hearing before Judge Katz. To the extent that she should have said anything (and Respondent is disadvantaged by the fact that she does not have the transcript of this hearing), any failure to speak was due to inexperience, not any intention to mislead a court.

#### **THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

The events alleged in the Complaint occurred primarily in 2020 and early 2021, and the underlying matters were first raised with the ARDC in 2021. The formal disciplinary Complaint was not filed until May 1, 2026. The passage of more than five years is relevant to the reliability of recollections, the availability and completeness of evidence, and Respondent's ability to defend against allegations that depend on her contemporaneous knowledge, understanding, and

intent. The delay has also imposed a prolonged personal and professional burden on Respondent. After the underlying events were first raised with the ARDC in 2021, the passage of years without a formal complaint reasonably contributed to Respondent's understanding that the matter was not being actively pursued. The filing of the Complaint more than five years after the events at issue has renewed substantial stress and uncertainty for Respondent, who is now married and pregnant, with her child due in July. Respondent states that the timing and renewed burden of these proceedings should be considered in evaluating prejudice, culpability, mitigation, and any sanction.

#### **FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE MATTER**

Respondent reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses and mitigating factors as discovery progresses.

**PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

NOW COMES the Respondent Hannah Shores (Hereinafter “Respondent”), through her attorneys, Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker LLP, and pursuant to Commission Rule 231, states her professional background information:

(a) Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of Missouri on September 18, 2019, under the name Hannah Elizabeth Shores, and was admitted to practice law in the State of Illinois on December 16, 2019, under the same name. Respondent has not been admitted to practice law before any other state court, federal court, or administrative agency, nor admitted before the bar of any foreign country.

(b) Respondent has not practiced law since leaving the Sivia law firm in 2021.

(c) Respondent has received this year an insurance license from the State of Missouri.

(d) Respondent wishes to inform the hearing board that she is currently in the final trimester of a pregnancy and is due to give birth in July 2026. As a result, she will be impaired from traveling to give testimony this summer.

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN,  
& DICKER LLP

By: /s/ John D. Nafar

One of the Attorneys for the Respondent  
**HANNAH E. SHORES**  
Daniel E. Tranen, Esq. – ARDC# 6244878  
daniel.tranen@wilsonelser.com  
John Nafar, Esq. – ARDC# 6334616  
john.nafar@wilsonelser.com  
WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN,  
& DICKER LLP  
7777 Bonhomme Ave Suite 1900  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
314.930.2860  
314.930.2861 (Fax)

**VERIFICATION**

I, John Nafar, state under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure and certify that the foregoing statements set forth in this Verification are true and correct, except as to matters herein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters I certify that I verily believe the same to be true. Specifically, I state and certify that I am an attorney for the Respondent in the above entitled cause; that I am informed as to some of the allegations in the complaint that there is insufficient knowledge on behalf of this Respondent to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of the Answer, and that on the basis of such information, I believe said statements of insufficient knowledge are true.

*/s/ John D. Nafar*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John D. Nafar, Esq.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 21, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing Answer of Respondent Hannah Elizabeth Shores, including Affirmative Matters and Professional Background Information, with the Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, and served a copy by electronic mail upon:

Rachel C. Miller  
Counsel for Administrator Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission  
3161 W. White Oaks Dr., Suite 301  
Springfield, IL 62704  
Email: ARDCeservice@iadc.org  
Email: rmiller@iadc.org

*/s/ John D. Nafar*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT  
**HANNAH E. SHORES**

FILED  
5/21/2026 3:23 PM  
ARDC Clerk