

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

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
 **SALENA RACHELLE YOUNG,** )  
 )  
 Attorney-Respondent, )  
 )  
 No. 6279523. )

Commission No. 2024PR00037

**NOTICE OF FILING**

**TO:** Rachel C. Miller  
Counsel for the Administrator  
Email: ARDCeService@iadc.org; rmiller@iadc.org

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on December 19, 2024, I will submit the attached ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT and this notice to the Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, One Prudential Plaza, 130 East Randolph, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois 60601, for filing by electronic means through the Odyssey eFileIL system.

/s/William F. Moran, III  
Counsel for Respondent

**COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT:**

William F. Moran, III (#06191183)  
STRATTON, MORAN, REICHERT & SRONCE  
725 South Fourth Street  
Springfield, IL 62703  
Telephone: 217/528-2183  
Email: bmoran@stratton-law.com

FILED  
12/19/2024 5:28 PM  
ARDC Clerk

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, William F. Moran, III, state that I served copies of this Notice of Filing and the attached Answer to First Amended Complaint on Counsel for the Administrator by emailing true and correct copies thereof to her at the email addresses shown on the face of this Notice of Filing on this 19<sup>th</sup> day of December 2024. Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 735 ILCS 5/1-109, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct.

/s/William F. Moran, III  
Counsel for Respondent

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

In the Matter of:

SALENA RACHELLE YOUNG,  
  
Attorney-Respondent,  
  
No. 6279523

Commission No. 2024PR00037

**ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

NOW COMES, Attorney-Respondent, SALENA RACHELLE YOUNG, by and through her attorney, William F. Moran, III, and for her Answer to the First Amended Complaint hereby states the following:

**Respondent's Professional Background**

1. Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in the State of Illinois on May 8, 2023. In addition, she is licensed to practice in United States District Court for the Central and Southern Districts of Illinois.
2. Respondent does not have any other professional license or certificate.

**COUNT I**

*(Dishonesty in Employment at the Illinois Attorney General's Office)*

1. Prior to November 16, 2021, Respondent operated Young Law Office as a sole practitioner. Beginning in December 2017 and continuing through August 2023, she served as a part-time Sangamon County Assistant Public Defender handling juvenile abuse and neglect cases.

FILED  
12/19/2024 5:28 PM  
ARDC Clerk

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 1 of the First Amended Complaint.**

2. On November 16, 2021, Respondent began working in a full-time position as an Assistant Attorney General in the General Law Bureau in Springfield.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 2 of the First Amended Complaint.**

3. At all times related to this complaint, the Illinois Attorney General policy and procedures manual, section 8.1.7, stated, that, "Assistant Attorneys General shall not engage in the private practice of law." Section 4.1.10(b)(2)(D) of the Illinois Attorney General policy and procedure manual further stated that, "An employee may not engage in any paid or non-paid employment outside the office which may create an actual conflict of interest or an appearance of conflict of interest. An employee may not use office time, equipment, resources, or personnel in any outside paid or non-paid employment."

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 3 of the First Amended Complaint.**

4. Between November 16, 2021, and June 12, 2023, Respondent appeared on Wednesdays and Thursdays in Sangamon County for her juvenile abuse and neglect cases in her role as a Sangamon County Assistant Public Defender.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 4 of the First Amended Complaint.**

5. At no time when appearing in Sangamon County as a Sangamon County Assistant Public Defender between November 16, 2021, and June 13, 2023, did Respondent use benefit time or reflect on her timekeeping log that she was not engaged in work for the Illinois Attorney General.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 5 of the First Amended Complaint.**

6. On at least 36 occasions, Respondent submitted timekeeping records which showed she clocked in and worked on Wednesdays and Thursdays for the Illinois Attorney General's Office.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 6 of the First Amended Complaint.**

7. Respondent's timekeeping logs reflecting that she worked full days for the Illinois Attorney General's office on Wednesdays and Thursdays was false, because she worked as a Sangamon County Assistant Public Defender at least part of the day on Wednesdays and Thursdays.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 7 of the First Amended Complaint. Answering further, Respondent would state that she would make up the time for the Attorney General's office by working early in the morning, late at night and/or on weekends, so she did work the total number of hours required for the position, but admits that her timekeeping logs did not appropriately reflect the actual times of day that she was working on assignments for the Attorney General.**

8. Respondent knew at the time that she submitted the timekeeping logs to the Illinois Attorney General's office reflecting that she was clocked in and working for the Illinois Attorney General, as described in paragraph 6, above, that the timekeeping logs were false.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 8 of the First Amended Complaint.**

9. By reasons 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 knowingly submitting false timesheets to the Illinois Attorney General's Office, as described in paragraphs four and five, above, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the First Amended Complaint.**

**COUNT II**

*(Conflict of Interest by Simultaneously working as an Assistant Attorney General and Sangamon County Assistant Public Defender)*

10. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs one through eight, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent restates and incorporates her answers to paragraphs 1 through 8 of the First Amended Complaint for her response to paragraph 10.**

11. As part of Respondent's duties as an Assistant Attorney General, she represented employees of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 11 of the First Amended Complaint.**

12. In at least six separate matters between November 2021 and November 2022, Respondent represented DCFS as an agency or DCFS employees in various matters, including domestic relations matters, a probate matter, a guardianship matter, an administrative review of an indicated finding, and a civil lawsuit.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 12 of the First Amended Complaint.**

13. In Respondent's juvenile abuse and neglect matters in Sangamon County, DCFS routinely served as a witness in the cases.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 13 of the First Amended Complaint.**

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

- a. representing a client when there is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a person interest of the lawyer, by conduct including representing clients in Sangamon County while employed by, and using office time for, the Illinois Attorney General, in violation of the Illinois Attorney General policy and procedures manual and Rule 1.7(a)(2) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Respondent denies the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the First Amended Complaint, as there was not a significant risk of a material limitation on her representation of the DCFS, any of its employees or agents or her abuse and neglect clients in Sangamon County based upon the circumstances described above.**

### COUNT III

*(Disclosure of Confidential Client Information—City of Springfield Fly Ash Case)*

15. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs 10 through 13 above.

**ANSWER: Respondent restates and incorporates her answers to paragraphs 10 through 13 of the First Amended Complaint for her response to paragraph 15.**

16. On October 12, 2023, the Illinois Attorney General's Office filed a lawsuit against the City, Water, Light and Power ("CWLP"), the municipal utility company for Springfield. The lawsuit alleged that CWLP released 700 tons of coal byproduct, called fly ash, into the environment and that the fly ash contaminated ground water. The lawsuit was docketed as *People of the State of Illinois, ex. rel. Kwame Raoul, Attorney General of the State of Illinois v. City Water, Light, and Power*, 2023 CH 39 (Sangamon County Circuit Court).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 16 of the First Amended Complaint.**

17. On October 16, 2023, Respondent started working for the City of Springfield Corporation Counsel as an Assistant Corporation Counsel.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 17 of the First Amended Complaint.**

18. Prior to November 16, 2023, Respondent's supervisor, G.M., requested that Respondent work on the fly ash case, and Respondent entered her appearance on behalf of CWLP that day.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 18 of the First Amended Complaint.**

19. Between November 15, 2023, and November 16, 2023, Respondent exchanged emails with G.M., as well as D.W., a CWLP employee. The emails discussed the answer Respondent wanted to file on behalf of CWLP.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 19 of the First Amended Complaint.**

20. On November 21, 2023, at 2:19 p.m. T.E., an Illinois-licensed attorney and friend of Respondent's, sent an email to Respondent that stated, without explanation:

“The facts establishing an affirmative defense must be pleaded with the same degree of specificity required by a plaintiff to establish a cause of action. (*Kermeen v. City of Peoria*, (1978), 65 Ill. App. 3d 969, 973, 382 N.E.2d 1374, 22 Ill. Dec. 619 (“facts constituting an affirmative defense must be plainly set forth in the answer”).) A motion to dismiss is an affirmative **[\*\*854] [\*\*\*\*320]** defense pursuant to section 2 – 615, as with all section 2 – 615 motions, admits all well-pleaded facts constituting the defense and attacks only the legal sufficiency of those facts. (*Raprager v. Allstate Insurance Co.*, **[\*631]** (1989), 183 Ill. App. 3d 847, 539 N.E.2d 787, 132 Ill. Dec. 224.) Where the well-pleaded facts of an affirmative **[\*\*\*37]** defense raise the possibility that the party asserting them



will prevail, the defense should not be stricken. *Raprager v. Allstate Insurance Co.*, 183 Ill. App. 3d 847, 539 N.E.2d 787, 132 Ill. Dec. 224; *Farmer City State Bank v. Guingrich* (1985), 139 Ill. App. 3d 416, 487 N.E.2d 758, 94 Ill. Dec. 1.

*International Ins. Co. v. Sargent & Lundy*, 242 Ill. App. 3d 614, 630-631”

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 20 of the First Amended Complaint, with the exception of the allegation that T.E. is merely a friend; noting that T.E. is a member of Respondent's household.**

21. On November 21, 2023, at 2:28, Respondent sent an email to G.M. and D.W. that stated:

[G.M. and D.W.]:

“Rather than re-pleading the Answer and affirmative defenses, I would let her file a Motion to Strike and Memorandum of Law in support thereof and let the Court decide. If the Court did strike any of our affirmative defenses, the Court would allow us time to file an Amended Answer with more specific facts included.

Case law cited below:

“The facts establishing an affirmative defense must be pleaded with the same degree of specificity required by a plaintiff to establish a cause of action. (*Kermeen v. City of Peoria*, (1978), 65 Ill. App. 3d 969, 973, 382 N.E.2d 1374, 22 Ill. Dec. 619 (“facts constituting an affirmative defense must be plainly set forth in the answer”).) A motion to dismiss is an affirmative [\*854] [\*\*\*\*320] defense pursuant to section 2 – 615, as with all section 2 – 615 motions, admits all well-pleaded facts constituting the defense and attacks only the legal sufficiency of those facts. (*Raprager v. Allstate Insurance Co.*, [\*631] (1989), 183 Ill. App. 3d 847, 539 N.E.2d 787, 132 Ill. Dec. 224.) Where the well-pleaded facts of an affirmative [\*\*\*37] defense raise the possibility that the party asserting them will prevail, the defense should not be stricken. *Raprager v. Allstate Insurance Co.*, 183 Ill. App. 3d 847, 539 N.E.2d 787, 132 Ill. Dec.

224; Farmer City State Bank v. Guingrich (1985), 139 Ill. App. 3d 416, 487 N.E.2d 758, 94 Ill. Dec. 1.

International Ins. Co. v. Sargent & Lundy, 242 Ill. App. 3d 614, 630-631”

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 21 of the First Amended Complaint.**

22. On December 19, 2023, Respondent emailed D.W., and asked if she could “let [Respondent] know if there are any additional facts that [D.W.] could share...”

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 22 of the First Amended Complaint.**

23. On December 20, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., D.W. emailed Respondent back, and she provided more information as Respondent requested.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 23 of the First Amended Complaint.**

24. On December 20, 2023, at 11:17 a.m., Respondent forwarded D.W.’s email to T.E.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 24 of the First Amended Complaint.**

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

- a. revealing information related to the representation of a client with the client providing informed consent, the disclosure being impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation, or otherwise permitted, by conduct including sending emails between Respondent and a CWLP employee to a third party, T.E., without CWLP’s consent or the disclosure being otherwise authorized, in violation of Rule 1.6(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 25 of the First Amended Complaint.**

**COUNT IV**

*(Disclosure of Confidential Client Information – Curran Gardner Water District Case)*

26. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs 15 through 24, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent restates and incorporates her answers to paragraphs 15 through 24 of the First Amended Complaint for her response to paragraph 26.**

27. On August 7, 2023, the Curran-Gardner Townships Public Water District (“Curran-Gardner”) filed a lawsuit against the City of Springfield alleging that the City of Springfield provided “water service and/or threatened to provide public water supply services” in an area that Curran-Gardner provided water services. The lawsuit was docketed as *Curran-Gardner Townships Public Water District v. City of Springfield*, 2023-cv-03250 (Central District of Illinois).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 27 of the First Amended Complaint.**

28. Prior to November 25, 2023, Respondent’s supervisor, G.M., requested that Respondent work on the Curran-Gardner case, and Respondent entered her appearance on behalf of the City of Springfield that day.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 28 of the First Amended Complaint.**

29. On December 5, 2023, at 3:04 p.m., M.C., a CWLP employee, emailed Respondent and D.W. that she made a log of Curran-Gardner’s discovery. M.C.’s email stated, in part, that “many of the plats are for locations nowhere near [Curran-Gardner’s] jurisdiction...” M.C. also included images of specific PDF file names.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 29 of the First Amended Complaint.**

30. On December 7, 2023, at 9:35 a.m., Respondent emailed M.C. and D.W. and asked if M.C. could “compile a list of all names (with title, whether they are with CWLP or not) of anyone having information about issues contained within the Complaint?” Respondent explained that the “names are required for our Initial Disclosures.”

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 30 of the First Amended Complaint.**

31. On December 7, 2023, at 9:46 a.m., D.W. replied to Respondent that she and M.C. “should be getting the list to [Respondent] soon.” She also asked if Respondent needed other items.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 31 of the First Amended Complaint.**

32. On December 7, 2023, at 10:22 a.m., Respondent forwarded D.W.’s email and thread, which contained the discussion of land plats, to T.E.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 32 of the First Amended Complaint.**

33. On February 6, 2024, at 11:03 a.m., D.W. emailed Respondent edits to CWLP’s discovery responses.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 33 of the First Amended Complaint.**

34. On February 6, 2024, at 1:45 p.m., Respondent forwarded D.W.’s email described in paragraph 33, above, to T.E.

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 34 of the First Amended Complaint.**

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

- a. revealing information related to the representation of a client with the client providing informed consent, the disclosure being impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation, or otherwise permitted, by conduct including forwarding emails between Respondent and CWLP employees to a third party, T.E., without CWLP's consent or the disclosure being otherwise authorized, in violation of Rule 1.6(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Respondent admits the allegations in paragraph 35 of the First Amended Complaint.**

**WHEREFORE**, Respondent, SALENA RACHELLE YOUNG, would request that the Hearing Board conduct a hearing on the First Amended Complaint filed in this cause by the Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, LEA S. GUTIERREZ, consider the evidence presented by the parties and make a recommendation to the Supreme Court of Illinois which is right and just based upon the facts and law presented.

Respectfully submitted,  
SALENA RACHELLE YOUNG, Respondent

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/William F. Moran, III  
Her attorney

**COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT:**

William F. Moran, III (#06191183)  
STRATTON, MORAN, REICHERT & SRONCE  
725 South Fourth Street  
Springfield, IL 62703  
Telephone: 217/528-2183  
Email: bmoran@stratton-law.com