

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

In the Matter of:

ANTHONY ROBERT BURCH,  
  
Attorney-Respondent,  
  
No. 6281093.

Commission No. 2025PR00071

**NOTICE OF FILING**

To: M. Katherine Boychuk ([kboychuk@iardec.org](mailto:kboychuk@iardec.org)) ([ARDCeservice@iardec.org](mailto:ARDCeservice@iardec.org))  
Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission  
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6219

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **April 24, 2026**, we e-filed with the Clerk of the Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission: **ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**, a copy of which is served upon you herewith.

By: /s/ Adrian Vuckovich

Adrian Vuckovich ([av@cb-law.com](mailto:av@cb-law.com))  
COLLINS BARGIONE & VUCKOVICH  
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 300  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Telephone: 312-372-7813

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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 they served the foregoing document(s) by causing copies to be delivered to the above stated SERVICE LIST by **email** on **April 24, 2026**.

/s/ Monica Nunez

FILED  
4/24/2026 12:30 PM  
ARDC Clerk

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

In the Matter of:

ANTHONY ROBERT BURCH,  
  
Attorney-Respondent,  
  
No. 6281093.

Commission No. 2025PR00071

**ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

COMES the Respondent, Anthony Robert Burch, by counsel, Adrian Vuckovich, denying any prefatory allegations, except that he was licensed to practice law in Illinois on November 6, 2003, and for his Answer to Complaint, states as follows:

COUNT I

*(Lack of Diligence, Failure to Communicate, Failure to Refund Unearned Fee)*

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent operated a law practice in Chicago named Burch & Associates.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

2. On October 29, 2021, an individual with the initials "L.P." hired Respondent to prepare estate planning documents for L.P.'s father, who at the time was 72 years old and did not have an estate plan. Respondent and L.P. entered into a written engagement agreement which provided that L.P. would pay a security retainer of \$7,500 to Respondent, and that Respondent and his staff would bill their time against the security retainer according to hourly rates set forth in the engagement agreement. L.P. paid the security retainer in two credit card payments, on October 29, 2021, and on November 23, 2021, in the amounts of \$3,500 and \$4,000 respectively.

FILED  
4/24/2026 12:30 PM  
ARDC Clerk

**ANSWER: Admitted except the description of the services requested is incomplete in that L.P.'s father requested that documents be prepared in connection with a dispute with the father's sister.**

3. Between October 29, 2021 and February 3, 2025, Respondent did not provide estate planning documents to L.P. or issue any invoices to L.P. for work he purportedly performed on L.P.'s father's behalf.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

4. On January 15, 2025, L.P.'s father died. On February 3, 2025, L.P. called Respondent's law office to terminate the representation. L.P. informed the person who answered the phone that L.P.'s father had died and that estate planning documents were no longer needed.

**ANSWER: Respondent has insufficient knowledge of the allegations contained in paragraph 4, except that it is admitted that at some point L.P. contacted Respondent's office and sought a refund, and therefore Respondent neither admits nor denies the remaining allegations.**

5. On February 5, 2025, L.P. emailed Respondent, stating again that L.P. was terminating the representation and requested the refund of unearned fees. L.P. sent a letter by USPS Certified Mail to Respondent's law office the same day, but it was not delivered. On February 10, 2025, L.P. sent a letter by USPS Priority Mail to Respondent's law office, stating again that L.P. was terminating the representation and requested the refund of unearned fees. The letter was delivered on February 12, 2025. Respondent did not respond to the letter.

**ANSWER: Respondent has insufficient knowledge of a letter which was not delivered and therefore neither admit nor denies the allegations concerning the undelivered**

**letter. The remaining allegations are admitted except the allegation that Respondent did not respond.**

6. On February 11, 2025, L.P. emailed Respondent, stating again that L.P. was terminating the representation and requested the refund of unearned fees. Respondent did not respond to the email.

**ANSWER: Admitted the email was sent. Denied Respondent did not respond to the email.**

7. On May 13, 2025, following L.P.'s filing of a charge with the ARDC, Respondent emailed L.P. with a "proposed resolution" which consisted of a \$1,500 fee refund. The same day, L.P. responded to the email and requested that Respondent return his file and provide a description of the work performed and the amounts charged. Respondent did not respond to the email, return the file, provide a description of the work performed and amounts charged, or provide any refund.

**ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent sent an email proposing a resolution and L.P. sent an email to Respondent which did not address the proposal for resolution. The remaining allegations concerning Respondent's actions are argumentative and therefore, require no answer.**

8. The value of the services L.P. received from Respondent and his firm during the course of Respondent's representation, if any, did not warrant Respondent's retention of the \$7,500 he received from L.P.

**ANSWER: The allegations of paragraph 8 state a legal conclusion and therefore require no answer. In further answer, Respondent offered a partial refund which L.P. did not address.**

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

- a. failing to act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, by conduct including failing to prepare estate planning documents for L.P.'s father after being retained to do so, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);

**ANSWER: Denied.**

- b. failing to communicate with a client, by conduct including failing to respond to L.P.'s reasonable requests for information by phone calls on February 3, 2025 and February 4, 2025, by emails on February 5, 2025 and February 11, 2025, and by U.S. Postal Service letters sent on February 5, 2025 and February 10, 2025, in violation of Rule 1.4(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);

**ANSWER: Denied.**

- c. charging or collecting an unreasonable fee, by conduct including collecting \$7,500 in legal fees from L.P. without performing the estate planning work he was retained to perform, in violation of Rule 1.5(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and

**ANSWER: Denied. The \$7500 was a retainer, not a charge or a fee.**

- d. failing to refund an unearned fee, by conduct including failing to refund the \$7,500 in legal fees Respondent received from L.P., in violation of Rule 1.16(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Denied.**

## COUNT II

*(Failure to Respond to ARDC's Requests for Information)*

10. On May 29, 2025, counsel for the Administrator sent Respondent a request for information relating to the allegations described in Count I. In the request, counsel for the Administrator asked Respondent to respond in writing and produce responsive documents within

14 days. The request was sent via email to the email address Respondent provided to the Commission as part of his annual registration.

**ANSWER: Admitted the letter was sent.**

11. As of June 30, 2025, Respondent had not provided a response to the request for information. On that day, counsel for the Administrator sent Respondent another request for information, seeking the same information and documents originally requested on May 29, 2025, within seven days. The request was sent via email to the email address Respondent provided to the Commission as part of his annual registration.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

12. As of July 7, 2025, Respondent had not provided a response to the request for information. On that day, a Commission paralegal called Respondent's office regarding Respondent's failure to respond. The paralegal spoke to Respondent's assistant, who said that she would convey the message to Respondent.

**ANSWER: Admitted no response was made by July 7, 2025. Respondent has insufficient knowledge of the remaining allegations.**

13. As of July 25, 2025, Respondent had not returned the phone call or provided a response to the request for information. On that day, a Commission paralegal called Respondent's office again regarding Respondent's failure to respond. The paralegal left a message with an assistant stating that Respondent should return the call.

**ANSWER: Admitted no response was made by July 7, 2025. Respondent has insufficient knowledge of the remaining allegations.**

14. As of August 21, 2025, Respondent had not returned the phone calls or provided a response to the May 29, 2025 request for information. On that day, the Administrator issued a

