

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

In the Matter of:

DAVID HASWELL ROBERTSON, JR.,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 3128953.

Commission No. 2025PR00073

NOTICE OF FILING

To: Marci Jacobs (mjacobs@iadc.org) (ARDCeservice@iadc.org)
Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6219

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **May 14, 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/ Kathrynne Hayes

Kathrynne Hayes (khayes@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 **May 14, 2026**.

/s/ Monica Nunez

FILED
5/14/2026 4:06 PM
ARDC Clerk

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

In the Matter of:

DAVID HASWELL ROBERTSON, JR.,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 3128953.

Commission No. 2025PR00073

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

COMES the Respondent, David Haswell Robertson, Jr., by counsel, Kathyne Hayes of Collins Bargione & Vuckovich, for his Answer to Complaint, states as follows:

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 231

Respondent was licensed to practice law in the State of Illinois on May 1, 1981.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Supreme Court Rule 794 required that, subject to certain exceptions that do not apply to Respondent in this matter, every Illinois attorney was required to complete 30 hours of continuing legal education (“CLE”) activity during the attorney’s two-year reporting period ending on June 30. Attorneys whose last names started with the letter “R,” including Respondent, were subject to the reporting period that ran from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2023.

ANSWER: Admitted.

2. Respondent had registered successfully since 1981 and therefore was familiar with the registration process, including for the entire time that the Minimum Continuing Legal Education (“MCLE”) requirement has been in place since 2005.

FILED
5/14/2026 4:06 PM
ARDC Clerk

ANSWER: Admitted.

3. As of July 31, 2023, Respondent had completed only 14.5 hours of the 30 hours of CLE activity required by Supreme Court Rule 794.

ANSWER: Admitted.

4. Certain attorneys, including Respondent, who were required to comply with the 2021-2023 CLE reporting period were eligible to obtain a grace period extension from the MCLE Board until October 30, 2023, to complete their CLE requirements. To obtain the grace period extension, a qualifying attorney would need to enter certain information online and pay the MCLE Board a \$100 fee no later than July 31, 2023. Respondent requested that the MCLE Board grant him a grace period extension until October 31, 2023, to complete his MCLE requirements, and paid the \$100 fee on June 30, 2023.

ANSWER: Admitted.

5. As of October 31, 2023, Respondent had completed only 14.50 hours of the 30 hours of CLE activity required by Supreme Court Rule 794.

ANSWER: Admitted.

6. At all times set forth in this complaint, Supreme Court Rule 796(e) required the Administrator to remove from the Roll of Attorneys authorized to practice law in Illinois (“Roll of Attorneys”) the name of any attorney who had not complied with their CLE requirement.

ANSWER: Admitted.

7. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 756(h), “any person whose name is not on the Roll of Attorneys and who practices law or who holds himself or herself out as being authorized to practice law pursuant to the attorney’s Illinois law license is engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and may also be held in contempt of the Court.”

ANSWER: Respondent admits the existence of Ill. Sup. Ct. R. 756(h) which speaks for itself.

8. Respondent received at least the following communications from the MCLE Board concerning his compliance with Supreme Court Rules 794 and 796 regarding the 2021-2023 MCLE reporting period:

DATE	METHOD OF CORRESPONDENCE	DESCRIPTION
August 16, 2023	E-mail to dave@robertsonwall.com	Notice of non-compliance with Illinois MCLE Requirements for the 2021-2023 Reporting period.
October 4, 2023	E-mail to dave@robertsonwall.com	OFFICIAL ILLINOIS MCLE BOARD COMMUNICATION – October 31, 2023 is Your Credit Completion Deadline
October 26, 2023	E-mail to dave@robertsonwall.com	OFFICIAL ILLINOIS MCLE BOARD COMMUNICATION – FINAL DEADLINE APPROACHING – October 31, 2023 is Your Credit Completion Deadline
October 31 2023	E-mail to dave@robertsonwall.com	OFFICIAL ILLINOIS MCLE BOARD COMMUNICATION – Your Final Completion Deadline is Today
November 16, 2023	Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	OFFICIAL ILLINOIS MCLE BOARD COMMUNICATION – Your Grace Period Credit Reporting Deadline is November 30, 2023.
November 20, 2023	Call from (312) 961-1312 to (312) 924-2420	MCLE Board Staff Member, Jeanine Emery, left a courtesy call reminder on cell re credits not completed by October 31, 2023, removal by ARDC will occur Dec 1, 2023 with steps to be reinstated.
December 1, 2023	Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	Notice of Removal from the Roll of Attorneys for MCLE Non-compliance Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 796(e)
December 20, 2023	Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	OFFICIAL ILLINOIS MCLE BOARD COMMUNICATION – You were removed for the 2021-2023 reporting period and information about holiday hours.

June 26, 2024	Incoming call to (312) 924-2420 from (312) 961-1312	MCLE Board Staff Member Deidre McCarthy spoke to atty: Atty called in after talking to the ARDC to find out the status of his reinstatement. I informed atty that he's still at 25 hours. Until the remaining hours come in, he won't be able to pay his reinstatement fee. I walked him through how to login and see this himself.
---------------	---	---

DATE	METHOD OF CORRESPONDENCE	DESCRIPTION
January 24, 2025	Incoming call to (312) 924-2420 from (312) 961-1312	MCLE Board Staff Member Jeannine Emery spoke to atty: Attorney says he knows he was removed for 21-23 how many credits does he need. Replied he's at 25 credits needs 30 including 3 5 PR and 1 DI credit. Not much changed since he contacted Dee about this back in June of last year. He said he would take care of credits, I explained once all credits reported by provider, we'll mark 21-23 complied and he can pay \$400 RF. He also needs to register license with ARDC. He said he would get to work and appreciated info.
May 1, 2025	E-mail to dave@robertsonwall.com and dhr75@icloud.com	Initial Notice for the 2023-2025 Reporting Period from the MCLE Board of the Illinois Supreme Court – Your Name is Removed from the Roll of Attorneys

ANSWER: Admitted.

9. On December 1, 2023, the MCLE Board electronically sent a removal referral for Respondent for MCLE noncompliance to the Administrator of the ARDC. On the same day, the Administrator removed Respondent's name from the Roll of Attorneys.

ANSWER: Admitted.

10. Supreme Court Rule 756 requires that every attorney admitted to practice law in Illinois shall register and pay an annual registration fee to the Commission on or before the first day of January. On or after February 1 of each year, the Administrator shall remove from the Roll of Attorneys the name of any attorney who has not registered for that year.

ANSWER: Admitted.

11. Respondent did not register and pay his annual registration fee by January 1, 2024, and his failure to register provided another basis for his removal and ineligibility to practice law on March 14, 2024, and June 6, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

12. Respondent did not register and pay his annual registration fee by January 1, 2025, and his failure to register provided another basis for his removal and ineligibility to practice law on February 28, 2025.

ANSWER: Admitted.

13. Respondent received at least the following communications from the ARDC during the 2023-2025 reporting period:

DATE	METHOD OF CORRESPONDENCE	DESCRIPTION
October 4, 2023 to October 19, 2023	USPS to Robertson & Wall 670 N Clark St Ste 300 Chicago, IL 60654-3483	2024 Notice of Registration
February 13, 2024	USPS to Robertson & Wall 670 N Clark St Ste 300 Chicago, IL 60654-3483	2024 Final Notice of Registration
March 14, 2024	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2024 Notice of Removal
March 19, 2024	USPS to Robertson & Wall 670 N Clark St Ste 300 Chicago, IL 60654-3483	2024 Notice of Removal
October 19, 2024	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Notice of Registration
December 10 2024 to December 13, 2024	USPS to 459 Locust St Winnetka, IL 60093	2025 Notice of Registration
December 19, 2024	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Registration Reminder
January 9, 2025	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Registration Reminder
February 4, 2025	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Registration Reminder

February 24, 2025	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Impending Removal Notice
February 27, 2025	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Imminent Removal Notice
February 28, 2025	Mailchimp Mass Email to dave@robertsonwall.com	2025 Notice of Removal
March 11, 2025	USPS to 459 Locust St Winnetka, IL 60093	2025 Notice of Removal

ANSWER: Admitted.

14. Respondent logged on to his “My MCLE” page on the MCLE Board website twice on April 15, 2025. When he logged on to the MCLE Board website, his “My MCLE” stated the following: “Your name is currently removed from the Roll of Attorneys for the MCLE reporting period(s) listed in the boxes below.” One box showed that there was a “Reinstatement requirement for the 2021-2023 reporting period,” and the other box showed that he could “not earn credits for the 2023-2025 reporting period until [he had] been reinstated for all prior periods.”

ANSWER: Admitted.

15. On or about December 1, 2023, the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements. As of at least this date, Respondent knew that he was no longer authorized to practice law in Illinois as a result of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys.

ANSWER: Admitted.

16. On or about March 14, 2024, and February 28, 2025, the ARDC sent and Respondent received notices of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to fulfill all of the registration requirements for 2024, and 2025, respectively, pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756.

ANSWER: Admitted.

17. Since being removed from the Roll of Attorneys and knowing that he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois, Respondent represented clients in at least the following three matters: Cook County case numbers 2021L006516, 2023L009615, and 2023L006644.

ANSWER: Admitted.

COUNT I

(Alleged Practicing Law After Removal from the Roll of Attorneys, Lack of Diligence, Engaging in Conduct that is Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice)

18. On June 24, 2021, Respondent filed a complaint on behalf of his client, a woman with the initials "T.S.," in the Cook County Law Division. The complaint alleged that T.S. sustained injuries arising out of a car accident. The defendants were not insured.

ANSWER: Admitted.

19. On November 22, 2021, Respondent initiated an uninsured motorist claim with T.S.'s insurance company.

ANSWER: Admitted.

20. On January 30, 2024, Respondent appeared in court in the case on behalf of T.S. The court dismissed the case for want of prosecution on that date.

ANSWER: Admitted.

21. At the time Respondent appeared in court on January 30, 2024, Respondent was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

22. Respondent knew that as of January 30, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

23. On January 30, 2024, Respondent knew the case had been dismissed because he was present in court when the court dismissed it. At no time did Respondent file to reinstate the court case.

ANSWER: Admitted.

24. Respondent never told T.S. that her court case had been dismissed.

ANSWER: Admitted.

25. On March 5, 2024, Respondent received an email from the insurance company's attorney stating that the insurer planned to move forward under the uninsured motorist claim. The attorney issued a request for production and interrogatories and stated he would set up a sworn statement for T.S.

ANSWER: Admitted.

26. On March 7, 2024, Respondent emailed the insurance company's attorney stating he was "looking forward to pursuing this claim to its conclusion." Respondent acknowledged that he received the insurance company's discovery notices.

ANSWER: Admitted.

27. On April 11, 2024, the insurance company issued a "Notice of Video Sworn Statement" to be taken virtually on June 6, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. On April 11, Respondent emailed T.S. informing her of the June 6, 2024, sworn statement date.

ANSWER: Admitted.

28. On April 25, 2024, T.S. emailed Respondent her answers to the interrogatories he had sent her.

ANSWER: Admitted.

29. On June 6, 2024, T.S. took off work to attend the scheduled sworn statement. Respondent arrived late. At 1:46 p.m. on June 6, 2024, Respondent called the lawyer for the insurance company and left a voicemail asking for the Zoom link for the sworn statement. The insurance company's attorney emailed Respondent stating that the sworn statement would not proceed because Respondent had failed to submit written discovery answers, Respondent had not confirmed the date as a firm date, and the insurance company's lawyer did not schedule a court reporter. The insurance company's attorney requested that Respondent produce the "answers/responsive documents," and he would "re-notice" the sworn statement.

ANSWER: Admitted.

30. On June 6, 2023, the insurance company issued a notice rescheduling the sworn statement for July 23, 2024. On June 18, 2024, Respondent advised T.S. that her sworn statement had been rescheduled for July 23, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

31. As of July 22, 2024, Respondent had still not responded to discovery. On that date, the insurance company sent a new notice to Respondent indicating the sworn statement would be rescheduled for September 13, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

32. At 2:28 a.m. on July 23, 2024, Respondent confirmed the July 23, 2024, statement date with T.S. Respondent did not show up for the statement. At 11:46 a.m. on July 23, 2024, Respondent informed T.S. of the new statement date of September 13, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

33. As of August 25, 2024, Respondent still had not complied with written discovery. The insurance company's attorney sent Respondent a letter advising him that the insurer may close the claim and did not schedule a new date for T.S.'s sworn statement.

ANSWER: Admitted.

34. On September 12, 2024, T.S. emailed Respondent to confirm the statement the following day, and Respondent did not respond. T.S. also emailed and called Respondent on September 13, 2024, but he did not respond, and his phone was off. T.S. has not heard from Respondent since July 23, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

35. On January 9, 2025, the insurance company's attorney put the file on inactive status, and the insurance company closed the claim for lack of interest on the part of the insured.

ANSWER: Admitted.

36. On January 24, 2025, Respondent sent documents in response to the insurance company's attorney's request for production, but he did not respond to the interrogatories.

ANSWER: Admitted.

37. On February 5, 2025, the insurance company's attorney emailed Respondent acknowledging receipt of the documents, requesting responses to the interrogatories that were served in March of 2024, and offering to schedule another sworn statement date when he received the interrogatory answers.

ANSWER: Admitted.

38. On February 6, 2025, Respondent spoke to the insurance company's attorney's secretary about T.S.'s case.

ANSWER: Admitted.

39. When Respondent: 1) emailed the insurance company on March 7, 2024 stating he was “looking forward to pursuing this claim to its conclusion”; 2) emailed T.S. about the April 11, 2024 sworn statement date; 3) called the insurance company’s lawyer on June 6, 2024 and left a voicemail asking for the Zoom link for T.S.’s sworn statement; 4) advised T.S. on June 18, 2024 that her sworn statement had been rescheduled; 5) confirmed the July 23, 2024 statement date to T.S. on July 23, 2024; 6) sent documents to the insurance company’s attorney on January 24, 2025; and 7) spoke to the insurance company’s attorney’s secretary on February 6, 2025, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

40. Respondent knew that on March 7, 2024, April 11, 2024, June 6, 2024, June 18, 2024, July 23, 2024, January 24, 2025, and February 6, 2025, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

41. To date, Respondent has not contacted T.S. about answers to interrogatories or scheduling another sworn statement date.

ANSWER: Admitted.

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

- a. failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client by failing to comply with written discovery requests in an uninsured motorist claim; in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);

- b. practicing law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, by conduct including appearing in court on January 30, 2024, for T.S.'s Cook County Law Division case; and communicating with T.S.'s insurance company's representatives in the capacity as her attorney in relation to her uninsured motorist claim on March 7, 2024, April 11, 2024, June 6, 2024, July 23, 2024, January 24, 2025, and February 6, 2025, when Respondent's name had been removed from the Roll of Attorneys and he was not authorized to practice law, in violation of Rule 5.5(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- c. engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including knowingly holding himself out as being able to practice law although not authorized to do so, above, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- d. engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, by conduct including holding himself out as authorized to practice law to clients, opposing counsel, and the court when he was not so authorized, in violation of Rule 8.4(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Paragraph 42 states a legal conclusion and no answer is required.

COUNT II

(Alleged Practicing Law After Removal from the Roll of Attorneys, Engaging in Conduct that is Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice, Lack of Diligence, and Dishonesty to a Third Party)

43. On September 20, 2023, Respondent filed a complaint on behalf of his client, a woman with the initials "M.A.," in the Cook County Law Division. The case was set for case management on November 21, 2023.

ANSWER: Admitted.

44. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the November 21, 2023 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

45. Respondent did not appear in court on November 21, 2023, for a case management hearing. Judge Frank Andreou ordered that the next court date was to be “in person” on January 10, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

46. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the January 10, 2024 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

47. Respondent did not appear on January 10, 2024, and Judge Andreou ordered Respondent to appear on January 17, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

48. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the January 17, 2024 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

49. Respondent did not appear on January 17, 2024, and Judge Andreou ordered Respondent to appear “in person” on January 31, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

50. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the January 31, 2024 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

51. On January 31, 2024, Respondent appeared in court. Judge Andreou continued the matter to March 5, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

52. When Respondent appeared in court for M.A.'s case on January 31, 2024, Respondent was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

53. Respondent knew that on January 31, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

54. In February 2024, M.A. asked Respondent if he was authorized to practice law. Respondent replied that he was authorized to practice law, that he only had to take a test, and that he had taken it.

ANSWER: Admitted.

55. Respondent's statement to M.A. that he was authorized to practice law and that he only had to take a test that he had already taken, was false.

ANSWER: Admitted.

56. Respondent knew that his statement to M.A. that he was authorized to practice law and that he only needed to take a test and that he had taken it was false, because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

57. Respondent did not appear in court on M.A.'s case on March 5, 2024. Judge Andreou ordered Respondent to appear on April 15, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

58. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the April 15, 2024 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

59. Respondent appeared on April 15, 2024, and Judge Andreou continued the case to April 30, 2024.

ANSWER: Admitted.

60. Respondent appeared in court on April 30, 2024, and filed a case management order.

ANSWER: Admitted.

61. When Respondent appeared in court on April 15, 2024, and April 30, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

62. Respondent knew that on April 15, 2024, and April 30, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

63. On April 25 and 26, 2024, Respondent corresponded by email with the defendant's attorney about extending the date for the attorney's response to M.A.'s policy limits demand. On April 29, 2024, Respondent spoke with the defense attorney's associate about obtaining a continuance in M.A.'s court case.

ANSWER: Admitted.

64. At the time Respondent communicated with the defense attorney and his associate about M.A.'s case on April 25, 26, and 29, 2024, Respondent was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

65. At the time Respondent spoke with the defense attorney and his associate about M.A.'s case on April 25, 26, and 29, 2024, he knew he not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

66. The court continued M.A.'s case for status on June 7, 2024, and July 2, 2024. Respondent did not appear in court on those dates.

ANSWER: Denied as alleged. (See Group Exhibit A.)

67. On June 19, 2024, Respondent emailed M.A. informing her about a partial settlement offered to her by the defendant's insurance company.

ANSWER: Denied as alleged. Respondent states that he emailed M.A. on June 20, 2024.

68. At the time that Respondent emailed M.A. on June 19, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Denied as alleged with respect to the date June 19, 2024.

69. Respondent knew that on June 19, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

70. On July 2, 2024, Judge Eileen M. O'Connor filed an order stating that neither side had appeared, and that "plaintiff's failure to appear [on August 29, 2024] would result in a dismissal for want of prosecution."

ANSWER: Admitted.

71. On August 7, 2024, defense counsel filed a motion to compel discovery stating that plaintiffs' depositions had to be rescheduled due to their failure to answer written discovery.

ANSWER: Admitted.

72. On August 15, 2024, Judge O'Connor issued an order entering and continuing defendant's motion to compel, and ordering Respondent to appear August 29, 2024, or the matter would be dismissed for want of prosecution.

ANSWER: Admitted.

73. As the attorney of record, the court sent notice of the August 29, 2024 court date to Respondent.

ANSWER: Admitted.

74. On August 29, 2024, Respondent did not appear in court and M.A.'s case the court dismissed the case for want of prosecution.

ANSWER: Admitted.

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

- a. failure to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client by failing to appear in court in M.A.'s Law Division case on November 21, 2023, January 10, 2024, January 17, 2024, March 5, 2024, and August 29, 2024; and by failing to comply with written discovery requests causing the case to be dismissed for want of prosecution; in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);

- a. knowingly making false statements to a third party, by conduct including telling M.A. in February 2024 that he was authorized to practice law when he knew he was not authorized to practice law, in violation of Rule 4.1(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. practicing law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, by conduct including appearing in court on M.A.'s Law Division court case on January 31, 2024, April 15, 2024, and April 30, 2024; filing a case management order in M.A.'s Law Division court case on April 30, 2024; and in communicating with the defendant's attorney, the defendant's attorney's associate, and the insurance company in the capacity as M.A.'s attorney in order to negotiate a settlement when Respondent's name had been removed from the Roll of Attorneys and he was not authorized to practice law, in violation of Rule 5.5(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- c. engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including knowingly holding himself out as being able to practice law although not authorized to do so, and making false statements to M.A. by telling M.A. in February 2024 that he was authorized to practice law when he knew he was not authorized to practice law, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- d. engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, by conduct including holding himself out as authorized to practice law to clients, opposing counsel, and the court when he was not so authorized, in violation of Rule 8.4(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Paragraph 75 states a legal conclusion and no answer is required.

COUNT III

(Alleged Practicing Law After Removal from the Roll of Attorneys, and Engaging in Conduct that is Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice)

76. On June 30, 2023, Respondent filed a complaint in the Cook County Law Division on behalf of his client, a woman with the initials "D.G.," against her real estate agent alleging that

the real estate agent defrauded her of funds she paid him for a deposit on a home she wanted to buy.

ANSWER: Admitted.

77. On December 6, 2023, Respondent appeared in court in D.G.'s court case for a status hearing.

ANSWER: Admitted.

78. At the time Respondent appeared in court on December 6, 2023, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

79. Respondent knew that on December 6, 2023, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

80. On January 3, 2024, the Court dismissed D.G.'s case for want of prosecution. Respondent did not appear in court on that date.

ANSWER: Denied as alleged. (See Exhibit B.)

81. On March 25, 2024, Respondent filed a motion to vacate the dismissal. On April 2, 2024, filed a re-notice of his motion to vacate.

ANSWER: Admitted.

82. At the time Respondent filed his motion to vacate and re-notice of motion in court in D.G.'s court case on March 25, 2024, and April 2, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois.

ANSWER: Admitted.

83. Respondent knew that on March 25, 2024, and April 2, 2024, he was not authorized to practice law in Illinois because the MCLE Board sent and Respondent received notice on December 1, 2023, of his removal from the Roll of Attorneys because he failed to comply with the MCLE requirements.

ANSWER: Admitted.

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

- a. practicing law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, by conduct including appearing in court on December 6, 2023, for D.G.'s Law Division Court case, and filing a motion to vacate on March 25, 2024, and a re-notice of motion on April 2, 2024, in D.G.'s Law Division Court case, when Respondent's name had been removed from the Roll of Attorneys and he was not authorized to practice law, in violation of Rule 5.5(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including knowingly holding himself out as being able to practice law although not authorized to do so, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- c. conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, by conduct including holding himself out as authorized to practice law to clients, opposing counsel, and the court when he was not so authorized, in violation of Rule 8.4(d) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

ANSWER: Paragraph 84 states a legal conclusion and no answer is required.

WHEREFORE, Respondent respectfully requests that the Hearing Board make a just recommendation.

Kathryne Hayes (khayes@cb-law.com)
Collins Bargione & Vuckovich
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Telephone: 312-372-7813

By: /s/ Kathryne Hayes

Exhibit A

To Answer to Complaint

#7

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS



 _____ v. _____

No. 23 L 9615

ORDER

THIS CAUSE COMING TO BE HEARD BEFORE THE COURT, NEITHER SIDE HAVING APPEARED, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 8/29/24 AT 9 AM/PM, IN ROOM 2207. PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO APPEAR WILL RESULT IN A DISMISSAL FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION.

9619-4250
4251

Attorney No.: _____
 Name: _____
 Atty. for: _____
 Address: _____
 City/State/Zip: _____
 Telephone: _____

Judge Eileen M. O'Connor
 JUL 02 2024
 ENTERED: Circuit Court - 2285
 Dated: _____

 Judge Judge's No.

Exhibit B

To Answer to Complaint

