

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND



47th Annual Report

July 1, 2021 thru June 30, 2022

Our Mission

The Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland is dedicated to protecting the public and maintaining the integrity of the legal profession. The Commission, through the Office of Bar Counsel, seeks to encourage and promote the ethical practice of law and the highest standards of professionalism by members of the Bar. In carrying out their functions of evaluating complaints and enforcing ethical standards for lawyers, the Commission and Bar Counsel strive for fairness and equity.

**200 Harry S Truman Parkway, Suite 300
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
410-514-7051**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Attorney Grievance Commission..... | 1 |
| Disciplinary Summaries..... | 2 |
| Targeted Mail Solicitations..... | 20 |
| Attorney Trust Account Overdrafts..... | 20 |
| Conservatorships..... | 21 |
| Peer Review Committee..... | 23 |
| Conditional Diversion Agreements..... | 24 |
| Activities of Professional Staff..... | 25 |
| The Commission..... | 26 |
| Professional Staff..... | 27 |

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 10 Year Comparison Chart..... | 28 |
| Reasons for Disciplinary Action..... | 30 |
| Overview of Cases Received and Cases Docketed..... | 31 |
| Docketed Cases by Law Practice Category..... | 32 |
| Docketed Cases by Locale..... | 33 |
| Docketed Cases by Primary Rules of Professional Conduct Violated..... | 34 |
| Dispositions of Docketed Complaints..... | 35 |
| Disciplinary Action (by Attorney)..... | 36 |
| Audited Financial Statements..... | 37 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
47th Annual Report (Fiscal Year 2022)
July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022

At the beginning of Fiscal Year 2022 (FY 2022), Michael W. Blow, Jr., was promoted to Deputy Bar Counsel. The Office of Bar Counsel also welcomed Assistant Bar Counsel Leonard H. Addison, IV.

The number of licensed attorneys in Maryland increased slightly from 41,611 to 42,050. This year, the Office of Bar Counsel opened 1,589 files, up from 1,433 in fiscal year 2021 (FY 2021). Bar Counsel docketed 303 matters for further investigation, a 50% increase from the prior year. Cases docketed for investigation included complaints received, reinstatement petitions, attorney trust account overdraft notifications, and applications to resign from the bar. The number of sanctioned attorneys, 79, decreased slightly from FY 2021 when 81 received sanctions. The number of sanctioned attorneys is consistent with the ten-year average for all sanctions: approximately 80 per year. The number of reprimands, 33, is slightly higher than the ten-year average. Disbarments, numbering 19, were significantly lower than the ten-year average of 29 while suspensions, 27, were consistent with the ten-year average of 26.

The largest percentage of complaints docketed continues to involve attorneys located in Montgomery County (18%). Montgomery County is followed by out-of-state attorneys (15%), Baltimore City and Baltimore County (12%), and Prince George's County (10%). The practice areas at issue with the most docketed complaints were civil litigation (13%), family law (12%), and criminal defense (10%). The largest category of conduct complained about included some combination of competence, diligence and communication failures, representing 20% of all docketed complaints followed by issues involving safekeeping of property (13%).

One of the most important functions of the office is to establish and pursue conservatorships of the client files and accounts of deceased, disbarred and disappeared lawyers. This year, as in FY 2021, eleven (11) new conservatorships were established. Nineteen (19) conservatorships were closed in FY 2022, a significant increase from the previous year. Thirty-two (32) remained open at the end of the fiscal year.

As in previous years, the staff of the Office of Bar Counsel and the Executive Counsel and Director were involved in educational programs presented to lawyers, law students and judges in an effort to alert participants to their ethical and professional obligations.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
DISCIPLINARY SUMMARIES
Fiscal Year 2022

ADAMS, Sylvia Lorraine – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on October 28, 2021, for knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to file federal or state income tax returns for three years and failed to provide complete, timely responses to Bar Counsel’s requests for information and documentation regarding the status of her tax returns.

BENAROYA, E. Anne – Commission Reprimand on April 26, 2022, for failing to represent her clients competently and diligently, failing to abide by the scope of the representation, and collecting unreasonable fees. The Respondent agreed to represent the defendants in a lawsuit but failed to enter her appearance in the case and failed to file an answer or any preliminary motions on behalf of her clients, resulting in an Order of Default.

BONNER, Keith M. – Disbarred on March 3, 2022, effective immediately, for committing criminal acts that reflect adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney and engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation. The Respondent misappropriated funds from his law firm over a period of several years and made numerous knowing and intentional misrepresentations to principals and employees at his law firm to conceal the misconduct.

BORGERDING, Francis Xavier, Jr. – Commission Reprimand on February 25, 2022, for failing to diligently administer an estate, including failing to timely pay the probate fee and failing to file the Second Account resulting in multiple notices from the Register of Wills and the issuance of a Show Cause Order by the Orphans’ Court. The Orphans’ Court ordered the allowance of personal representative commission in the amount of \$1,500.00 and ordered the Respondent to immediately distribute the net assets to the beneficiaries and report the distribution of the remaining assets available on an amended account. The Respondent withdrew \$1,500.00, representing his commissions, but failed to otherwise comply with the order. The Orphans’ Court removed the Respondent as personal representative for “willfully disregard[ing] an order of the court” and “fail[ing], without reasonable excuse, to perform a material duty pertaining to the office.” The Respondent refunded the estate his \$1,500.00 commission and wrote a check to the successor personal representative for the total assets of the estate.

BROCKMEYER, Adele Louise – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for failing to properly supervise a non-attorney assistant and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. Prior to a hearing in a custody matter, the Respondent failed to thoroughly review exhibits and incorrectly assumed certain information was related to certain non-privileged therapy sessions. As a result, the Respondent’s paralegal filed exhibits with the court containing notes from privileged sessions in advance of the hearing, the Respondent referenced information included in the privileged therapy notes in her opening statement, and the Respondent attempted to introduce the privileged notes as an exhibit during the hearing. The Respondent’s

paralegal, without the Respondent's knowledge or authorization, also improperly issued and served a trial subpoena due to the Respondent's lack of supervision.

BROOKS, Gary Morgan – Reprimand on August 27, 2021, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently; failing to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter; failing to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account and failing to obtain his client's informed consent, confirmed in writing, to hold the funds outside of trust; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; and failing to maintain required financial records of the attorney trust account. The Respondent failed to properly manage his attorney trust account and made numerous errors in administering a small estate, including but not limited to errors contained in documents filed with the Orphans' Court, errors in applying the statutory order of priority of claims against the Estate, errors in depositing client funds, errors in withdrawing funds, and the Respondent's overall failure to keep client matter records and ledgers.

BROWN, Jibril Abdussaboor – Suspension by Consent for ninety days on November 22, 2021, stayed in favor of eighteen months of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In one matter, the Respondent failed to attend a hearing and failed to comply with an order directing him to respond to a motion to dismiss. In a second matter, the Respondent failed to communicate with a potential witness in any manner prior to designating her as an expert witness and failed to properly serve her with a trial subpoena.

CASSILLY, Joseph Ignatius – Disbarred on October 22, 2021, effective immediately, for failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; failing to maintain fairness to opposing party and counsel; failing to abide by the special responsibility of a prosecutor to make timely disclosure to the defense of all evidence or information known to the prosecutor that tends to negate the guilt of the accused or mitigates the offense, and, in connection with sentencing, disclose to the defense and to the tribunal all unprivileged mitigating information known to the prosecutor, except when the prosecutor is relieved of this responsibility by a protective order of the tribunal; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel's lawful requests for information; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent, in his capacity as a prosecutor, knowingly and intentionally failed to disclose for more than a decade exculpatory evidence that came to light after a defendant's conviction, discarded evidence, sought to have forensic evidence in the case destroyed, knowingly made false statements of fact to the court and defense counsel concerning the content of the evidence, and, during Bar Counsel's investigation, failed to comply with a subpoena to provide a statement under oath.

CHRISTMAN, Edward Charles, Jr. – Commission Reprimand on December 20, 2021, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping requirements. The Respondent admitted that he did not create or maintain records associated with the maintenance and disbursement of client and third-party funds and that he did not perform monthly reconciliations of his attorney trust account.

COLLINS, Natalie Thryphenia – Indefinite Suspension on February 25, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; knowingly making false statements as an applicant for reinstatement to the Bar and in connection with a disciplinary matter; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent was the subject of a sixty-day definite suspension from the practice of law in Maryland as a result of an unrelated disciplinary action. The Respondent subsequently applied for reinstatement to the Bar and made knowing and intentional misrepresentations in her petition for reinstatement, in her response to Bar Counsel’s objection to her petition for reinstatement, and in correspondence with Bar Counsel. In addition, the Respondent repeatedly failed to respond to Bar Counsel’s requests for information concerning a new complaint.

CORCORAN, Andrew Ryan – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on March 9, 2022, effective April 15, 2022, with the right to petition for reinstatement in eighteen months, for failing to represent his client competently; failing to adequately communicate with his client; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account; failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements; failing to properly supervise attorneys and non-attorney assistants; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent’s firm had collected substantial proceeds belonging to a client and which required deposit and maintenance in an attorney trust account. The Respondent was the attorney responsible for managing his firm’s attorney trust account but improperly relied on another to manage the account, resulting in misappropriation of entrusted funds. The Respondent then made misrepresentations regarding the status of entrusted funds based on his failure to conduct adequate due diligence and mistaken reliance on statements of others. The Respondent repeatedly attempted to disburse a large sum of client funds via checks drawn on the attorney trust account with knowledge that the funds were not maintained in the account.

CRADDOCK, MyEsha Ruth – Disbarment by Consent on February 23, 2022, for committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent pled guilty to one count of theft over \$100,000.00 in violation of Maryland Code, Criminal Law § 7-104.

DAILEY, Mitzi Elaine – Disbarred on July 23, 2021, for failing to represent her client competently and diligently; failing to abide by the scope of representation; failing to adequately communicate with her client; collecting unreasonable fees; failing to safekeep funds and make required deposits in an attorney trust account; failing to create and maintain required financial records of the attorney trust account; failing to take steps to protect her client’s interest upon termination of the representation; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to maintain an attorney trust account, failed to act on her client’s case, failed to communicate with her client, abandoned representation of her client, misappropriated client funds, and made intentional misrepresentations to Bar Counsel.

DALEY, Thereen Dian – Indefinite Suspension on October 22, 2021, effective immediately, for knowingly making false statements of material fact or law to third persons; communicating about the subject of representation with a person known to be represented by counsel; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel’s lawful requests for information; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent made intentional misrepresentations to opposing counsel during her representation of her client, communicated directly with an opposing party whom she knew to be represented by counsel, failed to cooperate with Bar Counsel during the investigatory process, and made intentional misrepresentations to Bar Counsel.

DISCAVAGE, John Robert – Suspension by Consent for six months on June 2, 2022, stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for failing to represent his clients competently, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, representing clients involving conflicts of interest, failing to uphold his duties to former clients, representing clients when the representation would result in violation of the Maryland Attorneys’ Rules of Professional Conduct, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving conflicts of interest. One such conflict involved a husband and wife jointly retaining the Respondent to prepare a Marital Settlement Agreement; the Respondent failed to advise the clients that the joint representation created a conflict of interest and failed to obtain the clients’ informed consent, confirmed in writing, waiving the conflict. Another such conflict involved the Respondent’s personal involvement in civil litigation where a witness to the civil proceeding was also the arresting officer in one of the Respondent’s client’s criminal cases.

DUNWIDDIE, David Alan – Disbarment by Consent on February 23, 2022, effective immediately, for committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent pled guilty to one count of theft of government property in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 641.

EKEKWE, Olekanma Arnette – Disbarred on June 1, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to communicate effectively with her client; failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; engaging in the unauthorized practice of law; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; and failing to comply with the affirmative duties of suspended attorneys. The Respondent failed to adequately communicate with a client, represented a client while she was suspended from practicing law, and made knowing and intentional misrepresentations to the court about her status.

FELLNER, Brian Robert – Suspension by Consent for thirty days on February 25, 2022, stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation. The Respondent planned to resign from the firm where he was employed to open his own practice and, when no one else was present, removed numerous paper client files from the firm, despite not having permission or authorization to do so and despite not having informed any of the firm’s clients of his departure.

FICKER, Robin Keith Annesley – Disbarred on March 3, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently; failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; failing to properly supervise a non-attorney assistant; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to appear for a trial and made false statements to the court regarding a continuance motion that contained a materially false statement concerning the position of the opposing party.

FRANCIS, Ernest P. – Disbarred on August 24, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, for failing to abide by the scope of the representation; failing to adequately communicate with his client; filing frivolous pleadings; knowingly making a false statement of material fact or law to a third person; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent made substantive decisions regarding his client’s federal lawsuit without his client’s knowledge or consent, including rejecting two settlement offers without his client’s authorization, proffering an unauthorized settlement demand, and submitting filings containing factual representations that the Respondent had reason to believe were false. The Respondent filed multiple frivolous pleadings in the case that were not based on any good faith argument. The Respondent also conducted himself with “pervasive incivility” during the underlying litigation and during a hearing conducted before a District Committee of the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board.

GERTNER, Abraham Allan – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for failing to represent his clients diligently, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent settled two personal injury claims but failed to deposit the settlement funds in an attorney trust account and instead placed the settlement checks in the client files. The Respondent failed to disburse the proceeds from the settlements despite both clients’ repeated requests for him to do so. After both clients filed complaints with Bar Counsel, the Respondent requested the reissue of the settlement checks, deposited them into his attorney trust account, and, approximately eight months after receiving the original settlement checks, disbursed the proceeds to both clients.

GOLESORKHI, Reza – Commission Reprimand on September 22, 2021, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently, failing to uphold his duty to a former client, representing a client involving an imputed conflict of interest, representing a client when the representation would result in violation of the Maryland Attorneys’ Rules of Professional Conduct, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In a custody matter, the Respondent’s law firm assigned him to represent a client in a matter directly adverse to a former client of the firm. The Respondent failed to do appropriate due diligence prior to making incorrect representations to the court regarding the prior representation. After receiving the adverse party’s motion to strike his appearance, the Respondent failed to speak to the attorney at his firm about the scope of the prior representation, failed to identify the conflict of interest that existed as to continued representation of the client in any custody dispute, failed to obtain the client’s informed consent waiving any conflict, and failed to withdraw from the representation.

GRAU, Angela Beckner – Commission Reprimand on July 26, 2021, for failing to promptly inform her client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which her client’s informed

consent is required, failing to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit her client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, failing to communicate to her client the scope of the representation and the basis or rate of the fee and expenses for which her client would be responsible before or within a reasonable time after commencing the representation, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent and her client verbally agreed that the client would use the property at issue in the representation as collateral to obtain financing to pay any balance of attorney's fees. This arrangement was not incorporated into the client's retainer agreement, and the Respondent failed to adequately communicate, in writing, the terms of payment for which her client would be responsible. At the conclusion of the litigation, the Respondent failed to clearly advise her client that the representation had ended and began assisting her client in seeking financing to pay off the balance owed to the Respondent. The Respondent failed to explain to her client how the Respondent's efforts to assist the client in obtaining a loan differed from the representation in the underlying litigation.

GRIMM, Bernard Seton – Disbarment by Consent on August 17, 2021, effective September 1, 2021, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account. The Respondent recklessly misappropriated client funds.

HAAR, Paul Saul – Suspension by Consent for seven months on April 22, 2022, effective *nunc pro tunc* to March 24, 2022, followed by one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account. The Respondent negligently misappropriated client funds by failing to deposit a flat fee into a trust account three years after District of Columbia case law clarified that, per the District of Columbia Rules of Professional Conduct, attorneys were required to deposit pre-paid flat fees into trust.

HELLMER, Ellennita Muetze – Commission Reprimand on March 23, 2022, for failing to represent her client competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with her client, collecting unreasonable fees, knowingly failing to disclose facts necessary to correct a misapprehension, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent was retained to prepare an opposition to the Department of Homeland Security's motion to reopen her client's removal proceedings. Upon receipt of a labor certification allowing the Respondent's employer to file an Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers on behalf of the client, the Respondent advised the client that an opposition was no longer necessary because the client could pursue an adjustment of status and would want his case reopened. The Respondent agreed to represent the client in connection with the Petition and the subsequent Application for Adjustment of Status. The Respondent completed and mailed the Petition but did not receive notice from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) acknowledging receipt or take any timely action to confirm that they had received the Petition before the labor certification expired. The Respondent later informed the client that USCIS never received the Petition but failed to return any portion of the fees and expenses paid in connection with the representation.

HUNTER, Matthew Robert – Commission Reprimand on November 20, 2021, for failing to represent his client diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his client, and failing to uphold his responsibilities regarding a non-attorney assistant. The Respondent retained the services of an independent consultant who was formerly admitted to the practice of law and had been and remained indefinitely suspended. As an independent consultant for the Respondent's

law firm, the formerly admitted attorney continued to work on several of his former clients' matters. The Respondent inadvertently assisted the former attorney in violating the Maryland Attorneys' Rules of Professional Conduct, as the Respondent was unaware of the prohibition on formerly admitted attorneys working on matters for clients whom they previously represented. The Respondent failed to file notice with Bar Counsel of the formerly admitted attorney's association with his firm.

ISAAC, Maurice Onome Oghomienor – Commission Reprimand on November 23, 2021, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel, and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping requirements. The Respondent received funds from an organization that were not associated with any client or third-party matter and constituted the Respondent's personal funds. The Respondent improperly deposited the funds into his attorney trust account and failed to create or maintain a record identifying the nature of the deposited funds and therefore showing any disbursements. The Respondent issued a check from his attorney trust account payable to a possible expert witness in his client's medical malpractice case and identified the money received from the organization as the source of funds used to pay the possible witness.

JOHNSON, Anitha Wileen – Temporary suspension on November 19, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia, pending further Order from the Court of Appeals.

JONES, Antoini Martin – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on January 12, 2022, stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for collecting unreasonable fees; failing to safekeep unearned fees in his attorney trust account and failing to obtain his client's informed consent, confirmed in writing, to hold the funds outside of trust; failing to take steps to protect his client's interest upon termination of the representation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The client's mother retained the Respondent to represent her son in a criminal matter for a flat fee. The Respondent failed to deposit and maintain the unearned funds in an attorney trust account. The Respondent failed to provide a refund.

KASTL, Joseph Wayne – Commission Reprimand on July 26, 2021, for making false or misleading communications about his legal services, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, collecting unreasonable fees, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent's law firm website and letterhead listed his Maryland address as his law firm address and failed to adequately reflect that the Respondent was licensed to practice law in Illinois, not Maryland, or that his practice was limited to federal military practice. The Respondent's retainer agreement failed to specify what legal services would be provided for his client's flat fee, and the Respondent refused his client's request for a refund after the client terminated the representation due to his failure to advance her case in any meaningful way. In another matter, the Respondent charged an unreasonable fee when he collected payment, failed to advance his client's case or provide any services of value, and failed to refund any portion of the payment.

KING, Marnitta Lanette – Commission Reprimand on November 22, 2021, for failing to represent her client competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with her client, collecting unreasonable fees, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to make a

reasonably diligent effort to comply with a legally proper discovery request by opposing counsel, knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping requirements. The Respondent represented a client in a family law matter and, among other issues, failed to ensure her staff filed her drafted answer to a countercomplaint, failed to respond to a motion to compel discovery, failed to prepare a pendente lite order even though she agreed to do so in court, failed to appear at a hearing, and failed to file a motion to vacate the dismissal of her client's case. The Respondent repeatedly failed to inform her client of these failures, up to and including failing to inform him that his complaint had been dismissed. The Respondent also failed to deposit and maintain her client's funds in an attorney trust account until earned. In addition, the Respondent overdrew her attorney trust account and failed to maintain client matter records.

KRAME, Evan J. – Temporary suspension on November 19, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia, pending further Order from the Court of Appeals.

KURLAND, Sari Karson – Commission Reprimand on July 26, 2021, for failing to adequately communicate with her client, failing to memorialize a contingent fee arrangement in a writing signed by her client, and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements. The Respondent contemplated a contingency fee arrangement but failed to include it in the retainer agreement her client signed, failed to issue invoices in a timely or regular manner, and failed to maintain proper records of escrow transactions.

LAZAR, Charles Steven – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice and for knowingly manifesting by words or conduct bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status. The Respondent was retained to represent a client in a criminal matter. During a telephone conversation with the Assistant State's Attorney assigned to the case, the Respondent suggested the attorney should be called a racially insensitive nickname. The Respondent subsequently repeated the racially insensitive nickname to his client.

LEE, Arlene Frances – Commission Reprimand on August 25, 2021, for failing to represent her clients competently and diligently. The Respondent submitted several out-of-date immigration forms on her client's behalf and mistakenly submitted corrected forms after her client's U-Visa expired, resulting in one of the applications being denied. In another immigration matter, the Respondent failed to make sure her client's petition was filed before the deadline, resulting in the client's petition being denied.

LILLARD, III, John Franklin – Commission Reprimand on February 9, 2022, for filing frivolous pleadings, knowingly disobeying obligations under the rules of a tribunal, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent litigated a class action lawsuit on behalf of himself and a proposed class of other similarly situated Annapolis residents that alleged that the defendant companies overcharged for water and sewer services. During the litigation, the Respondent failed to comply with the orders and Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and failed to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Respondent also filed two frivolous motions for sanctions without any legal basis or justification.

MAIDEN, Amber Lisa – Indefinite Suspension on May 11, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent her client competently; representing a client involving a conflict of interest; acquiring an improper proprietary interest in her client’s cause of action; failing to withdraw from representing her client when continued representation would result in violation of the Maryland Attorneys’ Rules of Professional Conduct; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; and knowingly manifesting by words or conduct bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status. The Respondent created, failed to recognize, and failed to act to resolve a conflict of interest. The Respondent sent an antisemitic and highly offensive twenty-page letter to a client and later knowingly and intentionally misrepresented to Bar Counsel that she had sent the letter by mistake.

MALLON, Thomas K. – Commission Reprimand on March 22, 2022, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently; failing to abide by the scope of the representation; failing to adequately communicate with his clients; collecting unreasonable fees; filing a frivolous pleading; failing to reasonably expedite litigation; failing to maintain fairness to an opposing party and counsel; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In the first matter, the Respondent failed to timely file a countercomplaint, failed to file a financial statement, and failed to ensure that his client’s discovery responses were timely provided to opposing counsel. The Respondent failed to review certain discovery responses with his client and signed the document on his client’s behalf without her authority. As a result, the discovery responses included multiple false assertions. In the second matter, the Respondent double billed against his client’s retainer fee for the same service and failed to provide the client with a final invoice or remove the double-billed amount from the balance.

MARKS, Isaac H. – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on November 15, 2021, effective *nunc pro tunc* to September 13, 2021, with the right to petition for reinstatement after one year, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account; failing to promptly deliver funds that a client or third party was entitled to receive; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. While serving as trustee of a trust, the Respondent failed to provide required accountings, failed to marshal and maintain trust assets, negligently misappropriated trust funds, and made knowing misrepresentations to the court regarding his actions and inactions as trustee.

MARKS, Jay Schine – Commission Reprimand on June 21, 2022, for failing to properly supervise a non-attorney assistant. As his firm’s managing and supervising attorney, the Respondent failed to make reasonable efforts to ensure that a paralegal finalized an immigration client’s Motion to Reopen by the filing deadline.

MASLAN, Gary Richard – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In the first matter, the Respondent filed an incomplete asylum application on behalf of his client in an immigration matter. The court set a deadline for the client to file a completed application. The Respondent failed to file a completed application on behalf of the client prior to the deadline. In the second

matter, the Respondent filed a cancellation of removal application on behalf of a client in an immigration matter. The court held a hearing and ordered the Respondent to refile the application because the court did not have a copy of the application in its file. The Respondent failed to refile the application before the deadline.

MATHEWS, Singleton Sinclair – Commission Reprimand on May 24, 2022, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently; failing to abide by the scope of representation; failing to adequately communicate with his clients; collecting unreasonable fees; failing to safekeep unearned fees in an attorney trust account; failing to take steps to protect his clients' interests upon termination of the representation; failing to properly supervise an associate attorney; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent engaged in professional misconduct while representing clients in four individual criminal matters. He failed to take appropriate steps to protect the clients' interests at the outset of the representation by filing appropriate motions or communicating with the clients. The Respondent deposited the clients' funds directly into his operating account without obtaining their informed consent, confirmed in writing, to hold the funds outside of trust. The Respondent failed to provide two clients with any services of value and failed to provide them with refunds.

McLEAN, Pamela Anne – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on February 25, 2022, stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia for disclosing confidential client information and representing a client when her professional judgment on behalf of the client will be or reasonably may be adversely affected by her responsibilities to or interests in a third party or her own personal interests. While representing a mother in a child custody matter, the Respondent disclosed several specific concerns about her client's fitness as a parent to the guardian ad litem, to the judge, and to opposing counsel. Despite her concerns, the Respondent did not move to withdraw from the representation until the day of trial.

MOAWAD, Edward Emad – Disbarred on August 11, 2021, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently; failing to adequately communicate with his clients; collecting unreasonable fees; failing to properly supervise non-attorney assistants; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to properly file his clients' immigration forms, failed to take remedial action to correct his filing errors, failed to communicate with his clients about the status of their cases, failed to supervise his non-attorney staff to ensure their conduct was compatible with his professional obligations, charged unreasonable fees for legal services never rendered or erroneously completed, and made intentional misrepresentations to Bar Counsel.

MOODY, John Anthony – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on February 18, 2022, effective April 15, 2022, with the right to petition for reinstatement after one year, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently; failing to adequately communicate with his client; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent represented a client in a personal injury matter. Over a period of approximately two years, the Respondent failed to respond to his client's insurance carrier's numerous attempts to contact him and failed to respond to his client's many requests for information. The Respondent knowingly and intentionally misrepresented to his client that he submitted her demand package

and was waiting to hear back from a representative. Approximately eleven months later and only weeks before the expiration of the statute of limitations, the Respondent informed his client that he could not represent her. During Bar Counsel's investigation, the Respondent made numerous knowing and intentional misrepresentations about the representation and about his communications with the insurance carrier.

MOSHMAN, Rachael Alexandra Schmid – Suspension by Consent for seven months on May 9, 2022, effective immediately, with thirty days stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for failing to represent her client competently and with reasonable promptness and for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account. The Respondent failed to provide competent representation and negligently misappropriated client funds while serving as a court-appointed conservator of an incapacitated elderly resident of the District of Columbia in a probate matter.

O'NEILL, Lawrence Daniel – Disbarred on March 9, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent his client competently; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account; failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping, prohibited transaction, and monthly reconciliation requirements; commingling funds; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to properly maintain client funds in an attorney trust account and misappropriated client funds for his own personal use. The Respondent caused a negative balance to occur in his attorney trust account on multiple occasions by withdrawing client funds to pay for monthly expenses. The Respondent made knowingly and intentionally false statements to Bar Counsel, failed to timely and completely answer Bar Counsel's requests for financial records, and failed to participate in proceedings before the hearing judge.

PAVLICK, Richard Mark – Reinstatement vacated and indefinite suspension reimposed on June 16, 2022, effective immediately, with the right to petition for reinstatement after sixty days, for failing to safekeep property of clients or third persons, failing to maintain adequate trust account records, commingling funds, and disbursing funds from an attorney trust account when the disbursement created a negative balance with respect to an individual client matter or all client matters in the aggregate.

PEACE, Lynnell Davis – Commission Reprimand on July 24, 2021, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements, making cash withdrawals from her attorney trust account, and disbursing funds from an attorney trust account when the disbursement created a negative balance with respect to an individual client matter or all client matters in the aggregate. The Respondent's attorney trust account was overdrawn. Over a seventeen-month period, the Respondent made several cash withdrawals, maintained negative client ledger balances, commingled her personal funds in her attorney trust account, and negligently misappropriated client funds. In addition, during the period observed, the Respondent failed to perform monthly reconciliations of her attorney trust account and failed to maintain client ledgers.

PRALEY, James Charles – Reprimand by Consent on February 18, 2022, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently and failing to adequately communicate with his client. The Respondent was retained to conduct a closing transaction on four properties by his client, the

purchaser, who provided the Respondent with a cashier's check made payable to the Respondent's title company at the settlement at the Respondent's law office. After the settlement, the Respondent failed to record the deed, failed to remit payment for the outstanding tax debt for the properties, and failed to inform his client of his failure to do so.

PRICE, Gerald Patrick, Jr. – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for charging unreasonable fees; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent pled guilty to one count of assault in the second degree and accepted probation before judgment. In an unrelated matter, the Respondent provided his client with an invoice that he was unable to adequately explain, including failing to explain why certain work was charged at different rates, failing to identify who performed some of the services invoiced, and failing to substantiate other work.

PROCTOR, Deidra Nicole – Disbarred on March 9, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent her clients competently and diligently; failing to abide by the scope of representation; failing to adequately communicate with her clients; collecting unreasonable fees; failing to take steps to protect her clients' interests upon termination of the representation; failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; engaging in the unauthorized practice of law; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent made intentional misrepresentations to multiple clients, represented a client while she was not permitted to practice law, overcharged clients for fees and expenses, and also made misrepresentations to the court and Bar Counsel.

SAPONARO, George Richard Marshall – Indefinite Suspension on June 15, 2022, effective immediately, with the right to petition for reinstatement only following reinstatement in New Jersey, in a reciprocal action from the Supreme Court of New Jersey, for handling or neglecting matters entrusted to him in such manner that his conduct constituted gross negligence, failing to represent his clients diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, failing to communicate to his client in writing the basis or rate of the fee before or within a reasonable time after commencing the representation, failing to take steps to protect his clients' interests upon termination of the representation, and failing to cooperate with disciplinary authorities. The Respondent abandoned his law practice, engaged in misconduct in three client matters, and failed to cooperate with the subsequent disciplinary investigations and proceedings in New Jersey. In addition, the Respondent failed to notify Bar Counsel of the discipline imposed in New Jersey.

SAYADIAN, Nema – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on May 10, 2022, stayed in favor of two years of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for entering into business transactions with clients without obtaining their informed consent, improperly directly soliciting employment from prospective clients, knowingly failing to provide timely responses to Bar Counsel, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. A marketing and consulting company contacted five individuals shortly after they sustained injuries in automobile accidents and solicited representation for the Respondent. After the Respondent settled each personal injury matter, he provided the clients with documents stating they agreed to waive any claims against the Respondent related to the representation. The Respondent failed to advise the clients that the waiver created a conflict of interest and that they should seek independent counsel.

SCHAAF, Gregg Gerard – Commission Reprimand on November 6, 2021, for failing to represent his client diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his client, failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping requirements, and failing to promptly remove earned fees from his attorney trust account. For approximately three years after judgment was entered in the Respondent’s client’s divorce matter, the Respondent failed to obtain the information necessary to prepare and file the required Qualified Domestic Relations Order, despite repeated inquiries from his client. In addition, for approximately three years, the Respondent failed to promptly withdraw earned fees from his attorney trust account and failed to perform monthly reconciliations of the account.

SCHAUB, Ruth Marguerite Marie – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on August 16, 2021, effective October 1, 2021, with the right to petition for reinstatement after sixty days, for committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In 2017 and 2018, the Respondent withheld funds from her employees’ paychecks but failed to safekeep the funds for the benefit of the Internal Revenue Service and failed to pay the funds to the IRS. The Respondent filed her firm’s quarterly federal tax returns but failed to remit employment tax for the last three quarters of 2017 and all of 2018. The Respondent falsely claimed income tax withholding credits on her personal federal tax returns for 2017 and 2018.

SCHUMAN, Jonathan Robert – Disbarment by Consent on August 16, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to promptly deliver funds that his client was entitled to receive, and engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation. The Respondent intentionally misappropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars of his former clients’ funds and made false representations regarding the refund of a former client’s funds.

SHANAHAN, Terrance James – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on October 25, 2021, effective immediately, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his client, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, filing frivolous pleadings, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent refused to dismiss his clients’ lawsuit after opposing counsel advised him that their claims had previously been discharged in bankruptcy. The opposing parties had to reopen their bankruptcy cases, and the bankruptcy court determined that the Respondent’s clients’ violation of the discharge injunction was malicious and without any good faith basis and entered an award of attorneys’ fees and sanctions. The Respondent agreed to pay in twelve monthly installments but only made three payments. In addition, the Respondent was safekeeping funds in his attorney trust account in connection with two real estate transactions at the time the Respondent closed his law firm, but the Respondent failed to advise the parties to the transactions that he was closing his firm and failed to make arrangements to transfer the funds. The Respondent also failed to maintain accurate client matter records for his attorney trust account.

SHEDLICK, Christopher Broughton – Suspension by Consent for six months on September 13, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping requirements. The Respondent admitted to the Virginia State Bar

Disciplinary Board that he did not have any cash receipts journals, cash disbursements journals, client subsidiary ledgers, or evidence of reconciliations for his attorney trust account. The Respondent also erroneously deposited a check into his operating account instead of his attorney trust account, which resulted in his attorney trust account being overdrawn.

SHIELDS, Jon Edward – Disbarred on October 22, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, for failing to abide by his client’s decision whether to settle a matter, failing to represent his client diligently, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent settled a client’s matter without the client’s authorization or knowledge, failed to advise the client that he had settled his case, failed to respond to the client’s requests for information, and failed to provide the client with an accounting regarding the use of the client’s retainer fee. In addition, the Respondent failed to notify Bar Counsel promptly of the discipline imposed in Virginia.

SILBIGER, Clifford Baer – Disbarred on May 26, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent his clients competently; failing to adequately communicate with his client; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account; knowingly failing to disclose facts necessary to correct a misapprehension; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements; commingling funds; and using trust money for purposes other than the purpose for which the money is entrusted. The Respondent misappropriated client and third-party funds and used the funds to pay for personal and business expenses. The Respondent engaged in intentional misappropriation when he made disbursements from a client’s settlement funds without the client’s knowledge or authorization. Initially, the Respondent knowingly and intentionally withheld information and documentation requested by Bar Counsel during its investigation.

SITTON, Winston Bradshaw – Indefinite Suspension on August 24, 2021, effective immediately, with the right to petition for reinstatement only following unconditional reinstatement in Tennessee, in a reciprocal action from the Supreme Court of Tennessee where it suspended the Respondent from the practice of law in Tennessee for four years, for engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent made inappropriate statements in comments posted to Facebook concerning potential criminal defenses.

SKALNY, Paul George – Commission Reprimand on July 29, 2021, for failing to promptly inform his client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which his client’s informed consent is required, failing to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, failing to communicate to his client the basis or rate of the fee and expenses for which his client would be responsible before or within a reasonable time after commencing the representation, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent and his client verbally agreed that the client would use the property at issue in the representation as collateral to obtain financing to pay any balance of attorney’s fees. This arrangement was not incorporated into the client’s retainer agreement. At the conclusion of the litigation, the Respondent failed to advise his client that the representation had ended before beginning to assist her in seeking financing to pay off the balance owed to the

Respondent. The Respondent failed to explain to his client how the Respondent's efforts to assist the client in obtaining a loan differed from the representation in the underlying litigation.

SKULLNEY, Kathleen Susan – Commission Reprimand on February 26, 2022, for failing to represent her client competently, failing to adequately communicate with her client, failing to communicate to her client the scope of the representation and the basis or rate of the fee and expenses for which her client would be responsible before or within a reasonable time after commencing the representation, entering into business transactions with a current client without obtaining the client's informed consent, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent failed to finalize terms of representation or execute a retainer agreement until approximately six months after she began representing the personal representative of an estate. The retainer agreement stated that her client agreed to pay the Respondent a percentage or flat amount, whichever was greater, of the amount allowed as commissions and fees for services as personal representative. The Respondent later improperly attempted to renegotiate and increase her fee and failed to inform her client of the conflict of interest or advise him to seek independent legal counsel. During the representation, the Respondent sought payment for pre-death services she provided to the decedent and for funeral expenses she paid on the decedent's behalf. In addition, the Respondent failed to advise her client that she was not entitled to fees for serving as the decedent's power of attorney and that the time to file claims against the estate had expired.

SMITH, Timothy Guy – Disbarment by Consent on August 10, 2021, effective immediately, in a reciprocal action from the District of Columbia, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent, who was hired to establish a special needs trust to receive the proceeds from a confidential settlement agreement, recklessly misappropriated and commingled entrusted funds and interfered with the administration of justice by failing to keep adequate records of entrusted funds.

STAFILATOS, Calistratos Spiros – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on August 30, 2021, effective November 1, 2021, with the right to petition for reinstatement after ninety days, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his clients, collecting unreasonable fees, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to take steps to protect his clients' interests upon termination of the representation, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. In a civil matter, the Respondent failed to file an answer to an amended complaint and failed to respond to a motion for entry of default judgment, resulting in the court entering judgment against his client. In a custody matter, the Respondent failed to respond to discovery, resulting in sanctions being assessed against his client. In two custody matters, the Respondent charged unreasonable fees, failed to deposit unearned fees in his attorney trust account, and failed to provide his clients with periodic invoices for fees charged. Over a nine-month period, the Respondent made multiple cash withdrawals from his attorney trust account, failed to reconcile the account, and failed to maintain client matter records.

STEIN, Leslie Alvin – Commission Reprimand on August 28, 2021, for disclosing confidential client information, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to take steps to protect his client's interest upon termination of the representation, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, and failing to comply with attorney trust account

record-keeping and monthly reconciliation requirements. The Respondent failed to obtain his client's informed consent, confirmed in writing, to hold his client's funds outside of trust before doing so. Additionally, the Respondent revealed confidential information related to the representation in his Motion to Strike Appearance without obtaining his client's informed consent. After his appearance was withdrawn, the Respondent initially refused to refund his client any portion of the flat fee he had charged.

STOUT, Matheau Jay Weldon – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on December 2, 2021, stayed in favor of one year of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, failing to promptly remove earned fees from an attorney trust account, knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and monthly reconciliation requirements, commingling funds, and disbursing funds from an attorney trust account when the disbursement created a negative balance with respect to an individual client matter or all client matters in the aggregate. The Respondent's attorney trust account was overdrawn twice, and, for approximately two years, the Respondent failed to conduct monthly reconciliations of his attorney trust account, failed to maintain accurate records of deposits and disbursements, and failed to maintain accurate client ledgers for all client matters.

SUTTON, Walter Timothy – Commission Reprimand on March 21, 2022, for failing to represent his client diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his client, and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent's law firm filed an incomplete asylum application on behalf of a client in an immigration matter. The court set a deadline for the client to file a completed application. The Respondent failed to contact the client to obtain the information necessary to complete the application and failed to file a completed application on behalf of the client prior to the deadline.

TOMPKINS, David Errol – Commission Reprimand on January 24, 2022, for making false or misleading communications about his legal services and giving things of value to individuals for recommending his legal services. The Respondent routinely disseminated a newsletter to his clients via email that offered to pay a referral fee for new clients. Between November 2015 and April 2021, the Respondent paid referral fees to over 300 former clients. The Respondent's email newsletter included an offer to purchase a dashcam camera for any client who left his firm a five-star review, and the Respondent purchased fifty-one dashcams for former clients in exchange for positive reviews.

TYRONE, Erick Renard – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on September 7, 2021, effective October 7, 2021, with the right to petition for reinstatement after six months, for failing to represent his client competently, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements, and commingling funds. The Respondent's attorney trust account was overdrawn. Over a period of approximately two years, the Respondent made personal expenditures from his trust account, commingled personal and client funds with trust funds, made over forty cash disbursements from his trust account, failed to maintain client matter records, and failed to perform monthly reconciliations of trust account activity. The Respondent's negligent record-keeping practices resulted in negative client ledger balances in several matters.

VASILIADES, Christopher Edward – Disbarred on August 16, 2021, effective immediately, for knowingly failing to disclose facts necessary to correct a misapprehension; committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as an attorney; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; and knowingly manifesting by words or conduct bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status. The Respondent intentionally failed to supplement his answers to questions on his bar application and failed to disclose that information to the character committee. The Respondent committed second-degree assault and violated various protective orders that were not reported to the Attorney Grievance Commission. In addition, the Respondent’s public social media accounts, which he used to advertise his legal practice, included racial, homophobic, and sexist content; reflected inappropriate bias; and were prejudicial to the administration of justice.

WALKER-TURNER, John Wayne, Sr. – Indefinite Suspension by Consent on August 20, 2021, effective September 20, 2021, with the right to petition for reinstatement after ninety days, for failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements, making cash withdrawals from his attorney trust account, and disbursing funds from an attorney trust account when the disbursement created a negative balance with respect to an individual client matter or all client matters in the aggregate. The Respondent deposited personal funds into his trust account, made cash withdrawals from the account, and failed to maintain client matter records. The Respondent’s attorney trust account was overdrawn twice.

WELCH, III, William Lawrence – Commission Reprimand on February 22, 2022, for failing to represent his client diligently and failing to adequately communicate with his client. The Respondent represented a client in post-conviction proceedings paneled to him by the Office of the Public Defender. The Respondent repeatedly failed to timely and adequately communicate with his client and repeatedly failed to respond to his client’s requests for information and updates on his case.

WEMPLE, Mark David – Disbarred on June 16, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently; failing to adequately communicate with his clients; failing to use legal procedure in good faith; failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; knowingly making false statements of material fact or law to a third person; failing to maintain respect for the rights of a third person; assisting another in engaging in the unauthorized practice of law; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent provided incompetent representation by failing to communicate his appearance to a client until the day before trial, failing to advise a client of fee arrangements, and repeatedly failing to appear at clients’ hearings. The Respondent abused the legal process by intentionally serving an unenforceable subpoena to coerce a witness to appear at a deposition and baselessly threatening to hold the witness in contempt for failing to answer questions. The Respondent made knowingly false statements to the circuit court by intentionally misrepresenting that his associate, who was suspended from the practice of law in Maryland, was a specially admitted out-of-state attorney. Finally, the Respondent submitted false evidence and statements during the disciplinary proceeding.

WHITE, Landon Maurice – Disbarred on June 6, 2022, effective immediately, for failing to represent his clients competently and diligently; failing to abide by the scope of representation; failing to adequately communicate with his clients; collecting unreasonable fees; failing to provide written retainer agreements when collecting contingency fees; impermissibly dividing fees between other attorneys without obtaining his clients’ written consent; improperly providing financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation; failing to take steps to protect his clients’ interests upon termination of the representation; filing frivolous pleadings; failing to maintain candor to the tribunal; knowingly making false statements to Bar Counsel; knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel; engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; failing to safekeep funds in his attorney trust account and failing to obtain his clients’ informed consent, confirmed in writing, to hold unearned fees outside of trust; and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and prohibited transaction requirements, including making cash withdrawals and disbursing funds from the account when the disbursement created a negative balance with respect to an individual client matter or all client matters in the aggregate. The Respondent failed to communicate with clients; refused to refund client funds; made intentional misrepresentations to various courts and Bar Counsel; failed to cooperate with Bar Counsel during the investigatory process; and mismanaged client funds in a variety of ways.

WILKINSON, Stephen Carroll – Commission Reprimand on May 2, 2022, for engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The Respondent initiated physical contact with a minor witness while she was testifying without the authorization or consent of the witness or the court.

WILSON, Donna M.P. – Commission Reprimand on May 23, 2022, for failing to represent her clients competently; failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account; failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping, monthly reconciliation, and prohibited transaction requirements; and engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. Over a period of approximately fourteen months, the Respondent commingled earned fees with trust funds in her attorney trust account; used the earned fees to make personal expenditures from her trust account; made cash withdrawals of earned fees from her trust account; failed to perform monthly reconciliations of her trust account; caused an overdraft on the account; and failed to maintain client ledgers.

WORTHINGTON, II, James D. – Suspension by Consent for sixty days on January 27, 2022, stayed in favor of six months of probation with the terms contained in the Probation Agreement, for failing to represent his client competently and diligently, failing to adequately communicate with his client, failing to safekeep funds in an attorney trust account, knowingly failing to respond to Bar Counsel, engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, and failing to comply with attorney trust account record-keeping and monthly reconciliation requirements. The Respondent failed to maintain his client’s retainer fee in an attorney trust account until earned. After the Respondent and his client disagreed as to the direction and course of his client’s case, for approximately three months, the Respondent failed to take any action to advance his client’s case and failed to respond to his client’s requests for information. Bar Counsel’s investigation revealed that in 2019, the Respondent failed to maintain accurate attorney trust account records of deposits and disbursements of client funds and failed to maintain client ledgers for all client matters.

TARGETED MAIL SOLICITATIONS

The Business Occupations and Professions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland §10-605.2 requires an attorney to file with Bar Counsel copies of letters of solicitation sent to prospective clients under certain circumstances. In FY 2022, there were 528 targeted mail submissions, up from 519 submissions in FY 2021. Of the submissions to Bar Counsel this year, fourteen (14) submissions required revisions. The revisions were necessary to address violations of the Maryland Attorneys’ Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 19-307.1-19-307.5, including failure to provide Bar Counsel with a copy of the communication together with a sample copy of the envelope, failure to include the required wording on the advertising envelope and on the advertisement itself, failure to include the name of at least one attorney responsible for its content, and failure to omit language likely to create an unjustified expectation about results the attorney can achieve.

ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT OVERDRAFTS

Maryland Rule 19-411 permits approved financial institutions to maintain attorney trust accounts. Those approved institutions must agree to promptly report overdrafts on attorney trust accounts to Bar Counsel. Upon receipt of the bank’s report, Bar Counsel seeks an explanation from the attorney. This year, there were seventy-eight (78) overdraft notifications, up from seventy-six (76) in FY 2021. Twenty-three (23) were transferred to docketed status for further investigation, up slightly from twenty-one (21) in FY 2021. The reasons for docketing were:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Misappropriation of Client Funds | 3 |
| Safekeeping Property | 7 |
| Comingling | 7 |
| Cash Withdrawals | 1 |
| Improper Recordkeeping | 5 |
| <hr/> | |
| Total | 23 |

Six (6) overdrafts were attributed to some form of bank error that included fees charged in error, bank reported in error, transfers from the wrong account, incorrect postings and incorrect dollar amounts, and failure to honor stop payments.

CONSERVATORSHIPS

When an attorney is deceased, disbarred, or suspended, and there is no responsible attorney to take possession of the client files of that attorney, it may become necessary for Bar Counsel to petition the local Circuit Court to establish a conservatorship. If no attorney is available in the community to take on the task, an attorney on Bar Counsel's staff is nominated to serve as conservator. Upon approval by the Circuit Court in the county where the attorney maintained an office for the practice of law, an appointment of a conservator is ordered, the files of the attorney are marshaled, and, with the aid of Staff Attorneys, notices are sent to clients to determine the appropriate disposition of active files. Pursuant to court order, the destruction of unclaimed client files is permitted.

In FY 2022, eleven (11) conservatorships were established, and members of Bar Counsel's staff were appointed as the conservator in four (4) cases. Private lawyers were appointed as conservators in the remaining seven (7) cases. Nineteen (19) conservatorships were closed during the fiscal year. There are thirty-two (32) pending conservatorship cases at the end of FY 2022, including the conservatorships which were opened, and remain open, this fiscal year. Bar Counsel staff members are appointed as conservators in twenty (20) of the cases, and third parties are appointed as conservators in the remaining twelve (12) cases.

| Opened | DATE | Third Party or AGC |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Callahan, Thomas R. | 10/06/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 2. Crum, Robert S. | 08/30/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 3. Hoppe, Jon A. | 06/06/2022 | AGC |
| 4. King, Robert W. | 04/07/2022 | 3 rd Party |
| 5. Leventhal, Stephen R. | 12/20/2021 | AGC |
| 6. Miller, Richard S. | 10/01/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 7. Opoku-Asare, Jennifer | 04/25/2022 | 3 rd Party |
| 8. Rouse, Joseph H. | 03/14/2022 | AGC |
| 9. Spahn, Ronald L. | 01/30/2022 | AGC |
| 10. Winton, Gregory S. | 08/05/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 11. Wright, David C. | 02/15/2022 | 3 rd Party |

| Closed | DATE | Third Party or AGC |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Ashurst, Charles R. | 01/05/2022 | 3 rd Party |
| 2. Giunta, J. Thomas | 07/27/2021 | AGC |
| 3. Green, Michael | 11/15/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 4. Jenkins, Frank P. | 03/23/2022 | AGC |
| 5. Judd, Robert J. | 05/24/2022 | AGC |
| 6. Leventhal, Stephen R. | 03/07/2022 | AGC |
| 7. Lewis, Neil | 08/04/2021 | AGC |
| 8. Mirsky, Steven E. | 05/11/2022 | AGC |
| 9. Mollock, Shakaira Simone | 10/21/2021 | AGC |
| 10. Norman, Jr., Howard Wayne | 08/04/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 11. O'Connor, Jr., Edward J. | 03/07/2022 | AGC |
| 12. Reckson, Howard Andrew | 04/13/2022 | AGC |
| 13. Rhoads, Arthur | 03/24/2022 | AGC |
| 14. Shoup, Jonathan | 07/19/2021 | 3 rd Party |

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| 15. Snyder, Stuart J. | 10/27/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 16. Stephenson, Marcia A. | 04/13/2022 | AGC |
| 17. Ticer, Wilmer R. | 04/19/2022 | AGC |
| 18. Tivvis, Joseph I. | 08/04/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 19. Wasserman, Barry M. | 11/24/2021 | 3 rd Party |

| Pending: | DATE OPENED | Third Party or AGC |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Bell, John T. | 02/21/2019 | AGC |
| 2. Bennett, Russell J. | 12/01/2020 | AGC |
| 3. Briskin, Robert K. | 03/09/2016 | AGC |
| 4. Callahan, Thomas R. | 10/06/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 5. Charles, Steven A. | 04/28/2020 | 3 rd Party |
| 6. Clarke, Timothy E. | 01/25/2021 | AGC |
| 7. Crum, Robert S. | 08/30/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 8. Dement, Pamela | 02/20/2020 | AGC |
| 9. Fezell, Howard J. | 04/05/2021 | AGC |
| 10. Haley-Pierson, Monica | 12/16/2020 | AGC |
| 11. Hoppe, Jon A. | 06/06/2022 | AGC |
| 12. Johnson, Breon L. | 08/05/2019 | 3 rd Party |
| 13. King, Robert W. | 04/07/2022 | 3 rd Party |
| 14. Kolbe, Franklin James | 10/19/2020 | AGC |
| 15. Miller, Albert Matthew | 03/19/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 16. Miller, Richard S. | 10/01/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 17. Ober, William | 05/03/2018 | AGC |
| 18. Opoku-Asare, Jennifer | 04/25/2022 | 3 rd Party |
| 19. Osborne, Matthew Hayes | 10/09/2020 | AGC |
| 20. Peitersen, Marc N. | 07/23/2019 | 3 rd Party |
| 21. Resnick, Jonathan & Perry | 04/22/2021 | AGC |
| 22. Rouse, Joseph H. | 03/14/2022 | AGC |
| 23. Sacks, Stephen H. | 06/01/2018 | AGC |
| 24. Shrybman, James A. | 03/05/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 25. Smith, Robert R. | 02/19/2020 | AGC |
| 26. Spahn, Ronald L. | 01/30/2022 | AGC |
| 27. Striar, Eliot G. | 01/13/2020 | AGC |
| 28. Van Sweringen, Raymond A. | 01/09/2017 | AGC |
| 29. White, Darryl F. | 08/19/2019 | AGC |
| 30. Williams, Patrick Todd | 10/02/2019 | AGC |
| 31. Winton, Gregory S. | 08/05/2021 | 3 rd Party |
| 32. Wright, David C. | 02/15/2022 | 3 rd Party |

PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

This fiscal year 301 lawyers and 61 non-lawyers volunteered their time to participate in the peer review process. There were 38 statements of charges filed and 22 peer review meetings completed. One peer review proceeding was terminated for non-cooperation by the Respondent attorney and nine proceedings were terminated by Bar Counsel either due to a negotiated disposition or the Respondent attorneys' suspension or disbarment prior to the peer review panel meeting. Six peer review panels were pending at the end of the fiscal year. In total, 49 complaints were subject to peer review. Of the 22 peer review panels, the panel recommended public charges in 16 matters, dismissal in three matters, dismissal with a letter of admonition in two matters, and a reprimand in one matter.

The Commission makes the final decision after receiving a recommendation from a Peer Review Panel. This fiscal year the Commission overturned two recommendations, one resulting in greater disciplinary exposure for the attorney and one in less exposure.

Prince George's County (9) and Baltimore County (7) had the highest number of attorneys subject to Statements of Charges filed followed by Montgomery (6) and Baltimore City (3).

| STATEMENT OF CHARGES BY LOCALE | FY 2022 |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Anne Arundel County | 2 |
| Baltimore City | 3 |
| Baltimore County | 7 |
| Calvert County | 1 |
| Carroll County | 1 |
| Frederick County | 1 |
| Harford County | 1 |
| Howard County | 2 |
| Montgomery County | 6 |
| Prince George's County | 9 |
| Washington County | 1 |
| Wicomico County | 2 |
| Out of State | 2 |
| TOTAL: | 38 |

Note: The following counties had **0 Statements of Charges** in their jurisdiction:

**Allegany, Caroline, Cecil, Charles, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent,
Queen Anne's, Somerset, St. Mary's, Talbot, and Worcester**

CONDITIONAL DIVERSION AGREEMENTS

When appropriate under Maryland Rule 19-716, when it is determined that misconduct by an attorney can be remediated, and the attorney and Bar Counsel agree, then a Conditional Diversion Agreement may be executed with the approval of the Commission. The agreement may have a variety of conditions, tailored to the needs of the attorney, recognizing any harm done to the complainant. Those conditions may include one or more of the following: an apology to a complainant, attendance at educational seminars, obtaining legal malpractice insurance, the appointment of a practice monitor for a specified period, hiring an accountant to instruct on proper bookkeeping practices, and/or psychiatric and psychological treatment, among other conditions.

Such agreements usually conclude the disciplinary process. Ordinarily, the attorney has not been the subject of prior complaints. This fiscal year, the Commission approved eleven (11) conditional diversion agreements. Nine (9) conditional diversion agreements were closed, and no agreements were revoked. Twenty-three (23) were pending at the end of the fiscal year.

ACTIVITIES OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Bar Counsel Lydia E. Lawless presented programs to numerous bar associations and groups including the Maryland State Bar Association Small & Solo Section, the Nigerian American Bar Association, Maryland Legal Aid, the Baltimore City Bar Association, the Montgomery County Bar Association, the Maryland State’s Attorneys’ Association, the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility, and the District of Columbia Bar Association. Ms. Lawless served as an Adjunct Professor at the University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law where she co-taught Legal Profession and at the Catholic University Columbus School of Law where she co-taught Managing a Law Practice. She also guest lectured at the University of Baltimore School of Law. Ms. Lawless continued to serve on the Executive Committee of the National Organization of Bar Counsel as the NOBC’s Delegate to the American Bar Association House of Delegates as well as continuing to serve on the NOBC’s Communication Committee and Future of Legal Profession Committee, the Executive Committee of the Montgomery County Inn of Court, the MSBA Leadership Academy Executive Committee, and the American University Washington College of Law Public Interest Alumni Advisory Board. Ms. Lawless served as “Master Serjeant” to the Serjeants’ Inn Law Club and was included on The Daily Record’s 2021 Power 30 Law List.

Deputy Bar Counsel Erin A. Risch served as a panelist on a program at the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility Annual Meeting entitled, “True or False: A Prosecutor is a Minister of Justice.” Ms. Risch serves on the National Organization of Bar Counsel’s Current Developments Committee and presented a current developments program at the NOBC’s Mid-Year Meeting. She participated in a presentation to the Southern Maryland Inn of Court entitled, “Lawyers, the Judiciary, and the Truth,” and gave presentations on ethics and attorney disciplinary matters to the Baltimore City Family Law Committee and several law firms throughout the State. Ms. Risch continues to serve as a Past Chair of the Maryland State Bar Association’s Litigation Section Council.

Deputy Bar Counsel Michael W. Blow, Jr., served as a panelist on a program during the National Organization of Bar Counsel’s Mid-Year Meeting entitled, “Return from COVID – There’s No Going Back,” and conducted a training for the Prince George’s County State’s Attorney’s Office regarding ethics for prosecutors.

Mr. Blow, along with Assistant Bar Counsel Lisa A. Piccinini and Staff Attorney Lana Hitchens, presented a program for the Prince George’s County Bar Association about recent disciplinary cases and conservatorship actions.

Executive Counsel and Director Marianne J. Lee served as Past President of the National Council of Lawyer Disciplinary Boards (NCLDB) and continued to serve on the NCLDB Planning Committee for its Annual Meeting. Ms. Lee presented programs for the NCLDB and the National Organization of Bar Counsel (NOBC). Ms. Lee served as a mock trial judge for the MYLaw, Maryland Youth & the Law, High School Mock Trial Competition.

THE COMMISSION

(as of June 30, 2022)

Linda H. Lamone, Esq., Chair
J. Donald Braden, Esq., Vice-Chair
Betty Smith Adams, Esq.
Jeffrey P. Ayres, Esq.
Nicole Barmore, Esq., Secretary
William M. Shipp, Esq.
Kerry D. Staton, Esq.
Pilar C. Nichols, Esq.
Dennis Whitley, III, Esq.
LaNae S. Croxton, Public Member
Barry P. Gossett, Public Member, Treasurer
Timothy Phelps, Public Member

Executive Counsel & Director

Marianne J. Lee

Administrative Assistant to Executive Counsel & Director

Sharon Gross

THE OFFICE OF BAR COUNSEL

(as of June 30, 2022)

Bar Counsel

Lydia E. Lawless

Deputy Bar Counsel

Erin A. Risch
Michael W. Blow, Jr.

Sr. Assistant Bar Counsel

Jessica B. McCully

Assistant Bar Counsel

C. Shea McSpaden
Nora A. Nichols
Brittany L. Strickland
Lisa M. Piccinini
Clara H. Salzberg
Leonard H. Addison
Kelly A. Robier

Staff Attorneys

Lana B. Hitchens
Maria Bermudez

Law Clerk

Caitlin Phillips

Investigators

Jason P. Bogue, Lead Investigator
Marc O. Fiedler
Charles E. Miller, IV, CPA
Daniel J. Weishaar
Darin T. Bush
Bill Lynn

Financial Specialist

Sandy E. Martinez

Operations Manager

Susan G. Townshend

Administrative Assistants

Debora A. Goodrick
Nancy M. LaRocque
Daniela Valverde
Kelsey E. Rowe

Receptionist

Nancy I. Sale

File Clerk

Geneva Yearwood

TEN (10) YEAR COMPARISON CHART

July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2022

| | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | Ten Year Totals |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Active Maryland Attorneys | 37,290 | 37,266 | 38,938 | 39,814 | 39,890 | 40,300 | 40,393 | 41,177 | 41,611 | 42,050 | n/a |
| New Cases Received | 1,963 | 2,082 | 2,147 | 1,835 | 2,061 | 1,802 | 1,657 | 1,599 | 1,433 | 1,589 | 18,168 |

| Cases Docketed | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | Ten Year Totals |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| Complaints | 320 | 332 | 331 | 339 | 243 | 212 | 232 | 253 | 155 | 257 | 2,674 |
| Reinstatement Petitions | 16 | 22 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 10 | 16 | 20 | 157 |
| Trust Account Overdraft | 23 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 21 | 20 | 17 | 21 | 23 | 158 |
| Resignation | n/a | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 25 |
| Child Support | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 359 | 365 | 352 | 357 | 272 | 254 | 278 | 285 | 196 | 303 | 3,021 |

| | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | Ten Year Totals |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Docketed Cases Concluded | 376 | 368 | 426 | 347 | 394 | 276 | 265 | 293 | 316 | 363 | 3,424 |

TEN (10) YEAR COMPARISON CHART

July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2022

| Disposition by Number of Attorneys | 2012- 2013 | 2013- 2014 | 2014- 2015 | 2015- 2016 | 2016- 2017 | 2017- 2018 | 2018- 2019 | 2019- 2020 | 2020- 2021 | 2021- 2022 | Ten Year Totals |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Disbarred | 16 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 147 |
| Disbarred by Consent | 21 | 8 | 24 | 13 | 19 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 5 | 142 |
| Suspension | 21 | 29 | 33 | 18 | 31 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 30 | 25 | 243 |
| Interim Suspension | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 21 |
| Public Reprimand by Court | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 51 |
| Public Reprimand by Commission | 23 | 19 | 24 | 26 | 22 | 12 | 25 | 26 | 23 | 31 | 231 |
| Inactive Status | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 30 |
| Dismissed by Court | 10 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 59 |
| Petitions for Reinstatement Granted | 6 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 76 |
| Petitions for Reinstatement Denied | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 58 |
| Petitions for Reinstatement Withdrawn | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Petitions for Reinstatement Revoked | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Resignations Filed | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 21 |
| TOTALS | 113 | 121 | 133 | 100 | 118 | 94 | 103 | 104 | 110 | 107 | 1,103 |

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2022

| REASONS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION: (Excludes reinstatement, resignation, inactive status, dismissal by the court, or monitoring. Disciplinary action may have resulted from several rule violations, only the primary rule violated is indicated below.) | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Advertising | 0 | 1 |
| Candor to the Tribunal | 2 | 0 |
| Communications Concerning an Attorney's Services | 0 | 1 |
| Communication with Person Represented by Counsel | 1 | 0 |
| Competence, Diligence, Communication, Failure to Abide by Client's Decisions | 19 | 24 |
| Conflict of Interest | 6 | 2 |
| Direct Contact with Prospective Clients | 0 | 1 |
| Disclosure of Confidential Client Information | 1 | 1 |
| Declining or Terminating Representation | 1 | 0 |
| Duties to Former Clients | 0 | 1 |
| Excessive, Improper Division of, or Illegal Fee | 1 | 0 |
| Failure to Inform Professional Authority that an Attorney Has Committed a Violation of MARPC | 1 | 0 |
| Failure to Maintain Complete Records, Account for Client or Third-Party Funds, Failure to Maintain Trust Account or Safeguard Funds, Commingling | 11 | 11 |
| Failure to Respond to or Making a False Statement to Admissions or Disciplinary Authority | 2 | 1 |
| Fairness to Opposing Party and Attorney | 0 | 1 |
| False Statement Concerning Integrity/Qualifications of a Judge | 1 | 0 |
| Meritorious Claims and Contentions | 1 | 3 |
| Misappropriation of Client Funds, Estate Funds, Fiduciary Funds or Law Firm Funds | 10 | 10 |
| Misconduct – Conduct Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice | 1 | 3 |
| Misconduct – Criminal Action or Conviction | 5 | 4 |
| Misconduct – Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit, or Misrepresentation | 10 | 8 |
| Misconduct – Knowingly Manifest by Words/Conduct – Bias/Prejudice | 0 | 2 |
| Misconduct – Violate or Attempt to Violate MARPC | 1 | 0 |
| Responsibility for Actions of Subordinate Lawyer or Non-Lawyer Personnel | 1 | 3 |
| Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor | 0 | 1 |
| Truthfulness in Statements to Others | 1 | 1 |
| Unauthorized Practice of Law | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 81 | 80 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT
 Fiscal Year 2022

| NEW CASES RECEIVED | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Complaint | 1,274 | 1,445 |
| Attorney Trust Account Overdraft Notice | 76 | 78 |
| Reinstatement Petition Received | 18 | 23 |
| Resignation | 5 | 3 |
| Rule 19-741 Compliance Files | 60 | 40 |
| TOTAL: | 1,433 | 1,589 |

| NEW DOCKETED CASES | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Complaint | 155 | 257 |
| Attorney Trust Account Overdraft Notice | 21 | 23 |
| Reinstatement Petition Received | 16 | 20 |
| Resignation | 4 | 3 |
| TOTAL: | 196 | 303 |

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2022

| DOCKETED CASES BY LAW PRACTICE CATEGORY | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Attorney Trust Account | 21 | 29 |
| Bankruptcy | 10 | 15 |
| Civil Litigation | 26 | 40 |
| Contract | 1 | 4 |
| Criminal | 5 | 10 |
| Criminal – Prosecution | 0 | 4 |
| Criminal – Defense | 19 | 32 |
| Debt Collection/Landlord-Tenant | 2 | 4 |
| Employment Law | 5 | 6 |
| Family Law | 24 | 31 |
| Guardianship/CINA | 4 | 6 |
| Immigration | 13 | 14 |
| Injury to Persons, Property/Workers’ Compensation | 7 | 28 |
| Other Categories | 19 | 16 |
| Other – Criminal Conduct | 0 | 8 |
| Other – Personal Conduct | 11 | 7 |
| Probate | 6 | 21 |
| Real Estate | 7 | 8 |
| Reinstatement | 16 | 20 |
| TOTAL: | 196 | 303 |

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2022

| DOCKETED CASES BY LOCALE | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Allegany County | 1 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel County | 16 | 16 |
| Baltimore City | 33 | 38 |
| Baltimore County | 30 | 41 |
| Calvert County | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline County | 2 | 0 |
| Carroll County | 3 | 8 |
| Cecil County | 0 | 2 |
| Charles County | 1 | 2 |
| Dorchester County | 0 | 2 |
| Frederick County | 5 | 8 |
| Garrett County | 2 | 1 |
| Harford County | 4 | 3 |
| Howard County | 7 | 22 |
| Kent County | 1 | 1 |
| Montgomery County | 38 | 61 |
| Prince George's County | 30 | 34 |
| Queen Anne's County | 0 | 1 |
| Somerset County | 0 | 0 |
| St Mary's County | 2 | 0 |
| Talbot County | 1 | 0 |
| Washington County | 1 | 7 |
| Wicomico County | 2 | 2 |
| Worcester County | 0 | 5 |
| Out of State | 17 | 49 |
| TOTAL: | 196 | 303 |

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2022

| DOCKETED CASES BY PRIMARY RULE: (Primary rule violated may change during the course of the case; only the primary rule alleged is indicated below.) | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Competence (1.1) | 13 | 19 |
| Scope of representation/allocation of authority (1.2) | 3 | 4 |
| Diligence (1.3) | 30 | 28 |
| Communication (1.4) | 20 | 20 |
| Fees (1.5) | 10 | 5 |
| Confidentiality of Information (1.6) | 1 | 6 |
| Conflict of Interest: General Rule (1.7) | 5 | 16 |
| Conflict of Interest: Current Clients: Specific Rules (1.8) | 3 | 3 |
| Duties to Former Clients (1.9) | 1 | 3 |
| Imputation of Conflicts of Interest: General Rule (1.10) | 2 | 0 |
| Safekeeping Property (1.15) | 32 | 44 |
| Declining or Terminating Representation (1.16) | 1 | 4 |
| Duties to Prospective Clients (1.18) | 1 | 0 |
| Meritorious Claims and Contentions (3.1) | 3 | 3 |
| Expediting Litigation (3.2) | 0 | 1 |
| Candor Toward the Tribunal (3.3) | 0 | 5 |
| Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel (3.4) | 0 | 4 |
| Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal (3.5) | 0 | 2 |
| Trial Publicity (3.6) | 0 | 1 |
| Lawyer as Witness (3.7) | 2 | 0 |
| Communication with Person Represented by Counsel (4.2) | 1 | 6 |
| Respect for the Rights of Third Persons (4.4) | 1 | 1 |
| Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers (5.1) | 0 | 5 |
| Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants (5.3) | 0 | 17 |
| Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law (5.5) | 4 | 10 |
| Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services (7.1) | 0 | 1 |
| Advertising (7.2) | 0 | 3 |
| Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters (8.1) | 9 | 16 |
| Judicial and Legal Officials (8.2) | 1 | 1 |
| Misconduct (8.4) | 0 | 2 |
| Misconduct - Violate or attempt to violate rules through another (8.4(a)) | 0 | 1 |
| Misconduct - Commit a criminal act (8.4(b)) | 1 | 11 |
| Misconduct - Dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation (8.4(c)) | 11 | 16 |
| Misconduct - Prejudicial to administration of justice (8.4(d)) | 15 | 9 |
| Misconduct - Knowingly manifest bias or prejudice (8.4(e)) | 1 | 2 |
| Other (Reinstatement, Reciprocal, Inactive, etc.) | 25 | 34 |
| TOTAL: | 196 | 303 |

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2022

| DISPOSITION OF CASES | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Administratively Closed | 72 | 131 |
| Disbarment by COA | 22 | 27 |
| Disbarment by Consent | 21 | 5 |
| Dismissed by Commission | 63 | 43 |
| Dismissed by Court | 10 | 8 |
| Dismissed with Letter of Admonition | 0 | 23 |
| Dismissed with Letter of Cautionary Advice | 0 | 9 |
| Dismissed with Warning | 36 | 22 |
| Inactive | 4 | 4 |
| Indefinite Suspension | 7 | 4 |
| Indefinite Suspension by Consent | 24 | 12 |
| Reinstatement – Denied | 8 | 3 |
| Reinstatement – Granted | 7 | 13 |
| Reinstatement – Revoked | 0 | 1 |
| Reinstatement – Withdrawn | 0 | 1 |
| Reprimand by Commission | 24 | 41 |
| Reprimand by COA | 5 | 2 |
| Resignation – Granted | 4 | 0 |
| Resignation – Denied | 0 | 1 |
| Suspension 30 Days | 0 | 0 |
| Suspension 30 Days Stayed with Probation | 0 | 1 |
| Suspension 60 Days | 3 | 1 |
| Suspension 60 Days Stayed with Probation | 0 | 5 |
| Suspension 90 Days | 0 | 0 |
| Suspension 90 Days Stayed with Probation | 0 | 2 |
| Suspension 120 Days | 2 | 0 |
| Suspension 6 Months | 4 | 1 |
| Suspension 6 Months Stayed with Probation | 0 | 1 |
| Suspension 7 Months with Probation | 0 | 1 |
| Suspension 7 Months 30 Days Stayed with Probation | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 316 | 363 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATISTICAL REPORT
 Fiscal Year 2022

| DISCIPLINARY ACTION (by number of attorneys) | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Disbarment | 10 | 14 |
| Disbarment by Consent | 11 | 5 |
| Dismissed by COA | 6 | 6 |
| Inactive | 1 | 1 |
| Inactive by Consent | 3 | 2 |
| Indefinite Suspension | 6 | 6 |
| Indefinite Suspension by Consent | 17 | 7 |
| Interim Suspension | 2 | 2 |
| Reinstatement – Denied | 8 | 3 |
| Reinstatement – Granted | 7 | 13 |
| Reinstatement – Revoked | 0 | 1 |
| Reinstatement – Withdrawn | 0 | 1 |
| Reprimand by Commission | 23 | 31 |
| Reprimand by COA | 5 | 2 |
| Resignation | 4 | 0 |
| Resignation – Denied | 0 | 1 |
| Suspension | 7 | 2 |
| Suspension Stayed with Probation | 0 | 8 |
| Suspension with Probation upon Reinstatement | 0 | 2 |
| TOTAL: | 110 | 107 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND
Annapolis, Maryland

AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
June 30, 2022 and 2021

| <u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u> | <u>Page(s)</u> |
|--|-----------------------|
| Independent Auditor's Report | 3-4 |
| Statements of Financial Position | 5 |
| Statements of Budget, Receipts, Expenditures, and Net Assets | 6 |
| Statements of Cash Flows | 7 |
| Notes to Financial Statements | 8-12 |
| Appendix A: Additional Required Disclosures Under GASB 75 | 14-21 |
| Supplementary Schedules | 23-24 |

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Commissioners
Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland

Opinion

We have audited the financial statements of the Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland (the Commission), which comprise the statements of financial position as of June 30, 2022 and 2021, and the related statements of budget, receipts, expenditures, and net assets, and cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements.

In our opinion, the accompanying statements of financial position of the Commission as of June 30, 2022, and the related statements of budget, receipts, expenditures, net assets, and cash flows for the year then ended, present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Commission as of June 30, 2022, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the year then ended, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Qualified Opinion – 2021

In our opinion, except for the effects of expensing software costs as described in the Basis for Qualified Opinion – 2021, the accompanying statements of financial position of the Commission as of June 30, 2021, and the related statements of budget, receipts, expenditures, net assets, and cash flows for the year then ended, present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Commission as of June 30, 2021, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the year then ended, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAS). Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements section of our report. We are required to be independent of the Commission and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements relating to our audits. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion on the statements of financial position as of June 30, 2022, and the related statements of budget, receipts, expenditures, and net assets, and cash flows for the year then ended.

Basis for Qualified Opinion – 2021

The Commission recognized expense for certain software costs totaling \$173,000 for the year ended June 30, 2020. In our opinion, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, these costs should have been recognized for the year ended June 30, 2021. See Note 10 for additional detail regarding this matter and the accounts affected.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial statements, management is required to evaluate whether there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the Commission's ability to continue as a going concern for one year after the date that the financial statements are issued.

ALEXANDRIA
1900 Duke Street, Suite 110
Alexandria, VA 22314
703.299.6565

ANNAPOLIS
180 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Suite 520
Annapolis, MD 21401
410.841.5575

LEXINGTON PARK
22738 Maple Road, Suite 201
Lexington Park, MD 20653
301.862.3367

Auditor's Responsibility for the Audit of the Financial Statements

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not absolute assurance and therefore is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with GAAS will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control. Misstatements are considered material if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, they would influence the judgment made by a reasonable user based on the financial statements.

In performing an audit in accordance with GAAS, we:

- Exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.
- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, and design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks. Such procedures include examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements.
- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission's internal control. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall presentation of the financial statements.
- Conclude whether, in our judgment, there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the Commission's ability to continue as a going concern for a reasonable period of time.

We are required to communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit, significant audit findings, and certain internal control-related matters that we identified during the audit.

Report on Supplementary Information

Our audits were conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the financial statements as a whole. The supplemental information is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements or to the financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion the information is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the financial statements as a whole.



HeimLantz CPAs & Advisors, LLC
Annapolis, Maryland

September 26, 2022

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

| ASSETS | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| | 2022 | 2021 |
| CURRENT ASSETS | | |
| Cash and cash equivalents | \$ 748,015 | \$ 1,168,947 |
| Certificates of deposit - short-term | 4,000,000 | 3,500,000 |
| Client Protection Fund accounts receivable | 91,301 | 87,242 |
| Prepaid expenses | 16,003 | 10,911 |
| TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS | 4,855,319 | 4,767,100 |
| NON-CURRENT ASSETS | | |
| Property and equipment, net | 19,617 | 37,647 |
| Certificates of deposit - long-term | - | 750,000 |
| Security deposits | 20,020 | 20,020 |
| TOTAL NON-CURRENT ASSETS | 39,637 | 807,667 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | \$ 4,914,573 | \$ 5,612,414 |
| LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS | | |
| CURRENT LIABILITIES | | |
| Accounts payable and other current liabilities | \$ 25,458 | \$ 168,124 |
| Payroll liabilities | 78 | 310 |
| Pension payable | 330,016 | 326,208 |
| Accrued compensated absences | 224,265 | 199,301 |
| Current portion of deferred lease expense | 5,859 | 5,859 |
| TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES | 585,676 | 699,802 |
| LONG-TERM LIABILITIES | | |
| Deferred lease expense | 11,719 | 17,578 |
| Retiree health insurance credit plan | 1,061,553 | 1,026,525 |
| TOTAL LONG-TERM LIABILITIES | 1,073,272 | 1,044,103 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES | 1,658,948 | 1,743,905 |
| NET ASSETS | | |
| Restricted fund balance | - | 771,755 |
| Unrestricted fund balance | 3,236,008 | 3,096,754 |
| TOTAL NET ASSETS | 3,255,625 | 3,868,509 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS | \$ 4,914,573 | \$ 5,612,414 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

**ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATEMENTS OF BUDGET, RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES AND NET ASSETS
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021**

| | <u>2022</u> | | | <u>2021</u> |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| | <u>Actual</u> | <u>Budget</u> | <u>Variance Positive (Negative)</u> | <u>Actual</u> |
| COMMISSION RECEIPTS | | | | |
| Attorney assessments | \$ 4,605,165 | \$ 4,562,910 | \$ 42,255 | \$ 4,566,140 |
| Investment income | 6,065 | 12,000 | (5,935) | 54,707 |
| Court recovered costs | 65,404 | 45,000 | 20,404 | 40,194 |
| TOTAL RECEIPTS | <u>4,676,634</u> | <u>4,619,910</u> | <u>56,724</u> | <u>4,661,041</u> |
| COMMISSION EXPENSES | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 3,558,362 | 3,557,966 | 396 | 3,139,497 |
| Case management costs | 178,126 | 232,000 | (53,874) | 217,542 |
| Staff support | 52,552 | 102,900 | (50,348) | 32,481 |
| Outside services | 104,753 | 113,500 | (8,747) | 105,584 |
| Information technology support | 183,243 | 216,000 | (32,757) | 150,754 |
| Office expense | 300,631 | 355,445 | (54,814) | 306,439 |
| Court mandated costs | 122,066 | 145,000 | (22,934) | 126,513 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | <u>4,499,733</u> | <u>4,722,811</u> | <u>(223,078)</u> | <u>4,078,810</u> |
| INCREASE IN UNRESTRICTED FUND BALANCE BEFORE COURT ORDERED REFUND | 176,901 | (102,901) | 279,802 | 582,231 |
| Refunding of funds dedicated to the Maryland Professionalism Center | - | - | - | 3,157 |
| INCREASE IN NET ASSETS | <u>\$ 176,901</u> | <u>\$ (102,901)</u> | <u>\$ 279,802</u> | <u>\$ 585,388</u> |
| NET ASSETS, BEGINNING OF YEAR | 3,830,862 | | | 3,340,249 |
| RESTRICTED FUND BALANCE, PRIOR YEAR | (771,755) | | | (94,775) |
| RESTRICTED FUND BALANCE, CURRENT YEAR | - | | | 771,755 |
| UNRESTRICTED FUND BALANCE | <u>3,236,008</u> | | | <u>3,059,107</u> |
| NET ASSETS, END OF YEAR | <u>\$ 3,236,008</u> | | | <u>\$ 3,830,862</u> |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

THE ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

| CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES | 2022 | 2021 |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|
| Increase in net assets: | \$ 176,901 | \$ 582,231 |
| Adjustments to reconcile increase in unrestricted net assets to cash provided by (used in) operating activities | | |
| Depreciation | 19,430 | 21,819 |
| (Increase) decrease in: | | |
| Client Protection Fund accounts receivable | (4,059) | 12,778 |
| Prepaid expenses | (5,092) | 1,236 |
| Increase (decrease) in: | | |
| Accounts payable | (142,666) | (34,598) |
| Payroll liabilities | (232) | (955) |
| Pension payable | 3,808 | 7,419 |
| Accrued compensated absences | 24,964 | 63 |
| Retiree health insurance credit plan | 35,028 | 106,944 |
| Deferred lease expense | (5,859) | (5,860) |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY OPERATING ACTIVITIES | 102,223 | 691,077 |
| CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Net proceeds from investments held to maturity | 250,000 | - |
| Purchase of property & equipment | (1,400) | (7,117) |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN) INVESTING ACTIVITIES | 248,600 | (7,117) |
| CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Court ordered transfer to the Client Protection Fund | (771,755) | (94,775) |
| Refund from the Maryland Professionalism Center | - | 3,157 |
| NET CASH USED IN FINANCING ACTIVITIES | (771,755) | (91,618) |
| NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH | (420,932) | 592,342 |
| CASH AT BEGINNING OF YEAR | 1,168,947 | 576,605 |
| CASH AT END OF YEAR | \$ 748,015 | \$ 1,168,947 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

NOTE 1 - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Nature of the Commission

The Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland, (the Commission) was authorized and created by the Court of Appeals of Maryland on February 10, 1975 to oversee the conduct of both Maryland lawyers and nonmembers of the Maryland Bar who engage in the practice of law in the State. The Commission investigates and, where indicated, prosecutes attorneys whose conduct violates the Maryland Attorneys' Rules of Professional Conduct as well as those engaged in the unauthorized practice of law.

Basis of Accounting

As an instrumentality of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the Commission maintains its accounting records on a basis consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. The Commission's funds are used to account for the proceeds of revenue sources that are restricted to expenditures for specific purposes.

Revenue and Revenue Recognition

Attorney assessments are the Commission's primary source of revenue. Assessments are received through payments made by individual attorneys to the Client Protection Fund of the Bar of Maryland (CPF) on a billing which includes assessments for CPF and the Commission. These annual assessments are required by the Maryland Judiciary for any individual admitted to practice before the Court of Appeals or issued a certificate of special authorization pursuant to Title 19, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules.

Since there is no requirement that an individual remain admitted to practice law in the State of Maryland, assessments are deemed to be revenue only when collected. When assessments are collected by the Client Protection Fund, but not yet remitted to the Commission, they appear as a receivable on these financial statements. Based on prior experience, management feels that all amounts will be collected; therefore, there is no allowance for doubtful accounts included in these financial statements. The assessment collected by the Commission for each attorney in practice was \$110 for the years ended June 30, 2022 and June 30, 2021. The number of practicing attorneys as of June 30, 2022 and 2021 was 41,605 and 41,626, respectively.

Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect certain reported amounts and disclosures. Accordingly, actual results could differ from those estimates.

Income Tax Status

The Commission is an instrumentality of the Maryland Court of Appeals and as such is not subject to income taxes. Accordingly, no provision has been made. The Commission believes that it has appropriate support for any tax positions taken, and as such, does not have any uncertain tax positions that are material to the financial statements.

Cash and Cash Equivalents

Cash and cash equivalents represent cash held in checking and money market accounts with original maturities of less than ninety days.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

Investments

The Commission invests solely in brokered, negotiable, certificates of deposit. Because the certificates of deposit are purchased in increments of \$250,000 or less, they are fully insured by the FDIC. Accordingly, there is virtually no risk of gain or loss if the investments are held to maturity.

Management intendeds to hold all certificates of deposit to maturity. In accordance with FASB ASC 825, *Financial Instruments – Overall*, these investments are carried at cost.

Any certificates of deposit that mature within one year of the financial statement date are classified on the statement of financial position as “certificates of deposit - short-term” and those with maturity dates greater than one year after the financial statement date are classified “certificates of deposit – long-term”.

Property and Equipment

Acquisitions of equipment and furniture and all expenditures for repairs, maintenance, and betterments costing \$1,000 or greater that materially prolong the useful lives of assets are capitalized. Expenditures for maintenance and repairs are charged to expense as incurred. Equipment and furniture are stated at cost, less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation and amortization are computed using the straight-line method over estimated useful lives of three to thirty-nine years. Leasehold improvements are amortized on the straight-line method over the shorter of the lease term or estimated useful life of the asset.

Compensated Absences

The Commission accrues a liability for certain sick leave, and all annual leave which has been earned but not taken by the employees. Employees can earn a maximum of 25 days for annual leave per year. Annual leave can be accumulated up to 35 days. There is no requirement that annual leave be taken in the year earned. Upon termination, employees are paid for any accumulated annual leave. Employees hired prior to January 1, 1989 are reimbursed one third of accumulated sick leave, up to 60 days upon termination. Employees hired after 1988 are not reimbursed for accumulated sick leave. As of June 30, 2022, there are only two current employees hired prior to January 1, 1989.

NOTE 2 – PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment consisted of the following as of June 30:

| | <u>2022</u> | <u>2021</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Computer equipment | \$ 118,890 | \$ 120,324 |
| Furniture and fixtures | 88,202 | 88,202 |
| Leasehold improvements | 17,390 | 17,390 |
| Software | 118,796 | 118,796 |
| Total property and equipment | <u>343,278</u> | <u>344,712</u> |
| Less accumulated depreciation | <u>(323,661)</u> | <u>(307,065)</u> |
| Property and equipment, net | <u>\$ 19,617</u> | <u>\$ 37,647</u> |

Depreciation expense for the periods ending June 30, 2022 and 2021 was \$19,430 and \$21,819 respectively.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

NOTE 3 - PENSION PLAN

The Commission sponsors a trustee defined contribution pension plan covering substantially all employees meeting minimum age and service requirements. Contributions to the plan for the years ended June 30, 2022 and 2021 were \$330,016 and \$326,208 respectively. This amount is equal to 15% of the participant's compensation. For periods ending June 30, 2022 and 2021, the amount owed by the Commission to the plan was \$330,016 and \$326,208 respectively.

NOTE 4 – OTHER POSTEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

On September 1, 2012 the Commission adopted an Other Post-Employment Benefit Plan (OPEB) to provide health insurance reimbursement benefits to eligible retirees and their surviving spouses. The official name of the plan is “The Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland Retiree Health Insurance Credit Plan.” Eligible retirees include employees with at least ten years of service and have attained age fifty-five, or persons who have become disabled and are receiving benefits under the terms of the Social Security Act. Surviving spouses must have been covered under this plan at the time of the retiree’s death and enroll in the Plan on the first day of the month following the death of the covered retiree. Plan benefits will be paid directly by the Commission to the retiree at a rate of the lesser of \$4,200 annually or their actual health insurance premiums.

An actuarial valuation is performed to determine the outstanding “Net OPEB Liability” on an annual basis. This valuation is performed as of the final day of the prior year, and reflects what the Commission’s liability would be if all eligible employees terminated employment at that date. See below for key actuarial and balance information for the most recent valuation.

Key Actuarial Factors

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Actuarial cost method | Entry age normal cost method |
| Discount rate | 1.92% |
| Actuarial valuation date | June 30, 2021 |

The “2021 Net OPEB Liability” was calculated as \$1,103,515. See **Appendix A** for additional information regarding how this figure was calculated, as well as additional disclosures required under GASB 75 - *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefits Other than Pension*.

During the year ended June 30, 2022, the Commission made payments \$41,962 to current retirees, thereby reducing the OPEB liability to \$1,061,553, as of June 30, 2022. This balance is reflected on the statement of position as “retiree health insurance credit plan”.

NOTE 5 – LEASE COMMITMENT

The Commission leases office space in Annapolis, MD. The lease calls for monthly rental payments beginning on July 1, 2016. In addition to lease payments, the Commission is responsible for their portion of common area maintenance and property tax of approximately \$900 per month. The lease is an operating lease and the agreement expires in 2025, with an option to renew for up to five years. In the normal course of business, it is expected that available options to renew will be exercised.

In addition, at signing, the lease included a lease incentive of deferred lease expense for the first three months of the agreement. This amount is amortized over the life of the lease. Total remaining amount of deferred lease expense provided by the lessor at June 30, 2022 is \$17,578.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

The following is a schedule, by year, of future minimum rental payments required under the operating lease agreements:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------|
| June 30, 2023 | \$ 240,236 |
| June 30, 2024 | 240,236 |
| June 30, 2025 | <u>180,177</u> |
| Total | \$ 660,649 |

NOTE 6 - RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Revenue

The Commission has significant transactions with the Client Protection Fund of the Bar of Maryland (CPF), an instrumentality of the State of Maryland. All attorney assessments are collected by CPF and the Commission's portion is transferred monthly by check. At year end, CPF owed the Commission attorney assessments in the amount of \$1,715 and \$1,500 at June 30, 2022 and 2021, respectively.

Reimbursable Expenses

The Commission provided office space, salary and benefits to three CPF employees. CPF reimburses the Commission for these expenses on a quarterly basis. During the years ending June 30, 2022 and 2021, the Client Protection Fund of the Bar of Maryland was billed \$258,323 and \$329,100, respectively, by the Commission for fees incurred for salaries, benefits and lease expenses. At June 30, 2022 and 2021, the Client Protection Fund of the Bar of Maryland owed these fees to the Commission in the amount of \$89,586 and \$85,742, respectively.

NOTE 7 – BONDS

The Commission has a \$6,000,000 blanket crime protection insurance policy in effect for employee dishonesty.

NOTE 8 – CONTINGENCIES

Prior to the 2014 fiscal year, the Maryland Court of Appeals, at its discretion, was permitted to order a transfer of funds from the Commission to court related agencies. On March 13, 2014 an Administrative Order was issued by the Maryland Court of Appeals, requiring the Commission to maintain a net asset balance of 75% of the prior year's fiscal expenditures. Any excess net asset amount would be due to the Client Protection Fund, as of 30 days following the issuance of annual audited financial statements.

As this amount cannot be determined by the Commission as of the fiscal year end, and it has not been declared or approved by the Courts, it is not a current liability of the Commission, but rather a restricted portion of net assets. Per this Order, at June 30, 2022 and 2021, the Commission owed \$0 and \$771,755 to the Client Protection Fund, respectively. These amounts are reported as "Restricted Fund Balance" on the Statements of Financial Position. The \$771,755 owed as of June 30, 2021 was paid to the Client Protection Fund by the Commission on September 28, 2021.

In addition, on October 17, 2019, and as directed by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the Commission received a refund of unspent funds from the Maryland Professionalism Center in the amount of \$341,466. On June 22, 2021, the Commission received a second payment in the amount of \$3,157. No further payments were received, and the Commission does not anticipate additional refunds in the future.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2022 and 2021

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Beginning Net Assets | \$ 3,830,862 |
| Plus Refund From Maryland Professionalism Center: | - |
| Plus Net income: | 176,901 |
| Less Balance Paid Prior Year: | <u>(771,755)</u> |
| Ending Net Assets | <u>\$ 3,236,008</u> |
| | |
| Total FY2022 Expenditures | \$ 4,499,733 |
| 75% of Total Expenditures | 3,374,800 |
| | |
| Excess Fund Balance, June 30, 2022 | <u><u>\$ -</u></u> |

NOTE 9 – MANAGEMENT’S SUBSEQUENT REVIEW

The Commission has evaluated subsequent events through September 26, 2022 the date which the financial statements were available to be issued, and no events were noted that would materially impact the financial statements.

NOTE 10 – RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SOFTWARE COSTS

The Commission entered into an agreement to upgrade its internal software system for \$173,000 in June 2020, and recognized this expense in the year that the agreement was made. The Commission paid a deposit of \$50,000 at that time. Under accounting principles generally accepted in the United States (US GAAP), expenses should be recognized in the period that the corresponding benefit has been received. That is, the year the system upgrade work is performed. The Commission’s treatment of this expenditure is a departure from US GAAP and a summary of the effect of departure is provide below.

As of and for the year ended June 30, 2020:

| Account | As Reported | Per US GAAP | Effect of departure |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Software license/updates expense | \$ 196,963 | \$ 23,963 | + 173,000 |
| Prepaid expense | \$ 12,147 | \$ 62,147 | - 50,000 |
| Accounts payable | \$ 202,722 | \$ 79,755 | + 123,000 |
| Net assets | \$ 3,340,249 | \$ 3,513,249 | - 173,000 |

As of and for the year ended June 30, 2021:

| Account | As Reported | Per US GAAP | Effect of departure |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Software license/updates expense | \$ 20,650 | \$ 193,650 | - 173,000 |
| Net assets | \$ 3,830,862 | \$ 3,830,862 | No change to end. bal. |

There were no variances between amounts reported and US GAAP, related to the above matter, as of June 30, 2022.

Appendix A

Additional Required Disclosures Under GASB 75

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Change in Net OPEB Liability

| | Total OPEB Liability (a) | Plan Fiduciary Net Position (b) | Net OPEB Liability (a) - (b) |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Balance as of June 30, 2020 for FYE 2021 | \$1,065,608 | \$0 | \$1,065,608 |
| Changes for the Year | | | |
| Service Cost | 43,009 | | 43,009 |
| Interest | 25,577 | | 25,577 |
| Changes of Benefit Terms | 0 | | 0 |
| Experience Losses/(Gains) | (43,574) | | (43,574) |
| Trust Contribution - Employer | | 39,139 | (39,139) |
| Net Investment Income | | 0 | 0 |
| Changes in Assumptions | 52,034 | | 52,034 |
| Benefit Payments (net of retiree contributions) | (39,139) | (39,139) | 0 |
| Administrative Expense | | 0 | 0 |
| Net Changes | 37,907 | 0 | 37,907 |
| Balance as of June 30, 2021 for FYE 2022 | \$1,103,515 | \$0 | \$1,103,515 |
| Funded status | | 0.00% | |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

OPEB Expense

| | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|
| 1. Service Cost | \$ | 43,009 |
| 2. Interest | | 25,577 |
| 3. Projected Earnings on OPEB Trust | | 0 |
| 4. OPEB Administrative Expense | | 0 |
| 5. Changes in Benefit Terms | | 0 |
| 6. Differences Between Expected and Actual Earnings | | |
| In Current Fiscal Year Recognized in Current Year | | 0 |
| From Past Years Recognized in Current Year | | 0 |
| Total | | 0 |
| 7. Differences Between Expected and Actual Experience | | |
| In Current Fiscal Year Recognized in Current Year | | (4,842) |
| From Past Years Recognized in Current Year | | (6,247) |
| Total | | (11,089) |
| 8. Changes in Assumptions | | |
| In Current Fiscal Year Recognized in Current Year | | 5,782 |
| From Past Years Recognized in Current Year | | 8,710 |
| Total | | 14,492 |
| 9. Total OPEB Expense | \$ | 71,989 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Sensitivity of Total and Net OPEB Liability

The following table presents Attorney Grievance Commission's Total and Net OPEB liability. We also present the Total and Net OPEB liability if it is calculated using a discount rate that is 1 percentage point lower or 1 percentage point higher.

| Discount Rate | 1% Decrease 0.92% | Discount Rate 1.92% | 1% Increase 2.92% |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Total OPEB Liability | \$1,261,701 | \$1,103,515 | \$973,371 |
| Net OPEB Liability/(Asset) | \$1,261,701 | \$1,103,515 | \$973,371 |

The following table presents Attorney Grievance Commission's Total and Net OPEB liability. We also present the Total and Net OPEB liability if it is calculated using a health care cost trend rate that is 1 percentage point lower or 1 percentage point higher.

| Ultimate Trend | 1% Decrease 3.00% | Medical Trend 4.00% | 1% Increase 5.00% |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Total OPEB Liability | \$957,343 | \$1,103,515 | \$1,288,184 |
| Net OPEB Liability/(Asset) | \$957,343 | \$1,103,515 | \$1,288,184 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Deferred Inflows/Outflows of Resources Related to OPEB

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, Attorney Grievance Commission recognized an OPEB expense of \$71,989. At June 30, 2022, Attorney Grievance Commission reported deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to the OPEB plan from the following sources:

| | Deferred Outflows of Resources | Deferred Inflows of Resources |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Differences between expected and actual experience | \$ - | \$ 79,573 |
| Changes of assumptions | 152,368 | 26,580 |
| Net difference between projected and actual earnings on OPEB plan investments | - | - |
| Employer contribution subsequent to measurement date | TBD | |
| Total | \$ 152,368 | \$ 106,153 |

An amount to be determined will be reported as deferred outflows of resources related to OPEB resulting from employer contributions subsequent to measurement date will be recognized as a reduction of the net OPEB liability in the year ended June 30, 2023.

Other amounts reported as deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to the OPEB plan will be recognized in the expense as follows:

| Fiscal Year Ended June 30 | Measurement Date | Earnings (Inflow)/Outflow |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 2023 | 6/30/2022 | \$ 3,403 |
| 2024 | 6/30/2023 | 3,403 |
| 2025 | 6/30/2024 | 3,403 |
| 2026 | 6/30/2025 | 3,403 |
| 2027 | 6/30/2026 | 3,401 |
| Thereafter | 6/30/2027 and after | 29,202 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Schedule of Differences between Projected and Actual Earnings on OPEB Plan Investments

In conformity with paragraph 86b of Statement 75, the effects of differences between projected and actual earnings on OPEB plan investments are recognized in collective OPEB expense using a systematic and rational method over a closed five-year period, beginning in the current reporting period. The following table illustrates the application of this requirement.

| Increase (Decrease) in OPEB Expense Arising from the Recognition of Differences between Projected and Actual Earnings on OPEB Plan Investments | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Year | Differences between Projected and Actual Earnings on OPEB Plan Investments | Recognition Period (Years) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 |
| 2018 | \$ - | 5 | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2019 | - | 5 | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2020 | - | 5 | | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2021 | - | 5 | | | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2022 | - | 5 | | | | | \$ - | - | - | - | - |
| Net increase (decrease) in OPEB expense | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |

Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Arising from Differences between Projected and Actual Earnings on OPEB Plan Investments

| Year | Investment Earnings Less than Projected (a) | Investment Earnings Greater Than Projected (b) | Amounts Recognized in OPEB Expense Through June 30, 2021 (c) | Balances at June 30, 2021 | |
|------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Deferred Outflows of Resources (a) - (c) | Deferred Inflows of Resources (b) - (c) |
| 2018 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 2019 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2020 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2021 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2022 | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | | | \$ - | \$ - |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Schedule of Differences between Expected and Actual Experience

In conformity with paragraph 86a of Statement 75, the effects of differences between expected and actual experience are recognized in collective OPEB expense, beginning in the current reporting period, using a systematic and rational method over a closed period equal to the average of the remaining service lives of all employees that are provided with OPEB through the OPEB plan (active and inactive employees), determined as of the beginning of the measurement period. The following table illustrates the application of this requirement.

| Increase (Decrease) in OPEB Expense Arising from the Recognition of Differences between Expected and Actual Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|-------|------|------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Year | Differences between Expected and Actual Experience | Recognition Period (Years) | Prior | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | Thereafter | |
| Prior | | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 2017 | - | 1 | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 2018 | - | 10 | | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 2019 | (32,870) | 10 | | | | \$ (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | (3,287) | |
| 2020 | (25,525) | 10 | | | | | \$ (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (2,553) | (5,101) | |
| 2021 | (4,067) | 10 | | | | | | \$ (407) | (407) | (407) | (407) | (407) | (407) | (407) | (1,218) | |
| 2022 | (43,574) | 9 | | | | | | | \$ (4,842) | (4,842) | (4,842) | (4,842) | (4,842) | (4,842) | (14,522) | |
| Net increase (decrease) in OPEB expense | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (3,287) | \$ (5,840) | \$ (6,247) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (11,089) | \$ (24,128) | |

Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Arising from Differences between Expected and Actual Experience

| Year | Experience Losses (a) | Experience Gains (b) | Balances at June 30, 2021 | | |
|-------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | Amounts Recognized in OPEB Expense Through June 30, 2021 (c) | Deferred Outflows of Resources (a) - (c) | Deferred Inflows of Resources (b) - (c) |
| Prior | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 2017 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2018 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2019 | - | 32,870 | 13,148 | - | 19,722 |
| 2020 | - | 25,525 | 7,659 | - | 17,866 |
| 2021 | - | 4,067 | 814 | - | 3,253 |
| 2022 | - | 43,574 | 4,842 | - | 38,732 |
| | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 79,573 |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Schedule of Changes of Assumptions

In conformity with paragraph 86a of Statement 75, the effects of changes of assumptions should be recognized in OPEB expense, beginning in the current reporting period, using a systematic and rational method over a closed period equal to the average of the remaining service lives of all employees that are provided with OPEB through the OPEB plan (active and inactive employees), determined as of the beginning of the measurement period. The following table illustrates the application of this requirement.

| Increase (Decrease) in OPEB Expense Arising from the Effects of Changes of Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Year | Changes of Assumptions | Recognition Period (Years) | Prior | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | Thereafter |
| Prior | \$ - | | \$ - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | - | 1 | | \$ - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | (48,022) | 10 | | | \$ (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,802) | (4,804) | - |
| 2019 | (4,280) | 10 | | | | \$ (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) | (428) |
| 2020 | 53,976 | 10 | | | | | \$ 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 5,398 | 10,792 |
| 2021 | 85,418 | 10 | | | | | | \$ 8,542 | 8,542 | 8,542 | 8,542 | 8,542 | 8,542 | 8,542 | 25,624 |
| 2022 | 52,034 | 9 | | | | | | | \$ 5,782 | 5,782 | 5,782 | 5,782 | 5,782 | 5,782 | 17,342 |
| Net increase (decrease) in OPEB expense | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (4,802) | \$ (5,230) | \$ 168 | \$ 8,710 | \$ 14,492 | \$ 14,492 | \$ 14,492 | \$ 14,492 | \$ 14,492 | \$ 14,490 | \$ 53,330 |

Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Arising from Changes of Assumptions

| Year | Increases in the Total OPEB Liability (a) | Decreases in the Total OPEB Liability (b) | Amounts Recognized in OPEB Expense Through June 30, 2021 (c) | Balances at June 30, 2021 | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | Deferred Outflows of Resources (a) - (c) | Deferred Inflows of Resources (b) - (c) |
| Prior | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 2017 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2018 | - | 48,022 | 24,010 | - | 24,012 |
| 2019 | - | 4,280 | 1,712 | - | 2,568 |
| 2020 | 53,976 | - | 16,194 | 37,782 | - |
| 2021 | 85,418 | - | 17,084 | 68,334 | - |
| 2022 | 52,034 | - | 5,782 | 46,252 | - |
| | | | \$ 152,368 | \$ 26,580 | |

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DISCLOSURES UNDER GASB 75
JUNE 30, 2022

Schedule of Changes in the Total Liability and Related Ratios

Changes in Employer's Net OPEB Liability and Related Ratios

Last 10 Fiscal Years

Information for FYE 2017 and earlier is not available

| Disclosure for Fiscal Year Ending: | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Measurement Date: | 6/30/2021 | 6/30/2020 | 6/30/2019 | 6/30/2018 | 6/30/2017 | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2015 | 6/30/2014 | 6/30/2013 | 6/30/2012 |
| Total OPEB liability | | | | | | | | | | |
| Service Cost | \$ 43,009 | \$ 35,343 | \$ 39,485 | \$ 39,422 | \$ 42,932 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Interest Cost | 25,577 | 29,333 | 31,845 | 31,258 | 25,234 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Changes in Benefit Terms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Differences Between Expected and Actual Experience | (43,574) | (4,067) | (25,525) | (32,870) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Changes of Assumptions | 52,034 | 85,418 | 53,976 | (4,280) | (48,022) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Benefit Payments | (39,139) | (39,214) | (38,682) | (28,927) | (24,441) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net Change in Total OPEB Liability | 37,907 | 106,813 | 61,099 | 4,603 | (4,297) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total OPEB liability - Beginning of Year | 1,065,608 | 958,795 | 897,696 | 893,093 | 897,390 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total OPEB Liability - End of Year | 1,103,515 | 1,065,608 | 958,795 | 897,696 | 893,093 | - | - | - | - | - |

Plan Fiduciary Net Position

Last 10 Fiscal Years

Information for FYE 2017 and earlier is not available

| Disclosure for Fiscal Year Ending: | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Measurement Date: | 6/30/2021 | 6/30/2020 | 6/30/2019 | 6/30/2018 | 6/30/2017 | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2015 | 6/30/2014 | 6/30/2013 | 6/30/2012 |
| Contributions - Employer | \$ 39,139 | \$ 39,214 | \$ 38,682 | \$ 28,927 | \$ 24,441 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Net Investment Income | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Benefit Payments (net of retiree contributions) | (39,139) | (39,214) | (38,682) | (28,927) | (24,441) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Administrative Expense | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net Change in Fiduciary Net Position | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fiduciary Net Position - Beginning of Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fiduciary Net Position - End of Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net OPEB Liability | 1,103,515 | 1,065,608 | 958,795 | 897,696 | 893,093 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fiduciary Net Position as a % of Total OPEB Liability | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Covered-Employee Payroll ¹ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Net OPEB Liability as a Percentage of Covered Employee Payroll ¹ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Expected Average Remaining Service Years of All Participants | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes to Schedule:

Benefit changes: None.

Changes of assumptions: The discount rate was changed as follows:

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| The discount rate changes year-to-year: | 1.92% | 2.45% | 3.13% | 3.62% | 3.58% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| The retirement and termination assumptions were updated to match those used by the most recent State of Maryland valuation. | | | | | | | | | | |

^{1/} Because this OPEB plan does not depend on salary, we do not have salary information.