

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, : No. 2189 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
Petitioner : No. 107 DB 2015  
: :  
: Attorney Registration No. 202416  
v. : :  
: (Montgomery County)  
PATRICK JOSEPH BRADLEY, : :  
: :  
Respondent :

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendations of the Disciplinary Board, Patrick Joseph Bradley is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000.00 to this Court within 60 days of the date of this Order. He shall comply with all the provisions of Pa.R.D.E. 217.

A True Copy Patricia Nicola  
As Of 1/5/2017

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL	:	No. 2189 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner	:	
	:	No. 107 DB 2015
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Registration No. 202416
PATRICK JOSEPH BRADLEY	:	
Respondent	:	(Montgomery County)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUSTICES  
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Pursuant to the Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated July 28, 2016, the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (“Board”) herewith submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above-captioned matter.

I. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

By Order of July 10, 2015, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (“Supreme Court”) placed Patrick Joseph Bradley, Respondent, on temporary suspension from the practice of law pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement (“Pa.R.D.E.”) 208(f)(5).

On May 3, 2016, Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed a Petition for Rule to Show Cause Why Respondent Should Not Be Held in Contempt. On May 12, 2016, the Supreme Court issued an Order and Rule upon Respondent to show cause why he

should not be held in contempt. Despite having been granted an extension to respond, Respondent failed to respond to the Rule to Show Cause.

On July 28, 2016, the Supreme Court made the Rule absolute and found Respondent in contempt of court for willful violation of the Court's Order of July 10, 2015. The matter was referred to the Disciplinary Board for accelerated proceedings, including a hearing, to recommend the appropriate sanction within 90 days.

A hearing was held on August 31, 2016, before a District II Hearing Committee comprised of Chair James E. Gavin, Esquire and Members Elizabeth A. Schneider, Esquire and Kyle M. Elliott, Esquire. Respondent appeared *pro se*. At the time of the hearing, the Hearing Committee was notified of Respondent's intention to resign from the bar and be disbarred on consent.

Respondent submitted a Verified Statement of Resignation on September 1, 2016.

The Hearing Committee filed a Report on September 2, 2016, and recommended that Respondent be ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000.00 within sixty days of the Supreme Court's Order and to fully comply with Pa.R.D.E. 217.

On September 15, 2016, the Supreme Court entered an Order disbarring Respondent on consent and directing him to comply with Pa.R.D.E. 217.

This matter was adjudicated by the Disciplinary Board at the meeting on October 13, 2016.

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings:

1. Petitioner, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, whose principal office is located at 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 2700, P.O. Box 62485, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17106-2485, is invested, pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, with the power and the duty to investigate all matters involving alleged misconduct of an attorney admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to prosecute all disciplinary proceedings brought in accordance with the various provisions of the aforesaid Rules.

2. Respondent is Patrick Joseph Bradley. He was born in 1971 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 2006. His attorney registration address is 3801 Germantown Pike, Suite 201C, Collegeville, PA 19426. Respondent is subject the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

3. In February 2015, Petitioner commenced an investigation regarding Respondent that included allegations, *inter alia*, that Respondent had converted, misapplied or misappropriated clients' advanced fees and expense retainers.

4. On June 15, 2015, Petitioner filed a Petition for Issuance of a Rule to Show Cause Why Respondent Should Not be Suspended Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 208(f)(5) alleging, *inter alia*, that Respondent's disregard of two subpoenas issued by the Supreme Court had materially delayed and obstructed Petitioner's investigation and warranted the temporary suspension of Respondent's license.

5. On June 17, 2015, the Petition, and an Order and Rule to Show Cause, were personally served on Respondent.

6. Respondent failed to file any response to the Order and Rule to Show Cause.

7. By Order dated July 10, 2015, the Supreme Court placed Respondent on temporary suspension pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 208(f)(5), until further definitive action by the Court, and further ordered Respondent to comply with all provisions of Pa.R.D.E. 217.

8. Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 217(d), the Order placing Respondent on temporary suspension was effective thirty (30) days after entry; Respondent was immediately prohibited from accepting any new retainer or engaging as an attorney for another in any new case or legal matter of any nature; and, Respondent could only wind up and complete matters which were pending on the date the Order was entered.

9. Under cover of a letter dated July 10, 2015, Elaine M. Bixler, Secretary of the Disciplinary Board, provided Respondent with, *inter alia*,

- a. the suspension order;
- b. a copy of Pa.R.D.E. 217 and corresponding Board rules;
- c. Standard Guidance of the Disciplinary Board to Lawyers who have been Suspended Under Rule 208(f);
- d. Non-Litigation (Form DB-23) and Litigation (Form DB-24) Notices of Disbarment, Suspension or Transfer to Inactive Status; and
- e. Statement of Compliance (Form DB-35).

10. The July 10, 2015 correspondence was sent by certified mail and by first class regular mail to Respondent's preferred mailing address. The certified mailing was returned to the Secretary's Office by the post office marked "unclaimed." The regular mailing was not returned.

11. Respondent received notice of his temporary suspension.

12. The effective date of Respondent's temporary suspension was August 9, 2015.

13. Commencing August 9, 2015, Respondent was prohibited from practicing law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and was prohibited from engaging in any form of law-related activities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, except in full accordance with the stringent requirements of Pa.R.D.E. 217(j).

14. On May 3, 2016, Petitioner filed a Petition for Rule to Show Cause Why Respondent Should Not Be Held in Contempt for violating the Supreme Court's Order of July 10, 2015.

15. The Petition averred that Respondent violated the Supreme Court's July 10, 2015 Order by performing prohibited law-related activities and engaging in the unauthorized practice of law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania subsequent to August 9, 2015, the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order, and by failing to comply with the requirements of Pa.R.D.E. 217.

16. The Petition contained allegations that following his temporary suspension, Respondent improperly held himself out as a lawyer by maintaining a law office, a website and signage, and that in six separate matters, he engaged in the willful unauthorized practice of law.

17. On May 12, 2016, the Supreme Court issued an Order and Rule upon Respondent to show cause why he should not be held in contempt.

18. Respondent failed to respond to the Rule to Show Cause, despite having been granted an extension.

19. On July 28, 2016, the Supreme Court made the Rule absolute and held Respondent in contempt of court for willful violation of the Court's Order of July 10,

2015. The Court referred the matter to the Board to recommend an appropriate sanction within ninety (90) days of the date of Order.

20. The allegations in the Petition for Rule to Show Cause are deemed admitted by operation of law.

21. On September 1, 2015, Respondent filed a Verified Statement of Resignation, pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215.

22. By Order of September 15, 2016, the Supreme Court disbarred Respondent on consent.

### III. DISCUSSION

This matter is before the Board for consideration of the appropriate sanction to address Respondent's contempt for willful violation of the Supreme Court's Order of July 10, 2015.

Pursuant to the Supreme Court's July 28, 2016 Order referring this matter to the Board, a hearing took place on August 31, 2016. At the hearing, Respondent notified the Hearing Committee of his intention to resign from the practice of law; he filed a Verified Statement of Resignation on September 1, 2016. The Supreme Court accepted Respondent's resignation and by Order of September 15, 2016, disbarred Respondent on consent.

The Hearing Committee filed its Report on September 2, 2016, acknowledging that Respondent resigned from the bar and recommending that his contempt of court be remedied with a \$1,000.00 fine. The Committee reasoned that Respondent's willfully violative conduct after the issuance of the Supreme Court's

temporary suspension order of July 10, 2015, must be punished to emphasize the importance of compliance with court orders.

The record demonstrates that Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in six separate matters and held himself out as a lawyer when he was prohibited from doing so. Respondent's conduct demonstrated willful ignorance of a court order and disrespect for the authority of the Supreme Court.

Contempt of a court order may be remedied by the imposition of a fine, which punishment serves to vindicate the dignity and authority of the court. ***Commonwealth v. Frank Marcone***, 410 A.2d 759 (Pa. 1980). After careful review, the Board recommends that a fine of \$1,000.00 be imposed on Respondent, to be paid within sixty (60) days of the Supreme Court's Order.




V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania recommends that the Respondent, Patrick Joseph Bradley, be ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000.00 to the Supreme Court within 60 days of the date of the Court's Order.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By:   
David E. Schwager, Vice-Chair

Board Members Leonard and Goodrich did not participate in the adjudication.

Date: 10/20/2016