

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA


OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL : No. 81 DB 2020
Petitioner :
v. : Attorney Registration No. 24596
JOHN JOSEPH GRECKO :
Respondent : (Berks County)

ORDER

AND NOW, this 9th day of October, 2020, in accordance with Rule 215(g), Pa.R.D.E., the three-member Panel of the Disciplinary Board having reviewed and approved the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent filed in the above captioned matter; it is


ORDERED that JOHN JOSEPH GRECKO be subjected to a **PUBLIC REPRIMAND** by the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as provided in Rule 204(a) and Rule 205(c)(9) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement.

BY THE BOARD:


Board Chair

TRUE COPY FROM RECORD

Attest:


Marcee D. Sloan
Board Prothonotary
The Disciplinary Board of the
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

**BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 81 DB 2020
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Reg. No. 24596
	:	
JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO,	:	
Respondent	:	(Berks County)

**JOINT PETITION IN SUPPORT
OF DISCIPLINE ON CONSENT
PURSUANT TO Pa.R.D.E. 215(d)**

Petitioner, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) by Thomas J. Farrell, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, and Krista K. Beatty, Disciplinary Counsel, and Respondent, John Joseph Grenko (“Respondent”), respectfully petition the Disciplinary Board in support of discipline on consent, pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement (“Pa.R.D.E.”) 215(d), and in support thereof state:

1. Petitioner, whose principal office is situated at Pennsylvania Judicial Center, 601 Commonwealth Ave., Suite 2700, P.O. Box 62485, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, is invested, pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, with the power and 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 Enforcement Rules.

2. Respondent, John Joseph Grenko, was born on January 29, 1952, and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on November 22, 1976. Respondent is currently on active status, and maintains his address of record at 519 Walnut St, Reading, PA 19601.

FILED 09/22/2020

3. Respondent is subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ADMITTED

CHARGE I

Estate of Jeffrey Haas and Katherine Haas

4. On or about August 13, 2014, Respondent was retained by Scott Pence to assist him with administration of the estate of his late stepfather, Jeffrey Scott Haas ("Mr. Haas"), who died August 4, 2014.

5. Mr. Pence resides in Las Vegas, Nevada.

6. On August 13, 2014, the Register of Wills of Berks County, Pennsylvania issued Letters of Administration appointing Respondent and Mr. Pence co-Administrators of the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas (the "Jeffrey Haas Estate").

7. Katherine Haas is the sole beneficiary of the Jeffrey Haas Estate.

8. Katherine Haas is the mother of Scott Pence.

9. On December 15, 2014, Katherine Haas died in Berks County, Pennsylvania.

10. Scott Pence is sole beneficiary of the Estate of his mother, Katherine Haas. Scott Pence is therefore sole beneficiary of the Jeffrey Haas Estate.

11. On or about December 19, 2014 Respondent was retained by Mr. Pence to assist him with administration of the Estate of Katherine Haas ("Katherine Haas Estate").

12. On December 19, 2014, the Register of Wills of Berks County, Pennsylvania issued Letters of Administration appointing Respondent and Mr. Pence, co-Administrators of the Katherine Haas Estate.

13. At the time of his death, Mr. Haas owned a forty-nine percent (49%) interest in real property located at 313-315 George Street, Muhlenberg Township, Berks County, Pennsylvania with his cousin, Alan R. Kohler, as tenants-in-common, (the "George Street property").

14. The George Street property was leased to a third-party tenant, and generated rental income for Mr. Kohler and the Jeffrey Haas Estate.

15. Beginning in 2015, Mr. Pence repeatedly requested Respondent take action to liquidate the Jeffrey Haas Estate's interest in the George Street property, and to finalize both the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate.

16. Respondent recommended to Mr. Pence that he force a sale of the George Street property.

17. Since 2015, Respondent took no action to dispose of the George Street property or to finalize the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate.

18. Respondent did not file a Pennsylvania Inheritance Tax return for the Jeffrey Haas Estate.

19. Respondent did not file a Pennsylvania Inheritance Tax return for the Katherine Haas Estate.

20. On January 16, 2016, Mr. Pence wrote to Respondent seeking information about valuation of his inheritance, and disclosing estate assets payable to him.

21. Respondent replied to Mr. Pence's letter on February 2, 2016, stating he did "not know the total extent of the claims that may be made against" the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate, so he could not "even give [Mr. Pence] an idea of how much money, if any, [would be] left for distribution to [him] after we pay the costs of administration and other priority debts."

22. Respondent's February 2, 2016 letter to Mr. Pence stated he was "still working on the paperwork to file with the court to force the sale" of the George Street property and that he "hope[d] to complete that within the next few months."

23. Between February 2016 and November 2018, Respondent failed to communicate with Mr. Pence.

24. Between February 2016 and November 2018, Respondent took no action to finalize the estates of Jeffrey Haas or Katherine Haas.

25. On June 4, 2018, the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue mailed to Respondent and Mr. Pence two Notices ("Notices") advising that: (a) a Pennsylvania Inheritance Tax Return has not been filed for the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate; (b) the Estates were delinquent and unsettled; and (c) financial and other penalties could be imposed for failure to file the Inheritance Tax Returns and pay all taxes due.

26. After receiving the Notices, Mr. Pence contacted Respondent to discuss how to resolve the issues presented therein.

27. Respondent did not respond to Mr. Pence's inquiries.

28. On June 19, 2018, Mr. Pence emailed Respondent, referencing Respondent's last communication to him, in February 2016, and questioned why "2 years & 4 months later, you still won't even call me to discuss the options??"

29. Respondent did not respond to Mr. Pence's June 19, 2018 email.

30. Respondent failed to timely pay any portion of the Pennsylvania Inheritance Tax on behalf of the Jeffrey Haas Estate.

31. Respondent failed to timely pay any portion of the Pennsylvania Inheritance Tax on behalf of the Katherine Haas Estate.

32. Respondent failed to take any action toward finalizing the Jeffrey Haas Estate or the Katherine Haas Estate, in response to the June 4, 2018 Notices.

33. For the Estate of Mrs. Haas, the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services maintains a claim of \$90,239.90 for medical assistance provided to Mrs. Haas before her death. Respondent did not pay over any portion of this debt during the four (4) years he served as attorney Co-Administrator of the Estate of Mrs. Haas.

34. On October 30, 2018, Respondent wrote a letter to Alan Kohler stating, “[a]t [Mr. Kohler’s] father’s request [Respondent] held off on doing anything about the disposition of Jeffrey Haas’ interest” in the George Street property but that he was “at a point where [he] must bring the administration of both of the Estates of Jeffrey S. Haas and Katherine R. Haas to closure.” Respondent’s October 30, 2018 letter proposed several ways to accomplish these tasks and requested that Mr. Kohler reply with an opinion concerning next steps within seven days. Respondent did not copy Mr. Pence on the October 30, 2018 letter to Mr. Kohler.

35. Respondent failed to obtain Mr. Pence’s informed consent to the over two year delay in disposition of the Jeffrey Haas Estate’s interest in the George Street property.

36. Respondent’s delay in disposing of the Jeffrey Haas Estate’s interest in the George Street property directly conflicted with Mr. Pence’s decisions concerning the objectives of the representation.

37. On or about November 8, 2018, Mr. Pence retained Frederick R. Mogel, Esquire and Jesse Kammerdeiner, Esquire to represent his interests as Co-Administrator of the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate.

38. By letter dated November 8, 2018, Mr. Mogel advised Respondent that he had been retained by Mr. Pence to represent the Jeffrey Haas and Katherine Haas Estates. Mr. Mogel’s letter

to Respondent requested copies of documents required in order to properly administer the Estates, and to assess whether Mr. Kohler's purchase of the Jeffrey Haas Estate's interest in the George Street property would be possible.

39. By letter dated November 9, 2018, Respondent replied to Mr. Mogel, stating that he was sending to Mr. Kohler and Mr. Mogel an appraisal for the George Street property, completed as of the date of Mr. Haas' death. Respondent's letter to Mr. Mogel, however, did not enclose the appraisal.

40. Respondent failed to promptly provide Mr. Mogel with any of the documents requested in his November 8, 2018 letter.

41. In or about November 2018, Mr. Kohler sent to Respondent's office a periodic net rental check for the George Street property, as remittance for the Jeffrey Haas Estate's share of rents.

42. Respondent failed to timely negotiate the check, and he did not deposit the funds into the Jeffrey Haas Estate checking account.

43. By letter to Respondent dated December 11, 2018, Mr. Mogel raised several estate administration issues and advised Respondent that Mr. Pence would be filing a petition for removal of Respondent as Co-Administrator of the Estate of Jeffrey Haas. Mr. Mogel's December 11, 2018 letter also offered to amicably transition the estate files to him, "whereby [Mr. Mogel] would replace [Respondent] as Co-Executor of the Estate and complete the administration of the same while acknowledging [Respondent's] fees for services rendered thus far."

44. Respondent orally communicated his agreement to amicably transition the file to Mr. Mogel as outlined in his December 11, 2018 letter; however Respondent took no further action with regard to transferring the Estate file.

45. By letter dated January 3, 2019, Mr. Mogel advised Respondent that he had a potential buyer for the George Street property and that they needed to “act quickly to get this prospective purchaser a bona fide current value of the property.” The January 3, 2019 letter also stated Respondent previously told Mr. Mogel he was amenable to having the George Street property appraised by Tom Belliars on a current basis and that the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas would advance the fee for the appraisal.

46. Respondent provided Mr. Mogel with a check in the amount of \$750.00, drawn against the Estate of Jeffrey Haas checking account, to pay for Mr. Belliars’ appraisal.

47. Between December 2018 and early January 2019, Respondent failed to relinquish his role as Co-Administrator of the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate, and failed to provide Mr. Mogel with copies of his files for the Estates.

48. On January 8, 2019, on behalf of Mr. Pence, Mr. Mogel filed with the Court a Petition to: (a) remove Respondent as Co-Administrator of the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas; (b) appoint Mr. Mogel as successor Co-Administrator; and (c) compel Respondent to file an accounting for the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas from the date of the decedent’s death to the present.

49. That same day, on behalf of Mr. Pence, Mr. Mogel also filed with the court a Petition to: (a) remove Respondent as Co-Administrator of the Estate of Katherine Haas; (b) appoint Mr. Mogel as successor Co-Administrator; and (c) compel Respondent to file an accounting for the Estate of Mrs. Haas from the date of the decedent’s death to the present.

50. By Orders dated February 5, 2019, the Honorable J. Benjamin Nevius issued Rules to Show Cause directing Respondent to file Answers to the Petitions within 20 days, and scheduling an evidentiary hearing for March 20, 2019 at 10:30 a.m. to resolve any disputed issues of material fact.

51. By letter dated February 12, 2019, Mr. Mogel provided Respondent with courtesy copies of the February 5, 2019 Orders and suggested Respondent work with him to transition administration of the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas and the Estate of Mrs. Haas to his office by agreement of the parties and avoid the March 20, 2019 evidentiary hearing.

52. By separate letter dated February 12, 2019, Mr. Mogel advised Respondent that he received an email from Mr. Kohler stating that the periodic net rental check for the George Street property, sent to Respondent in November 2018, had not been negotiated and the funds had not been deposited into the Jeffrey Haas Estate checking account.

53. Respondent failed to timely file Answers to the Petitions as directed by the February 5, 2019 Orders.

54. Respondent failed to respond to Mr. Mogel's February 12, 2019 letters.

55. By letter to Respondent dated March 7, 2019, Mr. Mogel asked Respondent to provide, as soon as possible: (a) proof of deposit of the November 2018 rent check sent by Mr. Kohler; (b) copies of annual fiduciary returns filed at the Federal and State levels relating to income to the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas from rent and any other interest, dividends, and the like; and (c) a definitive answer concerning whether Respondent would agree to transfer Co-Administrator duties to Mr. Mogel with the understanding that Respondent's fee for work performed would be honored.

56. Thereafter, Respondent informed Mr. Mogel that he would agree to transfer CoAdministrator duties to him. Mr. Mogel provided Respondent with proposed Orders for filing with the court to accomplish this task.

57. By Orders dated March 13, 2019, Judge Nevius continued the evidentiary hearing previously scheduled for March 20, 2019 pending the negotiated resolution of the Petitions for Removal.

58. Respondent failed to timely approve the proposed Orders transferring CoAdministrator duties to Mr. Mogel.

59. By letter to Respondent dated May 7, 2019, Mr. Mogel indicated it had been "quite some time since [he] forwarded to [Respondent] the proposed Orders having [him] relinquish [his] position as Co-Administrator" of the Jeffrey Haas Estate and the Katherine Haas Estate, and that he had not heard from Respondent. Mr. Mogel stated it was "vital" that his office receive Respondent's file materials relating to the Estates "since we are very close to an agreement to have the George Street property sold" and he needed to have the file and his status as Co-Administrator secured before settlement.

60. Respondent did not timely respond to Mr. Mogel's May 7, 2019 letter.

61. Mr. and Mrs. Kohler periodically paid to Respondent a portion of the monthly net rental income associated with the George Street property for the benefit of the Estate of Jeffrey Scott Haas.

62. Respondent failed to provide an accounting, or any relevant documents, to Mr. Pence.

63. On May 20, 2019, Petitioner mailed to Respondent a DB-7 Request for Statement of Respondent's Position Letter ("DB7 letter") requesting his Statement of Position with regard to the above allegations, within thirty (30) days.

64. Respondent received the DB-7 letter.

65. Respondent failed to answer or otherwise respond to the DB7 letter.

66. On July 15, 2019, Petitioner wrote to Respondent and requested a response, within ten (10) days.

67. Respondent failed to answer or otherwise respond.

68. On Friday, July 26, 2019, Petitioner telephoned Respondent and questioned him about his failure to Answer the DB-7. Respondent stated to Disciplinary Counsel that he was working on a response, and would mail his response the following Monday.

69. Respondent did not answer the DB-7.

Count II
Dean Borrell Matter

70. In or about June 2017, Respondent was retained by Dean Borrell for matters involving Mr. Borell's father, Arthur Borrell, including estate planning, asset liquidation, obtaining Medical Assistance coverage and coordinating nursing home care and costs.

71. Dean Borrell was agent for Arthur, pursuant to a financial power-of-attorney.

72. Respondent was paid an initial retainer of \$1,500.

73. Although Respondent had not previously represented Dean, Jeffrey or Arthur Borrell, Respondent did not provide a written fee agreement.

74. On or about July 4, 2017, Respondent wrote to Dean Borrell and Dean's brother, Jeffrey Borrell, and provided recommendations and a detailed plan for immediate action.

75. Respondent's letter stated he would like to meet with Dean Borrell to sign a deed transferring title of Arthur's home to Jeffrey, subject to a life estate for Dean. Respondent's letter further stated he would like to meet with Dean "to complete a Medical Assistance application for filing with the PA Department of Human Services, so there can be a seamless transition in the payment of your father's care bills at Kutztown Manor."

76. Additionally, Respondent's letter stated that "[attorney Jennifer] Grimes and myself will remain available to complete any necessary Medical Assistance planning on an ongoing basis."

77. Respondent met with Dean Borrell on or about August 23, 2017 and agreed to move forward with regard to liquidating certain funds, and filing a Medical Assistance appeal.

78. On or about August 24, 2017, Respondent prepared and filed a new deed on the property owned by Arthur Borrell; the property was placed in the names of Dean Borrell and Jeffrey Borrell.

79. Respondent failed to complete an application for Medical Assistance on behalf of Arthur Borrell.

80. Between August 2017 and February 2018, Dean Borrell made numerous attempts to reach Respondent seeking to have Respondent complete the work he began for Mr. Borrell's father, but Respondent did not respond to Mr. Borrell's telephone calls or emails.

81. On or about October 18, 2017, Dean Borrell contacted Jennifer Grimes, Esquire, but Ms. Grimes was unable to secure Respondent's cooperation in assisting Dean Borrell.

82. In or about February 2018, Dean Borrell retained Erik Spurlin, Esquire, to complete and file Arthur Borrell's Medical Assistance paperwork.

83. In March 2018, Ms. Grimes wrote to Dean Borrell stating, "We really need to get this [medical] application in- there are many many letters from the Manor [nursing home] and it doesn't look like John [Grenko] has responded for months! Ughhh."

84. As a result of Respondent's inaction since August 2017, Arthur Borrell's Medical Assistance application was significantly delayed. When filed, Arthur Borrell's Medical Assistance eligibility could only be made retroactive to November 1, 2017.

85. On February 4, 2020 Petitioner mailed Respondent a DB-7 letter requesting a Statement of Respondent's Position, and directing Respondent to answer within thirty (30) days.

86. Respondent received the DB-7 letter.

87. Respondent did not answer the DB-7 letter requesting a statement of his position.

88. Respondent admits that in connection with his representation of Mr. Borrell, he violated RPC 1.4(a)(2) and RPC 1.4(a)(3), because he did not communicate with Mr. Borrell as frequently as he should have. Additionally, although Respondent contends he verbally advised Mr. Borrell that he would be available to complete the Medical Assistance application as needed, Respondent now recognizes he should have expressly set forth the terms and conditions of their agreement, in writing.

**SPECIFIC RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT
AND RULES OF DISCIPLINARY ENFORCEMENT VIOLATED**

89. Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct and Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement:

A. RPC 1.1 which states that a lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation;

B. RPC 1.2(a), which states that a lawyer shall abide by his client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation and shall consult with the client as to the means by which they are to be pursued;

C. RPC 1.3, which states that a lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client;

D. PC 1.4(a)(1), which states that a lawyer shall promptly inform the client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent is required;

E. RPC 1.4(a)(2), which states that a lawyer shall reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished;

F. RPC 1.4(a)(3), which states that a lawyer shall keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter;

G. RPC 1.4(a)(4), which states that a lawyer shall promptly comply with reasonable requests for information;

H. RPC 1.4(b), which states that a lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation;

I. RPC 1.5(b), which states that when a lawyer has not regularly represented the client, the basis or rate of the fee shall be communicated to the client, in writing, before or within a reasonable time after commencing the representation;

J. RPC 1.15(e), which states in pertinent part that a lawyer shall promptly deliver to the client or third person any property, including but not limited to Rule 1.15 Funds, that the client or third person is entitled to receive and, upon request by the client or third person, shall promptly render a full accounting regarding the property;

K. RPC 1.16(a)(3), which states that a lawyer shall withdraw from the representation of a client if the lawyer is discharged;

L. RPC 1.16(d), which states that upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to protect a client's interests, such as surrendering papers and property to which the client is entitled;

M. RPC 8.4(d), which states that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice; and

N. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7), which states that failure by a respondent-attorney without good cause to respond to Disciplinary Counsel's request for a statement of the respondent-attorney's position shall be grounds for discipline.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION FOR DISCIPLINE

89. Petitioner and Respondent jointly recommend that the appropriate discipline for Respondent's admitted misconduct is a public reprimand.

90. Respondent hereby consents to that discipline being imposed upon him. Attached to this Petition is Respondent's executed Affidavit required by Rule 215(d), Pa.R.D.E., stating that he consents to the recommended discipline and including the mandatory acknowledgements contained in Rule 215(d)(1) through (4), Pa.R.D.E.

91. In support of the joint recommendation, it is respectfully submitted that the following mitigating circumstances are present:

- a) Respondent has admitted engaging in misconduct and violating the charged Rules of Professional Conduct;
- b) Respondent is currently cooperating with Petitioner, as evidenced by Respondent's admissions herein and his consent to receiving a public reprimand;
- c) Respondent has paid to the Estate of Jeffrey Haas \$20,646.00, representing the amount of penalties and fees assessed to the estate for Respondent's lack of diligence;
- d) Respondent represents he is currently working to resolve the harm caused to Mr. Borrell resulting from his lack of diligence in that matter; and
- e) Respondent is remorseful for his misconduct and understands he should be disciplined, as evidenced by his consent to receiving a public reprimand.

92. In support of Petitioner and Respondent's joint recommendation, the following aggravating circumstance is present:

a) Respondent has previous private discipline. On August 14, 2014, Respondent received an informal admonition for neglect, lack of diligence and for making misrepresentations to his client in an estate matter in which he had been retained to administer an estate and terminate a revocable trust, in violation of RPC 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(b), 1.4(c), 1.5(a), 1.5(e), 1.16(a)(1), 1.16(a)(3), 1.16(d), 3.2 and 8.4(c).

93. Precedent supports imposition of public discipline, without suspension, for attorneys who engage in neglect and failure to communicate, and have a record of private discipline. In *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. John E. Quinn*, 138 DB 2019 (D.Bd. Order 8/2/19), the Disciplinary Board approved a Joint Petition for Discipline on Consent for a Public Reprimand involving Mr. Quinn's similar neglect and violations of RPC 1.3, 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.5(a), 1.15(e), 1.16(d) in multiple complaint files. Like Respondent Mr. Grenko, Respondent Quinn also had a previous Informal Admonition. In a matter very similar to the instant case, *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Neil Anthony Grover*, No. 128 DB 2014 (D.Bd. Order 8/29/2014) the Board Ordered a Public Reprimand based on Respondent's violations of RPC 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 and Pa.R.D.E 203(b)(7), for failure to respond to two DB-7 Requests for Statement of Respondent's Position. Respondent Grover, like Respondent Grenko had a previous Informal Admonition.

94. Since the Supreme Court's adoption of the public reprimand as a new form of discipline in May, 2012, the Board has consistently imposed a public reprimand in matters involving general neglect, failure to communicate and failure to turn over client files and property, including Rule 1.15 funds, in matters where the respondent-attorney had previously received private discipline. The discipline suggested here is consistent with this well-established precedent.

See ODC v. Robert Dixon, 162 DB 2018 (D.Bd. Order 10/5/18; Public Reprimand administered January 2019, with probation, where respondent failed to communicate/consult with clients in three separate matters, failed to respond to ODC's DB-7 requests for Statement of Respondent's Position, and had previous history of informal admonition, private reprimand and public reprimand in 2008, 2015 and 2016); *ODC v. Kevin Mincey*, 45 DB 2016 (Public Reprimand administered July 11, 2016 for neglect and failure to communicate in two client matters, coupled with previous private reprimand for similar misconduct); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Jeffrey Servin*, 118 DB 2015 (Public reprimand administered September 28, 2016, where Respondent lacked diligence, failed to communicate and failed to turn over client file and property in one matter, and had two previous informal admonitions in 2004 and 2007, and a prior public reprimand, in 2012); *see also ODC v. Charles A. Pascal, Jr.*, 88 DB 2019 (Public reprimand administered September 9, 2019 based on severe neglect, and lack of communication, in two client matters; no previous history of discipline).

95. Under the circumstances, a public reprimand, as opposed to a suspension, appears warranted. *Compare Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Matthew Porsch*, 88 DB 2017 (D.Bd. Rpt. 2/21/2018)(failure to appear for informal admonition, but subsequent expression of extreme regret and remorse warranted public reprimand with condition to refund money owed) with *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Frederick Seth Lowenberg*, 9 DB 2017 (D.Bd. Rpt. 11/1/2017)(S.Ct Order 12/26/2017)(failure to appear for Informal Admonition, and failure to appear for disciplinary hearing warranted one-year and one-day suspension).


WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Respondent respectfully request that, pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 215(e) and 215(g), a three-member panel of the Disciplinary Board review and approve the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent, and

order that Respondent receive a Public Reprimand and that Respondent pay all necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this matter as a condition to the grant of the Petition.


Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
THOMAS J. FARRELL, ESQUIRE
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Date: 9/22/2020


KRISTA K. BEATTY, ESQUIRE
Disciplinary Counsel
Attorney Reg. No. 75211
District II Office
820 Adams Avenue, Suite 170
Trooper, PA 19403
(610) 650-8210

Date: 9/22/2020


JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO, ESQUIRE
Respondent
Attorney Reg. No. 24596
519 Walnut Street
Reading, PA 19601-3477
(610) 376-5313

VERIFICATION

The statements contained in the foregoing *Joint Petition In Support of Discipline on Consent* are true and correct to the best of my knowledge or information and belief and are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S.A. §4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

9/22/2020
Date

Krista K. Beatty
KRISTA K. BEATTY, ESQUIRE
Disciplinary Counsel

9/22/2020
Date

John Joseph Grenko Esq.
JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO, ESQUIRE
Respondent

**BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 81 DB 2020
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Reg. No. 24596
	:	
JOHN JOSEPH GRECKO,	:	
Respondent	:	(Berks County)


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am this day serving the foregoing document upon all parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of 204 Pa. Code §89.22 (relating to service by a participant).

By First Class mail and Email:

JOHN JOSEPH GRECKO, ESQUIRE
Respondent
519 Walnut Street
Reading, PA 19601-3477
(610) 376-5313
jjg5313@aol.com

Dated: 9/22/2020



KRISTA K. BEATTY, ESQUIRE
Disciplinary Counsel
Attorney Reg. No. 75211
Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District II Office
820 Adams Avenue, Suite 170
Trooper, PA 19403
(610) 650-8210

**BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 81 DB 2020
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Reg. No. 24596
	:	
JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO,	:	
Respondent	:	(Berks County)

AFFIDAVIT
UNDER RULE 215(d), Pa.R.D.E.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA:
COUNTY OF BERKS:

JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and hereby submits this affidavit consenting to the recommendation of discipline in the form of a public reprimand in conformity with Pa.R.D.E. 215(d) and further states as follows:


1. He is an attorney actively licensed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having been admitted to the bar on or about November 22, 1976.
2. He desires to submit a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d).
3. His consent is freely and voluntarily rendered; he is not being subjected to coercion or duress, and he is fully aware of the implications of submitting this affidavit.
4. He is aware that there is presently pending a proceeding into allegations that he has been guilty of misconduct as set forth in the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent of which this affidavit is attached hereto.
5. He acknowledges that the material facts set forth in the Joint Petition are true.
6. He submits the within affidavit because he knows that if charges predicated upon the matter under investigation were filed, or continued to be prosecuted in the pending proceeding,

he could not successfully defend against them.

7. He acknowledges that he is fully aware of his right to consult and employ counsel to represent him in the instant proceeding. He has not retained, consulted and acted upon the advice of counsel in connection with his decision to execute the within Joint Petition.


It is understood that the statements made herein are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S.A. §4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Signed this 22nd day of September, 2020.



JOHN JOSEPH GRENKO
Respondent

Sworn to and subscribed
before me this 22nd day
of Sept., 2020.


Notary Public
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
NOTARIAL SEAL
Cherylan Hoffman-Hess, Notary Public
Wyomissing Boro, Berks County
My Commission Expires April 16, 2021
MEMBER PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF NOTARIES

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Krista K. Beatty, Esquire certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Submitted by: ODC

Signature: Krista K. Beatty

Name: Krista K. Beatty

Attorney No. (if applicable): 75211