

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

In the Matter of : No. 2966 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
DANIEL P. RING : No. 105 DB 2019  
: :  
: Attorney Registration No. 79110  
: :  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Montgomery County)

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this 1<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2023, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted. Petitioner is ordered to pay the expenses incurred by the Board in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement. See Pa.R.D.E. 218(f).

A True Copy Nicole Traini  
As Of 05/01/2023

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 105 DB 2019  
:  
:  
DANIEL P. RING : Attorney Registration No. 79110  
:  
:  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Montgomery County)  
From Administrative Suspension

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 Rule 218(c)(5) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above captioned Petition for Reinstatement from administrative suspension.

I. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

By Order dated August 2, 2012, effective September 1, 2012, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania transferred Petitioner, Daniel P. Ring, to administrative suspension for failure to comply with Continuing Legal Education (CLE) requirements. On June 3, 2019, Petitioner filed a Petition for Reinstatement from administrative suspension for a

period more than three years, pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 218(d). On October 11, 2019, Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) filed a response in opposition to reinstatement. On December 30, 2019, Petitioner filed a request to withdraw the Petition, which the Board granted by Order of January 2, 2020. On January 29, 2021, Petitioner filed a second Petition for Reinstatement. Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) filed a response on December 17, 2021. Therein, ODC raised several concerns related to Petitioner's ability to meet his burden of proof under Pa.R.D.E. 218(d)(3).

By Reference for Special Reinstatement Hearing dated January 24, 2022, this matter was assigned to a single Hearing Committee Member ("Member"). Following a prehearing conference on February 18, 2022, the Member held a special reinstatement hearing on May 17, 2022. At the hearing, Petitioner testified on his own behalf and called two witnesses. Petitioner introduced eight exhibits without objection. ODC cross-examined Petitioner and introduced 62 exhibits without objection.

On July 19, 2022, Petitioner filed a post-hearing brief and requested that the Member conclude that he met his burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(d)(3) and recommend to the Board that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted. On August 8, 2022, ODC filed a post-hearing brief and requested that the Member conclude that Petitioner failed to meet his reinstatement burden as to his moral qualifications and recommend to the Board that the Petition be denied.

By Report filed on October 7, 2022, the Member concluded that Petitioner failed to meet his burden as to his moral qualifications and recommended that the Petition for Reinstatement be denied. On November 11, 2022, Petitioner filed a Brief on

Exceptions to the Report and requested oral argument before the Board. ODC filed a letter in lieu of a brief and stated that it relied on its post-hearing brief and the Member's Report to oppose Petitioner's exceptions.

On January 6, 2023, a three-member panel of the Board held oral argument. The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on January 19, 2023.

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings:

1. Petitioner is Daniel P. Ring, born in 1970 and admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth on January 7, 1997. Petitioner currently resides in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Petitioner is subject to the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

2. Petitioner has no prior history of discipline.

3. Following his admission to the bar in 1997, Petitioner worked for a short period of time for Lewis Cates, Esquire, handling real estate work. After Attorney Cates passed away, Petitioner became employed as an associate at the law firm of Padova & Lisi in Philadelphia for approximately one year. Around 1998, Petitioner commenced employment with Rutgers Casualty handling automobile defense cases for seven years. Petitioner handled approximately 100 arbitration cases, 15 jury trials and 35-40 nonjury trials in New Jersey, where he was admitted in 1996. N.T. 87, 88. Following his stint as in-house counsel, from 2005 until 2006, Petitioner was employed by two Pennsylvania law firms and worked briefly as a sole practitioner, doing legal work for his own company.

N.T. 89, 90.

4. In 2006, Petitioner ceased practicing law in order to devote time to his business interests, and to allow him more flexibility to spend time with his three children.

N.T. 90, 91, 95.

5. By Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated August 2, 2012, effective September 1, 2012, Petitioner was transferred to administrative suspension for failure to comply with CLE requirements.

6. After Petitioner ceased practicing law in 2006, and through his period of administrative suspension which commenced in 2012, Petitioner engaged in various business ventures, which included a fencing manufacturing and distribution company and a fence installation company. N.T. 96-97. Petitioner sold these businesses after approximately six years and became involved in other business ventures, including a venture based in Texas manufacturing and distributing equipment for the oil and gas industry. That business ended after about five years. N.T. 96-101.

7. On June 3, 2019, Petitioner filed a Petition for Reinstatement (2019 Petition) and a Special Reinstatement Questionnaire (2019 Questionnaire). ODC Ex.14.

8. In response to Question 11(a) on the 2019 Questionnaire as to his involvement in a civil action or as one who claimed an interest, Petitioner answered "Yes" and disclosed one pending civil case Petitioner filed against a former business partner in Harris County, Texas. ODC Ex. 14, 2019 Questionnaire, 11(a).

9. Petitioner failed to disclose that he was also a named defendant in six civil cases, five of which had been filed in Montgomery County, while the sixth civil case was

initially filed in Philadelphia but subsequently moved to Montgomery County. ODC Ex. 1-6; N.T. 169, 181.

10. In response to Question 13(b) on the 2019 Questionnaire, Petitioner answered “No” as to whether he had any debts that were 90 days past due. ODC Ex. 14, 2019 Questionnaire, 13(b).

11. When Petitioner answered Question 13(b) on the 2019 Questionnaire, he had four debts that were 90 days past due, three of which were the subject matter of three of the civil actions which Petitioner had also failed to disclose. N.T. 186-194, 206-207, 209-221.

12. In 2019, Petitioner and Disciplinary Counsel Richard Hernandez exchanged correspondence regarding, *inter alia*, Petitioner’s response to Question 11(a) on the 2019 Questionnaire. ODC Ex. 15,16, 18-21.

13. In a July 31, 2019 letter to Disciplinary Counsel Hernandez, Petitioner, *inter alia*, claimed that he did not list the six civil cases in response to Question 11(a) on the 2019 Questionnaire because he “did not have an interest, were settled, involved a business entity or [he] simply forgot.” ODC Ex. 16.

14. In a September 13, 2019 letter to Disciplinary Counsel Hernandez, Petitioner offered the following reasons for omitting the six civil cases (ODC Ex. 19):

- a. the divorce case “was not on [his] mind” because no discovery and no court appearances had occurred in that matter;
- b. the BOA lawsuit “was not on [his] mind as a current or prior lawsuit or as a complaint” because he had “negotiated” that matter “with a third-party

company”;

c. the 2013 PNC lawsuit “was not on [his] mind” because a “settlement was negotiated” and no discovery or court appearances had occurred in that matter;

d. the PNC credit card lawsuit “was not on [his] mind” because that matter had not been “pursued” and he did “not recall any activity from that matter”;

e. he had “not remember[ed]” the Iron World lawsuit because no court appearances had occurred in that matter; and

f. he had “simply forgotten” to include the six civil lawsuits because “none went to court or trial, none were presently active in [his] mind as a pending suit that would go to trial, and the one matter listed [was] at the top of [his] mind currently as that is an ongoing issue involving an ex-business partner.”

15. In a subsequent September 27, 2019 letter to Disciplinary Counsel Hernandez (ODC Ex. 21), Petitioner stated, inter alia, that:

a. the Iron World lawsuit “was simply not on [his] radar at the time Question 11 was answered”;

b. he did not recall the Hyperion confession case and that this lawsuit “did not come to mind at all when answering Question 11”; and

c. neither the 2013 PNC lawsuit nor the PNC credit card lawsuit “came to mind when answering Question 11 as there had been no activity for many, many months or years.”

16. On October 11, 2019, ODC filed a response to Petitioner’s 2019 Petition

and stated its opposition to reinstatement.

17. On December 30, 2019, Petitioner filed a request to withdraw his 2019 Petition and by Order dated January 2, 2020, the Board granted Petitioner's request.

18. Petitioner's request was granted prior to any hearing or adjudication on the 2019 Petition.

19. On January 29, 2021, Petitioner filed his second Petition for Reinstatement (2021 Petition).

20. In its response filed on December 17, 2021, ODC raised concerns with reinstatement in connection with Petitioner's answers on the 2019 Questionnaire and in connection with Petitioner's 2021 Questionnaire.

21. At the May 17, 2022 Reinstatement hearing, Petitioner testified regarding his errors and omissions on the 2019 Petition. Petitioner credibly testified that he did not disclose the six civil cases in response to Question 11(a) on the 2019 Questionnaire because he was "sloppy" in filling out the Questionnaire and did not recall the lawsuits. Petitioner testified that he remedied the inaccurate information on his 2021 Questionnaire. N.T. 132-133, 211, 236, 238.

22. On his 2019 Questionnaire, Petitioner failed to disclose debts 90 days past due. Petitioner testified that at the time he filled out the application, he had not thought of debt as something that was due and owing on a regular basis, such as a credit card or mortgage payment, or an active settlement agreement or anything that pertained to lawsuits. Petitioner testified that it was a major oversight on his part and it was wrong. N.T. 133-134.



23. Petitioner testified that because of his errors and omissions, he withdrew the 2019 Petition, remedied the wrong answers, and filed a new Petition and Questionnaire in 2021. N.T. 134, 209-210, 249.

24. Petitioner accepted full responsibility for the errors and omission on his 2019 Questionnaire and wants to make amends for that. He agreed that he wrongly filled out the first Questionnaire and that is why he withdrew it, corrected the information and refiled in 2021. N.T. 134, 135, 152, 186, 200.

25. Petitioner testified that at the time he completed the 2019 Questionnaire, he did so without benefit of counsel and he never intended to mislead ODC. N.T. 116, 275, 276, 277.

26. Petitioner testified that “[o]nce I realized all the errors made, I withdrew that and wanted to do it right. I wanted to present myself before this hearing committee in the best possible manner, and give them the most candor that I possibly can, and rectifying any issues that were made before.” N.T. 283.

27. Petitioner stated that he was “humbly before the committee” and credibly apologized “from the bottom of my heart” and again emphasized that he never meant to mislead anyone, and that if given a “second chance” he intends to be an “excellent” attorney and has learned lessons along the way. N.T. 282, 284.

28. Petitioner’s 2021 Questionnaire is accurate and disclosed the civil cases and debts that he failed to disclose in 2019. N.T. 117, 118, 119, 133. Petitioner cooperated with ODC in sending additional information for the 2021 Petition. N.T. 276-277.

29. Petitioner testified concerning his current moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law.

30. Petitioner currently teaches school at Sandy Run Middle School in Upper Dublin, Pennsylvania. as a substitute on an emergency teaching certification, works every weekday, and has held that position since November 2020. Petitioner testified that he loves teaching and finds it very fulfilling. N.T. 105; 2021 Questionnaire, 7(a).

31. Petitioner maintains an interest in a business broker franchise. N.T. 102-103.

32. During the time frame of his administrative suspension, Petitioner has not engaged in the practice of law, has not given legal advice, and has not represented clients. N.T. 91-92.

33. During his administrative suspension, Petitioner was made aware that a Facebook post inaccurately identified him as general counsel of a company he owned in Texas, and upon being made aware of the post, Petitioner took it down. N.T. 92, 141, 157, 158.

34. Petitioner testified that during his administrative suspension, he entered his appearance as counsel of record for a corporation, and that such appearance was entered in error. Petitioner resolved the issue by quickly retaining counsel. Petitioner never appeared in court on the matter. N.T. 139-140, 160, 161,

35. During his period of administrative suspension, Petitioner went through a divorce from his former wife, with whom he has three children. The divorce took effect in 2017. Since the divorce, Petitioner has maintained a very close relationship with his

children, and supported their participation in various activities, including coaching their sports and serving on the board of a youth basketball league. N.T. 93-95.

36. Petitioner decided to seek reinstatement to the bar for several reasons. He testified that it was a mistake to let his active license lapse, and he was “careless and stupid” for not taking his CLE credits. Petitioner realized that he misses practicing law, and wants to have that option. N.T. 114.

37. As a further basis for seeking reinstatement, Petitioner testified that in his capacity as a teacher, he works with special needs children who do not have the resources or advocacy that they need to get services through the schools. He realized that he can do a great deal of good, either as an advocate or as an attorney, to help these students. N.T. 114.

38. Petitioner testified that another reason for wanting to reinstate his law license is financial, in that he can earn more money as a lawyer in order to pay off debts and take care of his children and their higher educational needs. N.T. 278-279, 289-290.

39. As far as his current debts and financial obligations, Petitioner testified that he does not want to file for bankruptcy, intends to pay his debts, and that when the marital property is sold, the equity will help cover most of the debts. Petitioner also testified that he is current in all tax filings. N.T. 130, 143, 144, 271, 277-278.

40. Petitioner completed the required CLE credits for reinstatement, and took an additional course on small business law. N.T. 145-146.

41. Petitioner is interested in educational law and has kept apprised of updates in that area of law. He reads *The Legal Intelligencer* on a regular basis and reviews

American Bar Association publications from time to time. N.T. 146-147.

42. If reinstated, Petitioner intends to practice law in the area of small business issues and consulting. He is also considering representing special needs children. N.T. 114, 115; 2021 Questionnaire, 18.

43. Petitioner testified that he would like the opportunity to practice law again and provide a service to the community. N.T. 151-152.

44. Petitioner's testimony is credible.

45. At the hearing, Petitioner had two witnesses appear on his behalf and testify as to his good character and reputation in the community. These witnesses offered credible testimony.

46. Seth Reidenberg, Esquire is a Pennsylvania lawyer who was licensed in 1998 and is currently employed by Wilmington Savings Fund Society performing in-house legal work. N.T. 14, 15.

47. Mr. Reidenberg and Petitioner have maintained a close friendship since they met in college in 1988, and communicate with each other on a regular basis. N.T. 15, 16, 21.

48. Mr. Reidenberg testified that Petitioner is an excellent family man and very involved in his children's activities, even after Petitioner and his former wife divorced. N.T. 16, 17.

49. Mr. Reidenberg is aware that Petitioner stopped practicing law and developed several businesses, and is also aware that Petitioner currently teaches middle school. N.T. 17.

50. Mr. Reidenberg knows people in the community who know Petitioner, and he testified that Petitioner has a good reputation in the community as a truthful and honest person and as a peaceful and law-abiding person. N.T. 17, 18.

51. Mr. Reidenberg has no hesitation in recommending Petitioner's reinstatement to the practice of law. N.T. 19.

52. Mr. Reidenberg was not aware that Petitioner had applied for reinstatement at an earlier point in time and withdrew the application in 2019. N.T. 24, 25.

53. Laurence Ring, Esquire, is Petitioner's uncle. Mr. Ring was admitted to practice law in Pennsylvania in 1967, and has practiced primarily in California since 1977. N.T. 31, 32.

54. Mr. Ring testified that Petitioner is a "great father" and a "good guy and he should be a lawyer. He has the competence, experience and morality and he should be back practicing law. " N.T. 39, 42, 43.

55. Mr. Ring has no hesitation in recommending Petitioner's reinstatement to the practice of law.

56. Mr. Ring knew that Petitioner was put on administrative suspension for failing to complete CLE and that Petitioner was attempting to be reinstated for a period of time, but was unaware that Petitioner applied for reinstatement and withdrew the application in 2019. N.T. 44, 45, 46.

57. ODC offered no adverse witnesses.

### III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Petitioner demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice in the Commonwealth. Pa.R.D.E. 218(d)(3).

### IV. DISCUSSION

Petitioner seeks reinstatement to the practice of law in Pennsylvania from administrative suspension imposed by Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, effective September 1, 2012. Pursuant to Rule 218(d)(3), Pa.R.D.E, a formerly admitted attorney who has been on administrative suspension for more than three years bears the burden of demonstrating that such person has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice in the Commonwealth.

Before the Board is the Member's Report recommending denial of Petitioner's reinstatement request, Petitioner's Brief on Exceptions to the Report, and ODC's letter brief in opposition to Petitioner's Exceptions. Petitioner objects to the Member's conclusion that he lacks the moral qualifications to practice law. Following review of the record before us, and after hearing oral argument, we find that the Petitioner's exceptions have merit and we conclude that Petitioner met his reinstatement burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(d)(3) by a preponderance of the evidence as to his moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law. For the reasons set forth below, we recommend that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

The record demonstrates that Petitioner was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth in 1997 and practiced for a period of approximately nine years in law firm settings and as in-house counsel. In 2006, Petitioner decided to cease practicing law and focus his attention on business ventures. One basis for this transition was to have more time with his three children, who were young at that time. Because Petitioner did not comply with CLE requirements after he ceased practicing law, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania placed him on administrative suspension, effective September 1, 2012.

Nearly seven years after his transfer to administrative suspension, Petitioner decided to seek reinstatement of his active license and filed his first Petition for Reinstatement on June 3, 2019, accompanied by a Special Reinstatement Questionnaire. On the 2019 Questionnaire, in response to Question 11(a) which required Petitioner to fully and concisely disclose all civil actions in which he ever had an interest, Petitioner disclosed one civil action and failed to disclose six civil actions in which he was a party. Likewise, in response to Question 13(b) where he was required to fully and precisely disclose all debts that were overdue for more than 90 days, Petitioner failed to disclose four debts that were 90 days overdue.

In 2019, Petitioner and Disciplinary Counsel exchanged correspondence regarding Petitioner's responses to Questions 11(a) and 13(b). Disciplinary Counsel advised Petitioner that upon investigation, it had been discovered that in addition to the one lawsuit he disclosed on the 2019 Questionnaire, Petitioner was a defendant in six civil lawsuits, five of which were filed before the Court of Common Pleas in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, and a sixth lawsuit that was filed in Philadelphia County and later

transferred to Montgomery County. Disciplinary Counsel also advised Petitioner that as a result of its investigation, it had discovered that Petitioner had debts that were 90 days past due. In correspondence to ODC, Petitioner offered explanations for failing to disclose the information. In October 2019, ODC filed its response in opposition to the 2019 Petition, and ultimately, on December 30, 2019, Petitioner filed a voluntary request with the Board to withdraw his 2019 Petition, which the Board granted on January 2, 2020.

On January 29, 2021, Petitioner filed his 2021 Petition and the accompanying Special Reinstatement Questionnaire. On the 2021 Questionnaire, Petitioner fully disclosed information in response to Questions 11(a) and 13(b) that he failed to disclose on his 2019 Questionnaire. At the reinstatement hearing held on May 17, 2022 to consider the 2021 Petition, considerable time was spent reviewing the withdrawn 2019 Petition and probing Petitioner's reasons for failing to disclose the civil lawsuits and debts 90 days past due.

Petitioner testified that he failed to list the six lawsuits and failed to disclose certain past due debts because at the time he completed his 2019 Questionnaire, he either had not recalled or not remembered certain lawsuits, that certain lawsuits were not on his mind, or he did not classify certain actions as lawsuits that needed to be disclosed, and that he failed to comprehend that certain obligations constituted debts that were 90 days past due and were required to be included on the 2019 Questionnaire. Petitioner accepted full responsibility for his failures, described his approach to completing the 2019 Questionnaire as "sloppy," admitted he was wrong to omit information, explained that these failures were the reason he withdrew his 2019 Petition, and testified that he



remedied the omissions and inaccuracies when he filed his accurate 2021 Petition. Petitioner stated that he was humbled and wanted to present himself with candor before the Member, expressed remorse and apologized for his failures on the 2019 Questionnaire, stating that it was not his intention to mislead ODC.

After the hearing, ODC took the position that misrepresentations and omissions in Petitioner's responses on the withdrawn 2019 Questionnaire, coupled with what it viewed as Petitioner's incredible testimony at the hearing, was intended to mislead ODC, which actions demonstrated Petitioner's lack of moral qualifications required for reinstatement from administrative suspension. The Member agreed with this position and recommended denying reinstatement, concluding that Petitioner "failed to credibly and truthfully" explain his reasons for his omissions in response to Questions 11(a) and 13(b) on the 2019 Questionnaire, and that Petitioner "steadfastly clung to unbelievable and untruthful explanations for such failure." Member Report at p. 2, 8. The Member further observed that "[h]ad Petitioner simply testified that his failure to disclose the civil actions and past due debts was a mistake for which he was truly sorry and remorseful, he would have affirmatively shifted the burden of proof in his favor." Member Report at p. 14. On our review of the entire record, the Board finds that Petitioner did exactly that.

It is appropriate to explore Petitioner's failures concerning the information on his 2019 Questionnaire; however, the Board is more interested at this point in time in how Petitioner addressed these problems in the aftermath of ODC raising them. In our view, such actions are more dispositive of the question of Petitioner's current moral qualifications than the fact that he made omissions and misrepresentations on his 2019

Questionnaire. To be clear, Petitioner does not dispute that he filed a first petition that contained misinformation. He readily admits this failure. The record shows that Petitioner forthrightly testified as to his reasons for omitting the information at the time he filled out his 2019 Questionnaire. The record further demonstrates that Petitioner's testimony is consistent with the explanations he initially provided to ODC when it raised these issues after investigating the 2019 Petition, and that his testimony on cross-examination did not substantially deviate from these explanations.

Turning to how Petitioner addressed his problematic first petition, the record demonstrates that Petitioner currently understands that his actions in omitting and misrepresenting information were wrong. First, Petitioner of his own volition withdrew his inaccurate 2019 Petition, which shows self-awareness of his lack of candor on his first Questionnaire. Petitioner then waited a full year before filing his second, accurate 2021 Petition and Questionnaire. At the hearing, Petitioner straightforwardly answered all questions put to him and did not shirk responsibility for his earlier inadequate petition. He acknowledged he was wrong to not disclose the information and apologized. Petitioner stated that he was humbled and wanted to present himself to the Member with candor, and forthrightly conveyed that he never intended to deceive ODC. The totality of the evidence of record demonstrates that Petitioner corrected the wrong information, admitted his wrongdoing, explained what happened, and apologized. Upon the Board's independent review of the record, we find Petitioner's testimony credible and truthful as to his prior failure to disclose certain lawsuits and debts, and as to his current remorse for his actions. While the Board gives substantial deference to the fact finder's credibility

findings,<sup>1</sup> here, the Member's findings that Petitioner was incredible and dishonest are not supported by the record.

We next examine the evidence of record that supports Petitioner's reinstatement. Petitioner practiced law for nine years after his admission in 1997 and has no prior record of discipline. He stopped practicing in order to devote his attention to business ventures, during which time he neglected to take CLE credits to maintain an active license and was transferred to administrative suspension. Petitioner expressed regret that he failed to complete his CLE requirements that caused his transfer to administrative suspension and gave several reasons for seeking reinstatement: he misses the practice of law, his experience teaching school and interacting with special needs students has sparked an interest in using his legal skills to advocate for such individuals, and regaining his law license will have financial benefits, allowing him to realize increased income and support the educational pursuits of his children, who are now in high school and college.

During his period of administrative suspension, Petitioner pursued business opportunities and eventually sold several of the businesses. Petitioner maintains an interest in a business broker franchise. Petitioner has taught middle school in Upper Dublin, Pennsylvania, since 2020 as a regular substitute teacher, a position he enjoys and finds satisfying. Petitioner did not engage in the practice of law during his administrative suspension and did not hold himself out to others or give advice. In 2017,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anthony Cappuccio*, 48 A.3d 1231, 1236 (Pa. 2012) (findings of the Hearing Committee are guidelines for judging the credibility of witness and should be given substantial deference).

Petitioner and his former wife divorced. After the divorce, Petitioner maintained a very close relationship with his three children, supporting them in their various activities, and serving as a youth sports coach and on a youth sports league board. Petitioner discussed his debts and his plan to address them. Petitioner is current with tax filings.

Petitioner demonstrated his current competency and learning in the law through the fulfillment of 36 CLE credit hours and regular review of various legal publications, including *The Legal Intelligencer* and ABA materials. Petitioner reviewed materials related to education law, as well. If reinstated, Petitioner expressed an interest in education law resulting from his teaching experience, as well as business and commercial areas of legal practice.

In addition to his own testimony, Petitioner demonstrated moral qualifications and competency through the credible, unrefuted testimony of his two witnesses. Mr. Reidenberg's testimony was particularly compelling, as he has known Petitioner for nearly 35 years, is in regular contact with Petitioner, knows him to be a good father, knows people in the community who know Petitioner, and credibly testified that Petitioner has a good reputation for honesty and trustworthiness, such that Mr. Reidenberg has no hesitation in recommending Petitioner's reinstatement. We give less weight to the testimony of Mr. Ring, Petitioner's uncle, who while credibly testifying as to Petitioner's qualities as a good family man, was less aware of Petitioner's reputation in the community, as Mr. Ring has lived and worked in California for decades. Nevertheless, we credit the testimony of both witnesses in our conclusion that Petitioner has met the requirements for reinstatement.

The matter before this Board focuses squarely on Petitioner's qualifications to be reinstated from an administrative suspension caused by his CLE lapses. Significantly, Petitioner has never been the subject of professional discipline in this Commonwealth during the time that he practiced law.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, during his administrative suspension, Petitioner did not engage in any actions that violated the ethical rules. It is Petitioner's burden to demonstrate his moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law by a preponderance of the evidence. On this record, we conclude that Petitioner met his burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(d)(3). Petitioner engaged in continuous employment since leaving the practice of law, supported his family, maintained learning and competency in the law, has considered his options for resuming practice, and offered independent, objective evidence that he is presently qualified to resume practicing law. The weight of the evidence supports the Board's conclusion that Petitioner met his reinstatement burden by a preponderance of the evidence. For all of the above reasons, the Board recommends that the Petition for Reinstatement from administrative suspension be granted.

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner corrected his omissions within his amended petition, he acknowledged his failures in such regard, and he has already endured a three to four year delay to his reinstatement as a consequence of his failures.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Petitioner, Daniel P. Ring, be reinstated to the practice of law.

The Board further recommends that, pursuant to Rule 218(f), Pa.R.D.E., Petitioner be directed to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: */s/ Joshua M. Bloom*  
Joshua M. Bloom, Member

Date: 02/28/2023