

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 2844 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
: :
DANIEL MICHAEL DIXON : 174 DB 2020
: :
: Attorney Registration No. 202108
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT :
: (Philadelphia)
:

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 30th day of June, 2026, the Petition for Reinstatement is denied. Petitioner is directed to pay the expenses incurred by the Disciplinary 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 06/30/2026

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 2844 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
: :
: No. 174 DB 2020
DANIEL MICHAEL DIXON : :
: Attorney Registration No. 202108
: :
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Philadelphia)

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.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following factual findings:

Dixon's Background and Misconduct

1. Petitioner, Daniel Michael Dixon (“Dixon”), was born in 1978 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth in 2006. He was admitted to the bar in New Jersey in 2006.
2. Following his admission in Pennsylvania, Dixon worked for several large law firms located in Philadelphia. Reinstatement Questionnaire, No. 6(a).
3. From on or about November 15, 2016, Dixon was an attorney with the law firm of Morgan Lewis & Bockius (“Morgan Lewis”) in Philadelphia representing client CSI International, Inc. (“CSI”) in an appeal of a \$176,734.81 tax assessment before the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue’s Board of Appeals (“BOA”). ODC-2 ¶¶ 5-7.
4. On June 6, 2017, the BOA issued an order denying CSI’s request for relief of the tax assessment. Dixon received the order. ODC-2 ¶¶ 17-23, 151-154, 170.
5. On or about July 17, 2017, Dixon received another copy of the order from BOA correcting a typographical error. ODC-2 ¶¶ 25-33.
6. Dixon billed .3 hours, the equivalent of up to 18 minutes, for reviewing the order. ODC-2 ¶¶ 25-33.
7. Dixon failed to notify CSI of BOA’s order denying their request for relief. ODC-2 ¶¶ 24, 34.
8. Dixon failed to timely appeal BOA’s determination concerning his client’s request for relief to the Board of Finance & Revenue (“BF&R”). ODC-2 ¶¶ 37-38.
9. Dixon repeatedly failed to reply to his client when CSI contacted him for information and updates concerning the case; when he did reply, he misled his client. ODC-2 ¶¶ 48-52, 60-66, 84-92, 97-99, 103-104, 109-110, 125, 134-136.

10. At a hearing before the BF&R Dixon provided false affidavits to support his claim that he had not received the BOA's decision until after the time to appeal had expired. ODC-2 ¶¶ 113-120.
11. Dixon's false affidavits to the BF&R were intentional. ODC-2 ¶ 32.
12. Morgan Lewis terminated Dixon's employment in 2018.
13. Following his departure from Morgan Lewis, Dixon worked for a short period of time at the firm of Kaplan Stewart in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania. In late 2019, he joined the Chadds Ford firm of Murphy Maddren & Dixon as a partner, where he remained until his suspension. Reinstatement Questionnaire, No. 6(a).

Dixon's Disciplinary Proceedings at No. 174 DB 2020

14. By DB-7 Letter dated May 2, 2019, Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("ODC") notified Dixon of the allegations of misconduct. ODC-22.
15. In response to the DB-7 letter, Dixon made several knowingly false statements, including that he "never once intentionally made any false representations, statements, or submitted falsified documents to any agency" and he "never once attempted to hide, falsify, or misrepresent any facts ... to anyone." ODC-23.
16. At the disciplinary hearing on March 2, 2021, Dixon acknowledged that "a mistake was made," that "the appeal deadline was missed," and that he "made things worse by ultimately being dishonest." ODC-3, pp. 64-66.
17. At oral argument before a Board panel on September 22, 2021, Dixon admitted that he "lied to the client." ODC-4, p. 98.

18. The Board issued a Report on December 8, 2021, wherein it concluded that Dixon committed professional misconduct by neglecting to file an appeal, engaging in multiple misrepresentations to conceal the neglect, and filing two false affidavits to a tribunal. The Board recommended to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that Dixon be suspended for a period of one year and one day. ODC-2.
19. By Order dated March 4, 2022, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania suspended Dixon for a period of one year and one day.
20. Based on the March 4, 2022 Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the New Jersey Office of Attorney Discipline moved for the imposition of reciprocal discipline on Dixon. N.T. 155-156.
21. On March 16, 2023, the Disciplinary Review Board of the Supreme Court of New Jersey heard argument on the motion. ODC-14.
22. During the New Jersey argument, Dixon denied that he knowingly or intentionally filed a false affidavit. ODC-14, 450-452.
23. By Order dated October 31, 2023, the Supreme Court of New Jersey reciprocally suspended Dixon for one year. ODC-2 ¶ 62; ODC-16.
24. By Order dated December 1, 2023, the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey suspended Dixon for one year. ODC-5 at 181.

Reinstatement Proceedings at No. 174 DB 2020

25. On March 6, 2024, Dixon filed a Petition for Reinstatement and accompanying Reinstatement Questionnaire.
26. Dixon's Reinstatement Questionnaire (ODC-5) contained the following statements:

- a. In response to No. 6(b), Dixon represented that his only employment during his suspension was as a consultant with “Dixon LLC” located in Philadelphia, and his job duties did not include any law-related activity.
- b. In response to No. 6(b)(i) Dixon stated, “I conducted no Pennsylvania legal or para-legal activities during my period of suspension to date.”
- c. In response to No. 6(c), Dixon stated, “I conducted no Pennsylvania legal or para-legal activities during my period of suspension to date. My New Jersey Bar License was active until July 3, 2023. However, I also conducted no New Jersey legal or para-legal activities since my period of Pennsylvania suspension.”

27. ODC sent Dixon letters seeking information regarding his employment during his suspension. ODC-7, ODC-9, R1.

28. In his response to ODC’s initial inquiry, Dixon asserted that “the only Pennsylvania client for which [he] performed work was ‘Campbell’s Place’,” a restaurant in Philadelphia, and that Dixon LLC “performs no Pennsylvania Legal Services.” ODC-8.

29. On May 2, 2024, ODC filed a Response to the Petition for Reinstatement and reserved the right to raise any objections after evaluating the evidence Dixon presented at the reinstatement hearing.

The September 5, 2024 Reinstatement Hearing

30. Following the appointment of a Hearing Committee (“Committee”), a prehearing conference was held on July 10, 2024.

31. The Committee conducted a reinstatement hearing on September 5, 2024. Dixon called two witnesses, testified on his own behalf, and introduced three exhibits. ODC introduced 43 exhibits and cross-examined Dixon and his two witnesses.
32. Dixon admitted that he “did” the acts of misconduct for which he was suspended. He also acknowledged that he did not take his disciplinary proceedings as seriously as he should have (“I was flippant in this proceeding at the outset”). N.T. 108, 109, 118-124.
33. Dixon acknowledged that initially he was not truthful with ODC or with the Board and later changed his position regarding some of the misconduct. N.T. 105, 140, 158-159. Dixon further admitted that some of his filings in the New Jersey disciplinary proceeding “danc[ed] around the facts that I lied to my clients and I lied to the Board of Finance and Revenue.” *Id.*
34. When asked to explain why, after admitting in the Pennsylvania disciplinary proceeding that he had been dishonest and had lied to his client, he then claimed in the subsequent New Jersey proceeding that he was never intentionally dishonest, Dixon answered, “I don’t know.” N.T. 142-144.
35. To prevent future misconduct, Dixon plans to be “exponentially” more careful with deadlines. N.T. 106.
36. During his 2021 disciplinary proceedings, Dixon raised mental health issues relating to anxiety and depression. ODC-2. Dixon briefly addressed his mental health treatment at the reinstatement hearing and provided a mental health intake form from February 2019 from Belmont Behavioral Hospital and eight progress

notes dated April 2, 2021, July 20, 2021, October 19, 2021, January 21, 2022, April 27, 2022, August 18, 2022, July 26, 2023, and January 29, 2024. N.T. 102-103; ODC 17-19.

37. Dixon indicated that the progress notes from April 2021 through January 2024 were everything he was able to find on his treatment. N.T. 172-173.

38. Dixon did not submit any progress notes or medical reports for any period after January 2024.

39. Dixon explained that at some point following the Covid pandemic and a change to his insurance, he did not have a therapist and had to find a new one, so there was an unspecified period when he was not in talk therapy. N.T. 102.

40. Dixon currently utilizes the online platform Talkspace for his talk therapy needs. N.T. 102-103.

41. Dixon did not call an expert witness in the field of mental health to testify on his current mental health.

42. During his suspension, Dixon reconnected with close family members and friends from whom he had been estranged. N.T. 101-102.

43. During his suspension, Dixon volunteered with his wife in church kitchens over the holidays to feed people. N.T. 94.

44. Dixon completed a background screening and checklist to volunteer for Special Olympics and talked to his local YMCA about volunteering to coach swim lessons, but did not actually participate in volunteer work for those organizations. N.T. 94.

45. While suspended, Dixon undertook creative writing and completed a screenplay.

N.T. 96.

46. Dixon completed his CLE requirements necessary for reinstatement. N.T. 94-95.

47. After reviewing and completing his Reinstatement Questionnaire, Dixon began tracking changes in the tax law and current events. N.T. 95.

48. In explaining his writing efforts and research, Dixon testified that he “kept my writing and research skills sharp doing that while not running afoul of any practice of law.” N.T. 96.

49. Dixon did not testify concerning any employment during his suspension.

50. Dixon presented the testimony of Michael Maddren, Esquire, and Donna Warrington.

51. Michael Maddren has been admitted to the bar in Pennsylvania since 1999 and first met Dixon about twenty years ago when Mr. Maddren was an attorney at the law firm of Blank Rome and Dixon worked at the firm as a paralegal. N.T. 63. Mr. Maddren encouraged Dixon to go to law school. *Id.* Although they did not see each other as often after Dixon went to law school, they remained friendly through the years. N.T. 64.

52. Around 2020, Mr. Maddren approached Dixon to form a partnership with a third attorney. N.T. 73, 74. At that time, Mr. Maddren was unaware that Dixon had been terminated from Morgan Lewis. He learned early on in their partnership about the disciplinary action against Dixon but was willing to give Dixon a “second chance.” N.T. 75-78.

53. Mr. Maddren and Dixon were partners at the firm of Murphy Maddren & Dixon from approximately 2020 until Dixon's suspension in 2022. N.T. 64.
54. During the time they practiced law together, Mr. Maddren trusted Dixon to interact with the firm's clients. N.T. 64. He described Dixon's work product as "great" and "almost incomparable" when Dixon was "in the right head space." N.T. 65, 87. Mr. Maddren observed that Dixon had "trouble staying on track" when he was not in therapy. N.T. 87-88.
55. Mr. Maddren believes that Dixon needs to treat his mental health issues to properly manage his practice and at times during their partnership, Mr. Maddren approached Dixon to check whether he was seeing his therapist. N.T. 82, 84.
56. Mr. Maddren is aware of Dixon's past misconduct at Morgan Lewis and believes Dixon would now "behave a little differently" in a similar situation. N.T. 65, 77-78.
57. Mr. Maddren sees no reason why Dixon should not be readmitted and has "no qualms" about Dixon resuming practice. N.T. 65.
58. Mr. Maddren testified that if Dixon were reinstated, he would refer work to him and would oversee Dixon's work on those matters. N.T. 65-66, 68-69.
59. Donna Warrington is Dixon's wife. They have been married since 2012, although they experienced a two year separation from approximately 2016 to 2018. N.T. 30, 36.
60. Since reconnecting in 2018, Ms. Warrington has seen Dixon work on himself through a healthy work-life balance, improvement in managing his anger,

improvement in reliability and dependability, and rebuilding relations with family members. N.T. 36, 37, 40, 41.

61. Ms. Warrington could not think of any reason Dixon should not be reinstated. N.T. 40.

62. The testimony of Mr. Maddren and Ms. Warrington is credible.

63. Following the close of the record, on October 16, 2024, Dixon submitted a post-hearing brief to the Committee in support of his reinstatement.

64. On October 29, 2024, ODC filed a post-hearing brief to the Committee and requested that the Committee recommend to the Board that the Petition for Reinstatement be denied as Dixon had not met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence.

The Petition to Reopen the Record

65. The Committee's report was due on December 28, 2024; however, on December 16, 2024, ODC filed a Petition to Reopen the Record to Permit the Presentation of Newly-Discovered Evidence, pursuant to Disciplinary Board Rules, § 89.251(a). The Petition set forth information that ODC had received after the close of the September 5, 2024 record that Dixon had provided legal representation during his suspension.

66. On December 18, 2024, Dixon filed a Response to ODC's Petition, wherein he claimed that ODC's assertions were inaccurate or intentionally misleading. Dixon claimed he was providing "[his] thoughts" as "a friend" and believed this did not amount to the practice of law. Dixon's Response, 2-4, 12, 29, 34-35.

67. On January 16, 2025, the Hearing Committee Chair issued an order granting ODC's Petition and an additional hearing date was scheduled.

The June 26, 2025 Reinstatement Hearing

68. Following a prehearing conference on May 6, 2025, the Committee held a continuation of the reinstatement hearing on June 26, 2025. ODC called one witness, Kelly Meerbott, and introduced eleven additional exhibits. Dixon cross-examined the witness and provided two exhibits. He did not call any witnesses or testify on his own behalf, but gave an opening statement and made a closing argument.

69. Ms. Meerbott credibly testified and explained Dixon's legal representation of her business, You Loud and Clear.

70. Dixon met Kelly Meerbott in 2016 at an exercise class and they became social friends. N.T. 6/26/25 at 31, 32. At some point, approximately late 2022 or 2023, Ms. Meerbott needed to find a new attorney and asked Dixon what kind of law he practiced. Dixon informed her that he handled small business law and that he represented a number of restaurants. *Id.* at 33-34.

71. While suspended from the practice of law, Dixon provided legal services to Ms. Meerbott and You Loud and Clear.

72. You Loud and Clear is a Pennsylvania corporation with its office in Narberth, Pennsylvania. ODC-54; N.T 6/26/25 at 30.

73. Dixon provided his legal services through Dixon LLC, a limited liability company organized in Pennsylvania, with its office in Philadelphia. Dixon formed the LLC in July 2022, after he was suspended. ODC-5, p. 117; ODC-54; ODC-55.
74. At the time Ms. Meerbott retained Dixon, she understood that he was currently representing other clients. N.T. 6/26/25 at 34.
75. Between April 2023 and October 2024, Dixon provided You Loud and Clear with representation in multiple matters, including:
- a. a dispute with PEMA.io, involving You Loud and Clear's requests for deletion of certain video recordings from PEMA's website and negotiation of a settlement agreement (N.T. 6/26/25 at 45-46);
 - b. review of a proposed contract You Loud and Clear was negotiating with SBX Productions regarding production of podcasts (*Id.* at 60, 61);
 - c. a request for a refund of an engagement fee from Clients2Calendar, LLC (*Id.* at 52-54);
 - d. advising You Loud and Clear regarding a request for a refund from a customer, Hall Pass Learning Solutions, and drafting language to accompany the refund (*Id.* at 65-67);
 - e. reviewing a contract from Kardia House regarding publication of a book Ms. Meerbott had written (*Id.* 70-72); and
 - f. advising You Loud and Clear about possibly reincorporating in the State of Delaware. *Id.* 49-52.

76. On May 30, 2024, Ms. Meerbott paid Dixon \$1,500 for his legal services. N.T. 6/26/25 at 44; ODC-51.
77. Throughout the representation, Ms. Meerbott understood Dixon to be a licensed attorney in Pennsylvania. N.T. 6/26/25 at 29, 36.
78. Dixon never told Ms. Meerbott he had been suspended from the Pennsylvania Bar. N.T. 6/26/25 at 36-37.
79. In November 2024, Ms. Meerbott learned from ODC that Dixon's law license had been suspended and he was ineligible to practice law in Pennsylvania. N.T. 6/26/25 at 29, 31. She cut off communication with Dixon except for requesting a refund. *Id.* at 74.
80. Ms. Meerbott requested from Dixon a refund through Venmo of the \$1,500 that she paid for legal service; Dixon did not refund any of the moneys. N.T. 6/26/25 at 35, 36, 74. Ms. Meerbott explained that she requested the refund because Dixon had lied to her about being a licensed lawyer. *Id.* at 36.
81. Following the close of the record, on September 3, 2025, Dixon submitted a supplemental brief in support of his reinstatement. On September 3, 2025, ODC submitted its supplemental brief in opposition to reinstatement.

The Proceedings Below

82. By Report filed on November 3, 2025, the Committee concluded that Dixon failed to meet his reinstatement burden. The Committee found that Dixon's non-compliance with the Court's March 4, 2022 suspension order, his continued pattern of dishonesty, and his failure to acknowledge his wrongdoing demonstrated his

lack of qualifications and fitness to resume practice. The Committee recommended that the Petition for Reinstatement be denied.

83. The parties did not take exception to the Committee's Report.

84. The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on January 22, 2026.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Dixon failed to meet his burden by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency, and learning in the law required for admission to practice law in this Commonwealth. Pa.R.D.E. 218 (c)(3).

2. Dixon failed to meet his burden by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law in this Commonwealth will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice, nor subversive of the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218 (c) (3).

III. DISCUSSION

This matter is before the Board for consideration of the Committee's Report and unanimous recommendation to deny Dixon's Petition for Reinstatement. The parties have not objected to the Committee's recommendation. After conducting an independent review of the record, we conclude that Dixon failed to meet his stringent reinstatement burden and recommend that his request for reinstatement to the bar of this Commonwealth be denied.

Dixon seeks readmission to the practice of law following his suspension for a period of one year and one day, ordered by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on March 4, 2022. Pursuant to Rule 218(a)(4), Pa.R.D.E., an attorney who is suspended for a period exceeding one year may not resume the practice of law until reinstated by the Court. To gain reinstatement, Dixon must prove by evidence that is clear and convincing, that he is morally qualified, competent and learned in the law and that his resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3). It is well-established that a reinstatement proceeding is a “searching inquiry into a lawyer’s present professional and moral fitness to resume the practice of law. The object of concern is not solely the transgressions which gave rise to the lawyer’s suspension or disbarment, but rather, the nature and extent of the rehabilitative efforts he has made since the time the sanction was imposed and the degree of success achieved in the rehabilitative process.” *Philadelphia News, Inc. v. Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*, 363 A.2d 779, 780-781 (Pa. 1976). This inquiry necessarily involves a thorough examination of a wide range of issues relevant to a petitioner’s fitness to resume the practice of law. *Id.*

The Board’s chief basis for concluding that Dixon failed to meet his heavy reinstatement burden is his violation of the Court’s March 4, 2022 suspension order. The Court’s order directed Dixon to comply with all provisions of Pa.R.D.E. 217. Pursuant to subdivision (j) of that rule, as a formerly admitted attorney, Dixon was only able to engage in certain law-related activities in Pennsylvania under the supervision of a member in

good standing of the bar, and was specifically prohibited from, *inter alia*, representing himself as a lawyer or person of similar status, having contact with clients, rendering legal consultation or advice to a client, negotiating or transacting any matter for or on behalf of a client with a third party or having any contact with third parties regarding such a negotiation or transaction, and receiving, disbursing or otherwise handling client funds.

The record evidence established that Dixon engaged in conduct that violated Pa.R.D.E. 217, in blatant disregard of the Court's order. The credible testimony of Ms. Meerbott and the numerous emails and texts to which Dixon was a party established that he represented You Loud and Clear in multiple matters. The representation began in or about April 2023 and continued until October 2024. While suspended, Dixon reviewed contracts for You Loud and Clear, advised Ms. Meerbott about multiple matters, drafted language to include in at least one agreement and supplied comments on another agreement, and drafted language to accompany a refund to one of Ms. Meerbott's clients. Dixon requested \$1,500 for his legal services; Ms. Meerbott made the payment on May 30, 2024. Dixon never informed Ms. Meerbott of his suspended status. Ms. Meerbott ended the representation after she learned from ODC that Dixon was suspended and therefore not eligible to practice law. She requested a full refund of her moneys based on the fact that Dixon had lied to her; Dixon has not refunded any moneys.

Dixon offered several bases to support the validity of his representation of Ms. Meerbott's company, all of which must fail. Dixon initially claimed in his response to ODC's request to reopen the record that he was merely providing his thoughts to Ms.

Meerbott as her friend. Dixon Response, ¶¶ 2, 34. The record belies this claim, as Ms. Meerbott credibly testified she retained Dixon to act as her attorney and to assist her with multiple legal matters. Dixon also stressed that there is no definition of the “practice of law” and appeared to suggest that his activities did not encompass the practice of law. Dixon Response, ¶ 4. We reject this position, primarily because regardless of what activities fall under the “practice of law,” Dixon was bound by Pa.R.D.E. 217(j), which limits the law-related activities of a formerly admitted attorney; he violated those requirements. Dixon engaged in a final attempt to justify his conduct by arguing at the reinstatement hearing that he was entitled to continue practicing law after his suspension in Pennsylvania because he was still licensed in New Jersey and that “[n]one of the advice that [he] gave [to Ms. Meerbott] was Pennsylvania-specific.” N.T. 6/26/25, 23-24, 94-95. Dixon’s reasoning is specious. The record demonstrated that Dixon was practicing law through a limited liability company organized and located in Pennsylvania, on behalf of a client similarly incorporated and located in Pennsylvania, in matters having nothing to do with New Jersey. However, even if Dixon had been permitted to continue practicing law in Pennsylvania with a New Jersey license—which he was not—his New Jersey license was suspended in late 2023, yet he continued to represent Ms. Meerbott’s business through October 2024.

In addition to his deceitful conduct toward Ms. Meerbott, Dixon lied about his legal services on the Reinstatement Questionnaire he filed on March 6, 2024, where he unequivocally stated that he “conducted no Pennsylvania legal or para-legal activity” during suspension. When ODC requested information about his employment with Dixon

LLC, Dixon repeatedly failed to disclose his work for You Loud and Clear, even as he continued to provide legal representation. Later, at the September 5, 2024 reinstatement hearing, Dixon testified about his efforts to avoid “running afoul of any practice of law” by limiting himself to creative writing, research and volunteer work. This testimony is not credible, considering that at the very time he was testifying, Dixon was “running afoul” of his suspension order by providing a variety of legal services to Ms. Meerbott’s company.

The unauthorized practice of law while serving a disciplinary suspension is a serious violation of the ethical rules. *See Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. William J. Weiss*, No. 133 DB 2021 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/11/2024) (S. Ct. Order 5/2/2024) (Weiss’s continued practice of law while suspended warranted an additional five year suspension from practice). The Board has previously recommended denying reinstatement on the basis that a formerly admitted attorney who practiced law during his suspension was not fit to resume practice. *See In the Matter of Lawrence J. DiAngelus*, No. 189 DB 2003 (D. Bd. Rpt. 1/3/2013, p. 7-8) (S. Ct. Order 4/24/2013) (DiAngelus was denied reinstatement for, *inter alia*, “repeatedly and persistently” violating Pa.R.D.E. 217(j) by performing law-related activities without supervision, representing himself to be a lawyer, having contact with clients, rendering legal advice to a client, and handling client funds).

We further observe that Dixon’s deceit towards Ms. Meerbott and his attempts to conceal his improper activities from disciplinary authorities are disturbingly similar to his underlying misconduct, where he concealed information by lying to a client, his employer, and the BF & R. His continued dishonesty during suspension demonstrates a lack of fitness for reinstatement. *See In the Matter of Robert Philip Tuerk*, Nos. 51 DB

2014 & 178 DB 2017 (D. Bd. Rpt. 9/17/2024, p. 25) (S. Ct. Order 11/21/2024) (the Board found that Tuerk's continued pattern of behavior during his disbarment that mirrored his underlying misconduct "eviscerates any claim [Tuerk] has made ... that he is rehabilitated, trustworthy, and deserving of reinstatement.")

While the ample evidence of Dixon's flagrant violation of his suspension order and dishonest conduct relating thereto standing alone provides a sound basis to reject his reinstatement, we find additional support to deny reinstatement based on Dixon's insufficient evidence to establish his qualifications under Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3). Dixon's evidence does not clearly and convincingly establish that he is morally qualified and competent and has been rehabilitated from his underlying misconduct.

Dixon attempted to satisfy his burden by presenting evidence of his remorse, mental health status, activities during suspension, and character. We first examine Dixon's acceptance of responsibility and contrition. The record evidence demonstrated that Dixon did not take his disciplinary proceedings seriously and initially failed to fully acknowledge his acts of misconduct. However, during his 2021 disciplinary hearing and oral argument before the Board, Dixon acknowledged his dishonesty. Yet after he was suspended in Pennsylvania in 2022 for that dishonest conduct, Dixon reverted to denying wrongdoing during his 2023 New Jersey disciplinary proceeding, claiming he was never intentionally dishonest in the CSI matter. Dixon was unable to explain his contradictory stances at his 2024 reinstatement hearing. These inconsistencies raise doubts as to the sincerity of Dixon's accountability and remorse.

Dixon raised the issue of his mental health during his disciplinary proceedings in 2021, where he asserted that he suffered from anxiety and depression and was seeking treatment. Despite placing this issue squarely before the Board, Dixon provided scant evidence as to his current diagnosis, current treatment, and ability to resume practice. Dixon relied primarily on an intake form from February 2019 and eight progress notes from April 2, 2021 through January 29, 2024. Dixon's testimony on the subject was brief and he indicated that he uses the online program Talkspace for therapy. Dixon provided no expert testimony as to his current mental health. This evidence does not clearly and convincingly establish that Dixon has addressed his mental health issues and is competent and fit to return to practice.

Dixon provided limited information regarding his activities during suspension. As to community service, Dixon volunteered at local church kitchens during holidays to help feed people; he offered no details on the frequency of his charitable service or where he performed the service. Dixon filled out an application to volunteer for the Special Olympics and approached his local YMCA to help with swim lessons, but has not participated in any services for those organizations. Dixon made amends with family members from whom he had been estranged. He engaged in creative writing, fulfilled his CLE credits, and researched tax issues. He offered little evidence of employment during his suspension, other than listing on his Questionnaire that he performed consulting work for Dixon LLC.

Dixon's two character witnesses, consisting of his wife and former law partner, were credible and well-meaning. However, we find their testimony of limited value

in satisfying Dixon's heavy burden for reinstatement. Ms. Warrington shared her personal observations of her spouse and behavioral improvements she has witnessed since 2018. Mr. Maddren shared his views on Dixon's legal competence, testifying that when they practiced law together, Dixon did "great" legal work as long as he was "in the right head space." NT. 65, 87. Mr. Maddren acknowledged he has seen Dixon only twice since Dixon's suspension in 2022, although they text regularly.

The paucity of evidence on the above points in conjunction with Dixon's violation of the Court's suspension order and his continued dishonesty overwhelmingly demonstrates that Dixon's reinstatement would be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar and the administration of justice and would subvert the public interest. On this record, we conclude that Dixon failed to meet his reinstatement burden by clear and convincing evidence and we recommend that his Petition for Reinstatement be denied.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Petitioner, Daniel Michael Dixon, be denied reinstatement 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: 04/27/2026