

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 2723 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
: :
BRADLEY ADAM WINNICK : No. 69 DB 2020
: :
: Attorney Registration No. 78413
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT :
: (Dauphin County)

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 23rd day of June, 2026, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted. 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).

Justice Brobson did not participate in the consideration or decision of this matter.

A True Copy Nicole Traini
As Of 06/23/2026

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 2723 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
: :
: No. 69 DB 2020
BRADLEY ADAM WINNICK : :
: Attorney Registration No. 78413
: :
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Dauphin County)

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

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

Pursuant to 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:

Winnick's Background

1. Petitioner, Bradley Adam Winnick ("Winnick"), was born in 1971 and was admitted to the practice law in the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania in 1996.

2. After graduating law school, Winnick obtained a full-time position as an Assistant Public Defender in Dauphin County in the fall of 1996. N.T. 93. Winnick had previously worked for the Public Defender's Office as an intern. N.T. 92.

3. Winnick left the Public Defender's Office in August or September of 2000 for private practice. N.T. 95. He initially worked for Shaffer and Engle Law in Harrisburg, where he predominantly practiced criminal law. *Id.* In January 2003, Winnick moved to Wiley Lenox Colgan and Marzzacco in Dauphin County. N.T. 95-96.

4. In November 2006, Winnick returned to the Public Defender's Office as the First Assistant Public Defender. N.T. 97.

5. As First Assistant Public Defender, Winnick worked to effectuate changes to improve the office and the services provided to the indigent. N.T. 97-106.

6. In February 2011, Winnick became the Chief Public Defender of Dauphin County. N.T. 106.

7. While Chief Public Defender, Winnick was appointed to the Pennsylvania Act 81 Place of Confinement Committee, the Joint State Commission Task Force on Indigent Defense, and the Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission Strategic Planning Workshop. N.T. 111.

8. Beginning in 2012, Winnick was active in the Inn of Court through the Dauphin County Bar Association, which had a CLE component and public service work. N.T. 108.

9. Winnick was elected to serve as the President of the Pennsylvania Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (“PACDL”). N.T. 112. In that position, he held an ex officio, non-voting position in the PBA House of Delegates. *Id.*

10. Winnick was on the Joint Government Commission on Capitol and the Dauphin County Bar Association Board of Directors. N.T. 112.

11. Winnick served on the Board of Directors of the Gamut Theater Group and served four years on the board of his temple, Ohev Shalom. N.T. 114-115.

12. Winnick coached recreational youth baseball for a total of approximately 13 years and stopped around 2024. N.T. 116.

13. Winnick routinely volunteered to speak at high schools, colleges, Widener Law School, and civic organizations about the criminal justice system and its Constitutional underpinnings. N.T. 116-117.

14. Winnick served on the Dauphin County Criminal Justice Advisory Board. N.T. p. 66, 74.

Winnick’s Misconduct and License Suspension

15. In 2017, there were three vacancies on the Dauphin County Bench. One of the candidates was a criminal defense attorney. N.T. 117.

16. Winnick offered employees of the Public Defender's Office double compensatory time off for each hour they handed out campaign literature promoting the candidate at the polls during the 2017 primary and general elections. N.T. 118, 119; Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent ("Jt. Pet."). at 11.

17. None of the candidates were aware of what Winnick was doing and no "quid pro quo" was involved. N.T. 119.

18. Winnick knew it was a wrong thing to do but "did not stop and think." N.T. 119, 158.

19. In August 2019, Winnick learned that his actions were the subject of an investigation by the Attorney General's Office. N.T. 119-120.

20. Winnick immediately retained an attorney, met with the investigators, and provided all relevant information. N.T. 120-121.

21. Winnick admitted to the conduct and provided evidence to the authorities because he "did it." He testified that he realized his actions were wrong and wanted to start making things right. N.T. 121.

22. Winnick was also motivated to confess to prevent what he felt would be the inevitable disruption in the Public Defender's Office

if the investigation continued. He felt that if he “didn’t come in and come clean, that [his staff] was going to be dragged in, probably before a Grand Jury, and made to feel afraid that maybe they’re going to get in trouble. They’d have to go get lawyers.” N.T. 121-122.

23. Before the charges became public, Winnick resigned from the Boards of Directors of the Gamut Theatre, PACDL, and Ohev Shalom. N.T. 123.

24. In early October 2019, Winnick was charged in Dauphin County with one count Conspiracy – Diversion of Assets (18 Pa.C.S. § 903), one count Tamper with Public Records/Information (19 Pa.C.S. § 911, §§ A1), and one count Restricted Activities – Conflict of Interest (65 Pa.C.S. § 1103, §§ A). Jt. Pet at 7. Winnick turned himself in and waived his preliminary hearing and formal arraignment. N.T. 125.

25. On March 5, 2020, Winnick pled guilty to Restricted Activities – Conflict of Interest, an ungraded felony. Jt. Pet at 8.

26. By letter dated March 13, 2020, Winnick, through counsel, timely notified Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) of his criminal conviction and of his desire to enter into a joint petition for temporary suspension of his law license. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania granted the joint petition and placed Winnick on temporary suspension on May 22, 2020. Jt. Pet. at 12.

27. On June 1, 2020, Winnick was sentenced to 18 months

of probation and ordered to pay approximately \$13,000 in restitution. Winnick promptly paid the restitution in full. After completing 50 hours of community service, Winnick was discharged from probation on September 10, 2020. Jt. Pet. at 13, 14; N.T. 128.

28. Winnick performed his community service at Ohev Shalom, his synagogue. N.T. 129.

29. Winnick entered into consent discipline with ODC and by Order dated February 24, 2021, the Court suspended Winnick for one year and one day, retroactive to the date of his temporary suspension.

Post-Suspension Activities

30. In the summer of 2020, Winnick was hired by his friend, Bryan Walk, Esquire, a sole criminal practitioner in Hershey, to work in his law practice. N.T. 131. Mr. Walk and Winnick filed Notices of Engagement with the Board. N.T. 131. Winnick answered phones, drafted motions, and performed research. N.T. 131-132.

31. On March 1, 2021, Winnick left Attorney Walk's office to become a law clerk for Dauphin County Judge Scott Evans. N.T. 133, 135. Winnick filed the appropriate notice to the Board of his new employment. In this position, Winnick writes opinions, drafts orders, and conducts research, among other responsibilities. N.T. 135.

32. Judge Evans became President Judge in 2024; Winnick serves as a "sounding board" for the President Judge on administrative

matters. N.T. 136.

33. Winnick completed the required Continuing Legal Education (“CLE”) credits for his license to be reinstated. Reinstatement Questionnaire, No. 13(a) attachments; P-2.

34. In addition to reviewing and analyzing legal issues as a judicial law clerk, Winnick reviewed *The Legal Intelligencer*, Dauphin County Reporter and Law 360. Reinstatement Questionnaire, No. 13(b).

35. If reinstated, Winnick intends to practice criminal law with possible employment at the Dauphin County District Attorney’s Office. Reinstatement Questionnaire, No. 14(b); N.T. 146-147.

36. Winnick rejoined the Gamut Theater Board at their request and also joined the Board of the Dauphin County Victim Witness Assistance Program, at their invitation. N.T. 141-142.

37. Winnick was “shocked” when asked to join the Victim Witness Board after his conviction and suspension. N.T. 141. Winnick never “thought that person, who is also a convicted felon, would have been asked by a Victim Witness Program to serve on the Board. And it was very meaningful to me.” N.T. 142.

Reinstatement Proceedings

38. On March 12, 2024, Winnick filed a Petition for Reinstatement and accompanying Reinstatement Questionnaire with the Board.

39. ODC filed a Response on May 9, 2025, and reserved the right to review the testimony and evidence Winnick presented before taking a final position on the Petition for Reinstatement.

40. The Board appointed a Hearing Committee and a prehearing conference was held on July 8, 2025.

41. The Committee conducted a reinstatement hearing on September 29, 2025. Winnick presented fact and character witnesses, testified on his own behalf, and presented character letters, which were admitted without objection. ODC offered no evidence and called no witnesses.

42. Winnick credibly testified on his own behalf.

43. As to his criminal conduct, Winnick explained that he was arrogant and gave “shockingly little” thought to what he did at the time he did it. He “very quickly, very recklessly, very mindlessly” did it. N.T. 119. He unequivocally stated that he has only himself to blame for his actions. N.T. 121-122.

44. Winnick recognized that his decisions were made out of “arrogance”; it was the kind of arrogance “of simply moving forward on the thought that everything is going to be fine.” N.T. 155.

45. Winnick is cognizant of the hubris that he had and of the

impact of not taking the time to stop and be mindful of his actions. Winnick testified that “you’re rolling the dice when you act as recklessly as I did.” N.T. 143.

46. Winnick felt shame for his actions, as he believed they set back the work that had been done in the Public Defender’s Office to improve its reputation. N.T. 126, 127.

47. Winnick recognized that, because of his actions, he created an unfair dynamic in the office. While he did not intentionally pressure any employee to work a poll, he realized that the perception was that he wanted them to do so. N.T. 150.

48. Discussing why he waited to seek reinstatement, Winnick testified that he “made a terrible mistake[]” and it was “a mistake I never would have thought I would do.” He “thought the whole situation, deserved some introspection, some figuring out what went wrong.” N.T. 140.

49. Winnick also did not believe that he was “emotionally ready” to do return to practice. N.T. 140. He did not feel that he was in a place to take on the problems of others when he was recovering from his “own self-induced trauma and [he] needed time to do that before [he] took on that kind of responsibility for someone else.” N.T. 141.

50. As to his current employment as a law clerk, Winnick testified that people have been “overwhelmingly supportive” about his

return to the courthouse and that he “was shocked how much [he] was welcomed back.” N.T. 137.

51. In his current job Winnick is more cautious. He recognizes that he has to take his time and slow down his decision-making process. N.T. 144.

52. To make certain that he does not repeat his misconduct, Winnick understands that he needs to be “much more cognizant of everything I do.” N.T. 160. Winnick reiterated that he can never let his misconduct happen again. N.T. 159-160.

53. Winnick has developed a circle of individuals with whom he now consults in his decision-making. N.T. 167.

54. Winnick has been humbled by his experience and “[i]t is shameful to me to have to have people come in here today to have that, to have these [reinstatement] proceedings.” N.T. 159.

55. Winnick is sincerely sorry for his actions and “ashamed” of himself. N.T. 121, 126, 136, 137.

56. Winnick presented the credible testimony of six additional witnesses.

57. Stephen Libhart has been the Dauphin County Court Administrator since 2024 and previously worked for Dauphin County in a variety of capacities. N.T. 9 -10. He has known Winnick since 2006 or 2007. N.T. 12. Mr. Libhart currently interacts with Winnick “three, four

times a week at a minimum” due to Winnick’s position as a judicial law clerk to the president judge. N.T. 16, 17. Mr. Libhart finds Winnick to be very collaborative on issues. N.T. 19, 20.

58. Mr. Libhart testified that Winnick has “been remorseful and took accountability always.” N.T. 22. According to Mr. Libhart, Winnick’s position has always been, “I messed this up []” and that he was not “pressed to do it and there was no one else but me.” *Id.* Mr. Libhart testified that if Winnick is reinstated, he believes Winnick will be an asset to the profession. N.T. 22. Mr. Libhart chose to testify on Winnick’s behalf, commenting that Winnick’s “character and service warrants me being here if I am able to do so.” N.T. 23-24.

59. The Honorable Edward M. Marsico, Jr. testified as a fact witness. N.T. 27. Prior to ascending the bench, Judge Marsico was employed with the Dauphin County District Attorney’s Office when Winnick started in the Public Defender’s Office and he has known Winnick since that time. N.T. 28. Judge Marsico testified that, from his perspective, Winnick has “an outstanding legal acumen.” N.T. 28-29. In Winnick’s current role as a law clerk, Judge Marsico discusses legal issues with him because “I just know how well he knows criminal law.” N.T. 32. Judge Marsico testified that Winnick was a “good sounding board” and he consulted Winnick “a couple times a month,” always

finding his legal analysis sound and on point. N.T. 32-33. Judge Marsico described Winnick as a “mentor” to other law clerks. N.T. 33.

60. Winnick spoke to Judge Marsico about the criminal charges and his suspension. N.T. 34. Judge Marsico shared that Winnick was “very embarrassed[,]” and “sincerely remorseful” and regretted his actions. N.T. 34. Judge Marsico believes Winnick would be an asset to the profession if reinstated. N.T. 35.

61. Kristen Weisenberger is a criminal defense attorney in Harrisburg and previously worked with Winnick in the Public Defender’s Office. N.T. 51. Ms. Weisenberger described Winnick as “a person who you could go to when you needed to. A person who would listen to you.” N.T. 52. Ms. Weisenberger stated that many people in the office considered Winnick a mentor. N.T. 52-53. Ms. Weisenberger described Winnick as “highly skilled.” N.T. 53.

62. Ms. Weisenberger has interacted with Winnick since his suspension. N.T. 61. Ms. Weisenberger indicated that, as part of his current job, Winnick handles appeals and PCRA’s and he is somebody that she goes to for help with those issues. *Id.* Ms. Weisenberger testified that Winnick discussed his misconduct with her and she shared that Winnick took complete responsibility for his actions and was concerned, not with himself, but with how his actions reflected on

the profession, particularly criminal defense lawyers. N.T. 57-58. Ms. Weisenberger “definitely think[s] [Winnick] has the moral qualifications to be an attorney.” N.T. 58. Ms. Weisenberger does not believe that Winnick would make the same mistake again. According to Ms. Weisenberger, “I think that was a mistake that was made and that he has learned from that mistake and I don’t foresee anything like that happening in the future.” N.T. 59.

63. Francis T. Chardo is the Dauphin County District Attorney and has been a prosecutor since 1994. N.T. 79. DA Chardo has known Winnick since Winnick began as an Assistant Public Defender. *Id.* DA Chardo testified that Winnick “has a superb knowledge of the law and exhibits that.” N.T. 80. He testified that Winnick was respected by those he practiced with as well as judges and “was recognized as a very, very, talented trial lawyer and as a very talented leader among lawyers.” *Id.* DA Chardo testified that Winnick accepted full responsibility for his criminal conduct. N.T. 86.

64. DA Chardo and Winnick have discussed the possibility of Winnick working at the District Attorney’s Office if he is reinstated and DA Chardo “thought it was a great idea....” N.T. 87. DA Chardo did not have any qualms about the fact that he would be hiring a felon in the District Attorney’s Office, explaining that he felt that the conviction

had not changed his assessment of Winnick's character and that Winnick's "full and complete" acceptance of responsibility, along with his legal talent overcame any objections. N.T. 88. Further, DA Chardo believes it would be good for the legal profession and the community for Winnick to be reinstated and he does not believe that Winnick will reoffend. N.T. 88.

65. Amy Rosenberry has been the Executive Director of the Dauphin County Victim Witness Assistance Program ("Victim Witness") since 2014. N.T. 63-64. Ms. Rosenberry has known Winnick since 2014 through her employment; he was the Chief Public Defender and they both served on the Criminal Justice Advisory Board. N.T. 66. Ms. Rosenberry is aware that Winnick was very remorseful for his criminal conduct and very humble. N.T. 69.

66. Upon learning that Winnick was going to be employed with Dauphin County after his suspension, Ms. Rosenberry approached Winnick in 2024 about joining the Victim Witness Board of Directors. N.T. 69-70. Ms. Rosenberry testified that she had "absolutely no issues" with Winnick's moral fitness to be a member of the Board. N.T. 71. The Victim Witness Board discussed Winnick's possible membership in light of his conviction and Winnick was elected to the board in June 2024. N.T. 73.

67. Ms. Rosenberry and Winnick discussed his efforts to

seek reinstatement. Ms. Rosenberry testified that Winnick “felt that he needed to earn it back. ... He wanted to reestablish himself I believe that there are many of us that felt that he deserved it long before he felt that way himself.” N.T. 74. Ms. Rosenberry believes Winnick would be an asset to the profession and has the moral qualifications to practice law. N.T. 75.

68. Melissa Nicholson is the co-founder and Executive Director of the Gamut Theatre Group in Harrisburg and has known Winnick since approximately 2010 through his involvement with the theater group, which included membership on the Board of Directors. N.T. 37-38. Ms. Nicholson testified that as part of Winnick’s resignation from the Gamut Board, he met privately with her and her husband, the other co-founder of the theatre, to advise them of his wrongdoing. N.T. 40-41. Ms. Nicholson shared that Winnick was “very sorry for what he had done. He was very - - first and foremost, he just didn’t want to affect Gamut in any way.... But he was also very forthcoming with the information. ... I did this thing, and I’m going to have to, you know, step down from my position and I would like to explain to you why I am doing that.” N.T. 41 - 42.

69. After Winnick’s conviction and suspension, Ms. Nicholson explained that Gamut Theatre asked Winnick to rejoin the Board of Directors “because he was an ideal Board member when he

had served before.” N.T. 44-45. Winnick came and talked to the entire Board at that time and was very forthcoming and remorseful. N.T. 45-46. Winnick then rejoined the Board. Ms. Nicholson believes that if Winnick is reinstated, he will be an asset to the profession and is someone she would recommend as a lawyer. N.T. 47. Ms. Nicholson has no concerns about Winnick’s moral fitness as he has “always been very honest and kind and hardworking and just always looking out for the best interests of the theatre and always looking out for the people involved too.” N.T. 46-47.

70. In addition to presenting character testimony, Winnick presented character letters. See P-1. The letters demonstrate, among other things, that Winnick has shown genuine remorse, and that if he is reinstated, he will be an asset to the profession. See e.g., Batz letter (discussing, among other things, Winnick’s genuine remorse); Kovatch letter (referencing that Winnick has “expressed remorse, humility and regret” for the actions that led to his suspension); Taylor letter (noting that Winnick has contributed “positively to the collaborative discussions and knowledge sharing that is imperative to growing and fostering not only our profession but the Dauphin County Court of Common Pleas as well”); Phillips letter (discussing Winnick’s current positive contributions to young attorneys and the courthouse and finding Winnick “to be humbled and remorseful in his interactions”); Canavan letter (discussing

Winnick’s role as a law clerk, his legal acumen and his interactions with those around him, and noting that Winnick “has demonstrated that he feels not just remorse but anguish over those choices he made”); Muller letter (noting that Winnick “has shown remorse for his actions” and that “he has been humbled by this experience and understands now more than ever that being a member of the bar is a privilege”); Perry letter (discussing Winnick’s legal acumen, noting that his work as a law clerk “is second to none[,]” and opining that there “is no question that he will never be in a situation like this again”); Robinette letter (noting, among other things, that Winnick would be an asset to the people of Dauphin County if reinstated and hired in the Dauphin County District Attorney’s Office); McNulty letter (noting that she is “impressed” with “his reflection on the actions that led to his suspension[]” and commenting that “[t]he time he has taken to make the decision to return to the practice of law shows that he has truly reflected on the importance of our profession”); Walk letter (noting, among other things, that Winnick, if reinstated, will be an asset to the legal profession, his community and his colleagues).

The Proceedings Below

71. On November 5, 2025, Winnick filed a post-hearing brief to the Committee in support of his reinstatement.

72. On November 13, 2025, ODC filed a letter with the Committee to advise that it did not oppose Winnick’s reinstatement.

73. By Report filed on December 31, 2025, the Committee concluded that Winnick met his reinstatement burden and recommended to the Board that Winnick's Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

74. The parties did not take exception to the Committee's Report and recommendation.

75. This matter was adjudicated by the Board at the meeting on January 22, 2026.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Winnick met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

2. Winnick met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive to 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 grant Winnick's Petition for Reinstatement. After conducting an independent review of the record, we conclude that Winnick met his reinstatement burden and recommend that he be reinstated to the bar of the Commonwealth.

Winnick seeks readmission to the practice of law following his suspension for a period of one year and one day on consent, ordered by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on February 24, 2021, retroactive to May 22, 2020. 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, Winnick 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). 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).

The underlying misconduct for which Winnick consented to a suspension of his law license for one year and one day is his criminal conviction of Restricted Activities—Conflict of Interest. At the time of his criminal conduct, Winnick was the Chief Public Defender in Dauphin County, a position he had held since 2011, following a long career in the Public Defender’s Office. In that capacity, Winnick asked his employees to work the election polls in 2017 for a favored candidate in exchange for double compensation. Winnick explained that he knew what he was doing was wrong but at that time did not stop to consider his actions, which he acknowledged was due in part to arrogance.

Upon learning he was the subject of a criminal investigation in August 2019, Winnick immediately accepted responsibility for his actions, as he recognized that he was to blame and wanted to spare the Public Defender’s Office and his staff of the negative consequences if he did not accept responsibility. He retained counsel and very shortly thereafter met with the Attorney General’s Office. At that meeting, Winnick provided documentation proving his guilty. Winnick waived his preliminary hearing and formal arraignment and entered a guilty plea in March 2020, after which he timely notified ODC of his criminal conviction and agreed to a temporary suspension of his law license. Winnick was sentenced for his crime in June 2020, paid restitution, completed community service and was later discharged from probation. Winnick later consented to the suspension of his law license for one year and one day, which was imposed by the Court on February 24, 2021, retroactive to the date of the temporary suspension.

It has been approximately six years since Winnick was suspended and nearly nine years since the original misconduct. The record evidence demonstrated that

since the time of his misconduct and during his suspension, Winnick has persevered to rehabilitate himself in all aspects of his life. Winnick accepted full responsibility for his misconduct, demonstrated a thorough understanding of his wrongdoing, and displayed sincere contrition. Winnick is clearly ashamed of his violation of the law and the public trust he held as Chief Public Defender and is humbled by the aftermath of his misconduct. He understands how detrimental his conduct was to the reputation of the Public Defender's Office.

Winnick spent extensive time during his suspension reflecting on his criminal conduct. Though Winnick was permitted under the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement to apply for reinstatement at an earlier time,¹ by his own account he was not emotionally ready to take on the legal problems of others and needed to understand the reasons for his serious error in judgment to ensure it did not occur again. Winnick's self-analysis led him to conclude that his decision to engage in criminal activity was done without any careful thought or consideration, and with a degree of arrogance. Winnick understands he now needs to consider his actions carefully and humbly. We find Winnick's testimony very compelling and forthright as to his past transgressions, his exploration of the behavior that led to his misconduct, and how to avoid errors of judgment in the future.

During his suspension, Winnick maintained a high level of legal competence

¹ Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 217(e)(3), the waiting period for eligibility to apply for reinstatement began when Winnick filed his verified Statement of Compliance on June 8, 2020. Under Board Rule § 89.272(c), Winnick was permitted to file a petition for reinstatement not more than nine months prior to the expiration of his term of suspension.

and learning in the law by working as a paralegal and a judicial law clerk. From the summer of 2020 through February 2021, Winnick worked as a paralegal for Bryan Walk, Esquire, a criminal defense lawyer. In that capacity, Winnick conducted legal research, drafted motions and answered phones. In March 2021, Winnick received an opportunity to work as a judicial law clerk to Dauphin County Judge Scott Evans (now President Judge). Winnick gladly accepted this position and has competently performed his job responsibilities consisting of writing opinions and orders, performing research, and providing general legal support to the judge. Winnick's prior experience in the law has enabled him to be a mentor to other judicial clerks. As well, judges on the Dauphin County bench rely on Winnick's analysis of the law. In addition to his law clerk work, which entails daily review of case law and legal analysis, Winnick keeps abreast of the law by reviewing legal newspapers and reporters. He also fulfilled his CLE requirements for reinstatement. If reinstated, Winnick intends to practice criminal law, possibly with the District Attorney's Office in Dauphin County.

The record established that prior to his suspension, Winnick had significant involvement in community service, including professional organizations, community theater, and youth sports. When his misconduct came to light, Winnick resigned from several of the boards and explained his misconduct to those involved. Winnick has begun to reestablish himself in community programs during his suspension. Winnick was gratified to be asked to rejoin the theater group board, which had been fully apprised of Winnick's criminal history. In 2024, Winnick was approached by Amy Rosenberry, the director of the Victim Witness program, about serving on the board. The Victim Witness

Board had been made aware of Winnick's criminal background and had no hesitation in approving his board membership. Winnick found the request very meaningful to him in light of his status as a convicted felon and he is currently an active participant on that board.

Five character witnesses credibly testified on Winnick's behalf and offered compelling evidence as to Winnick's rehabilitation, competency and moral fitness to resume the practice of law. These witnesses included the Dauphin County District Attorney, the Dauphin County Court Administrator, the director of the Victim Witness program, a criminal defense attorney in the community, and the director of the Gamut Theater. Each witness shared the view that Winnick is qualified to resume practice both as a highly skilled lawyer and as a morally sound person of good character. The witnesses wholeheartedly endorsed Winnick's return to the profession as an asset to the community. Judge Marsico offered fact testimony only as to Winnick's excellent work as a judicial law clerk and his high degree of legal competency. We also credit the abundance of character letters offered that confirmed Winnick's sincere expressions of remorse and regret for his misconduct, positive contributions to the community and strong legal abilities.

On this record, we conclude Winnick met the requirements of Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E., by presenting clear and convincing evidence of his current moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law. Further, the evidence established that Winnick is not predisposed to commit future ethical infractions and has demonstrated via his own testimony and the testimony of his witnesses, that his reinstatement will not harm the public or be detrimental to the integrity of the profession.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Petitioner, Bradley Adam Winnick, 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/ Ryan J. Cassidy
Ryan J. Cassidy, Member

Date: 04/27/2026