

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 3215 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
Petitioner	:	No. 75 DB 2025
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Registration No. 318682
	:	
	:	(Somerset County)
	:	
AMY LEE THOMAS,	:	
	:	
Respondent	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 26th day of October, 2026, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendations of the Disciplinary Board, Amy Lee Thomas is suspended from the Bar of this Commonwealth for a period of two years. Respondent shall comply with the provisions of Pa.R.D.E. 217 and pay costs to the Disciplinary Board. See Pa.R.D.E. 208(g).

A True Copy Nicole Traini
As Of 10/26/2026

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, Petitioner	: : : : : : :	No. 75 DB 2025
v.	:	Attorney Registration No. 318682
AMY LEE THOMAS, Respondent	: : : : : : :	(Somerset 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 208(d)(2)(iii) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (“Board”) herewith submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above-captioned Petition for Discipline.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following factual findings:

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

2. Respondent, Amy Lee Thomas, was born in 1985 and was admitted to the practice of law by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 2014. Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

The Underlying Misconduct

3. On April 9, 2022, Trooper Meghan L. Flati of the Pennsylvania State Police received information that a 911 call had been placed by Respondent's sister, Rachel Hewitt, about a domestic disturbance at or near the residence belonging to Respondent and Jeffrey Lynn Thomas, II (Jeffrey Thomas), who were husband and wife, located in Windber Borough, Somerset County. ODC 1 Bates 2, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

4. During Trooper Flati's investigation of the matter, Ms. Hewitt reported to Trooper Flati that she observed Jeffrey Thomas assaulting Respondent on May 15, 2021, during a FaceTime call while Respondent and Jeffrey Thomas were traveling in a moving vehicle. ODC 1 Bates 2, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

5. Ms. Hewitt received a FaceTime call from Respondent at approximately 1:00 a.m. on May 15, 2021. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

6. Ms. Hewitt observed that the interior light of the vehicle was on, which enabled her to view Jeffrey Thomas punching Respondent with a closed fist, at least 10 times, about the head and face area. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

7. Ms. Hewitt yelled at Jeffrey Thomas via the FaceTime connection to stop hitting Respondent. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

8. Ms. Hewitt was aware that Respondent was sharing her and Jeffrey Thomas's location with her via the iPhone location service and Ms. Hewitt proceeded to check her whereabouts. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

9. Ms. Hewitt thereby determined that, while the assault was occurring, the Thomases' vehicle was in motion, traveling from the City of Johnstown in Cambria County toward Windber Borough in Somerset County. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

10. Ms. Hewitt was aware, from a prior conversation she had with Respondent, that Respondent had planned on being in Johnstown on the date of the incident. ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40.

11. Ms. Hewitt, who was an Emergency Medical Technician, then left her residence located in Lower Burrell, Westmoreland County, to assist Respondent. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 40-41.

12. After Respondent notified Ms. Hewitt of her whereabouts via text message, Ms. Hewitt arrived at the residence of Jeffrey Thomas's parents in Windber. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 31, ODC 3 Bates 41.

13. Ms. Hewitt found Respondent sitting on the bathroom floor of the residence, visibly upset and crying. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

14. Ms. Hewitt observed that Respondent had visible marks and bruising to her head, neck, back, arms, and legs. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

15. Ms. Hewitt took multiple photos of Respondent's injuries, which showed abrasions to her scalp, swelling and bruising about her face and right cheekbone, abrasions on the tops of her hands, bruising on the front and back of her arms, and abrasions/lacerations behind her right ear. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

16. Ms. Hewitt also photographed Respondent's clothing because the back of her pants had dirt on them and her blouse had been torn. ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

17. Shortly thereafter, Respondent sent additional photos to Ms. Hewitt showing what Respondent told her was considerable bruising and abrasions around her right eye and cheekbone area resulting from Jeffrey Thomas's actions. ODC 1 Bates 4-5, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

18. Ms. Hewitt implored Respondent to allow her to take Respondent to the hospital for medical attention. ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

19. Respondent refused to go to the hospital. ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 2 Bates 32, ODC 3 Bates 41.

20. On April 25, 2022, Trooper Flati presented to Magisterial District Judge Kevin Price, District Court 47-1-03, Cambria County, a criminal complaint and affidavit of probable cause charging Jeffrey Thomas with Simple Assault, Recklessly Endangering Another Person, and Harassment for the assault upon Respondent that occurred on May 15, 2021. ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 3 Bates 36-41.

21. Also on April 25, 2022, Jeffrey Thomas was taken into custody and arraigned on those charges. ODC 1 Bates 5.

22. After Respondent learned that her husband had been taken into custody, she sent Ms. Hewitt numerous text messages from her mobile phone, including the following messages:

(a) "You are a fucking piece of shit and I hope you die."

(b) "I want every single thing that I gave you back. Every piece of clothing, every toy. Every penny of money that I gave you and I have a

record of all of it. You have 7 days to get it all back here or I am filing a complaint with the magistrate.”

(c) “I will also be billing you for all of the legal work I’ve done for you over the last two years. It will be due within 30 days and if you don’t pay the bill, that will also go to the magistrate.”

(d) “If you testify to the lies that you told the police, I will file a private criminal complaint against you for perjury and I will be filing a defamation case against you for this”

(e) “You aren’t married yet, so the judgement will attach to your house and you will lose it. If you are going to take everything from me, I will do the same to you.”

(f) “You will be getting a bill for the divorce, representing you for the sale of the house, advising [Ms. Hewitt’s fiancé] on custody issues, dealing with your landlord issues, and dealing with the UC shit.”

(g) “With everything you’ve done, the only thing you can do to avoid all this is to tell the police you lied or were mistaken and make a public statement that you were pressured into it.”

(h) “I don’t care whether you hate Jeff – that’s not an excuse for you to do this to me and the kids. They loved you. I’m going to tell them the truth – Aunt Rachel is a bad person because she told lies and got Daddy in trouble and tried to take you guys away from Mommy. They will hate you for the rest of their lives and they will never see [Ms. Hewitt’s infant daughter].”

ODC 1 Bates 5-7, ODC 2 Bates 32.

23. Also on April 25, 2022, Respondent drove to Ms. Hewitt's residence to confront her about what Ms. Hewitt had told Trooper Flati concerning the events of May 15, 2021. ODC 1 Bates 7, ODC 2 Bates 32.

24. Ms. Hewitt's fiancé and sister were present when Respondent arrived at Ms. Hewitt's residence. ODC 1 Bates 7, ODC 2 Bates 32.

25. After Respondent left Ms. Hewitt's residence, Trooper Flati and North Huntingdon Police appeared at that location and interviewed Ms. Hewitt's fiancé and sister.

(a) Ms. Hewitt's sister stated she was feeding Ms. Hewitt's baby in the living room when Respondent entered through the front door without knocking and began yelling, inquiring about Ms. Hewitt's whereabouts and accusing Ms. Hewitt and her sister of hating Respondent and ruining her life.

(b) Ms. Hewitt's sister stated that she found Respondent's behavior to be hostile and aggressive because Respondent was screaming that she would not leave until she had spoken to Ms. Hewitt.

(c) Ms. Hewitt's sister stated that because she feared Respondent in that moment, she told Respondent that Ms. Hewitt was at work, then took the baby into another room and locked the door. She further stated that Respondent replied, "I'll just go to the station and wait for her."

(d) After Respondent left Ms. Hewitt's residence it was determined that Respondent's vehicle was in the New Kensington area, near Ms. Hewitt's place of employment.

ODC 1 Bates 7-8, ODC 2 Bates 33.

26. Ms. Hewitt applied for and was granted an Emergency Protection from Abuse Order against Respondent. ODC 1 Bates 8, ODC 2 Bates 33.

27. During her investigation of the May 15, 2021 incident, Trooper Flati interviewed an individual who had been out with Respondent on May 15, 2021, and the individual provided Trooper Flati with text messages Respondent had sent from her mobile phone number to that individual. ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 33-34.

28. The individual was identified by Trooper Flati as "Individual #1" in the text message exchange that occurred, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) Respondent: "I'm getting a divorce."

(b) Individual #1: "Why? What happened[?]"

(c) Respondent replied by sending a picture of her face to Individual #1 that shows bruising and abrasions around her right eye and cheekbone area.

(d) Respondent: "Went to meet up with him. He was at the bar with [woman's name]."

(e) Individual #1: "Oh my fucking God. Are you ok? Did he do that to you?"

(f) Respondent: "Yes. Yes I'm okay now. Yes, he did it."

(g) Individual #1: "Should've called the cops. Honestly Amy. This breaks my heart."

(h) Respondent: "I tried. He wrestled my phone out of my hands."

(i) Individual #1: "Where are you?"

(j) Respondent: "At his parents'."

(k) Individual #1: "What did they say?"

(l) Respondent: "His Dad came to get me. They are appalled. I told him to leave the bar. We got in his truck and he started beating the shit out of me. My entire face is swollen, but I'm okay. My sister came in."

(m) Individual #1: "What did she say?"

(n) Respondent: "She's pissed. Wanted to go to the police. He's trying to say that I attacked him. That's not true. The only thing I did was take his hat off on the bar and tell him that we were leaving. Then I got in the truck. And he started hitting me in the face over and over. I didn't do anything. I didn't even try to fight back. Look at my hair. It is soo matted I can barely do anything with it."

(o) At or about the time of Respondent's conversation with Individual #1, she sent two pictures of her matted hair to Individual #1.

(p) Respondent: "Because he was pulling it."

ODC 1 Bates 11-13, ODC 2 Bates 33-34.

29. On April 29, 2022, in an unrelated criminal case filed against Jeffrey Thomas in Somerset County, Respondent testified at a hearing held on the Commonwealth's motion to revoke Jeffrey Thomas's bond.

(a) Respondent testified under oath and she swore to tell the truth.

(b) Respondent testified that she had not contacted anyone in law enforcement about an assault on May 15, 2021.

ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 31-35, ODC 3 Bates 40-41, ODC 4 Bates 69-78.

30. On May 20, 2022, a preliminary hearing was held for Jeffrey Thomas at District Court 47-1-01, before Magisterial District Judge Kevin Price, regarding the

criminal complaint filed against Jeffrey Thomas arising from the incident involving Respondent on May 15, 2021. ODC 1 Bates 8-9, ODC 2 Bates 33.

31. Respondent was called as the sole witness on behalf of Jeffrey Thomas. ODC 1 Bates 9, ODC 2 Bates 33.

32. Magisterial District Judge Price administered the oath to Respondent and she swore to give truthful testimony. ODC 1 Bates 9, ODC 2 Bates 33.

33. Respondent testified, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) Respondent went to the Haven Bar in Johnstown in the early morning of May 15, 2021.

(b) Respondent knew Jeffrey Thomas was there because of the location sharing feature on each of their mobile phones.

(c) Respondent became upset when she arrived at the Haven because Jeffrey Thomas was sitting next to a woman with whom Respondent suspected he had previously had an affair, and it had been Respondent's belief that the affair was over.

(d) Respondent and Jeffrey Thomas left the bar together and became involved in an argument as they walked to Jeffrey Thomas's truck.

(e) They both got into Jeffrey Thomas's truck and Respondent struck him once, but he never struck her back.

(f) Respondent made Jeffrey Thomas drive her to her father-in-law's residence so that she could drive herself home.

(g) After Jeffrey Thomas dropped off Respondent, she was driving while speaking on the phone with Ms. Hewitt to tell her Jeffrey Thomas had been at the Haven with the woman in question.

(h) While driving onto the bypass on State Route 56, Respondent's vehicle left the roadway, causing her vehicle to spin around and hit the median and that impact caused injuries to the right side of Respondent's body and a flat tire on the vehicle.

(i) Respondent then called her father-in-law, who owns a tow truck, and asked him to tow her vehicle.

ODC 1 Bates 9-10, ODC 2 Bates 33, ODC 3 Bates 40-41, ODC 11 Bates 165-166.

34. Respondent's testimony at Jeffrey Thomas's bond revocation hearing on April 29, 2022, consisted of false statements of material fact. ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 31-35, ODC 4 Bates 69-78.

35. Respondent's testimony at Jeffrey Thomas's preliminary hearing on May 20, 2022, consisted of false statements of material fact. ODC 1 Bates 10, ODC 2 Bates 31-35, ODC 3 Bates 40-41, ODC 11 Bates 165-166.

36. On July 8, 2022, Trooper Flati presented to the Honorable Norman Krumenacker, III, President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Cambria County, an affidavit of probable cause in support of an application for disclosure of call detail records for Respondent's mobile phone number for the period 8:00 a.m. EST on May 14, 2021, through 8:00 a.m. EST on May 15, 2021. ODC 1 Bates 13-14, ODC 2 Bates 34.

37. Trooper Flati requested the phone records to corroborate the testimony of Ms. Hewitt about Respondent's telephone contact with her during Jeffrey Thomas's assault of Respondent and to discover if Respondent had contacted her father-in-law following the alleged crash about which Respondent had testified on May 20, 2022. ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

38. President Judge Krumenacker issued an Order authorizing the disclosure of the telephone records. ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

39. On July 11, 2022, Trooper Flati received the call detail records from Verizon Wireless for the specified period. ODC 1 Bates 14.

40. The call detail records do not show that Respondent had called her father-in-law as she had testified during Jeffrey Thomas's preliminary hearing. ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 34.

41. The call detail records show that Respondent made a call to Ms. Hewitt on May 15, 2021, as Respondent had testified at Jeffrey Thomas's May 20, 2022, preliminary hearing. ODC 1 Bates 9-10, ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 31-32.

42. The call detail records further show that, on May 15, 2021, at 1:26 a.m., Respondent received an incoming call from a phone number associated with the Cambria County 911 dispatcher. ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

43. Trooper Flati obtained recordings of the calls Respondent had made to Cambria County 911 on May 15, 2021. The recordings evidence the following:

(a) On May 15, 2021, at 1:13 a.m., Respondent called 911 and screamed "Please help me!" multiple times.

(b) Respondent can also be heard saying, "He's holding my mouth shut!"

(c) Throughout the duration of the call, the 911 dispatcher requested an address to which help could be dispatched.

(d) Respondent yelled "Southmont Boulevard," before the call was disconnected.

(e) On May 15, 2021, at 1:14 a.m., after officers were dispatched to the area of Southmont Boulevard, a 911 dispatcher attempted a callback to Respondent's

phone number and received a voice mail recording for “Amy Thomas,” but the 911 dispatcher was unable to leave a message because the voice mailbox was full.

(f) On May 15, 2021, at 1:28 a.m., the 911 dispatcher called Respondent’s phone number and Respondent answered the call.

(g) The dispatcher asked if Respondent was the person who had dialed 911.

(h) Respondent replied, “It was.”

(i) The dispatcher advised Respondent that there were officers in the area of Southmont Boulevard and asked for Respondent’s location.

(j) Respondent stated that she was no longer at that location and that both she and [Jeffrey Thomas] were in the vehicle.

(k) The dispatcher requested Respondent’s location.

(l) Respondent replied, “We’re in Windber.”

(m) The dispatcher asked Respondent what was going on.

(n) Respondent replied, “[Jeffrey Thomas] was hitting me in the face and pulling my hair.”

(o) The dispatcher asked, “Where is he at right now?”

(p) Respondent replied that Jeffrey Thomas was driving the vehicle. She then gave a description of the vehicle as a Chevrolet Silverado, dark blue, 4-door.

(q) The dispatcher asked Respondent, “What is his name?” and a male voice was heard whispering “Stop.” The male voice also whispered, “You’re going to ruin our lives.”

(r) The dispatcher stated he could not understand what Respondent was saying.

(s) The call was then disconnected and there was no further communication between Respondent and the 911 dispatcher.

ODC 1 Bates 15-17, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

44. Pennsylvania vehicle registration ZPC - 4011 identified the registered vehicle as a dark blue 2019 Chevrolet Silverado registered to Jeffrey Lynn Thomas, II, and Respondent, of Windber, Pennsylvania. ODC 1 Bates 17, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

45. On multiple occasions during Trooper Flati's investigation, she observed Jeffrey Thomas operating the registered vehicle in question. ODC 1 Bates 17, ODC 2 Bates 34-35.

46. On October 7, 2022, Respondent was charged in the Cambria County Court of Common Pleas, at docket number CP-11-CR-0000933-2022, with one count each (except as noted) of the following offenses:

(a) Intimidation of a Witness/Victim False/Misleading Testimony, 18 § 4952 §§ (A)(2), a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree;

(b) Hindering Apprehension/Prosecution - Concealing/Destroying Evidence, 18 § 5105 §§ (A)(3), a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree;

(c) Two counts of Obstructing the Administration of Law/Other Government Function, 18 § 5101, a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree;

(d) Perjury, 18 § 4902 §§ (A), a felony of the 3rd degree;

(e) False Swearing – Official Proceeding 18 § 4903 §§ (A)(1), a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree; and

(f) Harassment – Communicating Repeatedly in Another Manner, 18 § 2709 §§ (A)(7), a misdemeanor of the 3rd degree.

ODC 1 Bates 17-18, ODC 2 Bates 26-35, ODC 5 Bates 115-145, ODC 6 Bates 147-148.

47. On May 21, 2024, in the Cambria County Court of Common Pleas, Jeffrey Thomas:

(a) entered his plea of *nolo contendere* to the charge of Simple Assault, a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree, arising out of his involvement in the May 15, 2021, altercation with Respondent; and

(b) was sentenced to a period of probation of 24 months, to run concurrently with the sentence imposed in an unrelated criminal matter docketed in the Court of Common Pleas of Somerset County.

ODC 1 Bates 18-19, ODC 7 Bates 149, ODC 8 Bates 150-157, ODC 9 Bates 138.

48. On June 13, 2024, Respondent was accepted into the Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition (ARD) program on the lone charge of Intimidation of a Witness/Victim to Give False/Misleading Testimony, 18 §§ 4952(A)(2), a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree. ODC 1 Bates 19, ODC 5 Bates 115-145, ODC 10 Bates 160-163, ODC 11 Bates 165-166.

49. By Order of Court dated September 26, 2024, Respondent completed her ARD and the remaining charges against her were *nolle prossed*. ODC 1 Bates 19, ODC 5 Bates 115-145.

The Disciplinary Proceedings at No. 75 DB 2025

50. In connection with its investigation of this matter, on June 10, 2024, ODC sent to Respondent a DB-7 Request for Respondent's Statement of Position. ODC 1 Bates 19, ODC 12 Bates 167-179.

51. Despite having received reminders from ODC to submit her Statement of Position and having been granted extensions of time within which to comply with those requests, Respondent failed to provide her statement of position to ODC. ODC 1 Bates

19-20, ODC 13 Bates 180-182, ODC 14 Bates 183, ODC 15 Bates 184, ODC 16 Bates 185.

52. On February 25, 2025, ODC received the unclaimed June 10, 2024, DB-7 Request for Respondent's Statement of Position, labeled "02/18/25 RETURN TO SENDER UNCLAIMED UNABLE TO FORWARD."

53. ODC filed a Petition for Discipline against Respondent on July 24, 2025.

54. Respondent was personally served with the Petition for Discipline on July 29, 2025. She failed to file an Answer to the Petition. N.T. 6-8; ODC 1 Bates 24, ODC 17 Bates 187.

55. Respondent received the Disciplinary Board's Notice dated September 8, 2025, scheduling both the prehearing conference and the disciplinary hearing in this matter. N.T. 7-8; ODC 17 Bates 187.

56. In the days leading up to, and on the date of, the prehearing conference scheduled for Monday, October 6, 2025, Respondent sent emails in response to the Webex invitation for her to remotely attend the conference. In her email dated Friday, October 3, 2025, Respondent stated, in pertinent part, "This date and time do not work for me." The Hearing Committee Chair replied to Respondent's email with his denial of her request to continue the prehearing conference to another date. In her email dated October 6, 2025, Respondent stated she would be unable to attend the prehearing conference. N.T. 7; ODC-17 Bates 187.

57. Respondent failed to attend the prehearing conference held on October 6, 2025. N.T. 7; ODC 17 Bates 187.

58. Respondent received, via email, a copy of the Hearing Committee's Prehearing Order dated October 6, 2025, that was issued pursuant to the prehearing conference held on that date. N.T. 8.

59. The Hearing Committee held a disciplinary hearing on January 7, 2026.

60. Respondent failed to attend the disciplinary hearing. N.T. 1-19.

61. ODC presented exhibits ODC 1 through ODC 17, which were admitted into evidence. ODC offered no witnesses in its case-in-chief or in the dispositional phase of the proceeding.

62. ODC filed a post-hearing brief to the Hearing Committee on February 2, 2026, and requested that the Committee recommend to the Board that Respondent be suspended for two years.

63. Respondent did not file a post-hearing brief to the Hearing Committee.

64. The Hearing Committee filed a Report on April 14, 2026, wherein it concluded that ODC met its burden by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent violated the rules charged in the Petition for Discipline, and recommended that Respondent be suspended for two years.

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

66. The Board adjudicated this matter on July 23, 2026.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Respondent failed to answer the Petition for Discipline. The factual allegations set forth in the Petition are deemed admitted under Pa.R.D.E. 208(b)(3).

2. By her conduct as set forth above, Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct ("RPC") and Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement ("Pa.R.D.E."):

- a. RPC 8.4(b) provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects.
- b. RPC 8.4(c) provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.
- c. RPC 8.4(d) provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.
- d. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7) provides that the following shall also be grounds for discipline: Failure by a respondent-attorney without good cause to respond to Disciplinary Counsel's request or supplemental request under Disciplinary Board Rule § 87.7(b) for a statement of the respondent-attorney's position.

IV. DISCUSSION

This matter is before the Board on review of the Committee's Report and unanimous recommendation to suspend Respondent for a period of two years for violations of Rules of Professional Conduct and Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement relating to her conduct involving threatening and intimidation of a witness, making false statements of material fact under oath, and failing to respond to ODC's inquiries.

In attorney discipline matters, ODC bears the burden of proving professional misconduct by clear and convincing evidence. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anonymous Attorney*, 331 A.3d 523 (Pa. 2025). Upon our independent review of this matter pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 208(d)(2), we conclude that ODC met its burden and established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's conduct violated the charged rules. For the reasons that follow, we recommend that Respondent be suspended for two years.

The record evidence demonstrates that in the early morning hours of May 15, 2021, while traveling in a vehicle together, Jeffrey Thomas assaulted Respondent, who was his wife. Respondent FaceTimed her sister, Rachel Hewitt, during the assault. Ms. Hewitt observed Jeffrey Thomas punching Respondent about the head and face. Respondent called Cambia County 911 during the assault, asked for help, and said Jeffrey Thomas was hitting her and pulling her hair. Respondent later texted another individual who had been out with Respondent the night before the assault and sent pictures of her face with bruising and abrasions and said Jeffrey Thomas had hit her. After receiving the FaceTime call and observing Jeffrey Thomas's assault on Respondent, Ms. Hewitt drove to meet Respondent. Ms. Hewitt observed visible marks and bruising on her sister, which Ms. Hewitt photographed. Ms. Hewitt encouraged Respondent to go to the hospital, but Respondent refused.

At some later point, Ms. Hewitt contacted the police and made a report about the assault that occurred on May 15, 2021. On or about April 25, 2022, Respondent became aware that Jeffrey Thomas had been taken into custody relating to the assault. After learning this information, Respondent sent harassing and threatening text messages to Ms. Hewitt. These messages threatened Ms. Hewitt with various dire consequences,

including Respondent filing a private criminal complaint and a defamation case against Ms. Hewitt if she did not “tell the police [Ms. Hewitt] lied or [was] mistaken” about the physical harm that Jeffrey Thomas had caused to Respondent on May 15, 2021, and “make a public statement that [Ms. Hewitt] [was] pressured into it.” In addition to the text messages, Respondent took steps to confront Ms. Hewitt in person by appearing at Ms. Hewitt’s residence and at her place of employment, causing Ms. Hewitt to obtain an Emergency Protection From Abuse order against Respondent.

Not only did Respondent threaten a witness to the May 15, 2021 assault in an attempt to make the witness alter her report to law enforcement, Respondent falsely testified under oath on two occasions regarding the events of May 15, 2021. On April 29, 2022, Respondent testified at a hearing held on the Commonwealth’s motion to revoke Jeffrey Thomas’s bond in a separate criminal case in Somerset County. During that hearing, Respondent testified that she had not contacted anyone in law enforcement about an assault on May 15, 2021. This was false, as she had contacted Cambria County 911 during the assault.

A few weeks later, on May 20, 2022, Respondent testified as the sole witness on behalf of Jeffrey Thomas at his preliminary hearing on the criminal complaint filed against him arising out of the May 15, 2021 events. In pertinent part, Respondent testified that she and Jeffrey Thomas had an argument and she struck him while in his truck but he never struck her back. Respondent further testified that after Jeffrey Thomas dropped her off so she could retrieve her car, she was driving while speaking on the phone with Ms. Hewitt and her vehicle left the roadway, causing it to spin and hit the median, which caused her personal injuries. Respondent then called her father-in-law to bring his tow truck. Respondent’s testimony consisted of false statements of material fact

based on evidence that demonstrated Jeffrey Thomas struck Respondent and caused her injuries and that she never called her father-in-law.

Respondent's threatening and harassing actions toward Ms. Hewitt and false testimony under oath did not have the intended result of aiding her husband to avoid the consequences of his assault.¹ Instead, Respondent faced her own criminal prosecution. Following investigation by Trooper Flati during which she sought and obtained Respondent's phone records in order to corroborate Ms. Hewitt's testimony and to ascertain if Respondent had contacted her father-in-law as she had testified, charges were filed against Respondent in October 2022 for the offenses of Intimidation of a Witness/Victim False/Misleading Testimony, Hindering Apprehension/Prosecution-Concealing/Destroying Evidence, Obstructing the Administration of Law/Other Government Function, Perjury, False Swearing – Official Proceeding, and Harassment – Communicating Repeatedly in Another Manner. In June 2024, Respondent was accepted into the Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition ("ARD") program on the charge of Intimidation of a Witness, a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree. She completed her ARD and the remaining charges were *nolle prossed*.

ODC investigated Respondent's conduct and requested a statement of her position in the matter; Respondent failed to respond, despite having received reminders and having been granted extensions.

The record evidence clearly and convincingly establishes Respondent's violations of the rules charged in the Petition for Discipline. Respondent's actions in threatening and intimidating Ms. Hewitt to recant her statements to law enforcement about

¹ Jeffrey Thomas entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to the charge of Simple Assault, a misdemeanor of the 2nd degree and was sentenced to a period of probation for 24 months, to run concurrent with the sentence in the unrelated Somerset County matter.

Jeffrey Thomas's assault and making materially false statements under oath at the preliminary hearing and the bond hearing were criminal acts that reflected adversely on her honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects, in violation of RPC 8.4(b). Her conduct in intimidating Ms. Hewitt to recant or alter her otherwise truthful statements to law enforcement involved deceit, dishonesty, and misrepresentation, in violation of RPC 8.4(c), as Respondent sought to intimidate her sister with the knowledge that if Ms. Hewitt changed her statements to law enforcement, Ms. Hewitt would be making false statements of material fact. And very clearly, Respondent's false testimony under oath at the preliminary hearing concerning Jeffrey Thomas's conduct that caused her physical harm and her false statement during the hearing on Jeffrey Thomas's bond revocation, were acts of dishonesty that violated RPC 8.4(c). These same acts of intimidation and false statements under oath clearly prejudiced the administration of justice, in violation of 8.4(d). Finally, it is clear that Respondent's failure to respond to ODC's DB-7 request for a statement of position violated Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7).

Having concluded that Respondent engaged in serious professional misconduct, this matter is ripe for the determination of discipline. In assessing the appropriate quantum of discipline, the Board must weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Brian J. Preski*, 134 A.3d 1027, 1031 (Pa. 2016).

Considering this record, we find weighty aggravation. Respondent exhibited a notable lack of participation in these disciplinary proceedings. Respondent initially failed to respond to ODC's requests for her position at the early stages of the proceedings, despite receiving extensions of time to do so. Respondent was personally served with the Petition for Discipline and on notice of the serious charges of misconduct against her; she

failed to answer these charges. Continuing this pattern of nonresponsive behavior, despite receiving notice of the dates and times of scheduled hearings, Respondent failed to appear. The record demonstrates that Respondent received notice dated September 8, 2025, that the prehearing conference was scheduled for October 6, 2025, and the disciplinary hearing was scheduled for January 7, 2026. On October 3, 2025, one business day prior to the scheduled conference, Respondent requested a continuance. The Committee Chair denied her request. Despite her knowledge that the conference would go forward, Respondent failed to appear on October 6, 2025. She later failed to appear at her January 7, 2026 disciplinary hearing; the Committee conducted the hearing in her absence. Respondent did not file a brief in this matter, either to the Committee or this Board.

It is well-established that failure to participate in disciplinary proceedings constitutes an aggravating factor. *See Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Richard Joseph Silverberg*, No. 172 DB 2023 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/11/2025, p. 45) (S. Ct. Order 5/16/2025) (the Board concluded that “Silverberg’s nonappearance at his own disciplinary hearing signifies the ultimate act of disinterest in his professional license and weighs heavily in aggravation”). We observe that Respondent’s nonappearance at the disciplinary hearing capped off a history of ignoring ODC’s DB-7 inquiry, Petition for Discipline, and Board notices. Her persistent and overwhelming failure to engage with the disciplinary system denotes a severe lack of professionalism and respect.

In counterpoint to the aggravation, we assign weight in mitigation to Respondent’s unblemished record of discipline since her admission to the bar in 2014. It is well-settled that a lack of prior discipline is a mitigating factor when assessing the final disciplinary sanction. *See Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Philip A. Valentino*, 730 A.2d

479, 483 (Pa. 1999). On this record, we find no other mitigation. While the record reflects that the underlying criminal charges filed against Respondent included evidence that the crimes for which her husband was accused of and eventually convicted involved a domestic violence situation where Respondent was a victim, Respondent refused to participate in the disciplinary process and provided no testimony or other evidence to explain the circumstances of her misconduct.

Discipline in Pennsylvania is imposed to protect the public, preserve the integrity of the courts, and deter unethical conduct. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Akim Czmus*, 889 A.2d 1197, 1203 (Pa. 2005). In reviewing the nature of Respondent's misconduct and the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, we agree with the Committee that a two year suspension is appropriate. This matter involves serious acts of misconduct that amply demonstrate Respondent's manifest unfitness to practice law. "Truth is the cornerstone of the judicial system and a license to practice law requires allegiance and fidelity to truth." *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Holston*, 619 A.2d 1054, 1057 (Pa. 1993). The record reflects that Respondent's conduct ran directly opposite of these requirements. She flagrantly disregarded her core professional duties of truth and honesty by intimidating a witness to recant otherwise truthful statements and by lying under oath in two matters, which lies were intended to frustrate the truth-determining process. While we observe that Respondent's misconduct occurred in her personal life and did not involve the practice of law, her acts exhibited a wholesale disrespect for the integrity of legal and judicial processes that calls for a stringent sanction.

We turn to the guiding precedent. "As is often the case with attorney disciplinary matters, there is no case precedent that is precisely on all fours..." *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anthony C. Cappuccio*, 48 A.3d 1231, 1240 (Pa. 2012). While our

survey of precedent did not reveal a matter that is strictly analogous on all points to the instant matter, the precedent establishes that Respondent's base acts of misconduct constituting criminal acts that reflect adversely on her fitness to practice law, dishonest behavior, and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice warrant suspension for a substantial period of time.

A range of discipline has been imposed on attorneys who engage in dishonest conduct, including false statements of material fact during a judicial proceeding and false testimony under oath, which prejudices the administration of justice. See *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Holston*, 619 A.2d 1054 (Pa. 1993) (the Court disbarred Holston for making a false statement to a judge in a judicial proceeding and forging a judge's signature on a divorce decree); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Daniel E. Houlihan*, Nos. 208 DB 2003 & 110 DB 2004 (the Court suspended Houlihan for four years for his misconduct in four separate client matters, one of which involved intentional misrepresentations to the Court of Common Pleas in an adoption proceeding); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Craig B. Sokolow*, No. 83 DB 2018 (D. Bd. Rpt. 9/4/2019) (S. Ct. Order 12/11/2019) (the Court suspended Sokolow for two years for his false statements to a court and to disciplinary authorities); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Itzhak Kornfeld*, No. 177 DB 2007 (S. Ct. Order 6/24/2009) (the Court granted consent discipline and suspended Kornfeld for two years for his efforts to conceal his failure to file a timely appeal on his client's behalf and his false testimony before an administrative hearing officer concerning the filing of the appeal); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Cary Bartlow Hall*, No. 80 DB 2006 (S. Ct. Order 12/14/2006) (the Court granted consent discipline and imposed an 18 month period of suspension on Hall for his false testimony under oath before an unemployment compensation referee where he falsely testified that he filed an

appeal of the referee's decision by the last date to appeal where the evidence demonstrated he filed the appeal one day after the time to appeal had expired); *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Daniel Michael Dixon*, No. 174 DB 2020 (D. Bd. Rpt. 12/8/2021) (S. Ct. Order 3/4/2022) (the Court suspended Dixon for one year and one day for his conduct that involved, *inter alia*, filing two false affidavits with the Board of Finance and Revenue to conceal his neglect of his client's matter).

On this record, we conclude that a two year suspension is appropriate to address Respondent's intentional and extensive violation of her ethical duties and to advance the important goals of our disciplinary system.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Respondent, Amy Lee Thomas, be Suspended for two years from the practice of law in this Commonwealth.

It is further recommended that the expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this matter are to be paid by the Respondent.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: /s/ Robert J. Mongeluzzi
Robert J. Mongeluzzi, Member

Date: 08/25/2026

Members Bloom, Cassidy and Wilson recused.