

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 92 DB 2025
Petitioner	:	
	:	File Nos. C1-23-544
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Registration No. 210082
SHAKA MZEE JOHNSON	:	
Respondent	:	(Philadelphia)

ORDER

AND NOW, this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August 2025, in accordance with Rule 208(a)(5), Pa.R.D.E., the determination by a Review Panel of the Disciplinary Board of the above captioned matter is accepted; and it is

ORDERED that SHAKA MZEE JOHNSON of Philadelphia be subjected to a **PUBLIC REPRIMAND** by the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as provided in Rule 204(b) and Rule 205(c)(8) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement.

Costs shall be paid by the Respondent.

BY THE BOARD:



---

Board Chair

TRUE COPY FROM RECORD

Attest:



---

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

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 92 DB 2025
Petitioner	:	
	:	File No. C1-23-544
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Registration No. 210082
SHAKA MZEE JOHNSON,	:	
Respondent	:	(Philadelphia)

**PUBLIC REPRIMAND**

Shaka Mzee Johnson, you appear before the Disciplinary Board for the imposition of a Public Reprimand ordered by the Board on August 1, 2025. By letter of that same date, the Board notified you of the disposition of this matter and further notified you of your opportunity to demand as of right the institution of formal charges within twenty days of the date of notification. You did not demand the institution of formal charges; therefore, you accept this public reprimand.

It is an unpleasant task to publicly reprimand one who has been granted the privilege of membership in the bar of the Commonwealth. Yet as repugnant as this task may be, it has been found necessary that you receive this public discipline.

Attorney Johnson, the record sets forth your misconduct in one client matter. In December 2021, your law firm, the Law Offices of Shaka Johnson, LLC, was retained by Cesar Tavaréz to appeal his criminal conviction of attempted homicide and related charges in the Berks County Court of Common Pleas. On March 16, 2022, you filed a Notice of Appeal to the Superior Court. By Order of March 21, 2022, Berks County Common Pleas Judge Thomas Parisi directed that you file a concise statement of matters complained of on appeal; you failed to comply with the order.

The managing attorney for your law office contacted Mr. Tavaréz on April 14, 2022, and stated that she would be working with you to ensure Mr. Tavaréz's appeal issues were handled appropriately. The managing attorney explained she would assemble a file, review discovery, determine what issues should be listed in the 1925(b), and keep Mr. Tavaréz advised on the progress. However, you and the managing attorney failed to have any further communication with Mr. Tavaréz about the Superior Court appeal, despite his reasonable requests for information. On July 1, 2022, the Superior Court issued a briefing schedule providing that Mr. Tavaréz's brief would be due by August 10, 2022. You received a copy of the briefing schedule but no one from your law firm filed a brief.

On September 9, 2022, the Superior Court entered an order dismissing Mr. Tavaréz's appeal for failure to file a brief and instructing you to file a certification with the Court within 10 days of the Order stating that Mr. Tavaréz had been notified of the dismissal order. You failed to notify Mr. Tavaréz of the dismissal of his appeal and failed to obey the Court's order to file a certification. Mr. Tavaréz later filed a pro se PCRA motion with the Court of Common Pleas alleging you had abandoned him and requesting that his appellate rights be reinstated. This motion was granted.

Office of Disciplinary Counsel requested a DB-7 statement of your position in this matter. You submitted a response and admitted all the alleged facts and rule violations: incompetence, lack of diligence, communication deficiencies, and failure to properly supervise the managing attorney. You explained that you are taking additional care to ensure matters are competently handled and you provided evidence that you reimbursed the unearned fee to Mr. Tavaréz.

By your conduct, you violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct (“RPC”):

1. RPC 1.1 – A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client.
2. RPC 1.3 – A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.
3. RPC 1.4(a)(3) – A lawyer shall keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter.
4. RPC 1.4(a)(4) – A lawyer shall promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.
5. RPC 5.1(a) – A partner in a law firm, and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Attorney Johnson, your conduct in this matter is public. This Public Reprimand is a matter of public record and shall be posted on the Disciplinary Board’s website at [www.padisciplinaryboard.org](http://www.padisciplinaryboard.org).

It is the Board’s duty to reprimand you for your misconduct. We note that you have a record of discipline consisting of a public reprimand and two years of probation in 2016 for misconduct during your representation in four criminal matters.

Please be aware that subsequent violations of the rules may result in further discipline and more severe sanctions. We sincerely hope that you will conduct yourself in such a manner that future disciplinary action will be unnecessary.

*S/Celeste Dee*

---

Designated Member  
The Disciplinary Board of the  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

Administered by a designated panel of three Members of The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on January 15, 2026.