

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, : No. 3191 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
Petitioner : No. 93 DB 2024  
: :  
v. : Attorney Registration No. 90657  
: :  
: (Allegheny County)  
: :  
AMY NICOLE WILLIAMSON, : :  
: :  
Respondent :

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2026, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendations of the Disciplinary Board, Amy Nicole Williamson is suspended from the practice of law in this Commonwealth for a period of one year and one day. 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 07/06/2026

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

|                                 |   |                                 |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, | : | No. 93 DB 2024                  |
| Petitioner                      | : |                                 |
|                                 | : |                                 |
| v.                              | : | Attorney Registration No. 90657 |
|                                 | : |                                 |
| AMY NICOLE WILLIAMSON,          | : |                                 |
| Respondent                      | : | (Allegheny 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 Nicole Williamson (“Williamson”), was born in 1975 and was admitted to the practice of law by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on May 7, 2003.

Williamson’s Practice of Law While on Administrative Suspension

3. In 2023, Williamson was counsel of record for the plaintiff, Carissa Veith, in the matter of *Veith v. Advanced Finishing USA*, docketed at 1:22-cv-00185-SPB in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. NT 13; ODC 1 Bates 2, ODC 2 Bates 20, ODC 7 Bates 49.

4. By Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated August 9, 2023, Williamson was administratively suspended for failure to comply with attorney registration requirements pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 219, effective 30 days thereafter on September 8, 2023. NT 28-32; ODC 1 Bates 2-3, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 5 Bates 39-45, ODC 6 Bates 46-48.

5. A copy of the Order was sent to Williamson under cover of a letter dated August 9, 2023, via certified mail, return receipt requested, at Williamson’s mailing address of 355 Parkway Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228. NT 28-32; ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 3 Bates 28-35, ODC 4 Bates 36-38, ODC 5 Bates 39-45, ODC 6 Bates 43-48.

6. By Order of the District Court entered August 29, 2023, in the *Veith* litigation, a Telephonic Status Conference on a Motion to Compel filed by the defendant, Advanced Finishing, was scheduled for September 8, 2023, at 10:00 AM. NT 14-16; ODC 1 Bates 2-3, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 52-53.

7. Williamson failed to notify her client, opposing counsel, and the District Court that September 8, 2023, would be the effective date of Williamson’s administrative suspension. NT 14-16; ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 21.

8. Williamson appeared for the telephonic status conference on September 8, 2023, before the Honorable Susan Paradise Baxter, District Judge, of the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. NT 15-16; ODC 1 Bates 3, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 52-53.

9. By Order of Court dated September 8, 2023, the District Court:

(a) Granted the motion to compel discovery.

(b) Extended the discovery deadline to November 3, 2023.

(c) Ordered that the plaintiff respond to interrogatories by October 6, 2023.

(d) Ordered plaintiff's deposition be completed within 30 days.

(e) Permitted defendant to file a motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute if plaintiff failed to comply with the Order.

NT 16-17; ODC 1 Bates 3-4, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 52-53.

10. By Order dated September 22, 2023, a Telephonic Post-Discovery Status Conference that had been scheduled for October 11, 2023, was rescheduled to November 15, 2023. NT 17; ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 53.

11. On October 3, 2023, Williamson filed a motion to continue her client's deposition which had been scheduled for October 4, 2023. NT 17-18; ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 53, ODC 8 Bates 55-56.

12. On October 4, 2023, Barry A. Kronthal, counsel for Advanced Finishing, filed a response to plaintiff's motion to continue. NT 18-19; ODC 1 Bates 4, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 53, ODC 9 Bates 57-66.

13. By Order dated October 4, 2023, the District Court:

(a) Scheduled a telephonic hearing to be held later on that day for plaintiff's Motion to Continue her deposition.

(b) Granted plaintiff's motion "insofar as Plaintiff shall appear in person for her deposition on October 5, 2023."

(c) Ordered that both Williamson and her client, Ms. Veith, were jointly and severally liable for the costs of defense counsel's travel and hotel expenses for two nights.

(d) Ordered that both Williamson and her client were jointly and severally liable to defense counsel for sanctions in the amount of \$250, plus \$100 for each day that plaintiff's deposition was not completed, up to and including October 13, 2023.

NT 19-20; ODC 1 Bates 4-5, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 53, ODC 10 Bates 67.

14. On October 5, 2023, Mr. Kronthal filed on behalf of the defendant a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, which included the averment:

On October 5, 2023, undersigned counsel became aware for the first time that Plaintiff's lawyer's Pennsylvania license to practice law is currently under administrative suspension by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Undersigned counsel feels ethically obligated to inform the Court of this information.

NT 19-22; ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 2 Bates 21, ODC 7 Bates 53, ODC 11 Bates 68-72.

15. On October 6, 2023, the District Court set a briefing schedule and ordered Williamson to file plaintiff's brief in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss by October 23, 2023. NT 22; ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 2 Bates 22, ODC 7 Bates 54.

16. In order to reinstate her active status, on October 6, 2023, Williamson filed her 2023-24 Pennsylvania Administrative Change in Status Form with the Disciplinary Board's Attorney Registration office, wherein she stated her preferred address for

receiving communications was 355 Parkway Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15228. NT 32-36; ODC 12 Bates 75-77.

17. Williamson represented therein:

(a) She had no jurisdictions in which she was licensed to practice law other than Pennsylvania.

(b) She had no current clients, tribunals, or third parties she was required to notify pursuant to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 217.

(c) She had ceased and desisted from communications that expressly or implicitly conveyed eligibility to practice law in Pennsylvania.

NT 32-36; ODC 12 Bates 73-77.

18. On October 10, 2023, partly in reliance upon the misrepresentations made in her Pennsylvania Administrative Change in Status Form, Williamson was reinstated to active license status. NT 35-36; ODC 1 Bates 5, ODC 2 Bates 22, ODC 12 Bates 73-77.

19. By Order dated November 15, 2023, after a Telephonic Post-Discovery Status Conference at which neither Williamson nor her client appeared, the District Court granted the defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, with prejudice. NT 23-25; ODC 1 Bates 6, ODC 2 Bates 22, ODC 7 Bates 54, ODC 13 Bates 78-81, ODC 14 Bates 8.

Williamson's Failure to Provide a Statement of Position in Response to ODC's Request

20. By letter dated December 7, 2023, sent by regular mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, ODC requested a statement of Williamson's position in response to the foregoing events. NT 56-58; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 23, ODC 15 Bates 83-94.

21. Williamson failed to provide ODC with a statement of her position. NT 58-60; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 23, ODC 16 Bates 95-104.

22. On January 30, 2024, only the certified mailing was returned to ODC marked "Return to Sender Unclaimed Unable to Forward." NT 57-58; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 23, ODC 15 Bates 90-94.

23. By letter dated April 17, 2024, ODC re-sent its request for a statement of Williamson's position via regular mail and certified mail, return receipt requested. NT 58-60; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 24, ODC 16 Bates 95-104.

24. The return receipt ("green card") was returned to ODC bearing a signature, Williamson's printed name, and was dated April 20, 2024. NT 59; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 24, ODC 17 Bates 101-104.

25. Williamson again failed to provide a statement of position. NT 58-60; ODC 1 Bates 11, ODC 2 Bates 24.

Williamson's Failure to Appear for the Administration of a Private Reprimand

26. By Order of the Disciplinary Board dated October 18, 2024, the determination made by a Review Panel of the Disciplinary Board in the matter docketed at No. 93 DB 2024 was accepted and Williamson was ordered to be subjected to a Private Reprimand by the Disciplinary Board for her violation of the Court's August 9, 2023 administrative suspension order and unauthorized practice of law. NT 36-39; ODC 1 Bates 12, ODC 2 Bates 24, ODC 17 Bates 108.

27. By letter to Williamson dated October 18, 2024, she was notified, among other things, that:

- (a) The investigation of a complaint filed at #C4-23-925 had been completed pursuant to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 205(c)(7).

(b) The Disciplinary Board's three-member Review Panel had determined that the matter be concluded by a Private Reprimand before the Board, and a copy of the Board's Order dated October 1[8], 2024, was enclosed.

(c) Williamson had violated the specific Rules of Professional Conduct and Disciplinary Enforcement Rules listed.

(d) Williamson had the option of notifying the Board Prothonotary, in writing, within 20 days of the October 18, 2024 notice, that she would not appear for the Private Reprimand and that she wanted her case to be referred for the institution of a formal proceeding.

NT 36-37; ODC 1 Bates 12-13, ODC 2 Bates 24, ODC 17 Bates 105-110.

28. Williamson did not notify the Board Prothonotary that she would not appear for the administration of a Private Reprimand. ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 18 Bates 111-119.

29. Williamson did not notify the Board Prothonotary that she wanted the matter to be referred for the institution of a formal proceeding. NT 37; ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 18 Bates 111-119.

30. By Notice to Appear for Private Reprimand dated November 13, 2024, sent by regular and certified mail, return receipt requested, and via email, Williamson was directed to appear for a private reprimand before a designated panel of the Disciplinary Board on December 11, 2024, at 1:15 PM, to be conducted via Webex videoconference. A copy of the Board's Order dated October 18, 2024, was enclosed along with instructions, guidance, and protocols for the conduct of the Private Reprimand. NT 39-40; ODC 1 Bates 14, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 18 Bates 111-119, ODC 34 pp. 6-7.

31. The certified mail return receipt (“green card”), was returned to the Board Prothonotary bearing a signature above Williamson’s printed name, and a partial date of “11/16....” NT 38-41; ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 18 Bates 119.

32. The Disciplinary Board’s regular mail envelope was not returned to the Board Prothonotary as undeliverable. NT 38-39; ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 25.

33. By email dated December 6, 2024, the Board Prothonotary sent Williamson a Webex meeting hyperlink for a practice session scheduled for December 9, 2024, in anticipation of the Private Reprimand to be administered via Webex scheduled for December 11, 2024. NT 42, 45, 50-53; ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 34 pp. 3-6.

34. By email dated December 10, 2024, the Board Prothonotary sent Williamson a Webex meeting hyperlink for the Private Reprimand scheduled to be administered via Webex on December 11, 2024. NT 43-45, 50-53; ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 34 pp. 3-4.

35. On December 11, 2024, Williamson failed to appear for the administration of the Private Reprimand. NT 46-47, 50-53; ODC 1 Bates 15, ODC 2 Bates 25, ODC 19 Bates 120, ODC 21 Bates 128, ODC 34 pp.1-2.

36. By letter to ODC dated December 12, 2024, the Board Prothonotary advised that Williamson had failed to appear for the scheduled Private Reprimand and, in accordance with Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(2), the matter docketed at No. 93 DB 2024 was referred to ODC for “institution of formal proceedings relating to such act of misconduct and to the grievance upon which the private reprimand was to relate.” NT 54; ODC 1 Bates 15-16, ODC 2 Bates 26, ODC 21 Bates 128.

37. By email dated December 17, 2024, sent at 10:34 AM in response to the Prothonotary's email dated December 10, 2024, Williamson stated:

My sincere apologies but I am just finding this email in my spam folder. Unfortunately, I am now seeing that I have received it too late and hence, was unable to attend the webinar meeting. Again, I apologize and am requesting to reschedule the hearing. Please advise at your earliest convenience.

NT 46, 51; ODC 1 Bates 16, ODC 2 Bates 26, ODC 34 pp. 2-4.

38. By email dated December 17, 2024, sent to Williamson at 10:46 AM, the Board Prothonotary stated, in pertinent part:

The Notice to Appear was also sent to you via first class and certified mail. The matter has been remanded back to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, so you should contact [ODC]....

NT 47; ODC 1 Bates 16, ODC 2 Bates 26, ODC 34 pp. 1-2.

39. By email dated December 17, 2024, sent to the Board Prothonotary at 11:28 AM, Williamson stated:

My apologies as I didn't see a link included in the notice. I will follow up with [ODC] in any case.

NT 46-47; ODC 1 Bates 16, ODC 2 Bates 26, ODC 34 p. 1.

The Disciplinary Proceedings at No. 93 DB 2024

40. On January 2, 2025, ODC filed a Petition for Discipline charging Williamson with violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement based on her failure to appear for the private reprimand and the underlying misconduct that led to the imposition of the reprimand.

41. On March 19, 2025, Williamson filed an Answer to Petition for Discipline.

42. By Reference for Disciplinary Hearings dated April 17, 2025, Williamson was notified, via regular mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, of the assignment of

three Hearing Committee Members to hear evidence and submit a report to the Disciplinary Board based upon the Petition for Discipline filed by ODC and the Answer thereto by Williamson. NT 60-61; ODC 22 Bates 129-131.

43. Williamson received the certified mailing and signed, dated and returned the “green card” receipt on or about April 24, 2025. NT 60-61; ODC 22 Bates 129-131.

44. By a “Revised Notice of Prehearing Conference and Hearing – Replacement Panel Member” dated May 8, 2025, Williamson was notified, via regular mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, that the Prehearing Conference in the matter was scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 2025 at 10:00 AM before the “Replacement Panel Member,” and the scheduling of the Disciplinary Hearing before the full Hearing Committee on Monday, July 28, 2025 at 9:30 AM. NT 61-62; ODC 23 Bates 132.

45. The certified mailing was returned to the Board Prothonotary stamped “Return to Sender Unclaimed Unable to Forward.” NT 62; ODC 22 Bates 129-130, 23 Bates 132.

46. By “Revised Notice of Prehearing Conference and Hearing – Prehearing Time Change” dated May 14, 2025, Williamson was notified, via regular mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, that the Prehearing Conference scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 2025, at 10:00 AM was changed to 2:00 PM. NT 62-63; ODC 24 Bates 133.

47. The regular mailing of that notice was not returned to the Board Prothonotary as undeliverable. NT 62-63; ODC 24 Bates 133.

48. By email dated June 16, 2025, at 10:14 AM, the Board’s Systems Support Specialist provided Respondent with a Webex meeting hyperlink for Williamson’s appearance at the Prehearing Conference scheduled for Wednesday June 18, 2025, at 2:00 PM. NT 66; ODC 25 Bates 135.

49. By email dated June 17, 2025, sent at 4:11 AM, sent to, among others, the Board's Special Counsel Kimberly Henderson, Williamson stated:

I am just seeing this invitation and it appears as though I missed this hearing. Could you please advise what the hearing pertains to? My apologies for any inconvenience.

NT 66-67; ODC 25 Bates 134-135.

50. By email dated June 17, 2025, sent at 8:28 AM, Special Counsel Henderson replied to Williamson, in pertinent part:

The Prehearing conference is scheduled for June 18<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m. virtually via Webex. Teri was sending you the link so that you can join the prehearing conference. Please see the attached notice that was sent to you earlier by the Prothonotary's Office regarding the scheduling in your matter.

NT 66-67; ODC 25 Bates 135.

51. The Prehearing Conference was held as scheduled on June 18, 2025, at 2:00 PM. Williamson failed to appear. NT 67-68; ODC 26 Bates 136-147.

52. The disciplinary hearing was held as scheduled on July 28, 2025, at 9:30 AM. Williamson failed to appear. NT 2, 4; ODC 22 Bates 129-131, ODC 23 Bates 132, ODC 24 Bates 133.

53. At the hearing, ODC presented the testimony of Barry Kronthal, Esquire; Board Prothonotary Marcee Sloan; and Sheila A.M. Bluemling, ODC Auditor/Investigator. ODC offered exhibits ODC 1 through ODC-34, which were admitted into evidence.

#### Aggravating Factors

54. By Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated November 13, 2024, Williamson was administratively suspended for Continuing Legal Education non-compliance, effective 30 days thereafter on December 13, 2024. NT 72-75; ODC 27 Bates 149-151.

55. A copy of the Order was sent to Williamson under cover of a letter dated November 13, 2024, via certified mail, return receipt requested, to Williamson's mailing address of 355 Parkway Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228. NT 72-75; ODC 27 Bates 148-154.

56. In an American Arbitration Association ("AAA") matter captioned *Nick Attalah, Claimant v. The Arias Organization of Globe Life-American Income Division; American Income Life Insurance Company, Respondents*, Case No. 01-23-0005-7870, Williamson served as co-counsel for the Claimant along with the firm of Savinis, Kane & Galluci, LLC (SDK Law). ODC 30, ODC 31, ODC 32, ODC 33.

57. By email dated December 16, 2024, Thomas D. Rees, AAA Arbitrator, notified counsel for the parties of an "Order scheduling the requested Motions to Dismiss" in the AAA matter. ODC 30.

58. By email dated December 17, 2024, Williamson replied to the Arbitrator's email as follows:

I have been ill and unable to work for the past week. To that end, I am requesting an opportunity to respond to the Motion to dismiss by Friday 12/27. ODC 30.

59. On January 14, 2025, sent at 9:37 AM, SDK Law attached Praecipos to Withdraw the Appearances of Janice M. Savinis, John R. Kane, and Michael J. Galluci from several cases, including the *Attalah* matter. ODC 32.

60. On January 14, 2025, Angela Aveard, on behalf of SDK Law, distributed Praecipos to Withdraw the Appearances of Attorneys Savinis, Kane, and Galluci, on behalf of the Claimant, noting that Williamson "will continue to represent Claimant in this matter." ODC 31.

61. On January 15, 2025, Williamson sent an email to Ms. Aveard at SDK Law, and others including Arbitrator Rees, and stated:

My apologies if I missed it, but I think that you will need to file these with AAA in addition to serving on opposing counsel. In other words, you should probably forward this email on to the case administrators to ensure that it gets filed/docketed in AAA. ODC 32.

62. On February 12, 2025, Arbitrator Rees filed a “Supplemental Order Re Motion to Dismiss” setting forth, in pertinent part:

(a) Arbitrator Rees signed an Order dated January 21, 2025, granting motions to dismiss Mr. Attalah’s Claim for failure to prosecute.

(b) On January 27, 2025, Williamson, who was then the lone counsel of record for the Claimant in the AAA matter, requested leave to file a response to the motions to dismiss on behalf of her client, Mr. Attalah.

(c) The AAA notified counsel for the opposing parties about Williamson’s request and asked them to comment, which they did.

(d) The AAA asked Arbitrator Rees to decide whether he had jurisdiction to address Williamson’s request for leave to file a response to the motion to dismiss.

(e) Arbitrator Rees concluded that jurisdiction existed because an award had not been issued in the case, and he ruled that:

Because of new and material unexpected information, the Arbitrator will reopen proceedings in this case to allow very limited proceedings before issuance of an award. The Arbitrator takes this unusual step despite a belief that the January 22, 2025, dismissal decision was and is correct because of the dilatory conduct set forth in that decision.

(f) Arbitrator Rees further stated:

It has come to the Arbitrator’s attention, however, that [Williamson] has been under administrative suspension by the Pennsylvania [Supreme

Court] while she has been acting as Claimant's representative. This information may not have been known by any co-counsel or opposing counsel but is material to the disposition of this case.

(g) Arbitrator Rees Ordered, in pertinent part:

4. ...[Williamson] shall inform Claimant immediately of the issuance of this Order and shall fully assist Claimant in the transition to new counsel or pro se status as required under applicable Pennsylvania rules.

5. Except as set forth in paragraph 4 of the Order, [Williamson] may no longer serve as representative of Claimant in this matter.

ODC 33.

63. On February 21, 2025, Williamson filed her 2024-25 Pennsylvania Administrative Change in Status Form with the Disciplinary Board's Attorney Registration office, wherein she stated her preferred address for receiving communications was 355 Parkway Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15228. NT 74-75; ODC 29 Bates 159-162.

64. Williamson represented that:

(a) She had no jurisdictions in which she was licensed to practice law other than Pennsylvania.

(b) She had no current clients, tribunals, or third parties she was required to notify pursuant to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 217.

(c) She had ceased and desisted from communications that expressly or implicitly conveyed eligibility to practice law in Pennsylvania.

NT 74-75; ODC 29 Bates 159-160.

65. On February 21, 2025, partly in reliance upon Williamson's false representations made in her Pennsylvania Administrative Change in Status Form, she was reinstated to active status. NT 74-75; ODC 29 Bates 159-162.

### Mitigating Factor

66. Williamson has no record of prior discipline.

### The Proceedings Below

67. Following the close of the record, ODC filed a post-hearing brief on August 25, 2025, and requested that the Committee recommend to the Board that Williamson be suspended for a period of two years.

68. Williamson did not file a brief.

69. The Committee filed a Report on December 22, 2025, and concluded that ODC met its burden of proof to establish Williamson's violation of the rules charged in the Petition for Discipline. The Committee recommended that Williamson be suspended for one year and one day.

70. The parties did not file exceptions to the Committee's Report and recommendation.

71. This matter was adjudicated by the Board at the meeting on April 15, 2026.

## II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. By Williamson's conduct set forth above, she violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct ("RPC") and Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement ("Pa.R.D.E."):

- a. RPC 1.7(a)(2) – Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest. A concurrent conflict of interest exists if: there is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by

the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer.

- b. RPC 1.16(a)(1) – Except as stated in paragraph (c), a lawyer shall not represent a client or, where representation has commenced, shall withdraw from the representation of a client if the representation will result in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.
- c. RPC 3.3(a)(1) – A lawyer shall not knowingly make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer.
- d. RPC 5.5(a) – A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction or assist another in doing so.
- e. RPC 8.4(d) – It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.
- f. Pa.R.D.E. 217(b) – A formerly admitted attorney shall promptly notify, or cause to be promptly notified, all clients who are involved in pending litigation or administrative proceedings, and the attorney or attorneys for each adverse party in such matter or proceeding, of the ... administrative suspension.... The notice to be given to the client shall advise the prompt substitution of another attorney or attorneys in place of the formerly admitted attorney. In the event the client does not obtain substitute counsel before the effective date of the ... administrative suspension, it shall be the responsibility of the formerly admitted attorney to move in the court or agency in which the proceeding is pending for leave to withdraw. The notice

to be given to the attorney or attorneys for an adverse party shall state the place of residence of the client of the formerly admitted attorney. The notice required by this subdivision (b) may be delivered by the most efficient method possible as long as the chosen method is successful and provides proof of receipt. At the time of the filing of the verified statement of compliance required by subdivision (e)(1) of this Rule, the formerly admitted attorney shall file copies of the notices required by this subdivision and proofs of receipt with the Board and shall serve a conforming copy on Disciplinary Counsel.

- g. Pa.R.D.E. 217(c)(3) – A formerly admitted attorney shall promptly notify, or cause to be promptly notified, of the administrative suspension ... any other tribunal, court, agency or jurisdiction in which the attorney is admitted to practice.
- h. Pa.R.D.E. 217(j) – A formerly admitted attorney may not engage in any form of law-related activities in this Commonwealth except in accordance with the following requirements: (1) All law-related activities...shall be conducted under the supervision of a member in good standing of the Bar of this Commonwealth who shall be responsible for ensuring that the formerly admitted attorney complies with the requirements of this subdivision....(2) For purposes of this subdivision..., the only law-related activities that may be conducted by a formerly admitted attorney are the following: (i) legal work of a preparatory nature....; (ii) direct communication with the client or third parties to the extent permitted by paragraph (3);...(3)...The formerly admitted attorney shall clearly indicate in any such communication that he

or she is a legal assistant and identify the supervising attorney. (4)...[A] formerly admitted attorney is specifically prohibited from engaging in any of the following activities: (i) performing any law-related activity for [an entity] if the formerly admitted attorney was associated with that [entity] on or after the date on which the acts which resulted in the...suspension occurred, through and including the effective date of...suspension....(ii) performing any law-related services from an office that is not staffed by a supervising attorney on a full-time basis; (iii) performing any law-related services for any client who in the past was represented by the formerly admitted attorney; (iv) representing himself...as a lawyer or person of similar status; (v) having any contact with clients either in person, by telephone, or in writing, except as provided in paragraph (3); (vi) rendering legal consultation or advice to a client; (vii) appearing on behalf of a client in any hearing or proceeding or before any judicial officer....; (viii) appearing as a representative of the client at a deposition or other discovery matter.

- i. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7) - Failure by a respondent-attorney without good cause to respond to Disciplinary Counsel's request or supplemental request under Disciplinary Board Rules, § 87.7(b) for a statement of the respondent-attorney's position is grounds for discipline.
- j. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(2) – Willful failure to appear before the Board for a private reprimand is grounds for discipline.

### III. DISCUSSION

This matter is before the Board on review of the Committee's Report and unanimous recommendation to suspend Williamson for a period of one year and one day for violations of multiple Rules of Professional Conduct and Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement relating to her unauthorized practice of law after the effective date of her administrative suspension, failure to appear for a private reprimand before the Disciplinary Board, and failure 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 Williamson's conduct violated the charged rules. For the reasons that follow, we recommend that Williamson be suspended for a period of one year and one day.

Williamson's misconduct in this matter flows from her failure to comply with annual attorney registration obligations, which resulted in the Court's August 9, 2023 order transferring her to administrative suspension. As of the September 8, 2023 effective date of that order, Williamson was considered a formerly admitted attorney under Pa.R.D.E. 102(a), was required to comply with Pa.R.D.E. 217 governing formerly admitted attorneys on administrative suspension, and was ineligible to practice law in the Commonwealth. The record evidence demonstrated that in violation of the administrative suspension order and Pa.R.D.E. 217, Williamson failed to notify the court and others of her suspended status and ineligibility to practice law and continued to represent the

plaintiff in a civil action docketed in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania for approximately one month. The representation included Williamson's appearance before the court during a telephone status conference held on September 8, 2023 (the effective date of Williamson's suspension). Her practice of law violated RPC 5.5(a). In addition, Williamson violated RPC 3.3(a)(1) by knowingly and falsely holding herself out to the court as eligible to represent her client in litigation. By failing to withdraw from representation, Williamson violated RPC 1.16(a)(1) and by continuing her representation when she knew there was a significant risk that the representation would be materially limited by her personal interest, she violated RPC 1.7(a)(2). Williamson's failure to inform the court of her administrative suspension prejudiced the administration of justice, in violation of RPC 8.4(d).

On October 6, 2023, Williamson filed her change in status form with the Board's Attorney Registration department to reinstate her active license status. Therein, she inaccurately represented, *inter alia*, that she had no current clients, tribunals or third parties she was required to notify under the rules and she was not licensed in any other jurisdictions. Williamson was reinstated to active status on October 10, 2023.

ODC investigated Williamson's conduct relating to her unauthorized practice and sought her response to its inquiries on two occasions; Williamson's first misstep in her disciplinary proceedings was her failure to respond to ODC and provide a statement of her position, in violation of Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7). The disciplinary matter proceeded in due course and resulted in a Board determination that Williamson be subjected to a private reprimand. Williamson received notice of the Board's sanction determination and was advised of her rights and obligations pertaining thereto, including that if she did not agree to accept the private reprimand, she had the right to request that

formal charges be filed against her. Williamson did not request formal charges. The record reflects that Williamson thereafter received ample notice that the private reprimand was scheduled to be administered on December 11, 2024. Williamson could have concluded this matter by appearing for her private discipline; however, despite notice by regular mail, certified mail and email, Williamson failed to appear before the Board. Williamson's willful nonappearance violated Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(2) and directly escalated the seriousness of her matter, as the Board thereafter directed that formal disciplinary charges be filed against her, leading to the instant proceeding.

Having concluded that Williamson engaged in 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).

The record reflects two weighty aggravating factors. Significantly, Williamson engaged in additional acts of unauthorized practice approximately one year after the events that comprise the instant Petition for Discipline. Because Williamson failed to fulfill her Continuing Legal Education requirements, on November 13, 2024, the Court transferred Williamson to administrative suspension, effective December 13, 2024. Similar to her actions subsequent to her 2023 administrative suspension, Williamson continued representing her client in an arbitration matter, even though she was ineligible to practice law. She regained active status on February 21, 2025, after once again filing a change in status form that inaccurately represented she had no current clients, tribunals or third parties she was required to notify and that she was not licensed in any other jurisdictions.

In additional aggravation, despite receiving notice of the scheduled dates and times of disciplinary proceedings, Williamson failed to appear at both the prehearing conference and the disciplinary hearing. 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 Williamson’s nonappearance in the instant matter merely continued her previous pattern of ignoring ODC’s inquiries and Board notices to appear for her private reprimand and we conclude that her persistent and overwhelming failure to engage with the disciplinary system denotes a severe lack of professionalism and respect.

In counterpoint to the aggravating factors, we accord weight in mitigation to Williamson’s unblemished record of discipline since her admission to the bar in 2003. 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).

As a guide to our assessment of appropriate discipline, we turn to the precedent, which supports our conclusion that a suspension for one year and one day is warranted for an attorney who engaged in the unauthorized practice of law while administratively suspended, failed to respond to ODC’s inquires, failed to appear for a private reprimand to address the underlying misconduct, engaged in additional acts of unauthorized practice, and failed to appear at the disciplinary hearing.

The Board and the Court have consistently recognized that an attorney's practice of law while ineligible to do so is a breach of ethics that warrants discipline, which may range from private discipline to suspension based on the scope and duration of the misconduct. *Compare Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anonymous Attorney*, No. 142 DB 2010 (D. Bd. Order 11/14/2011) (private reprimand imposed for attorney's unauthorized practice for eight months while on inactive status due to CLE noncompliance; the attorney had completed CLE course requirements but had failed to pay a late fee; the attorney reported his conduct, accepted responsibility, cooperated with ODC, and had no record of discipline), *with Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Carl B. Williamson*, No. 36 DB 2019 (D. Bd. Rpt. 2/21/2020) (S. Ct. Order 5/29/2020) (one year and one day suspension imposed for Williamson's unauthorized practice while administratively suspended for CLE deficiencies; he remained as counsel in ten separate matters and engaged in law-related activities in at least one of the matters; failed to attend the disciplinary hearing, but expressed remorse and responsibility in a post-hearing brief; record of prior private discipline), *and Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. John Joseph Garagozzo*, No. 58 DB 2016 (D. Bd. Rpt. 8/8/2017) (S. Ct. Order 10/6/2017) (the Court suspended Garagozzo for two years for practicing law for eighteen months while on administrative suspension for CLE noncompliance; his failure to appear for the disciplinary hearing was an aggravating factor).

Moreover, an attorney's failure to appear before the Board for the imposition of a private reprimand will subject that attorney to an increased disciplinary sanction, often in the form of a suspension. *See Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Michael Paul Gordon*, No. 213 DB 2009 (D. Bd. Rpt. 9/16/2011) (S. Ct. Order 12/22/2011) (one year and one day suspension for an attorney who failed to appear for a private reprimand); *Office of*

*Disciplinary Counsel v. Francis S. Cutruzulla*, No. 147 DB 2004 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/28/2006) (S. Ct. Order 6/15/2006) (one year and one day suspension for an attorney who failed to appear for a private reprimand and later failed to participate in the disciplinary process).

The totality of Williamson's misconduct aligns with the cited suspension cases; the two weighty aggravating factors and little countervailing mitigation further underscore the need to remove Williamson from practice.

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). A one year and one day suspension is consistent with discipline imposed in cases involving similar misconduct and fulfills the important goals of our disciplinary system by addressing Williamson's persistent disrespect for her professional obligations and requiring her to undergo the reinstatement process to prove her fitness before resuming practice.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Respondent, Amy Nicole Williamson, be Suspended for one year and one day 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/ Joshua F. Wilson*  
Joshua F. Wilson, Member

Date: 05/06/2026

Chair Vance and Member Alfano recused.