

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 3178 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
Petitioner	:	No. 30 DB 2026
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Registration No. 68276
	:	
KEILA M. GILBERT,	:	(Bucks County)
	:	
Respondent	:	

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW** this 11<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2026, upon consideration of the Recommendation of the Three-Member Panel of the Disciplinary Board, the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent is granted, and Keila M. Gilbert is suspended on consent from the Bar of this Commonwealth for a period of six months. 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 05/11/2026

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,:	:	No. 30 DB 2026
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 68276
KEILA M. GILBERT,	:	
Respondent	:	(Bucks County)

**JOINT PETITION IN SUPPORT  
OF DISCIPLINE ON CONSENT  
PURSUANT TO Pa.R.D.E. 215(d)**

Petitioner, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”), by Thomas J. Farrell, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, and Emily R. Provencher, Disciplinary Counsel, and Keila M. Gilbert, Esquire (“Respondent”), by and through her counsel, James C. Schwartzman, Esquire, respectfully petition the Disciplinary Board in support of discipline on consent, pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement (“Pa.R.D.E.”) 215(d), and in support thereof state:

1. Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, ODC, whose principal office is situated at Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Pennsylvania Judicial Center, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 2700, P.O. Box 62485, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17106, is invested with the power and duty to investigate all matters involving alleged misconduct of an attorney admitted

**FILED**  
**03/05/2026**  
**The Disciplinary Board of the  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania**

to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to prosecute all disciplinary proceedings brought in accordance with the various provisions of the Enforcement Rules.

2. Respondent was born in May 1952 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth on June 7, 1993. On July 1, 2021, Respondent voluntarily transferred to inactive status and accordingly became a “formerly admitted attorney.” Respondent chose retired status in 2024. Her last registered address is: 155 North Main Street, Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901.

3. Respondent is subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court.

4. Respondent has no prior record of discipline in Pennsylvania.

#### **SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ADMITTED**

5. In 1996, Respondent founded Alpha Center for Divorce Mediation (“Alpha Center”) in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

6. The Alpha Center website offers the following Mediation Services:

- a. Divorce, Separation & Prenuptial Agreements;
- b. Parenting Agreements;

- c. Tax Planning and Business Valuations;
- d. Child Support, Spousal Support, and Alimony;
- e. Post-Divorce Financial Strategies;
- f. Gay & Lesbian Partnerships;
- g. Military Divorces; and
- h. Gray Divorce.

7. Alpha Center employs attorneys, offers legal services, and engages in the business of law, specifically divorce mediation.

8. At all relevant times, Alpha Center had several different office locations in the state of Pennsylvania with a corporate office in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

9. At all relevant times, the Alpha Center website represented that Respondent:

- a. was the President and CEO of Alpha Center;
- b. was part of the team of divorce attorneys who work for Alpha Center; and
- c. had the title Keila M. Gilbert, Esquire.

10. At all relevant times, Respondent was a formerly admitted attorney and prohibited from engaging in any form of law-related activities in

Pennsylvania except in accordance with the requirements set forth in Pa.R.D.E. 217(j).

11. On April 16, 2024, Sandra L. Zell signed a two-year contract with Alpha Center as an attorney mediator.

12. At all relevant times, Ms. Zell was a formerly admitted attorney in Pennsylvania and not authorized to practice law in Pennsylvania.

13. At all relevant times, Ms. Zell was prohibited from engaging in any form of law-related activities in Pennsylvania except in accordance with the requirements set forth in Pa.R.D.E. 217(j).

14. On or about May 1, 2024, the Alpha Center website published a 00:52 minute long YouTube video, featuring Ms. Zell communicating the following, *inter alia*, to the viewer:

- a. ...“I am an Alpha Attorney Mediator here at Alpha Center;”
- b. ...“and I am here to help you in any way that I can;”
- c. “I look forward to meeting with you both to learn more about the specifics of your situation;” and
- d. ...“I will do whatever I can to make it as comfortable as possible.”

15. In the YouTube video, Ms. Zell failed to tell potential clients that she was not actively licensed to practice law in Pennsylvania.

16. Respondent was present when Ms. Zell recorded the video.

17. Respondent provided Ms. Zell with the script of what to say in the video.

18. Respondent authorized the publication of the YouTube video on the Alpha Center website.

19. In or about May 2024, with Respondent's full authorization and knowledge, the Alpha Center website listed Ms. Zell as an "Attorney-Mediator" under the section of "Divorce Attorneys."

20. On May 1, 2024, Ms. Zell emailed Respondent stating, *inter alia*, that she had been advised by the Pennsylvania Disciplinary Board, indicating that the title "Esquire" could not be attached to Ms. Zell's Alpha Center website profile pending her reinstatement.

21. Respondent informed Ms. Zell that even though she could not use the title "Esquire", Ms. Zell was permitted to use the title "Attorney."

22. On May 9, 2024, the Bucks County Herald Newspaper published a news article ("article") titled "Attorney Sandra L. Zell is joining Alpha Center for Divorce Mediation."

23. The article stated, *inter alia*, that Ms. Zell:
- a. is a Montgomery County attorney who is joining Alpha Center for Divorce Mediation as part of its professional team of experts assisting clients through the divorce process;
  - b. is a Temple University Beasley School of Law graduate where she was a member of the Temple Law Review, graduating with honors in 2004;
  - c. practiced with a prestigious Philadelphia law firm before taking time to raise her three sons;
  - d. has since returned to the legal profession, specializing in divorce law and mediation;
  - e. is now a certified divorce mediator in Pennsylvania; and
  - f. claims to bring the knowledge that she gained from studying under leading mediation experts, as well as her own divorce journey, to support her work with Alpha Center.

24. Respondent authorized the publication of the article and its contents.

25. The article failed to explain that Ms. Zell was a formerly admitted attorney and was not currently eligible to practice law in Pennsylvania.

26. While employed with Alpha Center, Ms. Zell:
- a. met with clients without the supervision of a member in good standing of the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and
  - b. contacted Respondent for supervision and guidance before and after she met with clients.

27. On May 14, 2024, Ms. Zell filed a Petition for Reinstatement and supporting Questionnaires (“Petition”) with the Pennsylvania Supreme Court (ODC Case No. R2-24-476; DB Case No. 51 DB 2024).

28. On the Petition, Ms. Zell indicated, *inter alia*, that on April 16, 2024, she signed a two-year contract Alpha Center and was currently training for the mediation position under Respondent’s supervision as her supervising attorney.

29. Prior to Ms. Zell’s filing of the Petition, Respondent failed to file a Notice of Engagement, identifying Respondent as Ms. Zell’s supervising attorney as required by Pa.R.D.E. 217(j).

30. On July 11, 2024, Respondent spoke on the telephone with ODC Auditor Robert McHugh.

31. Respondent told Auditor McHugh, *inter alia*, that Respondent:

- a. founded Alpha Center approximately thirty years ago;
- b. stopped seeing clients several years ago;
- c. spent all her energy guiding the other professionals at Alpha Center;
- d. was responsible for the managing and training of everyone who worked at Alpha Center;
- e. was voluntary inactive since 2021 and changed her status to retired on Respondent's 2024-2025 Pennsylvania Attorney Registration paperwork;
- f. personally hired Ms. Zell as an "independent contractor" for two-years with the title "Attorney-Mediator" for Alpha Center;
- g. was aware that Ms. Zell did not have an active license to practice law in Pennsylvania;
- h. had hired Ms. Zell as a member of a team of "Attorney-Mediators" with Alpha Center;
- i. was Ms. Zell's direct supervisor;
- j. was responsible for Ms. Zell's training and oversaw Ms. Zell's work;

- k. was aware that Ms. Zell met directly with clients under her close supervision;
- l. believed that Ms. Zell met with approximately ten couples while working at Alpha Center; and
- m. paid Ms. Zell a percentage of fees.

32. On July 22, 2024, Respondent filed a letter with the Pennsylvania Disciplinary Board, stating, *inter alia*, that Respondent:

- a. founded Alpha Center thirty (30) years ago;
- b. carefully reviewed the marriage settlement agreements handled by Alpha Center;
- c. engaged Ms. Zell as a mediator at Alpha Center as of April 16, 2024;
- d. created a role for Ms. Zell to assist with consultation meetings;
- e. carefully monitored Ms. Zell;
- f. met with Ms. Zell before and after every client encounter; and
- g. continually monitored all professionals who work for Alpha Center.

33. Respondent signed the letter filed July 22, 2024, as Keila M. Gilbert, Esquire.

34. On July 26, 2024, Respondent emailed ODC, stating, *inter alia*:
- a. Ms. Zell shared her concerns with Respondent about Ms. Zell's reinstatement to practice law in Pennsylvania;
  - b. Respondent worked together with Ms. Zell to ensure that she would not be acting as a licensed attorney pending reinstatement;
  - c. Respondent failed to instruct and direct her marketing team about the limitations of how Ms. Zell should be represented on the website and other marketing initiatives;
  - d. Ms. Zell expressed concern to Respondent several times regarding how Ms. Zell was represented on Alpha Center's website;
  - e. Respondent mistakenly reassured Ms. Zell that Ms. Zell was in compliance with the reinstatement rules;
  - f. Respondent planned for all the Alpha Center attorneys to make a short, scripted video that would be marketed on the website for potential clients;

- g. Respondent sent a script to all the Alpha Center attorneys, including Ms. Zell;
- h. Ms. Zell did in fact express her concerns with the video content in referring to herself as an "Attorney-Mediator";
- i. Respondent reassured Ms. Zell that this video would not pose a problem regarding reinstatement;
- j. Respondent prematurely initiated a press release regarding Ms. Zell joining Alpha Center;
- k. Ms. Zell expressed concern about this press release coming out prior the reinstatement proceedings;
- l. Respondent was genuinely unaware of the significant negative impact this would cause Ms. Zell and authorized the press release;
- m. these were Respondent's mistakes;
- n. Respondent is sorry for not monitoring her marketing team and this situation more closely; and
- o. Respondent's greatest concern is that Ms. Zell is not held accountable for Respondent's failures.

35. In Respondent's email to ODC office dated July 26, 2024, Respondent signed her name with the title "Esquire."

36. Respondent apologized for her errors and is remorseful.

37. Respondent mistakenly believed that identifying Ms. Zell as an attorney did not violate any rules.

38. Respondent is extremely remorseful for negatively impacting Ms. Zell's reinstatement and wants to take full responsibility for mistakenly advising Ms. Zell.

39. By Order dated August 7, 2025, Ms. Zell was reinstated to active status as a member of the Bar of Pennsylvania (No. 71 DB 2025).

40. Respondent has fully cooperated with ODC in connection with its investigation, and through her attorney, has expressed her willingness to accept the proposed discipline.

41. By Respondent's conduct as alleged in Paragraphs 5 through 43 of this Joint Petition, during the period of her inactive and/or retired status, Respondent:

- a. engaged in the practice of law;
- b. performed law-related activities in Pennsylvania;
- c. represented herself as a lawyer or person of similar status;

- d. rendered legal consultation;
- e. employed a formerly admitted attorney who performed law-related activities; and
- f. supervised a formerly admitted attorney who performed law-related activities.

**SPECIFIC RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT VIOLATED**

42. Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct (“RPC”):

- a. RPC 5.1(a), which states that 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.
- b. RPC 5.1(b), which states that a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over another lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyer conforms to the Rules of Professional Conduct.

- c. RPC 5.1(c)(2), which states that a lawyer shall be responsible for another lawyer's violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if the lawyer is a partner or has comparable managerial authority in the law firm in which the other lawyer practices, or has direct supervisory authority over the other lawyer, and knows of the conduct at a time when its consequences can be avoided or mitigated but fails to take reasonable remedial action.
- d. RPC 5.5(a), which states that 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 5.1(b)(1) and (2), which states that a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction shall not: 1) except as authorized by these Rules, Pa.B.A.R. 302 or other law, establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law; or 2) hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

- f. RPC 7.1, which states that a lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services.
- g. RPC 8.4(c), which states that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.

43. Respondent violated the following Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement ("Pa.R.D.E."):

- a. Pa.R.D.E. 217(d)(2), which states in addition to the steps that a formerly admitted attorney must promptly take under other provisions of this Rule to disengage from the practice of law, a formerly admitted attorney shall promptly cease and desist from using all forms of communication that expressly or implicitly convey eligibility to practice law in the state courts of Pennsylvania, including but not limited to professional titles, letterhead, business cards, signage, websites, and references to admission to the Pennsylvania Bar.

- b. Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(1), which states a formerly admitted attorney may not engage in any form of law-related activities in this Commonwealth except in accordance with the following requirements: All law-related activities of the formerly admitted attorney 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 (j). If the formerly admitted attorney is engaged by a law firm or other organization providing legal services, whether by employment or other relationship, an attorney of the firm or organization shall be designated by the firm or organization as the supervising attorney for purposes of this subdivision.
  
- c. Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(4) (ii), (iii) and (iv), which states without limiting the other restrictions in this subdivision (j), a formerly admitted attorney is specifically prohibited from engaging in any of the following activities: 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; and iv) representing herself as a lawyer or person of similar status.

- d. Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(5), which states the supervising attorney and the formerly admitted attorney shall file with the Disciplinary Board a notice of engagement, identifying the supervising attorney and certifying that the formerly admitted attorney's activities will be monitored for compliance with this subdivision (j). The supervising attorney and the formerly admitted attorney shall file a notice with the Disciplinary Board immediately upon the termination of the engagement between the formerly admitted attorney and the supervising attorney.
- e. Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(6), which states the supervising attorney shall be subject to disciplinary action for any failure by either the formerly admitted attorney or the supervising attorney to comply with the provisions of this subdivision (j).

### **SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION FOR DISCIPLINE**

44. ODC and Respondent jointly recommend that an appropriate discipline for Respondent's admitted misconduct is a six-month suspension from the practice of law.

45. Respondent consents to that discipline being imposed upon her by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Respondent's affidavit required by Pa.R.D.E. 215 stating, *inter alia*, her consent to the recommended discipline is attached as Exhibit A.

46. In support of ODC and Respondent's joint recommendation, it is respectfully submitted that the following mitigating circumstances are present:

- a. Respondent cooperated with ODC;
- b. Respondent admitted her misconduct and acknowledged the rule violations;
- c. Respondent has taken responsibility for her actions and the actions of Ms. Zell;
- d. Respondent has taken remedial actions;

- e. Respondent has expressed regret, remorse and acceptance of responsibility by admitting to violating the Rules of Professional Conduct and Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, understanding she should be disciplined, and consenting to a six-month suspension of her law license; and
- f. Respondent has no record of discipline in over thirty (30) years as a member of the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

47. The imposition of a six-month suspension is consistent with the range of sanctions imposed in similar cases involving the unauthorized practice of law. By way of example, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania granted joint petitions for discipline on consent and imposed six-month suspensions in:

- a. ***ODC v. Hope Renae D'Oyley***, No. 2107 DD No. 3, No. 137 DB 2014 (2014) (D'Oyley was the Assistant General Counsel and Associate General Counsel for a pharmaceutical company from May 2009 through April 2014 while on administrative suspension);

- b. **ODC v. Megan McCarthy Clark**, No. 2315 DD No. 3, No. 132 DB 2016 (2016) (McCarthy Clark was in-house counsel at three successive companies over a period of approximately four years in Massachusetts despite never being admitted to practice law in Massachusetts or any other jurisdiction other than Pennsylvania and had elected voluntary inactive status in Pennsylvania for the entire period at issue);
- c. **ODC v. Alice Ann Pellegrino**, No. 2409 DD No. 3, No. 130 DB 2017 (2017) (Pellegrino engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and law-related activities in Pennsylvania while on administrative suspension by working as Vice President/Senior Counsel at a securities company, providing legal advice and serving as counsel of record in numerous federal court filings from December 2012 through March 2017);
- d. **ODC v. James J. Vassallo, Jr.**, No. 2511 DD No. 3, No. 45 DB 2018 (2018) (Vassallo acted as in-house counsel, title

agent and president of his title company while on administrative suspension);

- e. **ODC v. Catherine Muldoon**, No. 2582 DD No. 3, 33 DB 2019 (2019) (Muldoon engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and law-related activities in her role as Chief Legal Officer at BDP International, Inc., while on administrative suspension between April 2015 and November 2018);
- f. **ODC v. Andrea Dee Goodrich**, No. 2627 DD No. 3, 102 DB 2019 (2020) (Goodrich worked as a Senior Vice President and Corporate Secretary for over one year at Lincoln Financial Group despite not having an active Pennsylvania license where her job responsibilities included leading a team of corporate attorneys and handling corporate legal matters); and
- g. **ODC v. Jami Segota**, No. 2745 DD No. 3. No. 153 DB 2020 (2020) (Segota engaged in unauthorized practice of law and prohibited law-related activities for over two years while administratively suspended at which time she was the Senior Vice-President, General Counsel and Secretary for

an electronics company and was responsible for the company's legal issues, ethics, compliance, corporate and information security, and regulatory affairs in several countries).

WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Respondent respectfully request that, pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 215(e), 215(g) and 215(i), a three-member panel of the Disciplinary Board review and approve this Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent and file a recommendation with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that Respondent receive a six-month suspension on consent.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL  
THOMAS J. FARRELL,  
Attorney Registration No. 20955,  
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

March 4, 2026  
DATE

Emily R. Provencher  
Emily R. Provencher, Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration Number 309804  
Office of Disciplinary Counsel, District II Office  
820 Adams Avenue, Suite 170  
Trooper, PA 19403  
(610) 650-8210

2/9/26

DATE

Keila M Gilbert

Keila M. Gilbert

Respondent

Attorney Registration Number 68276

3/2/26

DATE

James C. Schwartzman

James C. Schwartzman, Esquire

Counsel for Respondent

Attorney Registration Number 16199

**VERIFICATION**

The statements contained in the foregoing *Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d)*, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge or information and belief and are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S.A. §4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

March 4, 2026  
DATE

Emily R. Provencher  
Emily R. Provencher, Esquire  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration Number 309804

2/9/26  
DATE

Keila M. Gilbert  
Keila M. Gilbert  
Respondent  
Attorney Registration Number 68276

3/2/26  
DATE

James C. Schwartzman  
James C. Schwartzman, Esquire  
Counsel for Respondent  
Attorney Registration Number 16199

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,:	No.	DB 2026
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	
	:	Attorney Reg. No. 68276
KEILA M. GILBERT,	:	
Respondent	:	(Bucks County)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I am this day serving the foregoing document upon all parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of Administrative Order of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated April 7, 2020 (relating to electronic service upon a respondent-attorney).

Via First Class and E-Mail, as follows:

Keila M. Gilbert  
c/o James C. Schwartzman, Esquire  
Stevens & Lee  
620 Freedom Business Center, Suite 200  
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406  
[james.schwartzman@stevenslee.com](mailto:james.schwartzman@stevenslee.com)

Dated: March 5, 2026



---

Emily R. Provencher, Esquire  
Disciplinary Counsel  
Attorney Registration No. 309804  
Office of Disciplinary Counsel  
820 Adams Avenue, Suite 170  
Trooper, PA 19403

# **EXHIBIT A**

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, :	No.	DB 2026
Petitioner :		
v. :		
		Attorney Reg. No. 68276
KEILA M. GILBERT, :		
Respondent :		(Bucks County)

**AFFIDAVIT UNDER RULE 215(d), Pa.R.D.E.**

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA:  
COUNTY OF BUCKS:

KEILA M. GILBERT, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and hereby submits this affidavit consenting to the recommendation of a six-month suspension from the practice of law in Pennsylvania in conformity with Pa.R.D.E. 215(d) and further states as follows:

1. She is an attorney admitted to the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on June 7, 1993 and is currently on retired status.
2. She desires to submit a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d).
3. Her consent is freely and voluntarily rendered; she is not being subjected to coercion or duress, and she is fully aware of the implications of submitting this affidavit.

4. She is aware that there is presently pending a proceeding into allegations that she has been guilty of misconduct as set forth in the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d) (“Joint Petition”) to which this affidavit is attached.

5. She acknowledges that the material facts set forth in the Joint Petition are true.

6. She submits this affidavit because she knows that if charges predicated upon the matter under investigation were filed, or continued to be prosecuted in the pending proceeding, she could not successfully defend against them.

7. She acknowledges that she is fully aware of her right to consult and employ counsel to represent her in the instant proceeding. She has retained, consulted and acted upon the advice of James C. Schwartzman, Esquire, in connection with her decision to execute the Joint Petition.


It is understood that the statements made herein are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S.A. §4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Signed this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026.

Keila M. Gilbert  
Keila M. Gilbert

Sworn to and subscribed  
before me this 09 day  
of February, 2026.

[Signature]  
Notary Public



**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Case Records Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Submitted by: Office of Disciplinary Counsel

Signature: Emily R. Provencher

Name: Emily R. Provencher

Attorney No. (if applicable): 309804