

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	No. 3093 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
Petitioner	:	No. 87 DB 2025
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Registration No. 29361
	:	
PAUL T. SOSNOWSKI,	:	(Philadelphia)
	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 22nd of December, 2025, 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 Paul T. Sosnowski is suspended on consent from the Bar of 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 12/22/2025

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	87 DB 2025
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	
	:	Atty. Reg. No. 29361
PAUL T. SOSNOWSKI,	:	
Respondent	:	(Philadelphia 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 Michael D. Gottsch, Disciplinary Counsel, and Respondent, Paul T. Sosnowski, Esquire (“Respondent”), 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:

PARTIES TO DISCIPLINE ON CONSENT

1. Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, ODC, whose principal office is situated at Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Pennsylvania Judicial Center, Suite 2700, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, 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 to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to prosecute all disciplinary proceedings brought in accordance with the provisions of the Enforcement Rules.

2. Respondent was born on October 20, 1953, is currently 72 years old, and was admitted to the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on April 30, 1979.

FILED
11/14/2025
The Disciplinary Board of the
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

Respondent is on active status in Pennsylvania, and his last registered address is 7321 McCallum Street, Philadelphia, PA 19119.

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

4. Respondent has no prior record of discipline.

5. Respondent's affidavit stating, *inter alia*, his consent to the recommended discipline is attached as Exhibit A.

SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ADMITTED

CHARGE I: THE WRIGHT MATTER

6. On November 9, 2021, Rita Wright filed a complaint in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas Civil Division against MJR Enterprises, case ID 211100743.

7. By Amended Complaint filed on June 13, 2023, Wright added Matthew Roane, Sr., and Denise Roane as defendants.

8. On or about July 14, 2023, Respondent was retained by the Roanes to represent all defendants.

9. The scope of Respondent's representation included finishing answering discovery requests from Wright, obtaining discovery from Wright and from third parties, and preparing for trial.

10. At Respondent's request, Mr. Roane fully paid a lump sum fee of \$5,180.00 for Respondent's representation.

11. Respondent does not maintain professional liability insurance of at least \$100,000 per occurrence and \$300,000 in the aggregate per year, subject to commercially reasonable deductibles, retention or co-insurance, nor did Respondent

maintain such insurance during the period when Respondent represented the Roanes and MJR.

12. When Respondent undertook to represent the Roanes and MJR, Respondent failed to inform Mr. and Mrs. Roane in writing that Respondent did not have professional liability insurance of at least \$100,000 per occurrence and \$300,000 in the aggregate per year, subject to commercially reasonable deductibles, retention or co-insurance.

13. On July 14, 2023, Respondent entered his appearance on behalf of the Roanes and MJR enterprises.

14. Pursuant to a July 24, 2023, revised case management order, all discovery was scheduled to be completed no later than October 2, 2023.

15. From July 24, 2023, to October 2, 2023, Respondent did not serve any discovery requests, nor did Respondent respond to interrogatories and requests for production of documents that had been served by Wright. This is so, even though:

- a. Robert M. Reibstein, an attorney friend of the Roanes reminded Respondent by phone to issue subpoenas to obtain discovery; and
- b. Reibstein called Respondent again in September 2023 to remind Respondent about obtaining discovery for trial. Respondent promised him on the phone that he would prepare subpoenas that week.

16. Respondent failed to prepare any subpoenas during the discovery period.

17. On October 2, 2023, Wright filed a motion to compel interrogatory answers and production of documents.

18. Respondent failed to respond to the motion.

19. On October 24, 2023, Judge Abbe Fletman granted Plaintiff's motion to

compel and ordered Mr. and Mrs. Roane to provide full and complete responses without objections within twenty (20) days.

20. That order was served on Respondent that day as counsel for the Roanes.

21. Respondent failed to notify the Roanes of the order or to comply with the order by producing the required discovery.

22. On November 26, 2024, Wright filed a motion for sanctions for non-compliance with the discovery order.

23. Respondent failed to respond to the motion.

24. By Order dated December 13, 2023, Judge Joshua Roberts granted Plaintiff's motion for sanctions and ordered the Roanes to provide full and complete responses to Plaintiff's discovery without objection within ten (10) days, along with \$100 payable to the Plaintiff.

25. On or about December 13, 2023, the order was served on Respondent as counsel for the Roanes.

26. Respondent failed to notify the Roanes of this order or to produce the required discovery.

27. In or around December 2023, Reibstein called Respondent asking about the trial schedule. Respondent told him that he would prepare the Roanes for trial in January 2024.

28. On December 27, 2023, Wright filed a motion for sanctions for non-compliance with the discovery order.

29. Respondent filed an answer to the motion on January 11, 2024, and Respondent supplemented that answer on January 18, 2024.

30. On February 22, 2024, Judge Roberts granted Plaintiff's motion for sanctions and ordered the Roanes to provide "full, complete, and verified answers along with supporting documentation to interrogatory numbers 11,13,14,16,23, and 24 by end of business, Tuesday, February 27, 2024 or they shall be precluded in presenting any evidence at the time of trial."

31. On February 22, 2024, the order was served on Respondent as counsel for the Roanes.

32. Respondent failed to notify the Roanes of this order.

33. On February 29, 2024, the court listed March 5, 2024, as the trial date.

34. Respondent made an appointment with the Roanes and Reibstein to meet at Reibstein's condominium at 1:00 PM on March 3, 2024, to prepare for trial.

35. Respondent failed to appear on March 3, 2024, leaving the Roanes and Reibstein waiting for Respondent for six (6) hours.

36. Respondent abandoned the Roanes and MJR on the eve of trial in their case.

37. On the same day, March 3, 2024, Reibstein reviewed the case docket, and for the first time the Roanes learned of the three orders against them for discovery non-compliance.

38. Reibstein then called Robert Morris, Esquire to assist the Roanes and MJR.

39. On March 4, 2024, Morris entered his appearance on behalf of the Roanes and MJR and filed an emergency motion for a continuance of the trial.

40. During the trial on or about March 6, 2024, Judge Roberts struck the emergency motion for a continuance, stated that the Roanes would not be permitted to

introduce any evidence, and advised Morris to settle the case.

41. The case was settled on the record following a settlement conference in court, with the Roanes agreeing to pay Wright \$22,500.00 within thirty (30) days.

42. Respondent paid \$13,000.00 toward the settlement amount in exchange for a release from Mr. and Mrs. Roane.

43. In addition, Respondent contributed \$2,500 to the Roanes to defray the expense of their obtaining alternate representation.

44. On May 17, 2024, ODC sent Respondent a DB-7 letter (Request for Statement of Respondent's Position).

45. Respondent's statement of position was due 30 days from May 17, 2024.

46. On May 20, 2024, Respondent called Disciplinary Counsel to request a one-week extension, to June 24, 2024, in which to answer the DB-7 letter. Disciplinary Counsel agreed to this and informed Respondent of a joint program of the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia Bar Associations whereby Respondent might be able to obtain a lawyer to represent him on a *pro bono* basis in responding to the DB-7 letter.

47. When Respondent's extended deadline arrived, he requested an additional extension, until July 1st. When that deadline approached, Respondent requested an extension until July 19th, to which ODC agreed. That deadline passed without response.

48. Respondent, on multiple subsequent occasions, promised specific dates on which he would submit his answer by email or hand-delivery. Each time those dates fell by the wayside only for Respondent to promise yet a new answer date.

49. Respondent professed to be working on the answer but in fact he was not.

50. Subsequently, Respondent promised that he would submit his statement of

position on specific dates which, each time, Respondent did not honor, specifically: July 26, 27, and 29, 2024, September 30, 2024, October 1, 2024, and October 2, 2024.

51. On October 2, 2024, Respondent emailed Disciplinary Counsel, stating, “I did reach out [for] help from the PA Bar that you recommended.”

52. Subsequently, Lowell Raeder, Esquire committed to represent Respondent in answering the DB-7 letter. Raeder submitted Respondent’s verified statement of position on November 8, 2025.

53. The DB-7 letter contained 40 paragraphs of allegations, most of which are set forth in the paragraphs above.

54. Except for three paragraphs of the DB-7 letter that Respondent “denied as stated” because he lacked knowledge of the truth of the allegations, Respondent admitted all but six of the allegations.

55. With respect to Respondent’s admissions that were tantamount to admissions of wrongdoing in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, Respondent attributed most of such violations to his alcoholism and drinking during the periods of time at issue.

56. Despite his awareness that his physical or mental condition materially impaired his ability to represent the Roanes and MJR, Respondent failed to withdraw from the representation.

57. By his conduct as alleged in Paragraphs 3 through 56 above, Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct:

- a. RPC 1.1, which provides that a lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal

knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

- b. RPC 1.3 which provides that a lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.
- c. RPC 1.4(a)(2) which provides that a lawyer shall reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished.
- d. RPC 1.4(a)(3) which provides that a lawyer shall keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter.
- e. RPC 1.4(b) which provides that a lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.
- f. RPC 1.4(c) which provides that a lawyer in private practice shall inform a new client in writing if the lawyer does not have professional liability insurance of at least \$100,000 per occurrence and \$300,000 in the aggregate per year, subject to commercially reasonable deductibles, retention or co-insurance, and shall inform existing clients in writing at any time the lawyer's professional liability insurance drops below either of those amounts or the lawyer's professional liability insurance is terminated.
- g. RPC 1.16(a)(2), which provides that a lawyer shall withdraw from representing a client if the lawyer's physical or mental condition materially impairs the lawyer's ability to represent the client.
- h. RPC 8.4(a) which provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to

violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct.

CHARGE II: THE DUI MATTER

58. On August 20, 2018, Respondent was adjudged guilty in New Jersey of Operating a Motor Vehicle Under the Influence of Liquor or Drugs, in violation of N.J. Stat. § 39:4-50, in Ticket No. EWT 128952 (East Windsor Twp., NJ).

59. Respondent was sentenced to the 12-hour program of the Intoxicated Drivers Resource Center (IDRC) and a 3-month license revocation.

60. On March 14, 2022, Respondent pled guilty to Driving Under the Influence ("DUI"), in violation of 75 Pa.C.S. § 3802(c) (highest rate of alcohol, .16% or higher), in *Commonwealth v. Paul Thaddeus Sosnowski*, No. CP-46-CR-0002792-2020 (C.P. Montgomery Cty.).

61. Respondent was sentenced to imprisonment of 3 days to 6 months, fined \$1,000, and required to pay the costs of prosecution.

62. Respondent failed to timely report this conviction to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel as required by Pa.R.D.E. 214(a).

63. The allegations in the preceding five paragraphs were set forth in a DB-7 letter sent to Respondent on December 18, 2024.

64. Respondent represented himself with respect to responding to the DUI DB-7 letter.

65. Respondent initially requested an extension to answer to February 3, 2025 (from January 17th), to which ODC consented.

66. Subsequently, Respondent sent a series of emails to Disciplinary Counsel,

catalogued below, in which Respondent continually professed that he was ill and not drinking, and gave other reasons for failing to answer as well:

- a. 1/27/25 -- "I'm aware of [my 2/3/25 deadline] and have it on my calendar. I will hand deliver it to your office if acceptable."
- b. 2/3/25 -- "I will not be able to respond until tomorrow."
- c. 2/5/25 -- "I would greatly appreciate and extension until tomorrow to respond"
- d. 2/10/25 -- "I expect to have my Answers ... by the end of the day."
- e. 2/11/25 -- "I will send the response today."
- f. 2/19/25 -- "I expect to have the response submitted by the end of tomorrow."
- g. 2/25/25 -- "I will complete the responses ... by the end of tomorrow."

67. Respondent's 2/25/25 email was the last time he communicated with Disciplinary Counsel about his response deadline.

68. A period of more than 6 months expired since Respondent first requested an extension.

69. Respondent never submitted a statement of position in response to the December 18, 2024, DB-7 letter.

70. By his conduct as alleged in Paragraphs 58 through 69 above, Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct and Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement:

- a. RPC 8.4(b), which states 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. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(1), which states that conviction of a crime is a ground for discipline.
- c. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(7) which states, as a ground for discipline, 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.
- d. Pa.R.D.E. 214(a), which states that an attorney convicted of a crime shall report the fact of such conviction within 20 days to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

JOINT RECOMMENDATION FOR DISCIPLINE

71. Petitioner and Respondent jointly recommend that the appropriate discipline for Respondent's misconduct is a one-year and one-day suspension.

72. Respondent hereby consents to the discipline being imposed upon him by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Attached to this Petition as Exhibit A is Respondent's executed Affidavit as required by Pa.R.D.E. 215(d)(1) through (4).

73. In support of the Joint Petition, the parties respectfully submit that the following mitigating circumstances are present:

- a. Respondent accepts full responsibility for his misconduct and is remorseful;
- b. Respondent has cooperated with Disciplinary Counsel in jointly agreeing to discipline on consent;

- c. Respondent understands discipline is necessary and appropriate, and has expressed a willingness to accept discipline in the form of a one-year and one-day suspension;
- d. Respondent has no history of discipline in 46 years of law practice;
- e. Respondent did not receive undue pecuniary gain to the detriment of his clients as a result of his conduct; and
- f. Respondent ultimately acknowledged his wrongdoing to his clients and apologized to them for his actions.

74. Respondent also wishes for the following circumstances to be considered in connection with this Petition:

- a. Even though not qualifying for *Braun* mitigation, Respondent's alcoholism and intoxication during his representation of the Roanes during their court case contributed to his mishandling of the case;
- b. The Roanes had paid Respondent \$5,180 in attorney's fees. Prior to the filing of these disciplinary cases, Respondent twice apologized to the Roanes for mishandling their case and contributed \$13,000 to the \$22,500 settlement amount they had to pay to their litigation adversary and an additional \$2,500 for them to obtain another lawyer to represent them in the case.
- c. Respondent is attending two AA meetings per day to help address his alcoholism.

75. In Pennsylvania, there is no *per se* discipline for a particular type of misconduct; instead, each case is reviewed individually while being mindful of precedent

and the need for consistency. ***Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Lucarini***, 472 A.2d 186, 190 (Pa. 1983).

76. The parties believe, and therefore aver, that their recommendation for a one-year and one-day suspension is consistent with other comparable cases:

- a. In ***Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Bret Keisling***, No. 65 DB 2017 (D.Bd. Rpt. 6/19/2018) (S.Ct. Order 8/30/2018), the respondent, with no history of discipline in 13 years of practice, and who was on the Board of LCL, was suspended for one year and one day for, in one client matter, violating, *inter alia*, RPCs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(2), 1.4(b), 1.4(c), and 1.16(d). He failed to respond to the DB-7 letter and the Petition for Discipline. The Board found that respondent had credibly testified to his struggles with mental health issues, drug addiction, and long-term alcoholism. The respondent did not dispute the disciplinary charges against him. He expressed remorse and admitted to the alleged rule violations. He stated that he had approximately 5 clients but maintained non-legal employment providing trustee services to employee-owned companies.
- b. In ***Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Brian Oliver Williams***, 38 DB 2022 (S.Ct. Order 4/19/2022) the respondent, with no history of discipline in 14 years of law practice, was suspended for one year and one day on consent for his neglect and mishandling of multiple client matters where, although he did not qualify for ***Braun*** mitigation, his misconduct was attributable in part to mental health issues, including

suspected alcohol use observed by law firm office personnel. The respondent had denied an alcohol problem but admitted to anxiety and depression issues which, in one instance led to the respondent's self-described nervous breakdown. In one of the client matters, the respondent abandoned his client by failing to appear for a pretrial conference in the client's DUI case and failing to advise the client that he would not be appearing. The Petition cited, *inter alia*, **Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Peter Jude Caroff**, No. 42 DB 2019 (D.Bd. Rpt. 2/25/2020) (S.Ct. Order 6/5/2020), where the Board had stated that a suspension of one year and one day protects the public from "substandard representation by an attorney not able to meet the requirements of the profession."

- c. In **Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Tangie Marie Boston**, 99 DB 2018 (D.Bd. Rpt. 12/10/2019) (S.Ct. Order 2/12/2020), the respondent, with no history of discipline in 22 years of law practice, was suspended for one year and one day for violations of RPCs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a)(3) and (4), 1.4(b), and 1.16(d) in multiple client matters. The Board stated that "a suspension of one year and one day is appropriate and sufficient to address the misconduct, particularly where, as in the instant matter, the attorney had not engaged in dishonest or deceitful conduct." D.Bd. Rpt. at 27.
- d. In **Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Lon VanDusen Hughes**, 128 DB 2021 (D.Bd. Rpt. 8/22/2022) (S.Ct. Order 10/25/2022), the respondent,

with no history of discipline in 7 years of practice, was suspended for one year and one day. He pleaded guilty to a DUI which he failed to report to ODC. As aggravating factors, after his sentencing he pleaded guilty to three alcohol-related summary offenses. He had also been found guilty of a similar offense prior to his sentencing. The respondent failed to respond to the DB-7 letter or the Petition for Discipline and, though he attended the prehearing conference where he misbehaved, he failed to attend his disciplinary hearing. He was found by the hearing committee to have violated the same rules that Respondent in the current case admits to violating in regard to his DUI conviction.

77. Respondent recognizes the need to get his life in order and to then petition for reinstatement and demonstrate his fitness. Accordingly, he consents to a suspension of one year and one day.

78. The parties respectfully suggest that Respondent's lack of prior discipline, admission of wrongdoing, expression of remorse, and cooperation with Disciplinary Counsel in consenting to discipline make a one year and one day suspension the appropriate discipline for Respondent.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Respondent respectfully request that:

- a. Pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 215(e) and 215(g), a Three-Member Panel of the Disciplinary Board review and approve the Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent and file a recommendation with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that Respondent receive a one-year and one-day license suspension; and

- b. Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(i), the Three-Member Panel of the Disciplinary Board recommend the Pennsylvania Supreme Court enter an order for Respondent to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this matter, and that under Pa.R.D.E. 208(g)(1) all expenses be paid by Respondent within 30 days after the notice of taxed expenses is sent to Respondent.

Respectfully and jointly submitted,
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
THOMAS J. FARRELL
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

11/14/25
DATE

Michael D. Gottsch
Michael D. Gottsch
Disciplinary Counsel

11/14/25
DATE

Paul T. Sosnowski
Paul T. Sosnowski
Respondent

VERIFICATION

The statements contained in the foregoing *Joint Petition In Support of Discipline on Consent* are true and correct to the best of our 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.

11/14/25
DATE

Michael D. Gottsch
Michael D. Gottsch, Esquire
Disciplinary Counsel

11/14/25
DATE

Paul T. Sosnowski
Paul T. Sosnowski, Esquire
Respondent

EXHIBIT A

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	87 DB 2025
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	
	:	Atty. Reg. No. 29361
PAUL T. SOSNOWSKI,	:	
Respondent	:	(Philadelphia County)

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

Paul T. Sosnowski, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and submits this affidavit consenting to the recommendation of a one-year and one-day license suspension in conformity with Pa.R.D.E. 215(d), and further states as follows:

1. He is an attorney admitted to the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on or about April 30, 1979.
2. He desires to submit a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 215(d).
3. His consent is freely and voluntarily rendered; he is not being subjected to coercion or duress, and he is fully aware of the implications of submitting this affidavit.
4. He is aware that there is presently pending a proceeding regarding allegations that he 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) to which this affidavit is attached.
5. He acknowledges that the material facts set forth in the Joint Petition are true.
6. He submits this affidavit because he knows that if charges predicated upon the matter continued to be prosecuted in the pending proceeding, he could not successfully defend against them.

7. He acknowledges that he is fully aware of his right to consult and employ counsel to represent him in the instant proceeding and he has declined to employ counsel.

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 14 day of November, 2025.

Paul T. Sosnowski

Paul T. Sosnowski, Esquire

Sworn to and subscribed
Before me on this 14th
day of November, 2025

Rosanne DeFlavia
Notary Public



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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,	:	87 DB 2025
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	
	:	Atty. Reg. No. 29361
PAUL T. SOSNOWSKI,	:	
Respondent	:	(Philadelphia 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 204 Pa. Code §89.22 (relating to service by a participant).

First Class Mail and Email, as follows:

Paul T. Sosnowski
7321 McCallum Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19119
paultsosnowski@yahoo.com

and hand-delivery

Dated: 11/14/25

Michael D. Gottsch

Michael D. Gottsch
Disciplinary Counsel
Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District I Office
1601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 560-6296

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

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

Submitted by: Office of Disciplinary Counsel

Signature: Michael D. Gottsch

Name: Michael D. Gottsch

Attorney No. (if applicable): 39421