

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

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL	:	No. 94 DB 2013
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Attorney Registration No. 42478
	:	
MARGARET M. STUSKI	:	
Respondent	:	(Cumberland County)

PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Margaret M. Stuski, you stand before the Disciplinary Board, your professional peers and members of the public for the imposition of a Public Reprimand. It is an unpleasant task to publicly reprimand one who has been granted the privilege of membership in the bar of this Commonwealth. Yet as repugnant as this task may be, it has been deemed necessary that you receive this public discipline. We note that you agreed to a Public Reprimand by a joint petition in support of discipline on consent.

Ms. Stuski, in an attempt to collect a disputed claim from Peter Brandow and Stephen Spielman, on March 9, 2009, you filed as the sole petitioning creditor an Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition in the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, against Brandow Chrysler Jeep claiming "an undisputed, non-conditional" \$500,000 in "Legal Fees." The petition was dismissed on May 14, 2009, for failure to effectuate service.

On June 29, 2009, you signed and subsequently filed Involuntary petitions in the Bankruptcy Court against Express Car and Truck Rental, Inc. and Repete Associates, claiming "an undisputed, non-conditional" \$500,000 in "Legal fees, business fees" against Express and \$500,000 in "Legal fees" against Repete. The Petitions were

dismissed on July 20, 2009, as they lacked any reasonable factual and legal foundation. By Order dated November 9, 2010, United States Bankruptcy Judge Eric L. Frank awarded attorney fees to the Brandow Group in the amount of \$26,495.00

Your conduct in this matter has violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct:


1. RPC 3.1 – A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law.
2. RPC 8.4(d) – It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.

We note you have not received professional discipline in any other matters. You admitted and acknowledged engaging in the misconduct upon which this disciplinary prosecution is based, and you expressed sincere remorse for failing to adequately research your course of action before you filed the involuntary bankruptcy petitions. You paid in full the attorney fees imposed by the court.

Ms. Stuski, your conduct in this matter is now fully public. This Public Reprimand is a matter of public record.

As you stand before the Board today, we remind you that you have a continuing obligation to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct and Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement. This Public Reprimand is proof that Pennsylvania lawyers will not be permitted to engage in conduct that falls below professional standards. Be mindful that any future dereliction will subject you to disciplinary action.

This Public Reprimand shall be posted on the Disciplinary Board's website at www.padisciplinaryboard.org.




Designated Member
The Disciplinary Board of the
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

Administered by a designated panel of three Members of The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on March 27, 2015.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The undersigned, Respondent in the above proceeding, herewith acknowledges that the above Public Reprimand was administered in his presence and in the presence of the designated panel of The Disciplinary Board at Courtroom #3002, Pennsylvania Judicial Center, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on March 27, 2015.



Margaret M. Stuski