

Ms. Vernacchio to be close friends. It is denied that the interaction occurred in Judge DiClaudio's judicial chambers; rather, the interaction took place in Judge DiClaudio's robing room.

5. Denied as stated. By way of further response, Judge DiClaudio met with Judge Shaffer and Ms. Vernacchio for approximately thirty (30) minutes before a knock was heard on the door, signaling that the next case was ready to be heard. It was at this time that Ms. Vernacchio stepped toward the door, and Judge DiClaudio signaled for her to wait a second. The characterization that this interaction occurred so Judge DiClaudio and Judge Shaffer could speak privately is emphatically denied.

6. Admitted in part and denied in part. It is admitted that Dwayne Jones pled guilty and was scheduled to be sentenced by Judge Shaffer on June 16, 2025. It is denied that Judge DiClaudio showed Judge Shaffer a piece of paper on which was written Judge Shaffer's courtroom number and the name of Dwayne Jones. By way of further response, Judge DiClaudio was given a generic business card by Dwayne Jones at a concert a couple of weeks prior, which he placed in the back of his phone case. At that time, Mr. Jones explained to Judge DiClaudio that he was due to be sentenced before Judge Shaffer. Judge DiClaudio told Mr. Jones that Judge Shaffer "was a good judge who always does the right thing." After this initial encounter, Judge DiClaudio forgot the business card was in his phone case. Before this encounter, Judge DiClaudio had never met Mr. Jones or knew who he was.

7. Denied as stated. By way of further response, as Judge DiClaudio was leaving the robing room to hear the next case, he remembered that Mr. Jones' business card was in his phone case and showed it to Judge Shaffer. He briefly explained to Judge Shaffer the prior interaction he had with Mr. Jones at the concert, where he recited the same line he told Mr. Jones: "I told him you were a good judge who always does the right thing." This statement was intended solely as a

compliment to a respected colleague to whom Judge DiClaudio viewed himself as his mentor. Nothing was insinuated or intended to suggest what Judge Shaffer should do in Mr. Jones' case going forward.

8. Admitted in part and denied in part. It is denied that Judge DiClaudio "ripped the paper up," as there was no paper but instead a business card as described above. By way of further response, at the conclusion of the above-referenced exchange, Judge DiClaudio did not rip the business card but instead discarded it in the trash can and left the robing room.

9. Denied. Strict proof is hereby demanded at trial. By way of further answer, Judge DiClaudio has no personal knowledge of what, if anything, Judge Shaffer reported to Administrative Judge Daniel Anders or Supervising Judge Rose DeFino-Nastasi.

10. Admitted in part and denied in part. It is admitted that following the above-described interaction, Judge Shaffer recused himself from Mr. Jones' sentencing, which was reassigned to another judge, as reflected in the docket. It is denied that any conduct by Judge DiClaudio necessitated or caused Judge Shaffer's recusal.

11. Admitted in part and denied in part. It is admitted that on June 25, 2025, Administrative Judge Anders limited Judge DiClaudio's judicial assignment to drafting and filing Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) opinions for matters on appeal to the Pennsylvania Superior Court. It is denied that this reassignment was made because of any misconduct.

12. Denied as stated. Strict proof is hereby demanded at trial. By way of further answer, Judge DiClaudio has no personal knowledge of whether Mr. Jones and Meek Mill are social acquaintances. It is emphatically denied that any attempt to influence a judicial proceeding ever occurred or that any conduct by Judge DiClaudio was in any way connected to Meek Mill.

13. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

14. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

15. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

16. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

17. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

18. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

19. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

20. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

21. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

22. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

23. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

24. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

25. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

26. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

27. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

28. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

29. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

30. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

31. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

32. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

33. This paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, it is denied.

Respectfully submitted,

**VAN DER VEEN, HARTSHORN,
LEVIN & LINDHEIM**

Date: November 13, 2025

BY: */s/ Michael T. van der Veen*
Michael T. van der Veen, Esquire
Attorney for Respondent

VERIFICATION

I, Michael T. van der Veen, Esquire, verify that the statements made in the foregoing Answer to Complaint are true and correct. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Respectfully submitted,

**VAN DER VEEN, HARTSHORN,
LEVIN & LINDHEIM**

Date: November 13, 2025

BY: */s/ Michael T. van der Veen*
Michael T. van der Veen, Esquire
Attorney for Respondent

VAN DER VEEN, HARTSHORN, LEVIN & LINDHEIM

BY: Michael T. van der Veen
Attorney ID No. 75616
1219 Spruce Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
mtv@mtvlaw.com
P: (215) 546-1000
F: (215) 546-8529

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

IN RE:
JUDGE SCOTT DICLAUDIO
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
PHILADELPHIA COMPLAINT

:
:
: **COMMONWEALTH OF**
: **PENNSYLVANIA COURT OF**
: **JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE**
:
: **NO. 2 JD 2025**
:
:
:

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Michael T. van der Veen, Esquire, 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.

Respectfully submitted,

**VAN DER VEEN, HARTSHORN,
LEVIN & LINDHEIM**

Date: November 13, 2025

BY: /s/ *Michael T. van der Veen*
Michael T. van der Veen, Esquire
Attorney for Respondent

