

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of	:	No. 2507 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
DAVID TEVIS SHULICK	:	No. 117 DB 2018
	:	
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT	:	Attorney Registration No. 74333
	:	
	:	(Montgomery County)

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 7th day of July, 2026, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted. Petitioner is directed to pay the expenses incurred by the Disciplinary Board in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement. See Pa.R.D.E. 218(f).

A True Copy Nicole Traini
As Of 07/07/2026

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of	:	No. 2507 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
	:	No. 117 DB 2018
DAVID TEVIS SHULICK	:	
	:	Attorney Registration No. 74333
	:	
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT	:	(Montgomery 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 218(c)(5) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above captioned Petition for Reinstatement.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following factual findings:

Background and Criminal Conduct

1. Petitioner, David Tevis Shulick, was born in 1969 and was admitted to the practice of law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1995. He was admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1995. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 43.

2. After working for a few law firms in Philadelphia, Shulick opened his own practice in August 1999 and acquired a business that operated schools. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 44, 65.

3. Shulick's company, Delaware Valley High School Management Corporation ("DVHS"), was involved in operating alternative schools for the state and school districts. As of 2009, DVHS operated approved schools at locations in Reading, Bucks-Montco, and on Kelly Drive in Philadelphia, which was named the Judith B. Shulick Memorial Alternative School after Shulick's mother. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 65-67.

4. In connection with the Kelly Drive school, DVHS entered into a contract with Chaka Fattah, Jr.'s company, 259 Strategies, LLC, as a certified minority vendor in accordance with requirements of the School District of Philadelphia. This contract was for the provision of social support services for all of the DVHS schools. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 68-69, 71-73.

5. In July 2010, Shulick was contacted by the School District of Philadelphia, which asked that DVHS take over the Southwest Philadelphia School and have it open in September 2010. Shulick and DVHS performed the work to have the school open on time. Chaka Fattah, Jr., was on the team involved with Southwest School. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 69-70, 73.

6. The budget for Southwest School was prepared by the company that operated the school before DVHS took over and DVHS approved that it be included in its contract. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 75.

7. Shulick signed the contract that contained the budget, under which DVHS received \$1 million per school year from the School District of Philadelphia, or \$2 million total. DVHS did not adhere to the budget for Southwest School. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 76-77.

8. On October 11, 2016, Shulick was charged by indictment with conspiring with Chaka Fattah, Jr. to embezzle from a program receiving federal funds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 (Count 1); embezzling funds from a program receiving federal funds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(A) (Count 2); devising a scheme to defraud the School District of Philadelphia, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Counts 3-6); devising a scheme to defraud PNC Bank (from November 2009 to July 2010), in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1344 (Count 7); making a false statement to a bank (related to settling a loan for Chaka Fattah, Jr. that understated Fattah's income), in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1014 (Count 8); and filing false tax returns for tax years 2009, 2010, and 2011, in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7206(1) (Counts 9-11). Stip. 2. As to Counts 9-11, Shulick filed amended returns and paid the taxes due before he was indicted. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 97-98.

9. On October 13, 2016, Shulick was arraigned on the charges in the indictment. Before trial, the government moved to dismiss the wire fraud charges (Counts 3-6). Stip. 3.

10. On May 8, 2018, after a three-week trial, the jury found Shulick guilty on all charges presented to it. Stip. 4.

11. Shulick filed a notice of his jury verdict with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”), pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 214.

12. On July 6, 2018, ODC filed Shulick’s Certificate of Conviction with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and requested that the Court issue a rule to show cause why Shulick should not be placed on temporary suspension.

13. The Court issued a Rule to Show Cause on July 26, 2018.

14. On August 7, 2018, Shulick filed an Answer to Rule to Show Cause, set forth his intention to appeal his convictions, and requested that the Court allow him to continue practicing law.

15. By Order dated September 11, 2018, the Court placed Shulick on temporary suspension under Pa.R.D.E. 214(d)(2). Stip. 6.

16. On September 26, 2018, Shulick filed with the Board a verified statement of compliance under Pa.R.D.E. 217(e)(1). Stip. 7.

17. On September 27, 2018, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania imposed a sentence on Shulick of 60 months imprisonment and a term of supervised release of three years on Counts 1, 2, 7, and 8. For Counts 9, 10, and 11, the Court imposed a sentence of 20 months imprisonment on each count, to be served consecutively to each other but concurrently to the sentence on Counts 1, 2, 7, and 8, and supervised release of one year. Stip. 8.

18. According to the Criminal Monetary Penalties portion of Shulick's Judgment of Conviction, Shulick was ordered to pay a \$700.00 special assessment, a \$20,000 fund, and \$764,735.00 in restitution (\$5,000 to PNC Bank and \$759,735.00 to the School District of Philadelphia). The court waived the interest requirement for the fine and restitution for Shulick, and restitution in the amount of \$764,735.00 was made joint and several with Chaka Fattah, Jr. Stip. 9.

19. After consultation with counsel, including Lisa Mathewson, Esquire, Shulick pursued multiple appeals and other challenges to his convictions and criminal sentence which ultimately were unsuccessful. Stip. 5; N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 159-163, 176-171.

20. In an opinion dated November 15, 2021, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed the judgment of conviction and order of sentence. ODC Exhibit 23.

21. After consultation with counsel, Shulick decided not to file a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, as he was aware of his obligation to his family and to make restitution. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 175.

22. After consultation with counsel, including James Beasley, Jr., M.D., Esquire, Shulick initiated a malpractice suit against his trial lawyers but later withdrew the suit because he wanted to move on with his life. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 111.

23. Shulick's incarceration began on October 30, 2018. On November 19, 2020, Shulick was released early to home confinement, which ended on January 30, 2022. Stip. 38. Thereafter, Shulick remained on supervised release.

24. By Resignation Statement dated September 22, 2023, and filed with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on September 26, 2023, Shulick requested to resign from the practice of law in Pennsylvania. Stip. 10.

25. In his Resignation Statement, Shulick acknowledged that there was a pending disciplinary investigation into allegations that he was guilty of misconduct relating to his criminal convictions in *United States of America v. David T. Shulick*, Docket No. 2:16-cr-00428-HB-1, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and that the material facts upon which his professional misconduct was predicated were true. Stip. 11.

26. By Order dated October 12, 2023, the Court disbarred Shulick on consent, retroactive to September 11, 2018. Stip. 12.

27. On October 13, 2023, Shulick filed with the Board a second verified statement of compliance pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 217(e)(1). Stip. 14.

28. By Order of the Supreme Court of New Jersey dated November 28, 2023, Shulick was disbarred on consent “effective immediately” and further ordered that he be “permanently restrained and enjoined from practicing law” in New Jersey. Stip. 15; ODC Exhibit 14. By Order dated December 5, 2023, the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey similarly ordered that Shulick was disbarred on consent and “restrained and enjoined from practicing law before this Court during such time that he remains disbarred by the Supreme Court of New Jersey and until further order of this Court.” Stip. 15; ODC Exhibit 11.

29. By Order dated May 22, 2024, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit ordered that Shulick be disbarred on consent “effective immediately” and further ordered that Shulick “may not apply for reinstatement until the expiration of five years from the effective date of the disbarment.” Stip. 17; ODC Exhibit 8.

30. By Order dated June 18, 2024, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania disbarred Shulick on consent, retroactive to September 11, 2018, and further ordered that Shulick is disbarred “until further order of this Court.” Stip. 16; ODC Exhibit 5.

31. Prior to his conviction and disbarment, Shulick had never been convicted of a crime or received discipline for any ethics violations. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 45.

Post-Disbarment Activities

Fulfillment of Criminal Sentence

32. From the time his home confinement ended in January 2022 until January 31, 2025, Shulick was under the supervision of the EDPA United States Probation Office. He had no issues relating to noncompliance. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 58; Stip. 20; Pet. Exhibit 37.

33. As of February 3, 2025, Shulick’s restitution balance was \$717,421.57. Stip. 28. From January 2022 through August 2023, Shulick had permission from the court to pay less than the \$1,000 minimum payment per month required by his court-ordered payment plan. Stip. 27. He has paid more than the \$1,000 per month on other occasions and as of the reinstatement hearing, had paid \$20,000 more (by way of a lump sum payment applied to restitution) than the court-ordered schedule. N.T. 97.

Shulick's \$20,000 fine must be paid after restitution has been satisfied. Shulick pays as much as he can and plans to pay it all off. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 96-97, 139-140.

34. On July 16, 2024, Shulick wrote letters of apology to the United States Attorney's Office and the School District of Philadelphia. Stip. 21; Pet. Exs. 21, 22.

Drug Addiction and Treatment

35. Shulick suffered from anxiety prior to 2009 and used marijuana to self-medicate. To stop using marijuana, he began treatment with Dr. Bruce Miller, a psychologist, and Dr. John Rusk, a psychiatrist. Shulick was prescribed Xanax and became addicted to it. During the 2009-2011 time period when Shulick's crimes were committed, Shulick was using marijuana and Xanax every day. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 49-52.

36. Prior to his prison surrender date in 2018, Shulick went through drug detoxification with Dr. Susan Rushing Richter. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 50, 52.

37. While in prison, Shulick voluntarily completed the Non-Residential Drug and Alcohol Program at Fort Dix and voluntarily completed the Residential Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program at FCI Lewisburg. The program at Lewisburg consisted of 1400 hours of extensive residential rehabilitation and cognitive behavioral therapy. Shulick also participated in Alcoholics Anonymous at Lewisburg. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 53; Pet. Ex. 23.

38. After release from prison, Shulick continued cognitive behavioral treatment with Dr. Miller, who later retired. In October 2023, Shulick began treating with Dr. Moss A. Jackson, a psychologist. Shulick treats with Dr. Jackson on a biweekly basis. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 53.

39. Shulick testified at length about his cognitive therapy and how it has taught him coping and problem solving skills. Shulick has learned new attitudes, including humility, responsibility and gratitude. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 53-57, 108-109.

40. Shulick has overcome his addictions to marijuana and Xanax and has been drug-free and sober for six and a half years as of the time of the reinstatement hearing. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 50.

Community Service

41. Prior to his conviction and imprisonment, Shulick engaged in community service. He created a foundation in his mother's memory, which gave scholarships to students, adopted parks, and renovated playgrounds, among other projects. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 84-86. Shulick was on the board of the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers and was involved with the Temple Inns of Court. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 44-45. Shulick was active with the American Israel Political Action Committee, raised money for multiple sclerosis and the ALS Foundation, performed pro bono legal services through the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers, raised money for and worked with the Mayor's Development Program to provide summer jobs to high school students, served on Governor Corbett's Transition Team Education Committee, and participated in Operation Understanding in Philadelphia to promote harmony among different cultures. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 98-100.

42. Since his release from prison, Shulick has engaged in community service with the Jewish Relief Agency in Philadelphia packing and delivering food, serving on the board of the Petey Green Project that supports mentorship of formerly incarcerated youth, volunteering with the Ardmore Bethel Church by providing mentorship and

performing paralegal work, providing paralegal work to a co-worker at ESD regarding a foreclosure, and rejoining the board of the Northwood Community Homeowners Association, where he resides. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 59-63.

43. In connection with the paralegal work he performed, Shulick complied with Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(5). On December 1, 2023, Shulick filed a Notice of Engagement with the Board to perform supervised paralegal work for the pastor of Ardmore Bethel Church. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 60, 61. On February 20, 2024, Shulick filed a Notice of Engagement with the Board to perform supervised paralegal work for his co-worker. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 62, 63.

Employment and Learning in the Law

44. Shulick has been continuously employed since his release from prison. From November 2020 to October 2021, he was employed at WRDC as a managing director overseeing commercial real estate management and development. Since November 2021, Shulick has been employed full-time as Vice-President of Corporate Affairs for Equipment Systems and Devices (“ESD”). He oversees operation of affiliated corporations in the vended laundry industry. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 109, 114-115; Pet. Ex. 1.

45. If reinstated, Shulick intends to serve as counsel for ESD and maintain a small law practice on the side where he can represent clients and make referrals. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 107-108.

46. Shulick completed over 100 hours of continuing legal education during his period of disbarment, in excess of the 36 hours required for reinstatement. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 106.

47. Shulick keeps current with the law by reading *The Legal Intelligencer* and other publications. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 106-107.

The Reinstatement Proceedings at No. 117 DB 2018

48. On July 1, 2024, Shulick filed a Petition for Reinstatement and Reinstatement Questionnaire. He filed supplements on July 2, July 23, and July 26, 2024.

49. ODC conducted an investigation of Shulick's reinstatement petition. Shulick cooperated with ODC by responding to its information and document requests. Stip. 39.

50. In its formal response filed on August 29, 2024, ODC stated it did not contend that Shulick's conduct which led to his disbarment was so serious as to forever preclude his reinstatement under *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Keller*, 506 A.2d 872 (Pa. 1986). ODC outlined several concerns bearing on Shulick's ability to meet his burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3). These concerns generally included the number of years since Shulick's disbarment and the sufficiency of his rehabilitation.

51. A specific concern raised by ODC related to Shulick's pursuit of multiple appeals and other challenges to his conviction and criminal sentence. ODC stated, "[t]he claims raised, multiplicity of motions, and alleged 'context' to his conduct are inconsistent with Mr. Shulick's expressed remorse and claimed acceptance of

responsibility.” ODC stated the issue should be explored at the hearing. ODC Response, p. 3, ¶2.

52. Following the appointment of a District II Hearing Committee (“Committee”), a prehearing conference was held on December 11, 2024.

53. The Committee held a reinstatement hearing on February 12 and 13, 2025. Shulick called eight witnesses and introduced Exhibits 1 through 41 and the Party Stipulations. ODC introduced Exhibits ODC 1 through ODC 41 and did not call any witnesses.

54. Shulick testified on his own behalf. We find his testimony credible.

55. Shulick explained the most serious part of the indictment against him in plain terms: he was charged with criminal misapplication of funds in that he had a company, DVHS, that received more than \$10,000 a year of federal funds from an entity, the School District of Philadelphia, and DVHS did not comply with the budget for the Southwest School, which was a crime in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 77-78.

56. As far as the violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666, Shulick acknowledged he never focused on the Southwest School budget, but rather focused on DVHS’s other three schools. He further admitted that he signed the contract that contained the budget for Southwest School but never read it. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 76, 142.

57. Shulick went to trial and filed appeals because he believed he had a valid defense and exercised his constitutional rights. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 128.

58. Shulick admitted and agreed that he did not comply with the Southwest School budget and that he deviated from the budget and did not spend the funds in accordance with the contract. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 76, 82, 135. He testified, “I don’t dispute that I did not spend that 2 million in accordance with the budget in that contract, I don’t dispute it, and I don’t dispute that, because of that I violated 666.” N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 138-139.

59. When asked by Disciplinary Counsel as to whether he agreed that he embezzled funds for his personal benefit and for the benefit of his co-conspirator, Shulick testified that he agreed he violated 18 U.S.C. § 666. “I agree that I did not spend those funds in accordance with the contract. If that is the term of embezzlement that is used here, then I agree with it. I’m not sitting here trying to say that I don’t take responsibility. Because I do. I was wrong and I’m a felon as a result. I don’t want to get into which words and how they were used and the context. I will tell you right now, I don’t dispute that I did this. I violated 18 U.S.C. 666.” N.T. 2/12/25, p. 135.

60. Shulick accepted responsibility for his violation of 18 USC § 666, bank fraud, and filing false tax returns and expressed remorse multiple times throughout the reinstatement proceeding:

Q: [Shulick’s counsel] Do you accept full responsibility for the crimes you committed 13 to 15 years ago?

A: [Shulick] Unquestionably. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 45.

Q: [Shulick’s counsel] Do you regret your poor decisions and your criminal conduct?

A: [Shulick] Unequivocally. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 46.

Q: [Shulick’s counsel] Do you want to read ... what you want to highlight to the Committee?

A: [Shulick] There is not a single day that goes by when I do not reflect on this case with great pain and anguish, tremendous pain. While I have worked very hard to rehabilitate myself and analyze and reflect about the lack of judgment that led to the behavior, I will always, for the rest of my life, be remorseful. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 47, 48.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] And you accept responsibility that your company did not adhere to the budget for the Southwest School, true?

A: [Shulick] Absolutely, unequivocally 100 percent did not adhere to that budget.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] And you accept responsibility for that?

A: [Shulick] That's why I went to prison. That's why I pay restitution every month. That's why my children had the shame and I live with the shame of being a felon for the rest of my life. That's - - I think about this every single day. I not only accept responsibility, I live it, I live it. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 91-92.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Are you blaming Chaka Fattah or anyone else for your crimes?

A: [Shulick] No. I owned this company [DVHS]. I owned this company, and everything that happened falls on me. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 93.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] And why did you send [the apology letters to the AUSA and the School District of Philadelphia]?

A: [Shulick] To document and make a record of my acceptance of responsibility and remorse and to communicate to Paul McCarthy [from the School District], who I knew personally, and to Michael Donovan, who prosecuted me. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 95.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Do you admit that you filed inaccurate tax returns for the tax years 2009, '10, and '11?

A: [Shulick] I do.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Did you amend your returns and pay all taxes before you were ever charged with that crime, those crimes?

A: [Shulick] I did.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] And was restitution required for the IRS for the taxes?

A: [Shulick] No, there was no restitution required. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 97-98.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Do you admit that you committed bank fraud by sending a letter to PNC on behalf of Chaka Fattah, Jr.?

A: [Shulick] I do. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 98.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Do you specifically accept responsibility for that crime [bank fraud]?

A: [Shulick] I do. I pay the restitution. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 98.

Q: [Shulick's counsel] Are you blaming anyone for your crimes?

A: [Shulick] Not at all. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 110.

61. Shulick testified that he "left society and left [his] wife and children and was incarcerated and did [his] time and did [his] release," accepts responsibility "every day," and his remorse is genuine. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 114, 129, 130, 132.

62. Shulick testified, "I don't know - - I can't change what happened. I can't. But have I done everything that I as a man, as a human being who is 55-years old and a husband and a father, a former lawyer, a citizen can do, I think so." N.T. 2/12/25, p. 111.

63. Shulick further testified:

I don't think there's anything else I can do other than what I've done, from the volunteer work to the mentorship to the paralegal work to being a dad and a father and citizen and trying to help people and everything that I can do to make amends and pay every month restitution and - - and I just don't - - and going to therapy. I mean I have voluntarily - - and nobody told me to do more therapy and continue with Moss Jackson. Nobody told me to do that. Nobody told me to go to RDAP. That wasn't court-ordered. That was a voluntary thing on my part. I had to be accepted into that. I have studied myself, my flaws, my lack of coping skills, how I dealt with pressure, how I kneaded [sic] my anxiety and what triggers it. I have spent so much time studying myself. I am a different person, I understand myself. I understand what to do when I am triggered. I don't need a single drug. I am sober, sober

for six and a half years. ... This is all voluntary. I think it's been genuine. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 111-112.

64. Shulick testified that he is a “completely different person” than he was at the time of his crimes. He is now sober and has coping skills, which he puts to use frequently. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 108-109.

65. Shulick credited his wife and children for what they have been through because of him and acknowledged that he put in a “tremendous” amount of work to keep those relationships intact and rebuild them. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 109-110.

66. Shulick desires reinstatement because he loved practicing law and wants to get back to representing clients. He feels it was a large part of who he was. Shulick loved having the responsibility and the honor of being able to advocate for people. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 107, 113.

67. Shulick presented the credible and uncontroverted testimony of seven additional witnesses.

68. Moss A. Jackson, Ph.D. is a doctor of Clinical Psychology licensed in Pennsylvania and testified as an expert witness. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 183, 187.

69. Shulick was referred to Dr. Jackson by Dr. Miller, who was retiring. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 187-188. Dr. Jackson began treating Shulick in October 2023 and as of the reinstatement hearing date, Dr. Jackson had seen Shulick 33 to 35 times. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 187, 197.

70. Dr. Jackson spoke with Dr. Miller and reviewed some reports about Shulick from other providers. He also interviewed Shulick's wife at one point. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 188-189; Pet. Ex. 23.

71. Dr. Jackson referred Shulick to Dr. Kolson, a clinical psychologist, for psychological testing. No clinical diagnosis resulted from the testing as the findings were normal, although Dr. Kolson found the presence of guilt, failure, and discouragement. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 188-190.

72. Dr. Jackson prepared a report dated July 25, 2024. Pet. Ex. 23. Dr. Jackson reviewed Shulick's diagnosis of major anxiety disorder, his use of prescription drugs and marijuana, and his detoxification and abstention from drugs for the past six or so years. Dr. Jackson reviewed Shulick's criminal history. Dr. Jackson reported that Shulick has expressed sincere remorse and acceptance of responsibility and is ashamed of his criminal actions. Pet. Ex. 23; N.T. 2/12/25, p. 190.

73. Dr. Jackson stated in his report that "It is my professional opinion that David's abuse of these drugs was a substantial factor in contributing, if not the causal factor, for his criminal conduct." N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 191-192.

74. Dr. Jackson explained that a major focus of his therapy has been to help Shulick feel "triggers" (i.e., upsetting events) and to better understand them and manage disagreements and conflicts and to appreciate the perspectives of others. Dr. Jackson has found Shulick to be open and cooperative with the therapy. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 194.

75. Dr. Jackson also stated in his report that "it is highly unlikely that David will abuse drugs in the future because he has developed the critical problem-solving skills to address and process stress, pain, conflict and emotionally-charged

situations.” Dr. Jackson testified that he stands by his professional opinion as to Shulick’s prognosis. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 195.

76. Dr. Jackson further stated in his report that “based upon David’s genuine remorse and acceptance of responsibility, rehabilitation, and motivation to provide public service as a lawyer, I have no reservations that he would benefit the public if permitted to practice law again.” Dr. Jackson testified that he has seen stability, reliability, acceptance of responsibility, and remorse from Shulick. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 196.

77. Douglas S. Goldstein is the Vice President of ESD Corporation and employs Shulick. Mr. Goldstein has known Shulick on a personal level for nearly four decades. He credibly testified that Shulick has been a model and superb employee who has done a remarkable job. He trusts Shulick to have access to checkbooks and business funds. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 245-246; Pet. Ex. 32.

78. If Shulick is readmitted to the Bar of Pennsylvania, Mr. Goldstein testified that ESD would use him as counsel. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 246.

79. Mr. Goldstein is aware of the details of Shulick’s criminal convictions and that Shulick went through extensive rehabilitation since 2018 because he abused marijuana and Xanax. He has been involved with Shulick on a daily basis for the past three years and has observed a noticeable change in him as to staying sober. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 246-247, Pet. Ex. 32.

80. Even though Shulick was convicted of crimes, Mr. Goldstein “most certainly” recommends that he be reinstated to the bar. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 247-248.

81. Mr. Goldstein wrote a letter in support of Shulick's reinstatement dated September 15, 2024. Mr. Goldstein testified that he stands by that letter, in which he states that Shulick has fully and completely accepted responsibility for his crimes and deserves a second chance. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 245; Pet. Ex. 32.

82. Edwin L. Guyer, Esquire has been a member of the Pennsylvania Bar for 51 years. He is in private practice with a focus on criminal defense. N.T. 2/13/25, p. 5.

83. Mr. Guyer lives in the Northwood Community and has known Shulick for more than ten years related to their service with the homeowners association. N.T. 2/13/25, pp. 5-6; Pet. Ex. 32.

84. Mr. Guyer testified that Shulick has done an "unbelievable job" with the landscaping and snowplowing contractors. N.T. 2/13/25, p. 6.

85. Mr. Guyer credibly testified that Shulick has expressed remorse and humility about his crimes and wrongful conduct. Mr. Guyer recommends that Shulick be readmitted to the Bar. N.T. 2/13/25, pp. 6-7.

86. Mr. Guyer wrote a letter in support of Shulick's reinstatement dated May 14, 2024, and testified that he stands by what he wrote. N.T. 2/13/25, p. 7; Pet. Ex. 32. Mr. Guyer stated that he believes Shulick's matter was an anomaly in an otherwise successful career and his reinstatement would benefit the community.

87. Cherie Shulick has been married to Shulick for 20 years. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 224-225.

88. Mrs. Shulick testified that in the 2009-2012 time period, Shulick was extremely stressed from running his law practice and owning four schools, and he was abusing Xanax and marijuana to cope with his stress at that time. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 225. Since going through detoxification before being imprisoned, Mrs. Shulick confirmed that Shulick has not used drugs. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 225.

89. Mrs. Shulick testified that her husband has expressed remorse many times. She testified that Shulick was deeply distraught and felt that he disappointed himself, her, his family, and his friends. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 226-227.

90. According to Mrs. Shulick, since her husband stopped using drugs, he is humbler, more patient and more focused on his family. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 227- 228.

91. Mrs. Shulick believes that Shulick should be given a second chance to practice law, as he has served his punishment, accepted responsibility, shown remorse, and wants to move forward. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 228- 229.

92. Kim Hafer is Shulick's sister. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 238.

93. Ms. Hafer testified that between 2009 and 2012, Shulick was abusing marijuana and Xanax because of stress, and starting in 2018, he underwent drug rehabilitation and counseling. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 238.

94. Ms. Hafer testified that while in prison and after returning, Shulick expressed to her his regret and remorse for everything he had done wrong. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 239-240.

95. Ms. Hafer recommends that Shulick be reinstated to practice law, because the crimes happened years ago and he has received rehabilitation. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 240.

96. To address ODC's specific concern set forth in its August 29, 2024 response to Shulick's Petition for Reinstatement that Shulick's appeals and challenges were inconsistent with his remorse and acceptance of responsibility, Shulick presented the testimony of Lisa A. Mathewson, Esquire, and James E. Beasley, Jr., M.D., Esquire.

97. Ms. Mathewson is a member of the Pennsylvania Bar with an active appellate practice. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 154-55. She was hired by Shulick's trial counsel to review his conviction. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 158.

98. Ms. Mathewson reviewed the record and concluded that there were several grounds for appeal. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 159-163, 167-171. After the appeal was not successful, there was a decision not to seek review by the United States Supreme Court. Shulick did not believe that he received a fair trial, but in consideration of his obligations to restitution and to his family, it was decided not to file a petition for certiorari. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 173-175.

99. Ms. Mathewson recommends that Shulick be reinstated to the Bar. She believes that he has accepted responsibility and she was impressed by his legal acumen. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 177-178.

100. Mr. Beasley is a member of the Pennsylvania Bar and has experience handling legal malpractice cases. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 210, 211. After Shulick

was released from prison, Mr. Beasley met with him a few times to review Shulick's potential case for legal malpractice. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 211.

101. Mr. Beasley reviewed all of the case materials and believed that there was a breach of the standard of care by Shulick's criminal defense attorneys. N.T. 2/12/25, p. 212. Mr. Beasley filed a lawsuit on Shulick's behalf. The case was stayed while a habeas petition was litigated. After the habeas petition was denied, Shulick decided to voluntarily withdraw his malpractice case so he could "move on with his life." N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 213-215.

102. Mr. Beasley testified that Shulick was remorseful and recommends that he be reinstated to the bar. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 215-216.

103. Shulick submitted character letters in lieu of testimony from a cross-section of attorneys, community leaders, neighbors, and others in which they stated their respective opinions that he is genuinely remorseful and has accepted responsibility, all recommending his reinstatement, as follows:

- a. Kenneth Grunfeld, Esquire and Jennifer Grunfeld, Esquire
- b. Rabbi David Straus, Main Line Reform Temple
- c. Pastor Carolyn Cavaness, M.Div., Ardmore Bethel Church
- d. Andrew Swain, Esquire
- e. Mitchell Bleicher, RDAP Participant with Shulick
- f. Mark Jaffe, Esquire
- g. David Cohen, Petitioner's first legal client
- h. Daniel Erlbaum, Chairman, Jewish Relief Agency

- i. David L. Smoger, M.D. and Sally Smoger, SLP, Northwood Community. Pet. Ex. 32.

104. On March 10, 2025, Shulick filed a post-hearing brief to the Committee in support of his reinstatement.

105. On March 24, 2025, ODC filed a letter to the Committee advising that it found no basis to oppose Shulick's reinstatement.

106. By Report filed on May 23, 2025, the Committee concluded that Shulick satisfied the *Keller* standard but failed to meet his burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law within the Commonwealth will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. The Committee found that Shulick failed to establish he accepted full responsibility and had genuine remorse for his misconduct. The Committee further concluded that fewer than seven years of disbarment was insufficient to dissipate the detrimental impact of Shulick's egregious misconduct on the public trust.

107. The Committee recommended to the Board that the Petition for Reinstatement be denied.

108. On June 30, 2025, Shulick filed a Brief on Exceptions to the Committee's Report and requested oral argument before the Board. Shulick contended the Committee erred in finding that he was not remorseful and did not accept responsibility, erred by not considering Shulick's drug abuse as a *Braun* mitigating factor and failed to consider that he has fully recovered, erred in concluding that Shulick's

misconduct was worse than that of the petitioner in *In the Matter of Charles M. Naselsky*, No. 169 DB 2012 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/24/2022) (S. Ct. Order 5/4/2022), and erred in finding that Shulick's time spent on disbarment, approximately seven years, is insufficient.

109. On July 10, 2025, ODC filed a letter advising that it would not submit exceptions to the Committee's Report and recommendation or a brief opposing Shulick's exceptions. It emphasized that the Board and the Court would exercise independent review of the matter.

110. A three-member panel of the Board held oral argument on October 14, 2025.

111. The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on October 24, 2025.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The misconduct for which Shulick was disbarred on consent is not so egregious as to preclude consideration of his Petition for Reinstatement. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. John Keller*, 506 A.2d 872 (Pa. 1986).

2. Shulick met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

3. Shulick met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law will be neither detrimental to the integrity and

standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

III. DISCUSSION

Shulick seeks readmission to the practice of law in Pennsylvania following his disbarment on consent by Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on October 12, 2023, retroactive to September 11, 2018. Upon the Board's independent review of the record and for the reasons that follow, we conclude that Shulick satisfied the *Keller* threshold standard and met his reinstatement burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3) and recommend that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

The primary purpose of the lawyer disciplinary system is to protect the public from unfit attorneys and to maintain the integrity of the legal system. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. John Rodes Christie*, 639 A.2d 782, 785 (Pa. 1994). When a disbarred attorney seeks reinstatement, the Board must first examine whether the magnitude of the breach of trust committed by the attorney is so egregious that it precludes further consideration of the petition for reinstatement. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. John Keller*, 506 A.2d 872 (Pa. 1986).

Shulick's breach of trust that caused his disbarment on consent was based on his criminal convictions of conspiracy to embezzle from a program receiving federal funds, embezzling funds from a program receiving federal funds, making a false statement to a bank, and filing false tax returns for tax years 2009, 2010, and 2011 (the tax returns were amended and the taxes were paid prior to the indictment). He was found

guilty by a jury and sentenced to 60 months imprisonment followed by three years of supervised release and ordered to pay \$764,735 in restitution.

Shulick's misconduct was very serious and adversely impacted the profession and the public. Nevertheless, consistent with precedent we conclude, as did the Committee below, that Shulick's misconduct is not so egregious that it should foreclose consideration of his reinstatement request. Shulick's misconduct is similar to that of other attorneys who were disbarred for criminal activity and who later met the *Keller* standard. See *Matter of Greenberg*, 749 A.2d 434 (Pa. 2000) (conviction of conspiracy and bankruptcy fraud stemming from fraudulent financial transfers made when Greenberg's company faced financial difficulties; Greenberg met the Keller standard); *In the Matter of Charles M. Naselsky*, No. 169 DB 2012 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/24/2022) (S. Ct. Order 5/4/2022) (conviction for tax evasion, filing false tax returns, wire fraud, and obstruction of justice; conduct not so egregious to bar reinstatement).

The Board's inquiry does not end with the determination of the *Keller* threshold issue. A reinstatement proceeding is a "searching inquiry into a lawyer's present professional and moral fitness to resume the practice of law. The object of concern is not solely the transgressions which gave rise to the lawyer's suspension or disbarment, but rather, the nature and extent of the rehabilitative efforts he has made since the time the sanction was imposed and the degree of success achieved in the rehabilitative process." *Philadelphia News, Inc. v. Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*, 363 A.2d 779, 780-781 (Pa. 1976). We therefore consider pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3), whether Shulick has established by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral

qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice law in Pennsylvania and that his readmission would not have a detrimental impact on the integrity and standing of the bar, the administration of justice nor be subversive of the public interest. To meet this burden, Shulick must demonstrate that a sufficient amount of time has passed since his misconduct, during which he engaged in rehabilitative efforts such that the detrimental impact of his serious misconduct on the public trust has been dissipated. *Matter of Verlin*, 731 A.2d 600, 602 (Pa. 1999).

A petitioner seeking reinstatement from disbarment may not apply for reinstatement until the expiration of at least five years from the effective date of the disbarment. Pa.R.D.E. 218(b). Approximately 14 years have passed since Shulick's criminal misconduct ended in 2011 and more than seven years have gone by since the effective date of his disbarment on consent on September 11, 2018. The record evidence demonstrates that Shulick's period of disbarment has been a time of genuine rehabilitation that has dissipated the breach of trust caused by his serious misconduct.

Shulick has spent the past seven years focused on rehabilitating himself from his misconduct and repairing the damage inflicted by his wrongdoing. Shulick has demonstrated his rehabilitation through actions and words. Following his temporary suspension ordered on September 11, 2018, Shulick cooperated with disciplinary authorities by ceasing the practice of law and timely filing with the Board his statement verifying his compliance with the Supreme Court's order and the rules for formerly admitted attorneys. Shulick again exhibited cooperation with the disciplinary authorities when he filed his voluntary resignation from the practice of law in September 2023 and

timely filed his required statement of compliance following the Court's order of disbarment on consent.

Shulick suffered from a drug dependency for a number of years that coincided with his criminal conduct. He used marijuana regularly to address his anxiety. In an attempt to stop using marijuana, Shulick sought treatment with Dr. Miller and Dr. Rusk and was prescribed Xanax; he became addicted to that substance. Prior to reporting to prison in October 2018, Shulick underwent extensive detoxification treatment with Dr. Susan Rushing Richter, which was successful. While in prison, Shulick voluntarily participated in drug treatment programs. He completed the Non-Residential Drug and Alcohol Program at Fort Dix and completed the Residential Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program at FCI Lewisburg. The program at Lewisburg consisted of 1400 hours of extensive residential rehabilitation and cognitive behavioral therapy. Shulick also participated in Alcoholics Anonymous at Lewisburg. Shulick overcame his addictions and at the time of the reinstatement hearing in February 2025, had been sober for approximately six and a half years with no relapse.

Shulick served his prison time without incident and was released to home confinement in 2020, which ended in 2022. Thereafter, he remained on supervised release until January 2025. Shulick experienced no issues of noncompliance related to his home confinement and supervision. Shulick has complied with his restitution order. He was permitted to pay less than the court-ordered \$1,000 per month at times, but on many occasions paid more than the court-ordered amount. At the time of the

reinstatement hearing, Shulick's restitution balance was \$717,421.57 and he had paid \$20,000 more than the court-ordered schedule. Shulick intends to pay it all off. In July 2024, Shulick wrote personal letters of apology to the Assistant U.S. Attorney who prosecuted him and to the School District of Philadelphia.

After leaving prison, Shulick continued to rehabilitate himself by voluntarily resuming treatment with Dr. Miller and later with Dr. Jackson in October 2023. Shulick testified extensively about the cognitive behavioral therapy he receives and how it has helped him address his stress and anxiety. Shulick meets with Dr. Jackson on a bi-weekly basis and as of the hearing date had met with him between 33 and 35 times. Through his therapy, Shulick has developed coping and problem solving skills, which he finds useful to his everyday life, and has discovered and adopted new attitudes of humility, responsibility and gratitude. Shulick engaged in self-reflection during his disbarment period and has an improved understanding of himself and his flaws and how to manage them. Shulick's rehabilitation included his recognition of the difficulties his wife and children endured as a consequence of his wrongdoing and his efforts to keep his family relationships intact and rebuild them.

Shulick has maintained steady employment during his disbarment. After working at a commercial real estate management business for approximately eleven months, he obtained employment at ESD in November 2021 and serves as Vice-President of Corporate Affairs. Shulick strengthened his learning in the law and has prepared for his return to legal practice by completing approximately 100 credit hours of

Continuing Legal Education and reading publications such as *The Legal Intelligencer* to follow developments in the law. Shulick has considered his professional options if reinstated and intends to remain at ESD as an attorney, while also maintaining a small law practice on the side where he can represent clients and make referrals. Shulick previously enjoyed the responsibility and the honor of being able to advocate for clients and looks forward to resuming that part of his life.

In addition to his paid employment, Shulick devoted time during his disbarment to a variety of community service endeavors, an extension of the meaningful volunteer work he performed for many years while he was an active lawyer. Shulick elaborated on both time periods. Prior to disbarment, Shulick served on charitable boards, created a foundation in honor of his mother, and was active with numerous worthwhile civic and legal organizations. Since returning home from incarceration, Shulick has volunteered his time and efforts by packing and delivering food for the Jewish Relief Agency in Philadelphia, serving on the board of the Petey Green Project to support mentorship of formerly incarcerated youth, volunteering with the Ardmore Bethel Church by performing supervised paralegal work and providing mentorship, performing supervised paralegal work on behalf of a co-worker at ESD, and rejoining the board of his homeowners association.

These steady and concrete efforts at personal and professional rehabilitation are bolstered by Shulick's genuine expressions of remorse and accountability for his actions. The record established that Shulick has committed himself

to a path of responsibility and has demonstrated contrition for his transgressions. Shulick directly admitted to his guilt and testified numerous times throughout the reinstatement hearing that he “unquestionably,” “absolutely,” and “unequivocally” committed the crimes and accepted responsibility for misapplying funds in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666, for defrauding PNC bank, and for filing false tax returns in 2009, 2010, and 2011. N.T. 2/12/25, pp. 45, 46, 91. “I not only accept responsibility, I live it, I live it.” N.T. 2/12/25, p. 92. He further credibly testified that he did not blame anyone for his crimes. Shulick’s testimony reflected that he has given extensive thought to his actions and has deep remorse and regret for his crimes.

Shulick presented credible witness testimony to demonstrate strong moral qualifications, competency and fitness to resume the practice of law. Members of Shulick’s community voiced strong support for his reinstatement. Seven witnesses, including his psychologist, employer, former counsel, family members and a neighbor, provided credible and compelling evidence as to Shulick’s rehabilitation, qualifications and good character.

Dr. Jackson, who has 50 years of experience as a psychologist and has worked with Shulick since October 2023, expressed his expert opinion that Shulick feels responsible for his crimes, is ashamed of his actions, and is remorseful. Dr. Jackson shared his professional judgment that it is highly unlikely that Shulick will use drugs in the future, as Shulick has developed coping skills and displayed stability and reliability. He has no reservations concerning Shulick’s return to the practice of law. Ms. Mathewson and Mr. Beasley, both experienced attorneys, credibly testified that Shulick has

expressed remorse for his misconduct and his reinstatement to the bar would pose no danger to the public. Mr. Goldstein is the Vice-President of ESD and employs Shulick in a non-legal capacity. He described Shulick's work performance in glowing terms and had no concerns about Shulick's re-entry to the practice of law. Mr. Goldstein demonstrated his confidence in Shulick in that he intends to employ Shulick as ESD's counsel upon reinstatement. Mr. Guyer is a licensed Pennsylvania attorney who knows Shulick through their homeowners association and believes Shulick is doing an effective job as a member of the association's board. Based on their conversations, Mr. Guyer is aware that Shulick feels remorse and humility for his misconduct. Shulick's wife and sister shared their observations that Shulick is remorseful for his wrongdoing and has changed for the better during his disbarment, becoming humbler, patient and focused on family.

In addition to this supportive testimony, Shulick introduced letters written by a cross-section of his community, including his rabbi, his first legal client, lawyers in his community, a board member of the Jewish Relief Agency, neighbors, and an individual who participated with him in the RDAP program in prison. These individuals affirmed that Shulick is genuinely sorry for what he did, has accepted responsibility, and should be readmitted to practice.

Despite this robust record, the Committee found Shulick did not express adequate remorse and acceptance of responsibility for his crimes. We disagree. Shulick was convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. § 666, as well as making false statements to PNC and filing false tax returns. Shulick accepted responsibility for these crimes; the record is replete with his expressions of accountability and remorse. Shulick's testimony shows

self-reflection, growth and change during his disbarment. Equally strong evidence of Shulick's remorse are the concrete rehabilitative actions he took during his disbarment. On our independent review, we find the totality of the record demonstrates Shulick's clear remorse and acceptance of responsibility.

The Committee also criticized Shulick's presentation of the testimony of Ms. Mathewson, who represented Shulick on appeal, and Mr. Beasley, who initiated a malpractice suit on Shulick's behalf against his trial counsel, as Shulick's attempt to "explain to the panel how he was wrongly convicted and did not actually engage in the criminal behavior for which he was convicted." HC Report, p. 39. Again, we respectfully disagree with the Committee's interpretation. Shulick presented the testimony of his post-conviction lawyers in direct response to ODC's August 29, 2024 formal response to the Petition for Reinstatement, wherein it raised the issue of whether Shulick's appeals and challenges were inconsistent with his expressed remorse and claimed acceptance of responsibility. The testimony of Attorneys Mathewson and Beasley explained the legal bases for taking appeals and filing a malpractice action; this testimony was not an attempt by Shulick to show that he was improperly convicted and did not engage in criminal behavior.

To be clear, Shulick had a constitutional right to go to trial and file appeals. It should be noted that the primary legal theories asserted in Shulick's appeals were technical in nature and related to the grading of his offenses, which if successful, could have been relevant for sentencing purposes. It does not appear that these appellate efforts entailed disclaiming the impropriety of his conduct or the factual premise of the

underlying criminal charges. Under these circumstances, we do not find Shulick's exercise of these rights to be inconsistent with his acceptance of responsibility for his crimes. Shulick's appeals were not successful and after consultation with counsel, he ultimately decided to forego filing a petition for certiorari with the United States Supreme Court, as he was aware of his obligations to his family and to make restitution. He also withdrew his malpractice suit. Once Shulick determined to cease his appeals and other challenges, the record established that he acted to make amends by voluntarily resigning his law license and complying with disciplinary rules and procedures, serving his prison sentence and supervised release without incident, paying restitution, apologizing to the School District of Philadelphia and the Assistant U.S. Attorney who prosecuted him, addressing his drug problem and maintaining sobriety for over six years, voluntarily seeking therapy and applying therapeutic techniques in his everyday life, rebuilding relationships with his family, serving his community, obtaining gainful employment, and enhancing his learning in the law.

While Shulick's breach of trust was great, the record evidence demonstrates that he has engaged in significant rehabilitation that has dissipated the impact of his original misconduct on the public trust. Shulick demonstrated via his own testimony, the testimony of his witnesses, and the documentary evidence that he is not predisposed to repeat his misconduct as he has established that he is a changed person committed to personal and professional development.

We conclude that after seven years of disbarment devoted to rehabilitation from his serious criminal conduct, Shulick's reinstatement at this time would not cause

harm to the public or adversely affect the public's perception of the legal profession. In previous matters, the Court has reinstated disbarred attorneys who satisfied their heavy burden after a disbarment period similar in length to that of Shulick. See *In the Matter of Charles M. Naselsky*, No. 169 DB 2012 (D. Bd. Rpt. 3/24/2022) (S. Ct. Order 5/4/2022) (reinstated from disbarment on consent after eight years; conviction for tax evasion, filing false tax returns, wire fraud, and obstruction of justice); *In the Matter of Joshua Lawrence Gayl*, No. 79 DB 2016 (D. Bd. Rpt. 9/19/2022) (S. Ct. Order 10/25/2022) (reinstated from disbarment on consent after six years; conviction of conspiracy to obstruct justice); *In the Matter of Stephen Greg Doherty*, 69 DB 2010 (D. Bd. Rpt. 9/13/2017) (S. Ct. Order 10/27/2017) (reinstated from disbarment on consent after seven years; conviction of wire fraud, mail fraud, bankruptcy fraud, and money laundering); *In the Matter of Gerard Emmett Evans*, 10 DB 2001 (D. Bd. Rpt. 10/3/2008) (S. Ct. Order 12/15/2008) (reinstated from disbarment on consent after seven years; conviction of wire fraud and mail fraud).

Upon this record, we conclude Shulick is fit to practice law. Shulick has met his reinstatement burden by clear and convincing evidence that he is morally qualified, competent and learned in the law, and that his reinstatement will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. For the above reasons, we recommend Shulick's reinstatement.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania recommends that the Petitioner, David Tevis Shulick, be reinstated to the practice of law.

The Board further recommends that, pursuant to Rule 218(f), Pa.R.D.E., Petitioner be directed to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: /s/ Catherine R. O'Donnell
Catherine R. O'Donnell, Member

Date: 03/17/2026

Chair Senoff and Vice-Chair Vance dissent.
Member Alfano recused.