

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

In the Matter of:	:	No. 2757 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
RYAN D. BREEN	:	No. 134 DB 2020
	:	
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT	:	Attorney Registration No. 318069
	:	
	:	(Allegheny County)
	:	

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2025, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted. Petitioner is ordered to pay the expenses incurred by the 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 10/14/2025

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of	:	No. 2757 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
	:	
	:	No. 134 DB 2020
RYAN D. BREEN	:	
	:	Attorney Registration No. 318069
	:	
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT	:	(Allegheny 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:

1. Petitioner, Ryan D. Breen, was born in 1987 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth in 2014. He is subject to the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

2. Following his admission to the bar, Petitioner practiced law with his father in Pittsburgh handling primarily family law and criminal cases. N.T. 66-67.

The Misconduct

3. On June 7, 2017, when Petitioner was 29 years old, he was driving his personal vehicle at the Pittsburgh International Racing Complex in Wampum, Pennsylvania, in an event called "Track Night of America." ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶7.
4. While driving during the event, Petitioner collided with a guardrail at the racetrack. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶9.
5. On June 8, 2017, the day following the racetrack accident, Petitioner reported to his insurance company, Erie Insurance, that he was driving his vehicle to his girlfriend's house with a pizza when he struck a guardrail on Overbrook Road in Valencia, Pennsylvania to avoid striking a deer. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶10.
6. Petitioner's representation to Erie Insurance was false. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶11.
7. Pursuant to Petitioner's false statement that the damage to his vehicle was caused when he stuck a guardrail to avoid striking a deer, Erie Insurance paid Petitioner \$21,299.00 for the damage to his vehicle. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶12.
8. A subsequent investigation by Erie Insurance revealed the true circumstances of the cause of the damage to Petitioner's vehicle and Erie Insurance referred the

matter to the Allegheny County Police Department. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶¶13, 14.

9. On May 8, 2019, the Allegheny County District Attorney's Office filed a criminal information in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, charging Petitioner with Insurance Fraud, in violation of 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 4117(a)(2). ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶¶16, 18.

10. On July 2, 2020, Petitioner was accepted into the Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition program (ARD), subject to conditions of probation for 24 months, payment of full restitution to Erie Insurance, payment of a \$5,000 civil penalty to the Insurance Fraud Prevention Trust Fund, agreement of no early termination of ARD, and 50 hours of community service. ODC-1, Jt. Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent at ¶19.

11. Petitioner satisfactorily completed the terms of his probation and paid all costs, fines, expenses and restitution attendant to his criminal matter. N.T. 72-73.

12. By Order dated November 9, 2020, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania granted a Joint Petition in Support of Discipline on Consent and suspended Petitioner for a period of one year and one day.

13. Petitioner timely filed a Statement of Compliance as required under Pa.R.D.E. 217(e).

#### Post-Suspension Employment and Personal Life

14. Following his suspension in November 2020, Petitioner accepted the reality that he was not going to be a lawyer for a long time and needed to "reinvent himself"

to pay his bills. N.T. 70.

15. Petitioner's attempts to secure employment based on his education and advanced degree were unsuccessful due to his felony insurance fraud charge. He turned to other forms of employment to support himself. From November 2020 through February 2022, Petitioner was employed as a pizza delivery driver. N.T. 64-65, 70-71, 106-108.

16. Petitioner worked part-time for a landscaping company owned by a friend, James Brzoska. Petitioner eventually took over the accounts and since April 2022, Petitioner has been self-employed as the owner-operator of Breen Landscaping. N.T. 36, 64; ODC-1, No. 6(b).

17. Although Petitioner found it frustrating that he was unable to obtain employment that reflected his level of education, he found peace in his landscaping job and time to reflect on his past mistakes and his intention to move forward with his life. N.T. 71.

18. In 2021, Petitioner's girlfriend died and her loss was difficult for him. Her death propelled him to begin working on his physical and mental health. N.T. 77, 109.

19. Petitioner began working out six days a week at Jack's Boxing Gym, owned by John Mook, a former Pittsburgh Police narcotics detective. N.T. 20, 24. This experience helped Petitioner to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of his past actions. N.T. 111-112. Petitioner competes as an amateur boxer in USA Boxing N.T. 20.

20. In September 2022, Petitioner began dating a new girlfriend. N.T. 74. In 2023, the girlfriend obtained a Temporary Protection From Abuse order (PFA) against him. ODC-9, ODC-10. Petitioner denied the allegations, but in lieu of contesting the allegations, he resolved the Temporary PFA by way of a negotiated disposition of a continuance without any judicial finding of abuse. N.T. 84-86. No further incident occurred. N.T. 86. The allegations set forth in the Temporary PFA never resulted in any separate criminal investigation or charges. N.T. 80-86.
21. Although Petitioner denied the allegations, he explained that he decided not to go to a hearing on the matter because given the “he said she said” nature of the allegations it seemed like a risk. N.T. 138-139.
22. Petitioner has had no contact with the individual who filed the Temporary PFA against him. N.T. 137.
23. The Temporary PFA “completely crushed” Petitioner and stalled his plans to apply for reinstatement in 2023, as he knew he needed to deal with the issue. N.T. 79, 86.
24. Petitioner has committed himself to learning in the law since December 2, 2021, amassing 99.5 CLE credits (including the Bridge the Gap course), and he has met the requisite number of credit hours needed in the 12 months preceding the filing of his Petition for Reinstatement. ODC-1; R-A.
25. Petitioner kept apprised of developments in the law during his suspension. N.T. 131-132.

### The Petition for Reinstatement

26. On July 8, 2024, Petitioner filed a Petition for Reinstatement from suspension with an accompanying Reinstatement Questionnaire. ODC-1.

27. Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) filed a response by letter dated August 30, 2024 and identified concerns it intended to explore at the reinstatement hearing.

28. Following a prehearing conference on November 25, 2024, a District IV Hearing Committee ("Committee") held a reinstatement hearing on March 4, 2025.

29. At the hearing, Petitioner was represented by counsel. He testified on his own behalf and presented four character witnesses. ODC did not offer witness testimony but cross-examined Respondent and his witnesses. Exhibits proffered by Petitioner and ODC were admitted without objection.

30. Petitioner fully and candidly disclosed the existence of the Temporary PFA as part of the reinstatement process and credibly answered questions related to the allegations and the underlying proceedings. N.T. 73, 74 80-84, 84-86, 137-139; ODC-1.

31. In his Reinstatement Questionnaire, certain information regarding Petitioner's criminal history, social media accounts, and tax filings was not included or fully disclosed.

32. In his Reinstatement Questionnaire, Petitioner omitted his July 2017 summary disorderly conduct charge. At the hearing, Petitioner explained that in May 2017, he was stopped by the police after running a stop sign and later charged with

possession of drug paraphernalia (related to a marijuana grinder in the cup holder of his vehicle), duties at a stop sign, and disorderly conduct. The drug paraphernalia and duties at stop sign charges were withdrawn and Petitioner pled guilty to a summary disorderly conduct for which he paid a fine. He was not required to report this summary disposition to ODC at that time. N.T. 93- 94, 95, 134; ODC-7.

33. While Petitioner disclosed the information related to the summary disorderly conduct to his counsel prior to filing the reinstatement documents, the disposition was not reported as part of the reinstatement process because of a misunderstanding of whether it was required to be disclosed. N.T. 92-97, 143-45.

34. Petitioner's counsel advised him that under Pa.R.D.E. 214(h), the summary disorderly conduct charge was not a "crime" subject to disclosure because it lacked a corresponding period of imprisonment. Counsel did not realize, given that it did not appear on the redacted magisterial docket of the matter, that Petitioner also had a dismissed misdemeanor paraphernalia charge, which would have qualified as a "crime" subject to disclosure on the Reinstatement Questionnaire. N.T. 95.

35. Petitioner did not willfully conceal this charge. The explanation as to the reason or justification for the nondisclosure was credible. N.T. 143-45.

36. Petitioner smoked marijuana throughout his 20s but does not anymore. N.T. 94.

37. In response to Question No. 4 at Part II of his Reinstatement Questionnaire,



Petitioner disclosed his LinkedIn account but did not disclose all of his social media accounts. ODC-1, Part II, No. 4. He credibly testified that his social media activity is minimal and he viewed his Facebook and Twitter (X) accounts as dormant. He further credibly testified that it was not his intent to keep the accounts a secret from ODC. N.T. 89-92, 117, 118.

38. Petitioner did not fully disclose his state tax records during the reinstatement process.

39. Petitioner credibly testified that his tax situation had changed in the past three or four years in terms of his employment. When he attempted to electronically file his 2022 state tax returns, the filing was rejected and he mailed a hard copy instead, which was subsequently rejected. N.T. 97-98.

40. After Petitioner determined the nature of the problem with his tax filing, he filed amended 2022 and 2023 tax returns and produced them to ODC. He is current with his taxes. N.T. 99, 121, 123, 124.

41. Petitioner did not intentionally withhold the information related to his summary disorderly conduct, social media accounts, or tax records. He forthrightly and credibly answered all questions put to him regarding these matters. These reasons explained the initial absence of this information as part of the reinstatement paperwork. N.T. 88-92, 97-99, 117-24.

42. Petitioner credibly testified on his own behalf.

43. Petitioner was candid about his criminal conduct that resulted in his license

suspension. He acknowledged that it changed the course of his life and he hit “rock bottom.” N.T. 99, 106.

44. At the time Petitioner committed the misconduct, he did not believe it was serious and did not comprehend the gravity of his actions. He explained that “there wasn’t a lot going through my head at the time” and he felt that “the easiest way to get through it was to tell – you know, tell a false statement to, you know, I guess make up for my lack of judgment in, you know, wrecking my car that day.” N.T. 69. He credibly testified that the seriousness of his actions has been made clear to him over time and he feels disappointment in himself and humility. N.T. 69, 70, 101, 104.

45. Petitioner has learned from his experience. He now has an acute sense of how the actions and decisions he makes have lasting consequences on people’s lives. N.T. 127. He now understands “how you need to live an ethical life, how I need to not cut corners.” *Id.*

46. Petitioner desires reinstatement because he worked hard to obtain his law license and took pride in helping people as an attorney and advocate. N.T. 100, 133. He believes he will have additional empathy for people who are faced with situations like his. N.T. 113.

47. If reinstated, Petitioner plans to practice in the Pittsburgh area and surrounding counties either as a sole practitioner or in a small firm. Questionnaire No. 14(b); N.T. 129-130. He plans to keep his landscaping business going, as well. N.T.

129.

48. Petitioner indicated he will be able to rely on his friend, Attorney Casey White, as a professional mentor. N.T. 131.

49. Petitioner has demonstrated remorse, introspection, growth, and maturity since the time of his offense and suspension.

50. Petitioner has committed to bettering himself physically, mentally, emotionally, and professionally.

51. Petitioner presented four character witnesses, each of whom offered credible testimony. N.T. 9-62.

52. Casey White, Esquire has known Petitioner for 30 years and was Petitioner's counsel in the underlying criminal case. N.T. 10. Mr. White credibly testified that Petitioner was contrite and remorseful over his behavior, which was evidenced by his actions in trying to make amends and rehabilitate himself. He described Petitioner as someone who has demonstrated maturity, growth, and a renewed sense of responsibility since his suspension. N.T. 11, 14, 16.

53. Since resolution of the criminal case, Mr. White has remained in contact with Petitioner and avows that he has seen Petitioner become a better person. N.T. 16. Mr. White expressed no reservations of referring clients to Petitioner if he is reinstated to practice law, describing him as a zealous and competent advocate. N.T. 9-19. He also does not recall anyone speaking negatively of Petitioner's reputation and endorsed Petitioner as being capable and worthy of reinstatement.

N.T. 10, 12.

54. John “Jack” Mook has known Petitioner for approximately three years after Petitioner joined his gym, “Jack’s Boxing Gym” and became an amateur boxer in USA Boxing. N.T. 20. Mr. Mook is in close contact with Petitioner roughly five to six days a week, and credibly testified that Petitioner is someone who has worked tirelessly and consistently on himself. N.T. 20. He believed that Petitioner has “learned a lot about himself” in his time at the gym, and has learned a lot about camaraderie, respect, responsibility, and accountability through his boxing training. N.T. 21, 24-25.

55. Mr. Mook acknowledged that, initially, it was obvious Petitioner reflected on his past quite a bit because, through his workouts, it was obvious he was “punishing” himself. N.T. 30-31. Mr. Mook further remarked that he helped Petitioner get beyond that, and Petitioner showed tremendous growth and maturity, as well as humility and remorse. N.T. 21-25.

56. Relying on his past decades of experience as a Pittsburgh Police narcotics detective, Mr. Mook made clear that he never suspected Petitioner of exhibiting signs of drug use; rather, Petitioner has largely demonstrated a commitment to a lifestyle of clean living and physical fitness. N.T. 28-29, 33-34. He relayed anecdotal evidence of Petitioner being someone you can depend on, whether it be by voluntarily plowing snow at the gym parking lot at 3 a.m., or by putting in a long day of setting up and taking down the boxing ring for events. N.T. 27-28. Mr. Mook counts Petitioner as a friend, and he expressed no hesitation to recommend

others to Petitioner if he were reinstated. N.T. 28, 32-33.

57. Mr. Mook was generally familiar with Petitioner's previous mistakes and the circumstances surrounding his suspension. N.T. 23, 29-30. In Mr. Mook's opinion, he believed Petitioner is capable and worthy of being reinstated as a member of the bar. N.T. 24-25, 32-33.

58. James Brzoska is a project manager for a construction company and Petitioner's longtime friend since childhood. N.T. 35. Mr. Brzoska credibly testified to his positive sentiments regarding Petitioner's work ethic, personal growth, and overall good character. N.T. 37. After being suspended, Petitioner reached out to Mr. Brzoska and started working in his landscaping business. N.T. 36. Mr. Brzoska said Petitioner "really pulled himself up by his bootstraps and earned everybody's trust and built his reputation back." N.T. 37.

59. Mr. Brzoska testified that Petitioner worked hard to gain his trust and so impressed him that he had no hesitation in selling his landscaping company, his client list, and all the goodwill he built up in it over the years to Petitioner. N.T. 36-37. He further testified that Petitioner has restored his reputation through accepting the consequences of what he had done and by working hard at the landscaping business to make a living. N.T. 40-41. Familiar with the circumstances surrounding Petitioner's suspension, Mr. Brzoska noted that Petitioner's remorse was apparent. N.T. 37-38. He endorsed Petitioner as being capable and worthy of being reinstated. N.T. 39, 42.

60. Martin Mueller, Jr. works in finance at PNC Bank and has been Petitioner's good

friend for over ten years. N.T. 44, 45. He described him as a “stand-up guy,” “a hard worker,” “dedicated,” and “reliable.” N.T. 45, 48. Mr. Mueller credibly testified that Petitioner was “open and honest about the mistakes that he’s made.” N.T. 48. He acknowledged that Petitioner is “a different person now than he was when [he] first met him.” N.T. 51. Mr. Mueller remarked on how it’s like “night and day” and noted that Petitioner has “moved in a positive direction.” N.T. 52. Noting that Petitioner struggled with the loss of his career by being suspended, Mr. Mueller commented that Petitioner matured, enhanced his physical and mental strength, and demonstrated resilience. N.T. 48, 57.

61. Like the other witnesses, Mr. Mueller was familiar with Petitioner’s circumstances surrounding his suspension. N.T. 46-47, 54-55. Bearing that in mind, he could not say that he ever recalled anyone speaking ill or negatively regarding Petitioner’s reputation. N.T. 45-46. Regarding the Temporary PFA matter, of which Mr. Mueller was somewhat familiar, he testified that Petitioner was not malicious and that his intentions had been misinterpreted. N.T. 61. Mr. Mueller endorsed Petitioner as being capable and worthy of being reinstated as a member of the bar. N.T. 57-58.

#### The Proceedings Below

62. On April 9, 2025, Petitioner filed a post-hearing brief to the Committee and requested that the Committee recommend his reinstatement to the Board.

63. By letter dated April 14, 2025, ODC stated its determination that it did not oppose Petitioner’s reinstatement.

64. By Report filed on June 13, 2025, the Committee concluded that Petitioner met his burden of proof for reinstatement from suspension and recommended that he be reinstated to the bar of this Commonwealth.

65. The parties did not file exceptions to the Committee's Report and recommendation.

66. The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on July 22, 2025.

## II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Petitioner 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 and resumption to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E.
2. Petitioner met his burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that his resumption of the practice of law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the Bar or the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Rule 218 (c)(3), Pa.R.D.E.

## III. DISCUSSION

Petitioner seeks readmission to the practice of law following his suspension for a period of one year and one day on consent, ordered by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on November 9, 2020.

Pursuant to Rule 218(a)(1), Pa.R.D.E., an attorney who is suspended for a period exceeding one year may not resume the practice of law until reinstated by the Court. To gain reinstatement, Petitioner must prove by evidence that is clear and convincing, that he is morally qualified, competent and learned in the law and that his resumption of the practice of law will not be 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). 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).

The underlying misconduct for which Petitioner consented to a suspension of his law license for one year and one day is his criminal conviction of insurance fraud. The record demonstrates that Petitioner’s criminal conduct occurred when he was 29 years old and a licensed lawyer for approximately three years. At the time of the accident that led to the insurance fraud, Petitioner did not feel the matter was that serious and decided the easiest way to deal with the situation was to make a false statement. Petitioner quickly learned that actions have consequences as criminal charges were filed against him. Petitioner accepted responsibility for his criminal acts. He was accepted into the ARD program and fully satisfied the terms and conditions of his ARD probation. He



cooperated with ODC and consented to the suspension of his law license for one year and one day.

Petitioner was humbled by the aftermath of his misconduct but persevered to put his life back on course. He accepted the reality that he was not going to be a lawyer for a long while and needed to “reinvent himself” to pay his bills. Due to his felony insurance fraud charge, Petitioner struggled to obtain employment that reflected his level of education. He consequently resorted to delivering pizzas to earn an income. He also worked part-time for his friend’s landscaping company, earned that friend’s trust through his dedicated work ethic, and eventually bought the landscaping business from his friend in April 2022. Petitioner enjoyed the landscaping work as it gave him time to reflect on his past misconduct and his future. In 2021, Petitioner suffered the tragic death of his girlfriend, after which he dedicated himself to improving his mental and physical health. Petitioner joined a boxing gym, where he committed himself to a better lifestyle through exercise and clean living. Petitioner does not use marijuana anymore. Petitioner eventually began boxing in amateur matches.

Petitioner began a relationship with a new girlfriend in September 2022 and began completing CLE courses to ready himself for reinstatement. However, he experienced a difficult setback when his girlfriend obtained a Temporary PFA against him in 2023. Although Petitioner adamantly denied the allegations, he recognized the “he-said she-said” nature of the matter and opted to resolve the matter by negotiating a resolution where the Temporary PFA would stay in effect for six months then be dismissed without a finding of abuse. There was no further incident and no criminal charges ever emanated

from the allegations. Petitioner has had no contact with the former girlfriend. Petitioner acknowledged that the Temporary PFA was “crushing” to him but he dealt with the issue and moved forward with his life, though it delayed his plan to apply for reinstatement in 2023.

Petitioner applied for reinstatement on July 8, 2024, and disclosed the Temporary PFA to ODC. However, Petitioner’s Reinstatement Questionnaire contained either omissions or incomplete disclosure pertaining to a summary disorderly conduct in January 2017, social media accounts, and tax information. At the hearing, Petitioner satisfactorily explained each of these issues and fully answered all questions put to him. As set forth below, we conclude that none of these issues are an obstacle to Petitioner’s reinstatement request.

Regarding the Temporary PFA, Petitioner forthrightly shared the details of his relationship with the former girlfriend, the circumstances leading to the Temporary PFA, and his thought process in negotiating a resolution of the matter. As to the summary disorderly conduct charge that was omitted, Petitioner disclosed the charge to his counsel at the time they were completing the reinstatement paperwork and it was decided that the summary disposition did not need to be reported as part of the reinstatement process as the disposition did not result in a period of imprisonment and was not a “crime” subject to disclosure. However, as part of the underlying matter Petitioner had a dismissed misdemeanor drug paraphernalia charge, which is a “crime” subject to disclosure. At the hearing, Petitioner candidly explained the circumstances that resulted in his summary disorderly conduct and the reasons for his failure to disclose it on the Questionnaire. We

conclude there was no intent to willfully conceal this information from ODC.

Regarding the social media accounts and tax information, Petitioner likewise provided credible explanations for his insufficient disclosure of these items. Petitioner viewed several of his social media accounts as dormant and never intended to conceal the information from ODC. On the issue of Petitioner's tax information, once Petitioner became aware of the reason for electronic rejection of his state tax returns, he successfully amended and filed the returns and produced the information to ODC.

On this record, we conclude that the circumstances of the fraud Petitioner perpetrated upon his insurance company occurred at a time of relative youth and immaturity, both in terms of age and years in practice. The record evidence demonstrates that Petitioner has grown and matured since his criminal conduct and license suspension. Petitioner forthrightly held himself accountable for his misconduct and expressed genuine contrition. He is disappointed in himself for his past behavior and feel humility. Where once Petitioner believed that lying to an insurance company was not very serious, he now clearly understands the seriousness and implications of that behavior and the importance of living an ethical life. This maturity can be seen in Petitioner's handling of the Temporary PFA in 2023 and his ability to move on from that difficult situation. Petitioner has shown himself to be industrious, persistent, and resilient. He accepted the fact that his life circumstances by his own measure changed for the worse due to his actions, and he persevered in moving forward from that low point to improve his finances and his mental and physical health.

Petitioner's growth and maturity have been observed by his character

witnesses. These witnesses were familiar with Petitioner's misconduct and described Petitioner as open and honest about his past. Attorney White and Mr. Brzoska have been friends with Petitioner since childhood and have observed the arc of Petitioner's life. From that vantage point, they credibly described Petitioner's remorse for his past actions and his newfound sense of responsibility. Attorney White has seen Petitioner become a better person since his criminal conduct and suspension and would not hesitate to refer clients to Petitioner if he is reinstated. Mr. Brzoska believes Petitioner has restored his reputation through accepting the consequences of his wrongful actions and working hard to make a living. Mr. Mueller has known Petitioner for about ten years and remarked on the positive changes in Petitioner since his misconduct, noting that the changes are "like night and day." N.T. 52. Mr. Mook met Petitioner through the boxing gym approximately three years ago, and while he did not know Petitioner prior to his criminal conduct and license suspension, he is aware of those events and observed Petitioner's tireless efforts to improve himself through hard work at the boxing gym and a healthy lifestyle. All of the witnesses credibly testified and endorsed Petitioner as hard-working, capable, and worthy of reinstatement to the bar.

Petitioner shared his sincere desire to resume the practice of law. As a young attorney, he took pride in practicing law and enjoyed helping people as an attorney and advocate. Petitioner believes his experiences over the past years have made him more empathetic toward people who are faced with situations like his. During his suspension, Petitioner kept abreast of developments in the law and prepared himself to resume practice through numerous CLE courses. If reinstated, he plans to practice in a

solo or small firm setting. He further indicated that he would rely on his friend, Attorney White, as a professional mentor.

The record evidence established that Petitioner spent his suspension period engaged in genuine rehabilitation. Petitioner demonstrated a thorough understanding of his wrongdoing, accepted full responsibility for his misconduct, and displayed sincere contrition. Over his nearly five years of suspension, Petitioner demonstrated growth and maturity through his commitment to physical, mental, and professional betterment. On this record, we conclude Petitioner met the requirements of Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E., by presenting clear and convincing evidence to show his moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law. Petitioner demonstrated via his own testimony and the testimony of his character witnesses, that his reinstatement will not harm the public or be detrimental to the integrity of the profession.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Petitioner, Ryan D. Breen, 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/ Celeste L. Dee*  
Celeste L. Dee, Member

Date: 09/10/2025