

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

In the Matter of : No. 3030 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
TODD ANDREW GOODMAN : No. 14 DB 2024  
: :  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : Attorney Registration No. 57626  
: :  
: (Philadelphia)

**ORDER**

**PER CURIAM**

**AND NOW**, this 27<sup>th</sup> day of April, 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 04/27/2026

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 3030 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
: No. 14 DB 2024  
TODD ANDREW GOODMAN : :  
: Attorney Registration No. 57626  
: :  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Philadelphia)

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:

Goodman's Background

1. Goodman was born on April 1, 1963. He is married and has two adult children. P-1, ¶ 2; N.T. 7/31/25 at 148, 153.

2. Goodman graduated from Temple University in 1986 with a degree in Pharmacy. N.T. 147.
3. Goodman graduated from Widener Law School in 1989 and was admitted to the bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1989. N.T. 147.
4. Following admission to the bar, Goodman worked full-time for Kornblau & Kornblau, P.C. from 1989 to 2003. N.T. 150. Goodman's legal practice at Kornblau focused on personal injury law and eventually centered on medical malpractice. N.T. 151.
5. Goodman left Kornblau in 2003 and started his own law firm while also working part-time as a pharmacist at Walgreens. N.T. 151-152.
6. Goodman left Walgreens around 2005 and worked part-time as a pharmacist at Verree Pharmacy. N.T. 152.
7. While working at Verree Pharmacy, Goodman performed per diem legal work for the law firm Oxman Goodstadt Kuritz ("Oxman"). N.T. 152.
8. Goodman became a part-time employee of Oxman in 2015. N.T. 152.
9. Goodman left Verree Pharmacy in 2021 and began working at Rapoport Pharmacy. N.T. 153.
10. Goodman left Rapoport Pharmacy in April 2022 and became a full-time attorney at Oxman. N.T. 153.
11. Goodman never maintained his own case files at Oxman. Rather, Goodman worked on the case files of the firm's three shareholders: Harry J. Oxman, Esquire; Sheldon A. Goodstadt, Esquire; and David Kuritz, Esquire. N.T.

114-115.

Goodman's Criminal Conviction

12. In December 2022, Goodman was indicted on ten felony counts alleging that he filled forged opioid prescriptions while working at Verree Pharmacy. N.T. 157.

13. In December 2023, the government filed a superseding indictment that dismissed the ten felony counts but charged Goodman with the misdemeanor offenses of knowingly dispensing a controlled substance without a valid prescription in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 842(a)(1) and (c)(2)(A), and aiding and abetting the same, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2. The conduct occurred in 2018. P-1, Exhibit B, Guilty Plea Agreement.

14. Goodman did not recall filling the fraudulent prescription underpinning the misdemeanor charges. N.T. 159-160.

15. However, when the government showed him the prescription, Goodman admitted it was forged and that he indeed must have filled it when it was presented to him around five years earlier. N.T. 159-160.

16. In December 2023, Goodman pleaded guilty to the superseding indictment. He was sentenced to four months' incarceration followed by one year of supervised probation. P-1, ¶¶ 5, 8.

17. Goodman also paid a fine but was not required to pay restitution because he received no financial benefit from his crime. N.T. 161-162.

18. Goodman reported to prison on February 1, 2024, and on May 3, 2024, after

serving three of the four months, Goodman was released early from prison for good behavior. N.T. 161, 167, 207.

19. Goodman completed his supervised probation on May 3, 2025, without incident. N.T. 161.

20. Goodman's pharmacy license is suspended for three years, with the first year an active suspension that was in effect until August 27, 2025, and the next two years on probation. N.T.162-163.

#### Goodman's Suspension From the Practice of Law

21. In compliance with Pa.R.D.E. 214(a), Goodman reported his conviction to Office of Disciplinary Counsel. P-1, ¶ 11.

22. On February 7, 2024, ODC filed a Notice of Criminal Conviction with the Court and requested that a rule to show cause be entered why Goodman should not be temporarily suspended from the practice of law.

23. By Order dated February 22, 2024, the Court issued a rule on Goodman to show cause.

24. By Order dated March 25, 2024, the Court made the rule absolute and placed Goodman on temporary suspension pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 214(d)(2). The Order was effective April 24, 2024. P-1, Exhibit A.

25. On July 12, 2024, ODC and Goodman filed a Joint Petition for Discipline on Consent. P-1.

26. The Joint Petition recommended that Goodman be suspended from the Pennsylvania bar for one year and one day. P-1, ¶ 13.

27. The Joint Petition noted there were “several mitigating circumstances” in Goodman’s case, including his admission of misconduct, his cooperation with the ODC, and his remorse. P-1, ¶ 15.
28. The Joint Petition further noted that Goodman’s criminal conviction “did not involve clients and/or former clients of his law practice, and there was no evidence that [Goodman] was a drug user.” P-1, ¶ 18.
29. On October 16, 2024, the Supreme Court approved the Joint Petition and ordered that Goodman be suspended for one year and one day, retroactive to April 24, 2024, the effective date of his temporary suspension.
30. On January 13, 2025, Goodman filed a Statement of Compliance with the Board pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 217.

#### Goodman’s Post-Suspension Activities

##### Employment

31. While incarcerated, Goodman communicated regularly with David Kuritz, Esquire, who is Goodman’s personal friend and the managing shareholder of Oxman. N.T. 166.
32. Upon release from prison, Goodman sought to resume working at Oxman. N.T. 167.
33. However, Goodman had concerns that Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(4)(i) prohibited his employment with Oxman during his suspension. N.T. 167.
34. Rule 217(j)(4)(i) states that a formerly admitted attorney “is specifically prohibited from ... performing any law-related activity for a law firm,

organization or lawyer if the formerly admitted attorney was associated with that law firm, organization or lawyer on or after the date on which the acts which resulted in the disbarment, suspension or temporary suspension occurred, through and including the effective date of disbarment, suspension or temporary suspension[.]” Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(4)(i).

35. Goodman was familiar with the rule,<sup>1</sup> and he initially interpreted it to prohibit his employment at Oxman during his suspension. N.T. 195-196.

36. Nevertheless, Goodman testified that he believed the rule may not, and should not, apply to his particular circumstances because his suspension-related conduct was entirely unrelated to his practice of law at Oxman. N.T. 167, 195-196.

37. Goodman sought advice from his disciplinary counsel, Daniel Siegel, Esquire regarding whether he could resume employment at Oxman without violating Rule 217(j)(4)(i). N.T. 167-169.

38. Goodman testified that he aimed “to do everything possible to comply with the rules” so he could get back his law license. N.T. 176, 201. That is why Goodman retained Mr. Siegel for advice regarding compliance with the rules. N.T. 198.

39. Goodman also contacted his former employer, Kornblau & Kornblau, P.C., to make employment arrangements at that firm if Mr. Siegel advised he could not work at Oxman. N.T. 167.

---

<sup>1</sup> Goodman testified that he read the rule even before his incarceration. N.T. 167.

40. Goodman testified that if Mr. Siegel advised that Rule 217(j)(4)(i) applied to his circumstances, he would have worked at Kornblau & Kornblau, P.C. instead of at Oxman. N.T. 167.
41. Mr. Siegel advised Goodman that his resumption of employment at Oxman would **not** violate the Rule. N.T. 169, 196.
42. Goodman similarly spoke to Mr. Kuritz about whether Rule 217 prohibited his returning to work at Oxman. N.T. 86.
43. Mr. Kuritz told Goodman that Rule 217(j)(4)(i) “did not appear to apply” because Goodman’s suspension-related misconduct was unrelated to his practice of law at Oxman. N.T. 87-88.
44. Mr. Kuritz discussed the rule with the firm’s other partners, waited for Goodman to get advice from his ethics counsel, and ultimately agreed with Goodman’s counsel that the Rule did not apply “because the events that led to the suspension had nothing to do with [Oxman] or with the practice of law[.]” N.T. 88-89; P-4.
45. Goodman began working at the Oxman firm on or around May 13, 2024. N.T. 142, 207-208; P-4.
46. On May 14, 2024, Mr. Kuritz sent an engagement letter to the Disciplinary Board advising that Oxman would employ Goodman during his suspension, that Mr. Kuritz would be Goodman’s supervising attorney as required by Rule 217, and that the Board should contact him with any questions. N.T. 89. On or around May 14, 2024, Goodman also sent an engagement letter

to the Board advising of his employment with Oxman. N.T. 173; P-5.

47. Mr. Kuritz testified that he believes Oxman complied with Rule 217 in employing Goodman and that he would not have employed Goodman if he believed it violated the Rule. N.T. 95-96.

48. Goodman is employed at Oxman as a law clerk and performs legal research and writing. N.T. 82, 93. Mr. Kuritz described Goodman's work as "excellent." N.T. 94.

49. Goodman reports to Mr. Kuritz who acts as his overall supervisor and Goodman apprises him of all his work for Oxman. N.T. 117, 118, 178.

50. Goodman speaks with Mr. Kuritz every day to discuss what he is working on. N.T. 178.

51. Since resuming work at Oxman, Goodman has not held himself out as an attorney and has had no contact with the firm's clients. N.T. 92-93, 182-183.

52. Since resuming work at Oxman, Goodman has not worked on cases that he worked on before his suspension. N.T. 177. Goodman changed his email address to avoid giving the impression that he was an attorney. N.T. 182-183.

53. Oxman removed Goodman's name from its website and letterhead and Mr. Kuritz wrote letters to clients informing them of Goodman's status at the firm. N.T. 93.

54. Mr. Kuritz believes Goodman has "followed all the [R]ules during [his] period of suspension." N.T. 97.

### Community service

55. Prior to his suspension, Goodman performed pro bono work during his legal career. N.T. 188-190.

56. Prior to his suspension, Goodman was involved in coaching youth sports for many years (e.g., baseball, basketball, roller hockey, and soccer). N.T. 153-156.

57. Goodman enjoyed mentoring the young players and developed lasting friendships with several of them. N.T. 156.

58. Goodman similarly mentored younger inmates while he was incarcerated in 2024. Upon his release, the prison's Pretrial Services asked Goodman to continue mentoring "incoming inmates" to assist them in preparing for prison life. He now volunteers every quarter to confer with incoming prisoners. N.T. 161-164, 221-222.

59. Goodman volunteers at the Willow Grove Baptist Church food bank. He typically volunteers in winter and helps two Thursdays per month. N.T. 164, 220.

60. Goodman's current community service is voluntary and not required as part of his sentence. N.T. 164.

61. Goodman enjoys helping people and seeks to "pay it forward." N.T. 162.

### Learning in the Law

62. Goodman fulfilled his Continuing Legal Education requirements for reinstatement and periodically reviews *The Legal Intelligencer*. N.T. 191.

The Reinstatement Proceeding at No. 14 DB 2024

63. On March 19, 2025, Goodman filed a Petition for Reinstatement and accompanying Questionnaire.

64. ODC filed a response on May 9, 2025. and expressed concerns regarding Goodman's compliance with Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(4)(i) in regard to his performance of law-related activities with a law firm that he was associated with prior to his suspension.

65. A Hearing Committee was appointed and the chair held a prehearing conference on June 18, 2025.

66. The parties filed Joint Stipulations on July 21, 2025.

67. The Committee conducted a reinstatement hearing on July 31, 2025. Goodman testified on his own behalf and presented the testimony of three additional witnesses. Goodman offered exhibits P-1 through P-7 and Joint Stipulations, which were admitted into evidence without objection. ODC cross-examined Goodman and his witnesses and did not present any witness testimony or offer any exhibits.

Todd A. Goodman

68. Goodman testified credibly on his own behalf.

69. Goodman takes full responsibility for filling the forged prescription, sincerely regrets his conduct and the shame he brought on his family, recognizes the severity of opioid-related problems in society, blames nobody but himself, and has worked to redeem himself. N.T. 157-165, 180-181.

70. Goodman expressed remorse and described his criminal conduct as the “worst thing [he has] ever done” and an aberration from his otherwise law-abiding life. N.T. 180-181.

71. Goodman seeks reinstatement to continue helping people and desires to give clients the best representation possible in an ethical, moral and legal way. N.T. 182, 186.

72. Goodman does not intend to return to pharmacy work. N.T. 162-163.

### Amy Titus

73. Ms. Titus credibly testified.

74. Ms. Titus has known Goodman for fifteen years since the time her son and Goodman’s sons were teammates on Little League baseball teams coached by Goodman. N.T. 21-22.

75. Ms. Titus described Goodman as a friend who is an “honest,” “honorable,” “kind,” and “trustworthy” man with “high integrity.” N.T. 22.

76. Ms. Titus described how her husband died unexpectedly in 2019 and Goodman was “the person [she] went to for everything to help ... make the decisions [she] was incapable of making at that time.” N.T. 23-24.

77. Goodman has since helped Ms. Titus’s son with career advice and assistance. N.T. 24.

78. Ms. Titus testified that Goodman told her about his arrest “when it occurred,” that she visited him three times during his three month incarceration, that Goodman was “devastated” by his criminal matter, that Goodman is “very

remorseful,” and that Goodman accepts responsibility for his misconduct. N.T. 25-26, 29-30.

79. Ms. Titus testified that Goodman’s criminal misconduct is “completely out of character” with the “honest,” “true,” “good person” she has known for fifteen years. N.T. 23.

80. Ms. Titus testified that Goodman’s reputation in the community is that of “a person who is helpful, kind [and] generous with his time.” Ms. Titus trusts Goodman “100%” and she is “100%” comfortable sharing “confidential or sensitive information” with him. N.T. 24-25.

81. Ms. Titus spent time with Goodman during his suspension and this interaction has solidified her desire for him to be reinstated. N.T. 35.

Lynn S. Kornblau, Esquire

82. Ms. Kornblau credibly testified.

83. Ms. Kornblau is a licensed Pennsylvania attorney and is the founder and president of a non-profit charity for patient advocacy. N.T. 40-41. She testified that Goodman worked for her law firm Kornblau & Kornblau, P.C., from 1989 to 2003. During that time, Ms. Kornblau came to know Goodman both personally and professionally. N.T. 41-42.

84. Ms. Kornblau described Goodman as a “reliable” and “wonderful attorney,” and a “genuinely good” and “honorable person.” She emphasized that he is “a man of impeccable character and integrity.” N.T. 41-42, 46.

85. Ms. Kornblau learned of Goodman’s criminal problems from Goodman

himself and was aware of the details of the conduct. N.T. 42, 44.

86. Ms. Kornblau kept in touch with Goodman both before and after his time in jail. N.T. 44-45. Ms. Kornblau offered Goodman the opportunity to work for her firm or at her non-profit and had no concerns regarding his criminal matter. N.T. 45.

87. Ms. Kornblau believes that Goodman has the character and integrity to return to the practice of law and his readmission will not be detrimental to the integrity of the bar. N.T. 46, 65.

David Kuritz, Esquire

88. Mr. Kuritz credibly testified.

89. Mr. Kuritz is a licensed Pennsylvania attorney with over forty years of practice and is the managing shareholder of Oxman Goodstadt Kuritz. He currently supervises Goodman's law-related activities at the firm pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 217(j).

90. Mr. Kuritz first met Goodman approximately twenty years ago when their children played on Little League baseball teams that Goodman coached. N.T. 68-69, 95. Mr. Kuritz and Goodman soon became friends and coached Little League together for several years. N.T. 69.

91. Mr. Kuritz explained that all the parents wanted Goodman as their children's coach. Goodman "tried to teach kids not just about Little League, be it baseball or basketball, but also how those lessons apply to life." N.T. 70.

92. Mr. Kuritz testified that Goodman is more involved in the community than

“the vast majority of other residents.” N.T. 128.

93. Mr. Kuritz employed Goodman part-time for about four or five years prior to his suspension, which position became full-time about a year or so prior to Goodman’s suspension. N.T. 71, 73, 75, 123-124. He testified that Goodman is a competent lawyer and he has no concerns about Goodman’s integrity or ethics. N.T. 72, 73, 133, 134.

94. Mr. Kuritz testified that Goodman’s reputation in the legal community is “very good.” N.T. 128.

95. Mr. Kuritz observed that Goodman was “extremely remorseful” and “wanted to spend the rest of his time making up for” the “one blip” in his life and career. N.. 79. Mr. Kuritz further observed that Goodman accepted responsibility for his criminal conduct. N.T. 127.

96. Mr. Kuritz described Goodman’s criminal conduct as out of character with the person whom Mr. Kuritz knows “very well ... both personally and professionally.” N.T. 75.

97. Mr. Kuritz testified that Goodman has the moral competency and qualifications for reinstatement and that his reinstatement would not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar; rather, Goodman’s reinstatement would be an asset to the bar. N.T. 94-95.

98. Mr. Kuritz described Goodman’s active participation in community service and explained that he has an agreement with Goodman that enables Goodman to fit in his volunteer activities. N.T. 129.

99. Mr. Kuritz intends to hire Goodman as a full-time attorney if he is reinstated.

N.T. 98.

The Proceedings Below

100. On September 15, 2025, Goodman filed a post-hearing brief to the Committee in support of his reinstatement.

101. On October 8, 2025, ODC submitted a letter in lieu of a formal brief and stated its decision not to file a brief opposing Goodman's reinstatement. However, ODC expanded on the issue of Goodman's interpretation of the rules as to his law-related practice with Oxman and concluded by stating that the decision to recommend reinstatement rested with the Committee.

102. By Report filed on November 24, 2025, the Committee concluded that Goodman met his reinstatement burden under Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3) and recommended to the Board that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted. The Committee found that Goodman's law-related employment with Oxman during his suspension, although violative of the rules, should not preclude reinstatement. The Committee did not consider Goodman's reliance on his counsel's advice as a complete defense but viewed it as a mitigating factor in his culpability. HC Rpt. p. 15-17. The Committee found the record reflected that Goodman relied in good faith on his counsel's advice and his violation of the rule was neither willful nor intentional. *Id.* p. 18.

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

104. The Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on January 22, 2026.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Goodman demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in law for admission to practice law in this Commonwealth. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).
2. Goodman demonstrated 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 to the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

III. DISCUSSION

Goodman 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 October 16, 2024, retroactive to April 24, 2024, the effective date of Goodman's temporary suspension.

Pursuant to Rule 218(a)(4), 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, Goodman 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).

It has been nearly two years since Goodman was suspended and several years since the original misconduct and criminal conviction. The record evidence demonstrates that since the time of his misconduct and suspension, Goodman has persevered to rehabilitate himself.

Goodman’s underlying misconduct involved his criminal conviction related to filling a fraudulent prescription at a pharmacy in Philadelphia County in his capacity as a licensed pharmacist. Goodman’s conviction was unrelated to his practice of law and no evidence was presented that he engaged in any ethical infractions during his legal career. Goodman candidly testified to the circumstances leading to his conviction. He demonstrated that he understood the nature of his wrongdoing, felt shame, accepted full responsibility for his misconduct, blamed no one else, and expressed genuine remorse. Goodman’s 2023 guilty plea demonstrated early acceptance of responsibility. He served his incarceration and was released early due to good behavior. He fulfilled his one year

of supervised probation without incident. Similarly, Goodman's consent to a one year and one day suspension of his law license exemplified acceptance of responsibility.

In addition to holding himself accountable for his criminal conduct, Goodman credibly testified that he is extremely remorseful and contrite. He described his conduct as the "worst thing [he has] ever done" and an aberration from his otherwise law-abiding life as a lawyer, husband, father and member of his community. Goodman has spent his suspension reflecting on his actions and described his intention to move forward and "pay it back." To that end, Goodman engaged in community service during suspension by informally mentoring younger inmates while he was in prison and continuing that mentoring service to incoming inmates after his release on a quarterly basis through prison pretrial services. Goodman also volunteers at a food bank. We observe that these acts of service are voluntary and were not directed as part of his criminal sentence. Rather, these acts are a continuation of the community service Goodman performed prior to his suspension, where he devoted time and talent to youth sports and performed pro bono services.

Following his release from prison, Goodman returned to work at the Oxman firm where he had been employed as a lawyer at the time of his criminal conviction and suspension. He began employment as a law clerk on May 13, 2024, under the supervision of Mr. Kuritz. A substantial portion of the reinstatement hearing was devoted to analyzing this employment in the context of Pa.R.D.E. 217(j)(4)(i), which provides that "a formerly admitted attorney is specifically prohibited" from "performing any law-related activity for a law firm, organization or lawyer if the formerly admitted attorney was associated with that

law firm, organization or lawyer on or after the date on which the acts which resulted in the disbarment, suspension or temporary suspension occurred, through and including the effective date of disbarment, suspension or temporary suspension.” The facts demonstrate that Goodman was employed at the Oxman firm on or after the date on which his misconduct occurred, including through the effective date of his suspension. Therefore, by the plain language of the rule, Goodman’s employment as a law clerk with Oxman during his suspension did not comply with the provision.

Nevertheless, we conclude that Goodman’s failure to abide by Rule 217(j)(4)(i) does not prohibit his reinstatement. The record reflects that Goodman reviewed the rule prior to his current employment as a law clerk. Goodman believed that the rule should not apply to his circumstances because his suspension-related conduct involved only his work as a part-time pharmacist and not his work as a lawyer with Oxman. To help clarify his interpretation of the rule, Goodman sought the advice of ethics counsel, Mr. Siegel, who advised Goodman that Goodman’s employment would not violate 217(j)(4)(i).<sup>2</sup> Armed with this advice, Goodman informed Mr. Kuritz that he had consulted with ethics counsel and his employment would not violate the rule. Mr. Kuritz relied on Goodman’s representation and discussed the issue with his partners, after which they determined they would hire Goodman. Thereafter, Goodman and Mr. Kuritz separately filed notices of employment with the Board in accordance with Pa.R.D.E. 217.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Siegel stipulated that he advised Goodman that he could continue his employment with the Oxman firm. J-1, 1(d).

The Oxman firm took steps to ensure that Goodman's status as a formerly admitted attorney was clear to clients and the public by contacting clients to inform them of Goodman's status and removing Goodman's name from its website and letterhead. Goodman changed his email address to avoid any confusion that he is an active attorney. Since resuming work at Oxman, Goodman has not held himself out as an attorney, has had no contact with the firm's clients, and has not worked on cases that he worked on prior to his suspension. Goodman performs legal research and writing under the strict supervision of Mr. Kurtiz, who described Goodman's work product as "excellent."

Based on this record, we conclude that Goodman relied in good faith on the advice of his disciplinary counsel and his noncompliance with Rule 217(j)(4)(i) was neither willful nor intentional. He did not circumvent the rule in an effort to unlawfully resume practicing law. Rather, Goodman relied on the erroneous advice of ethics counsel who consistently advised Goodman that he could work at Oxman without breaching the rule. Goodman's reliance on counsel, while not a defense here, serves to mitigate his rule violation such that the infraction should not preclude his reinstatement under Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3). Goodman's work at the firm during his suspension has been otherwise consistent with permissible activities as a formerly admitted attorney.

Goodman demonstrated his competency and learning in the law by completing the required 36 hours of CLE. He kept apprised of the current law by reviewing *The Legal Intelligencer* and through his work as a law clerk at Oxman. Goodman shared his desire to return to legal practice to help people and represent them in an ethical, moral

and legal manner. The Oxman firm intends to hire Goodman as a full-time attorney upon reinstatement.

In support of his reinstatement, Goodman presented credible character evidence demonstrating strong moral qualifications, integrity, competency and fitness to resume the practice of law. Goodman's three character witnesses voiced compelling and unreserved support for his character and for his reinstatement. These witnesses constituted a cross section of Goodman's life. Each witness knew Goodman for years before his criminal conviction and suspension, kept in contact with him after his suspension, and shared their view that Goodman is qualified to resume practice. No witness expressed any degree of hesitation in recommending Goodman's reinstatement. Each witness's high regard for Goodman remained consistent despite his conviction and bolstered the evidence that Goodman is of good moral character and is fit to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On this record, we conclude Goodman met the requirements of Rule 218(c)(3), Pa.R.D.E., by presenting clear and convincing evidence of his moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law. Further, Goodman 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 confronted his past wrongdoing and demonstrated a genuine commitment to personal and professional development such 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, Todd Andrew Goodman, 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/ Joshua F. Wilson*  
Joshua F. Wilson, Member

Date: March 18, 2026