

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD
OF THE
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION
AND
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DAVID HALL,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6333638.

Commission No. 2022PR00077

COMPLAINT

Jerome Larkin, Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, by his attorney, Matthew D. Lango, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 753(b), complains of Respondent, David Hall, who was licensed to practice law in Illinois on November 7, 2019, and alleges that Respondent has engaged in the following conduct which subjects Respondent to discipline pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 770:

COUNT I

(Creation of False Billing Entries and Misrepresentations to Employer)

1. In 2017, while attending law school in Chicago, Respondent began working as a summer associate at Dentons US LLP (“Dentons”). In October 2018, he joined the firm as an associate attorney.

2. Throughout his employment with Dentons, Respondent was assigned primarily to the firm’s litigation group. As a new associate attorney, one of Respondent’s primary responsibilities with respect to representation of the firm’s clients in litigation matters was to handle document review projects, often in connection with discovery productions.

FILED
9/9/2022 11:57 AM
ARDC Clerk

3. During Respondent's employment at Dentons, he prepared records relating to the time he spent providing legal services to Dentons' clients. Dentons billed clients for Respondent's services based on these records of time multiplied by his hourly billing rate.

4. In late 2020 and early 2021, Respondent was assigned to a document review project in which he was to review a substantial number of documents belonging to one of Denton's clients to determine which documents should be produced by the client in response to discovery requests in a litigation matter. As part of his review of the client's documents, Respondent was responsible for determining which documents were relevant and responsive to the discovery requests in the litigation, which were irrelevant or non-responsive, and which documents may be subject to attorney-client privilege. Respondent would use the firm's document review software to mark the documents as reviewed, and would flag the reviewed documents as responsive, non-responsive, or subject to privilege.

5. Between December 2020 and March 2021, with regard to the document review project described in paragraph 4 above, Respondent marked a total of 425 documents as having been reviewed by him and recorded a total of approximately 277 hours of time related to the review of said documents. Respondent then submitted his billing entries to his supervisors at Dentons.

6. In or about March 2021, upon reviewing Respondent's work, Respondent's supervisors at Dentons determined that Respondent had not opened or reviewed approximately 405 of the 425 documents that he claimed to have reviewed, and for which he submitted time records, as described in paragraph 5 above.

7. Respondent's records of time he spent on document review, as described in paragraph 5 above, were false because he had only reviewed approximately 20 of the 425

documents he had marked as reviewed. In addition, between December 2020 and March 2021, Respondent had not spent 277 hours reviewing the documents he claimed to have reviewed.

8. At the time Respondent prepared the billing entries described in paragraph 5 above, Respondent knew the entries were false because he knew he had not completed the work he described in those entries. Respondent falsely claimed to have reviewed documents and made false billing entries for the purpose of deceiving his supervisors into believing that he had performed work for the firm's client when he had not.

9. On March 12, 2021, after a review of Respondent's billing and document review records, attorneys from Dentons confronted Respondent about his false document review entries. Respondent admitted to Dentons personnel that he had not reviewed the documents and that his billing entries relating to the document review project contained false information. Dentons then terminated Respondent's employment.

10. Attorneys from Dentons discovered Respondent's false entries concerning his document review and billing entries as described above before any clients of the firm were billed for his work.

11. By reason of the conduct described above, Respondent has engaged in the following misconduct:

- a. conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including knowingly making false statements in recording time spent on document review when he had not in fact reviewed the documents and knowingly creating billing entries that exceeded the time actually spent working on client matters, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

WHEREFORE, the Administrator requests that this matter be assigned to a panel of the Hearing Board, that a hearing be held and that the panel make findings of fact, conclusions of fact and law and a recommendation for such discipline as is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome Larkin, Administrator
Attorney Registration and
Disciplinary Commission

By: /s/Matthew D. Lango
Matthew D. Lango

Matthew D. Lango
Counsel for the Administrator
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 565-2600
Email: mlango@iadc.org
Email: ARDCeService@iadc.org
MAINLIB_#1408331_v1