

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA  
(Before a Referee)

THE FLORIDA BAR,  
Complainant,

v.

ALLAN CAMPBELL,  
Respondent.

Supreme Court Case  
No. SC21-1495

The Florida Bar File Nos.  
2019-30,317 (5B);  
2019-30,392 (5B);  
2019-30,608 (5B);  
2019-30,726 (5B);  
2020-30,084 (5B);  
2020-30,781 (5B)

---

**CONDITIONAL GUILTY PLEA FOR CONSENT JUDGMENT**

COMES NOW the undersigned respondent, Allan Campbell, and files this Conditional Guilty Plea pursuant to Rule 3-7.9 of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

1. Respondent is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida.

2. Respondent is acting freely and voluntarily in this matter and tenders this plea without fear or threat of coercion. Respondent is represented by counsel in this matter.

3. As to The Florida Bar File Nos. 2019,30-317 (5B); 2019-30,392 (5B); 2019-30,608 (5B); 2019-30,726 (5B); 2020-30,084 (5B); and 2020-

30,781(5B), there have been findings of probable cause by the grievance committee.

4. The disciplinary measures to be imposed upon respondent are as follows:

A. Three-year suspension with proof of rehabilitation, including completion of The Florida Bar's Ethics School, required prior to reinstatement.

B. Attendance at Ethics School within six (6) months of the Court's order accepting the Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment, or the next available offering, if that is not within six (6) months. Respondent shall be responsible for payment of the \$750.00 fee associated with the program before his attendance.

C. Payment of the bar's disciplinary costs.

5. Respondent acknowledges that, unless waived or modified by the Court on motion of respondent, the Court order will contain a provision that prohibits respondent from accepting new business from the date of the order or opinion and shall provide that the suspension is effective 30 days from the date of the order or opinion so that respondent may close out the practice of law and protect the interest of existing clients.

6. Respondent agrees to eliminate all indicia of respondent's status as an attorney on email, social media, telephone listings, stationery, checks, business cards, office signs or any other indicia of respondent's status as an attorney, whatsoever. Respondent will not hold himself out as a licensed attorney until he has been reinstated as a member of The Florida Bar eligible to practice law in Florida.

7. The following allegations and rules provide the basis for respondent's guilty plea and for the discipline to be imposed in this matter:

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

A. In January 2017, respondent created a Florida business entity named Allan Campbell Attorney at Law LLC. The entity was registered to do business in the State of Florida under the fictitious name of Best Defense Law.

B. Respondent was a sole practitioner and wanted to set up a law office with his associate, William Glenn Pickard, a nonlawyer, to expand his practice.

C. Respondent agreed that one of Pickard's responsibilities as office manager of Best Defense Law was to bring in business for the firm.

D. Pickard introduced respondent to Roderic Boling, a nonlawyer, who wanted to be a silent investor in Best Defense Law.

E. Boling provided office space to Best Defense Law in the same building where Boling maintained an office.

F. Boling was associated with William Howell, a nonlawyer who owned Orlando Ventures and several other affiliated businesses that were involved in timeshare divestment.

G. Boling and Howell provided financial assistance to get Best Defense Law's office up and running.

H. Howell's businesses solicited timeshare owners to hire his businesses to divest their timeshare interests.

I. Howell also purchased timeshare divestment cases from other timeshare exit companies, acquiring those contracts without the clients' knowledge or consent.

J. Howell and Boling approached respondent about taking over their timeshare divestment cases, and respondent accepted.

K. Howell was seeking a new law firm to handle the matters after having severed his relationship with Timeshare Lawyers, Inc/Timeshare Lawyers, P.A.

L. Respondent had the timeshare clients execute limited powers of attorney authorizing respondent to negotiate on behalf of the clients with the respective time share resorts or time share companies.

M. None of Howell's timeshare divestment companies were registered lawyer referral services in accordance with the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

N. Respondent delegated virtually all of the work on the timeshare cases to case managers, who were nonlawyers, and exercised no meaningful supervision over them.

O. Howell and/or Boling provided the case managers to handle the timeshare divestment work and exercised ultimate control over them.

P. Respondent admitted that he did not talk to all of the timeshare customers.

Q. The case managers negotiated with the timeshare resorts, usually by letter or phone.

R. The case managers used form letters and affixed respondent's signature with a stamp, with respondent's knowledge and consent.

S. The timeshare owners and resorts were located nationwide, and, in some instances, resorts were located in foreign countries.

T. Respondent became aware that Howell had sent out solicitations using his name and Best Defense Law without his knowledge.

U. Respondent also learned that at least some of the timeshare clients had paid more money to Howell's businesses than respondent was being paid to work on their cases.

V. Respondent was paid \$500.00 per timeshare case by Howell and/or Boling and became aware that at least one timeshare customer paid Howell's business \$2,400.00.

W. In late 2017, respondent confronted Howell about the misleading direct solicitation and his concerns about fee sharing.

X. However, respondent continued to work for Howell and/or Boling representing the timeshare cases that they had until approximately March 2018.

Y. In late 2017, Howell and Boling again came to respondent to start doing foreclosure defense and bankruptcy cases.

Z. Respondent testified that he made it clear he was not comfortable doing foreclosure defense cases but that he wanted to learn bankruptcy.

AA. They all agreed that they would bring on two attorneys, Andrea Roebuck and R. Christopher A. Lim, to do the foreclosure defense cases.

BB. Roebuck and Lim were given office space in the same building as Best Defense Law and where Boling maintained an office.

CC. At the time they associated with Best Defense Law in or around November 2017, Roebuck and Lim were handling foreclosure defense cases for a private member association, Titans Reserve Group PMA, operated by Darrin Lavine, a nonlawyer.

DD. Around the time that Roebuck and Lim associated with Best Defense Law, Lavine ceased operations of Titans Reserve Group PMA and became involved with The Resilient Group Inc., often referred to as Resilient Group PMA, a corporation in which Boling served as President of Trustees.

EE. Lavine referred members of Titans Reserve Group PMA to Resilient Group.

FF. Best Defense Law took foreclosure defense cases from members of Resilient Group.

GG. Resilient Group was a private member association that focused on defending foreclosure cases by claiming the mortgage notes were fraudulent.

HH. Resilient Group purported to have a scientific process of examining notes to determine whether they were original or re-created.

II. Resilient Group offered its members pro se support, such as motions and legal research.

JJ. The website refers to its experienced team of foreclosure lawyers.

KK. Resilient Group accepted payments from its members for legal services and utilized Best Defense Law to provide those services. Members were not permitted to choose which attorney represented them.

LL. Members paid Resilient Group an initial fee of \$1,000.00 per property and \$600.00 per month per property until the foreclosure case was completed.

MM. Neither Resilient Group PMA nor The Resilient Group, Inc., were registered lawyer referral services in accordance with the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.



NN. When Roebuck and Lim began working with Best Defense Law, it was decided that all cases would be filed with the courts using respondent's name and e-filing credentials.

OO. Respondent's password for both state and federal court e-portal filing systems were available to office staff to allow office staff to file documents on his behalf.

PP. In foreclosure cases, after respondent filed his notice of appearance or other document in a case, Lim and/or Roebuck would handle the case going forward.

QQ. Further, it was agreed that Lim would assist respondent in becoming competent to handle bankruptcy cases.

RR. Because respondent continued his full-time court-appointed work he was not present in the office of Best Defense Law on a daily basis.

SS. Respondent delegated all handling of the law firm's finances to Pickard without exercising meaningful supervision and relied on Pickard to handle all agreements with Boling regarding the loan that Boling made to fund Best Defense Law. For instance, respondent was not completely aware of who he was paying as employees of the firm or

whether Best Defense Law was repaying the initial loan it received from Boling.

TT. Respondent also relied heavily on Pickard for the day-to-day operations of the firm, including to bring pleadings to be filed to respondent's attention.

UU. In December 2017, Pickard abruptly left Best Defense Law after a confrontation with Boling.

VV. Boling exercised considerable influence over the operation of Best Defense Law prior to Pickard's departure.

WW. Boling exerted increasing control over the operations and employees of Best Defense Law and respondent after Pickard's departure.

XX. After Pickard's departure, Boling installed a new office manager Danny Johnson, who reported to Boling rather than to respondent.

YY. Boling then offered respondent a salary increase as an incentive to prevent respondent's departure from Best Defense Law.

ZZ. Respondent testified that due to his discomfort with the increasingly hostile work environment, he spent less time at the Best Defense Law office, further exacerbating the issue with a nonlawyer controlling and directing a law firm without any supervision.

AAA. The employees of Best Defense Law, including the case managers and paralegals, took direction from Boling rather than from respondent.

BBB. The manner in which cases were managed provided Boling with access to attorney-client privileged information.

CCC. Boling routinely was included in law firm meetings where client matters were discussed, including attorney-client privileged information.

DDD. Boling routinely reviewed respondent's letters, discarding them if the language was not to Boling's liking, and directed the staff to send out a new version of the letters that Boling authored under respondent's name.

EEE. Respondent testified that he was told by staff that if clients complained about the quality of their legal representation, Boling handled those communications and advised those clients that respondent had 30 years of legal experience.

FFF. Respondent testified that he discovered in late 2017 that some foreclosure filings were made under his name and with his filing credentials without his prior knowledge or consent.

GGG. Respondent further testified that he confronted Roebuck and Lim about the unauthorized filings and directed them to cease using his e-filing credentials for the foreclosure cases.

HHH. Respondent acknowledged that he had no proof that either Roebuck or Lim were responsible for the filings rather than the nonlawyer staff who also had access to respondent's e-filing credentials.

III. The calendar and tickler system for Best Defense Law was created by Roebuck to automatically notify the nonlawyer staff of filing deadlines.

JJJ. The staff routinely drafted and filed documents using respondent's signature and filing credentials without supervision.

KKK. In or around March 2018, after a confrontation with Boling over respondent's growing concern about the manner in which Best Defense Law was being operated, Boling banned respondent from re-entering the office of Best Defense Law and told respondent he was changing the locks.

LLL. With respondent's abrupt departure, Boling assumed virtually all control over the operations of respondent's law firm.

MMM. Due to concerns that respondent might leave Best Defense Law, Roebuck incorporated the similarly named law firm of Best Defense Law, P.A. on December 28, 2017.

NNN. The name of the new law firm was dictated by Boling, who desired that the clients not become aware of the change in the law firm.

OOO. Best Defense Law, P. A., became operational after respondent's departure.

PPP. Because respondent's name was on pleadings in some of the foreclosure defense and bankruptcy cases, respondent continued receiving copies of filings from the court in those cases after he left Best Defense Law.

QQQ. If respondent perceived that the foreclosure cases were being actively litigated, respondent took no action to withdraw and permitted the court records to reflect him as counsel of record.

RRR. In cases where respondent perceived that Roebuck and/or Lim were not engaged with the clients or that the case was not being actively litigated, respondent filed a motion to withdraw and noticed the clients.

SSS. However, respondent did not set his motions for hearing or take the necessary steps to ensure he had been removed from the cases.

TTT. On the occasions when respondent was contacted by opposing counsel in a foreclosure case, respondent directed the attorney to Roebuck or Lim.

UUU. In one instance, opposing counsel refused to contact Roebuck because respondent was the attorney of record and informed respondent that she was seeking sanctions for having to defend a frivolous matter.

VVV. In response, respondent filed a dismissal instead of a motion seeking permission to withdraw from the case without consulting with the client prior to filing the motion for dismissal.

WWW. On March 29, 2018, respondent filed for an emergency injunction against Best Defense Law, of which he was the sole owner, officer, manager, and attorney of record, to stop the day-to day operations until he could bring all actions under his direct control.

XXX. The motion was denied on April 4, 2018, and a notice of lack of prosecution was entered in the case on February 21, 2019.

YYY. Respondent's lack of control over his law firm enabled Boling and Howell to use Best Defense Law to achieve their own business objectives, all of which, if engaged in by an attorney, would be a violation of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

### **COUNT I**

#### **THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2019-30,317 (5B)**

ZZZ. Beginning in or around August 2016, Thousand Hills Golf Resort, located in Missouri, began receiving letters from attorney Patrick Thompson of Timeshare Lawyers regarding Donald and Margaret Donovan, who allegedly owned a timeshare at the resort.

AAAA. Daniel C. Ruda, president of Thousand Hills Golf Resort, notified Thompson repeatedly that Thompson was addressing the wrong entity as the resort did not engage in the timeshare business and the Donovans did not own a unit at this resort. Thompson failed to correct the misidentification issue, resulting in Ruda issuing a cease and desist letter to Timeshare Lawyers.

BBBB. After Howell transferred the Donovan case to respondent's Best Defense Law, respondent wrote to Thousand Hills Golf Resort on January 15, 2018, reasserting the same allegations on behalf of the same clients that were previously proclaimed by Thompson in 2016.

CCCC. Then in May 2018, a letter was sent to Thousand Hills Golf Resort with Roebuck's signature on it, stating that Best Defense has been unable to successfully attain the resort's cooperation on behalf of the Donovans and their alleged timeshare.

DDDD. Ruda repeatedly advised each of the ensuing attorneys by telephone, postal letter, fax, and email that Thousand Hills Golf Resort was a whole-ownership resort with no timeshare option available and had no connection with the Donovans.

EEEE. In June 2018, Ruda wrote a letter to respondent to cease and desist from contacting the resort to avoid legal action against Best Defense Law, the Donovans, and all others associated with this claim.

FFFF. Ruda again advised that more accurate research by respondent's office should be conducted and that this could be considered as defamation of his company name.

GGGG. At the time of the June 2018 letter from Ruda, respondent had left Best Defense Law, without notice, and Andrea Marie Roebuck had assumed responsibility for the timeshare cases. Ruda was not provided with notice of the change in attorneys or law firms.

HHHH. Despite Ruda's June 2018 letter, other attorneys associated with Howell, who handled the timeshare cases after



respondent's departure, continued sending correspondence to the resort on behalf of the non-existent owners demanding relief.

IIII. Respondent's lack of supervision of his case managers resulted in respondent not being made aware of the Donovans' competence, understanding or their wishes as to the legal services being provided, including disclosure of their health conditions.

JJJJ. The Donovans' timeshare divestment case was purchased by Howell's company and eventually assigned to Best Defense Law years after the Donovans started the timeshare divestment process.

KKKK. Respondent was not aware of Ruda's cease and desist letters.

LLLL. Respondent never communicated with the Donovans and was not aware of their existence as his clients.

MMMM. Because respondent had no communication with the Donovans, he was not aware whether they still required divestment services, whether they were competent, whether the information provided was accurate, or whether they were still alive, given that his letter indicated that they were experiencing life-threatening medical issues.

NNNN. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3

(1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4 (Communication); 4-1.5(a) (2012, 2018) (Illegal, Prohibited, or Clearly Excessive Fees and Costs); 4-1.6(a), (e) (Confidentiality of Information); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest; Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.4(a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-5.5(a) (Unlicensed Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law); 4-5.7(a), (b), (c) (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlegal Services); 4-7.18(a) (2013, 2018) (Direct Contact with Prospective Clients); 4-7.22 (2013) (Referrals, Directories and Pooled Advertising); 4-8.4(a), (c) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6(b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

## **COUNT II**

### **THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2019-30,392 (5B)**

OOOO. On or about May 31, 2017, Joseph L. Cobb and his wife, residents of Louisiana, entered into a contract with respondent and Best Defense Law to provide legal services with respect to divesting the Cobbs' interest in a Wyndham Resorts timeshare property located in Florida. The Cobbs also executed a Limited and Specific Power of Attorney with respondent. The contract stated that Timeshare Lawyer Services was paying all fees on behalf of the Cobbs.

PPPP. In support of their hardship claim, the Cobbs provided respondent with confidential medical information.

QQQQ. Respondent permitted a situation to exist whereby the Cobbs' confidential health information was available to third parties.

RRRR. Cobb paid \$2,400.00 for this service.

SSSS. Best Defense Law wrote only one letter to Wyndham Resorts during a twenty-month period.

TTTT. Virtually all communication from Best Defense Law was from nonlawyers over whom respondent exercised little meaningful supervision.

UUUU. By November 2018, it appeared to the Cobbs that Best Defense Law had ceased operations and no refund of the unearned fees could be obtained.

VVVV. According to respondent, the fee paid by the Cobbs was not made to him or Best Defense Law, but rather to a third-party timeshare exit company that referred timeshare owners to Best Defense Law.

WWWW. Best Defense Law was paid a flat fee for each referral.

XXXX. Respondent left Best Defense Law in March 2018.

YYYY. Respondent explained that the client files remain the property of the various third parties who made the referrals to Best Defense Law. As a result, respondent had no access to the Cobbs' file.

ZZZZ. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3 (1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4 (Communication); 4-1.5(a) (2012, 2018) (Illegal, Prohibited, or Clearly Excessive Fees and Costs); 4-1.6 (a), (e) (Confidentiality of Information); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest; Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.4 (a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-5.5(a) (Unlicensed Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law); 4-5.7 (a), (b), (c) (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlegal Services); 4-7.18(a) (2013, 2018) (Direct Contact with Prospective Clients); 4-7.22 (2013) (Referrals, Directories and Pooled Advertising); 4-8.4 (a), (c) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6 (b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

### **COUNT III**

#### **THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2019-30,608 (5B)**

AAAAA. Joseph and Jodell Altier were members of Resilient Group PMA.

BBBBB. The Altiers had foreclosure and bankruptcy cases.

CCCCC. In Jodell Altier v. Goshen Mortgage, LLC, Case Number 6:18-cv-00438-JA, Jodell Altier sought an appeal of an order entered by the bankruptcy court in the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida.

DDDDD. The notice of appeal was filed on March 7, 2018, using respondent's e-filing credentials and his signature was affixed to the pleading.

EEEEE. The notice of appeal was filed around the time that respondent's association with Boling ended and he left Best Defense Law.

FFFFF. On or about July 7, 2018, Jodell Altier filed a pro se response to a motion to dismiss and motion for additional time to file an appeal prepared by Kelley Andrea Bosecker, a disbarred attorney, associated with Lavine, Roebuck, and Lim.

GGGGG. Goshen Mortgage, LLC filed a response in opposition stating that respondent did not know or represent Jodell Altier based on a telephone call opposing counsel received from respondent.

HHHHH. On September 7, 2018, the court held a status conference hearing in the matter. Roebuck appeared as counsel for Jodell Altier after being contacted by either Boling and/or Lavine.

IIII. When the issue was raised in court that respondent was not Jodell Altier's attorney and that the notice of appeal may have been fraudulently filed in his name, the court ordered an evidentiary hearing in an attempt to discover the truth of the matter.

JJJJ. In addition, the parties conducted discovery and held depositions on the matter.

KKKK. On January 8, 2019, Roebuck and attorney Stafford Shealy appeared at the evidentiary hearing on behalf of Jodell Altier.

LLLL. At the evidentiary hearing, respondent testified that he knew Roebuck and Lim had used both his state and federal court e-filing logins without his permission to file pleadings in his name.

MMMM. Later, during respondent's sworn statement taken in connection with this disciplinary matter, respondent testified that he did not know whether Roebuck or Lim filed pleadings in his name, explaining that he was upset about what was happening when he testified during the hearing in Jodell Altier's case in federal court.

NNNN. During his sworn statement, respondent testified that he did not know how the unauthorized filing occurred in Jodell Altier's case and, therefore, he did not report either Roebuck or Lim to the Bar.

OOOOO. Respondent also later testified that there had been an agreement, at least in the beginning, that all Best Defense cases would be filed in his name.

PPPPP. Respondent further acknowledged that office staff had access to his login credentials for both state and federal court.

QQQQQ. Although respondent was aware by the time that the notice of appeal was filed on behalf of Jodell Altier that his filing credentials were being used by staff in filing documents with state court, respondent did not change his password for the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida e-filing system.

RRRRR. Respondent permitted a situation to exist whereby his federal court e-filing credentials and login information were used by others to file documents in Jodell Altier's case without his knowledge or approval.

SSSSS. It was established at the January 8, 2019, evidentiary hearing in Jodell Altier's case that Lim met with respondent after a bankruptcy hearing for Jodell Altier in February 2018 to discuss whether Altier should appeal the bankruptcy court's decision.

TTTTT. Respondent could not explain why Lim met with him after the hearing other than to say that they worked in the same office.

UUUUU. Respondent denied sending Lim to cover the Altier bankruptcy hearing.

VVVVV. The deadline for filing the appeal in Jodell Altier's case was calendared by Best Defense Law staff who Roebuck, Lim and respondent shared.

WWWWW. One of the issues being considered in allowing Jodell Altier to file a belated appellate brief was whether she missed the deadline because she did not have adequate legal representation in this matter. The court was unable to discern who filed the notice of appeal using respondent's credentials.

XXXXX. At the January 8, 2019, hearing, the court ultimately granted Jodell Altier an extension of time to file an appellate brief with the judge stating: "I think under these circumstances I have to give a layperson who's dealing with the lawyers in this case the benefit of the doubt."

YYYYY. During the January 8, 2019, evidentiary hearing, it also came to light that Bosecker, a disbarred attorney, had drafted documents for Jodell Altier to file pro se in the matter at a time when Bosecker was suspended but not yet disbarred.



ZZZZZ. Jodell Altier testified that Bosecker called her after Jodell Altier missed the deadline and offered to file something to prevent dismissal of her case.

AAAAAA. Both of the Altiers testified that they believed respondent ultimately was responsible for the legal representation because it was his name that appeared on all of the pleadings filed in Jodell Altier's bankruptcy appeal case.

BBBBBB. Both of the Altiers testified that they relied on Resilient Group to provide them with competent legal services.

CCCCCC. Furthermore, Daniel Newton Brodersen, who gave up his right to practice law in 2017, sent Joseph Altier a copy of the membership agreement for Resilient Group from an email address associated with Best Defense Law.

DDDDDD. In this email, sent in February 2018, Brodersen stated: "Remember, those PMA fees contemplate our lawyers, as well as Roddy [Boling] and I, doing a great deal of work on the bankruptcy appeal, which is not normally something that the PMA deals with."

EEEEEE. Both Joseph Altier and Brodersen signed the agreement for Resilient Group.

FFFFFF. Respondent testified during his sworn statement taken in connection with these disciplinary proceedings that he was concerned about Brodersen being a "disbarred" attorney who was drafting pleadings and suggesting courses of legal actions.

GGGGGG. On January 23, 2019, Jodell Altier filed Appellant's Opening Brief *pro se*. A conference hearing was set for February 4, 2019. During the hearing, it came to light that an unknown nonlawyer at Resilient Group helped Jodell Altier draft the brief.

HHHHHH. Jodell Altier testified that there was no attorney involved and that she believed a secretary or paralegal helped her.

IIIIII. Although respondent was aware of the multiple allegations of professional misconduct in connection with the Altier case, Resilient Group and Best Defense Law, respondent did not report the attorneys and the former attorneys involved to The Florida Bar.

JJJJJJ. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3 (1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4(a) (Communication); 4-1.5(a) (Illegal, Prohibited, or Clearly Excessive Fees and Costs); 4-1.6 (a), (e) (Confidentiality of Information); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest; Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-

1.16(a)(1) (Declining or Terminating Representation); 4-3.3(a) (Candor Toward the Tribunal); 4-3.4(c) (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel); 4-5.1 (Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers); 4-5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.4 (a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-7.18(a) (2013, 2018) (Direct Contact with Prospective Clients); 4-7.21(f) (Firm Names and Letterhead); 4-7.22 (2013) (Referrals, Directories and Pooled Advertising); 4-8.3(a) (2006, 2012, 2018, 2019) (Reporting Professional Misconduct); 4-8.4 (a), (c), (d) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6 (b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

#### **COUNT IV**

##### **THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2019-30,726 (5B)**

KKKKKK. Attorney Kathleen Achille's firm represented the defendants in the following lawsuits: Russell Shrewsbury v. Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB, et al., in Brevard County Circuit Court Case No. 2018-CA-12016 and Krieger v. U.S. Bank, N.A., as Legal Title Trustee for Truman, et al., in Orange County Circuit Court Case No. 2018-CA-003193.

LLLLLL. Respondent was listed as counsel of record for the plaintiffs in both cases.

MMMMMM. In the Shrewsbury case in Brevard County, a hearing was held on March 6, 2019, on Achille's Motion to Quash Service of Process and Motion to Vacate Default where respondent failed to appear.

NNNNNN. Instead, respondent sent an *ex parte* email to the presiding judge advising that he could not be appear at the hearing due to a conflict with another matter in Lake County, Florida, that required his attendance.

OOOOOO. Respondent further advised the judge that he did not represent the plaintiff, Russell Shrewsbury, and never had contact with Shrewsbury.

PPPPPP. The morning of the hearing respondent filed a Motion to Discharge or Withdraw citing that respondent did not practice in the area of business torts or civil litigation, that he had not met the plaintiff, and that attorneys at Best Defense Law "behaved in a manner not consistent with [respondent's] understanding and expectations from representations previously made."

QQQQQQ. Despite respondent's assertion, all pleadings filed in both the Shrewsbury and Krieger cases bore respondent's signature block, his electronic signature, and his Florida Bar attorney number.

RRRRRR. Further, with respect to the Shrewsbury case, Achille's client was not properly served with process, yet a default was entered against the client.

SSSSSS. Achille's firm discovered the default by chance while conducting a routine docket check.

TTTTTT. Respondent permitted a situation to exist whereby others were able to access his e-filing credentials and file pleadings in respondent's name in cases where respondent was not representing the clients and had no knowledge of the cases.

UUUUUU. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3 (1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4(a) (Communication); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest; Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-1.16(a)(1) (Declining or Terminating Representation); 4-3.5(b) (Communication with Judge or Official); 4-4.1 (Truthfulness in Statements to Others); 4-5.1 (Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers); 4-5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.4 (a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-8.3(a) (2006, 2012, 2018, 2019) (Reporting Professional

Misconduct); 4-8.4 (a), (c), (d) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6 (b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

## **COUNT V**

### **THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2020-30,084 (5B)**

VVVVVV. William Hammond, a resident of Montana, owned a timeshare at a resort known as Festiva, located in Maryland.

WWWWWW. Although Hammond never retained respondent or Best Defense Law, Festiva resort was advised otherwise.

XXXXXX. Hammond advised that he was told that the resort had received an injunction from Best Defense Law Team on March 7, 2018.

YYYYYY. As a result of the apparent legal dispute, Festiva resort refused to permit Hammond use of his timeshare located at a resort property in Maryland.

ZZZZZZ. When Hammond attempted to contact respondent and/or Best Defense Law Team, he was unable to reach anyone. Best Defense Law Team's website was no longer operational, and Hammond was unable to leave a message at the phone number listed.

AAAAAAA. Respondent's failure to exercise supervision and control over the case managers, lawyers and non-lawyers working with

Best Defense Law resulted in respondent being unaware he was representing Hammond.

BBBBBBB. Respondent permitted a situation to exist whereby William Howell was able to use respondent's law firm to solicit timeshare owners and to lead the owners to believe they were receiving legal services from respondent.

CCCCCCC. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3 (1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4 (Communication); 4-1.5(a) (2012, 2018) (Illegal, Prohibited, or Clearly Excessive Fees and Costs); 4-1.6 (a), (e) (Confidentiality of Information); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest, Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-4.1 (Truthfulness in Statements to Others); 4-5.1 (Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers); 4-5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.4 (a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-5.5(a) (Unlicensed Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law); 4-7.18(a) (2013, 2018) (Direct Contact with Prospective Clients); 4-7.22 (2013) (Referrals, Directories and Pooled Advertising); 4-8.4 (a), (c) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6 (b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

**COUNT VI**

**THE FLORIDA BAR FILE NO. 2020-30,781 (5B)**

DDDDDDD. Joseph Nemchik believed he retained respondent through his membership in Resilient Group, PMA to represent him as the plaintiff in a civil case filed in Orange County Circuit Court, Nemchik v. Parablis, et. al., Case No. 2016-CA-010177.

EEEEEEE. Respondent explained that his involvement in this case was limited to filing a motion to continue on January 15, 2018, after being approached by a shared administrative person that neither attorney Roebuck nor Lim were available to cover a hearing that was set.

FFFFFFF. However, respondent's motion to continue filed on January 15, 2018, stated that respondent's law firm had just been retained by Nemchik on January 12, 2018, and that he was requesting to reschedule the hearing within the next thirty days to competently prepare to argue opposing counsel's motions.

GGGGGGG. Respondent's motion indicated that it was submitted by Allan Campbell, Esq., with Best Defense Law.

HHHHHHH. Furthermore, a Notice of Appearance was filed on January 10, 2018, also stating that it was submitted by respondent



and that Allan Campbell, Esq., with Best Defense Law was entering his appearance as counsel of record.

IIIIII. Prior to respondent entering his notice of appearance, Nemchik was *pro se*.

JJJJJJ. Respondent received an Order Setting Status Hearing approximately 20 months later and realized he remained counsel of record in Nemchik's case.

KKKKKKK. Upon receiving this order setting a status hearing for January 10, 2020, respondent promptly filed a Motion to Withdraw from Continued Representation on November 22, 2019.

LLLLLLL. In his motion to withdraw, respondent stated that he was no longer associated with Best Defense Law and had not been since March 2018.

MMMMMMM. Respondent further stated that he had not met with and did not know nor have any attorney-client relationship with Nemchik since having left Best Defense Law.

NNNNNNN. Finally, respondent stated that he had no independent means of contacting Nemchik about the case and the hearing.

OOOOOOO. Respondent did not set his motion to withdraw for hearing, and the court did not enter an order granting respondent's withdrawal.

PPPPPPP. When respondent and Nemchik failed to appear for the status hearing on January 10, 2020, the case was dismissed.

QQQQQQQ. Respondent believed he did not need to appear at the January 10, 2020, hearing because he could offer no information about the case and expected that Nemchik would be present as he was noticed about the hearing.

RRRRRRR. Nemchik has stated that he had met with respondent many times and that respondent had all of his contact information.

SSSSSSS. After learning the case was dismissed, Nemchik filed a motion to vacate the dismissal. The court then set a hearing on Nemchik's motion for January 30, 2020.

TTTTTTT. Thereafter, Nemchik contacted respondent and insisted that respondent file a motion to correct the dismissal.

UUUUUUU. On January 29, 2020, respondent filed a Motion to Hear Motion to Withdraw First and a Cross-Notice of Hearing to have his motion to withdraw heard at the January 30 hearing.

VVVVVVV. Both respondent and Nemchik appeared at the January 30, 2020, hearing.

WWWWWWW. Respondent stated that the court did not hear argument on respondent's motion to withdraw and found that because Nemchik had counsel, his *pro se* motions were moot.

XXXXXXX. Respondent then filed a Motion to Correct Mistake based on the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, realizing that he needed the case reopened for the court to hear his motion to withdraw.

YYYYYYY. A hearing was held on respondent's motion on March 3, 2020. The court denied respondent's motion to correct mistake but granted his amended motion to withdraw.

ZZZZZZZ. The following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar provide the basis for the discipline to be imposed in this matter: 3-4.3 (1993, 2018) (Misconduct and Minor Misconduct); 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.4(a) (Communication); 4-1.5(a) (Illegal, Prohibited, or Clearly Excessive Fees and Costs); 4-1.8(f) (2010, 2018) (Conflict of Interest; Prohibited and Other Transactions); 4-1.16(d) (Declining or Terminating Representation); 4-3.3(a) (Candor Toward the Tribunal); 4-3.4(c) (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel); 4-5.1(a) (Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers); 4-5.3(a) (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer

Assistants); 4-5.4 (a), (c), (d), (e) (Professional Independence of a Lawyer); 4-7.18(a) (2013, 2018) (Direct Contact with Prospective Clients); 4-7.21(f) (Firm Names and Letterhead); 4-7.22 (2013) (Referrals, Directories and Pooled Advertising); 4-8.3(a) (2006, 2012, 2018, 2019) (Reporting Professional Misconduct); 4-8.4 (a), (c), (d) (Misconduct); and 4-8.6 (b), (c), (d) (Authorized Business Entities).

8. The Florida Bar has approved this proposed plea in the manner required by Rule 3-7.9.

9. If this plea is not finally approved by the referee and the Supreme Court of Florida, then it shall be of no effect and may not be used by the parties in any way.

10. If this plea is approved, then respondent agrees to pay all reasonable costs associated with this case pursuant to Rule 3-7.6(q) currently totaling \$6,670.55 with the understanding that additional costs associated with the final hearing will be added once those amounts are known by the bar. These costs are due within 30 days of the Court order. Respondent agrees that if the costs are not paid within 30 days of this Court's order becoming final, respondent shall pay interest on any unpaid costs at the statutory rate. Respondent further agrees not to attempt to discharge the obligation for payment of the bar's costs in any future


proceedings, including but not limited to, a petition for bankruptcy.

Respondent shall be deemed delinquent and ineligible to practice law pursuant to Rule 1-3.6 if the cost judgment is not satisfied within 30 days of the final Court order, unless deferred by the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar.

11. Respondent acknowledges the obligation to pay the costs of this proceeding and that payment is evidence of strict compliance with the conditions of any disciplinary order or agreement and is also evidence of good faith and fiscal responsibility. Respondent understands that failure to pay the costs of this proceeding may reflect adversely on any reinstatement proceedings or any other bar disciplinary matter in which respondent is involved.

12. This Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment fully complies with all requirements of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Allan Campbell", written in a cursive style.

ALLAN CAMPBELL  
Respondent  
1300 South Duncan Drive, Building A  
Tavares, Florida 32778-4206  
(352) 609-6031  
Florida Bar ID No.: 854522  
[allan.campbell@myflfamilies.com](mailto:allan.campbell@myflfamilies.com)

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022.



PATRICK JOHN MCGINLEY  
Counsel for Respondent  
2265 Lee Road, Suite 100  
Winter Park, Florida 32789-1858  
(407) 681-2700  
Florida Bar ID No.: 85881  
[patrick@mcginleylaw.com](mailto:patrick@mcginleylaw.com)  
[christine@mcginleylaw.com](mailto:christine@mcginleylaw.com)

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.



LAURA N. GRYB  
Bar Counsel  
The Florida Bar  
1000 Legion Place, Suite 1625  
Orlando, Florida 32801-1050  
(407) 425-5424  
Florida Bar ID No. 89047  
[lgryb@floridabar.org](mailto:lgryb@floridabar.org)  
[orlandooffice@floridabar.org](mailto:orlandooffice@floridabar.org)  
[dsullivan@floridabar.org](mailto:dsullivan@floridabar.org)