

FILED  
10/28/2024 2:33 PM  
ARDC Clerk

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

In the Matter of:

DREW MICHAEL HARWICK,

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 3128559.

Commission No. 2024PR00065

COMPLAINT

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, by her attorney, Richard Gleason, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 753(b), complains of Respondent, Drew Michael Harwick (“Respondent”), who was licensed to practice law in Illinois on October 29, 1980, and alleges that Respondent has engaged in the following conduct, which subjects him to discipline pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 770:

*(Revealing client information involving J.O.)*

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent was a sole practitioner in Schaumburg with a practice focused on family law and criminal defense.

2. On or about January 3, 2013, Respondent consulted with J.O., who was seeking an attorney to represent him in a Cook County case in which J.O. was charged with the misdemeanor offense of battery (“the battery case”).

3. Following the consultation described in paragraph two, above, Respondent and J.O. agreed that Respondent would represent J.O. in the battery case. Respondent and J.O. further agreed that J.O. would pay Respondent a retainer fee of \$500, which would be deposited in Respondent’s client trust account, and against which Respondent would bill J.O. for legal fees. Respondent and J.O. further agreed that J.O. would pay Respondent \$180 per court appearance, and \$1,200 for Respondent’s representation of J.O. if the battery case was resolved after a jury

trial. In total over the course of Respondent's representation of J.O., J.O. paid Respondent \$2,500.

4. Between January 2, 2013 and May 28, 2013, Respondent met with J.O. on at least two occasions and obtained information from J.O. concerning the incident giving rise to the battery case. Further, as part of his representation of J.O., Respondent reviewed the police report generated by the arresting agency and J.O.'s criminal history.

5. On or about May 28, 2013, Respondent represented J.O. in a jury trial, which resulted in verdict of guilty against J.O.. Shortly thereafter, J.O. terminated Respondent's representation of him. J.O. subsequently moved to have the guilty verdict set aside, alleging ineffective assistance of counsel. The judge presiding over the matter granted J.O.'s motion, and thereafter expunged J.O.'s battery charge.

6. On or about October 23, 2013, J.O. posted a client review of Respondent's services on the website <http://LisTwins.com>, in which he discussed his dissatisfaction with Respondent's services. In the posting, J.O. stated:

this guy practices law just as bad as he looks. After you lose, his excuse is 'you got what you paid for.' Do yourself a favor, when you see his ad [...] FLAG IT – the untalented barrister, Drew Harwick, needs to advertise his services elsewhere.

7. On October 24, 2014, J.O. posted another client review of Respondent, this time on the legal referral website [www.AVVO.com](http://www.AVVO.com), in which he discussed his dissatisfaction with Respondent's services. In the posting, J.O. stated:

I hired Mr. Harwick to represent me for a simple misdemeanor battery charge. After my jury conviction I filed an appeal. Last week the trial judge vacated the jury verdict and granted me my new trial due to Mr. Harwick's ineffective assistance. I find it hard to believe I'm the only one who has a negative review of Mr. Harwick's ability to practice law.

8. In or in about December, 2014, Respondent, on his own website with the address

<http://drewharwickaffordableillinoisdivorcelawyer.info>, posted a reply to J.O.'s 2014 client reviews, described in paragraphs six and seven, above. In his response, Respondent stated:

This is Drew Harwick, Attorney's response to the negative review on the internet. To my clients: please look at the other articles under Google, Bing, and Yahoo to learn about my experience and background. This particular article is solely a response to a negative review (rant) by a rotten, mean-spirited convicted criminal bully named [J.]. ([J.] writes like a "jailhouse lawyer wannabe," a soap opera magazine trash writer), subverting "the truth" into "the tooth")(a clown)(takes over 60 hours to write (Wacko)(a clown) for a minor simple battery case over two years ago (double Wacko)(a clown) and steals my name to use in his own url or domain name (Triple Wacko)(a clown) [...]

9. Respondent further stated:

[...] [J.] received no jail time. (The judge wanted to put [J.] in jail, but I convinced the judge not to) (at the sentencing, [J.] stated to the judge that he had done jail time before.)

10. Respondent further stated:

[...] [J.] (bully) poked an old man (victim) while swearing at work, the old man jolted backwards. The old man (victim and co-worker) and an independent eye witness testified against [J.] at the trial. (The witness witnessed the bullying and swearing, she also testified that [J.] also came up to her and aggressively verbally bothered her). The police indicated [J.] had a reputation at the company he worked at of being a bully. I eventually called the company and the man who answered the phone indicated "they have cut ties" with [J.].

11. Respondent further stated:

[...] [J.] called me a year after the case was over. He used a fake name and pretended he had a legitimate reason to call. I said "This is [J.]" *[sic]* He denied it. I asked him what he did for work. He said he is heavily into military activities. [J.] is a veteran over 55 years old.

12. Respondent further stated:

By the way, does [J.] ever show any remorse for committing the crime of battery or for having committed the crimes of dui *[sic]* and driving on a suspended license? No, with [J.] it is always "what in it

for me”? [sic] “Let’s manipulate the justice system so that I can get away with the fact that I am a bully and I have hassled [sic] people at work and I have gotten drunk and driven and I was physically abusive to an old man at work” [sic] What about that old man who received the battery? Do you think he had a nice day at work that day? [J.] is just a loser.[...]

13. Respondent further stated:

“Finally, [J.] is just a high school graduate. My advice to [J.] is to go to college for four years and law school for three years. Then, pass the Illinois bar exam. By that time, he will be 66 years old.”

14. On or about August 6, 2018, Respondent created a website with a web address that included J.O.’s full name, nickname, occupation, and the town in which he lived. On or about July 18, 2019, Respondent posted the following comment on the website:

Notice: [J.O.], a 62 year old insurance adjuster, insurance agent who works at [J.O.’s office address] is a cyber-bully.... I had a small business transaction with [J.O.] about 6 years ago.... In 2013, after my business transaction with [J.] was over, he made a fake phone call to me denying he was [J.], I asked him what he did for work. He said that he is working deep in the military.

15. By naming J.O. in his 2019 post on the website Respondent created, described in paragraph 14, above, including J.O.’s full office address and the name of the town in which J.O. lived, by describing J.O. as a veteran whom Respondent had represented in 2013, and by stating that J.O. had made a phone call to Respondent during which J.O. denied his identity, Respondent disclosed information that could reasonably lead to the discovery by third persons that J.O. was the same individual Respondent described in his 2014 post, described in paragraphs eight through 13, above.

16. In his December 2014 statements posted on his own website, described in paragraphs eight through 13, above, Respondent revealed information relating to his representation of J.O. when he described details of J.O.’s battery case and criminal history. Respondent did not

obtain J.O.'s informed consent prior to posting the information described in paragraphs eight through 13, above.

17. Respondent's statements in the postings described in paragraphs eight through 14 were designed to intimidate and embarrass J.O. and to keep him from posting additional information about Respondent on the website [www.AVVO.com](http://www.AVVO.com) and the website [www.LisTwins.com](http://www.LisTwins.com).

18. On December 3, 2021, Respondent entered into an agreement pursuant to Commission Rule 108, in which he admitted the misconduct described above. As further part of that agreement, Respondent agreed to comply with the requirements of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct; agreed to complete the ARDC Professionalism Seminar within 180 days; agreed to attend meetings as scheduled by the Commission probation officer; agreed to submit quarterly written reports to the Commission probation officer concerning his compliance with the conditions of probation; agreed to continue with mental health treatment to be provided by mental health professionals Respondent designated; agreed to comply with the treatment recommendations of those mental health professionals; and agreed to provide quarterly reports from his mental health professionals relating to his continuing care and treatment.

19. Respondent failed to submit his December 2022, March 2023, or September 2023 quarterly reports to the Commission concerning his compliance with mental health treatment. In addition, since June of 2023, Respondent has failed to submit reports from his treating mental health professionals relating to their care and treatment of Respondent.

20. Between January 1, 2023 and November 14, 2023, Commission employees telephoned or wrote to Respondent or his counsel on at least eight occasions concerning Respondent's failure to comply with the requirements of the Commission Rule 108 deferral of

prosecution, including the filing of quarterly reports and the submission of reports from his treating mental health professionals, described in paragraph 19, above.

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

- a. revealing information relating to the representation of a client without the client's informed consent, by conduct including describing details of J.O.'s battery case and J.O.'s identity in Respondent's internet posts, in violation of Rule 1.6(a) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- b. knowingly failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, by conduct including failing to respond to Commission employees' demands that Respondent submit reports from his treating mental health professionals relating to their care and treatment of Respondent.

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

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator  
Attorney Registration and  
Disciplinary Commission

By: /s/ Richard Gleason  
Richard Gleason

Richard Gleason  
Counsel for the Administrator  
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Telephone: (312) 565-2600  
Email: [rgleason@iadc.org](mailto:rgleason@iadc.org)  
Email: [ARDCeService@iadc.org](mailto:ARDCeService@iadc.org)