

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

FILED  
6/18/2026 10:19 AM  
ARDC Clerk

In the Matter of:

RUTH RAMIREZ

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6292685.

Commission No. 2026PR00039

**NOTICE OF FILING**

To: Tammy L. Evans ([tevans@iardc.org](mailto:tevans@iardc.org); [ARDCeService@iardc.org](mailto:ARDCeService@iardc.org))  
Counsel for Administrator  
Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission  
3161 West White Oaks Drive, Suite 301  
Springfield, Illinois 62704

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **June 18, 2026**, we e-filed with the Clerk of the Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission, Chicago, Illinois on behalf of Respondent: **RUTH RAMIREZ'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**, a copy of which is served upon you herewith.

By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Granoff

Elizabeth A. Granoff ([elizabethagranoff@gmail.com](mailto:elizabethagranoff@gmail.com))  
Law Offices of Elizabeth A. Granoff  
1331 Central Avenue  
Wilmette, IL 60091  
(312) 441-1250

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure [735 ILCS 5/1-109], the undersigned certifies that they served the foregoing document(s) by causing copies to be delivered to the above stated SERVICE LIST by **email** on **June 18, 2026**.

By: /s/ Gail Weissman

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

In the Matter of:

RUTH RAMIREZ

Attorney-Respondent,

No. 6292685.

Commission No. 2026PR00039

**RESPONDENT RUTH RAMIREZ'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

Now comes, Respondent, Ruth Ramirez by and through her attorney, Elizabeth A. Granoff, who admits that she was licensed to practice law in the State Illinois on November 8, 2007, but denies the conclusory portions of the remaining allegations of the prefatory paragraph and answers as follows:

**ANSWER**

**(Each allegation of the Complaint is restated first, then Respondent's Answer)**

**COUNT I**

*(Lack of Diligence and Failure to Communicate – O.A.)*

1. On August 9, 2003, a man with the initials "D.W." and a woman with the initials "O.A." were married. During the marriage, D.W. and O.A. had two children.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph One.

2. On December 10, 2010, O.A. filed a *pro se* petition for dissolution of marriage in the Circuit Court of Cook County and caused D.W. to be served with the petition. D.W. did not file a response to the petition.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Two.

FILED  
6/18/2026 10:19 AM  
ARDC Clerk

3. On March 3, 2011, the trial court entered a judgment for dissolution of marriage. Pursuant to the judgment, D.W. was required to pay child support in the amount of \$500 every month to O.A. for their two minor children. D.W. has not made any child support payments since the judgment was entered.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations in the first two sentences contained in Paragraph Three. Respondent has insufficient evidence to admit or deny whether D.W. has made any child support payments since the judgment was entered.

4. Between January 1, 2018 and October 1, 2021, the parties' oldest child resided with D.W. On or before April 12, 2022, D.W. filed a petition to modify child support seeking to abate his obligation to pay child support for the parties' oldest child for the period of January 1, 2018 and October 1, 2021. D.W. caused O.A. to be served with the petition. Shortly thereafter, Respondent and O.A. agreed that Respondent would represent O.A. in matters relating to D.W.'s petition to modify child support and agreed that Respondent would charge O.A. a \$2,500 flat fee.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Four.

5. On April 14, 2022, Respondent filed her appearance in the couple's post-dissolution of marriage matter.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Five.

6. Between April 2022 and December 2023, O.A. made payments totaling \$1,400 toward Respondent's requested \$2,500 flat fee.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Six.

7. Between April 14, 2022 and December 18, 2023, Respondent appeared in court and filed pleadings on behalf of O.A. in the dissolution of marriage matter.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Seven but specifies that she appeared in court and filed pleadings not in a post dissolution of marriage matter but rather in a post decree matter.

8. On June 27, 2023, the court entered an order abating D.W.'s obligation to pay child support for the parties' oldest child for the period of January 1, 2018 through October 1, 2021.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Eight but specifies that it was an Agreed Order. The Agreed Order modified support and the parties agreed that D.W. would pay Retroactive child support in the amount of \$10,500 related to the time between August 1, 2020 through October 1, 2021.

9. As of August 7, 2023, the dispute between O.A. and her former spouse over the amount of child support D.W. owed O.A. was unresolved, and on that date, Respondent caused a petition for rule to show cause to be filed in O.A.'s case. On August 14, 2023, Respondent caused a notice of motion to be filed and served upon D.W.'s attorney. The notice of motion stated that Respondent would appear before the Honorable Matthew Jannusch on August 21, 2023, and present the petition for rule to show cause.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Nine but denies that the amount of child support D.W. owed O.A. was unresolved. Respondent admits that she caused a petition for rule to show cause to be filed in O.A.'s case and contends that this was a new separate issue for a different period of time related to back owed child support.

10. On August 21, 2023, D.W.'s attorney filed a motion to withdraw as counsel for D.W. On the same day, Respondent caused a notice of motion to be filed and served on D.W. and his attorney that stated Respondent would appear before Judge Jannusch on August 29, 2023, and

present the petition for rule to show cause. The trial court scheduled a status hearing for the motion to withdraw and petition for rule to show cause for September 11, 2023.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Ten.

11. On September 11, 2023, Respondent and O.A. appeared in court for the status hearing. Judge Jannusch entered an order allowing D.W.'s attorney to withdraw and advising D.W. that he had 21 days to retain counsel. Judge Jannusch continued the matter for a status hearing to be conducted via the Zoom videoconference platform on October 10, 2023, and provided the meeting number and password on the order.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Eleven.

12. On October 10, 2023, Respondent and O.A. appeared in court for the previously scheduled status hearing. Judge Jannusch directed Respondent to send notice of her petition for rule to show cause directly to D.W. and continued the matter to October 30, 2023 for a status hearing on Respondent's petition.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twelve.

13. On October 30, 2023, Respondent, O.A., and D.W. appeared via Zoom for the status hearing. Judge Jannusch entered an order granting D.W. 28 days to file a response to Respondent's petition for rule to show cause and continuing the matter to December 18, 2023 for entry of judgment and a proposed payment schedule.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirteen but denies that O.A. appeared for the October 30, 2023, status hearing.

14. On December 18, 2023, Respondent and O.A. appeared via Zoom for the hearing on Respondent's motion. D.W. did not appear. Respondent was directed to prepare a judgment and proposed payment schedule and docket the matter for presentation before the trial court.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Fourteen.

15. At no time between December 18, 2023 and June 3, 2024, did Respondent prepare or present a judgment and proposed payment schedule to the trial court.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Fifteen.

16. Between December 18, 2023 and June 3, 2024, O.A. called Respondent's law office on several occasions and left messages for Respondent asking about the status of her case, but Respondent did not return O.A.'s calls.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits that OA called Respondent's office during this time period but has insufficient evidence to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph Sixteen and demands strict proof thereof.

17. On April 23, 2024, O.A. sent an email to Respondent's office assistant and the general email address for Respondent's law office. In her email, O.A. stated that she had been calling the office and leaving messages but had not received a response and asked when Respondent would be filing an order in her case. She also informed Respondent that she would contact the court directly if she did not receive a response.

**ANSWER:** On April 23, 2024, Respondent's office sent a bill to OA which reflected a balance and Respondent admits that OA sent an email to Respondent's office that she had been calling the office but has insufficient evidence to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph Seventeen and demands strict proof thereof.

18. On May 21, 2024, O.A. contacted the court requesting a court date to finalize the order regarding child support. The court informed O.A. that her attorney must file the necessary order.

**ANSWER:** Respondent has insufficient evidence to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph Eighteen.

19. On June 3, 2024, O.A. filed a request for investigation with the ARDC.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Nineteen.

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

- a. failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client by conduct including failing to prepare or present a judgment and proposed payment schedule on behalf of O.A., in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. failing to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter, by conduct including failing to respond to O.A.'s telephone calls and email regarding the status of her matter, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- c. failing to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information, by conduct including failing to respond to O.A.'s telephone calls and email regarding the status of her matter, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(4) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER:** Respondent denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 20 (a)- (c). These statements are not allegations of fact but are conclusions of law which the Administrator must prove to the Hearing Board by clear and convincing evidence.

## COUNT II

*(Lack of Diligence and Lack of Communication – M.H.)*

21. On July 12, 1980, a woman with the initials “M.H.” and a man with the initials “H.H.” were married in Haiti.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-One.

22. On or about January 25, 2018, M.H. filed a petition for legal separation in the

Circuit Court of Cook County.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Two.

23. On or before March 8, 2019, Respondent and M.H. agreed that Respondent would represent M.H. in matters relating to her desire for a legal separation and that Respondent would charge M.H. a \$700 flat fee for the representation. On or before March 15, 2019, Respondent filed her appearance on behalf of M.H.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Three but denies that she received a \$700 flat fee for the representation and instead received a flat fee of \$750.00.

24. Between March 15, 2019 and May 16, 2022, Respondent appeared in court on behalf of M.H. for various status dates and hearings related to the case.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Four.

25. On May 16, 2022, the trial court entered an order continuing the matter for a pre-trial conference on August 25, 2022, and directing H.H. to appear in court on that date. The order further stated that H.H.'s failure to appear in court on August 25, 2022 may result in an adverse ruling against him.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Five

26. On August 25, 2022, neither Respondent, M.H. nor H.H. appeared in court for the scheduled pre-trial conference. The trial court continued the matter for a progress hearing on October 26, 2022. The circuit clerk sent an electronic notice of the trial court's order to Respondent.

**ANSWER:** Respondent denies that she did not appear in court in court on August 25, 2022, and demands strict proof thereof. Respondent admits that the matter was continued for a progress hearing on October 26, 2022, but denies that the trial court took this action. Respondent has

insufficient evidence to admit or deny if the circuit clerk sent an electronic notice of the trial court's order to Respondent.

27. On October 26, 2022, Respondent did not appear for the scheduled progress hearing, and the trial court entered an order dismissing the matter for want of prosecution.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Seven.

28. On October 27, 2022, the Cook County Circuit Clerk's office sent electronic notice of the trial court's dismissal order to Respondent. On or about October 27, 2022, Respondent received the electronic notice from the Circuit Clerk's office.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Eight.

29. At no time after October 27, 2022, did Respondent inform M.H. that her case had been dismissed for want of prosecution, or file a motion to vacate the trial court's October 26, 2022 order.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Twenty-Nine and states that the Case was refiled under case number 2024D631072 and is pending.

30. Between October 27, 2022 and July 2024, M.H. contacted Respondent's office to inquire about the status of her case. Each time M.H. contacted Respondent's office, Respondent's staff told M.H. that the judge presiding over her matter was ill and that her matter had been continued.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty.

31. In or around July 2024, M.H. contacted the Cook County Circuit Clerk's office and was told that her case had been dismissed on October 26, 2022.

**ANSWER:** Respondent has insufficient evidence to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-One.

32. On September 27, 2024, M.H. submitted a request for investigation of Respondent to the ARDC.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-Two.

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

- a. failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client by conduct including failing to appear for a pre-trial conference on August 25, 2022 and for a progress hearing on October 26, 2022, which resulted in M.H.'s matter being dismissed for want of prosecution, and failing to file a motion to vacate the trial court's October 26, 2022 dismissal order, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- b. failing to promptly inform a client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(e), is required by these Rules, by conduct including failing to inform M.H. that her case had been dismissed for want of prosecution, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(1) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- c. failing to reasonably consult with a client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished, by conduct including failing to inform M.H. that her case had been dismissed for want of prosecution, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(2) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010);
- d. failing to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter by conduct including failing to inform M.H. that her case had been dismissed for want of prosecution, in violation of Rule 1.4(a)(3) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010); and
- e. failing to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation, by conduct including failing to inform M.H. that her case had been dismissed for want of prosecution, in violation of Rule 1.4(b) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER:** Respondent denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 33 (a).- (e). These statements are not allegations of fact but are conclusions of law which the Administrator must prove to the Hearing Board by clear and convincing evidence.

COUNT III  
*(Failure to Cooperate with a Disciplinary Investigation)*

34. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs one through 19, and paragraphs 21 through 32, above.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-Four.

35. As of March 25, 2025, the Administrator was investigating allegations against Respondent made by both O.A. and M.H., who are referred to in Counts I and II, above. On that date, Respondent was personally served with a subpoena to appear via the Zoom video conference platform for a sworn statement on May 1, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. The subpoena also directed Respondent to produce copies of her client files for O.A. and M.H.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-Five.

37. At Respondent's request, the sworn statement was continued to September 18, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. Respondent appeared for the sworn statement but did not produce copies of her client files for O.A. and M.H.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-Six.

37. On December 10, 2025, counsel for the Administrator sent a letter to Respondent via email to Respondent's registered email address. In her letter, counsel requested that Respondent provide copies of her client files for O.A. and M.H. to counsel by December 31, 2025. As of March 31, 2026, the date that the Administrator's investigations relating to Respondent's representation of O.A. and M.H. were referred to the Inquiry Board, Respondent had not provided the requested files. Respondent's production of the client files has never been

waived or excused.

**ANSWER:** Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph Thirty-Seven and states that she provided all files to Counsel for the Administrator on April 25, 2026.

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

- a. failing to respond to a lawful demand for information from a disciplinary authority, by conduct including failing to provide copies of Respondent's client files for O.A. and M.H. pursuant to the subpoena that was personally served upon Respondent on March 25, 2025, and pursuant to counsel's December 10, 2025 letter, in violation of Rule 8.1(b) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER:** Respondent denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 38 (a). These statements are not allegations of fact but are conclusions of law which the Administrator must prove to the Hearing Board by clear and convincing evidence. We request the Hearing Board to make findings of fact and conclusions of law that are supported by the record and a recommendation for any appropriate discipline to the Supreme Court of Illinois; and for any and all further relief which is just and equitable based upon the circumstances.

Respectfully Submitted,

RUTH RAMIREZ, Respondent

By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Granoff  
Counsel for Respondent

Elizabeth A. Granoff  
Law Offices of Elizabeth A. Granoff  
1331 Central Avenue  
Wilmette, IL 60091  
312.441.1250  
[elizabethagranoff@gmail.com](mailto:elizabethagranoff@gmail.com)