

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

In the Matter of:

MICHAEL FRANCIS McCLAIN,  
  
Attorney-Respondent,  
  
No. 1818732.

Commission No. 2025PR00054

COMPLAINT

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, by her attorneys, Matthew Lango and Stephanie Bogdan, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 761, complains of Respondent, Michael Francis McClain, who was licensed to practice law in Illinois on April 22, 1977, and alleges that Respondent has engaged in the following conduct that subjects him to discipline pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 770:

*(Conspiracy to Commit Offense or Defraud the United States; Falsification of Books and Records in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977)*

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Commonwealth Edison Company (“ComEd”) was a utility company with headquarters located in Chicago. ComEd delivered electricity to customers across Northern Illinois and was subject to extensive regulation by the State of Illinois.

2. ComEd was a majority-indirect subsidiary of Exelon Corporation (“Exelon”), a utility services holding company that served customers across several states.

3. On November 18, 2020, a federal grand jury in the Northern District of Illinois charged Respondent and three co-defendants in a nine-count indictment. The matter was captioned

FILED  
8/29/2025 8:28 AM  
ARDC Clerk

*United States of America v. Michael McClain, Anne Pramaggiore, John Hooker, and Jay Doherty*, and assigned docket number 1:20-cr-00812.

4. Count One of the indictment charged that Respondent and all three co-defendants participated in a conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States in violation of Title 18, U.S.C. Sections 371 and 2. Specifically, it alleged that Respondent and the other co-defendants agreed to provide Illinois politician Michael Madigan a series of benefits with the intention of corruptly influencing Mr. Madigan to assist ComEd with respect to legislation that would benefit the company. The indictment also alleged that Respondent and his co-conspirators attempted to hide this activity by falsifying books and records through the use of payments to intermediaries to disguise the nature of the benefits provided to Mr. Madigan.

5. The indictment also alleged that from 1997 through 2021, Michael Madigan was the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the State of Illinois. In this role, Mr. Madigan exercised substantial influence over lawmakers concerning legislation, including legislation as it related to ComEd. Mr. Madigan was elected from a district comprised primarily of Chicago's Thirteenth and Twenty-Third Wards.

6. According to the indictment, from March 2012 through May 2018, co-defendant Anne Pramaggiore was the chief executive officer (CEO) of ComEd and from approximately June 2018 through October 2019, she was a senior executive at Exelon.

7. The indictment also charged that Respondent served with Mr. Madigan in the Illinois House of Representatives from 1972 until on or around 1982. Afterward, Respondent served as an external lobbyist and consultant for ComEd until on or around 2019. Respondent maintained a close personal and professional relationship with Mr. Madigan at all times relevant to this complaint.

8. The indictment further charged that co-defendant Jay Doherty was the owner of Jay D. Doherty & Associates which performed contracted consulting services for ComEd from 2011 through 2019.

9. The indictment also charged that co-defendant John Hooker served as ComEd's Executive Vice President of Legislative and External Affairs from approximately 2009 through 2012 and as an external lobbyist for ComEd from approximately 2012 through 2019.

10. More specifically, Count One charged that between approximately 2011 through 2019, Respondent and his co-defendants caused the hiring of Frank Olivo, Ray Nice, Michael Zalewski, Edward Moody, and Edward Acevedo, all of whom were Mr. Madigan's political allies, as "subcontractors" to ComEd and paid them through various intermediaries, including Jay D. Doherty & Associates. These individuals contributed no value to ComEd and performed little to no work for the pay they received.

11. Count One also alleged that Respondent and his co-defendants used misleading contracts, invoices, and false entries in ComEd's books and records to hide the fact that these individuals were receiving payments from ComEd that eventually amounted to \$1.3 million over the course of eight years and performing little to no work for these payments.

12. Count One further charged that Respondent, due to his close relationship with Mr. Madigan, served as the intermediary between Mr. Madigan and ComEd for all five subcontractors during the nearly eight-year long conspiracy.

13. Count One also charged that Respondent and Mr. Hooker were the architects behind the plan to mask payments to these subcontractors through existing contracts between ComEd and intermediaries such as Jay D. Doherty & Associates.

14. Count One of the indictment also charged that Ms. Pramaggiore, as CEO, maintained the Jay D. Doherty & Associates contract under her budget and authorized Mr. Doherty's contract along with the false invoices submitted by Mr. Doherty.

15. Counts One, Three, and Four of the indictment alleged that in 2017 and 2018, Ms. Pramaggiore, as part of her conspiracy with Respondent, reauthorized ComEd's contract with Jay D. Doherty & Associates by signing "Single Source Justification" forms which falsely stated that Jay D. Doherty & Associates was receiving large payments under the contract for Mr. Doherty's expertise, and did not mention that large portions of this money were going to subcontractors who were political allies of Mr. Madigan.

16. Counts One and Seven of the indictment charged that on June 29, 2018, Ms. Pramaggiore, at the request of Respondent through Mr. Madigan, signed an amendment to Jay D. Doherty & Associates' 2018 contract for an additional \$5,000 a month for the sole purpose of hiring Mr. Zalewski. The amendment stated that Mr. Zalewski would perform government affairs work with the City of Chicago and Cook County, however, Mr. Zalewski accepted payment and performed no work for Jay D. Doherty & Associates or ComEd.

17. Counts One and Nine of the indictment alleged that in 2019, Ms. Pramaggiore, who was then employed by Exelon, along with Respondent and their co-defendants, influenced the reauthorization of Jay D. Doherty & Associates' contract by causing the preparation of a Single Source Justification form which falsely stated that Jay D. Doherty & Associates was receiving large payments under the contract for Mr. Doherty's expertise, and did not mention that large portions of this money were going to subcontractors who were political allies of Mr. Madigan.

18. Counts One, Three, Four, Seven, and Nine of the indictment alleged that Respondent and his co-defendants maintained these contracts with Jay D. Doherty & Associates

for the purpose of currying favor with Mr. Madigan so he would promote legislation favorable to ComEd and Exelon in the Illinois Legislature.

19. As stated above, Count One of the indictment charged Respondent and his co-defendants with conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States. Counts Two, Five, Six, and Eight of the indictment charged Respondent and his co-defendants with the federal offense of Bribery in violation of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 666(a)(2), 2. Specifically, Respondent and his co-defendants corruptly offered things of value, such as contracts, jobs, and internships, to political allies of Mr. Madigan with the intent to further legislation favorable to ComEd.

20. Counts Three, Four, Seven, and Nine of the indictment charged Respondent and his co-defendants with the federal offense of the falsification of books and records of ComEd and Exelon in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, Title 15, U.S.C. Sections 78m(b)(5) and 78ff(a) (the “FCPA”) and Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2. Specifically, Respondent falsified books and records with regard to Jay D. Doherty & Associates’ 2017, 2018, and 2019 contract renewal and the 2018 contract amendment which added Mr. Zalewski.

21. On December 2, 2020, Respondent and his co-defendants were arraigned before the Honorable Harry D. Leinenweber, United States District Judge, on the indictment and pled not guilty to all counts.

22. From April 5, 2023, through May 2, 2023, Respondent and his co-defendants participated in a jury trial before Judge Leinenweber. On May 2, 2023, the jury returned a verdict of guilty on all nine counts of the indictment.

23. On August 27, 2024, Respondent and his co-defendants submitted Defendants’ Joint Motion for Reconsideration for Post-Trial Motions and Motion to Dismiss the Indictment (“Joint Motion”). The Joint Motion argued that a recent Supreme Court decision (*Snyder v. United*

*States*, 144 S. Ct. 1947) found that the Bribery statute applied to cases of *quid pro quo* bribery, where a gift was given to a public official in exchange for the performance of an official act. However, gratuities, gifts given to a public official after an official act had been performed, or gifts without expectation of the performance of an official act, did not have a *quid pro quo* requirement and should not be considered criminal acts under this Bribery statute. The Joint Motion maintained that the Respondent and his co-defendants did not engage in a *quid pro quo* and had merely been lobbying.

24. On March 3, 2025, the Honorable Manish S. Shah, United States District Judge, after having considered the Joint Motion, a response filed by the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, and a reply, vacated the defendants' convictions on Counts Two, Five, Six, and Eight of the indictment but maintained the convictions on Counts One, Three, Four, Seven, and Nine.

25. Judge Shah found that, in light of the recent *Snyder* decision, the jury instructions given in case number 1:20-cr-00812 with regard to the Bribery statute had been unclear and could have permitted the jury to convict on a non-applicable gratuities theory. However, in upholding the convictions on Counts One, Three, Four, Seven, and Nine, Judge Shah concluded that Respondent and his co-defendants had falsified official books and records regardless of whether these actions had conformed to the definition of the Bribery statute as defined under *Snyder*.

26. On July 24, 2025, Judge Shah entered a judgment of conviction against Respondent as to Counts One, Three, Four, Seven, and Nine of the indictment. Respondent was sentenced to 24 months in prison on each count with the terms to run concurrently. Judge Shah recommended that Respondent's two-year prison sentence be served at either the Medical Center for Federal Prisoners in Springfield, Missouri or Federal Medical Prison in Rochester, Minnesota. Following

his release from prison, Judge Shah ordered that Respondent serve a six-month period of supervised release, pursuant to 18 United States Code 3583(d), subject to certain conditions, including a prohibition on communication with his co-defendants in the case. Respondent was also ordered to pay a \$500 assessment.

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

- a. committing criminal acts that reflect adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects, by committing the criminal offenses of: conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States in violation of Title 18, U.S.C. Sections 371; and falsification of books and records of ComEd and Exelon, in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, Title 15, U.S.C. Sections 78m(b)(5) and 78ff(a) and Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2, all in violation of Rule 8.4(b) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010), and
- b. engaging in conduct involving fraud, dishonesty, deceit, or misrepresentation by conduct including conspiring to commit an offense against the United States in violation of Title 18, U.S.C. Sections 371; and falsifying of books and records of ComEd and Exelon, in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, Title 15, U.S.C. Sections 78m(b)(5) and 78ff(a) and Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2, all 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,

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator  
Attorney Registration and  
Disciplinary Commission

By: /s/ Stephanie Bogdan  
Stephanie Bogdan

Stephanie Bogdan  
Matthew Lango  
Counsel for the Administrator  
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Telephone: (312) 565-2600  
Email: [sbogdan@iadc.org](mailto:sbogdan@iadc.org)  
Email: [mlango@iadc.org](mailto:mlango@iadc.org)  
Email: [ARDCeService@iadc.org](mailto:ARDCeService@iadc.org)

4922-6414-9086, v. 1