

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

In the Matter of:

PHILIP CHOW,  
  
Attorney-Respondent,  
  
No. 6186695.

Commission No. 2025PR00045

**ANSWER TO ADMINISTRATOR'S COMPLAINT**

Philip Chow, Respondent, by his attorney, Stephanie Stewart, of Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke LLC, answers the complaint filed by the Administrator in this matter, as follows:

**INFORMATION PROVIDED PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 231**

Respondent has never held any other professional license (other than notary). He was never subject to discipline as a notary, and the license is not active.

Respondent has never been licensed in another state or federal jurisdiction.

**COUNT I**

***(Failure to communicate with a client and failure to promptly distribute client funds)***

1. At all times alleged in this complaint, Respondent operated as a sole practitioner in Chicago. He concentrated his practice in providing legal services to businesses.

**ANSWER: The first sentence is admitted. The second sentence is denied. In further answering, Respondent mostly represented individuals in real estate closings and commercial matters.**

FILED  
9/23/2025 9:13 AM  
ARDC Clerk

2. On November 11, 1995, Respondent opened a trust account ending in 0004 at Royal Business Bank (“Respondent’s client trust account”) to hold funds for clients and third persons. Respondent was the sole signatory on the trust account, which was titled “Philip Chow, Attorney at Law Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois.”

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

3. Prior to August 11, 2020, Respondent and a man with the initials “S.W.” agreed that Respondent would represent S.W. in the sale of S.W.’s business pro bono, and that Respondent would file any necessary documents with taxing authorities, including but not limited to filing a “CBS-1 Notice of Sale, Purchase, or Transfer of Business Assets” (“CBS-1 form”) with the Illinois Department of Revenue (“Department of Revenue”). Respondent and S.W. further agreed that Respondent would hold any escrowed tax funds relating to the sale of S.W.’s business in Respondent’s client’s trust account until Respondent received a release from the Department of Revenue, at which time Respondent would return that money to S.W.

**ANSWER: Admitted, except the allegation that the representation was pro bono. S.W. paid Respondent a \$500 fee.**

4. At all times alleged in this complaint, the Illinois Income Tax Act, Chapter 35, Section 5/902, required that a Bulk Sales Stop Order be issued where:

“[a] seller or transferor, or the purchaser or transferee, at least 10 business days before the date of the sale or transfer [of the stock of goods which he is engaged in the business of selling, the furniture or fixtures, the machinery and equipment, or the real property of a business], may notify the [Department of Revenue] of the intended sale or transfer and request the [Department of Revenue] to make a determination as to whether the seller or transferor owes any tax, penalty or interest due under this Act. The Department shall take such steps as may be appropriate to comply with such request.

Any order issued by the [Department of Revenue] pursuant to this Section to withhold [taxes] from the purchase price shall be issued within 10

business days after the [Department of Revenue] receives notification of a sale as provided in this Section.”

**ANSWER: The language of the statute speaks for itself.**

5. Prior to August 11, 2020, Respondent submitted the CBS-1 form to the Department of Revenue. The form stated that S.W. intended to sell his business on August 18, 2020, to a purchaser with the initials “Z.W.” for \$38,000.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

6. On August 11, 2020, after receiving the CBS-1 form from Respondent, the Department of Revenue issued a Notice of Stop Order that required \$11,116.38 be held in escrow pending payment of all taxes through the sale date of S.W.’s business. Respondent received the Notice of Stop Order on or about August 11, 2020.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

7. On August 18, 2020, the sale of the business closed. On August 20, 2020, S.W. gave a check to Respondent for \$11,116.38, the amount stated in the Department of Revenue’s Notice of Stop Order, for Respondent to hold in escrow for potential taxes.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

8. On March 4, 2021, the Department of Revenue sent a Release of Stop Order Bulk Sales to Respondent pertaining to the potential tax liability incurred by the sale of S.W.’s business, described in paragraph six, above. The release stated that the Department of Revenue was releasing the “Bulk Sales Stop Order that [it] issued on the purchase of the business....” The release was a declaration by the Department of Revenue that S.W. did not owe taxes from the sale and the \$11,116.38 that S.W. provided to Respondent to hold in Respondent’s client trust account could be returned to S.W.

**ANSWER: Denied that Respondent received the Release of Stop Order Bulk Sales**

**From the Department of Revenue. In further answering, Respondent ceased practicing and closed his office in February 2021. Denied that the release was a “declaration” that the funds S.W. provided to Respondent to hold in Respondent’s client trust account could be returned to S.W.**

9. At various times between March 4, 2021, and September 25, 2024, S.W. requested that Respondent provide an update on the status of the notice of stop order. During that time, Respondent did not notify S.W. that Respondent had received a release on the stop order.

**ANSWER: Admitted that Respondent did not notify S.W. of the release on the stop order because he did not receive it. The remaining allegations are denied.**

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

- a. failure to promptly distribute all portions of funds as to which interests are not in dispute, by conduct including failing to return \$11,116.38 in escrowed funds to S.W. between March 4, 2021, and December 5, 2024, in violation of Rule 1.15(f) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Denied.**

## **COUNT II**

**(Conversion of at least \$11,116.38 in client funds without authorization)**

11. The Administrator realleges and incorporates paragraphs one through nine, above.

**ANSWER: Respondent realleges and incorporates his answers for paragraphs one through nine as set forth above.**

12. On August 20, 2020, Respondent deposited a check in the amount of \$11,116.38 in his client trust account, which represented S.W.’s funds for potential tax liability related to the sale of S.W.’s business. As of February 29, 2024, Respondent had not received any authorization from

S.W. to disburse any portion of S.W.'s funds. Therefore, as of February 29, 2024, Respondent was required to maintain at least \$11,116.38 in his client trust fund on behalf of S.W.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

13. Between February 29, 2024, and May 31, 2024, Respondent drew down the balance in his client trust account to \$1,803.52 and deposited the funds into his business checking account ending in 0214 ("business checking account") at Royal Business Bank. Respondent used the funds for business and personal purposes, including paying office credit card bills and telephone bills.

**ANSWER: Admitted. In further answering, by 2024, approximately three years after closing his law practice, Respondent believed all client funds had previously been disbursed.**

14. On June 28, 2024, Respondent withdrew the remaining balance of \$1,803.52, deposited the funds into his business checking account, and closed the trust account.

**ANSWER: Admitted.**

15. Between February 29, 2024, and June 29, 2024, Respondent used \$11,116.38 belonging to S.W. for Respondent's own business or personal purposes, without authority from S.W. Respondent's use of those funds constitutes conversion.

**ANSWER: The first sentence is admitted. The second sentence is denied. In further answering, once Respondent became aware via communication from the ARDC that the amount of \$11,116.38 needed to be returned to S.W., he provided a check to S.W. for that amount in December, 2024. Respondent regrets that the funds were not timely disbursed to S.W.**

16. At the time Respondent engaged in the conversion of those funds, Respondent knew he was using the funds for his own personal or business purposes, and in doing so, he acted dishonestly.

**ANSWER: Denied.**

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

- a. failure to hold property of clients or third persons that is in the lawyer's possession in connection with a representation separate from the lawyer's own personal property, by conduct including, causing the balance of trust account
- b. conduct including dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, by conduct including knowingly using at least \$11,116.38. in funds belonging to S.W. for his own business and personal purposes, without authorization, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

**ANSWER: Denied.**

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Chow,  
Respondent

By: /s/ Stephanie Stewart  
Stephanie Stewart

Stephanie Stewart  
Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke LLC  
159 North Sangamon Street, Suite 327A  
Chicago, IL 60607  
(312) 782-5102  
[sstewart@rsmdlaw.com](mailto:sstewart@rsmdlaw.com)