

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION *
OF MARYLAND
100 Community Place, Suite 3301 *
Crownsville, Maryland 21032 *

Petitioner

v.

SANDY YEH CHANG
1 Research Court, #450
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Respondent

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

Misc. Docket AG No. 20
September Term, 2010

In the Circuit Court for
Montgomery County
Case No. 25302-M

ORDER

The parties herein have jointly petitioned this Court to reprimand the Respondent pursuant to Maryland Rule 16-772. Upon review of said joint petition and for the reasons set forth herein, it is this 9th day of September, 2010,

ORDERED, that the Respondent, Sandy Yeh Chang, be, and she is hereby,
REPRIMANDED.

/s/ Glenn T. Harrell, Jr.
JUDGE

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND

100 Community Place, Suite 3301
Crownsville, Maryland 21032

Petitioner

v.

SANDY YEH CHANG

1 Research Court, #450
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Respondent

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

Misc. Docket AG No. 20
September Term, 2010

In the Circuit Court for
Montgomery County
Case No. 25302-M

JOINT PETITION FOR REPRIMAND BY CONSENT

Petitioner, the Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland, by Glenn M.

Grossman, Bar Counsel, and Gail D. Kessler, Assistant Bar Counsel, its attorneys, and
Sandy Yeh Chang, Respondent by her attorney, Herbert A. Dubin, Esquire, pursuant to
Maryland Rule 16-772(b), jointly petition this Honorable Court to issue a reprimand to
the Respondent and state as follows:

1. Respondent was admitted to the Bar of Maryland on December 16, 2003.
2. A Petition for Disciplinary or Remedial Action was filed on June 11, 2010, charging Respondent with electronically filing a Voluntary Bankruptcy Petition in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia without first having her client, Reza Rafi review and execute the original petition in violation of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia Case Management/Electronic Case Files Policy Statement, Policy No. 8. This conduct violates

Maryland Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1 and 8.4(d).

3. Bar Counsel and Respondent have conferred on an appropriate disposition and have agreed that Respondent should be reprimanded.

4. Respondent's consent to a reprimand is freely and voluntarily rendered pursuant to the provisions of Maryland Rule 16-772(b)(1)(2), and she is not being subject to coercion or duress.

5. Respondent is fully aware of the implications of submitting her consent to a reprimand.


6. Respondent submits this consent to a reprimand because she knows that if a hearing was to be held, sufficient evidence could be produced to sustain the allegations of misconduct.

7. Respondent consents to a reprimand by the Court of Appeals.


WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Respondent pray this Honorable Court to:


A. Pass an Order reprimanding the Respondent for the misconduct as set forth herein; and;

B. Grant such other and further relief as the Court seems just and proper.



Sandy Yeh Chang
1 Research Court, Suite 450
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(301) 216-3845

Respondent


Glenn M. Grossman
Bar Counsel


Herbert A. Dubin
Sandy Spring Bank Building
611 Rockville Pike, Suite 225
Rockville, Maryland 20852
(301)294-4878

Attorney for Respondent


Gail D. Kessler
Attorney Grievance Commission
Of Maryland
100 Community Place, Suite 3301
Crownsville, Maryland 21032
(410) 514-7051 or 800-492-1660


Attorneys for Petitioner

AFFIDAVIT

I, Sandy Yeh Chang, solemnly affirm under the penalties of perjury and upon personal knowledge that the contents of the foregoing paper are true.

Date

9/3/10


Sandy Yeh Chang
Respondent