

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**



**In the Matter of**

**Glendia Mondesir**

**A Member of the Bar of the District  
of Columbia Court of Appeals**

**Bar No. 465537**

**RESPONDENT’S ANSWER TO THE SPECIFICATION OF  
CHARGES**

Under Rule 7.5 a respondent served with a petition must file an answer within 20 days. Prior to filing this answer, Mrs. Mondesir moved for a bill of particulars. Mrs. Mondesir argued that she was not able to respond to the petition because it was not clear which allegations corresponded to which ethics violations. Mrs. Mondesir requested a bill of particulars which, among other things, would specify which fact allegations supported which alleged violations. *See, e.g., In re Barber*, 128 A.3d 637, 641 (D.C. 2015)(ODC “identified the factual allegations in the Specification that supported the particular rule violations.”). ODC has in some cases voluntarily specified which fact allegations support which violations. In *In re Crane*, 2022-D124, ODC’s petition did include that information to some extent. For example, in paragraph 31(c) of the charges, the petition against Crane states:

Respondent's conduct violated the following rules of Professional Conduct...Virginia Rule 8.4(b), in that he engaged in a criminal or deliberately wrongful act, which reflects adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness or fitness to practice law *e.g., theft of Ms. Crane's portion of the 2015 tax refund.*

*Id.* at 10 (italics added).

One of the bases for Mrs. Mondesir's request for a bill of particulars was to allow her to compose a more informative answer. If Mrs. Mondesir were adequately informed on the basis for ODC's accusations, she could more easily expand on the allegations she has chosen to deny. The Board has not acted on Mrs. Mondesir's request for a bill of particulars. Therefore, without being on notice of which ethical rules the various allegations violated, Mrs. Mondesir is much more limited in her ability to provide explanations beyond admitting and denying.

Our specific responses to the enumerated paragraphs are below. Any allegation not specifically admitted is denied.

1. Admit.

**Mondesir/Johnson**

**2022-D025**

2. Admit.

3. Admit.

4. Denied.

5. Admit. It was not immediately possible to provide Mr. Job with a written retainer because he was incarcerated. The firm's consistent practice was to provide written retainer agreements to client's where possible, including the other clients named in the charges. Had the representation of Job not been terminated early, he certainly would have received a written engagement letter.
6. Denied due to vagueness as to "several other mistakes." Respondent admits to mistakenly using an incorrect name. *Compare, e.g.,* Specification ¶ 46(a)(referring to Mrs. Mondesir as "he").
7. Admit.
8. Denied.
9. Admit.
10. Admit.
11. Denied. Ms. Johnson always had access to the files.
12. Admit.
13. Admit.
14. Admit.
15. Admit.
16. Admit.
17. Denied.

18. Admit.
19. Denied.
20. Admit.
21. Denied. Firm policy was for clients and their families to pay their own filing fees directly.
22. Denied. The \$930 payment was not for legal services.
23. Denied. Mrs. Mondesir filed a cancellation of removal, but the remainder of the paragraph is denied.
24. Denied.
25. Denied.
26. Admit.
27. Denied.
28. Denied. Respondent was not providing legal services to Ms. Johnson.
29. Admit.
30. Admit.
31. Denied.
32. Denied.
33. Admit.
34. Denied. Attorneys adopting different strategies is not a violation of the rules.

35. Denied.
36. Admit.
37. Denied for vagueness. It is not clear which judge is referenced.
38. Admit.
39. Denied. Although some records had been lost through no fault of respondent, she was able, with the assistance of counsel, to reconstruct much of the lost information.
40. Admit.
41. Denied.
42. Denied.
43. Admit.
44. Denied.
45. Denied.
46. Denied.
47. Admit that Ms. Baatar is a citizen of Mongolia. Remainder denied.

**Mondesir/Baatar**

**2022-D069**

48. Admit.
49. Admit.

50. Admit.
51. Denied. Engagements were between clients and the law firm.
52. Admit.
53. Admit.
54. Admit.
55. Admit.
56. Admit.
57. Admit.
58. Admit. The addendum covered additional work made necessary by  
COVID conditions.
59. Admit.
60. Admit.
61. Admit.
62. Admit.
63. Denied. The account was “maintained” by a business, not Gilbert Scott  
individually.
64. Denied.
65. Denied.
66. Denied.
67. Denied.

68. Denied.
69. Admit.
70. Admit.
71. Admit. The credit card charges went through the commercially available “Square” processing system.
72. Denied. The payment was processed through a Vassell Law Group account.
73. Insufficient information to admit or deny.
74. Insufficient information to admit or deny.
75. Denied.
76. Admitted with the exception that we don’t know whether the dispute was with Square or a bank. Mrs. Mondesir withdrew for lack of payment.
77. Denied.
78. Denied.
79. Denied.
80. Denied. The 5.2 hours were only for attorney David Kim.
81. Admit.
82. Denied.
83. Admit.
84. Denied in part.

85. Denied for vagueness.
86. Denied. As respondent has informed ODC many times, many of her records were destroyed through the actions of a third party.
87. Denied.
88. Denied.
89. Denied.
90. Denied. No account in the name of “Terry Evans” was ever involved in respondent’s business.
91. Denied. No account in the name of “Gilbert Scott” was ever involved in respondent’s business.
92. Admit.
93. Denied.
94. Denied.

**Mondesir/Lopez**

**2022-D153**

95. Denied. Lopez retained the law firm.
96. Admit.
97. Admit.
98. Admit.

99. Admit. Respondent requested Lopez to make deposits to the trust account  
but Lopez decided on her own to use Zelle.

100. Admit.

101. Admit.

102. Admit.

103. Denied.

104. Admit.

105. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

106. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

107. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

108. Denied.

109. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

110. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

111. Denied.

112. Insufficient information to admit or deny.

113. Denied.

114. Admit.

115. Denied. Please refer to engagement letter.

116. Denied.

117. Denied.

- 118. Admit.
- 119. Denied.
- 120. Admit.
- 121. Admit.
- 122. Denied.
- 123. Denied.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of December, 2025.

/s/ Charles Burnham  
Charles Burnham  
DC Bar No. 1003464  
Burnham and Gorokhov, PLLC  
1634 I Street, NW  
Suite 575  
Washington DC 20006  
(202) 386-6920  
charles@burnhamgorokhov.com

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have on this day served a copy of this answer on all parties through the Court's efilng system.

*/s/ Charles Burnham* \_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Burnham  
DC Bar No. 1003464  
1634 I Street, NW  
Suite 575  
Washington DC 20006  
charles@burnhamgorokhov.com