THIS REPORT IS NOT A FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS
BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
HEARING COMMITTEE NUMBER FOUR

In the Matter of:	:	
	:	
KEMPER B. WARREN,	:	
	:	Board Docket No. 25-ND-007
Respondent.	:	Disciplinary Docket No. 2025-D105
	:	
An Administratively Suspended Member of the Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (Bar Registration No. 1617183)	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF HEARING COMMITTEE NUMBER FOUR
APPROVING AMENDED PETITION FOR NEGOTIATED DISCIPLINE

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter came before Hearing Committee Number Four ("Hearing Committee") on May 5, 2026, for a limited hearing on an Amended Petition for Negotiated Discipline ("Amended Petition"). The members of the Hearing Committee are Evelyn Tang, Esquire (Chair), Cecilia Carter Monahan (Public Member), and Francine Weiss, Esquire (Attorney Member). The Office of Disciplinary Counsel was represented by Assistant Disciplinary Counsel Hendrik deBoer, Esquire. Respondent, Kemper B. Warren, appeared *pro se*.

The Hearing Committee has carefully considered the Amended Petition signed by Disciplinary Counsel and Respondent, the supporting affidavit submitted by Respondent ("Amended Affidavit"), and the representations during the limited

---

* Consult the 'Disciplinary Decisions' tab on the Board on Professional Responsibility's website (www.dcattorneydiscipline.org) to view any subsequent decisions in this case.

hearing made by Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel. The Hearing Committee also has fully considered the Chair's *in camera* review of Disciplinary Counsel's files/records and *ex parte* communications with Disciplinary Counsel.

For the reasons set forth below, the Hearing Committee finds that the negotiated discipline of a one-year suspension, with nine months stayed in favor of an unsupervised probation with conditions, is justified and recommends that it be imposed by the Court.

II. FINDINGS PURSUANT TO D.C. BAR R. XI, § 12.1(c) AND BOARD RULE 17.5

The Hearing Committee, after full and careful consideration, finds that:

1. The Amended Petition and Amended Affidavit are full, complete, and in proper order.

2. Respondent is aware that there is currently pending against her an investigation into allegations of misconduct as described in the Amended Petition. Tr. 15.[1]

3. The allegations that were brought to the attention of Disciplinary Counsel are that Respondent engaged in conduct that violated D.C. Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4(c) (dishonesty). Am. Pet. at 5.

[1] "Tr." refers to the transcript of the limited hearing held on May 5, 2026. "Am. Pet." refers to the Amended Petition. "Am. Aff." refers to Respondent's Amended Affidavit.

4. Respondent has freely and voluntarily acknowledged that the material facts and misconduct reflected in the Amended Petition are true. Tr. 16, 21; Am. Aff. ¶¶ 3, 5. Specifically, Respondent acknowledges in the Amended Petition that:

1. In May 2018, Respondent graduated from the University of North Carolina School of Law ("UNC Law") and obtained a juris doctorate.

2. Respondent's final grade point average from UNC Law was 3.300.

3. In May 2024, Respondent applied to Georgetown Law for admission in its Tax LL.M. program.

4. As part of her application, Respondent submitted a resume that falsely claimed that her GPA from UNC Law was 3.4, along with an official transcript that correctly stated her GPA as 3.3.

5. Respondent also falsely claimed on her application that she had received merit certificates at UNC Law for courses in torts and evidence, when she had not.

6. Respondent was accepted into Georgetown Law's Tax LL.M. program.

7. During her first term, Respondent received an F in the course on Tax of Property Transactions, which was an administrative grade based on Respondent's technical failure to submit her exam, which she had completed.

8. Following her first term, Respondent applied for employment at several law firms through Georgetown Law and New York University School of Law's joint TIP [Taxation Interview Program].

9. As part of her TIP application, Respondent submitted an altered transcript of her grades for the LL.M. program.

10. On the altered Georgetown Law transcript, Respondent changed the F she received in Tax of Property Transactions to an A.[2] She also changed a B+ in Taxation of Partnerships to an A- and a B+ in U.S. International Inbound Tax to an A-. These alterations changed her GPA from 2.72 to 3.44.

11. As part of her TIP application, Respondent also submitted an altered transcript of her grades from UNC Law.

12. On the altered UNC Law transcript, Respondent changed her GPA from 3.30 to 3.53 and raised her grades in nine courses.

13. As part of her TIP application, Respondent also submitted a resume that falsely claimed that her Georgetown Law GPA was 3.44 and that her UNC Law GPA was 3.53.

[2] Respondent later successfully petitioned Georgetown Law's Registrar to change the F grade to a Withdrawal due to administrative error, which resulted in a GPA of 3.24.

14. The TIP resume also included the same false claim that she had received merit certificates at UNC Law for course[s] in torts and evidence. *See* ¶ *5* above.

15. Respondent submitted her TIP application with the false documents to 21 potential employers, including Morrison & Foerster.

16. Morrison & Foerster offered Respondent employment based on the false TIP application.

17. Administrators for Georgetown Law's LL.M. program discovered that Respondent had made false statements in her resume and referred her to Georgetown Law's Ethics Counsel.

18. Following an investigation, Respondent entered into a Consent Disposition with Georgetown Law.

19. In the May 2025 Consent Disposition, Respondent admitted that she submitted a false resume and altered transcripts as part of her TIP application and that she made false statements when applying to Georgetown Law's LL.M. program.

20. As a sanction for her misconduct, Respondent agreed that

- her LL.M. degree be withheld for one full academic year,
- her Georgetown Law transcript would contain a notation disclosing her misconduct,

- she would disclose the false statements in her application to Morrison & Foerster, and
- she would report her misconduct to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

21. On May 9, 2025, Respondent submitted a letter to Morrison & Foerster disclosing the false statements in her application and resigning from her position.

22. On May 27, 2025, Respondent reported her misconduct to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

23. Respondent's conduct violated the following District of Columbia Rule of Professional Conduct:

a. Rule 8.4(c) in that Respondent engaged in conduct involving dishonesty.

Am. Pet. at 2-5 (Stipulation of Facts and Charges).

5. Respondent is agreeing to the disposition because Respondent believes that she cannot successfully defend against discipline based on the stipulated misconduct. Tr. 15; Am. Aff. ¶ 4.

6. Disciplinary Counsel has made no promise to Respondent other than what is contained in the Amended Petition. Am. Aff. ¶ 6. That promise is to recommend the sanction set forth in the negotiated disposition. Am. Pet. at 5. Respondent confirmed during the limited hearing that there have been no other

promises or inducements other than those set forth in the Amended Petition. Tr. 20-21.

7. Respondent is aware of her right to confer with counsel and is proceeding *pro se*. Tr. 8; Am. Aff. ¶ 1.

8. Respondent has freely and voluntarily acknowledged the facts and misconduct reflected in the Amended Petition and agreed to the sanction set forth therein. Tr. 16, 21; Am. Aff. ¶¶ 3, 5.

9. Respondent is not being subjected to coercion or duress. Tr. 21; Am. Aff. ¶ 5.

10. Respondent is competent and was not under the influence of any substance or medication that would affect her ability to make informed decisions at the limited hearing. Tr. 8-9.

11. Respondent is fully aware of the implications of the disposition being entered into, including, but not limited to, the following:

a) she has the right to consult with counsel prior to entering this negotiated disposition;

b) she will waive her right to cross-examine adverse witnesses and to compel witnesses to appear on her behalf;

c) she will waive her right to have Disciplinary Counsel prove each and every charge by clear and convincing evidence;

d) she will waive her right to file exceptions to reports and recommendations filed with the Board and with the Court;

e) the negotiated disposition, if approved, may affect her present and future ability to practice law;

f) the negotiated disposition, if approved, may affect her bar memberships in other jurisdictions; and

g) any sworn statement by Respondent in her affidavit or any statements made by Respondent during the proceeding may be used to impeach her testimony if there is a subsequent hearing on the merits.

Tr. 8, 10-14; Am. Aff. ¶¶ 1, 8-9, 11.

12. Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel have agreed that the sanction in this matter should be a one-year suspension, with nine months stayed in favor of an unsupervised probation. The probation will begin on the date the Court issues the order sanctioning Respondent and end one-year after Respondent has completed the three-month served suspension. Am. Pet. at 6; Tr. 18.

a) Respondent further understands that she must file with the Court an affidavit pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) in order for her suspension to be deemed effective for purposes of reinstatement. Tr. 18-19; Am. Aff. ¶ 13.

b) Respondent additionally understands that if she does not file the Section 14(g) affidavit within ten days of the Court's order, the delay in filing the affidavit will extend the total length of her unsupervised probation beyond fifteen months. Tr. 19.

c) Respondent understands that the conditions of this negotiated disposition are that

(i) she will not engage in any misconduct in this or any other jurisdiction[3] during the probation period and

[3] During the limited hearing, Respondent acknowledged that she is also a member of the New York State Bar. Tr. 25; *see also* New York State Unified Court System

(ii) she will be required to notify any clients of the suspension and the probation period.

Tr. 19-20.

d) Finally, Respondent understands that if Disciplinary Counsel has probable cause to believe that Respondent has engaged in any misconduct, Disciplinary Counsel may request that Respondent be required to serve the remainder of the suspension previously stayed. Tr. 20.

13. Disciplinary Counsel has indicated that there are no circumstances in aggravation. Tr. 23.

14. Disciplinary Counsel and Respondent have considered the following mitigating factors in recommending the agreed-upon sanction: (1) Respondent has no prior discipline, (2) Respondent has taken full responsibility for her misconduct and has demonstrated remorse, and (3) Respondent has fully cooperated with Disciplinary Counsel. Am. Pet. at 8; Am. Aff. ¶ 14.

15. There was no complainant in this matter as Respondent self-reported the misconduct. Tr. 6; *see* Am. Pet. at 2.

Attorney Directory (Registration Number 6023444, admitted May 22, 2023) https://iapps.courts.state.ny.us/attorneyservices/details?6.

III. DISCUSSION

The Hearing Committee shall recommend approval of a petition for negotiated discipline if it finds:

> (1) The attorney has knowingly and voluntarily acknowledged the facts and misconduct reflected in the petition and agreed to the sanction set forth therein;
>
> (2) The facts set forth in the petition or as shown at the hearing support the admission of misconduct and the agreed upon sanction; and
>
> (3) The sanction agreed upon is justified.

D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12.1(c)(1)-(3); *see also* Board Rule 17.5(a)(i)-(iii).

A. Respondent Has Knowingly and Voluntarily Acknowledged the Facts and Misconduct and Agreed to the Stipulated Sanction.

The Hearing Committee finds that Respondent has knowingly and voluntarily acknowledged the facts and misconduct reflected in the Amended Petition and agreed to the sanction therein. Respondent, after being placed under oath, Tr. 7, admitted the stipulated facts and charges set forth in the Amended Petition, and denied that she is under duress or has been coerced into entering into this disposition. *See supra* Paragraphs 4, 8-9. Respondent understands the implications and consequences of entering into this negotiated discipline. *See supra* Paragraph 11.

Respondent has acknowledged that any and all promises that have been made to her by Disciplinary Counsel as part of this negotiated discipline are set forth in writing in the Amended Petition and that there are no other promises or inducements that have been made to her. *See supra* Paragraph 6.

B. The Stipulated Facts Support the Admissions of Misconduct and the Agreed-Upon Sanction.

The Hearing Committee has carefully reviewed the facts set forth in the Amended Petition and established during the hearing and concludes that they support the admission of misconduct and the agreed-upon sanction. Moreover, Respondent is agreeing to this negotiated discipline because she believes that she could not successfully defend against the misconduct described in the Amended Petition. *See supra* Paragraph 5.

With regard to the second factor, the Amended Petition states that Respondent violated Rule 8.4(c) (dishonesty). The evidence supports Respondent's admission that she violated Rule 8.4(c) in that the stipulated facts describe how in connection with her application to Georgetown's LL.M. in Taxation program, Respondent submitted a resume that falsely represented her law school GPA and included a false statement in the application. In addition, in connection with her application to Georgetown Law's Taxation Interview Program, Respondent submitted an altered transcript of her law school grades, an altered transcript of her grades in Georgetown's LL.M. in Taxation program, and a resume that included false statements.

C. The Agreed-Upon Sanction Is Justified.

The third factor the Hearing Committee must consider is whether the sanction agreed upon is justified. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12.1(c); Board Rule 17.5(a)(iii) (explaining that hearing committees should consider "the record as a whole, including the nature of the misconduct, any charges or investigations that

Disciplinary Counsel has agreed not to pursue, the strengths or weaknesses of Disciplinary Counsel's evidence, any circumstances in aggravation and mitigation (including respondent's cooperation with Disciplinary Counsel and acceptance of responsibility), and relevant precedent"); *In re Johnson*, 984 A.2d 176, 181 (D.C. 2009) (per curiam) (providing that a negotiated sanction may not be "unduly lenient"). Based on the record as a whole, including the agreed-upon circumstances in mitigation, the Hearing Committee Chair's *in camera* review of Disciplinary Counsel's investigative file and *ex parte* discussion with Disciplinary Counsel, and the Hearing Committee's review of relevant precedent, the Hearing Committee concludes that the agreed-upon sanction is justified and not unduly lenient, for the following reasons:

The range of sanctions imposed in cases involving dishonesty range from a brief suspension for a single instance of misrepresentation, *see, e.g.*, *In re Chapman*, 962 A.2d 922, 923-27 (D.C. 2009) (per curiam) (imposing sixty-day suspension, with thirty days stayed in favor of probation, for neglect of a client matter significantly aggravated by the respondent's deliberate dishonesty to Disciplinary Counsel and the Hearing Committee); *In re Sumner*, 665 A.2d 986, 986 (D.C. 1995) (per curiam) (imposing thirty-day suspension where the respondent made a false statement of material fact to a third person), to disbarment for flagrant dishonesty, *see, e.g.*, *In re Baber*, 106 A.3d 1072, 1077-79 (D.C. 2015) (per curiam) (disbarring the respondent for repeated and protracted dishonesty at the expense of client's

interests and for the respondent's personal gain); *In re Corizzi*, 803 A.2d 438, 442-43 (D.C. 2002) (disbarring the respondent for counseling clients to commit perjury).

The Amended Petition cites to the following relevant precedent for dishonesty in the context of an applications for employment or bar memberships: *In re Jenkins*, 298 A.3d 293, 293-94 (D.C. 2023) (per curiam) (imposing thirty-day suspension for concealing prior discipline, employment, and bar membership when applying for a job); *In re Thomas-Belammy*, 125 A.3d 1136, 1137-38 (D.C. 2015) (per curiam) (imposing one-year suspension with requirement to prove fitness prior to reinstatement for false statements in D.C. Bar application); *In re Hawn*, 917 A.2d 693, 963-64 (D.C. 2007) (per curiam) (imposing thirty-day suspension for falsifying resume and altering law school transcripts to obtain legal employment); *In re Powell*, 898 A.2d 365, 365-66 (D.C. 2006) (per curiam) (imposing one-year suspension with requirement to prove fitness prior to reinstatement for false statements on application to federal district court bar); *In re Rosen*, 570 A.2d 728, 729-730 (D.C. 1989) (per curiam) (imposing nine-month suspension with requirement to prove fitness prior to reinstatement for recklessly misrepresenting facts on application for admission to the Maryland State Bar). *See* Am. Pet. at 7.

In our opinion, the facts in *Hawn* are the most similar to the instant misconduct. *See In re Hawn*, Bar Docket No. 258-05 (BPR Dec. 5, 2006). In *Hawn*, the Respondent submitted a resume with false statements to a legal recruiter and several law firms in Los Angeles. *Id.* at 2-4. He then altered his law school transcript and sent it to multiple additional potential employers. *Id.* at 4-5. His dishonesty was

discovered when a potential employer noticed a discrepancy in his transcripts. *Id.* at 6. The Board recommended a thirty-day suspension, noting his relatively recent graduation from law school, among other factors. *Id.* at 13-14. In the instant case, Respondent submitted a resume with false statements and two falsified transcripts—one from UNC Law and one from Georgetown Law—to potential employers through the Taxation Interview Program. She received and accepted a job offer from a law firm based on these false documents. Georgetown Law discovered the false statements in her resume and her altered transcripts and also discovered that she was admitted to the LL.M. program based on an application that included false statements. Given that she graduated from law school several years ago (in 2018) and demonstrated separate instances of dishonesty in her application to the LL.M. program and her application to the Taxation Interview Program, a greater sanction in this case may be warranted.

The Hearing Committee agrees with the parties that a one-year suspension, with nine-months stayed in favor of unsupervised probation with conditions, is not unduly lenient in light of such precedent as well as the mitigating circumstances in this case. Respondent has no prior discipline, has shown remorse, and fully cooperated with Disciplinary Counsel. During the limited hearing we found her admission to the misconduct to be credible.

In *Powell* and *Rosen*, the sanction was suspension with reinstatement conditioned on demonstration of fitness or rehabilitation. The respondents in those cases made false sworn statements of material fact in connection with bar admission

applications, failing to disclose previous misconduct. *See Powell*, 898 A.2d at 365-66; *Rosen*, 570 A.2d at 728-730. As stated in *Rosen*, "bar application forms are designed to review an applicant's character and fitness to practice." 570 A.2d at 729. The prior misconduct along with the false sworn statements in the bar applications cast serious doubt on the respondents' fitness to practice. The purpose of conditioning reinstatement on proof of fitness is "conceptually different" from the basis for imposing a suspension. *In re Cater*, 887 A.2d 1, 22 (D.C. 2005). Thus, in *Cater*, the Court held that "to justify requiring a suspended attorney to prove fitness as a condition of reinstatement, the record in the disciplinary proceeding must contain clear and convincing evidence that casts a serious doubt upon the attorney's continuing fitness to practice law." 887 A.2d at 6. As in *Hawn*, Respondent has accepted responsibility for her misconduct and the resulting consequences on her employment as an attorney, has no prior discipline, and is remorseful. Accordingly, the absence of a fitness requirement does not make the agreed-upon sanction unduly lenient.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons stated above, it is the recommendation of this Hearing Committee that the negotiated discipline be approved and that the Court impose a one-year suspension, with nine-months stayed in favor of unsupervised probation. The probation would begin on the date the Court issues the order sanctioning Respondent and end one-year after the three-month served suspension. The conditions of the unsupervised probation are (i) Respondent will not engage in any

misconduct in this or any other jurisdiction during the probation period and (ii) she will be required to notify any clients of the suspension and the probation period.

We further recommend that the Court's Order direct Respondent's attention to the requirements of D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14, and their effect on eligibility for reinstatement. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 16(c).

HEARING COMMITTEE NUMBER FOUR

Evelyn S. Tang
Chair

Cecilia Carter Monahan
Public Member

Francine K Weiss

Francine Weiss
Attorney Member