

VIRGINIA :

**BEFORE THE FOURTH DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR**

**IN THE MATTER OF
SANDY YEH CHANG**

VS B Docket No. 10-042-080416

**SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINATION
(PUBLIC REPRIMAND WITHOUT TERMS)**

On October 14, 2010 a meeting in this matter was held before a duly convened Fourth District Section II Subcommittee consisting of Cary S. Greenberg, Esquire, Chair, Drewry B. Hutcheson, Jr., Esquire and Nancy M. Williams, Lay Person, and the subcommittee determined that the matter should be set down for a public hearing absent an agreed disposition of the case. The Respondent and Bar Counsel have tendered to the subcommittee an endorsed Agreed Disposition as representing an appropriate sanction if this matter were heard through an evidentiary hearing by a panel of the Fourth District Committee Section II.

Pursuant to Part 6, Section IV, Paragraph 13-15.E. of the Rules of the Virginia Supreme Court, the Fourth District Section II Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar hereby serves upon the Respondent the following PUBLIC Reprimand:

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant, Respondent was an attorney licensed and in good standing with the Bar of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
2. Respondent was admitted to the Bar of the Commonwealth of Virginia on September 4, 2008.
3. Reza Rafi hired Respondent to work out a loan modification and, subsequently, to file a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy for a fee of \$3,000.00.
4. Mr. Rafi paid Respondent \$200 for an initial office visit.

5. Mr. Rafi made calls and sent faxes to the Respondent and later claimed he was not satisfied with the response from Respondent. He was also dissatisfied with the way in which his case was handled.

6. Mr. Rafi alleges he left a voice mail for the Respondent stating that her services were terminated. Respondent denies that allegation.

7. Mr. Rafi subsequently hired Nora Raum to handle his Bankruptcy petition for a fee of \$1,500.00.

8. Ms. Raum filed a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy on Mr. Rafi's behalf. Respondent avers that she was not aware of this fact.

9. Unbeknownst to Ms. Raum, Respondent also filed a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy on Mr. Rafi's behalf within hours of the petition Ms. Raum had filed.

10. The office of the United State Trustee brought the matter to light, and subsequently dismissed the petition filed by the Respondent. The Trustee's office took no further action with respect to Respondent except to remind her that she was not authorized to file anything electronically unless her client had signed it.

11. A review of the petition filed by the Respondent on Mr. Rafi's behalf showed that it was not, in fact, reviewed or signed by Mr. Rafi.

12. Mr. Rafi confirmed that he neither reviewed nor signed the petition that Respondent filed with the bankruptcy court.

13. Despite having filed the bankruptcy, the Respondent knowingly filed suit against Mr. Rafi to collect the filing fees she incurred for the petition she filed on Mr. Rafi's behalf in violation of the automatic stay provisions of the United States Bankruptcy Code. Respondent asserts that she erroneously believed that the bankruptcy petition filed by Ms. Raum had been dismissed because Respondent understood that Mr. Rafi failed to appear at the Meeting of Creditors.

14. In a letter dated August 25, 2009 that Respondent sent to Ms. Raum, she claimed that the basis for her suit against Mr. Rafi was on a presumption of fraud in the contract Mr. Rafi entered into for Respondent's services.

15. The basis for Mr. Rafi's fraud, according to Respondent, was that he had provided fraudulent documentation and/or a lack of information that came to Respondent's attention after she learned of and reviewed the petition prepared by Ms. Raum, rendering it ultimately impossible for her to provide him with legal services.

II. NATURE OF MISCONDUCT

Such conduct by Sandy Yeh Chang constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct:

RULE 1.1 Competence

A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill and thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

* * * *

RULE 3.3 Candor Toward The Tribunal

(a) A lawyer shall not knowingly:

(1) make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal;

* * * *

III. PUBLIC REPRIMAND

Accordingly, it is the decision of the subcommittee to impose a PUBLIC Reprimand without terms and the Respondent is hereby so reprimanded.

Pursuant to Paragraph 13-9.E. the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall assess costs.

FOURTH DISTRICT SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR

By 
Cary S. Greenberg
Subcommittee Chair

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on 6th day of July, 2011, I caused to be mailed by certified mail a true and correct copy of the Subcommittee Determination PUBLIC Reprimand Without Terms to Sandy Yeh Chang, Esquire, Respondent, at, The Chang Law Firm, Suite 140, 1 Research Court, Rockville, MD 20850, her last address of record with the Virginia State Bar, and a courtesy copy to Herbert A. Dubin, Esquire, 611 Rockville Pike, Suite 225, Rockville, MD 20852.



Paulo E. Franco, Jr.
Assistant Bar Counsel