VIRGINIA:

IN THE ARLINGTON COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT

VIRGINIA STATE BAR *EX REL*
FIFTH DISTRICT, SECTION III COMMITTEE
VSB Docket Nos. 26-053-136531
26-053-136532
26-053-136533

VIRGINIA STATE BAR *EX REL*
SIXTH DISTRICT COMMITTEE
VSB Docket No. 25-060-135824

Complainants,

v. Case Nos. CL26001379-00
CL26001380-00

JONATHAN DEAN COX

Respondent.

FINAL JUDGMENT MEMORANDUM ORDER
(SUSPENSION OF SIXTY DAYS)

THIS MATTER was heard on July 15, 2026, before a Three-Judge Circuit Court duly impaneled pursuant to Section 54.1-3935 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended, consisting of the Honorable Tracy W. J. Thorne-Begland, Judge of the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit and Chief Judge Designate ("Chief Judge"), the Honorable Jane M. Reynolds, Judge of the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit, and the Honorable Dale B. Durrer, Judge of the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit (collectively, "the Court").

Assistant Bar Counsel Joseph M. Caturano, Jr., represented the Virginia State Bar ("VSB"). Jonathan Dean Cox ("Respondent" or "Mr. Cox"), having received proper notice, appeared in person throughout the proceeding and was represented by Daniel S. Schumack, Esquire. Mark Mahoney served as court reporter for the hearing.

The Chief Judge swore the court reporter, and each member of the Court verified that they had no personal or financial interest that might affect or reasonably be perceived to affect their ability to be impartial in this matter.

WHEREUPON a hearing was conducted upon Rules to Show Cause ("Rules") issued on April 15, 2026, against Mr. Cox by the Circuit Court for the County of Arlington. The Rules directed Mr. Cox to appear on July 15, 2026, and to show cause why his license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia should not be suspended, revoked or otherwise sanctioned by reason of the allegations of ethical misconduct set forth in Certifications issued by a VSB Subcommittee of the Fifth District, Section III, Committee and a VSB Subcommittee of the Sixth District Committee, in accordance with Part Six, Section IV, Paragraph 13 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia.

MISCONDUCT PHASE

The Court admitted into evidence VSB Exhibits 1-49, pursuant to the Pre-Hearing Order entered on May 20, 2026; the Court admitted into evidence Mr. Cox's Exhibits 1-13, pursuant to the Pre-Hearing Order entered on May 20, 2026.

The Court then received the parties' Stipulations of Fact and Misconduct, dated June 30, 2026 ("Stipulations"). Pursuant to the Stipulations, the Court makes the following findings of fact:

STIPULATED FINDINGS OF FACT TO ALL MATTERS

1. Respondent was admitted to the Virginia State Bar ("VSB") in 2017. At all times referenced herein, Respondent was a member of the VSB.

2. On July 24, 2025, Anne M. Heishman, Esquire, Commissioner of Accounts ("COA") for the Fairfax County Circuit Court ("Court"), advised the VSB pursuant to Va. Code §§ 64.2-1215-1216 that Respondent failed to properly respond to three (3) summonses served upon him in three (3) separate estates for which he was serving as fiduciary, and that a Show Cause was issued against Respondent in the following matters:

- the Estate of Deborah Ann Frick, Fiduciary No. 2023-0002275;
- the Estate of Janetta B. Inlow, Fiduciary No. 2022-0002491; and
- the Estate of Akiko Susie McLaren, Fiduciary No. 2023-000-2277.

VSB 26-053-136531
Estate of Deborah Ann Frick

3. On September 28, 2023, Respondent qualified as the Administrator of the Estate of Deborah Ann Frick, deceased, having been nominated by the sole heir-at-law.

4. By letter dated October 3, 2023, the COA reminded Respondent of his obligations and deadlines along with further information regarding his responsibilities as fiduciary.

5. The inventory was due by Respondent on January 29, 2024. After Respondent failed to file the inventory by the due date, on February 21, 2024, the COA advised Respondent that if a response was not received from him within 30 days, a summons would be issued.

6. On February 28, 2024, Respondent filed the inventory; the filing was a month late.

7. The first account was due on or before January 28, 2025. Respondent failed to file the first account by the due date. A late notice was sent to Respondent on February 14, 2025, by the COA requiring him to file the account within 30 days. Respondent failed to file the account, and on March 20, 2025, a summons was issued requiring Respondent to file the first account within 30 days. The summons was served upon Respondent on March 31, 2025.

8. On April 28, 2025, Respondent filed the first account; the filing was three (3) months late. The accompanying check for filing fees in the amount of $1,823 by Respondent was returned for insufficient funds.

9. The estate was immediately audited and on May 7, 2025, an exception letter was sent to Respondent by the COA. That letter identified multiple deficiencies and required a response within 30 days. Respondent failed to respond, and on June 13, 2025, a second summons was issued to Respondent, again, directing him to file a proper account within 30 days. The summons was served upon Respondent on June 23, 2025, but once more Respondent failed to comply. Respondent requested an extension, initially approved by a COA assistant who subsequently informed Respondent that the request was denied.

10. On July 24, 2025, a Report of Noncompliance was filed with the Court by the COA, and, on August 7, 2025, an Order was entered requiring Respondent to appear to Show Cause why he should not be punished for failing to respond to the summons. The Order was served upon Respondent on August 22, 2025.

11. On October 10, 2025, an Order was entered by the Court directing the COA to hold a hearing to determine whether the Court should remove Respondent as Administrator of

the Estate and whether, and in what amount, Respondent's fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

12. A hearing was held on October 30, 2025, and by email dated October 31, 2025, the COA advised that Respondent had cleared a few exceptions but the exceptions that remained in the Estate of Deborah Ann Frick were:

- The Fiduciary Fee of $579 remained due.
- Itemized list of gains not received.
- Itemized list of adjustments not received.
- Assets on hand documentation for Burke and Herbert Bank not received.

13. By letter dated November 12, 2025, the COA advised Respondent that a Commissioner's Order of Reference Report was filed with the Court on November 12, 2025. In that report, the COA recommended that Respondent be removed as Administrator and that a discrete and competent attorney be appointed to investigate Respondent's conduct as Administrator and determine whether, and if so, in what amount his fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

14. On December 12, 2025, because of Respondent's failures to file proper accounts required by law, among other things, Respondent was removed as fiduciary in the Estate of Deborah Ann Frick, and the matter was placed on the Court's docket on February 20, 2026, to determine if Respondent's fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

15. On or about February 20, 2026, at the request of the successor fiduciary, the COA filed a motion to continue the hearing on the forfeiture of Respondent's fiduciary bond to May 29, 2026, for the successor fiduciary to continue the investigation into Respondent.

VSB 26-053-136531
<u>Estate of Janetta B. Inlow</u>

16. On September 13, 2023, Respondent qualified as the Administrator of the Estate of Janetta Beryl Inlow, deceased, having been nominated by a beneficiary under the Last Will & Testament.

17. By letter dated September 21, 2023, the COA reminded Respondent of his obligations and deadlines along with further information regarding his responsibilities as fiduciary.

18. The inventory was due on January 16, 2024. At Respondent's request, the COA granted a 30-day extension, setting a new deadline of February 20, 2024. After Respondent failed to file the inventory by February 20, 2024, a letter from the COA dated February 28, 2024, advised Respondent that if a response was not received from him within 30 days, a summons would be issued.

19. On February 28, 2024, Respondent filed the inventory, and on or about April 15, 2024, it was audited. Approval was delayed until September 16, 2024, due to exceptions noted by the COA and Respondent's failure to provide timely responses to the COA.

20. The first account was due by Respondent on or before January 13, 2025. At Respondent's request, the COA granted a 30-day extension, setting a new due date of February 13, 2025. Respondent failed to file the first account by February 13, 2025. A late notice was sent to Respondent by the COA on February 20, 2025, requiring him to file the account within 30 days.

21. On March 26, 2025, a summons was issued to Respondent by the COA requiring him to file the first account within 30 days. The summons was served on March 31, 2025.

22. On April 28, 2025, the first account was filed by Respondent; the filing was two and one-half months late. The accompanying check by Respondent for filing fees in the amount of $1,858 was returned for insufficient funds.

23. The estate was immediately audited and on May 7, 2025, an exception letter was sent to Respondent by the COA. That letter identified multiple deficiencies and required a response within 30 days.

24. Respondent failed to respond and on June 13, 2025, a second summons was issued to Respondent, again directing him to file a proper account within 30 days. The summons was served on June 26, 2025, but once more Respondent failed to comply.

25. On or about July 23, 2025, Respondent contacted the COA to request an extension of time to August 1, 2025, to respond to the summons. A COA assistant initially informed Respondent that the extension was approved; but subsequently informed Respondent that the request was denied. Respondent failed to provide the documents on or before August 1, 2025.

26. On July 24, 2025, a Report of Noncompliance was filed by the COA with the Court and on August 7, 2025, an Order was entered requiring Respondent to appear to Show Cause why he should not be punished for failing to respond to the summons. The Order was served upon Respondent on August 22, 2025.

27. On October 10, 2025, an Order was entered by the Court directing the COA to hold a hearing to determine if the Court should remove Respondent as Administrator of the Estate and whether, and in what amount, the fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

28. A hearing was held on October 30, 2025, and by email dated October 31, 2025, the COA advised that Respondent had cleared a few exceptions but the exceptions that remained in the Estate of Janetta B. Inlow were:

- The Fiduciary Fee of $579 remained due.
- Amended accounting fee of $30.00 was due.

- Copy of recorded Registered Agent form.

29. By letter dated November 12, 2025, the COA advised Respondent that a Commissioner's Order of Reference Report was filed with the Court on November 12, 2025. In that report, the COA recommended that Respondent be removed as Administrator and that a discrete and competent attorney be appointed to investigate Respondent's conduct as Administrator and determine whether, and if so, in what amount his fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

30. On December 18, 2025, the COA filed a Memorandum of Commissioner of Accounts with the Court. In that Memorandum, the Commissioner stated, in part, "The fiduciary failed to file proper accounts as required by law." And "[w]hile the fiduciary improperly distributed the estate assets, your commissioner is satisfied that the distribution was made to Allen R. Inlow, the trustee."

31. An Order was entered by the Court on December 12, 2025, dismissing the show cause for failure to make filings in the Estate as required by law. The COA closed the Estate of Janetta B. Inlow on December 18, 2025.

VSB 26-053-136533
<u>Estate of Akiko Susie McLaren</u>

32. On September 25, 2023, Respondent qualified as the Administrator of the Estate of Akiko Susie McLaren, deceased, having been nominated by the sole beneficiary under the Last Will & Testament.

33. By letter dated September 27, 2023, the COA reminded Respondent of his obligations and deadlines along with further information regarding his responsibilities as fiduciary.

34. The inventory was due by Respondent on January 25, 2024. After Respondent failed to file the inventory by the due date, a letter from the COA dated February 13, 2024, was sent to Respondent. In that letter, Respondent was advised that if a response was not received from him within 30 days, a summons would be issued.

35. On February 28, 2024, Respondent filed the inventory; the filing was a month late. After an audit, an exception letter was sent to Respondent on March 29, 2024, granting him 30 days to cure the noted deficiencies.

36. On May 1, 2024, Respondent submitted additional documents, and the inventory was approved on July 30, 2024, after the auditor incorporated handwritten corrections.

37. The first account was due on or before January 27, 2025. Respondent failed to file the first account by the due date, and a late notice was sent to him on February 14, 2025, requiring him to file the account within 30 days.

38. On March 26, 2025, a summons was issued upon Respondent requiring him to file the first account within 30 days. The summons was served on March 31, 2025.

39. On April 28, 2025, the first account was filed by Respondent; it was filed three months late. The accompanying check for filing fees by Respondent in the amount of $2,599.40 was returned for insufficient funds.

40. The estate was immediately audited and on May 7, 2025, an exception letter was sent to Respondent. This letter identified multiple deficiencies and required a response within 30 days.

41. Respondent failed to respond, and again, on June 13, 2025, a second summons was issued to Respondent directing him to file a proper account within 30 days. The summons was served on June 23, 2025, but once more Respondent failed to comply.

42. On or about July 23, 2025, Respondent contacted the COA to request an extension of time to August 1, 2025, to respond to the summons. A COA assistant initially informed Respondent that the extension was approved; but subsequently informed Respondent that the request was denied. Respondent failed to provide the documents on August 1, 2025.

43. On July 24, 2025, a Report of Noncompliance was filed by the COA with the Court and on August 7, 2025, an Order was entered requiring Respondent to appear to Show Cause why he should not be punished for failing to respond to the summons. The Order was served upon Respondent on August 22, 2025.

44. On October 10, 2025, an Order was entered directing the COA to hold a hearing to determine if the Court should remove Respondent as fiduciary and whether, and in what amount, the fiduciary bond should be forfeited. That hearing was held on October 30, 2025, and by email dated October 31, 2025, the COA advised that Respondent had cleared a few exceptions but that exceptions in the Estate of Akiko Susie McLaren were:

    - The Fiduciary Fee of $579 remained due.
    - Assets on hand documentation remained due.
    - Disclaimer still needed.
    - Excess fees of $4,234.76.

45. By letter dated November 12, 2025, the COA advised that a Commissioner's Order of Reference Report was filed with the Court on November 12, 2025. In that report, the COA recommended that Respondent be removed as Administrator of the Estate and that a discreet and competent attorney be appointed to investigate Respondent's conduct as Administrator and determine whether, and if so, in what amount his fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

46. On December 12, 2025, because of Respondent's failures to file proper accounts required by law, among other things, Respondent was removed as fiduciary in the Estate of Akiko

Susie McLaren, and the matter was placed on the Court's docket on February 20, 2026, to determine if the Respondent's fiduciary bond should be forfeited.

47. On or about February 20, 2026, at the request of the successor fiduciary, the COA filed a motion to continue the hearing on the forfeiture of Respondent's fiduciary bond to May 29, 2026, for the successor fiduciary to continue the investigation into Respondent.

VSB 25-060-135824
<u>Estate of Barbara Shepard McShea</u>

48. On June 9, 2025, Jeannie P. Dahnk, Esquire, Commissioner of Accounts ("COA") for the Stafford County Circuit Court ("Court"), advised the VSB pursuant to Va. Code §§ 64.2-1215-1216 that Respondent failed to properly administer the Estate of Barbara Shepard McShea, Fiduciary No. 21-113-01 ("Estate"), an estate for which Respondent was serving as fiduciary, and that summonses were issued and served upon Respondent on his violations of Virginia law.

49. On June 2, 2021, Respondent qualified as Administrator of the Estate. Pursuant to the Last Will & Testament of Barbara Shepard McShea, Rodney L. Payne was to receive the entire estate.

50. At qualification, Respondent, under oath, represented to the Clerk that the Estate was comprised of personal property valued at $63,600 and real estate valued at $259,800, for a total value of $323,400. Respondent was appointed after the estate's sole beneficiary had disposed of certain assets. The figures given were based on records showing value at the time of Respondent's appointment.

51. The inventory was due by October 2, 2021; however, Respondent failed to file the inventory by the due date.

52. The first account in the Estate was due by October 2, 2022; however, Respondent failed to file the first account by the due date.

53. The second account was due by October 2, 2023; however, Respondent failed to file the second account by the due date.

54. On March 5, 2024, having received no response from Respondent, the COA issued a summons upon Respondent for a proper inventory, a first account and a second account. The summons was served upon Respondent on March 19, 2024.

55. On April 10, 2024, Respondent filed an inventory and first, second, third and final accounts with the COA. At that time, the COA noted the file:

- The inventory was more than two and one-half years late.
- The first account was more than one and one-half years late.

- The second account was more than six months late.

56. The COA noted that Respondent signed and dated the third account a month prior to the completion of the accounting. It was signed on April 8, 2024, and the accounting included data through May 5, 2024.

57. On April 11, 2024, the COA sent an invoice to Respondent detailing the fees that were outstanding. On April 25, 2024, the COA received the balance due on the outstanding fees.

58. On October 1, 2024, a one-page deficiency letter on the filing of April 10, 2024, was sent to Respondent, who was given 30 days to provide the required information and documentation to the COA. The deficiency letter of October 1, 2024, stated, in part:

    - Please clarify account #9015 on the Truist bank statements not reported on the inventory.
    - An inventory reports all assets of the deceased, valued as of the date of death, including tangible personal property such as clothing, jewelry, tools, collections, automobiles, etc. If the deceased owned NO tangible personal property, please provide a written explanation of the circumstances for our file.
    - Please provide all bank statements, please provide the closing bank statements.
    - Please clarify account #8953 left open at Truist bank with recurring transactions on all three accountings.
    - Please clarify the multiple legal fees reported on the First and Second Accounting.

59. Respondent in his Answer reported receiving the COA's letter in mid-October. On October 22, 2024, the COA received a telephone message and email from Respondent regarding the letter of October 1, 2024.

60. On June 9, 2025, a second summons was issued upon Respondent for a proper inventory, and a first and second account. The summons was served upon Respondent on June 28, 2025.

61. After receiving the second summons, Respondent made several calls to the COA's main number seeking to confer before the summons response date. On July 28, 2025, he hand-carried a letter and new set of documents to the COA's office.

62. By letter dated August 18, 2025, the COA advised Respondent that she was in receipt of his letter and documents of July 28, 2025. The COA's letter further advised Respondent that he had failed to address the deficiencies specified in the October 1, 2024, deficiency letter.

63. By letter dated August 19, 2025, the COA advised Respondent that she was in receipt of his request regarding outstanding amounts he owes to her office, and she enclosed a listing of the fees, the delinquency fees owed, and the payments received by her office.

64. Respondent engaged a Fairfax probate attorney, Elias M. Kerby III, to assist him in resolving issues with the COA. On September 24, 2025, a letter requesting clarification of the supporting documentation being requested was sent by Mr. Kerby's office. The COA responded by letter dated October 1, 2025.

65. By email dated November 4, 2025, the COA advised the VSB that there had been no change in the Estate as Respondent's delinquencies remain.

FURTHER FINDINGS OF FACT BY THE PANEL

Respondent sought direction from Commissioner Dahnk's office. His efforts to communicate with the Commissioner included more than a dozen calls with voice messages as well as several communications with the Clerk of Court seeking intervention on his behalf. Commissioner Dahnk did not respond to Respondent's inquiries seeking clarification. The Commissioner had the Respondent's voice messages transcribed for later use in the investigation of this matter.

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

The Court heard testimony from the following witnesses for the VSB, who were sworn under oath: Anne M. Heishman, Esquire, Commissioner of Accounts for Fairfax County, Jeannie P. Dahnk, Esquire, Commissioner of Accounts for Stafford County and Ronald H. McCall, Investigator for the VSB.

The Court heard testimony from the following witnesses for Mr. Cox, who were sworn under oath: Elias M. Kerby, III, Esquire, and Mr. Cox.

STIPULATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

Respondent stipulated to paragraphs 1-65 and stipulated to violations of Rule 1.1 and Rule 1.3(a), with respect to his handling of all of the Estates. Respondent stipulated that his conduct after August 22, 2025, in the Estates of Frick, Inlow and McLaren, collectively the Fairfax dockets, was sufficiently delayed and/or incomplete as to violate Rules 1.1 (competence) and 1.3(a) (diligence). Respondent did not stipulate that his conduct prior to August 22, 2025 in the Fairfax dockets violated Rules 1.1 (competence) or 1.3(a) (diligence). Bar Counsel contended that Respondent's conduct before and after August 22, 2025 in the Fairfax dockets violated Rules 1.1 (competence) and 1.3(a) (diligence).

Respondent also stipulated to violations of Rule 1.1 (competence) and Rule 1.3(a)(diligence), in the Estate of McShea, the Stafford docket. Respondent conceded that his conduct on April 10, 2024, in filing the overdue documents with the Commissioner of Accounts, was sufficiently delayed as to violate Rule 1.1 and Rule 1.3(a). Respondent did not stipulate that his April 10, 2024 filings were sufficiently deficient as to violate Rules 1.1 (competence) or 1.3(a) (diligence). Respondent did not admit any violations in the Stafford docket/Estate of McShea after April 10, 2024. Bar Counsel argued that Respondent's April 10, 2024 filings were sufficiently deficient as to violate Rules 1.1 (competence) and 1.3(a) (diligence) and that Respondent's conduct after April 10, 2024 also violated Rules 1.1 (competence) and 1.3(a) (diligence).

Counsel for Respondent asked the Court to qualify or bracket the misconduct in the Estate of Frick, in the Estate of Inlow, in the Estate of McLaren and in the Estate of McShea to avoid a Term Violation from a previous disciplinary case, <u>Virginia State Bar v. Jonathan D. Cox</u>, VSB 24-042-131173 / CL 24-1854, in the Arlington County Circuit Court. Respondent is subject to a Term in that disciplinary case requiring, "No Further Misconduct" from August 7, 2024, through August 7, 2025, by Final Memorandum Order of August 7, 2024.

FINDINGS OF MISCONDUCT

Having considered the request of counsel for Respondent to qualify or bracket the misconduct of Respondent in the estate administration cases to avoid a violation of the Term from Virginia State Bar v. Jonathan D. Cox, VSB 24-042-131173 / CL 24-1854, the Court denied the Respondent's request.

The Court announced that it found violations of the following Rules of Professional Conduct by clear and convincing evidence in each of the four (4) estate administration cases, in the Estate of Frick, in the Estate of Inlow, in the Estate of McLaren and in the Estate of McShea, without qualification and without bracketing as to certain dates:

Rule 1.1 Competence

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

Rule 1.3 Diligence

a. A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

SANCTIONS PHASE

The Court admitted into evidence a Certification by the VSB on Mr. Cox's disciplinary history during the Sanctions Phase of the hearing. Respondent's disciplinary history consisted of a Public Reprimand with Terms effective August 7, 2024, for violations of Rule 1.1 (competence) and Rule 1.3(a) (diligence) in his handling of Estate matters and a Public Reprimand effective July 24, 2025, for violations of Rule 5.5(c) (unauthorized practice of law (UPL) while license administratively suspended) and Rule 8.4(b) (UPL as Code § 54.1-3904 misdemeanor).

The Court then received the testimony of the following witnesses:

Mr. Cox

Ronald H. McCall.

Thereafter, the VSB and Mr. Cox, by counsel, rested.

At the conclusion of all evidence in the Sanctions Phase, both parties by counsel presented closing arguments to the Court, and the Court thereafter retired to deliberate.

DETERMINATION

After due consideration of the evidence presented in mitigation and aggravation and having considered the arguments of counsel for Mr. Cox and Assistant Bar Counsel, including arguments upon the *Annotated Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions, 2nd Edition* (ABA 2019), as well as cases submitted by counsel, the Court reconvened and noted that while "I don't think that we're convinced that there was harm to the clients in these cases" ….. "the aggravating facts, and you have not disputed this in any way, Mr. Cox, are that this is – this has become a pattern and it's in rapid succession. And so we do think a suspension is appropriate because of the rapid succession in which this has evolved."

The Court announced its sanction of a SUSPENSION of SIXTY DAYS of Mr. Cox's license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia, effective August 1, 2026, with terms.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Mr. Cox's license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and the same hereby is, SUSPENDED, effective August 1, 2026, for Sixty (60) Days, and Mr. Cox must comply with the following terms:

1. Complete 30 hours of CLEs on estate planning, office management, client communications, and/or ethics.

2. Complete 50 hours of Community Service through the VSB "Wills for Heroes" program.

Mr. Cox shall comply with the terms, above, within 12 months from the date of this Final Judgment Memorandum Order or within 12 months of reinstatement from any additional period of suspension issued upon him for violations of the Term in disciplinary case Virginia State Bar

v. Jonathan D. Cox, VSB 24-042-131173 / CL 24-1854, in the Arlington County Circuit Court, whichever is longer.

If, however, any of the terms and conditions are not met by the deadlines imposed above, the alternative disposition is a Certification for Sanction Determination pursuant to Rules of Court, Part Six, Section IV, Paragraphs 13-18.O and 13-20.

It is further ORDERED that Mr. Cox must comply with the requirements of Part Six, Section IV, Paragraph 13-29 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia. Mr. Cox must forthwith give notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, of the Suspension of his license to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia, to all clients for whom Mr. Cox is currently handling matters and to all opposing attorneys and presiding judges in pending litigation. Mr. Cox must also make appropriate arrangements for the disposition of matters then in Mr. Cox's care in conformity with the wishes of his clients. Mr. Cox must give such notice immediately and in no event later than 14 days from the effective date of the Suspension, and make such arrangements as are required herein as soon as practicable and in no event later than 45 days from the effective date of the Suspension. Mr. Cox must also furnish proof to the VSB within 60 days of the effective date of the Suspension that such notices have been timely given and such arrangements made for the disposition of matters.

It is further ORDERED that if Mr. Cox is not handling any client matters on the effective date of the Suspension, Mr. Cox must submit an affidavit to that effect to the Clerk of the Disciplinary System of the VSB. Issues concerning the adequacy of the notice and arrangement required by Paragraph 13-29 must be determined by the VSB Disciplinary Board, which may impose a sanction of Suspension or Revocation for failure to comply with these requirements.

It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Disciplinary System of the VSB must assess all costs pursuant to Paragraph 13-9.E.

It is further ORDERED that the Clerk must send a copy teste of this order to Jonathan D. Cox, Respondent, at 4818 24th St N, Arlington, VA 22207, Respondent's last address of record with the Virginia State Bar; by regular mail to Daniel S. Schumack, Counsel of Record for Respondent, at Schumack + Guggenheim PLLC, 3900 Jermantown Road, Suite 300, Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4900; to Joseph M. Caturano, Jr., Assistant Bar Counsel, Virginia State Bar, 1111 E. Main Street, Suite 700, Richmond, VA 23219; and to the Clerk of the Disciplinary System, Virginia State Bar, 1111 E. Main Street, Suite 700, Richmond, VA 23219.

This Order is the final judgment of this Court as provided by Rule 5:21(b)(2)(ii) of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia.

ENTERED this 10th day of August 2026.

Honorable Tracy W.J. Thorne-Begland
Judge of the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit and Chief Judge Designate