

VIRGINIA:

BEFORE THE SECOND DISTRICT, SECTION II SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR

IN THE MATTER OF
WILLIAM GREER McCREEDY, II

VS B Docket No. 24-022-131834

SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINATION
(PUBLIC ADMONITION WITHOUT TERMS)

On November 6, 2024, a meeting was held in this matter before a duly convened Second District, Section II Subcommittee consisting of Ann Caudle, Lay Member; Jessica Dixon, Esq.; and Patrick Maurer, Esq., Chair. During the meeting, the Subcommittee voted to approve an Agreed Disposition for a Public Admonition without Terms pursuant to Part 6, § IV, ¶ 13-15.B.4 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia. The Agreed Disposition was entered into by the Virginia State Bar, by Seth T. Shelley, Assistant Bar Counsel, and William Greer McCreedy, II, Respondent, *pro se*.

WHEREFORE, the Second District, Section II Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar hereby serves upon Respondent the following Public Admonition without Terms:

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent was admitted to the Virginia State Bar (“VSB”) in 1987. At all relevant times, Respondent was a member of the VSB.
2. Records from VSB Regulatory Compliance indicate that Respondent’s license was suspended on March 25, 2024, for failure to comply with MCLE requirements. VSB Regulatory Compliance sent multiple notices to Respondent informing him that his license would be suspended if he did not comply. Furthermore, VSB Regulatory Compliance provided notice when his license was suspended for noncompliance. The suspension notice was sent by certified mail and email on March 26, 2024.
3. On March 28, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge David Lannetti (“Judge Lannetti”) of the Norfolk Circuit Court in a family law case. Judge Lannetti recalled that he had previously seen Respondent’s name on a list of attorneys who had their licenses suspended. Judge Lannetti asked Respondent if he was able to practice and Respondent said, “yes.” Judge Lannetti said that Respondent appeared “a little off,

slow, and disheveled.” Opposing counsel and Respondent signed orders after the hearing.

4. On April 16, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge Devon R. Paige (“Judge Paige”) of the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for a contested hearing. Judge Paige learned the next day that Respondent was suspended. Judge Paige stated she was concerned about Respondent because, during the hearing, Respondent was jaundiced, yellow, and frail. Respondent also appeared “out of it” and she had concerns about his cognition. Judge Paige said Respondent’s paralegal sat behind him during the hearing and attempted to assist him. Judge Paige said Respondent’s client should have prevailed, but he failed to file the necessary paperwork.
5. On April 17, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge Lauri D. Hogge (“Judge Hogge”) of the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. Judge Hogge stated that Respondent appeared “a little off.” Prior to the hearing, the Guardian *ad litem* (“GAL”) in the case approached the bench and stated that Respondent seemed extremely confused. The GAL also stated that Respondent’s license was currently suspended. Judge Hogge asked Respondent if his license was suspended. Respondent said, “no.” Judge Hogge said that Respondent’s answer did not appear to be a firm answer, and he seemed confused. Judge Hogge removed Respondent from the case.
6. On April 22, 2024, Respondent completed the MCLE requirements. Respondent was reinstated in good standing.
7. In his written response, Respondent said he has had “health problems” that prevented him from complying with the MCLE requirements. Respondent said he was informed of his license suspension on March 28, 2024, by Judge Lannetti. Respondent asserted that he was notified in early March 2024 regarding the MCLE noncompliance and attempted to remedy the issue. Respondent wrote that he erroneously believed that, during this time, he could not engage new clients but should complete the representation of his current clients.
8. When interviewed, Respondent said he appeared in court with two clients during the suspension period. Respondent said he told Judge Lannetti that his license was in good standing because he believed it was and said he had not received notice at that time that his license was suspended. Respondent said he contacted the Bar after the hearing with Judge Lannetti and believed his license was in good standing. Respondent could not recall who he spoke with. Respondent stated that he thought he had complied with the MCLE requirements prior to the hearing on April 16, 2024.
9. Respondent described multiple serious health issues. Respondent said he was in a car accident in November 2023. Respondent said he had a “weird visual experience” and has not driven since. Respondent stated that he had a TIA, or mini stroke, in January 2021 but recovered. Respondent had a second TIA in court in June 2023.

Respondent said he is diabetic and is currently undergoing dialysis. Respondent described having “thinking problems.”

II. NATURE OF MISCONDUCT

Such conduct by Respondent constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct:¹

By appearing in court on multiple occasions and practicing law while his license was administratively suspended, Respondent violated the following Rule of Professional Conduct:

RULE 5.5 Unauthorized Practice of Law

* * *

(c) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.

III. PUBLIC ADMONITION WITHOUT TERMS

Accordingly, having approved the Agreed Disposition, it is the decision of the Subcommittee to impose a Public Admonition without Terms and William Greer McCreedy, II, is hereby so admonished.

Pursuant to Part 6, § IV, ¶ 13-9.E of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall assess costs.

SECOND DISTRICT, SECTION II SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR


By: _____


Patrick Maurer
Subcommittee Chair

¹ Italicized language is for explanatory purposes only.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that on the 12th day of November, 2024, a true and complete copy of the Subcommittee Determination (Public Admonition Without Terms) was sent by certified mail to William Greer McCreedy, II, Respondent, at The McCreedy Law Group, PLLC, 1310 E. Little Creek Rd., Norfolk, Virginia 23518, Respondent's last address of record with the Virginia State Bar, and by email to mccreedy@mccreedyllaw.com.



Seth T. Shelley
Assistant Bar Counsel

VIRGINIA:

BEFORE THE SECOND DISTRICT, SECTION II SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR

IN THE MATTER OF
WILLIAM GREER McCREEDY, II

VSB Docket No. 24-022-131834

AGREED DISPOSITION
PUBLIC ADMONITION WITHOUT TERMS

Pursuant to the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, Part 6, § IV, ¶ 13-15.B.4, the Virginia State Bar, by Seth T. Shelley, Assistant Bar Counsel; and William Greer McCreedy, II, Esq., (“Respondent”), hereby enter into the following Agreed Disposition arising out of the referenced matter.

I. STIPULATIONS OF FACT

1. Respondent was admitted to the Virginia State Bar (“VSB”) in 1987. At all relevant times, Respondent was a member of the VSB.
2. Records from VSB Regulatory Compliance indicate that Respondent’s license was suspended on March 25, 2024, for failure to comply with MCLE requirements. VSB Regulatory Compliance sent multiple notices to Respondent informing him that his license would be suspended if he did not comply. Furthermore, VSB Regulatory Compliance provided notice when his license was suspended for noncompliance. The suspension notice was sent by certified mail and email on March 26, 2024.
3. On March 28, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge David Lannetti (“Judge Lannetti”) of the Norfolk Circuit Court in a family law case. Judge Lannetti recalled that he had previously seen Respondent’s name on a list of attorneys who had their licenses suspended. Judge Lannetti asked Respondent if he was able to practice and Respondent said, “yes.” Judge Lannetti said that Respondent appeared “a little off, slow, and disheveled.” Opposing counsel and Respondent signed orders after the hearing.
4. On April 16, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge Devon R. Paige (“Judge Paige”) of the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for a contested hearing. Judge Paige learned the next day that Respondent was suspended. Judge Paige stated she was concerned about Respondent because, during the hearing, Respondent was jaundiced, yellow, and frail. Respondent also appeared “out of it” and she had concerns about his cognition. Judge Paige said Respondent’s paralegal sat behind him during the hearing and attempted to assist him. Judge Paige said Respondent’s client should have prevailed, but he failed to file the necessary paperwork.

5. On April 17, 2024, Respondent appeared before Judge Lauri D. Hogge (“Judge Hogge”) of the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. Judge Hogge stated that Respondent appeared “a little off.” Prior to the hearing, the Guardian *ad litem* (“GAL”) in the case approached the bench and stated that Respondent seemed extremely confused. The GAL also stated that Respondent’s license was currently suspended. Judge Hogge asked Respondent if his license was suspended. Respondent said, “no.” Judge Hogge said that Respondent’s answer did not appear to be a firm answer, and he seemed confused. Judge Hogge removed Respondent from the case.
6. On April 22, 2024, Respondent completed the MCLE requirements. Respondent was reinstated in good standing.
7. In his written response, Respondent said he has had “health problems” that prevented him from complying with the MCLE requirements. Respondent said he was informed of his license suspension on March 28, 2024, by Judge Lannetti. Respondent asserted that he was notified in early March 2024 regarding the MCLE noncompliance and attempted to remedy the issue. Respondent wrote that he erroneously believed that, during this time, he could not engage new clients but should complete the representation of his current clients.
8. When interviewed, Respondent said he appeared in court with two clients during the suspension period. Respondent said he told Judge Lannetti that his license was in good standing because he believed it was and said he had not received notice at that time that his license was suspended. Respondent said he contacted the Bar after the hearing with Judge Lannetti and believed his license was in good standing. Respondent could not recall who he spoke with. Respondent stated that he thought he had complied with the MCLE requirements prior to the hearing on April 16, 2024.
9. Respondent described multiple serious health issues. Respondent said he was in a car accident in November 2023. Respondent said he had a “weird visual experience” and has not driven since. Respondent stated that he had a TIA, or mini stroke, in January 2021 but recovered. Respondent had a second TIA in court in June 2023. Respondent said he is diabetic and is currently undergoing dialysis. Respondent described having “thinking problems.”

II. NATURE OF MISCONDUCT

Such conduct by Respondent constitutes misconduct in violation of the following provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct:¹

By appearing in court on multiple occasions and practicing law while his license was administratively suspended, Respondent violated the following Rule of Professional Conduct:

¹ Italics are explanatory and are not intended to limit the findings of the tribunal.

RULE 5.5 Unauthorized Practice of Law

* * *

(c) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.

III. PROPOSED DISPOSITION

Accordingly, Assistant Bar Counsel and Respondent tender to a subcommittee of the Second District, Section II Committee for its approval the Agreed Disposition of a Public Admonition without Terms as representing an appropriate sanction if these matters were to be heard through an evidentiary hearing by the Second District, Section II Committee.

If the Agreed Disposition is approved, the Clerk of the Disciplinary System shall assess costs.

Pursuant to Part 6, § IV, ¶ 13-30.B of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia, Respondent's prior disciplinary record shall be furnished to the subcommittee considering this Agreed Disposition.

THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR



Seth T. Shelley, Esq.
Assistant Bar Counsel



William Greer McCreedy II, Esq.
Respondent