Public Discipline

These summaries are based on information provided by the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR), an agency of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The OLR assists the court in supervising the practice of law and protecting the public from misconduct by lawyers. The full text of matters summarized can be located at https://compendium.wicourts. gov/app/search.

Public Reprimand of Thomas Gonzalez

The Office of Lawyer Regulation and Thomas Gonzalez entered into an agreement for the imposition of a public reprimand, pursuant to SCR 22.09(1). A Wisconsin Supreme Court-appointed referee approved the agreement and issued the public reprimand on April 21, 2025, pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

Gonzalez was traveling on an interstate highway that was restricted to one lane of traffic because of three accidents in the area. While driving through the area, Gonzalez hit the back of a fire truck, causing his car to block the only lane of traffic that had remained open. In relation to the incident, Gonzalez pled guilty to three misdemeanor counts: negligent operation of a motor vehicle, obstruction of emergency or rescue person, and hit and run. He also was found guilty of one count of misdemeanor first-offense operating with a prohibited alcohol concentration. By engaging in the conduct resulting in his criminal convictions, Gonzalez in each

BUSINESS LITIGATION

"LET MY EXPERTISE WORK FOR YOUR CLIENTS" Non-Compete Agreements • Contract Disputes Fraud and Misrepresentation • Trade Secrets/Customer Lists Dealership Terminations • Injunction Hearings

CASE OF THE MONTH



Rajaraman v. Government Employees Insurance Company, No. 23-CV-425-SCD, 2025 WL 1114020, (E.D. Wis. Apr. 15, 2025). Rajaraman worked for GEICO in Texas. Rajaraman claimed that when he sought to become a GEICO field representative (GFR) in Texas, he was told there were no opportunities there. Rajaraman applied for the Milwaukee GFR and at one meeting his wife, Hill, asked for franchise disclosure documents. GEICO responded that the GFR program was not a franchise program. Rajaraman became the sole shareholder and he and Hill, became directors of ANRI, a new insurance company in Wisconsin. On March 16, 2020, Rajaraman notified the GFR management team that he was closing the Milwaukee office that day. On March 31, 2023,

Rajaraman, Hill and ANRI initiated the action. The court denied plaintiff's motion to reconsider a previous denial of an amendment to add the bankruptcy trustee as a plaintiff, on the grounds that plaintiffs had the burden to establish that amendment or substitution would not "unduly" prejudice GEICO. The court determined that prejudice to GEICO would be undue. Plaintiffs failed to cite any authority establishing that courts must explicitly consider third-party beneficiaries of the litigation, here creditors. The court also granted summary judgment to GEICO. Wisconsin applies a three-year statute of limitations to intentional misrepresentation and fraud in the inducement claims. GEICO argued that the three-year clock started ticking on the date they closed the Milwaukee office. Plaintiffs argued that the discovery doctrine pushed the clocks' starting times to at least March 31, 2020. Under the discovery rule, it is not necessary that a defrauded party have knowledge of the ultimate fact of fraud. What is required is that the defrauded party be in possession of such essential facts as will, if diligently investigated, disclose the fraud. Ultimately, plaintiffs argued that "the mere understanding that certain financial, marketing and franchise-related representations were inaccurate, is not the same as testimony or evidence in the record that [p]laintiffs knew that GEICO had intentionally or fraudulently made such representations with the intent that plaintiffs rely on them." While the plaintiffs' observation was correct, they improperly blamed the defendant for failing to bridge the gap. Plaintiffs' idlure to introduce any evidence that they learned of material facts after March 16, 2020 was fatal to their claim.

ROBERT B. CORRIS, S.C. 414.573.8000 • rcorris@corrislaw.com co-counsel and conflicts representation to serve your clients instance violated SCR 20:8.4(b). Gonzalez has no prior discipline.

Public Reprimand of Danny Garcia

The Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) and Danny Garcia entered into an agreement for the imposition of a public reprimand, pursuant to SCR 22.09(1). A Wisconsin Supreme Court-appointed referee approved the agreement and issued the public reprimand on April 27, 2025, pursuant to SCR 22.03(2) and (3).

Garcia's reprimand is based on his misconduct in three matters. In the first matter, Garcia appeared in court when he was noticeably impaired due to alcohol consumption, in violation of SCR 20:1.1. He also failed to cooperate with the OLR's investigation of the matter, in violation of SCR 22.03(2) and (3).

In the second matter, Garcia failed to appear at two hearings and failed to respond to the court's dismissal order, in violation of SCR 20:1.3. He failed to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and failed to respond to texts and emails, in violation of SCR 20:1.4(a)(3) and (4). He also failed to protect the client's interests at the termination of the representation, in violation of SCR 20:1.16(d). Finally, he failed to cooperate with the OLR's investigation of the matter, in violation of SCR 22.03(2) and (3).

In the third matter, which involved the representation of several clients, Garcia failed to appear for hearings in four cases and failed to file a required response to a court order, in violation of SCR 20:1.3. He also failed to respond to calls and emails from the clients, in violation of SCR 20:1.4(a)(4). He also failed to protect the clients' interests at the termination of the representations, in violation of SCR 20:1.16(d). Finally, he failed to cooperate with the OLR's investigation of the matter, in violation of SCR 22.03(2) and (3).

Garcia has been sober for several years. He has no prior discipline. **WL** (\bullet)