



LAWYER DISCIPLINE

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>.

Disciplinary Proceedings Against Mark Robert Raddatz

Mark Robert Raddatz consented to the imposition of a public reprimand, as discipline reciprocal to that imposed by the District of Columbia. A Wisconsin Supreme Court-appointed referee issued the public reprimand on Oct. 1, 2025, pursuant to SCR 22.09(3).

Raddatz's public reprimand in the District of Columbia was based on violations of DC disciplinary rule 20:4.2(a), substantively equivalent to SCR 20:4.2(a), and DC disciplinary rule SCR 20:8.4(d). That rule does not have a counterpart in the Wisconsin Rules of Professional Conduct. The rule prohibits a lawyer from engaging in "conduct that seriously interferes with the administration of justice." Approximately one year after the settlement

of a civil matter, Raddatz entered into a modified settlement agreement with the opposing party, who was represented by counsel. Opposing counsel was not aware of the modified agreement until receiving notice of a hearing in the matter. Raddatz sent an associate to appear at the hearing, and the matter was adjourned. Thereafter, Raddatz failed to respond to opposing counsel's attempt to contact him. A second hearing was set and, again, Raddatz sent an associate to appear. It was only after receiving notice that a grievance had been filed that Raddatz communicated with opposing counsel. Raddatz agreed to withdraw the amended agreement and again sent his associate to the hearing, at which the court agreed to the withdrawal of the settlement agreement.

Raddatz had no prior discipline.

Disciplinary Proceedings Against Matthew V. Burkert

On Sept. 12, 2025, the supreme court suspended for two years the law license of Matthew V. Burkert, effective immediately. The court ordered Burkert to pay within 60 days restitution to his former firm in the amount of \$24,358.50. He was further ordered to pay within 60 days the cost of the proceeding, which totaled \$4,875.21. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Burkert, 2025 WI 44.*

The court found that Burkert violated SCR 20:8.4(c) by engaging in a pattern of deceit and dishonesty and that he had violated a standard of conduct set forth in *In re Disciplinary Proceedings Against Shea*, 190 Wis. 2d 560, 527 N.W.2d 314 (1995), enforced via SCR 20:8.4(f), imposing a fiduciary duty and a duty of honesty to an attorney's law firm.

Burkert, while a member of a law firm, incorporated a limited liability company (LLC), using firm resources, including having firm staff obtain an employer identification number from the IRS. Some months later, Burkert was asked to fill out an "Outside Interest Supplement" form. Burkert failed to disclose the existence of, or his interest in, his new LLC. The next year, Burkert left the firm. After he left, the firm discovered the existence of the LLC and multiple billing irregularities related to clients for whom Burkert had performed legal services during his time with the firm. Specifically, Burkert had directed some clients to remit payment to his LLC for work he and other firm employees had performed while still employed by the firm. The Office of Lawyer Regulation's complaint listed seven such instances, and Burkert entered a no-contest plea as to the misconduct alleged in the complaint.

Burkert had no prior discipline.

Reinstatement of Steven D. Johnson

On Oct. 10, 2025, the supreme court reinstated the law license of Steven D. Johnson, effective immediately. *Disciplinary Proc. Against Johnson, 2025 WI 45.*

Johnson's disciplinary history consists of a 2008 private reprimand for engaging in acts leading to a conviction of

STATE BAR OF WISCONSIN

Membership has its benefits.

Do cyber threats keep you awake at night? Your State Bar of Wisconsin membership provides deep discounts and exclusive access to tools that can help you address these issues – and reintroduce deep sleep back into your life.

BIZLock – A-rated cyber liability insurance coverage, and a risk management suite of tools to prevent, protect against and respond to cybercrime.

Identillect Technologies – encrypted email for both outbound and inbound communications.



Practice411 – complimentary practice management consultations with the State Bar's Law Office Management Assistance Program Manager, Christopher Shattuck. Contact him at (800) 957-4670 or cshattuck@wisbar.org for personalized assistance.



For more programs and products, visit www.wisbar.org/memben



one count of misdemeanor battery as a domestic abuse incident. In 2010, he received a public reprimand for engaging in acts leading to a conviction of one count of felony child abuse (recklessly causing harm), which related to an incident involving his son.

On Nov. 2, 2023, the court suspended Johnson's license to practice law for six months for professional misconduct consisting of one violation of SCR 20:8.4(g) via SCR 40.15; one violation of SCR 20:5.3(a) and (b); two violations of SCR 20:3.3(a)(1); and one violation of SCR 20:1.4(b). See *Johnson*, 2023 WI 73. The misconduct occurred between late 2018 and late 2020.

Johnson filed a petition for reinstatement of his license on March 11, 2024. On May 24, 2024, the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) filed a response stating that it did not oppose Johnson's reinstatement petition. Johnson's reinstatement petition and the stipulation for reinstatement were submitted for the court's consideration without the appointment of a referee. By order of Aug. 2, 2024, the court rejected the stipulation and referred the petition to a referee for a hearing. The referee submitted a report recommending reinstatement.

In reviewing the matter, the court discovered that Johnson had agreed to a consensual public reprimand, which was approved by a referee in November 2024. Neither party had disclosed that matter to the court. That reprimand covered two client matters and included violations of SCR 20:1.5(a), SCR 20:1.1, SCR 20:1.4(b), SCR 20:1.6, and SCR 20:1.9(c)(1) and (2). The misconduct occurred in 2021. Upon discovering the reprimand, the court sent the matter back for rehearing. After that hearing, based upon a report by the referee, the court concluded that Johnson established by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence that he satisfied all the criteria necessary for reinstatement. As a condition of reinstatement, Johnson was ordered within 30 days to enter into an agreement with the OLR to pay the cost of his prior disciplinary case, as well as the current reinstatement matter, commensurate with his ability to pay. **WL**



PROUD TO
BE THE
WISCONSIN
INSURANCE
COMPANY FOR

WISCONSIN

LAWYERS

A Member Benefit of

