

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY
COUNSEL,

PETITIONER,

v.

RALPH DAVID KARSH,

RESPONDENT.

) DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

) No. 13 DB 2023

) Attorney Registration No. 58782
) (Allegheny County)

) ANSWER TO PETITION FOR
) DISCIPLINE

) Filed on behalf of Respondent,
) RALPH D. KARSH

) Counsel of Record for this Party:

) John E. Quinn, Esquire
) Pa. ID No. 23268
) jquinn@quinnlogue.com

) QUINN LOGUE LLC
) 200 First Avenue, Third Floor
) Pittsburgh, PA 15222
) (412) 765-3800

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,)	DISCIPLINARY DOCKET
)	No. 13 DB 2023
)	
PETITIONER,)	Attorney Registration No.
)	58782 (Allegheny County)
v.)	
)	
RALPH DAVID KARSH,)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR DISCIPLINE

AND now comes the Respondent, Ralph David Karsh, Esquire, by and through his counsel, John E. Quinn, Esquire and the law firm of Quinn Logue, LLC., and files the following Answer to the Petition for Discipline filed at the above case number, averring as follows:

1. The averments of Paragraph 1 of the Petition are admitted.
2. The averments of Paragraph 2 of the Petition are admitted.
3. The averments of Paragraph 3 of the Petition are admitted.
4. The averments of Paragraph 4 of the Petition are admitted.
5. The averments of Paragraph 5 of the Petition are admitted.
6. The averments of Paragraph 6 of the Petition are admitted.

7. The averments of Paragraph 7 of the Petition are admitted.
8. The averments of Paragraph 8 of the Petition are admitted.
9. The averments of Paragraph 9 of the Petition are admitted.
10. The averments of Paragraph 10 of the Petition are admitted.
11. The averments of Paragraph 11 of the Petition are admitted.
12. The averments of Paragraph 12 of the Petition and its

subparts are admitted.

13. The averments of Paragraph 13 of the Petition are admitted.
14. The averments of Paragraph 14 of the Petition are admitted.

By way of further answer, the only discussion with Ms. Kenney was an acknowledgement of the amount of the check.

15. The averments of Paragraph 15 of the Petition are admitted.

16. The averments of Paragraph 16 of the Petition are conclusions of law to which no responsive pleading is required. To the extent a responsive pleading is required, the issue of the \$10,000.00 overpayment was not addressed in Respondent's engagement letter of November 30, 2019.

17. The averments of Paragraph 17 of the Petition are denied. Respondent recalls no specific discussion of the \$10,000.00 portion of the \$25,000.00 check.

18. The averments of Paragraph 18 of the Petition are denied. See Respondent's Answer to paragraph 14 and 17.

19. The averments of Paragraph 19 of the Petition are admitted.

20. The averments of Paragraph 20 of the Petition are conclusions of law to which no responsive pleading is required. To the extent a responsive pleading is required, Respondent reasonably believed that the \$25,000.00 payment was fee. Respondent spent approximately 30 hours on the file, including a day and a half trip to Mr. Taylor's place of confinement. At a rate of \$350.00 per hour, this would have translated into \$10,500.00 as earned fee. However, Respondent believed that the right thing to do under the circumstances was to return the entire sum even though Petitioner was stating that only \$10,000.00 should have been placed into IOLTA.

21. The averments of Paragraph 21 of the Petition are admitted. Respondent admits that he was dilatory in communicating with Mr.

Taylor and Ms. Kenney until his discussions of a possible petition *nunc pro tunc*.

22. The averments of Paragraph 22 of the Petition are denied as stated. Respondent reviewed the entire file of over 750 pages sent to him (piecemeal) by the client and Mr. Taylor. Respondent met with Mr. Taylor and spent two days in traveling to the State Correctional Institution which housed Mr. Taylor and met with him to go over the file. Respondent performed research in an effort to locate any issues for a PCRA petition. It was sometime after the meeting with Mr. Taylor that Respondent became convinced there were no issues for a PCRA petition. Respondent admits that he should have informed Ms. Kenney and/or Mr. Taylor of that belief.

23. The averments of Paragraph 23 of the Petition are admitted.

24. The averments of Paragraph 24 of the Petition are admitted.

25. The averments of Paragraph 25 of the Petition are denied as stated. Respondent has no knowledge as to when Ms. Kenney became aware of anything.

26. The averments of Paragraph 26 of the Petition are admitted.

27. The averments of Paragraph 27 of the Petition are admitted.

28. The averments of Paragraph 28 of the Petition are admitted.

29. The averments of Paragraph 29 of the Petition are admitted.

30. The averments of Paragraph 30 of the Petition are admitted.

31. The averments of Paragraph 31 of the Petition are admitted.

32. The averments of Paragraph 32 of the Petition are admitted.

33. The averments of Paragraph 33 of the Petition are admitted

in part and denied in part. It is admitted that Respondent did not immediately make a full refund of the \$25,000.00. Respondent returned the file to Ms. Kenney by the second week of June 2021. Respondent kept the file because he was discussing with Ms. Kenney the possible referral of the matter to another lawyer. Respondent also questioned Ms. Kenney as to whether the file should be returned to Mr. Taylor or to her. Ms. Kenney eventually produced proof that Mr. Taylor was satisfied with the return of the file to Ms. Kenney.

34. The averments of Paragraph 34 of the Petition are admitted.

35. The averments of Paragraph 35 of the Petition are admitted.

Please see response to Paragraph 33.

36. The averments of Paragraph 36 of the Petition are admitted.

37. The averments of Paragraph 37 of the Petition and all of its subparts constitute legal conclusions to which no responsive pleading is required.

WHEREFORE, Respondent asks to be heard in defense of this charge and in mitigation pursuant to Disciplinary Board Rule §89.151.

Respectfully submitted,

QUINN LOGUE LLC

Date: 3/2/23

By: 
John E. Quinn, Esquire
Counsel for Respondent

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,)	DISCIPLINARY DOCKET
)	No. 13 DB 2023
PETITIONER,)	Attorney Registration No.
)	58782 (Allegheny County)
v.)	
)	
RALPH DAVID KARSH,)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	

VERIFICATION

I verify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S.A. Section 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

5-3-23

Date



Ralph David Karsh

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,)	DISCIPLINARY DOCKET
)	No. 13 DB 2023
)	
PETITIONER,)	Attorney Registration No.
)	58782 (Allegheny County)
v.)	
)	
RALPH DAVID KARSH,)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Submitted by:



John E. Quinn, Esquire
Pa. ID No. 23268

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,)	DISCIPLINARY DOCKET
)	No. 13 DB 2023
)	
PETITIONER,)	Attorney Registration No.
)	58782 (Allegheny County)
)	
v.)	
)	
RALPH DAVID KARSH,)	
)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Answer to Petition was served upon the following parties and counsel of record on the below date via electronic mail:

Cory J. Cirelli, Esquire
Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District IV Office
Frick Building, Suite 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Cory.cirelli@pacourts.us

Date

7/13/23



John E. Quinn, Esquire
Counsel for Respondent