BEFORE THE
ATTORNEY REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

In the Matter of:
Antonio DeBlasio, Attorney-Respondent
Commission No. 2025IN04977

COMPLAINANTS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL FILING AND

RENEWED MOTION TO EXPEDITE HEARING

Complainants Jordan Tepper Weiner and Terri Tepper respectfully submit this Second Supplemental Filing to advise the Commission of material developments in the related federal court proceeding, *Tepper v. Oppenheimer & Co., Inc.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-09985 (N.D. Ill.), and to renew their request that this matter be set for an expedited hearing.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Complainants filed their original ARDC complaint on November 21, 2025. On January 16, 2026, Respondent submitted his response through counsel Allison L. Wood of Legal Ethics Consulting. On January 21, 2026, Senior Counsel John R. Cesario of the ARDC Intake Division forwarded Respondent's response to Complainants and granted fourteen days to reply. Complainants filed a detailed Reply on January 22, 2026, and a Supplemental Filing on January 24, 2026. On January 27, 2026, Complainants filed a Notice of Pending ARDC Proceeding and Supplemental Authority in Support of Equitable Tolling in the federal court (ECF No. 32), attaching the ARDC Reply as Exhibit A and the ARDC Supplemental as Exhibit B.

On February 6, 2026, Oppenheimer & Co. filed its Response to Petitioners' Notice (ECF No. 34). Complainants filed their Reply to Oppenheimer's Response on the same date. Both filings are attached hereto as Exhibit A (Oppenheimer's Response, ECF No. 34) and Exhibit B (Complainants' Reply). These filings confirm that the representations Ms. Wood made to this Commission on January 16, 2026 are material misrepresentations.

I. OPPENHEIMER'S FEBRUARY 6, 2026 FEDERAL COURT FILING CONCLUSIVELY DISPROVES THE "NO REPRESENTATIONAL HARM" CLAIM

In her January 16, 2026 response to this Commission, Ms. Wood represented that Mr. DeBlasio's conduct caused "no representational harm" to Complainants. On February 6, 2026—three weeks after that representation—Oppenheimer & Co. filed a seven-page brief in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (ECF No. 34, attached as Exhibit A) doing exactly what Complainants warned this Commission would happen: using Mr. DeBlasio's malpractice as its sole defense.

Oppenheimer's filing is built entirely on the consequences of Mr. DeBlasio's misconduct. Oppenheimer characterizes Complainants' own ARDC filings as "fatal admissions" (Exhibit A at 1)—weaponizing the very evidence of Mr. DeBlasio's malpractice against the clients he harmed. Oppenheimer quotes Complainants' ARDC submissions to argue that the late service bars the case, that Mr. Weiner's six written deadline warnings somehow defeat equitable tolling, and that the case should be dismissed without any review of the underlying claims of elder financial exploitation.

This is the "no representational harm" Ms. Wood told this Commission about: Oppenheimer is now using Mr. DeBlasio's admitted malpractice—and Complainants' own diligence in reporting it to this Commission—as a weapon to permanently shut the courthouse door. The harm is not theoretical. It is documented on the federal docket. It is escalating with every filing. And it exists solely because of what Mr. DeBlasio did.

II. OPPENHEIMER HAS STILL NOT ADDRESSED A SINGLE SUBSTANTIVE GROUND FOR VACATUR

In its February 6, 2026 filing, Oppenheimer devoted seven pages exclusively to procedural timeliness arguments. It did not address a single one of the substantive grounds for vacatur that Complainants have raised, including: fraud in procurement of the arbitration award based on attorney McGuire's material misrepresentation about when the retroactive fee increase occurred; the 56% fee increase imposed on an 80-year-old client with Parkinson's disease and Stage 4 cancer eleven days before obtaining any purported authorization; arbitrator misconduct in dismissing expert medical testimony documenting over 400 therapy sessions proving "significant cognitive decline"; systematic discovery violations; and manifest disregard of FINRA Rules 2165 and 3110 and Illinois elder financial exploitation statutes.

Oppenheimer's strategy is clear: avoid the merits entirely and rely on Mr. DeBlasio's malpractice to obtain dismissal. This strategy works only because of Mr. DeBlasio's misconduct. Without his failure to timely serve, Oppenheimer would be required to defend the substance of the arbitration award. The representational harm could not be more obvious.

III. THE FEDERAL COURT RECORD CONFIRMS MS. WOOD'S OTHER REPRESENTATIONS WERE ALSO FALSE

"The Transcripts Did Not Exist." Ms. Wood's January 16 response claimed Mr. Weiner "made repeated requests for something that did not exist" regarding official FINRA hearing transcripts. This is a fabrication. Mr. DeBlasio had the official FINRA audio recordings in his possession the entire time. Mr. Weiner requested transcript preparation six times in writing, beginning July 17, 2025. Mr. DeBlasio's own associate, Joseph Two, emailed Mr. DeBlasio: "Jordan's not giving up on his official transcripts—what do you want to do?" Mr. DeBlasio did nothing. Mr. Weiner ultimately obtained the recordings and transcribed them himself as a pro se litigant—proving the transcripts could have been prepared at any time.

"Retaining Other Counsel." Ms. Wood represented that Complainants "were retaining other counsel." The federal court record proves the opposite. Complainants have been forced to proceed pro se throughout these proceedings precisely because no attorney would accept the case after Mr. DeBlasio's malpractice created the procedural catastrophe Oppenheimer now exploits.

"Withdrawal Was Not at a Critical Time." Mr. DeBlasio filed his Motion to Withdraw on October 22, 2025—eight days after his recorded admission of "I take full responsibility"—while Oppenheimer's cross-motion for sanctions was pending. Those sanctions forced co-petitioner Terri Tepper, the 83-year-old widow and executor, to withdraw from the case entirely. Every element of this timing was critical.

"Genuinely Remorseful." Ms. Wood represented that Mr. DeBlasio is "genuinely remorseful." If that were true, he would do the one thing that would demonstrate genuine remorse: provide a letter acknowledging that the late service was caused by his error, so that

Complainants can establish equitable tolling and have their case heard on the merits. He has refused. His refusal to take the single action that would help his former clients—while costing him nothing—speaks louder than any representation of remorse.

IV. MR. DEBLASIO'S CONDUCT CONTINUES TO SERVE OPPENHEIMER'S INTERESTS

As Complainants documented in their January 22, 2026 Reply to this Commission, every action Mr. DeBlasio took harmed Complainants and helped Oppenheimer. The February 6, 2026 federal court filings confirm this pattern is continuing:

Mr. DeBlasio received six written deadline warnings—including one warning it would be "catastrophic"—and missed the deadline anyway. He received six written requests to order official FINRA hearing transcripts and ignored every one. He then withdrew eight days after admitting fault, concealing his malpractice in a motion citing vague "professional reasons." He has refused to provide an accountability letter. And now Oppenheimer has filed a seven-page brief using all of this as the basis to permanently dismiss the case without any merits review.

Mr. DeBlasio's failure to timely serve has accomplished what Oppenheimer's attorneys at Duane Morris could not: it has shifted the entire federal litigation from the merits of Oppenheimer's alleged elder exploitation to the procedural question of timeliness. His continuing refusal to provide an accountability letter—which would cost him nothing but would significantly help his former clients establish equitable tolling—reinforces the conclusion that his interests are aligned with Oppenheimer's, not with Complainants'. This Commission has the authority and the obligation to investigate whether that alignment is more than coincidental.

V. THE FEDERAL COURT PROCEEDINGS REQUIRE AN EXPEDITED HEARING

The urgency of this matter has increased. On February 6, 2026, both parties filed simultaneous briefs on the equitable tolling question. The federal court may now rule at any time. A formal ARDC finding of misconduct would constitute powerful evidence supporting Complainants' equitable tolling argument. The federal court is evaluating whether Mr. DeBlasio's conduct rises above "garden variety neglect" to the level of "serious instances of attorney misconduct" sufficient to warrant equitable tolling under *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 651–52 (2010). A formal ARDC determination would directly resolve this question.

Delay benefits only Mr. DeBlasio and Oppenheimer. Every day that passes without an ARDC hearing is a day closer to the possibility that the federal court rules without the complete record this Commission can provide. Complainants should not be forced to litigate their father's elder exploitation case with one hand tied behind their back because of Mr. DeBlasio's misconduct and his refusal to set the record straight.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Complainants respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Recognize that Ms. Wood's January 16, 2026 representations—including "no representational harm," that transcripts "did not exist," that Complainants "were retaining other counsel," and that the withdrawal "was not at a critical time"—are confirmed material misrepresentations now conclusively disproven by the federal court record;

2. Set this matter for an expedited hearing given that the federal court may rule on equitable tolling imminently and a formal ARDC finding would directly bear on that determination;

3. Investigate whether Mr. DeBlasio's failure to timely serve, combined with his refusal to acknowledge responsibility despite his recorded admission of "full responsibility," reflects intentional conduct designed to harm Complainants' federal case; and

4. Grant such other and further relief as the Commission deems appropriate.

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Oppenheimer & Co. Inc.'s Response to Petitioners' Notice of Pending ARDC Proceeding and Supplemental Authority in Support of Equitable Tolling (ECF No. 34, filed February 6, 2026)

Exhibit B: Petitioners' Reply to Oppenheimer & Co. Inc.'s Response (ECF No. 34) (filed February 6, 2026)

Dated: February 6th, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Jordan Tepper Weiner

_____

Jordan Tepper Weiner, Complainant
261 Kimberly Road
North Barrington, IL 60010
(281) 961-4002
jordan@internetconsultinginc.com

Terri Tepper

_____

Terri Tepper, Complainant
261 Kimberly Road
North Barrington, IL 60010