

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF IOWA**

**No. 25–1618**

**Grievance Commission No. 2024-24310**

**ORDER OF PUBLIC REPRIMAND**

**IOWA SUPREME COURT  
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD,  
Complainant,**

**vs.**

**RICHARD LOUIS PAZDERNIK, JR.,  
Respondent.**

---

Pursuant to Iowa Court Rule 35.12, the Iowa Supreme Court Attorney Disciplinary Board (Board) reprimand of attorney Richard Louis Pazdernik, Jr., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has been filed with the clerk of this court with proof of service and a statement that Pazdernik has not filed an exception to the Board’s recommendation within the time prescribed.

The court orders that the reprimand of Richard Louis Pazdernik, Jr. be included in the records of this court as a public document.

Copies to:

Justices of the Iowa Supreme Court  
Judges of the Iowa Court of Appeals  
Chief Judges  
District Court Administrators  
Clerks of Court  
Office of Professional Regulation  
Attorney Disciplinary Board  
The Iowa State Bar Association  
State Public Defender

Nicholas Tré Critelli  
Office of Professional Regulation  
1111 East Court Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Trinity Mary Braun-Arana  
Office of Professional Regulation  
Director of Client Security  
1111 East Court Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Tara van Brederode  
Attorney Disciplinary Board  
1111 East Court Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Jessica Jo Taylor  
Office of Professional Regulation  
1111 East Court Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Richard Louis Pazdernik Jr. (regular and restricted certified mail)  
1231 Park Place NE, Suite D  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

Richard Louis Pazdernik Jr. (regular and restricted certified mail)  
1449 40th Street  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52402



IOWA APPELLATE COURTS

State of Iowa Courts

**Case Number**  
25-1618

**Case Title**  
Board v. Richard Louis Pazdernik Jr.

So Ordered

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Waterman", written over a horizontal line.

Thomas D. Waterman, Justice

Electronically signed on 2025-10-31 15:40:51



# Attorney Disciplinary Board

OF THE SUPREME COURT OF IOWA

Judicial Branch Building ♦ 1111 East Court Avenue ♦ Des Moines, IA 50319  
515-348-4680 ♦ Fax: 515-348-4699 ♦ www.iowacourts.gov

July 21, 2025

Richard Louis Pazdernik  
1449 40th Street  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

Re: LETTER OF PUBLIC REPRIMAND  
Our File: 2024-24310: Pazdernik, Richard / ADB

Dear Mr. Pazdernik:

The above complaint filed against you was considered by the 12-member volunteer Attorney Disciplinary Board at its recent hearing meeting. The Board found that on September 30, 2024, you filed a Brief of Defendant in Support of Upholding Magistrate's Ruling in Iowa County Case No. MRNTA0048564. The brief contained several problematic citations. Some of the cited cases did not stand for asserted propositions, some were incorrect citations (purporting to be an Iowa case but actually an Indiana case, for example), and some were entirely fictitious. On October 29, the court issued an order noting that it was unable to locate certain cases you cited and ordering you to provide the court with copies of the cases or their correct citations within 7 days of the order.

On November 5, you filed Defendant's Response to the Court's Order in Re Cited Cases. You stated, "The brief draft included several cases that were not intended for this brief but for confusion or error in transcribing from paper to word document appeared in Defendant's brief." When you filed this response, you were aware that the problem involved your staff's use of artificial intelligence ("AI")—specifically ChatGPT—in editing the brief. You also filed an amended Brief in Support of Upholding Magistrate's Ruling. This brief contained similar citation problems to those in the original brief: cases not standing for the asserted proposition and inaccurate or fictitious citations. The court issued an order on December 24 that admonished you for "failing to submit accurate citations" and "misrepresenting the law."

The Board concluded that your conduct violated multiple Iowa Rules of Professional Conduct. You violated rule 32:3.3(a)(1),<sup>1</sup> which requires candor to the court. When you made your November 5 response to the court, you were aware that the cause of the problem was misuse of AI, since you told your assistant to cease using it. Your response, however, stated that the problem was a transcribing error. This was not true. Your second

---

<sup>1</sup> **Rule 32:3.3(a)(1):** A lawyer shall not knowingly make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer.

brief contained misrepresentations of the law with the continued use of AI, which also violated this rule.

The Board found your conduct also violated rule 32:5.3(b).<sup>2</sup> You were aware that your legal assistant was using an AI program to edit the documents and this method was causing inaccurate and misleading citations. You did not check the citations in the amended brief before filing it. Comment 2 to the rule specifically notes that lawyers are “responsible for [legal assistants’] work product” and that lawyers should take measures that “take account of the fact that they do not have legal training and are not subject to professional discipline.”

The Board concluded your conduct also violated rule 32:8.4(d)<sup>3</sup> because your initial failure to catch the problem and then your subsequent failure to remedy the inaccurate and misleading citations forced the court to address the issue in an order on October 29 and then in the ultimate ruling on the matter. The court was compelled to expend resources to conduct its own research to address its concerns about the citations.

It was the determination of the Board that you shall be, and hereby are, publicly reprimanded for the above conduct in violation of Iowa Rules of Professional Conduct 32:3.3(a)(1), 5.3(b), and 8.4(d). In accordance with Iowa Court Rule 35.12, you are notified that you have 30 days from the date of completed service of this reprimand to file an exception hereto with the Grievance Commission clerk. Under Court Rule 35.12(1), failure to file such an exception “constitutes a waiver of any further proceedings and a consent that the reprimand be made final and public.”

FOR THE IOWA SUPREME COURT  
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY BOARD



Tara M. van Brederode  
Director of Attorney Discipline

TMvB/tm vb

---

<sup>2</sup> **Rule 32:5.3(b)**: With respect to a nonlawyer employed or retained by or associated with a lawyer: a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over the nonlawyer shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the person’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.

<sup>3</sup> **Rule 32:8.4(d)**: It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.