

Supreme Court of Wisconsin



NO. 2026XX1557-D OFFICE OF LAWYER REGULATION V. HANNAH C. DUGAN

September 16, 2026

The Court has entered the following order:

On July 21, 2026, the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) filed a motion for the summary suspension of the license of Attorney Hannah C. Dugan to practice law in Wisconsin pursuant to Supreme Court Rule (SCR) 22.20(1).¹ The OLR stated the ground for the motion is Attorney Dugan's conviction of a "serious crime" as defined in SCR 22.20(2), specifically a federal felony conviction for Obstruction of Proceedings before Departments, Agencies and Committees, contrary to 18 U.S.C. § 1505. *United States v. Dugan*, E.D. Wis. Case Number 25-CR-89.

On July 21, 2026, pursuant to its standard practice for such motions, this court issued an order that directed Attorney Dugan to show cause, in writing, to this court concerning why the OLR's motion should not be granted and her license to practice law in Wisconsin should not be summarily suspended.

¹ SCR 22.20(1) provides as follows:

Upon receiving satisfactory proof that an attorney has been found guilty or convicted of a serious crime, the supreme court may summarily suspend the attorney's license to practice law pending final disposition of a disciplinary proceeding, whether the finding of guilt or the conviction resulted from a plea of guilty or no contest or from a verdict after trial and regardless of the pendency of an appeal.

OFFICE OF LAWYER REGULATION V. HANNAH C. DUGAN
No. 2026XX1557-D

On August 11, 2026, Attorney Dugan filed a response to the court's order opposing the OLR's motion.

Having considered the motion and the response, the court concludes, in the exercise of its discretion under SCR 22.20(1), that a summary suspension of Attorney Dugan's license to practice law in Wisconsin is not warranted under the facts of this matter. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the Office of Lawyer Regulation's motion for summary suspension is denied.

BRIAN HAGEDORN, J., dissents.

ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., *dissenting*. I dissent from the court's denial of the Office of Lawyer Regulation's ("OLR") motion for summary suspension of Attorney Dugan's law license. Because the court does not summarily suspend, Attorney Dugan's license reflects that she is "active" and in "good standing," and the OLR is not required to expedite its complaint against her. *See* SCR 22.20(6). However, the court's practice has been to summarily suspend, and thus expedite, under such circumstances. *See OLR v. Blomme*, 2022 WI 80, 405 Wis. 2d 122, 982 N.W.2d 100 (per curiam). Attorney Dugan, like Attorney Blomme, has now been convicted of a federal crime. The federal crime that Attorney Dugan was convicted of is "corruptly endeavor[ing] to influence, obstruct, and impede the due and proper administration of the law under which a pending proceeding was being had before a department and agency of the United States." Indictment at 2, *United States v. Dugan*, No. 25-CR-089 (E.D. Wis. May 13, 2025). More specifically, these charges concerned then-Judge Dugan, in her capacity as a circuit court judge, wearing a judicial robe, at the courthouse, obstructing federal agents. I am confounded by our court's inaction. But that inaction does not dictate that the OLR must wait to proceed.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court

Distribution List:

Stacie H. Rosenzweig (U.S. Mail)

Francis X. Sullivan (Intragovernmental Delivery)