



**BEFORE THE BOARD OF DISCIPLINARY APPEALS
APPOINTED BY
THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS**

**IN THE MATTER OF
THELMA M. ANDERSON
STATE BAR CARD NO. 24091728**

§
§
§

CAUSE NO. 71154

INTERLOCUTORY ORDER OF SUSPENSION

On the 12th and 26th days of February, 2026, the above-styled and numbered compulsory disciplinary action was called for hearing before a three-member panel of the Board of Disciplinary Appeals. *See* TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 7.05; BODA INTERNAL PROCEDURAL RULE 1.04(a). On February 12, 2026, the Commission for Lawyer Discipline, Petitioner, appeared by attorney and Thelma M. Anderson, Respondent, appeared pro se. On February 26, 2026, Petitioner appeared by attorney but Respondent, having been duly notified of the hearing setting, did not appear. All questions of fact and all issues of law were submitted to the Board of Disciplinary Appeals for determination. Having considered the pleadings on file, having received evidence, and having heard the argument of counsel, the Board of Disciplinary Appeals makes the following findings, conclusions, and orders:

Findings of Fact. The Board of Disciplinary Appeals finds that:

- (1) Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, State Bar Card number 24091728, is licensed and authorized by the Supreme Court of Texas to practice law in the State of Texas.
- (2) On March 5, 2025, a Judgment in a Criminal Case was entered in Cause No. 3:24-CR-00191-K(1), styled *United States of America v. Thelma Marshall Anderson*, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, wherein Respondent pleaded guilty to Count 1 of the three-count Indictment, filed on May 21, 2024, and was thereafter

adjudicated guilty of Wire Fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343. Respondent was sentenced to probation for a term of four (4) years, with Additional Special Conditions of Probation including the payment of restitution to the U.S. Small Business Administration in the amount of \$20,871.00.

- (3) Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, is the same person as the Thelma Marshall Anderson who is the subject of the criminal conviction referenced above.
- (4) Respondent has appealed the criminal conviction. Her appeal remains pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
- (5) Petitioner filed proof of service of the *Second Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline* on December 12, 2025. Petitioner provided proof of service of the *Third Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline* as an attachment to Petitioner's *Amended Business Records Affidavit*, which was admitted into evidence during the hearing on February 12, 2026.
- (6) During the hearing before a panel of the Board on February 12, 2026, Respondent admitted that she was served the *Second Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline* by certified mail and that she signed the USPS "green card" acknowledging receipt.
- (7) Respondent has repeatedly sought to delay the hearing and the Board's decision in this disciplinary matter through last-minute filings and tactics:
 - a. In her *Response to the First Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline*, filed September 8, 2025, Respondent sought abatement of the compulsory discipline case that was then set for hearing before the Board on October 24, 2025.
 - b. After she was served the *Second Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline*, Respondent filed a *Second Motion to Abate Compulsory Discipline Proceedings* on December 22, 2025. The Board denied that motion by order issued January 15, 2026.
 - c. On January 5, 2026, BODA staff sent both parties a *Hearing Acknowledgment Form* in advance of the January 30, 2026, hearing on the *Third Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline*. The parties were requested to return their completed forms by January 16, 2026. The form provided an option to check a box indicating that the party would file a motion for continuance and instructed in bold, underlined text: "Any such motion should be filed at least ten days before the above hearing setting." Respondent did not return the form.

- d. At 4:31 p.m. on January 29, 2026, late in the afternoon before the hearing, Respondent filed a *Motion for Continuance and Objection to Hearing Setting Due to Lack of Jurisdiction, Probation Restrictions, and Denial of Meaningful Access to the Hearing Via Email*, as to the hearing set for 9:00 the next morning. In that motion, Respondent asserted that because of her probation conditions, she “cannot lawfully travel to attend the hearing in person.” However, Respondent’s probation conditions actually prohibit her from knowingly leaving the federal judicial district where she resides “without first getting permission from the court or a probation officer.” Despite having ample advance notice of the hearing, Respondent provided no information about having requested leave to attend the hearing. BODA’s staff notified the parties that evening that the Board granted the motion for continuance. The Board issued an order on January 30, 2026, resetting the hearing for 9:00 a.m. on February 6, 2026, and ordering that the hearing would take place over Zoom, to further accommodate Respondent.
- e. At 4:05 p.m. on February 5, 2026, Respondent filed a *Notice of Medical Unavailability and Motion to Continue or Reset Hearing*, claiming to have two medical appointments on February 6, 2026. The Board issued an order on February 6, 2026, granting the motion for continuance and ordering that the Zoom hearing would be reset.
- f. On February 6, 2026, BODA staff inquired about the parties’ availability for hearing at 9:00 a.m. on February 12, 2026. Petitioner’s counsel replied that he would be available. Respondent replied that her “next opening is any day/time is [sic] the week of February 23.”
- g. On February 6, 2026, Respondent filed a *Motion to Abate and Hold Proceedings in Abeyance for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, Defective Service, and Constitutional Due Process Violations*.
- h. On February 9, 2026, BODA staff asked Respondent to provide documentation of any conflict as to a potential hearing setting for 9:00 a.m. on February 12, 2026. Respondent filed a response indicating that she had a client meeting scheduled at that time, stating that her availability “is actively filling for the week of February 23, 2025, with both medical appointments and client appointments,” and requesting an alternative date.
- i. On February 9, 2026, BODA staff notified the parties by email that the Board had set the hearing for 9:00 a.m. on February 12, 2026. The Board issued an order later that same day, setting the hearing on the *Third Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline* and Respondent’s *Motion to Abate and Hold Proceedings in Abeyance for Lack of*

Personal Jurisdiction, Defective Service, and Constitutional Due Process Violations for February 12, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., over Zoom.

- j. On February 11, 2026, Respondent filed a document reiterating her unavailability for the hearing at 9:00 a.m. on February 12, 2026. That same day, Respondent filed an *Emergency Memorandum Regarding Appearance of Impropriety, Legitimacy Concerns, and Due Process Impact Related to Proof of Service Documentation Produced February 10, 2026, After Extended Withholding*. In that document, Respondent requested an immediate stay of the proceedings. Respondent also filed a *Renewed and Supplemental Motion to Abate and Hold Proceedings in Abeyance for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, Defective Service, Constitutional Due Process Violations, and Preservation of the Integrity of the Disciplinary Record*, though she sent it only to the Board's email address for classification appeals and did not copy Petitioner's counsel.
- k. During the hearing on February 12, 2026, the panel first considered Respondent's challenges to the Board's jurisdiction, raised in her various pleadings. Respondent again sought abatement and delay of the hearing on the record. The panel ruled that the Board has jurisdiction to proceed and denied Respondent's requests for abatement, and then proceeded with the hearing on Petitioner's *Third Amended Petition for Compulsory Discipline*. After Petitioner's counsel presented its case on the merits and Respondent was called upon to present any argument or evidence as to interlocutory suspension under Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 8.04, Respondent asked for a brief recess, stating that her computer was "stuck." The panel granted a five-minute recess and instructed the Respondent to appear at 10:07 a.m. Respondent failed to appear at that time. At 10:17 a.m., BODA received an e-file notice indicating that Respondent had just filed a petition for writ of mandamus seeking to have a Dallas County district court order the disciplinary proceedings abated, during the time when Respondent's computer was purportedly not working. BODA staff also sent an email to Respondent and Petitioner which included the call-in number to access Zoom via telephone and instructed that the panel would wait until 10:20 a.m.
- l. Respondent did not rejoin the Zoom hearing in the time allotted by the panel. After the hearing concluded and the Zoom meeting ended, Respondent filed an *Emergency Motion to Reset Hearing, Reopen Record, and for Due Process Relief Regarding Compulsory Discipline Proceeding*. The Board issued an order on February 17, 2026, granting a continuance and resetting the hearing for 9:00 a.m. on February 26, 2026, for the "limited purpose of hearing Respondent's argument and allowing Respondent to complete the evidentiary record as to whether

the standard for interlocutory suspension under Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 8.04 has been met.” That order details the Board’s efforts to accommodate Respondent’s purported technical difficulties and states, “Further continuance requests will not be considered except under extraordinary circumstances.”

- m. On February 19, 2026, Respondent emailed the Board about a scheduling conflict for a medical appointment. BODA staff responded on February 20, 2026, stating that if Respondent wishes to request relief from the Board, she may file a motion complying with BODA Internal Procedural Rule 1.09. At 12:18 p.m. on February 25, 2026, Respondent filed a *Motion for Continuance [and] Notice of Medical Unavailability*, stating that she would provide additional documentation by email and that such documentation would assist the Board in rescheduling the hearing “consistent with the anticipated return date from scheduled medical leave.” Respondent did not provide additional documentation. The Board issued an order at 4:21 p.m. on February 25, 2026, denying Respondent’s motion for continuance.
- n. At 11:56 p.m. on February 25, 2026, Respondent emailed the Board a *Motion to Reconsider Denial of Medical Continuance and Request for Identification of Legal Basis*. That motion notes that Respondent is taking a six-week medical leave, beginning at 12:00 a.m. on February 26, 2026, and requests that the hearing be reset for after Respondent’s documented return from medical leave. At 12:01 a.m., Respondent emailed a *Record Preservation Notice, Constitutional Objection, and Assertion of Abuse of Discretion Regarding Denial of Medical Continuance*. In accordance with BODA Internal Procedural Rule 1.05(a)(2), those pleadings were file-stamped February 26, 2026, the same day as the second hearing in this matter.

- (8) Throughout this case, Respondent has never presented argument as to the question that Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 8.04 requires the Board to answer in this matter—whether a conviction for violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343, Wire Fraud, constitutes an Intentional Crime as defined by Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 1.06(V).

Conclusions of Law. Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the Board of Disciplinary

Appeals makes the following conclusions of law:

- (1) This Board has jurisdiction to hear and determine this matter. TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 7.08(G), 8.01–.04.
- (2) As announced during the February 26, 2026, hearing, Respondent’s *Motion to Reconsider Denial of Medical Continuance and Request for*

Identification of Legal Basis is **DENIED**, and Respondent's objections as to the denial of her requested continuance are **OVERRULED**.

- (3) Once a certified copy of the judgment of conviction and a certificate of the Clerk of the Supreme Court that the attorney is licensed to practice law in Texas have been offered and admitted into evidence, the Board "shall immediately determine whether the attorney has been convicted of an Intentional Crime or granted probation without an adjudication of guilt for an Intentional Crime." TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 8.04.
- (4) In compulsory discipline proceedings, the Board must be concerned with the broad purpose of "protection of the public from attorneys who are under the disability of criminal censure." *Matter of Ament*, 890 S.W.2d 39, 41 (Tex. 1994).
- (5) Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, having been found guilty of Wire Fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343, has been convicted of an Intentional Crime as defined by Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 1.06(V). *E.g., In re Krueger*, BODA Case No. 65866 (Feb. 1, 2022) (disbarring lawyer convicted of Wire Fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 1343).
- (6) Respondent has also been convicted of a Serious Crime as defined by Texas Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 1.06(GG).
- (7) Having been convicted of an Intentional and Serious Crime and having appealed such conviction, Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, shall have her license to practice law in Texas suspended during the appeal of her criminal conviction. TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 8.04.
- (8) The Board retains jurisdiction to enter a final judgment in this matter upon final decision in the criminal appeal.

It is, accordingly, **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, State Bar Card No. 24091728, is hereby **SUSPENDED** from the practice of law in the State of Texas effective immediately upon entry of this order and continuing hereafter until further order of this Board.

It is further **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, during said suspension is hereby prohibited, effective immediately, from practicing law in Texas, holding herself out as an attorney at law, performing any legal service for others,

accepting any fee directly or indirectly for legal services not completed before the date of this order, appearing as counsel in any proceeding in any Texas court or before any Texas administrative body, or holding herself out to others or using her name, in any manner, in conjunction with the words “attorney at law,” “attorney,” “counselor at law,” “Esquire,” “Esq.” or “lawyer.”

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, shall notify in writing, no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Order, each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, and chief justice of each and every court in which Respondent has any legal matter pending, if any, of her suspension, of the style and cause number of the pending matter(s), and of the name, address, and telephone number of the client(s) Respondent is representing in that court. Respondent is **ORDERED** to mail copies of all such notifications to the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701).

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, shall file with the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, an affidavit stating that Respondent has notified in writing each and every justice of the peace, judge, magistrate, administrative judge or officer, and chief justice of each and every court or tribunal in which Respondent has any matter pending of the terms of this judgment, the style and cause number(s) of the pending matter(s), and the name, address and telephone number(s) of the client(s) Respondent is representing in that court or tribunal. Respondent is **ORDERED** to mail copies of all such notifications to the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin,

Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701). If Respondent has no legal matters pending in any court or tribunal, the affidavit shall so state and describe with particularity the efforts made by Respondent to ensure no such pending legal matters.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, shall immediately notify each of her current clients, if any, in writing, of her suspension. In addition to such notification, Respondent is **ORDERED** to return all files, papers, unearned fees paid in advance, and all other monies and property which are in her possession or control but which belong to current or former clients, if any, to those respective clients or former clients within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, if requested.

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, within thirty (30) days of the date of this judgment, shall file with the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), an affidavit stating that all current clients and opposing counsel have been notified of Respondent's suspension and that all files, papers, monies, and other property belonging to all current and former clients have been returned as ordered herein. If Respondent should be unable to return any file, papers, money, or other property to any client or former client, Respondent's affidavit shall state with particularity the efforts made by Respondent with respect to each particular client and the cause of such inability to return to said client any file, paper, money, or other property. Respondent is also **ORDERED** to mail a copy of all notification letters to the Statewide Compliance Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701).

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent, Thelma M. Anderson, shall immediately surrender her Texas law license and permanent State Bar Card to the Statewide Compliance

Monitor, Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, State Bar of Texas, P.O. Box 12487, Austin, Texas 78711 (1414 Colorado St., Austin, TX 78701), for transmittal to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas.

It is further **ORDERED** that this Order is interlocutory and that the Board retains jurisdiction to enter a final judgment when the appeal of the criminal conviction is decided and final. TEX. RULES DISCIPLINARY P. R. 8.04; BODA INTERNAL PROCEDURAL RULE 6.02(a); *In the Matter of Mercier*, 242 S.W.3d 46 (Tex. 2007).

It is further **ORDERED** that Respondent shall promptly notify the Board and the State Bar of Texas Chief Disciplinary Counsel when the appeal of the criminal conviction is final.

It is further **ORDERED** that the Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas shall monitor the status of the appeal of the criminal conviction on at least a quarterly basis and shall promptly file an appropriate motion for entry of final judgment with the Board should the criminal conviction be affirmed and become final.

It is further **ORDERED** that this Interlocutory Order of Suspension shall be made a matter of public record and notice of this judgment shall be published in the *Texas Bar Journal*.

Signed this 2nd day of March 2026.



VICE CHAIR PRESIDING