

**From:** [lawrence litwin](#)  
**To:** [Comments Mailbox](#)  
**Cc:** [lawrence litwin](#)  
**Subject:** [External]Modification of in re Wilson  
**Date:** Monday, July 31, 2023 9:01:28 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Judge Grant,

Any modification of In re Wilson should require the attorney who seeks reinstatement to practice with a firm or if a solo to be supervised by a lawyer with at least 50 years at the bar or a retired judge who is to be paid by the lawyer. The supervising attorney or retired judge should be a required signatory on the business and trust account and hold possession of the check books. As an attorney for 53 years who believes in fairness, equity and second chances ; nevertheless I do not believe Wilson should be modified.

Having been a member and secretary of an ethics committee for more than 10 years, I have reviewed and heard several cases, I believe Wilson violators are capable and likely to be recidivists. It would not surprise me that such individuals would even forge a second signature. I am in agreement with the retired Assignment Judge from Hudson County. Lawyers are highly educated and know the bright line of Wilson.

Lawrence Litwin Esq  
Pobox 235  
Mendham NJ 07945  
973 615 7253

--

null