



client's decision concerning the scope and objectives of the representation); RPC 1.3 (lack of diligence); RPC 1.4(b) (failure to communicate with the client); RPC 1.15(a) commingling personal funds with client funds in the attorney trust account and negligent misappropriation of client funds); RPC 1.15(d) (failure to comply with the recordkeeping provisions of R. 1:21-6); RPC 1.16(a)(3) (upon discharge by client, failure to withdraw from representation); RPC 1.16(d) (upon termination of representation, failure to refund unearned fee); RPC 5.3(b) (failure of a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over a nonlawyer employee to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the conduct of the employee is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer); and RPC 5.5(a) (unauthorized practice of law – failure to maintain professional liability insurance while practicing as an LLC).

6. On or about January 21, 2020, the OAE and Respondent's counsel appeared before the Disciplinary Review Board ("DRB" or the "Board") in respect of the Disciplinary Stipulation.

7. The Board found that the stipulated facts clearly and convincingly establish that Respondent violated RPC 1.1(a), RPC 1.3, RPC 1.4(b), and RPC 1.16(a)(3). The DRB dismissed the stipulated violation of RPC 1.15(a) comingling allegation as de minimis and dismissed the RPC 1.2(a) and RPC 5.3(b) allegations since the stipulation lacked clear and convincing evidence to sustain the allegations that Respondent violated those RPCs.

8. Based on the totality of Respondent's misconduct, the Board determined that a censure was the quantum of discipline necessary to protect the public and preserve confidence in the bar. The Board also imposed certain conditions on Respondent in the event that she continued to practice law. On September 9, 2020, the Supreme Court of New Jersey entered an order of discipline imposing a censure on Respondent.

9. By entering into the Disciplinary Stipulation with the OAE, Respondent admitted that she failed to obtain and maintain in good standing a policy of lawyers' professional insurance, as required by Rule 1:21-1A(a)(3).

10. By her conduct as described above, Respondent violated Canon 1, Rule 1.1 and Rule 1.2 and Canon 2, Rule 2.1 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

### **Count II**

11. Complainant repeats the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if each were set forth fully and at length herein.

12. Pursuant to Rule 1:28A, any attorney engaging in the private practice of law in New Jersey must maintain an interest-bearing account ("IOLTA") into which all sums received on behalf of clients are deposited. Failure to maintain such an account results in the inclusion of the attorney on the list of attorneys who, by Supreme Court order, will be deemed ineligible to practice law until they submit the required trust account forms to the IOLTA Fund Trustee.

13. Despite three written requests from the IOLTA Fund, Respondent failed to register an attorney trust account with IOLTA as per Rule 1:28A-2.

14. From October 22, 2018 through October 17, 2019, Respondent was included on the IOLTA list of ineligible attorneys for her failure to comply with Rule 1:28A.

15. On or about October 22, 2018, pursuant to Rule 1:28A-2(d), the Supreme Court of New Jersey entered an Order declaring Respondent to be administratively ineligible to practice law based on her noncompliance with Rule 1:28A in respect of the Court's mandatory IOLTA program.

16. Respondent appeared in court on behalf of clients and continued to sit as a municipal court judge in the City of Paterson and Town of Dover during the period of IOLTA ineligibility.

17. On or about October 17, 2019, Respondent satisfied the requirement to comply with IOLTA by submitting the proper registration forms to the IOLTA Fund.

18. On or about July 24, 2020, Respondent submitted a Certification to the New Jersey Supreme Court wherein Respondent admitted that she failed to comply with the requirements of the IOLTA program.

19. By her conduct in practicing law and sitting as a municipal court judge in the City of Paterson and Town of Dover from October 22, 2018 through October 17, 2019, during which Respondent was administratively ineligible to practice law based on her failure to comply with IOLTA requirements as per Rule 1:28A, et seq., Respondent violated Canon 1, Rule 1.1 and Rule 1.2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

20. By her conduct as described above, Respondent also violated Canon 2, Rule 2.1 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

WHEREFORE, Complainant charges that Respondent has violated the following Canons of the Code of Judicial Conduct:

Canon 1, Rule 1.1, which requires that judges observe high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved;

Canon 1, Rule 1.2, which requires judges to respect and comply with the law; and

Canon 2, Rule 2.1, which requires judges to promote public confidence in the independence, integrity and impartiality of the Judiciary and to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Complainant also charges that Respondent's conduct violated Rule 1:14 and Rule 1:18 of the New Jersey Court Rules.

DATED: January 13, 2021



---

Maureen G. Bauman, Disciplinary Counsel  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT  
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex  
25 Market Street  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, North Wing  
P.O. Box 037  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625  
(609) 815-2900 ext. 54950