SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
Disciplinary Review Board
Docket No. DRB 16-165
District Docket No. XIV-2015-0199E

IN THE MATTER OF

ANDREY V. ZIELYK

AN ATTORNEY AT LAW : Dissent

Decided: January 11, 2017

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

dissent from the majority and vote to recommend respondent's disbarment. I do so not because of respondent's disciplinary record, but because an already disciplined attorney, who then fails to comply with an Order of the Court entered because of conduct previously determined to unethical, manifests a disdain for the disciplinary process and responsibilities attendant to the privilege of being the permitted to practice the profession of the law. If the Board were to recommend disbarment, respondent would be compelled to appear before the Court to explain why he or she has not complied with the Court's Order requiring the filing of the R. 1:20-20 affidavit. I believe that this should occur.

By such a procedure, I believe that the public and respondent's clients would be protected from the consequences of respondent's suspension and all attorneys would quickly come to understand and appreciate the importance of compliance with the Court's Orders and the grave potential consequences of non-compliance.

Disciplinary Review Board Maurice J. Gallipoli

Pilen A Brodsk

Chief Counsel