

Bill

DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD

OF THE

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

LOUIS PASHMAN, ESQ., CHAIR
BONNIE C. FROST, ESQ., VICE-CHAIR
EDNA Y. BAUGH, ESQ.
MATTHEW P. BOYLAN, ESQ.
BRUCE W. CLARK, ESQ.
JEANNE DOREMUS
RUTH JEAN LOLLA
HON. REGINALD STANTON
SPENCER V. WISSINGER, III



RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P. O. Box 962
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0962
(609) 292-1011

JULIANNE K. DECORE
CHIEF COUNSEL

ISABEL FRANK
DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL

ELLEN A. BRODSKY
FIRST ASSISTANT COUNSEL

LILLIAN LEWIN
DONA S. SEROTA-TESCHNER
COLIN T. TAMS
KATHRYN ANNE WINTERLE
ASSISTANT COUNSEL

March 31, 2009

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, R.R.R. & REGULAR MAIL

Richard M. Onorevole, Esq.
101 North Beverwyck Road
Lake Hiawatha, NJ 07034-2233

Re: In the Matter of Richard Onorevole
Docket No. DRB 08-424
District Docket No. XIV-07-373E
LETTER OF ADMONITION

Dear Mr. Onorevole:

The Disciplinary Review Board has reviewed your conduct in the above matter and has concluded that it was improper. Specifically, you were suspended from the practice of law for six months, effective November 1, 2005. You refrained from practicing law from the effective date of your suspension through April 30, 2006, a period of six months, but mistakenly assumed that you could automatically resume practicing law after April 30, 2006. Although you had not been reinstated to practice, from May 1, 2006 through late June, 2006, you practiced law. Your conduct was unethical and a violation of RPC 5.5(a)(1).

In June 2006, you learned that you had to apply for reinstatement to practice and did so on July 21, 2006. The Court reinstated you in August 2006.

Page Two

In the Matter of Richard Onorevole

In imposing only an admonition, the Board considered that your misconduct took place in an atypical context, making it far less egregious than is ordinarily found in similar matters. You did not defy the Court by practicing law knowing that you were suspended. Rather, you were unaware that you could not resume the practice of law without first seeking reinstatement.

We note, however, that the order imposing your suspension stated that you were suspended "for a period of six months and until the further Order of the Court." A review of R. 1:20-21 would also have provided notice that you needed to file a petition for reinstatement. Nevertheless, the stipulation between you and the Office of Attorney Ethics made clear that you did not have the mens rea to defy the Court. Although you have been previously disciplined, the discipline that gave rise to this matter was your first suspension. Thus, this was the first time that the reinstatement procedure provided by R. 1:20-21 applied to your case.

Your conduct has adversely reflected not only upon you as an attorney but also upon all members of the bar. Accordingly, the Board has directed the issuance of this admonition to you. R. 1:20-15(f)(4).

A permanent record of this occurrence has been filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court and the Board's office. Should you become the subject of any further discipline, it will be taken into consideration.

The Board has also directed that the costs of the disciplinary proceedings be assessed against you. An invoice of costs will be forwarded under separate cover.

Very truly yours,



Julianne K. DeCore
Chief Counsel

Page Three

In the Matter of Richard Onorevole

JKD/sj

c: Chief Justice Stuart Rabner
Associate Justices
Louis Pashman, Chair
Disciplinary Review Board
Stephen W. Townsend, Clerk
Supreme Court of New Jersey
Gail G. Haney, Deputy Clerk
Supreme Court of New Jersey (w/ethics history)
Charles Centinaro, Director
Office of Attorney Ethics