DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD

OF THE

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

LOUIS PASHMAN, ESQ. CHAIR
BONNIE C. FROST, ESQ. VICE-CHAIR
EDNA Y. BAUGH, ESQ.
BRUCE W. CLARK, ESQ.
JEANNE DOREMUS
HON. REGINALD STANTON
SPENCER V. WISSINGER, III
MORRIS YAMNER, ESQ.
ROBERT C. ZMIRICH



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

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

May 24, 2010

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

Raymond A. Oliver Rt. 618, 183 Sarepta Road Belvidere, New Jersey 07823

Re: In the Matter of Raymond A. Oliver

Docket No. DRB 09-368

District Docket No. XIV-2008-0489E; CAA 12-2008

LETTER OF ADMONITION

Dear Mr. Oliver:

The Disciplinary Review Board has reviewed your conduct in the above matter and has concluded that it was improper. Following a review of the record, the Board determined to impose an admonition.

Specifically, on versions of your letterhead in use between 2005 and 2008, you listed three attorneys as being of counsel to your firm. Two of the three were sitting judges, as of 1999 and 2002. At the time that the attorneys' names appeared on your letterhead, they did not have the close, ongoing relationship with your law firm required to list them as of counsel. Indeed, during the time in question you had no professional relationship with them. Your conduct was unethical and a violation of \underline{RPC} 7.1(a) and \underline{RPC} 7.5(a).

Moreover, your listing sitting judges on your letterhead could easily have created a perception among your clients or the public that you had improper influence with the judiciary. Your conduct

In the Matter of Raymond A. Oliver Docket No. DRB 09-368
Page 2

in this regard violated RPC 8.4(d).

In addition, certain versions of your letterhead contained the caption "lawyers litigators land developers" or a variation thereof, underneath the firm's name. In the Board's view, any client seeing the language "developers" on your letterhead would surmise that your firm was in some way involved in the business of land development. The language was improper and a violation of Advisory Committee on Professional Ethics Opinion 657,130 N.J.L.J. 656 (February 24, 1992).

The Board also noted your use of the Pedro Brosa law firm as an address for reply mail. Although the Committee on Attorney Advertising found that to be an aggravating factor, the Board deemed that conduct to be part and parcel of the within conduct and, as such, should not serve to elevate the level of discipline.

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. \underline{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,

ulianne K. DeCore

uliane K DeCore

Chief Counsel

JKD/si

C: Chief Justice Stuart Rabner, Associate Justices Louis Pashman, Chair, Disciplinary Review Board Mark Neary, 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
Cynthia A. Cappell, Chair, Committee on Attorney Advertising
Carol Johnston, Secretary, Committee on Attorney Advertising
Joseph A. Ascione, Grievant