

# 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  
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

June 13, 2011

Mark Neary, Clerk  
Supreme Court of New Jersey  
P.O. Box 970  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0962

Re: In the Matter of John Francis Coffey, II  
Docket No. DRB 11-038  
District Docket Nos. VI-2009-0028E, VI-2009-0029E,  
and VI-2009-0030E

Dear Mr. Neary:

The Disciplinary Review Board reviewed the motion for discipline by consent (reprimand or such lesser discipline as the Board may determine is warranted) filed by the District VI Ethics Committee, pursuant to R. 1:20-10(b). Following a review of the record, the Board determined to grant the motion. In the Board's view, a reprimand is the appropriate discipline for respondent's violations of RPC 1.1(a) (gross neglect) in two matters, and RPC 1.3 (lack of diligence) and RPC 1.4(b) (failure to communicate with the client) in all three matters. See, e.g., In re Tyler, 204 N.J. 629 (2011); In re Gellene, 203 N.J. 443 (2010); In re Shapiro, 201 N.J. 201 (2010), In re Uffelman, 200 N.J. 260 (2009); In re Aranguren, 172 N.J. 236 (2002); and In re Zeitler, 165 N.J. 503 (2000).

Specifically, in the Hughes-Suber matter, in January 2008, respondent was retained to assist in the administration of an estate, but failed to take any action, necessitating the retention of another attorney. He also failed to reply to the estate administrator's requests for information about the status

In the Matter of John Francis Coffey, II

Docket No. DRB 11-038

Page 2

of the matter and failed to provide an accounting of the retainer.

In the Alessi matter, respondent was retained, in or around late 2007, to close title to property, pay off an existing mortgage, and close on a new mortgage. Respondent failed to properly record the documents in connection with the transfer of ownership of the property and did not reply to the client's requests for the documentation in the transaction.


Finally, in the Kehoe matter, at a point not mentioned in the stipulation, respondent was retained to draft a will, but lacked diligence in finalizing it and failed to return his client's telephone calls and to reply to his emails.

In determining the appropriate discipline for respondent, the Board considered, as an aggravating factor, his prior admonition. The Board also considered mitigating factors: that respondent admitted his guilt, that he was dealing with both of his parents' failing health, and that he had been discharged from his job.

Enclosed are the following documents:

1. Notice of motion for discipline by consent, dated November 10, 2010.
2. Stipulation of discipline by consent, dated November 10, 2010.
3. Affidavit of consent, undated.
4. Ethics history, dated June 13, 2011.

Very truly yours,

  
Julianne K. DeCore  
Chief Counsel

In the Matter of John Francis Coffey, II

Docket No. DRB 11-038

Page 3

JKD/sj

encls.

cc: Louis Pashman, Chair, Disciplinary Review Board

(w/o encls.)

Charles Centinaro, Director, Office of Attorney Ethics

(w/o encls.)

Michael L. Dermody, Chair, District VI Ethics Committee

(w/o encls.)

Jack Jay Wind, Secretary, District VI Ethics Committee

(w/o encls.)

John Francis Coffey, II, Respondent

(w/o encls.)