

DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD

OF THE

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

BONNIE C. FROST, ESQ. CHAIR
EDNA Y. BAUGH, ESQ. VICE-CHAIR
BRUCE W. CLARK, ESQ.
JEANNE DOREMUS
HON. MAURICE J. GALLIOLI
MORRIS YAMNER, ESQ.
ROBERT C. ZMIRICH



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

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

June 19, 2013

Mateo J. Perez, Esq.
4919 Bergenline Avenue
West New York, NJ 07093

RE: In the Matter of Mateo J. Perez
Docket No. DRB 13-009
District Docket No. XIV-2012-0079E
Letter of Admonition

Dear Mr. Perez:

The Disciplinary Review Board has reviewed the motion for discipline by consent (admonition), filed by the Office of Attorney Ethics in the above matter, pursuant to R. 1:20-10. Following a review of the record, the Board determined to grant the motion and to impose an admonition.

Specifically, on February 18, 2011, you entered your appearance with the Monroe Village Justice Court, New York, on behalf of Elizabeth Danieli, who had been charged with two motor-vehicle offenses. You were never licensed to practice law in that state.

Monroe Village Judge Forrest Strauss noticed that you had not listed a New York law office or otherwise indicated on your letterhead that you were a licensed New York attorney. The judge conducted his own investigation and learned that you were not licensed in New York. You were not permitted to continue and Danieli was required to retain new counsel.

You acknowledged that, in the twelve years prior to the Danieli matter, you had represented several clients in other New York matters, either after admission pro hac vice or without pro

June 19, 2013

Page 2 of 2

hac vice admission, and with the judges' permission, because of the "pro bono" nature of the representation. When representing Daniels, you were under the mistaken belief that you could represent "pro bono" (more appropriately, termed "gratis") clients in New York town and village courts, because other such courts had allowed you to do so.

In mitigation, the Board considered that you have no prior discipline since your 1999 bar admission and that you gained no financial benefit from the representations.

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

JKD/sj

Chief Justice Stuart Rabner
Associate Justices
Bonnie C. Frost, 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
Christina Blunda Kennedy, Deputy Ethics Counsel,
Office of Attorney Ethics