

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. GALLIPOLI
MORRIS YAMNER, ESQ.
ROBERT C. ZMIRICH



ISABEL FRANK
ACTING CHIEF COUNSEL
ELLEN A. BRODSKY
ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL
LILLIAN LEWIN
BARRY R. PETERSEN JR.
DONA S. SEROTA-IESCHNER
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

October 25, 2013

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

Peter A. Ouda, Esq.
c/o Martin K. Indik, Esq.
Indik & McNamara, P. C.
Princeton Park Corporate Center
1100 Cornwall Road – Suite 203
Monmouth Junction, New Jersey 08852

Re: In the Matter of Peter A. Ouda
Docket No. DRB 13-124
District Docket No. XIII-2012-0002E
Letter of Admonition

Dear Mr. Ouda:

The Disciplinary Review Board reviewed the motion for discipline by consent (reprimand or such lesser discipline as the Board shall deem warranted), filed by the District XIII Ethics Committee (DEC) 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, in September 2009, six months after you began to represent your client in a malpractice action, you and she engaged in a brief sexual relationship. The Board found that there was no clear and convincing evidence that, at the time of your sexual encounters, she either did not consent or was so emotionally vulnerable as to be incapable of freely consenting to participation in those encounters with you. On the other hand, the Board found that, after the sexual relationship had

Peter A. Ouda, Esq.
October 25, 2013
I/M/O Peter A. Ouda, DRB 13-124
Page 2 of 3

ended, you should have terminated the attorney-client relationship because there was a significant risk that your representation might have been materially limited by your personal interest, an impermissible conflict of interest under RPC 1.7(a)(2). This violation, in turn, constituted a violation of RPC 8.4(a), which proscribes the violation of the RPCs.


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).

In imposing only an admonition, the Board considered that you have no prior discipline in your twenty-three years at the bar and that your client's matter was not adversely affected by your conduct.

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,


Isabel Frank
Acting Chief Counsel

IF/lg

c: Chief Justice Stuart Rabner
Associate Justices
Bonnie C. Frost, Chair (via e-mail)
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

Peter A. Ouda, Esq.

October 25, 2013

I/M/O Peter A. Ouda, DRB 13-124

Page 3 of 3

Amy Z. Shimalla, Chair, District XIII Ethics Committee

Donna P. Legband, Secretary, District XIII Ethics Committee