

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY D-4 September Term 2011 069112

IN THE MATTER OF

SCOT D. ROSENTHAL,

AN ATTORNEY AT LAW

(Attorney No. 027611988)

FILED

ORDER

JAN 6 6 2012



The Disciplinary Review Board having filed with the Court its decision in DRB 11-078, concluding on the record certified to the Board pursuant to Rule 1:20-4(f)(default by respondent), that SCOT D. ROSENTHAL of NORTH HALEDON, who was admitted to the bar of this State in 1988, should be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one year for his unethical conduct in seven matters, including violation of RPC 1.1(a) (gross neglect), RPC 1.1(b) (pattern of neglect), RPC 1.3(lack of diligence), RPC 1.4(b) (failure to keep client reasonably informed about the status of the matter), RPC 1.4(c)(failure to explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions about the representation), RPC 1.5(a) (unreasonable fee), RPC 1.5(b) (failure to set forth the basis or rate of fee in writing), RPC 3.2(failure to expedite litigation), RPC 8.1(b)(failure to cooperate with ethics authorities), RPC 8.4(c)(conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation), and RPC 8.4(c) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice);

And the Disciplinary Review Board having further concluded

that on reinstatement to practice, respondent should be required to practice under supervision for a period of two years;

And **SCOT D. ROSENTHAL** having been ordered to show cause why he should not be disbarred or otherwise disciplined;

And good cause appearing;

It is ORDERED that **SCOT D. ROSENTHAL** is suspended from the practice of law for a period of one year and until the further Order of the Court, effective February 6, 2012; and it is further

ORDERED that prior to reinstatement to practice, respondent shall submit proof of his fitness to practice law as attested to by a mental health professional approved by the Office of Attorney Ethics, and that following reinstatement, respondent shall practice law under the supervision of a practicing attorney approved by the Office of Attorney Ethics for a period of two years, and until the further Order of the Court; and it is further

ORDERED that respondent comply with $\underline{\text{Rule}}\ 1:20-20$ dealing with suspended attorneys; and it is further

ORDERED that pursuant to <u>Rule</u> 1:20-20(c), respondent's failure to comply with the Affidavit of Compliance requirement of <u>Rule</u> 1:20-20(b)(15) may (1) preclude the Disciplinary Review Board from considering respondent's petition for reinstatement for a period of up to six months from the date respondent files proof of compliance; (2) be found to constitute a violation of <u>RPC</u> 8.1(b) and <u>RPC</u> 8.4(c); and (3) provide a basis for an action for contempt pursuant to <u>Rule</u> 1:10-2; and it is further

ORDERED that the entire record of this matter be made a

permanent part of respondent's file as an attorney at law of this State; and it is further

ORDERED that respondent reimburse the Disciplinary Oversight Committee for appropriate administrative costs and actual expenses incurred in the prosecution of this matter, as provided in Rule 1:20-17.

WITNESS, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this 4th day of January, 2012.

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT

The rategoing is a nee copy of the original on hie in my office.

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT .

OF NUMBERSEY