

DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY



HON. MARY CATHERINE CUFF, P.J.A.D.
(RET.), CHAIR
PETER J. BOYER, ESQ., VICE-CHAIR
JORGE A. CAMPELO
THOMAS J. HOBERMAN
STEVEN MENAKER, ESQ.
SOPHIA A. MODU
PETER PETROU, ESQ.
LISA J. RODRIGUEZ, ESQ.
REMI L. SPENCER, ESQ.

RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P.O. BOX 962
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0962
(609) 815-2920
drb.mbx@njcourts.gov

TIMOTHY M. ELLIS
CHIEF COUNSEL
NICOLE M. ACCHIONE
FIRST ASSISTANT COUNSEL
BARRY R. PETERSEN, JR.
DEPUTY COUNSEL
SALIMA ELIZABETH BURKE
ADALINE KASER
ASHLEY KOLATA-GUZIK
NICHOLAS LOGOTHETIS
ALISA H. THATCHER
ASSISTANT COUNSEL

May 22, 2025

VIA CERTIFIED, REGULAR & ELECTRONIC MAIL

Corinne M. Mullen, Esq.
c/o Marc D. Garfinkle, Esq.
Law Office of Marc D. Garfinkle
89 Headquarters Plaza, North Tower, 12th Floor
Morristown, New Jersey 07960
marc@njethicsattorney.com

Re: In the Matter of Corinne M. Mullen
Docket No. DRB 25-080
District Docket No. XIV-2024-0105E
LETTER OF ADMONITION

Dear Ms. Mullen:

The Disciplinary Review Board (the Board) has reviewed the motion for discipline by consent (reprimand or such lesser discipline as the Board deems appropriate) filed by the Office of Attorney Ethics (the OAE) in the above matter, pursuant to R. 1:20-10(b). Following a review of the record, the Board granted the motion and determined to impose an admonition for your violation of RPC 3.4(g) (presenting, participating in presenting, or threatening to present criminal charges to obtain an improper advantage in a civil matter) and RPC 8.4(c) (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation).

Specifically, N.S.¹ retained you to represent her in connection with settlement negotiations with E.M., who allegedly had assaulted her while both were in Germany. Pursuant to your written fee agreement, the representation was limited to “settlement negotiations in a matter where [E.M.] is the defendant,” but that “[n]o filing of a lawsuit is contemplated by this agreement.” Your fee was contingent on the outcome of the matter. E.M. was represented by Lisa B. Shelkrot, Esq., the grievant in this matter.

On November 15, 2023, you sent a letter to Shelkrot regarding the alleged assault, recounting that E.M. had assaulted N.S. in her apartment and, further, that E.M. was in possession of an “improperly recorded video of the assault.” You also informed Shelkrot that N.S. intended to report the assault by E.M., who was on probation in Vermont at the time of the alleged assault, to the Vermont probation authorities, and to file a federal lawsuit. However, you maintained that, if E.M. agreed to a monetary settlement, N.S. would not report the assault to the Vermont probation authorities. You conceded that, pursuant to 1 V.S.A. § 200, a violation of probation can result in arrest, revocation of probation, and even incarceration.

On January 21, 2024, you sent a second letter to Shelkrot stating that her failure to address the civil matter left N.S. with no choice but to report E.M.’s behavior to the probation authorities and to file a civil action against him. You concluded your letter by stating “[s]hould you have any intention of resolving the matter, we ask that you provide an immediate response.”

Three days later, on January 24, 2024, you informed N.S. that you were terminating the attorney-client relationship. At the time you withdrew from the representation, no settlement had been reached between N.S. and E.M.

Subsequently, you conceded that both of your letters to Shelkrot were intended to elicit settlement negotiations. You also admitted that, at the time of your November 15, 2023 letter, you believed N.S. already had reported E.M.’s conduct to the probation authorities. None of your communications to Shelkrot, however, revealed that N.S. already had reported the assault to the authorities.

¹ Due to the nature of the assault allegations underlying this matter, the parties names have been anonymized.

The Board found that you violated RPC 3.4(g) by twice informing Shelkrot that your client intended to report E.M., who was on probation, to the criminal authorities and to file a civil action against him, unless a satisfactory financial settlement could be reached. Further, you conceded that your letters to Shelkrot were intended to elicit settlement negotiations. Next, you violated RPC 8.4(c) by making those representations to Shelkrot, despite your knowledge that your client already had notified the probation authorities months earlier.

In imposing only an admonition, the Board accorded considerable mitigating weight to your unblemished forty-two-year career at the bar. In addition, the Board considered your full cooperation with the OAE's investigation and your decision to enter into a stipulation of discipline on consent, thereby accepting responsibility for your misconduct and conserving disciplinary resources.

Your conduct has adversely reflected not only on you as an attorney but also on 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, this admonition will be taken into consideration.

The Board also has directed that the cost of the disciplinary proceedings be assessed against you. An invoice of costs will be forwarded to you under separate cover.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Timothy M. Ellis

Timothy M. Ellis
Chief Counsel

TME/akg

c: Chief Justice Stuart Rabner
Associate Justices
Heather Joy Baker, Clerk
Supreme Court of New Jersey
Hon. Mary Catherine Cuff, P.J.A.D. (Ret.), Chair
Disciplinary Review Board (e-mail)
Johanna Barba Jones, Director
Office of Attorney Ethics (e-mail and interoffice mail)
Kimberly Roman, Assistant Deputy Ethics Counsel
Office of Attorney Ethics (e-mail)
Lisa B. Shelkrot, Esq., Grievant (regular mail)