

**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

July 24, 2025

**VIA CERTIFIED, REGULAR, AND ELECTRONIC MAIL**

James Nicholas Barletti  
c/o Glenn L. Cavanagh, Esq.  
153 Central Avenue, #2965  
Westfield, New Jersey 07091  
gcavanagh@lawyer.com

Re: **In the Matter of James Nicholas Barletti**  
Docket No. DRB 25-117  
District Docket No. XA-2023-0033E  
**LETTER OF ADMONITION**

Dear Mr. Barletti:

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 District XA Ethics Committee (the DEC) 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, with a condition, for your violation of RPC 1.3 (lacking diligence) and RPC 1.4(b) (failing to keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter and to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information). The Board determined, however, to dismiss the charges that you violated RPC 1.1(a) (engaging in gross neglect) and RPC 5.1(a) (failing to make reasonable efforts to ensure that all members of a law firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct).

Specifically, on March 2, 2017, E.T.<sup>1</sup> (later, your client) underwent an unsuccessful medical procedure at Osteo Relief Institute (ORI). Subsequently, she engaged your firm – Gold, Albanese, Barletti & Locascio LLC (later Gold, Albanese & Barletti LLC) (the Firm) – to represent her in a medical malpractice action against ORI. Initially, another of the Firm’s attorneys represented her in the matter, which settled in April 2022. From the proceeds, her attorney reimbursed Medicare, apparently in full, for expenses associated with her care in the wake of the failed procedure.

In September 2022, the client’s attorney left the Firm. He informed the Firm’s partners, including you, that the client’s case would remain with the Firm “for final settlement processing.” In addition, he advised the client that you would handle her matter going forward.

By demand letter dated April 3, 2023, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) erroneously informed the client that she still owed \$22,628.75 for Medicare expenses. CMS had incorrectly designated the date of the procedure as February 3, 2017, not March 2, 2017, and, accordingly, billed her for an extra month of services. The client forwarded the April 2023 CMS notice to you, but you did not reply. On or around July 11, 2023, she received a second notice from CMS, which she forwarded to you. You again failed to reply. Finally, by correspondence dated August 7, 2023, CMS informed her that she owed \$22,825, with interest continuing to accrue. Although she arranged for hand delivery of this correspondence to you, you still did not reply.

In addition, the client contacted CMS directly to contest its demands. As a result, in November 2023, CMS corrected its error and acknowledged payment of the Medicare lien in full. By then, the client had tried to reach you roughly eight to twelve times, by both letter and multiple voicemail messages. You never replied or assisted her in correcting the erroneous CMS bills.

During the DEC’s ensuing investigation, among other things, you explained that you maintained law offices at the Firm’s locations in Morristown, New Jersey; Wall, New Jersey; New York, New York; and Boston, Massachusetts. You conceded that the Firm had “no formal process for forwarding mail between offices and waited for mail to accumulate over time

---

<sup>1</sup> We use initials to preserve the privacy of the individual who underwent the medical procedure.

before forwarding that mail.” Subsequently, you closed the Firm’s office in Wall, New Jersey, to simplify the administration of the Firm.

Based on the above facts, you stipulated that you violated RPC 1.1(a), RPC 1.3, RPC 1.4(b), and RPC 5.1(a).

Following a preliminary review of this matter, Chief Counsel to the Board wrote the parties to clarify whether they intended the stipulation to reflect that you received all, some, or none of the client’s communications. In response, the DEC advised that, during the investigation, you admitted receiving some correspondence (although you could not recall which); however, you did not recall receiving any of the client’s voicemail messages. Subsequently, you provided the DEC with copies of the July and August 2023 CMS notices, demonstrating that you or others at your Firm had received them. Moreover, recently, your attorney indicated that the July 2023 correspondence apparently went to one of your partners but was not forwarded to you, in part because your partner was receiving care for a serious medical condition that eventually led to his death, in January 2024.

The Board concluded that the stipulation and record establish your receipt of the client’s August 2023 correspondence. However, there is no evidence that her April 2023 correspondence reached the Firm and, although her July 2023 correspondence reached the Firm, it apparently went to your partner and was not forwarded to you. Moreover, the record does not establish that her voicemail messages reached you, as you did not recall receiving them and no other evidence indicated you had.

In connection with the client’s August 2023 correspondence, you violated RPC 1.3 and RPC 1.4(b) when you failed to reply to her and, notwithstanding the urgency of her circumstances, took no steps to resolve her matter. However, the record falls short of supporting the charged violation of RPC 1.1(a). That Rule addresses “deviations from professional standards which are so far below the common understanding of those standards as to leave no question of inadequacy.” In the Matter of Dorothy L. Wright, DRB 22-100 (November 7, 2022) at 17. Without discounting your dereliction in failing to assist or reply to the client after receiving the correspondence, the Board determined – because the limited record establishes your receipt of only one communication – that your misconduct does not rise to the level of gross neglect and, instead, is adequately encapsulated by the RPC 1.3 and RPC 1.4(b) charges.

The parties also stipulated that you violated RPC 5.1(a) by “failing to ensure that reasonable procedures were in place to respond to correspondence, hand deliveries, and voicemail communication from [the client].” As a named partner of the Firm, you numbered among those responsible for the Firm’s “reasonable efforts” to ensure that lawyers conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct, as RPC 5.1(a) requires. However, the stipulation does not adequately link a lack of such efforts (or their absence) with the lack of response to your client. It contains no information about the Firm’s handling of voicemail messages and, although the Firm had no formal procedure for forwarding mail among its offices, the DEC did not identify any communications affected by this deficit. Of the two items that clearly arrived at the Firm – the August 2023 correspondence – almost certainly reached you and, thus, the failure to answer lies with you. The July 2023 correspondence apparently went to your partner but was never forwarded to you, in part due to your partner’s severe medical condition at the time – an unfortunate personal circumstance, not a systemic issue resulting from deficient procedures.

In imposing only an admonition, the Board accorded mitigating weight to your entry into a disciplinary stipulation, whereby you accepted responsibility for your misconduct and conserved disciplinary resources. The Board also weighed your lack of prior discipline in twenty-seven years at the bar and your voluntary closure of the Firm’s office in Wall, New Jersey.

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).

As a condition of your discipline, the Board determined to require you, within ninety days of this letter of admonition, to attend a continuing legal education course, pre-approved by the Office of Attorney Ethics, focused on office administration.

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)  
Ryan J. Moriarty, Statewide Ethics Coordinator  
Office of Attorney Ethics (e-mail)  
Catherine Romania, Esq., Chair  
District XA Ethics Committee (e-mail)  
Caroline Record, Esq., Secretary  
District XA Ethics Committee (regular mail and e-mail)  
Mark T. Pasko, Presenter (regular mail and e-mail)  
E.T., Grievant (regular mail)