

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD
Docket No. DRB 25-091
District Docket No. XIV-2024-0118E

In the Matter of Vincent J. Frazzetto
An Attorney at Law

Decided
September 10, 2025

Certification of the Record

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Ethics History.....	1
Service of Process	2
Facts.....	4
Motion to Vacate the Default.....	8
Analysis and Discipline	15
Violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct.....	15
Quantum of Discipline	19
Conclusion	22

Introduction

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

This matter was before us on a certification of the record filed by the Office of Attorney Ethics (the OAE), pursuant to R. 1:20-4(f). The formal ethics complaint charged respondent with having violated RPC 5.5(a)(1) (engaging in the unauthorized practice of law – practicing law while administratively ineligible) and RPC 8.1(b) (two instances – failing to cooperate with disciplinary authorities).¹

On June 26, 2025, respondent filed a motion to vacate the default (MVD), which we denied on August 22, 2025. For the reasons set forth below, we determine that an admonition is the appropriate quantum of discipline for respondent's misconduct.

Ethics History

Respondent earned admission to the New Jersey bar in 2014 and to the New York bar in 2013. He has no prior discipline in New Jersey. At the relevant times, he maintained a practice of law in Staten Island, New York.

¹ Due to respondent's failure to file an answer to the formal ethics complaint, and on notice to him, the OAE amended the complaint to include the second RPC 8.1(b) charge.

Effective October 16, 2023, the Court declared respondent administratively ineligible to practice law in New Jersey for failing to comply with his continuing legal education (CLE) requirements. Respondent remained ineligible until he cured the deficiency, on June 10, 2025.

Effective June 24, 2024, the Court declared respondent administratively ineligible to practice law in New Jersey for failing to pay his required annual assessment to the New Jersey Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection. (the LFCP).

To date, respondent has not cured his LFCP deficiency and, thus, remains ineligible to practice law on this basis.

Service of Process

Service of process was proper. On February 7, 2025, the OAE sent a copy of the formal ethics complaint, by certified and regular mail, to respondent's home address of record. According to the United States Postal Service (USPS) tracking system, the letter sent by certified mail was delivered on February 13, 2025. The regular mail was not returned to the OAE.

On March 11, 2025, the OAE sent a second letter, by certified and regular mail, to respondent's home address of record. The letter informed respondent that, unless he filed a verified answer within five days of the date of the letter, the allegations of the complaint would be deemed admitted, the record would be

certified to us for the imposition of discipline, and the complaint would be deemed amended to charge a willful violation of RPC 8.1(b) by reason of his failure to answer. The certified mail was returned to the OAE as “not deliverable as addressed” and “unable to forward, The regular mail was not returned to the OAE.

As of April 14, 2025, respondent had not filed an answer to the complaint, and the time within which he was required to do so had expired. Accordingly, the OAE certified this matter to us as a default.

On April 28, 2025, Chief Counsel to the Board sent a letter to respondent, by certified and regular mail, to his home address of record, with an additional copy sent by electronic mail, to his e-mail address of record, informing him that this matter was scheduled before us on June 19, 2025, and that any MVD must be filed by May 19, 2025. On the same date, the Office of Board Counsel (the OBC) received a relayed receipt indicating that delivery to respondent’s e-mail address was complete. According to the USPS tracking system, the letter sent by certified mail was delivered on May 1, 2025. The regular mail was not returned to the OBC.

Moreover, the OBC published a notice dated May 5, 2025 in the New Jersey Law Journal and on the New Jersey Courts website, stating that we would consider this matter on June 19, 2025. The notice informed respondent that,

unless he filed a successful MVD by May 19, 2025, his prior failure to answer the complaint would remain deemed an admission of the allegations of the complaint.

On June 26, 2025, respondent, through counsel, submitted an MVD for our consideration, which consisted of a five-page certification setting forth his reasons for failing to answer the complaint and his defenses to the charges of misconduct. As noted above, on August 22, 2025, following our review of the MVD, we issued a letter denying the motion.

Facts

We now turn to the allegations of the complaint.

On January 23, 2024, Ryan Deverin, Esq., submitted to the OAE an ethics referral alleging respondent's abandonment of clients and his unauthorized practice of law. Deverin specifically alleged that he had been advised, by two clients that he recently had been retained to represent in a real estate matter, "that the attorney who started the transaction earlier in January [2024] for them has 'disappeared' as they put it and that they have not been able to reach him in approximately 10 days." Deverin also stated that he had identified respondent

as the clients' previous attorney, and that he believed respondent was "currently administratively ineligible [to practice law] here in NJ."²

On March 19, 2024, the OAE sent a copy of the ethics referral to respondent, by certified and regular mail, to his office address of record, with an additional copy by electronic mail to his e-mail address of record, together with a letter directing him to submit a written reply by March 30, 2024. On the same date, the OAE received a relayed receipt indicating that delivery to respondent's e-mail address was complete. The USPS tracking system indicated that the certified mail was delivered on March 25, 2024. The regular mail was not returned to the OAE. Respondent, however, failed to reply by the March 30, 2024 deadline.

On April 1, 2024, the OAE sent a second letter, by certified and regular mail, to respondent's office address of record, with an additional copy sent by electronic mail, to his e-mail address of record, warning him that his failure to submit a written reply to the ethics referral, by April 8, 2024, could expose him to immediate suspension from the practice of law in New Jersey, as well as an additional charge for a violation of RPC 8.1(b). On the same date, the OAE received a relayed receipt indicating that delivery to respondent's e-mail address was complete. The USPS tracking system indicated that the certified

² According to the formal ethics complaint, Deverin declined to become a grievant in this matter.

mail could not be delivered because the office was closed. The regular mail was not returned to the OAE. Respondent, however, failed to reply by the deadline.

On April 17, 2024, respondent contacted the OAE, by telephone, acknowledging receipt of its March 19, 2024 correspondence and requesting an extension of time in which to file his written reply to the ethics referral.

Two days later, on April 19, 2024, respondent sent the OAE an e-mail confirming the telephone conversation, presenting his partial reply to the ethics referral, and formally requesting an extension of time in which to submit his full reply and to comply with his CLE requirements.³

In his April 19, 2024 e-mail, respondent “acknowledge[d] that there was a lapse in my CLE reporting / attorney registration which resulted in my status as administratively ineligible to practice law in the State of New Jersey from late October of last year.” However, he denied that he had abandoned his real estate clients, Michael Hess and Gabriella Parisi, as alleged in the ethics referral. Instead, he stated that he had engaged in “voluminous negotiations over the [clients’] attempted purchase of no less than four properties” and, further, that he had “zealously represented them by pointing out the serious misgivings with

³ In his e-mail, respondent represented that, due to mail forwarding issues, he had not received the OAE’s March 19 correspondence until the beginning of the week of April 15 – the same week in which he sent this first, and only, e-mail response to the OAE.

each and every deal.” On the same date, the OAE granted respondent’s request for an extension to May 3, 2024. Respondent, however, failed to provide his reply by the new deadline.

On June 28, 2024, the OAE sent a follow-up e-mail to respondent, confirming that it had not received respondent’s full reply to the ethics referral, and requesting that he advise the OAE as to whether he intended to submit additional information. Respondent, however, again failed to reply.

Thereafter, on July 3, 2024, the OAE sent a letter, by regular mail, to respondent’s home address of record, and by electronic mail, to his e-mail address of record, scheduling a demand interview for July 31, 2024. On July 29, 2024, the OAE sent an e-mail requesting that respondent confirm the date and time of the demand interview, which respondent confirmed, via e-mail, the following day.

On July 31, 2024, respondent appeared for the demand interview. During his interview, respondent admitted that he had been administratively ineligible to practice law in New Jersey during his representation of the two real estate clients named in the ethics referral, Hess and Parisi.

On August 8, 2024, following his demand interview, the OAE sent a letter to respondent, via e-mail, directing him to produce additional documentation by August 23, 2024. Respondent, however, failed to reply.

On August 13, 2024, the OAE sent another e-mail to respondent, requesting that he confirm receipt of the August 8, 2024 correspondence. Again, respondent failed to reply.

On August 15, 2024, the OAE made a final attempt to contact respondent, this time by telephone, at his office and cellular telephone numbers of record. The OAE was unable to leave a message at either telephone number because his office number was no longer in service and his cellular mailbox was full.

Based on the foregoing, the OAE charged respondent with having violated RPC 5.5(a)(1) by practicing law while administratively ineligible, and RPC 8.1(b) by failing to cooperate with the OAE's investigation. Further, based on respondent's failure to answer the formal ethics complaint, the OAE amended the complaint to charge him with having committed a second violation of RPC 8.1(b).

Motion to Vacate the Default

On June 17, 2025, respondent, through counsel, requested an adjournment of the June 19, 2025 hearing date and an extension of time in which to file an MVD. We granted the adjournment and directed respondent to file an MVD by June 27, 2025. We also rescheduled the matter to our July 16, 2025 session.

On June 27, 2025, we received respondent's MVD and supporting certification. In support of his motion, respondent admitted that he failed to answer the complaint and "did not follow up on the status of the disciplinary investigation" following his July 2024 interview with the OAE. He explained his noncooperative behavior, in part, as follows:

Although there were several intertwined factors that resulted in my failure to timely respond to the bar, the principal reason seems to be my unfounded belief that the initial Complaint against me had been resolved. I surmise that this unfounded belief was either wishful thinking or a delusion that the [OAE] was satisfied with my initial response and Interview in mid-2024 and would not be requiring anything further from me. There is no basis in the record for that belief, but I actually held it. I have given this matter considerable thought, as I am troubled by my undeniably self-destructive nature.

[MVDc¶2.].⁴

Respondent claimed that his belief that the disciplinary matter had been resolved may have been the result of several physical and emotional difficulties he was experiencing at the time. More specifically, he claimed that, in late 2023, he was being treated for depression, after having been "devastated [both] by the deaths of two very close friends and [by] a major health issue."⁵

⁴ "MVDc" refers to respondent's certification in support of his MVD.

⁵ Respondent did not provide us with supporting medical records or the specific dates during which he received the medical and mental health treatment described in his MVD.

Respondent asserted that, due to his mental and physical “instability,” he had taken “a step back from the practice of law in 2024” and did not know if he would return to the practice. He admitted that, in July 2024, when he was interviewed by the OAE, he “was not practicing law at that point, and I did not complete my CLE requirements or pay my yearly registration fee.” In defense of this dereliction, however, he stated:

At the time, I did not fully understand the seriousness of the violations. I knew there might be consequences, but in my depressed state, I really didn’t care. I cannot describe my mental state more accurately than that. I make no excuses here, but it is difficult to explain why I was so derelict and self-destructive.”

[MVDc¶5.]

With respect to his failure to file an answer the formal ethics complaint, respondent explained that, in early February of 2025, following his mental and physical hardships, he attempted to get a “fresh start” by accepting a temporary job in Florida, working in a non-legal capacity. He further represented that his failure to answer the complaint was not a consequence of his intentional disregard for the disciplinary system, but rather the result of his misguided attempts to protect himself from negative emotional triggers during this “vulnerable” time in his life. As a result, throughout his stay in Florida, he was having his New Jersey mail checked by a friend on a weekly basis. He further admitted that, during the period when the friend was checking his mail, his

friend twice alerted him that he had received “something from the NJ Courts;” however, he claimed that, because “the disciplinary charge against me was off my radar, as I inexplicably believed that the matter was no longer active . . . I foolishly assumed that these letters involved my administratively ineligible status and were calling for registration payment and/or CLE credit proofs.”

Although respondent did not confirm if or when he ultimately received the letters, he stated that he became aware of the instant matter on June 10, 2025, following a Google search for his name.

With respect to the allegations of the complaint, respondent denied having abandoned his clients. To the contrary, he asserted that he had provided extensive legal assistance to the clients from 2021 to 2023 in their real estate search. He claimed that the last time he heard from the clients, prior to the filing of the ethics referral in this matter, was December 15, 2023. However, upon learning of the ethics referral against him, he contacted the clients directly, in order to assure them that he had not abandoned him, at which point, they advised him that they had no knowledge of the grievance, were not consulted about it, and “were very pleased” with respondent’s efforts to help them. Finally, respondent stated that he did not know Deverin and never had any dealings with him. In summary, respondent argued that “[i]t is rare, though not unheard of,

that an Ethics Grievance would be a complete fabrication, but this appears to be the case in this instance.”

In its July 7, 2025 opposition to respondent’s MVD, the OAE argued that respondent had failed to satisfy either prong of the two-part test necessary to prevail on an MVD. Specifically, the OAE argued that respondent had failed to adequately explain why he failed to file an answer to the complaint, notwithstanding his acknowledgement that service was proper. The OAE further noted that respondent failed to address his receipt of our April 28, 2025 scheduling letter, or his subsequent receipt of the OAE’s June 6, 2025 e-mail attaching a copy of our scheduling letter. Finally, the OAE emphasized that, despite hiring counsel, respondent failed to identify a specific medical event or reason that precluded him from answering the complaint or timely filing an MVD. Further, he did not provide the OAE with proof of his physical and mental health struggles.

Regarding the second prong, the OAE argued that respondent failed to set forth meritorious defenses to the charges – to the contrary, the OAE asserted that he admitted to both practicing law while administratively ineligible to do so and failing to fully cooperate with the OAE’s investigation of this matter.

To succeed on a motion to vacate default, a respondent must (1) offer a reasonable explanation for the failure to answer the ethics complaint, and (2)

assert a meritorious defense to all the underlying charges. In this matter, we determined that respondent failed to satisfy either prong.

Regarding the first prong, respondent failed to offer a reasonable explanation for his failure to file an answer to the formal ethics complaint. His supporting certification presented a sympathetic description of various mental and physical health issues which purportedly led him to act in an unprecedented and self-destructive manner, resulting in his failure to answer the formal ethics complaint, as well as his failure to timely comply with the OAE's repeated requests for information. Respondent also admitted to having received the OAE's directives and pleadings, yet he failed to file a verified answer to the complaint. Consequently, respondent failed to satisfy the first prong of the analysis.

Regarding the second prong, respondent failed to set forth any defense to the RPC 5.5(a)(1) charge. In fact, his certification confirmed what he already admitted during the investigation in this matter – that he represented two clients, in association with their purchase of real estate, at least in part, during the period when he was ineligible to practice law due to his noncompliance with CLE requirements. Instead, the defenses he presented were focused primarily on the initial allegation of client abandonment – a charge which the OAE ultimately did not pursue in its formal ethics complaint. Although respondent asserted that

he has now “resolved the issues of the CLE credits and the registration fees,” he did not assert, in specific defense to the RPC 5.5(a)(1) charge, that those issues were resolved prior to his representation of the clients in this matter.⁶

Concerning the RPC 8.1(b) charge, respondent explained that his mental and physical health issues impeded his ability to timely and properly respond to the OAE’s inquiries in this matter. Nevertheless, in the absence of medical documentation evidencing his asserted medical and mental health issues, this argument, while sympathetic, does not rise to the level of a “meritorious” defense for the purposes of satisfying the second prong of the MVD test. Thus, we concluded that respondent failed to assert a meritorious defense to the allegations set forth in the complaint and, consequently, failed to satisfy the second prong of the MVD analysis.

Based on respondent’s failure to satisfy either element necessary to vacate the default, we denied his MVD.

⁶ Although respondent’s certification noted that, as of the date of his MVD, he had “resolved the issues of the CLE credits and the registration fees,” a review of the Court’s attorney database confirmed that, as of the date of our decision, respondent remains ineligible to practice law for failing to pay his annual registration fee.

Analysis and Discipline

Violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct

Following our review of the record, we find that facts set forth in the formal ethics complaint support all the charges of unethical conduct by clear and convincing evidence. Respondent's failure to file an answer to the complaint is deemed an admission that the allegations are true and provide sufficient basis for the imposition of discipline. R. 1:20-4(f)(1).

Specifically, RPC 5.5(a)(1) states, in relevant part, that a "lawyer shall not . . . practice law in a jurisdiction where doing so violates the regulations of the legal profession in that jurisdiction." In New Jersey, attorneys may be deemed ineligible to practice the law if they fail to comply with mandatory CLE requirements during their respective compliance periods. R. 1:42-1 and BCLE Reg. 402.

Here, respondent was declared administratively ineligible to practice law in New Jersey, effective October 16, 2023, due to his failure to comply with mandatory CLE requirements. He remained ineligible until June 10, 2025, when he cured this deficiency.

Specifically, respondent admitted, both in his April 19, 2025 e-mail and during his demand interview, that he represented Hess and Parisi – the two clients named in Deverin's ethics referral – in a real estate transaction, despite

being administratively ineligible to do so, due to his failure to satisfy his CLE obligations. He further acknowledged that, over the course of this representation, he engaged in “voluminous negotiations over the [clients’] attempted purchase of no less than four properties . . . [and] zealously represented them by pointing out the serious misgivings with each and every deal.”

With respect to the specific timeframe in which respondent practiced while ineligible, the record shows that, in his January 23, 2024 ethics referral, Deverin stated that he had been advised, by the two clients in this matter, who sought his representation in an unfinished real estate transaction, “that the attorney who started the transaction earlier in January for them has ‘disappeared’ as they put it and that they have not been able to reach him in approximately 10 days.” The ethics referral represented that it was at or around the same time that he became aware that respondent – whom he identified as the clients’ “prior attorney” – was “currently administratively ineligible here in NJ.” The evidence clearly and convincingly establishes, therefore, that respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, while ineligible to do so, at least during the early part of January 2024.

Moreover, when viewed in the context of respondent’s admission – in which he acknowledged that his representation had spanned multiple potential

real estate transactions, over a prolonged period of time – the evidence is sufficient to support the finding that respondent’s representation of the relevant clients began long prior to January 2024 (and, at the very least, persisted throughout the end of 2023 and into January 2024, particularly considering respondent’s claim that he had communicated with the client in December 2023), during the months after October 2023, when respondent was ineligible to practice for failing to comply with CLE requirements. Therefore, the evidence clearly and convincingly establishes respondent’s violation of RPC 5.5(a)(1).

Respondent also violated RPC 8.1(b), which requires an attorney to “respond to a lawful demand for information from . . . [a] disciplinary authority,” by failing to cooperate fully with the OAE’s investigation. Specifically, between March 2024 and January 25, 2025 (the date of the formal ethics complaint), respondent failed to submit a complete reply to the ethics referral, despite the OAE’s repeated efforts to obtain his compliance. Indeed, the OAE sent him at least four letters and e-mails, and additionally attempted to reach him by telephone. Although respondent appeared at the OAE’s demand interview, he thereafter failed to produce the additional documents requested by the OAE. Further, despite having been granted two extensions, respondent failed to submit a complete reply to the grievance or to fully cooperate with the OAE’s investigation.

It is well-settled that cooperation short of the full cooperation required by the Rules has resulted in the finding that the attorney violated RPC 8.1(b). See In the Matter of Marc Z. Palfy, DRB 15-193, at 48 (2016) (describing the attorney’s “marginal and begrudging cooperation as no less disruptive and frustrating than a complete failure to cooperate,” and noting that “partial cooperation can be more disruptive to a full and fair investigation, as it forces the investigator to proceed in a piecemeal and disjointed fashion”), so ordered, 225 N.J. 611 (2016). See also In the Matter of Laurence R. Sheller, DRB 24-033 (April 30, 2024) (we concluded that the attorney violated RPC 8.1(b) by failing to cooperate fully with the OAE’s investigation; despite the attorney’s timely replies to the OAE, he failed, over a prolonged period of time and despite the OAE’s exhaustive efforts, to bring his financial records into compliance; the attorney’s productions to the OAE consistently remained deficient), so ordered, 257 N.J. 495 (2024).

Respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) a second time by failing to file an answer to the formal ethics complaint, despite proper notice, allowing this matter to proceed as a default.

In sum, we find that respondent violated RPC 5.5(a)(1) and RPC 8.1(b) (two instances). The sole issue left for our determination is the appropriate quantum of discipline for respondent’s misconduct.

Quantum of Discipline

Practicing law while ineligible to do so generally is met with an admonition if the attorney is either unaware of the ineligibility or advances compelling mitigating factors. See, e.g., In re Warren, 249 N.J. 4 (2021) (between October 20 and November 17, 2017, the attorney practiced law while administratively ineligible in New Jersey by appearing in court on two occasions – once as a municipal prosecutor and the second time as counsel to a party in Superior Court; there was no evidence that the attorney was aware of his ineligibility when he engaged in the misconduct; prior reprimand for unrelated misconduct); In the Matter of Johnathan A. Goodman, DRB 16-436 (March 22, 2017) (the attorney practiced law during two periods of ineligibility, but was unaware of his ineligibility due to problems with his mail and inattentiveness due to health issues of his own and his parents; no prior discipline in more than forty years at the bar); In the Matter of James David Lloyd, DRB 14-087 (June 25, 2014) (the attorney practiced law during an approximate thirteen-month period of ineligibility; in mitigation, the attorney was unaware of his ineligibility; no prior discipline).

Similarly, an attorney's failure to cooperate with disciplinary authorities typically is met with an admonition, even when the attorney has committed other minor misconduct, has an ethics history that is remote in time, or demonstrates

the existence of compelling mitigating factors. See In the Matter of Giovanni DePierro, DRB 21-190 (January 24, 2022) (the attorney failed to respond to letters from the investigator in the underlying ethics investigation, in violation of RPC 8.1(b); the attorney also violated RPC 1.4(b) (failing to communicate), RPC 1.5(c) (failing to set forth in writing the basis or rate of the attorney's fee – two instances), and RPC 1.16(d) (failing to protect the client's interests upon termination of the representation)), and In the Matter of Michael C. Dawson, DRB 15-242 (October 20, 2015) (the attorney failed to reply to repeated requests for information from the District Ethics Committee investigator regarding his representation of a client in three criminal defense matters, in violation of RPC 8.1(b)).

As a threshold matter, we conclude that the evidence in the record before us is insufficient to support a finding that respondent was aware of his ineligibility to practice law when he represented Hess and Parisi in connection with real estate transactions. Respondent, in his admissions, did not expressly admit that he had been aware of his ineligibility at the time when he undertook the representation of these clients, or that he persisted in this representation, despite having an awareness of his ineligibility to practice law. Further, the OAE also did not charge him with having done so knowingly. Accordingly, in contrast to our findings in In re Clausen, 213 N.J. 461 (2013), In re Sexton, 238 N.J. 384

(2019), and In re D'Arienzo, 217 N.J. 151 (2014), there is no evidence to support the inference that respondent had constructive awareness of his ineligibility to practice law, based on his CLE deficiencies, at the time he represented Hess and Parisi.⁷

Based on the foregoing disciplinary precedent, we conclude that the baseline discipline for respondent's misconduct is an admonition. To craft the appropriate discipline in this case, however, we also consider aggravating and mitigating factors.

In aggravation, respondent failed to answer the formal ethics complaint, thereby allowing the matter to proceed by default. It is well established that "a respondent's default or failure to cooperate with the investigative authorities operates as an aggravating factor, which is sufficient to permit a penalty that would otherwise be appropriate to be further enhanced." In re Kivler 183 N.J. 332, 342 (2008).

In mitigation, respondent has an otherwise unblemished disciplinary record spanning a twelve-year career at the bar. Moreover, there is no evidence that the clients were harmed by his misconduct in this matter.

⁷ The record does not demonstrate, and the OAE does not allege, that respondent ever experienced (and cured) a previous period of ineligibility resulting from his failure to complete mandatory CLE requirements, such that he would have had constructive or actual awareness of the fact that a declaration of administrative ineligibility would necessarily result from his 2023 failure to comply with mandatory CLE requirements.

In further mitigation, respondent's MVD certification also credibly establishes that, during the OAE's investigation of this matter, and throughout the time when the matter was pending before us, he was suffering from significant mental and physical health problems which, he asserted, inhibited his ability to deal with stressful life events and contributed to his failure to cooperate in this matter.

Conclusion

On balance, we find that the mitigating and aggravating factors are in equipoise and do not warrant a departure from the baseline quantum of discipline. Consequently, we determine that an admonition is the appropriate quantum of discipline to protect the public and preserve confidence in the bar.

Vice-Chair Boyer and Members Hoberman and Petrou were absent.

We further determine to require that respondent reimburse the Disciplinary Oversight Committee for administrative costs and actual expenses incurred in the prosecution of this matter, as provided in R. 1:20-17.

Disciplinary Review Board
Hon. Mary Catherine Cuff, P.J.A.D. (Ret.),
Chair

By: /s/ Timothy M. Ellis
Timothy M. Ellis
Chief Counsel

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD
VOTING RECORD

In the Matter of Vincent J. Frazzetto
Docket No. DRB 25-091

Decided: September 10, 2025

Disposition: Admonition

Members	Admonition	Absent
Cuff	X	
Boyer		X
Campelo	X	
Hoberman		X
Menaker	X	
Modu	X	
Petrou		X
Rodriguez	X	
Spencer	X	
Total:	6	3

/s/ Timothy M. Ellis
Timothy M. Ellis
Chief Counsel