

**SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
D-140 September Term 2024
090976**

In the Matter of :
Carlos H. Acosta, Jr. :
An Attorney at Law :
(Attorney No. 033081996) :

O R D E R

Pending before the Court is the Disciplinary Review Board’s decision in DRB 25-041, recommending on the basis of a disciplinary stipulation that **Carlos H. Acosta, Jr. of Union City**, who was admitted to the bar of this State in 1996, should be suspended from the practice of law for six months for violating RPC 1.1(a) (engaging in gross neglect), RPC 1.1(b) (engaging in a pattern of neglect), RPC 1.3 (lacking diligence), RPC 3.2 (failing to expedite litigation), RPC 8.4(c) (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation), and RPC 8.4(d) (engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

In this matter, the Office of Attorney Ethics (OAE) and respondent entered into a disciplinary stipulation. As part of the stipulation, the OAE agreed to recommend a censure or a three-month suspension. The Disciplinary Review Board (DRB) recommended a one-year suspension.

The Court later granted respondent's motion to supplement the record and remanded the matter to the DRB to consider an expanded record and file a revised decision.

Before the DRB on remand, the OAE recommended a six-month suspension. Respondent, in turn, argued that the OAE breached the stipulation and asked the DRB to declare it void. The DRB denied the request.

Disciplinary stipulations serve a valuable role in the disciplinary process. They help streamline disputes and allow for matters to be resolved fairly and expeditiously.

Both parties to a stipulation are entitled to rely on the admissions and promises it contains, so long as the stipulation remains in force. Here, the OAE was obligated to abide by its commitment to recommend a specific range of discipline – a censure or a three-month suspension. Because the OAE was bound by the stipulation, we do not consider its revised recommendation on remand to impose a six-month suspension.

Based on the Court's review of the record, which includes respondent's multiple admissions to the allegations in the complaint, along with evidence that supports his admissions, the Court determines that a three-month suspension is the appropriate quantum of discipline for respondent's unethical conduct.

It is therefore ORDERED that **Carlos H. Acosta, Jr.** is hereby suspended from the practice of law for three months, and until further order of the Court, effective December 17, 2025; and it is further

ORDERED that respondent comply with Rule 1:20-20 dealing with suspended attorneys; and it is further

ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 1:20-20(c), respondent's failure to comply with the Affidavit of Compliance requirement of Rule 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 RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(d); and (3) provide a basis for an action for contempt pursuant to Rule 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.

For the Court



Stuart Rabner
Chief Justice

November 17, 2025