

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

November 25, 2025

VIA CERTIFIED, REGULAR, AND ELECTRONIC MAIL

Christopher Raymond Fritz, Esq.
c/o Robert E. Ramsey, Esq.
2000 Hamilton Avenue
Hamilton, New Jersey 08619
robertramseylawoffice@gmail.com

Re: **In the Matter of Christopher Raymond Fritz**
Docket No. DRB 25-234
District Docket No. XIII-2023-0003E
LETTER OF ADMONITION

Dear Mr. Fritz:

The Disciplinary Review Board has reviewed your conduct in the above matter and has concluded that it was improper. Following a review of the record, the Board determined to impose an admonition for your violation of RPC 8.1(b) (failing to cooperate with disciplinary authorities).

Specifically, in late 2022, Sandra White retained you to represent her in a dispute with a residential solar energy company. On January 10, 2023, White filed an ethics grievance alleging that you, despite having received \$1,800 toward the representation, failed to adequately communicate with her about the matter, thereby causing her to do “all the leg work” necessary to resolve the dispute herself. Although she acknowledged that your law firm had informed

her that you were in the hospital, she alleged that no other lawyer was assigned to replace you in her matter.

On April 26, 2023, the District XIII Ethics Committee (the DEC) sent a copy of the ethics grievance, by certified and regular mail, to your Montclair office address of record, together with a letter directing you to submit a written reply within ten days after receipt. The certified mail receipt, which was returned to the DEC, confirmed that the certified mailing was signed for and accepted on April 28, 2023. The regular mail was not returned to the DEC.

On September 9, 2023, having received no reply from you, the DEC contacted you by telephone and left a voicemail message asking for a return call. Two days later, on September 11, 2023, you returned the DEC's call and confirmed your receipt of the September 9 voicemail; however, you claimed not to have received the DEC's April 26 letter or the attached copy of the grievance, and you claimed that the telephone call was the first notice you had received regarding the DEC's investigation in this matter. During the call, the DEC confirmed your Montclair office mailing address and advised you that it would resend its April 26, 2023 correspondence. On the same date, the DEC resent the April 26 letter and the copy of the grievance, by certified and regular mail, to the same Montclair office address where the letter and grievance previously had been sent. Neither the certified nor regular mail was returned to the DEC.

On December 19, 2023, the DEC attempted to contact you by telephone, to no avail. A month later, on January 17, 2024, the DEC sent a final e-mail to you, requesting that you contact the DEC; however, you again failed to respond.

On November 11, 2024, having received no reply to the grievance and no other communication from you following the September 2023 telephone call, the DEC issued a formal ethics complaint, alleging that you had violated RPC 8.1(b).

In your verified answer, you maintained that you did not knowingly fail to reply to the grievance or the DEC's attempts to reach you. Specifically, you asserted that, after the September 11 telephone call, the DEC had sent its mailings and e-mails, and had made its telephone calls, to addresses and telephone numbers that you were not then using. You further maintained that

you had no recollection of your September telephone conversation with the DEC and “had simply forgotten about the letter [you] had received on April 28, 2023.”

At the July 21, 2025 disciplinary hearing, however, you testified that you received the DEC’s April 26 letter, as well as the attached grievance, when the DEC resent those documents to you in September 2023. You further testified that, at the time of your receipt of those documents, you understood that you had an obligation to comply with disciplinary authorities investigating your alleged misconduct and, in fact, wanted to cooperate with the DEC in its investigation of the grievance. Based on the hearing panel’s review of the evidence, and after considering your testimony, the panel determined that you violated RPC 8.1(b) by failing to reply to the DEC’s repeated communications seeking your written reply to the ethics grievance.

Following its review of the record in this matter, the Board has determined that clear and convincing evidence fully supports the hearing panel’s finding that you violated RPC 8.1(b). Specifically, although you offered an explanation for your initial failure to reply to the DEC’s April and September letters, and for your subsequent failure to reply to the DEC’s December 2024 telephone call and January 2025 e-mail, the record nonetheless demonstrates that, by at least September 2023, you were aware of the existence the grievance and of your obligation to cooperate with the DEC’s associated ethics investigation. Notwithstanding the single return telephone call that you made on September 11, 2023, you repeatedly ignored the DEC’s communication attempts and altogether failed to submit a written reply to the grievance underlying this matter. Indeed, it was not until the DEC filed its formal ethics complaint, in November 2024, that you finally became an active participant in the instant disciplinary proceeding, with the assistance of counsel.

In imposing only an admonition, the Board accorded some weight to your testimony that you were suffering from and being treated for alcoholism during the relevant timeframe when the DEC was investigating the grievance underlying this matter. See In re Gillespie, 124 N.J. 81, 87 (1991). As determined by the hearing panel, the sequence of events preceding the issuance of the formal ethics complaint supports the conclusion that your receipt of the DEC’s notice letters, in April and September 2023, may have contributed to or directly caused the relapses you experienced in April and September of that year.

In further mitigation, the record contains no evidence that your misconduct resulted in any harm to clients.

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).

Additionally, as a condition of this discipline, the Board determined that you shall be required to submit documentation to the Office of Attorney Ethics, on a quarterly basis, for a one-year period following the date of this letter, verifying your ongoing treatment and recovery status.

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 costs 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/knd
Enclosures

c: (w/o enclosures)
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)

Ryan J. Moriarty, Statewide Ethics Coordinator

Office of Attorney Ethics (e-mail)

Sarah Mahony Eaton, Chair

District XIII Ethics Committee (e-mail)

Donna P. Legband, Secretary

District XIII Ethics Committee (e-mail and regular mail)

Benedict F. Valliere, Presenter

District XIII Ethics Committee (e-mail)

Sandra White, Grievant (regular mail)