SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD
Docket No. DRB 25-207
District Docket No. XIV-2024-0484E

---

In the Matter of Edward G. D'Alessandro, Jr.
An Attorney at Law

Decided
February 26, 2026

---

Certification of the Record

---

Table of Contents

Introduction ..... 1
Ethics History ..... 2
Service of Process ..... 3
Facts ..... 5
Analysis and Discipline ..... 9
Violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct ..... 9
Quantum of Discipline ..... 13
Conclusion ..... 21

## 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 1.16(d) (upon termination of the representation, failing to refund any advance payment of a fee that has not been earned or incurred and failing to surrender papers and property to which the client is entitled); RPC 5.5(a)(1) (engaging in the unauthorized practice of law); RPC 8.1(b) (two instances – failing to cooperate with disciplinary authorities); RPC 8.4(d) (engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).[1]

For the reasons set forth below, we determine that a two-year suspension, with a condition, is the appropriate quantum of discipline for respondent's misconduct.

[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.

**Ethics History**

Respondent earned admission to the New Jersey bar in 1990, the New York bar in 1991, and the Colorado and Pennsylvania bars in 1992. At the relevant time, he maintained a practice of law in Florham Park, New Jersey. He has prior discipline and interaction with the attorney regulatory system.

*Temporary Suspension*

Effective May 30, 2024, the Court temporarily suspended respondent from the practice of law for failing to cooperate with an OAE disciplinary investigation. In re D'Alessandro, 257 N.J. 484 (2024).

*D'Alessandro I*

Effective December 5, 2025, the Court suspended respondent for one year, in a default matter, for his violation of RPC 8.1(b), RPC 8.4(b) (committing a criminal act that reflects adversely on a lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer), and RPC 8.4(c) (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation). In re D'Alessandro, 262 N.J. 313 (2025) (D'Alessandro I). In that matter, respondent admitted that he failed to file his state and federal tax returns for three years, contrary to 26 U.S.C. § 7203. In the Matter of Edward G. D'Alessandro, Jr., DRB 25-053 (August 6, 2025) at 11, 26.

Further, he assisted in the commission of fraud in three separate schemes. Id. at 27. Specifically, he assisted his friend by misleading investors, obstructing law enforcement's attempt to arrest his friend, and dishonestly disbursing $22,000 in fees from an estate to himself without prior court approval. Id. at 27. Thereafter, he failed to cooperate with the OAE's investigation into the allegations of fraud. Id. at 28-20, 33. In mitigation, we considered respondent's then lack of disciplinary history. Id. at 32. In aggravation, we weighed the default status of the matter.

To date, respondent remains suspended from the practice of law pursuant to both his temporary and disciplinary suspensions.

**Service of Process**

Service of process was proper. On July 9, 2025, the OAE sent a copy of the formal ethics complaint, by certified and regular mail, to respondent's home address of record, with an additional copy sent by electronic mail, to his e-mail address of record.[2] The letter sent by certified mail was returned to the OAE as "unclaimed." The regular mail was not returned to the OAE.

[2] New Jersey attorneys have an affirmative obligation to inform both the New Jersey Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection and the OAE of changes to their home and primary law office addresses, "either prior to such change or within thirty days thereafter." R. 1:20-1(c). Respondent's official Court records continue to reflect the home address utilized for service in this matter. Further, his Court records reflect only one e-mail address which appears to be associated with his law office.

On August 12, 2025, the OAE sent a second letter, by certified and regular mail, to respondent's home address of record, with an additional copy sent by electronic mail, to his e-mail address of record. The letter informed respondent that, unless he filed a verified answer to the complaint 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. According to the United States Postal Service tracking system, the certified mail was returned to the OAE as "unclaimed" and "return to sender." The regular mail was not returned to the OAE.

As of August 27, 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 September 29, 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 November 20, 2025, and that any motion to vacate the default (MVD) must be filed by October 20, 2025. The Outlook e-mail tracking system did not indicate that the e-mail was delivered or read by the respondent. The letter sent by certified mail was

returned to the Office of Board Counsel (the OBC) as "unclaimed." The regular mail was not returned to the OBC.

Moreover, the OBC published a notice dated October 10, 2025 in the New Jersey Law Journal and on the New Jersey Courts website, stating that we would consider this matter on November 20, 2025. The notice informed respondent that, unless he filed a successful MVD by October 20, 2025, his prior failure to answer the complaint would remain deemed an admission of the allegations contained in the complaint.

Respondent did not file an MVD.

**Facts**

We now turn to the allegations of the complaint.

In February 2024, John T. Giordano retained respondent for representation concerning the estate of his uncle, John L. Giordano (the J.G. Estate). Giordano paid respondent a $2,500 retainer fee toward the representation.

As previously detailed, effective May 30, 2024, the Court temporarily suspended respondent from the practice of law and, to date, he remains temporarily suspended.

The Court's temporary suspension Order directed respondent to comply with R. 1:20-20, which required, among other obligations, that he, "within 30 days after the date of the order of suspension . . . file with the Director the original of a detailed affidavit specifying by correlatively numbered paragraphs how the disciplined attorney has complied with each of the provisions of this rule and the Supreme Court's order." Further, R. 1:20-20(c) expressly provides that an attorney's failure to file the affidavit constitutes a violation of RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(d). Respondent failed to file the required affidavit of compliance.

In September 2024, four months after the Court temporarily suspended him, respondent met with Giordano. During the meeting, Giordano retained respondent for representation concerning his father's estate (the A.G. Estate). Respondent failed to advise Giordano that he had been suspended from the practice of law. Giordano was unsure whether respondent provided him with a written retainer agreement for either estate matter; nevertheless, Giordano paid respondent a second $2,500 retainer fee for the representation concerning the A.G. Estate matter.[3] Giordano's September 19, 2024 check contained the

[3] Because respondent failed to cooperate with the investigation, the OAE was not able to confirm whether respondent violated RPC 1.5(b) (failing to set forth, in writing, the basis or rate of the legal fee).

notation "Fee for Dad's Probate." Respondent improperly deposited the check in his attorney business account (ABA) the same date.

By letter dated October 30, 2024, Giordano terminated the representation. In that letter, Giordano referenced a previous conversation he had with respondent after he had learned respondent had been suspended from the practice of law. He reiterated his prior request that respondent return his original documents (including the wills and death certificates) and the retainer fees he had advanced in connection with both estate matters. Respondent failed to reply to Giordano, failed to return his documents, and failed to refund the retainer fees.

In October 2024, the OAE received Giordano's grievance, in which he alleged that respondent had practiced law while suspended.

Accordingly, on October 21, November 6, and November 26, 2024, and on January 29, 2025, the OAE sent letters to respondent, via certified and regular, to his home address of record, with an additional copy via electronic mail to his e-mail address of record, directing that he provide a written reply to Giordano's grievance. The letters sent via certified mail were returned to the OAE as unclaimed; however, the letters sent via regular mail were not returned. Respondent failed to reply.

Consequently, on February 18, 2025, the OAE informed respondent, via e-mail, that it had scheduled a demand interview for the following day, by videoconference, and that his appearance was required. The OAE instructed respondent to confirm his availability. The same date, respondent replied to the OAE's e-mail, advising that he was "unavailable due to lack of notice." Consequently, the OAE rescheduled the demand interview to February 28, 2025. However, on February 27, 2025, respondent informed the OAE, via e-mail, that he was "unable to appear at an interview at this time. [He] recently filed bankruptcy and [was] still not represented by counsel."

Based on the foregoing, the OAE charged respondent with having violated RPC 1.16(d) by failing to provide Giordano with his client documents and unearned fees for both estate matters after Giordano terminated the representation. Next, the OAE alleged that respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, in violation of RPC 5.5(a)(1), by representing Giordano after having been temporarily suspended from the practice of law. The OAE alleged that respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) by failing to cooperate with its investigation. The OAE also alleged that respondent violated RPC 8.4(d) for his willful violation of the Court's temporary suspension Order by failing to file the required R. 1:20-20 affidavit of compliance and by failing to notify Giordano that he had been suspended.).

Finally, 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).

## Analysis and Discipline

*Violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct*

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

Respondent violated RPC 5.5(a)(1) by practicing law following his May 30, 2024 temporary suspension. Specifically, the evidence clearly and convincingly demonstrates that, in September 2024, approximately four months after the Court temporarily suspended him, respondent met with Giordano and agreed to represent him in connection with the A.G. Estate matter. He failed to inform Giordano that he was suspended and could no longer represent him in connection with the J.G. Estate matter. Worse, he accepted a $2,500 retainer fee toward the representation in the A.G. Estate matter, which he improperly deposited in his ABA.

In October 2024, approximately one month after meeting with respondent, Giordano terminated the representation, in writing, in connection with both the J.G. Estate and A.G. Estate matters, having independently learned of respondent's suspended status. In his letter, Giordano requested that respondent return his original documents and refund the retainer fees paid in connection with both matters. Respondent, however, failed to return Giordano's documents or unearned fees, despite Giordano's specific request that he do so. Thus, respondent violated RPC 1.16(d).

RPC 8.1(b) requires an attorney to "respond to a lawful demand for information from . . . [a] disciplinary authority." Here, respondent violated this Rule in three respects. First, he failed to comply timely and fully with the OAE's investigation into Giordano's grievance, despite having acknowledged the OAE's attempts to schedule his demand interview. Respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) a second time by failing to file a verified answer to the formal ethics complaint, despite proper notice, allowing this matter to proceed as a default.

Finally, respondent violated RPC 8.1(b) a third time, and also violated RPC 8.4(d), by willfully violating the Court's temporary suspension Order and failing to file the required affidavit of compliance, a step required of all suspended attorneys. Specifically, R. 1:20-20(b)(15) requires a suspended attorney, within thirty days of the Court's Order of suspension, to "file with the

Director [of the OAE] the original of a detailed affidavit specifying by correlatively numbered paragraphs how the disciplined attorney has complied with each of the provisions of this rule and the Supreme Court's order."

As the Appellate Division has observed, "the provisions of R. 1:20-20(b)(1) to (14) are designed to protect clients of the [suspended or] disbarred attorney, as well as any other individuals who might unknowingly seek to retain that attorney during the period of his suspension." Eichen, Levinson & Crutchlow, LLP v. Weiner, 397 N.J. Super. 588, 596 (App. Div. 2008). Non-compliance with R. 1:20-20, therefore, obstructs one of the primary purposes of the disciplinary system, "to protect the public from an untrustworthy lawyer." See In re Rigolosi, 107 N.J. 192, 206 (1987) ("The purpose of a disciplinary proceeding, as distinguished from a criminal prosecution, is not so much to punish a wrongdoer as it is to protect the public from an untrustworthy lawyer.") (citing In re Pennica, 36 N.J. 401, 418-19 (1962)). Non-compliance with R. 1:20-20 may also cause "confusion among . . . clients and an administrative burden for the courts." In re Kramer, 172 N.J. 609, 626 (2002).

For those reasons, and by operation of Rule, in the absence of an extension granted by the Director of the OAE, failure to file an affidavit of compliance pursuant to R. 1:20-20(b)(15) within the time prescribed "constitute[s] a violation of RPC 8.1(b) . . . and RPC 8.4(d)." R. 1:20-20(c).

Here, respondent willfully violated the Court's temporary suspension Order, filed on May 30, 2024, by failing to file the required affidavit, a step required of all suspended attorneys. He, thus, violated R. 1:20-20 and, consequently, RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(d).[4] Had respondent filed the required affidavit, Giordano would have received notice, prior to retaining him for representation in the A.G. Estate matter, that respondent was not authorized to practice law. However, respondent neither filed the required affidavit nor informed Giordano at their September 2024 meeting that he could no longer represent him in the J.G. Estate matter and could not represent him in connection with the A.G. Estate matter. Instead, he accepted the new representation and a $2,500 legal fee toward that representation, a fee that he then failed to return to Giordano.

In sum, we find that respondent violated RPC 1.16(d); RPC 5.5(a)(1); RPC 8.1(b) (three instances); and RPC 8.4(d). The sole issue left for our determination is the appropriate quantum of discipline for respondent's misconduct.

[4] Pursuant to R. 1:20-20(c), an attorney's failure to file an affidavit of compliance constitutes a per se violation of RPC 8.1(b) and RPC 8.4(d). In our view, respondent was on notice that his failure to file the required affidavit would result in a finding that he violated both RPCs, in conformity with In re Roberson, 194 N.J. 557 (2008). Consequently, we find respondent's violation of RPC 8.1(b) stemming from his failure to file an affidavit of compliance, despite the OAE having not expressly charged him with same.

*Quantum of Discipline*

Respondent's most serious misconduct in this matter was his continued representation of Giordano despite his May 2024 temporary suspension from the practice of law. Attorneys who practice law while suspended have received discipline ranging from a lengthy term of suspension to disbarment, depending on the presence of other misconduct including a failure to cooperate, the attorney's disciplinary history, and aggravating or mitigating factors. See, e.g., In re Gonzalez, __ N.J. __ (2022), 2022 N.J. LEXIS 996 (one-year suspension for an attorney who, during a three-month term of suspension, called the Motor Vehicle Commission (the MVC) on behalf of a friend whose driver's license had been suspended, identified himself as an attorney, and requested information on how to adjourn the friend's MVC hearing; thereafter, the attorney accompanied his friend, in a representative capacity, to the MVC hearing, where the attorney presented an MVC employee with a business card of another lawyer with an active law license; following the MVC's demand that he produce his own driver's license or social security number to confirm his identity, the attorney left the MVC; we weighed the fact that the attorney's misconduct was confined to a singular matter against his prior discipline, which included a 1995 reprimand, a 2012 admonition, and a 2017 three-month suspension); In re Choi, 249 N.J. 18 (2021) (two-year suspension for an attorney who, following his

indefinite suspension, in New York, for federal criminal convictions for money laundering and submitting false statements to federal authorities, represented a client, in New York state court, where he falsely certified that he was admitted to practice in New York; the attorney also maintained a law firm website that improperly claimed that he was admitted to practice in New York; finally, the attorney failed to comply with New York's affidavit of compliance rule for suspended or disbarred attorneys); In re Pinnock, 257 N.J. 604 (2024) (three-year suspension for an attorney who, following her suspension from the practice of law, mishandled numerous immigration client matters; violations of RPC 1.1(a), RPC 1.3, RPC 1.4(b), RPC 1.5(b), and RPC 5.5(a)(1); in mitigation, the attorney stipulated to her misconduct; in aggravation, the attorney had prior discipline for similar misconduct, her actions impacted vulnerable clients, and she failed to file the required R. 1:20-20 affidavit following her suspension); In re Boyman, 236 N.J. 98 (2018) (three-year suspension for an attorney, in a default matter, who, for more than four years following his temporary suspension, represented borrowers in nineteen, predominantly commercial, real estate transactions involving the same title company; when the title company discovered the attorney's suspended status, the attorney misrepresented to the title company that he had been reinstated to practice; additionally, despite the OAE's numerous attempts, spanning almost nine months, seeking the attorney's

written reply to the ethics grievance, the attorney failed to respond, despite acknowledging receipt of the OAE's letters in a telephone conversation; we weighed, in aggravation, the attorney's 2010 and 2014 censures, in default matters, in which he also failed to cooperate with disciplinary authorities; we also weighed the fact that the attorney's misconduct had continued, unabated, for four years, in numerous high-value matters); In re Kim, __ N.J. __ (2022), 2022 N.J. LEXIS 1068 (attorney disbarred, in a default matter, for practicing while suspended for almost three-and-a-half years following his temporary suspension, in connection with sixteen small business loan closings before the United States Small Business Administration (the SBA); during each loan closing, the attorney falsely certified that he maintained an active New Jersey law license; the SBA discovered the attorney's suspension and determined that it would no longer guarantee the client's loans until it had completed an internal review of the attorney's illicit behavior; the attorney also ignored the OAE's communications, spanning several months, which required him to reply to the SBA's ethics grievance; in recommending the attorney's disbarment, we weighed, in aggravation, the fact that the attorney's conduct jeopardized his clients' standing before the SBA and imperiled the closing of two pending small business loans; we also weighed, in aggravation, the attorney's prior three-year

suspension, in 2020, also for practicing law while suspended in connection with at least two client matters, among other misconduct).

Standing alone, respondent's unauthorized practice of law is comparable to that of the attorney in Gonzalez, whose practice of law while suspended was confined to one client matter. Thus, respondent's violation of RPC 5.5(a) could be met with a one-year term of suspension. However, respondent committed additional misconduct by (1) failing to return client documents to Giordano and to refund the fee for legal work on the A.G. Estate matter, (2) failing to cooperate with the OAE's investigation, and (3) failing to file his required R. 1:20-20 affidavit of compliance following his temporary suspension.

Attorneys who violate RPC 1.16(d), even when accompanied by other, non-serious ethics infractions, receive admonitions. See In the Matter of Karim K. Arzadi, DRB 23-169 (October 26, 2023) (admonition for an attorney whose representation was terminated by the client and, thereafter, failed to file either a substitution of counsel or a motion to be relieved as counsel; during the next several months, while the attorney remained counsel of record, the client, who wished to proceed pro se, was unable to pursue settlement negotiations with the opposing party, and the client's lawsuit ultimately was dismissed for failure to prosecute; violations of RPC 1.16(a)(3) (failing to withdraw from the representation despite being discharged by the client) and RPC 1.16(d)), and In

the Matter of Gary S. Lewis, DRB 21-247 (February 18, 2022) (admonition for an attorney who failed to notify his clients of the sale of his law practice to another attorney, thereby depriving his clients of the opportunity to retain other counsel and to retrieve their property and files; violations of RPC 1.15(d) (failing to comply with the recordkeeping requirements of R. 1:21-6) and RPC 1.17(c) (improperly selling a law practice); among other mitigating factors, we weighed that the attorney's sale of his law practice may have resulted from his spouse's emergent medical situation, he cooperated with disciplinary authorities by stipulating to the facts underlying his misconduct, and, in forty-six-years at the bar, he had only one prior admonition, twelve years earlier, for unrelated misconduct).

Attorneys with limited or no disciplinary histories, in default matters, have received reprimands for their failure to file the required R. 1:20-20 affidavit. See, e.g., In re Parisi, 261 N.J. 86 (2025) (the attorney failed to file the required affidavit of compliance following her temporary suspension for failing to cooperate with an OAE investigation; no prior final discipline); In re Hildebrand, 260 N.J. 20 (2025) (the attorney failed to file the required affidavit of compliance following his six-month disciplinary suspension, in connection with a motion for reciprocal discipline; his disciplinary history consisted of only the prior six-month suspension); In re Ashton, 257 N.J. 225 (2024) (the attorney

failed to file the required affidavit of compliance following his disciplinary suspension, in connection with a motion for reciprocal discipline; his disciplinary history consisted of only the prior two-year suspension); In re Cottee, 255 N.J. 439 (2023) (the attorney failed to file the required affidavit of compliance following his disciplinary suspension, in connection with a motion for reciprocal discipline; his disciplinary history consisted of only the prior three-month suspension).

In our view, the totality of respondent's misconduct is most analogous to that of the attorney in Choi, who received a two-year suspension. Like Choi, respondent previously engaged in fraudulent conduct in a matter that resulted in his temporary suspension. Based on respondent's admissions in connection with the OAE's investigation underlying D'Alessandro I – namely, that he failed to pay his state and federal taxes – along with his misconduct in other fraudulent schemes, the OAE petitioned for respondent's temporary suspension from the practice of law. Following the issuance of the Court's Order granting the OAE's petition and temporarily suspending respondent, he was required to cease the practice of law and to file the required affidavit detailing, among other requirements, that he provided notice to his clients that he had been suspended and advise them to seek legal advice elsewhere. However, like Choi, respondent failed to file the required affidavit and failed to notify Giordano that he could

no longer represent him in the J.G. Estate matter. Worse, four months after the effective date of his suspension, he agreed to represent Giordano in the A.G. Estate matter and accepted Giordano's $2,500 payment toward the representation. Thereafter, respondent failed to refund the fee to Giordano after his client terminated the representation. He also improperly deposited the funds in his ABA, in violation of R. 1:20-20(b)(5).[5]

Based on the foregoing disciplinary precedent, Choi in particular, the totality of respondent's misconduct should be met with a long-term suspension. To craft the appropriate discipline in this case, however, we also consider mitigating and aggravating factors.

There are no mitigating factors to consider.

In aggravation, respondent allowed this matter to proceed as a default. "[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, 193 N.J. 332, 342 (2008).

In further aggravation, respondent had a heightened awareness of his obligations under the Rules of Professional Conduct to cooperate with

[5] R. 1:20-20(b)(5) prohibits a suspended attorney from using "any bank accounts or checks on which the attorney's name appears as a lawyer or attorney-at-law or in connection with the words "law office."

disciplinary authorities attempting to address his misconduct. Although his instant misconduct predated the discipline imposed in D'Alessandro I (the Court's final disciplinary Order was filed December 5, 2025) and, thus, principles of progressive discipline are inapplicable, his failure to cooperate with the OAE's investigation in this matter bears a striking resemblance to his refusal to participate in the disciplinary investigation in D'Alessandro I, which resulted in his temporary suspension. In that matter, his failure to cooperate with the OAE commenced in October 2023 and continued through his May 2024 temporary suspension, predating his failure to cooperate in the instant matter.

In our view, respondent's failure to cooperate with two consecutive investigations into his misconduct, as well as his continued practice of law notwithstanding his temporary suspension, evidences a willful disregard of the Rules of Professional Conduct, Court Rules, and Court Orders. Indeed, a suspended attorney's compliance with R. 1:20-20 is a vital component of the disciplinary system's primary purpose – the protection of the public.

Here, respondent's intentional circumvention of the Rule undoubtedly harmed Giordano. He was unaware respondent could no longer provide representation in connection with either estate matter and, regrettably, was duped by respondent into providing him with a $2,500 retainer fee that respondent has refused to refund. Unfortunately, despite Giordano's ethics

grievance against respondent, given respondent's predilection for ignoring the disciplinary system, there is no guarantee that Giordano will ever recover his retainer fees or original estate documents directly from respondent – the very harm R. 1:20-20 seeks to prevent – thus, warranting stern discipline.

**Conclusion**

On balance, consistent with disciplinary precedent and considering the serious aggravating factors, we conclude that a two-year suspension is the appropriate quantum of discipline necessary to protect the public and preserve confidence in the bar.

In addition, as a condition to his discipline, we recommend that, within thirty days of the issuance of the Court's disciplinary Order in this matter, respondent be required to disgorge the $2,500 legal fee he accepted from Giordano in connection with the A.G. Estate matter. Because the record is unclear regarding whether respondent completed legal work in the J.G. Estate matter prior to his May 24, 2024 temporary suspension, we are unable to determine, on this record, whether he should be required to disgorge the $2,500 retainer fee in that matter.

We further determine to require respondent to 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 Edward G. D'Alessandro, Jr.
Docket No. DRB 25-207

Decided: February 26, 2026

Disposition: Two-Year Suspension

| ***Members*** | Two-Year Suspension |
|---|---|
| Cuff | X |
| Boyer | X |
| Campelo | X |
| Hoberman | X |
| Menaker | X |
| Modu | X |
| Petrou | X |
| Rodriguez | X |
| Spencer | X |
| Total: | 9 |

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