
From: Silverman, Robert <RSilverman@weitzlux.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2015 10:52 AM
To: Comments Mailbox
Subject: Report of Special Committee on Attorney Ethics and Admissions - Admission by Motion

Glenn A. Grant, JAD

I am writing on behalf of myself and several attorney at this office **in full support of Admission by Motion**. I am a lifelong resident of New Jersey and I have actively practiced law in New Jersey since 1977. I am also admitted to practice in Pennsylvania, the District Court of New Jersey and the District Court of The Eastern District of PA. I have been required to seek *pro hac* admission in other jurisdictions, including Delaware, Indiana and Illinois. I have been prevented from representing clients in New York, despite its geographical proximity. Other attorneys listed below from this office have in the past been admitted to practice in other jurisdictions by traditional means and some must limit themselves to matters outside New Jersey.

We believe that the time has come for New Jersey to move into the 21st century and **allow for Admission by Motion** as do 42 other states. New Jersey was thought to be a forward looking state and should not be mired in an admission system of the past which is based solely on the parochial interests of a small group attorneys. We would like to add the following specific comments to this discussion.

1. The only actual argument in opposition to Admission by Motion is the asserted economic protection of a small number of New Jersey attorneys who limit their practice to the New Jersey Courts and who are concerned about a the alleged but unsubstantiated effects of Admission by Motion upon them. The statistics contained in the Report show that almost 75% of attorneys admitted in New Jersey also have admissions in other jurisdictions, through traditional means.
2. The current system is anathema to firms which seek to establish and/or pursue a regional/national practice from a New Jersey office.
3. Admission by Motion would enable firms seeking a regional/national practice to do so more readily and increase the economic benefit to the New Jersey legal community in general. We have been hampered in adding additional attorneys to work in our New Jersey office who we believe fit our practice model but who are not currently admitted in New Jersey and who must take the bar examination late in their careers, without guarantee of success.
4. Our New Jersey attorneys have been prevented from representing our clients in some other jurisdictions, due to New Jersey's unwillingness to adopt Admission by Motion and the accompanying reciprocity it brings with it.
5. In addition, a multi-jurisdictional firms such as ours, is restricted in bringing our full array of attorneys, talents and services to all of our clients where and as needed.
6. Concern for the number of attorneys admitted in New Jersey is not an actual reason to prevent Admission by Motion, since nothing can be done about this number when it comes to attorneys who are admitted after taking the bar examination. Is there some artificial limit on the number of attorneys New Jersey is willing accommodate? Since I joined the bar in 1977, the number of attorneys has continued to increase year after year, and will continue to do. This has engendered additional competition for business and the same issues which now concern the opponents. We cannot take a position with regard to Admission by Motion on a protectionist basis alone.
7. The suggestion by opponents that we need to "proceed slowly and deliberately" is without merit, since as indicated in the Report this issue has been under consideration since 1983. The so called reasons espoused by the opposition will never go away, no matter how long we wait. Certainly not in three years as suggested. "Justice delayed is justice denied."

Joining in these comments are:

Leonard Feldman, Esq. (ID # - 031661999)

Jerry Krystal, Esq.

Kevin Mulderig, Esq. (ID # - 0291311986)

John Broaddus, Esq.

Mary Gaffney, Esq. (ID # - 034992002)

F. Alexander Eiden (ID # - 040332011)

Robert M. Silverman

Attorney at Law

WEITZ & LUXENBERG

200 Lake Drive East

Suite 205

Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

NEW JERSEY attorney ID # - 021571977

☎ office: (856) 406-3977

☎ fax: (856) 755-1995

☎ cell: (609) 206-9087

✉ email: rsilverman@weitzlux.com

Please visit us at <http://www.weitzlux.com>

[Like us on Facebook](#)

[Follow us on Twitter](#)

[Add us on Google +](#)

[Connect with us on LinkedIn](#)

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or by replying to the message and deleting it and all of its attachments from your computer. Thank you. Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C.

Every effort is made to keep our network free from viruses. You should, however, review this e-mail message, as well as any attachment thereto, for viruses. We take no responsibility and have no liability for any computer virus which may be transferred via this e-mail message.

All e-mails sent to Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C. or any individuals at Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C. are carefully scanned for viruses and content. The sender should have no expectation of privacy in said transmission.

In the course of scanning all incoming e-mails to W & L, virus scanning software may block the e-mail and prevent it from being delivered. Neither the intended recipient nor the sender will receive notice that their transmission has been blocked.

All e-mail to W & L or any individuals at W & L should be followed up by hard copy including attachment(s), as specific file types may be blocked at any time without notice being provided to sender or recipient.
