

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 1000 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
: :  
THOMAS JOSEPH COLEMAN, III : No. 98 DB 2003  
: :  
: :  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : Attorney Registration No. 58607

ORDER

PER CURIAM:

AND NOW, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendations of the Disciplinary Board dated April 15, 2011, the Petition for Reinstatement is granted.

Pursuant to Rule 218(f), Pa.R.D.E., petitioner is directed to pay the expenses incurred by the Board in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement.

A True Copy Patricia Nicola  
As Of 7/6/2011

Attest:   
Chief Clerk  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of : No. 1000 Disciplinary Docket No. 3  
: :  
: No. 98 DB 2003  
THOMAS JOSEPH COLEMAN, III : :  
: Attorney Registration No. 58607  
: :  
PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT : (Out of State)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUSTICES  
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Pursuant to Rule 218(c)(5) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above captioned Petition for Reinstatement.

I. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

By Order of April 19, 2005, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania suspended Thomas Joseph Coleman, III for a period of two years. Mr. Coleman filed a Petition for Reinstatement on June 1, 2010. Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed a Response to Petition on August 5, 2010 and does not oppose the reinstatement.

A reinstatement hearing was held on September 23, 2010 before a District II Hearing Committee comprised of Chair Daniel J. Donohue, Esquire, and Members Christopher M. Jamison, Esquire, and Stephanie L. Wills, Esquire. Petitioner appeared pro se.

The Hearing Committee filed a Report on December 20, 2010 and recommended that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted.

This matter was adjudicated by the Disciplinary Board at the meeting on January 19, 2011.

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings of fact:

1. Petitioner is Thomas Joseph Coleman, III. He was born in 1963 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1990. His attorney registration mailing address is 325 New Albany Road, Moorestown NJ 08057. Petitioner is subject to the jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.
2. On April 19, 2005, Petitioner was suspended from the practice of law in Pennsylvania for a period of two years as a result of his unauthorized practice of law while on inactive status.
3. The underlying misconduct consisted of Petitioner signing hundreds of mortgage foreclosure pleadings when he was not licensed to do so. Petitioner had been placed on inactive status by the Supreme Court and knew he was ineligible to practice law as a result of his failure to comply with Continuing Legal Education requirements and failure to pay yearly registration fees to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

4. Petitioner was admitted to the bar in New Jersey in 1990 and has maintained an uninterrupted practice of law in that State since his admission. He is a partner in the law firm of Raymond Coleman & Heinold, LLP, located in Moorestown, New Jersey.

5. As a result of the two year suspension in Pennsylvania, Petitioner received a public reprimand from the Supreme Court of New Jersey. He was also suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for two years as a result of reciprocal discipline. He remains suspended in that jurisdiction.

6. Petitioner expressed remorse and has accepted full responsibility for his actions. He realizes his actions were wrong. He feels fortunate to be able to practice law and wants the opportunity to once again practice in Pennsylvania.

7. Petitioner fulfilled the necessary CLE requirements for reinstatement.

8. Petitioner submitted two letters of support that assert that Petitioner possesses the requisite moral character, professionalism and competency for readmission to the Pennsylvania Bar.

9. Office of Disciplinary Counsel does not oppose Petitioner's request for readmission.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Petitioner has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that he possesses the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law for reinstatement to practice law in the Commonwealth. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

2. Petitioner has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that his readmission to the bar will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or to the administration of justice nor subversive of the public interest. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3).

IV. DISCUSSION

Petitioner seeks readmission to the bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania following his suspension for two years for the unauthorized practice of law. Pa.R.D.E. 218(c)(3) provides that Petitioner bears the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that he has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission and that his resumption of practice will be neither detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar nor subversive of the public interest.

Since his suspension Petitioner has continued his successful practice of law in New Jersey, where he received a public reprimand but no interruption of his practice for his misconduct in Pennsylvania. Although Petitioner was eligible for reinstatement in 2007, he did not seek readmission until 2010.

Petitioner presented two letters of support that indicate he is a morally qualified and competent individual. Petitioner testified on his own behalf and demonstrated sincere remorse for his wrongdoing, as well as acceptance of responsibility. He has not had any further disciplinary actions in Pennsylvania or New Jersey and has fulfilled his CLE credits required for readmission.

For these reasons, the Board recommends that Petitioner be reinstated to the bar in Pennsylvania.


V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that Petitioner, Thomas Joseph Coleman, III, be reinstated to the practice of law.

The Board further recommends that, pursuant to Rule 218(f), Pa.R.D.E., Petitioner be directed to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the investigation and processing of the Petition for Reinstatement.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By:   
Gerald Lawrence, Board Member

Date: April 15, 2011

Board Member Todd did not participate in the adjudication.