

State of New York  
Supreme Court, Appellate Division  
Third Judicial Department

Decided and Entered: August 5, 2021

PM-103-21

---

In the Matter of ATTORNEYS  
IN VIOLATION OF JUDICIARY  
LAW § 468-a.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE  
FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL  
DEPARTMENT,

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER  
ON MOTION

Petitioner;

NORMAN ANTHONY ROBERTS II,  
Respondent.

(Attorney Registration No. 2833945)

---

Calendar Date: June 21, 2021

Before: Garry, P.J., Clark, Aarons, Pritzker and Reynolds  
Fitzgerald, JJ.

---

Monica A. Duffy, Attorney Grievance Committee for the  
Third Judicial Department, Albany, for Attorney Grievance  
Committee for the Third Judicial Department.

Norman Anthony Roberts II, Fairfield, Connecticut,  
respondent pro se.

---

Per Curiam.

Respondent was admitted to practice by this Court in 1997  
and is also admitted in Connecticut, where he resides and  
maintains a law practice. Respondent was suspended from the  
practice of law in New York by May 2019 order of this Court for

conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice arising from his noncompliance with the attorney registration requirements of Judiciary Law § 468-a and Rules of the Chief Administrator of the Courts (22 NYCRR) § 118.1 from 2015 onward (Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a, 172 AD3d 1706, 1749 [2019]; see Judiciary Law § 468-a [5]; Rules of Professional Conduct [22 NYCRR 1200.0] rule 8.4 [d]). Upon curing his registration delinquency in November 2019, respondent has now moved, by application marked returnable on June 21, 2021, for his reinstatement. The Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department (hereinafter AGC) opposes the motion by correspondence from its Chief Attorney.<sup>1</sup>

The records of the Office of Court Administration indicate that, despite previously curing his attorney registration delinquency, respondent has once again fallen delinquent, having failed to timely register for the current biennial period beginning in February 2021 (see Rules of the Chief Admin of Cts [22 NYCRR] § 118.1 [c]). Respondent therefore cannot establish his entitlement to reinstatement and his motion must be denied (see Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a [Kabasinga], 152 AD3d 952, 953 [2017]; Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a [Ostroskey], 151 AD3d 1377, 1378 [2017]; Matter of Attorneys in Violation of Judiciary Law § 468-a [Harris], 151 AD3d 1373, 1374 [2017]).

Garry, P.J., Clark, Aarons, Pritzker and Reynolds  
Fitzgerald, J.J., concur.

---

<sup>1</sup> Finding no open claims, the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection advises that it does not oppose respondent's reinstatement application.

ORDERED that respondent's motion is denied.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert D. Mayberger". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "R" and "M".

Robert D. Mayberger  
Clerk of the Court