

Pro Se Applications - Requirements of New Jersey "Attorney of Record"

Directive #12-82

December 1, 1982
Issued by: Stephen W. Townsend, Clerk
Supreme Court

The Supreme Court recently entertained a motion by a *pro se* seeking to have a New York attorney admitted *pro hac vice* to represent her. A similar motion has been granted in the Appellate Division. No New Jersey attorney ever participated in the matter.

The Court has reviewed this procedure and has directed me to advise you that you may continue to entertain *pro se* motions of this type. Once the motion is granted, however, a New Jersey attorney must become the attorney of record so as to be responsible for the actions of the out-of-state attorney.

I would suggest that any *pro se* making an application of this type should be advised prior to court action on it that a New Jersey attorney will ultimately be required if the *pro hac* motion is granted. The *pro se* may not continue to serve as the "New Jersey attorney" of record after the grant of a *pro hac vice* application. (See, *R. 1:21-2*.)

EDITOR-S NOTE

This document originated as an inter office memorandum from the Clerk of the Supreme Court to the Clerk of the Appellate Division.

Since it is applicable to all courts, the then-Presiding Judge of the Appellate Division, Hon. Herman D. Michels, and John Musewicz, Appellate Administrator, recommended that it be issued as a directive to all divisions of Superior Court.

The only change has been the deletion of the footnote explaining that *State v. Genevieve Berger*, No. A-1755-81 (App. Div. September 4, 1982), an unreported case, generated this review of *pro hac vice* motions.