IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

,

JOSEPH D. LENTO,

Petitioner/Applicant,

V.

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL,

Respondent.

On Application for an Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

LAWRENCE ALAN KATZ
Counsel for Petitioner/Applicant

The Lento Law Group 1814 RT 70 STE 321 Cherry Hill , NJ 08003 P: (856) 652-2000 EXT 497

F: (856) 375-1010

Email: lakatz@lentolawgroup.com

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Petitioner/Applicant, Joseph D. Lento, is an individual to whom the Corporate Disclosure is inapplicable.

To the Honorable Samuel Alito, as Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit:

Pursuant to this Court's Rules 13.5, 22, 30.2, and 30.3, Petitioner/Applicant Joseph D. Lento (Lento) respectfully requests that the time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended for 60 days up to and including April 19, 2025. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court entered its final order on November 19, 2024. (Appendix) Absent an extension of time, the Petition for Writ of Certiorari would be due on February 17, 2025. Counsel has communicated with counsel for Respondent and Respondent will not take any position on this application.

Background

Lento was suspended from the practice of law for five years as a result of a personal crusade against him led by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) attorney Harriet Brumberg. The ODC recommendation to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court (Supreme Court) to suspend Lento contained voluminous factual errors, misrepresentations, and events taken out of context. However, the Supreme Court denied Lento a fundamental right, the opportunity to respond to the distorted factual findings underlying the recommendation for his suspension.

Lento was admitted to practice law in Pennsylvania on October 23, 2008. The ODC alleged that Lento acted unprofessionally with respect to six matters being managed by two firms with which he was associated. On June 3, 2022, the ODC filed a Petition for Discipline against Lento. Lento filed his response on July 18, 2022.

On August 25, 2022, the Disciplinary Board appointed former member Stewart L. Cohen as a special master to conduct hearings. The disciplinary hearing commenced on January 23, 2023, and continued through January 27, 2023. Additional hearings were held on March 6 and 8, 2023.

On September 18, 2023, the Special Master concluded that ODC met its burden as to all rule violations charged in the Petition for Discipline. The Special Master recommended that the Board impose a suspension for four years. On November 7, 2023, Lento filed a Brief on Exceptions and requested oral argument before the Board. Lento requested that the Board either dismiss the Petition for Discipline or, in the alternative, reduce the Special Master's recommended sanction by at least 30 months, which would result in an 18-month or less period of suspension.

On December 19, 2023, ODC requested that the Board adopt the Special Master's recommended discipline of a four-year suspension.

A three-member panel of the Disciplinary Board held oral argument on March 19, 2024. The Disciplinary Board adjudicated this matter at the meeting on April 10, 2024.

On July 1, 2024, the Disciplinary Board issued a 134-page Report and Recommendation to the Supreme Court recommending that Lento be suspended from practicing law in Pennsylvania for five years. The Report contained 503 paragraphs of alleged facts.

After Lento and his disciplinary counsel reviewed the Report, it became immediately apparent that the facts contained in the Report included voluminous falsehoods, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations of the record and hearings. Therefore, on August 27, 2024, Lento filed a motion with the Supreme Court to File a Brief or Supplemental Petition addressing the Details of ODC's Report. This pleading would have addressed and corrected the Report's falsehoods, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations. On September 5, 2024, ODC opposed the motion.

On November 19, 2024, the Supreme Court denied Lento's Motion. Therefore, when considering the ODC's Report and Recommendation, the Supreme Court was unaware that the Report contained falsehoods, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations. On that same date, despite denying Lento the opportunity to respond to the allegations against him and the misleading Report, the Supreme Court suspended Lento for five years from the practice of law.

This Court has recognized, "The essential requirements of due process . . . are notice and an opportunity to respond. The opportunity to present reasons, either in person or in writing, why proposed action should not be taken is a fundamental due process requirement." *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532, 546 (1985). The Supreme Court violated Lento's fundamental due process rights by refusing to allow him to respond to the ODC's Report and Recommendation and the falsehoods, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations contained therein.

Reasons For Granting An Extension Of Time

The time to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be extended for 60 days for the following reasons:

- 1. Petitioner/Applicant's counsel before this Court, Lawrence Alan Katz, is an employee of the Lento Law Group, P.C. (Firm). In December 2024 and January 2025, the Firm saw the sudden and unexpected exodus of several of its attorneys. These attorneys left without notice. The undersigned counsel's caseload tripled within days, with many hearings, documents, and deadlines on the verge of being due. The time required to address these new assignments becoming familiar with the files, meeting the clients, and drafting and filing documents and/or attending unexpected hearings and conferences has made it impossible to provide the attention required to prepare for and draft the Petition for Certiorari.
- 2. Petitioner/Applicant's counsel before this Court, Lawrence Alan Katz, was not involved in any of the proceedings resulting in the ODC's Report and Recommendation. In order to prepare to draft the Petition for Certiorari, he must read the five volumes of hearings, all briefs filed with regard to those hearings, review the voluminous exhibits introduced at the hearings, as well as the 134-page Report with 503 paragraphs of facts. After reviewing this material, undersigned counsel must discuss it with Lento and his prior disciplinary hearing legal team. The circumstances discussed

- in the previous paragraph make performing this review, etc., impossible within the current deadline for filing the Petition.
- 3. Petitioner/Applicant's counsel before this Court, Lawrence Alan Katz, currently has briefs due in the following matters that will take much of the remainder of February and March to draft:
 - a. Kamryn Randle v. Ladel Lewis, et al, Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals,
 CA No. 24-1888, Reply Brief due within the next 10 days.
 - b. Travis Roe v. Clint Redmond, et al, Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, CA No. 24-13588-D, opening brief and appendix due on March 21, 2025.
 - c. Bagnall v. California State University Maritime Academy, et al., Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, CA No. 25-248, opening brief and appendix due on March 26, 2025.
- 4. An extension will not cause prejudice to Respondents, as this Court would likely hear oral argument and issue its opinion in the October 2026 Term regardless of whether an extension is granted.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner/Applicant respectfully requests that the time to file the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended 60 days, up to and including April 19, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Lawrence Alan Katz

LAWRENCE ALAN KATZ
Counsel for Petitioner/Applicant

The Lento Law Group 1814 RT 70 STE 321 Cherry Hill, NJ 08003

P: (856) 652-2000 EXT 497

F: (856) 375-1010

Email: lakatz@lentolawgroup.com