

February, months after her original request for approval of additional fees. As such, without searching court inquiry, "this \$1,100 would have been paid without anyone knowing the difference." Order on Guardian's Third Motion for Reconsideration at 5 (Index #60). Again, this matter, at best, reflects poorly on Ms. Marino's bookkeeping acuity and at worst, reflects a certain inability or unwillingness to be forthright.

In sum, the undersigned is significantly bothered and deeply concerned by the events that unfolded in the J.L. guardianship. I accept, as I must, the Probate Division's multiple findings that Ms. Marino violated numerous court rules, an administrative order specifically pertaining to professional guardians, and NGA Standards. However, for purposes of recommending a sanction, I find no factors in mitigation as these were serious financial offenses that can only be explained as either significant lapses of professional competence, or, a more sinister pattern of intentionally enriching herself and others from the limited resources of her ward.

C) Other Instances of Questionable Professional Judgment

Although the undersigned was charged with evaluating and recommending a proper sanction for the Probate Division's findings in M.P. and J.L., it was agreed by Ms. Marino and her counsel that I, with assistance of staff, could inquire from other probate divisions about instances where Ms. Marino may have been removed or otherwise sanctioned as guardian. As already mentioned, although only a rather cursory and limited review was conducted, and as such, the notes below should not be considered conclusive or exhaustive in scope, I find the following instances of concern.

i) Guardianship of W.R.

This matter involves a developmentally disabled gentleman who became ill and