

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

v.

NOAM JAY COHEN,

Respondent.

Supreme Court Case No.

The Florida Bar File
No. 2025-70,043(11H)

CONDITIONAL GUILTY PLEA FOR CONSENT JUDGMENT

The undersigned respondent, Noam Jay Cohen, files this Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment under R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.9.

1. Respondent is, and at all times relevant to this matter was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida and the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

2. Respondent is acting freely and voluntarily in this matter and tenders this plea without fear or threat of coercion. Respondent is represented in this matter.

3. As to Florida Bar File No. 2025-70,043 (11H), there has been a finding of probable cause by the Grievance Committee.

4. The disciplinary measures to be imposed on respondent are:

EXHIBIT
A

Suspension from the practice of law for ninety (90) days, effective 30 days from the date of the Supreme Court of Florida's order approving the consent judgment so that respondent can close out respondent's practice and protect the interests of existing clients.

A. On entry of the Court's order, respondent must immediately:

- 1. accept no new clients from the date of the order;**
- 2. initiate no litigation on behalf of clients from the date of the order; and**
- 3. provide a copy of the suspension order to all courts, tribunals, or adjudicative agencies before which respondent is counsel of record; all state, federal, or administrative bars of which the respondent is a member; all clients; all co-counsel; and all opposing counsel, as required by Rule 3-5.1(h);**

B. Within 30 days from the date of the Court's order, respondent must:

- 1. cease all practice of law in Florida;**
- 2. cease holding respondent out as a Florida Bar member or lawyer and eliminate all indicia of respondent's status as a Florida Bar member or lawyer on websites, social media, telephone listings, stationery, checks, business cards, office signs, email address, and any other indicia of respondent's status as a Florida Bar member or lawyer;**
- 3. wind down all pending matters;**
- 4. cease withdrawing or disbursing any money from any trust account or other financial institution**

account holding funds of clients or third parties in respondent's possession in connection with legal representation;

5. not transfer any ownership of any real or personal property purchased in whole or in part with funds of clients or third parties in connection with legal representation; and
6. provide the bar's headquarters office in Tallahassee with an affidavit listing all of the following that respondent notified of the suspension order: all courts, tribunals, or adjudicative agencies of which respondent is a member; all state, federal, or administrative bars of which respondent is a member; all clients; all co-counsel; and all opposing counsel.

C. Respondent must fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-5.1(h).

D. Respondent must also fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-6.1, if applicable.

E. Respondent must attend the Professionalism Workshop in person where scheduled by the bar within 6 months of the order approving this consent judgment and pay associated fees totaling \$750.00 before attendance.

F. Payment of the bar's disciplinary costs in this proceeding.

5. The following allegations and rules provide the basis for respondent's guilty plea and for the discipline to be imposed in this matter:

A. Respondent sought to collect a judgment from garnishee's bank account on behalf of a client. Donte Cox, the individual whose funds were

the subject of the garnishment (“Garnishee”), acting pro-se, filed a claim of exemption for the bank account garnishment. Days later, respondent filed a claim for wage garnishment. Garnishee did not file a second claim of exemption. By failing to file the second claim of exemption timely, garnishee waived his right to request an exemption.

B. Respondent contacted garnishee by phone and obtained information that overcame garnishee's claim of exemption for the bank account garnishment. However, it appears respondent did not subpoena the garnishee's banking or tax records after receiving that information; nor did he have a witness present for the phone call to serve as an impeachment witness.

C. Respondent believed that he did not carry the burden of proof for the exemption hearing, therefore he did not seek to obtain that impeachment evidence.

D. On June 17, 2024, respondent appeared at a zoom hearing to evaluate garnishee's claim of exemption for the funds in his bank account. Garnishee appeared pro-se and demonstrated a general lack of knowledge of both court proceedings and the law relevant to his claim of exemption. Garnishee carried the burden of proof to sustain his claim of exemption.

E. At the hearing, respondent began questioning garnishee and was immediately frustrated with garnishee's responses, challenging them as untruthful when compared to garnishee's earlier statements to respondent.

F. However, respondent presented no impeachment testimony or documents, and garnishee's responses to respondent's questions failed to garner the evidence respondent needed to overcome the claim of exemption. Ergo, Judge Green orally granted garnishee's claim of exemption for the bank account, finding that respondent failed to develop evidence that overcame garnishee's affidavit.

G. Respondent then accused the judge of bias towards the garnishee while they were still on the record, prompting Judge Green to disconnect the zoom hearing. Judge Green referred the matter to the professionalism panel the same day.

H. On June 18, 2024, Judge Green issued a written order granting a claim of exemption for both the bank account and the garnishee's wages, and asserting that same was agreed to by the parties at the hearing. However, this was not an accurate reflection of what occurred at the hearing, and no such agreement was in place.

I. The same day, on June 18, 2024, respondent then sought rehearing and for the judge to be recused, accusing her of bias towards garnishee and ignorance of the precedent or applicable legal standards. The judge struck that motion for a procedural deficiency.

J. Respondent corrected the procedural error and filed the same motion, with the same allegations of bias and ignorance, two days later. Judge Green recused herself and Judge Gibson was assigned the matter.

K. Respondent filed a motion for final judgment in garnishment for garnishee's wages. This motion was in apparent contradiction of Judge Green's June 18 order, which extended protection to garnishee's bank account and wages.

L. Respondent admitted in the instant disciplinary proceedings that he failed to read the June 18, 2024 order in its entirety and was not aware of the provision alleging an agreement to extend the exemption to both garnishments. Accordingly, he failed to bring the error to Judge Green's attention, or to file an appropriate motion to amend the order.

M. As such, respondent states he did not intend to mislead the successor judge, but rather believed he was moving to enforce the provisions of Judge Green's order when he filed his motion for final judgment.

N. Respondent was ultimately granted the ability to garnish the tax-refund portion of garnishee's bank account funds and his wages, while Judge Gibson granted the Claim of Exemption to the *de minimis* portion of funds that was eligible for exemption.

O. Based on the foregoing, respondent has violated Rules 4-1.3 (Diligence), 4-8.2(a) (Impugning Qualifications and Integrity of Judges or Other Officers), 4-8.4(d) (A lawyer shall not engage in conduct in connection with the practice of law that is prejudicial to the Administration of Justice).

6. In mitigation, respondent has demonstrated a positive reputation in his faith community for strong character [3.3(b)(7)].

7. In aggravation, respondent has engaged in a pattern of misconduct, as demonstrated by prior contacts with the bar and the referring judge's comments to the bar [3.2(b)(3)]. Throughout the proceedings, respondent refused to acknowledge the wrongful nature of the conduct during the first garnishment exemption hearing and in his motions for recusal, focusing instead on the judge's alleged bias and incorrect application of the law [3.2(b)(7)]. The victim in the matter was an unrepresented and uneducated low-income individual who was vulnerable during the proceedings [3.2(b)(8)]. Respondent's twenty-five-year career

and extensive experience in this specific area of the law constitutes substantial experience in the practice of law, and he was therefore aware that there were alternative, ethical means of accomplishing his client's goals without impugning the integrity of the judiciary or intimidating the opposing party [3.2(b)(9)]. Moreover, Judge Green stated that respondent's conduct in her courtroom is frequently harsh and aggressive towards pro-se debtors, and she is concerned that his conduct scares individuals such that they do not want to appear in court.

8. The Florida Bar has approved this proposed plea as required by R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.9.

9. If this plea is not finally approved by the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar and the Supreme Court of Florida, then it has no effect and may not be used by the parties in any way.

10. If this plea is approved, respondent agrees to pay all reasonable costs associated with this case under Rule 3-7.6(q) in the amount of \$1,250.00. These costs are due within 30 days of the court order. Respondent agrees that if the costs are not paid within 30 days of this court's order becoming final, respondent will pay interest on any unpaid costs at the statutory rate. Respondent further agrees these disciplinary costs are not dischargeable in any future proceedings, including, but not

limited to, a petition for bankruptcy. Respondent will be delinquent and ineligible to practice law if respondent does not satisfy the cost judgment within 30 days of this order, unless The Florida Bar Board of Governors defers payment under R. Regulating Fla. Bar 1-3.6.

11. Respondent acknowledges the obligation to pay the costs of this proceeding, and that payment is evidence of strict compliance with the conditions of any disciplinary order or agreement and is evidence of good faith and fiscal responsibility.

12. This Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment fully complies with all requirements of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

Dated this 10th day of October, 2025.



Noam Jay Cohen, Respondent
11900 Biscayne Blvd Ste 502
Miami, FL 33181-2749
(305) 341-3545
Florida Bar No. 271240
noamc@noamjcohenpa.com

Dated this 11th day of December, 2025.



Amanda Harris, Bar Counsel
Miami Branch Office
The Florida Bar
Ste. M100, Rivergate Plaza
444 Brickell Ave.
Miami FL, 33131
(305) 377-4445
Florida Bar No. 69025
aharris@floridabar.org

Filed with the Supreme Court of Florida via the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal with copies served via the Portal to:

Amanda Harris, Bar Counsel, The Florida Bar; aharris@floridabar.org
Patricia Ann Toro Savitz, Staff Counsel; psavitz@floridabar.org
Noam Jay Cohen, Respondent; noamc@noamjcohenpa.com

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

v.

NOAM JAY COHEN,

Respondent.

Supreme Court Case
No.

The Florida Bar File
No. 2025-70,043(11H)

STIPULATION TO ENTRY OF AGREED ORDER

The Florida Bar and Noam Jay Cohen, stipulate to the entry of the attached order in this case, subject to the approval of the Supreme Court of Florida and state:

Respondent is and, at all times relevant to this matter was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida.

Respondent is simultaneously tendering a conditional guilty plea under an agreement with The Florida Bar for a consent judgment.

If the conditional guilty plea is approved, respondent agrees to the terms and conditions in the agreed consent judgment and attached order.

It is therefore stipulated by The Florida Bar and respondent that the attached order should be entered on approval of the Supreme Court of Florida.

Dated this 10th day of October, 2025.



Noam Jay Cohen, Respondent
11900 Biscayne Blvd., Ste 502
Miami, FL 33181-2749
(305) 341-3545
Florida Bar No. 271240
noamc@noamjcohenpa.com

Dated this 11th day of December, 2025.

Approved by:



Amanda Harris, Bar Counsel
Miami Branch Office - The Florida Bar
Ste. M100, Rivergate Plaza
444 Brickell Ave.
Miami FL, 33131
(305) 377-4445
Florida Bar No. 69025
aharris@floridabar.org

Supreme Court of Florida

DATE

The Florida Bar,

Complainant

v.

Noam Jay Cohen,

Respondent

Lower Tribunal No(s).:
2025-70,043(11H)

The Court hereby approves the conditional guilty plea and consent judgment for discipline under the stipulated terms below.

Stipulation

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for ninety (90) days, effective 30 days from the date of this order so that respondent can close out respondent's practice and protect the interests of existing clients. If respondent notifies this Court in writing that respondent is no longer practicing and does not need the 30 days to protect existing clients, this Court will enter an order making the suspension effective immediately. Respondent must fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-5.1(h). Respondent must also fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-6.1, if applicable.

A. Respondent must immediately:

1. accept no new clients from the date of the order;
2. initiate no litigation on behalf of clients from the date of the order; and
3. provide a copy of the suspension order to all courts, tribunals, or adjudicative agencies before which respondent is counsel of record; all state, federal, or administrative bars of

CASE NO.:

Page 2

which respondent is a member; all clients; all co-counsel; and all opposing counsel, as required by Rule 3-5.1(h).

B. Respondent must within 30 days from the date of this order:

1. cease all practice of law in Florida;
2. cease holding respondent out as a Florida Bar member or lawyer and eliminate all indicia of respondent's status as a Florida Bar member or lawyer on websites, social media, telephone listings, stationery, checks, business cards, office signs, email address, and any other indicia of respondent's status as a Florida Bar member or lawyer;
3. wind down all pending matters;
4. cease withdrawing or disbursing any money from any trust account or other financial institution account holding funds of clients or third parties in respondent's possession in connection with legal representation;
5. not transfer any ownership of any real or personal property purchased in whole or in part with funds of clients or third parties in connection with legal representation; and
6. provide the bar's headquarters office in Tallahassee with an affidavit listing all of the following that respondent notified of the suspension order: all courts, tribunals, or adjudicative agencies of which respondent is a member; all state, federal, or administrative bars of which respondent is a member; all clients; all co-counsel; and all opposing counsel.

C. Respondent must attend the Professionalism Workshop in person where scheduled by the bar within 6 months of the date of this order. Respondent must pay all associated fees and costs before attendance.

D. Payment of the bar's disciplinary costs in this proceeding.

CASE NO.:

Page 3

Respondent is further directed to comply with all other terms and conditions set forth in the consent judgment.

Judgment is entered for The Florida Bar, 651 East Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300, for recovery of costs from Noam Jay Cohen in the amount of \$1,250.00, for which sum let execution issue. These disciplinary costs are not dischargeable in any future proceedings, including, but not limited to, a petition for bankruptcy. Respondent will be delinquent and ineligible to practice law if respondent does not satisfy the cost judgment within 30 days of this order, unless The Florida Bar Board of Governors defers payment.

MUÑIZ, C.J., and CANADY, LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.

A True Copy

Test:

Served:

AMANDA HARRIS

PATRICIA ANN TORO SAVITZ

DONALD A. SMITH, JR.