

Faulk, Camilla

From: Dave Hanower [dhanower@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2008 1:49 PM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Subject: Proposed Changes to APR Rule 11

To the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Washington,

I understand that the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is considering amendments to Admission to Practice Rule 11 and the regulations thereunder. I would like to comment on the proposed amendment to Regulation 104(e).

I am a member of the Washington State Bar Association, and currently reside in Texas. During my time in Texas, I have attended a number of continuing legal education courses sponsored by local law firms. Those local law firms generally only seek accreditation of their courses with the State Bar of Texas. It seems unnecessarily onerous and burdensome for me to ask those local law firms to go through the process of applying for credit in Washington given the limited number of participants who would seek such credit (in essence, it would require firms to apply for credit in all MCLE states). In past years, I took it upon myself to apply for these courses in Washington, rather than asking the local firms to do so. The current rule imposes a significant and onerous burden on me in that I cannot apply for credit for these sessions as an individual participant. These sessions are an important source in my efforts to satisfy my MCLE requirements in Washington.

I would respectfully request that the Court adopt the proposed amendments to Rule 104(e), and would further request that the Court make whatever additional changes it considers reasonable to facilitate the ability of out-of-state members to satisfy their MCLE requirements in Washington. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

L. David Hanower