

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Linford, Tera](#)
Subject: FW: APR 11 comment
Date: Thursday, March 25, 2021 9:19:23 AM

From: Dennis Beemer [mailto:dennis@beemer-mumma.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 9:12 AM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: APR 11 comment

External Email Warning! This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

After 36 years, this is the first time I have ever felt compelled to comment on the rules governing the practice of law pending before the Court. The proposed amendment to APR 11 is, in my humble opinion, nothing more than political grandstanding. For 36 years the CLE Board has concluded that I have been capable of identifying and taking CLE courses which make me a better attorney and more effective representative for my clients. For 36 years I have maintained the highest ethical standards because I follow the golden rule, and treat others as I would want to be treated myself, with dignity, caring and compassion regardless of race, sexual orientation, etc.. For 36 years I have represented people of color and alternative sexual preferences by providing competent and professional legal services. Generally speaking, I love my clients, and they love me back. Yet the committee contends we are all biased, and must be required to participate in continuing legal education courses intended to enlighten us about our inherent prejudices. Apparently, the committee knows us better than we know ourselves. Unfortunately, the committee applies a broad paint brush stroke to all attorneys in its effort to make a political statement. The committee ignores the fact that well over half its membership opposes this amendment, and yet inexplicably the committee unanimously endorses this rule change. Is the committee's position really reflective of and consistent with the expressed opinions of the professionals whom it is supposed to assist in their practices and effectively represent? I think not. My suggestion is simple. If the committee wishes to make these type of CLE's available to all practitioners as an option, this is perfectly acceptable. However, it is simply not acceptable to conclude that a few bad apples (as exist in every profession) require that every attorney be subjected to mandatory re-education. Finally, why are attorneys being singled out here? Why aren't Physicians, CPA's, Educators, Legislators, etc. required to be re-educated regarding their inherent and unknown biases as part of maintaining their license to practice? The simple answer is because it is expected that professionals will act professionally and without bias. It is unfortunate that the committee assumes that attorneys are the only profession incapable of doing so. I respectfully request the proposed amendment be rejected by the Court, and that this attorney be allowed to continue doing what he does best, which is providing outstanding legal services to ALL

my clients without bias or prejudice. Dennis Beemer WSBA#15222