



Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE)

State of Connecticut Judicial Branch

CO-CHAIRS:
Hon. Elliot N. Solomon
Frederic S. Ury, Esq.

MEMBERS:
Hon. Elizabeth A. Bozzuto, Hon. William H. Bright
Hon. Bernadette Conway, Lawrence F. Morizio, Esq.
Rosemarie Paine, Esq., Louis R. Pepe, Esq.

**COUNSEL TO
COMMISSION:**
Michael P. Bowler, Esq.

Minutes of the Meeting Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education March 2, 2017

On March 2, 2017, the Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education (“Commission”) met by telephone conference call from 9:04 a.m. until 9:36 a.m. A meeting space for members of the public was provided at 100 Washington Street in Hartford.

Members in attendance were:

Attorney Frederic S. Ury, co-chair
Hon. William H. Bright
Attorney Lawrence F. Morizio
Attorney Rosemarie Paine
Attorney Louis R. Pepe

Also in attendance were Attorneys Michael P. Bowler, Cathy A. Dowd, and Kerry J. O’Connell Counsel to the Commission, and Attorney Joseph Del Ciampo, Deputy Director of Legal Services.

- I. The Commission reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 2, 2017 meeting. Attorney Paine abstained.
- II. The Commission discussed completed and upcoming MCLE seminars.
- III. The Commission reviewed requests for opinions from Attorneys Kristen Brandt and John Cizik whether teaching classes on legal subjects to undergraduate college students qualifies for MCLE credit. The Commission further reviewed a memorandum from Attorney Elizabeth Rowe, Counsel to the Commission, regarding responses on the subject received from the National Organization of Bar Counsel Listserv. The Commission determined that such activity does not qualify for MCLE credit. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel’s signature without additional review by the full Commission. Finally, in light

287 Main Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 2, East Hartford, CT 06118-1885

Website: www.jud.ct.gov/Committees/ContinuingLegalEducation

E-mail: mcle@jud.ct.gov

of this request and numerous others of a similar nature, the Commission decided to prepare an FAQ on the subject.

- IV. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Shari Murphy whether teaching undergraduate students ABA-accredited paralegal and pre-law studies courses qualifies for MCLE credit. The Commission determined that such activity does not qualify for MCLE credit. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.
- V. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Christian Moran whether an attorney who serves as a full time special master for the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Compensation Program is exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission determined that the position is not exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.
- VI. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Ronald Blake whether an attorney who works for the Board of Veterans' Appeals and drafts opinions for the BVA Board regarding veterans' claims is exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission determined that the position is not exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.
- VII. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Randy Cohen whether State of Connecticut Workers' Compensation Commissioners are exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission determined, with Attorney Morizio dissenting, that Connecticut Workers Compensation Commissioners are not exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission. Finally, in light of this request and numerous others of a similar nature from attorneys in adjudicative positions, the Commission decided to prepare an FAQ on the subject.
- VIII. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Larry Marshall Wentworth whether an attorney who serves as a justice of the Supreme Court of The Federated States of Micronesia is exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission determined that the position is not exempt from the MCLE requirement. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion

287 Main Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 2, East Hartford, CT 06118-1885

Website: www.jud.ct.gov/Committees/ContinuingLegalEducation

E-mail: mcle@jud.ct.gov

online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.

- IX. The Commission reviewed a request for an opinion from Attorney Tom S. Ward whether teaching legal seminars to licensed real estate brokers by attorneys certified to do so by the Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection qualifies for MCLE credit. The Commission determined that such activity does not qualify for MCLE credit. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.
- X. Counsel updated the Commission on questions that have been answered by Counsel since the February meeting.
- XI. The Commission adjourned at 9:36 a.m. after confirming that the next meeting of the Commission would be Thursday, April 6, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. via conference call.