

CLIENT SECURITY FUND COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING
JULY 24, 2014
14 WEST RIVER STREET
MILFORD, CONNECTICUT

MINUTES

Members Participating:

Judge Douglas S. Lavine
Attorney Patricia R. Beauregard
Mr. Stephen J. Grasso
Attorney John J. Houlihan, Jr.
Judge Alfred J. Jennings, Jr.
Attorney J. Adrian Rebollo
Attorney George L. Smith
Mr. David J. Sullivan, III
Attorney Harry Weller (from II.A)

Staff Present:

Attorney Christopher G. Blanchard
Ms. Nancy Pulito

The meeting commenced at 2:09 p.m.

I. OLD BUSINESS

A.) Minutes of Meeting, May 22, 2014

The minutes of the public meeting of May 22, 2014 were unanimously approved as drafted.

B.) Client Security Fund Fee Credit Card Payments Update

Attorney Blanchard provided an update on the Judicial Branch's efforts to allow online payments of the annual client security fund fee by credit card. The expectation continues to be that a credit card payment option will be made available sometime in the Fall of this year. In the meantime, the Branch has selected a new online payment vendor, and going forward, the client security fund will no longer be charged the monthly fee for maintaining a merchant number required with the prior vendor.

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A.) Payments of the Client Security Fund Fee By Authorized House Counsel – Memorandum from Attorney Christopher G. Blanchard dated May 19, 2014.

The committee considered a memorandum from Attorney Blanchard regarding a recent inquiry from the Judicial Branch's Bar Examining Committee pertaining to the collection of past due client security fund fees from authorized house counsel whose authorization is terminated, but who later reapply for certification. Attorney Blanchard noted that unlike attorneys who retire or resign from the bar, or who are disbarred, the Practice Book is silent as to whether such past due fees can be collected before allowing the authorized house counsel to reapply. He also noted that the issue appears to involve only a few attorneys each year. He suggested that a change to the Practice Book rules could clarify the matter, but given that only a few attorneys are affected, and those attorneys are already required to pay a new application fee in the amount of one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00), the issue does not appear significant enough to seek a rule change at this time. The committee determined that it will not seek a rule change at this time, subject to considering the matter again if developments warrant revisiting the issue.

- B.) Quarterly Report, January – March 2014

The committee took note of the quarterly report of its activities to the Executive Committee of the Superior Court for the first quarter of calendar year 2014.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m., with a meeting to consider matters exempt from F.O.I. and confidential pursuant to Practice Book Section 2-76 following immediately thereafter.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher G. Blanchard
Staff Attorney