

CONNECTICUT BAR EXAMINING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
APRIL 9, 2010

The Chair, Honorable Anne C. Dranginis (Ret.), of Litchfield, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. (EDT). Present were members Earl F. Dewey, II, Eric M. Gross, Karen L. Karpie, Honorable John J. Langebach, Honorable C. Ian McLachlan, Gail McTaggart, David Moraghan, Irving H. Perlmutter, Sharon A. Peters, Denise Martino Phelan, Matthew Wax-Krell and Michael Whelton. Present by invitation were Howard E. Emond, Deputy Director; Kathleen B. Wood, Administrative Director; and Jessica F. Kallipolites, Assistant Administrative Director. Also present was Paul McConnell, Assistant United States Attorney.

The Secretary presented the minutes of the public portions and non-public portions of the meeting of January 29, 2010. Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Mr. Wax-Krell, the minutes of the public portion of the January 29, 2010 meeting were accepted without amendment or correction. Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Mr. Gross, the minutes of the non-public portions of the January 29, 2010 meeting were accepted without amendment or correction.

The sub-committee appointed by the Chair to examine the issue of admission to the Bar of the State of Connecticut upon motion by attorneys seeking admission from states with policies reciprocal with Connecticut reported its recommendations to the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee as to the amendment of the rules of the Superior Court regulating admission to the Bar. Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Ms. Peters, it was voted unanimously to recommend deletion from Section 2-13 (a) the following provision:

“. . .appropriate standing committee on recommendations
for admission . . .”

substituting the following in its place and stead:

“. . .state bar examining committee. . . .”

Upon motion duly made by Judge Dranginis, seconded by Mr. Wax-Krell, it was voted unanimously to recommend deletion from Section 2-13 (a) (2) the words:

“. . .seven . . .”

where the same appears and to substitute the words

“. . .ten. . .”

in their place and stead.

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Ms. Peters, it was voted nine (9) in favor and four (4) opposed to recommend amendment to Section 2-13 (a) (4) by deleting therefrom the following:

“ . . .and to devote the major portion of his or her working time to the practice of law in Connecticut . . . certificates orstanding committee on recommendations for admission to the bar . . .(substituting therefore state bar examining committee)

and further deleting from Section 2-13 (a) (4) the following:

“and a certificate from the state bar examining committee that his or her educational qualifications are such as would entitle the applicant to take the examination in Connecticut or would have entitled the applicant to take the exam in Connecticut at the time of his or her admission to the bar of which the applicant is a member. . .”

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Judge Dranginis, it was voted unanimously to recommend adoption of the proposed definition amendment of Section 2-13 (b), as set forth below, and to incorporate the same in its entirety.

(b) For the purpose of this rule, the “practice of law” shall include the following activities, if performed in a reciprocal jurisdiction after the date of the applicant’s admission to that jurisdiction:

- (1) representation of one or more clients in the practice of law;
- (2) service as a lawyer with a state, federal, or territorial agency, including military service; however, such service for a federal agency, including military service, need not be performed in a reciprocal jurisdiction;
- (3) teaching law at an accredited law school, including supervision of law students within a clinical program;
- (4) service as a judge in a state, federal, or territorial court of record;

(5) service as a judicial law clerk; or

(6) any combination of the above.

Upon motion duly made by Judge Dranginis seconded by Mr. Dewey, it was voted unanimously to recommend deleting from Section 2-13 (c) the following:

“. . .7” . . .and to substitute therefore “ten”; and

to delete from said paragraph the following:

“An attorney so engaged for 5 of the 7 years immediately proceeding the date of application will be deemed to satisfy the threshold requirement of subdivision (a) (2) of this section if such attorney is duly licensed to practice law before the highest court of any state or territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia whether or not such jurisdiction is reciprocal to Connecticut.”

Upon motion duly made by Ms. Peters, seconded by Mr. Dewey, it was voted unanimously to recommend deleting in their entireties Section 2-14 and Section 2-15 of the Rules of the Superior Court regulating admission to the Bar.

No action was taken by the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee as to amending Articles VI-12 and VI-13 of the Regulations of the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee.

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Mr. Wax-Krell, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 3:03 p.m. (EDT).

Respectfully submitted,

IRVING H. PERLMUTTER
Secretary