

LAW CORPORATIONS RULES REVISIONS - SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED

November 16, 2009 - January 15, 2010

Member Name	Member #	Law Corp Name	LC #	Date	Comment
1 Jeffrey Dawson	147847	Law Office of Jeffrey S. Dawson, APC	14080	23-Nov	Objection to Rule 3.157. Insult to honest hard working attorneys as well as the public.
2 Dixon Dern	25007	Dixon Q. Dern, P.C.	11520	23-Nov	Former Board Member who has no objection to proposed changes.
3 Doug Chaffee	43920	Chaffee & Marshall	9308	24-Nov	LLCs and LLPs should be permissible practice entities. Rules applicable to PCs should uniformly apply to all of these entities.
4 Ron Oberndorfer	82554	Fischbeck & Oberndorfer	10613	24-Nov	- Objection to Rule 3.158(A) for providing no limitation of liability for guarantors. Purpose of incorporating is to have some insulation from personal liability for acts of others. Proposed security section seems to eliminate that limitation of liability entirely. - Also suggests that "A.P.C." be included with Rule 3.152(B) as a permitted designation of corp existence.
5 Jeff Goodwin	99310	Goodwin Law Corp	12012	24-Nov	In favor of proposed change: Rule 3.157
6 Thomas Martin	108539	Law Offices of Thomas E. Martin, APC	16469	1-Dec	- Does not like wording of Rule 3.156. Do corporations have to apply for renewal every year even if there were no changes to shareholders, articles, etc.? - Does not understand how much E&O coverage is needed per Rule 3.158. Also does not like the fact that State Bar determines policy limits

Yee, Debbie

From: Jeffrey Dawson [jeff@pi-attorney.com]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 11:11 PM
To: Yee, Debbie
Subject: Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to Law Corporation Rules

LC# 14080

I disfavor disbarred members from getting a second chance at the practice through the repurchase of a Law Corp. It is an insult to all honest hard working attorneys as well as the public. Disbarred, you are done in THIS State!!

Jeffrey S. Dawson
LAW OFFICE OF JEFFREY S. DAWSON, APC
9841 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 210
Irvine, Ca 92618
t: (949) 861-2191
f: (949) 861-2190
["www.PI-Attorney.com"](http://www.PI-Attorney.com)

Yee, Debbie

From: Dixon Dern [ddern@dixlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 6:06 PM
To: Yee, Debbie
Subject: RE: Request for Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to State Bar Law Corporation Rules - LC #11520

LC # 11520

Thank you for forwarding this. Based on the attached report as summarized for the Board it seems that nothing adversely affects the operation of Law Corporations. It has been a long time since I was on the Board but it brought back memories to be reading one of those reports again. Best, Dixon Dern

DIXON Q. DERN, P.C.
Attorney, Mediator, Arbitrator
1262 Devon Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Telephone 310-275-2003
Facsimile 310-275-7655
ddern@dixlaw.com
www.dixlaw.com

This e-mail message is confidential and intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, or are not a named recipient please notify the sender at sender's phone number or email address and delete this e-mail. Thank you.

From: The State Bar of California - Member Services Center [mailto:Debbie.Yee@calbar.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 4:57 PM
To: ddera@dixlaw.com
Subject: Request for Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to State Bar Law Corporation Rules - LC #11520

Dear Law Corporation Contact:

The State Bar of California is seeking public comment on proposed changes to its Law Corporation Rules.

The Public comment posting, including the related agenda item and proposed rules, can be found on the following page of our web site:

http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar_generic.jsp?cid=10145&n=96961

The deadline for comment is January 15, 2010. Written comments and inquiries may be directed to:

Debbie Yee
The State Bar of California
Office of Member Services
180 Howard St
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-538-2273 Ph
415-538-2305 Fax

Sincerely,

Yee, Debbie

From: Doug Chaffee [chaffeemar@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 8:37 AM
To: Yee, Debbie
Subject: Comments to proposed rule changes

LC # 9308

LLCs and LLPs should be permissible practice entities. Rules applicable to PCs should uniformly apply to all of these entities.

Thank you. Doug Chaffee.

Yee, Debbie

From: Ron Oberndorfer [rho@lamesalaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 12:27 PM
To: Yee, Debbie
Cc: wbl@cox.net
Subject: Proposed Law Corporation Rules

LC # 10613

Debbie,

I object to 3.158 (A) in that it provides no limitation of liability for the guarantors. See, existing rules IV. B.1.(c). The purpose of incorporating is to have some insulation from personal liability for acts of others. The security section as proposed seems to eliminate that limitation of liability entirely.

A more mundane suggestion is that "A.P.C." be included with Rule 3.152 (B) as a permitted designation of corporate existence.

Thank you,

Ron

Ron H. Oberndorfer
rho@LaMesaLaw.com
www.LaMesaLaw.com
5464 Grossmont Center Drive, Third Floor
La Mesa, California 91942
Telephone: (619) 464-1200

This e-mail message contains confidential information that may also be legally privileged and protected from disclosure. This e-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-2521 and is only intended for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you think you have received this e-mail message in error, please immediately delete it and any attachments from your computer system please notify us at (619) 464-1200.

IRS Circular 230 Notice: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, I inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

Yee, Debbie

From: Jeff Goodwin [jgg@goodwinlawcorp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 2:46 PM
To: Yee, Debbie
Subject: RE: Request for Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to State Bar Law Corporation Rules - LC #12012

LC # 12012

Dear Ms. Yee: I think the proposed rule change is a good idea. If a member is reinstated they should regain all benefits, including repurchase of corporate share. J. Jeffries Goodwin, Esq., Sacramento, CA (916) 929-6000x6

From: The State Bar of California - Member Services Center [mailto:Debbie.Yee@calbar.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 4:57 PM
To: jgg@goodwinlawcorp.com
Subject: Request for Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to State Bar Law Corporation Rules - LC #12012

Dear Law Corporation Contact:

The State Bar of California is seeking public comment on proposed changes to its Law Corporation Rules.

The Public comment posting, including the related agenda item and proposed rules, can be found on the following page of our web site:

http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar_generic.jsp?cid=10145&n=96961

The deadline for comment is January 15, 2010. Written comments and inquiries may be directed to:

Debbie Yee
The State Bar of California
Office of Member Services
180 Howard St
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-538-2273 Ph
415-538-2305 Fax

Sincerely,

- The State Bar of California's Member Services Team

Information from ESET Smart Security, version of virus signature database 4634 (20091124)

The message was checked by ESET Smart Security.

<http://www.eset.com>

Information from ESET Smart Security, version of virus signature database 4634 (20091124)

Yee, Debbie

From: Thomas Martin [tmartin@templaw.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2009 9:05 AM
To: Yee, Debbie
Subject: Public Comment on Proposed Revisions to Law Corporation Rules

4C# 16469

Good morning Ms. Yee. I am not a big fan of the wording Rule 3.156. It almost sounds as if the corporation must apply for renewal every year as opposed to simply having its registration automatically renewed if there were no changes to shareholders, articles of incorporation, etc. As for Rule 3.158, the way it is written I cannot immediately determine how much E&O coverage I need to get for the corporation. I also do not like the fact that it will be the Bar that determines what the policy limits will be as opposed to me.

Have a great day.

Thomas E. Martin
Law Offices of Thomas E. Martin, APC
30211 Avenida De Las Banderas, Suite 200
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
(949) 766-6792 phone
(949) 766-6793 fax
tmartin@templaw.net

This electronic message contains information from the Law Offices of Thomas E. Martin, APC, and is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at (949) 766-6792.