

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

CO-85-2205

OFFICE OF
APPELLATE COURTS
FILED

MAR 9 1987

WAYNE TSCHIMPERLE
CLERK

In Re Petition of the Client
Security Board for Adoption
of Rules and Assessment of
Attorneys.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA:

The Attorney Registration Fee Committee states:

1. The Supreme Court established the Attorney Registration Fee Committee by Court Order and appointed the following persons as members of the Committee:

Sheila Fishman	Richard Malone
Jeffrey Hassan	JoAnne MaGuire
Joseph B. Johnson	Jay Mondry
Elton Kuderer	Felix Phillips
Roger Magnuson	Jerry Simon

2. The Committee, as part of its duties and responsibilities, was charged with reviewing and commenting on the petition of the Client Security Board.

3. As part of the Committee's review, a member attended meetings of the Client Security Board and prepared a report for the Committee, and a mail poll was conducted to obtain the opinions of all Committee members.

4. The results of the mail poll were to be forwarded to the Supreme Court together with any comments of individual members in time for the Court's consideration of the petition.

5. Question 1 of the mail poll asked:

"Do you favor a court-mandated client security system to reimburse clients for the defalcations of their lawyers?"

Of the ten members of the Committee, five members answered "yes", with one of the five stipulating that such a system was preferable to mandatory bonding. Three members answered "no". One member stated he/she would not "quibble about a modest dollar amount."

6. Question 2 of the mail poll asked:

"Assume your answer to Question 1 was yes. Should the fund be financed from the attorney registration fee?"

Of the ten members of the Committee, seven answered "yes" and two answered "no."

7. Question 3 of the mail poll asked:

"Assume your answers to Questions 1 and 2 were yes. Do you support the one-time \$100 assessment system proposed by the Client Security Board?"

Of the ten members of the Committee, six answered "yes" and four answered "no." One member answering "no" added that the \$100 amount was excessive. Another member answering "no" stated that the assessment should be unlimited, not one-time, as would be needed as claims are paid.

Dated: March 6, 1987

Respectfully submitted,



M. L. Proctor, for the Committee
Attorney No. 88523
345 St. Peter, #800
St. Paul, MN 55102
(612) 297-6400