#002

From: Larry Freeman <larry.freeman@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 12:44 PM
To: Comments Mailbox
Subject: Admission by Motion

I send this email to urge the Supreme Court to allow New Jersey to join the other states that allow admission by motion. I've been a practicing attorney in Connecticut for 11 years. In 2012, for a variety of reasons, our family decided to relocate to my wife's hometown of Shrewsbury. We love our home, our community, our schools and just about every other aspect of living. However, as a 42 year old father of 2 young children who had to continue to work full-time, studying for the bar exam again was a nightmare. Fortunately, I had a very supportive family and an understanding employer and I am proud to say I passed. However, someone in my position should never be forced to "start from scratch" like I had to. In my opinion, it is an affront to the Constitutional ideals of free commerce, privileges and immunities and full faith and credit. And yes, I realize the practice of law is a privilege and not a right. But when almost every other profession is able to move freely about and my chosen profession treats me like a law school graduate and disregards my eleven years of experience.... quite frankly, it is not a very warm welcome from the legal community of the state.

As I write this letter, I am still looking for a new job in New Jersey as I have been commuting back & forth from Connecticut for almost two years. This has been an enormous expense and it would surely have been avoided if I could have found a New Jersey attorney's position prior to my move or shortly after. Our family made the decision to move fairly quickly once certain events took place so I did not have the option of lining everything up before the move. And deciding to study for the bar all over again and all the sacrifices that entails is a decision I struggled over. I made the correct decision, but it should not have been such a difficult decision.

It should be noted the test I studied endless hours for does not even address New Jersey law or procedure. This makes it all the more confounding to me and renders the justification of "protecting the public" completely moot. I agree that attorneys should be "studied in New Jersey law" and be familiar with its procedures, but after having taken the bar, I'm no closer to that aspiration.

It would be in my best interests to oppose Admission by Motion. After all, I have already been sworn in and I know an influx of out-of-state attorneys would come into the State and make it even harder for me to find a job given my background as a residential real estate attorney. But I would be a hypocrite if I disregarded all the frustration, sacrifice and hardship I endured a few short months ago. Yes, there will be more attorneys looking for more jobs. It will present challenges to our profession, to be sure. But I say with all due respect that the alternative appears to be naked economic protectionism, and that is something that this great state and great country should never countenance. It is hard to escape the conclusion that protectionism is the true motivation behind opposing Admission by Motion. An experienced attorney who has a lot to offer and whose record is without blemish should not be made to suffer on that basis. Likewise, if said attorney had to leave New Jersey due to his or her spouse's employment or other factors, that attorney and his or her family should not be punished because New Jersey did not have reciprocity with other states. I believe that the considerable continuing education requirements of this State will ensure that attorneys are well-versed in relevant New Jersey matters, certainly more than a cookie-cutter national test.

I urge that New Jersey join a vast majority of states in allowing Admission by Motion or at the very least offer a streamlined test targeted towards New Jersey law and procedure. Especially in this day and age where things are more mobile than ever, the barriers like the ones I faced are simply inexcusable and the negatives are far

outweighed by the positives. I think that many well-meaning proponents of the status quo simply have no idea what a nightmare taking the bar examination again with family and a full time job can be. Trust me, it was a very unpleasant experience. I had a death in the family right before the examination and I shudder to think what position I would be in now had I not passed. And I have to wonder if those that claim that we need to know more and we should not move too quickly will ever concede that the state is "ready" to admit upon motion. Have we not had enough time and empirical data by 2015? I take issue with the notion that there is "nothing to be lost" by waiting additional time. I was put in a very difficult position that I continue to feel the repercussions from. My life the last couple of years would have been infinitely easier had New Jersey been a reciprocal state.

In closing, protecting the nobility and dignity of our profession is an ideal goal, and I would submit a system that protects already licensed attorneys and excludes attorneys who wish to move to New Jersey is beneath the nobility and dignity of my cherished chosen profession. And quite simply, it is not the type of welcome this great state should give to well-intentioned attorneys who are simply trying to improve the lives of their families. There are other ways to protect the public that are not at such a great cost. Please, remove those barriers and spare experienced attorneys who have proven their competency the indignity of taking the bar examination all over again.

Sincerely,

Larry Freeman