

#003

From: Chanti Carter <carterc16@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 11:11 PM
To: Comments Mailbox
Subject: Comments on Proposed Amendments to Regulations Governing the Committee on Character

Hello,

My name is Chanti A. Carter-Rene and my comments regarding the referenced document are as follows:

Since the document discusses regulations relating to its purpose to determine the fitness of candidates seeking admission to the bar and that of its own membership structure, authority and self-governing discretion, perhaps a distinction should be made, in footnote or otherwise, that the term "candidate" refers to candidates seeking admission to the bar, and not candidates seeking membership to the Committee on Character.

Section 302:2 – Interview Procedures, Subsection 3 (Interviewing Committee Members or Members' Recommendation to Certify the Candidate with Conditions by Consent) - In such a scenario, would this conditional admit status be indicated in any way in the disciplinary action index of a newly admitted attorney's license search? Whether or not this is true or false, the answer to this question should be noted in this section of the regulations for informational purposes to the considering candidate.

Section 302:4 – The word "matter" in the newly proposed sentence is spelled incorrectly on page 11.

Section 303:3 – I would suggest that the sentence here should say:
"There shall be a rebuttable **presumption that willful nondisclosure** is prima facie evidence of"

rather than,

".....**presumption that nondisclosure** is prima facie evidence of the lack of good character."

Given that subsection (b) attempts to address the possibility of error, consider adding the "willful" adjective to nondisclosure as a catch all for all other possibilities that were not intentionally misleading for bona fide clarity (mistake, unknown to candidate, typographical, etc.)

304:4 – Why does the candidate, in this scenario of having previously withdrawn their application and now seeking reinstatement, have the option of:

"If the reinstatement request is filed more than three (3) years after the candidate sat for the bar examination, retaking and passing the examination **shall be a prerequisite of favorable consideration** of the application"

as opposed to other examples regarding child support obligations (Section 202:6) and student loan obligations (Section 202:7), wherein,

"If the reinstatement request is filed more than three (3) years after the candidate sat for the bar examination, retaking and passing the bar examination **shall be a prerequisite for consideration** of the application."

In essence, where does the equity in the favorability come in to play?

Thank you for your consideration of my edits and suggested revisions to the Regulations.