

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

In the matter of Amendment to SCR)
214 (1)(d) Regarding Exemption of)
Continuing Legal Education)
Requirement from Attorneys who are)
Seventy Years of Age and Older)

FILED

NOV 27 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

WRITTEN COMMENT

I am more than 70 years old and still actively practice law in Nevada. I opposed imposition of the mandatory rules requiring attorney attendance at annual Continuing Legal Education classes in 1981 and still do.

My opposition is and has been that in order to comply with the underlying existing rules of the State Bar requiring attorney competence and diligence in representing a client, every attorney who accepts employment requires that attorney to legally and factually research the issues presented by the case.


If an attorney is unwilling to do that research independently, it is very unlikely the attorney will select an appropriate CLE course in the first place. In the second place, there is not and never has been a testing requirement after attendance at the CLE course. Without a testing requirement the State Bar remains totally ignorant of the attorney's good faith in not only attending the CLE course,

RECEIVED
NOV 27 2019
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

1 but in paying attention and working at least a little bit to understand what was
2 presented.

3
4 The claim of the Nevada Bar Association that mandatory CLE courses
5 protects the public is deceptive nonsense.
6

7
8 DATED this 25 day of NOVEMBER 2019.
9

10
11 
12 Gary D. Woodbury
13 Nevada Bar # 1915
14 Law offices of Gary D. Woodbury
15 1053 Idaho Street,
16 Elko, Nevada 89801
17 (775)-738-8006
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28