

From: [Rosemary Spohn](#)
To: [Comments Mailbox](#)
Subject: [External]Comments to Proposed Amendments to CLE Regulations
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 10:06:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments to the Proposed Amendments to CLE Regulations dated December 13, 2022.

My comment is in relation to Section 201.8, providing that, for lawyers who reside or work on a regular and continuous basis in New Jersey, courses taken through alternative verifiable learning formats shall account for no more than twelve credit hours per compliance period.

My concern is that, for attorneys like me that work in a very specialized area, it has been difficult for me to find in-person courses that are relevant to my practice. I work in-house and my practice focuses on areas related to landlord/tenant law. The regulations define CLE as education activity “designed principally to maintain or advance the professional competence of lawyers, to enhance knowledge and skill in matters related to an attorney’s practice or employment, and/or to expand an appreciation and understanding of the ethical and professional responsibility of lawyers.”

I often find myself registering for courses that have nothing to do with areas in which I practice simply to fulfill the CLE requirements. I work mostly from my home in Southern New Jersey. When I do find live courses relevant to my practice area, they are often held in North Jersey, 2 or more hours of travel time each way, causing me to lose an entire day in the office for one CLE class because of the travel time. (On the course evaluation forms, I often write in the comment section: “Please have more classes in South Jersey!”)

When attorneys were permitted to fulfill all their CLE requirements virtually during the pandemic, I found it was easier to register for classes that were relevant to my practice, because of greater selection. I do find in-person classes valuable but lament the limited availability of options relevant to my practice and within a reasonable travel distance. It’s particularly frustrating when I do find a relevant course, but I am unable to attend that specific day because of a work obligation, such as a court appearance. If there were more options, this would not be an issue.

For the reasons above, I would ask that the Board consider increasing the number of virtual training hours permitted, to increase the likelihood of the lawyer being able to secure courses relevant to his or her practice area, or consider facilitating an increase in the number of in-person classes offered in the southern part of the state.

Thank you for your time.



Rosemary Spohn, Esq.
Deputy General Counsel – Operations
2 South Avenue West, Suite W411 Cranford, NJ 07016–2674
O: 484–690–3645 | F: 610–994–6281
rspohn@morganproperties.com | morganproperties.com

Unrestricted