

Committee on Disciplinary Rules and Referenda

December 4, 2019, Meeting Supplement

- Public Comments Received on Proposed Changes to Rules 3.01, 3.02, and 3.03, Texas Rules of Disciplinary Procedure (through December 2, 2019)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cdrr](#)
Subject: CDRR Comment: Wording is confusing
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 8:57:37 AM

*** State Bar of Texas External Message *** - Use Caution Before Responding or Opening Links/Attachments

Contact

First Name	R J
Last Name	Parham
Email	[REDACTED]
Member	Yes
Barcard	00792737

Feedback

Subject	Wording is confusing
----------------	----------------------

Comments

CURRENT WORDING: shall promptly assign an active district judge from within the administrative judicial region whose district does not include the county of appropriate venue to preside in the case
Suggested rewrite: shall promptly assign an active district judge to preside in the case. The assigned district judge may not serve in the judicial district which includes the county of appropriate venue, but must serve in a judicial district is within the administrative judicial region.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cdrr](#)
Subject: CDRR Comment: Changes to TRDP 3.01, 3.02 and 3.03
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 1:41:27 PM

*** State Bar of Texas External Message *** - Use Caution Before Responding or Opening Links/Attachments

Contact

First Name	Tracy
Last Name	Christopher
Email	[REDACTED]
Member	Yes
Barcard	11150500

Feedback

Subject	Changes to TRDP 3.01, 3.02 and 3.03
----------------	-------------------------------------

Comments

I am opposed to the change. As a trial judge I had to go to other counties to try these cases and did not find it burdensome. I think its a good idea for the trial judge to have very little knowledge of the attorney. If the trial judge is within the same judicial district, the judge will most likely have knowledge of the attorney. Before we change something due to "undue burden", I suggest that you survey the judges who have actually done these appointments to see the extent of the burden.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cdrr](#)
Subject: CDRR Comment: Comments on Proposed Changes to Rules 3.01 to 3.03, TRDP
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 2:49:56 PM

* State Bar of Texas External Message * - Use Caution Before Responding or Opening Links/Attachments	
Contact	
First Name	Sean
Last Name	Martinez
Email	[REDACTED]
Member	Yes
Barcard	13144500

Feedback	
Subject	Comments on Proposed Changes to Rules 3.01 to 3.03, TRDP
Comments	
The proposed changes appear to be appropriate and fair to all parties.	

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cdrr](#)
Subject: CDOR Comment: Appointment of district judges by the regional presiding judge
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 3:19:31 PM

*** State Bar of Texas External Message *** - Use Caution Before Responding or Opening Links/Attachments

Contact

First Name	Donald
Last Name	Dowd
Email	[REDACTED]
Member	Yes
Barcard	06068500

Feedback

Subject	Appointment of district judges by the regional presiding judge
----------------	--

Comments

Is there a jurisdictional problem for an active district judge who is appointed to hear a disciplinary case outside of his elected jurisdictional district, since "proper venue" for the disciplinary case must lie in another territorial district outside his own?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cdrr](#)
Subject: CDRR Comment: Proposed rule changes
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 3:28:03 PM

*** State Bar of Texas External Message *** - Use Caution Before Responding or Opening Links/Attachments

Contact

First Name	Todd
Last Name	Keagle
Email	[REDACTED]
Member	Yes
Barcard	24031529

Feedback

Subject Proposed rule changes

Comments

I fully support these rules. Currently, there are so many unknowns an accused lawyer must navigate when dealing with a grievance. By appointing a District Court Judge, hopefully this will bring more structure and proper guidance to an already stressful situation.