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CALENDAR OF EVENTS FOR APRIL

Friday, April 8
AVAILABILITY OF LEGAL SERVICES
Monthly Rountable
Noon @ Boulder County Legal Services

Wednesday, April 13
CRIMINAL
The Role of the Media in Criminal Justice
Presenter: John Bear and Mitchell Byars
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Justice Center Training Room West

Tuesday, April 19
PARALEGAL
Privilege & Confidentiality for the Private Sector
Presenter: Josh Marks
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Bryan Cave

Tuesday, April 19
BUSINESS & INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
Intellectual Property Law for Commercial Lawyers: A Primer
Presenter: Kirstin Jahn
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Hutchison Black and Cook

Wednesday, April 20
FAMILY
A View from the Bench
Presenter: Judges Langer, MacDonald, and Mulvahill, Magistrate Haenselman, and Michelle Haynes
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Justice Center Training Rooms East

Thursday, April 21
REAL ESTATE
The Contract-Deeding Trap for the Unwary Buyer
Presenter: Doug Tueller
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Hutchison Black and Cook

Tuesday, April 26
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
TBD
Presenter: TBD
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Justice Center Training Room West

Wednesday, April 27
LONGMONT LAWYERS LUNCH
$25 CLE and lunch
Noon @ The Rib House, 1920 S. Coffman Street

Thursday, April 28
NATURAL RESOURCES/ENVIRONMENTAL
TBD
Presenter: TBD
$25 CLE, $15 New/Young Lawyer, brown bag lunch
Noon @ Bryan Cave

CALENDAR OF EVENTS FOR APRIL

2016 Safe Shelter Symposium on Domestic Violence
On April 14 & 15 Safe Shelter of St. Vrain Valley will be sponsoring its 2016 Symposium on Domestic Violence: Navigating the Power of Technology in Longmont.

Launching with a free bilingual evening endorsed by St. Vrain Valley Schools for Youth, Parents, and Educators, the event will be facilitated by two dynamic presenters to examine the positive and negative features of technology. Topics will include teen dating; digital risks and vulnerabilities; relationship responsibilities, safety, how to avoid unintended harms; and how contribute to a positive online culture.
The following day will begin with a Keynote by District Attorney Stan Garnett and feature concurrent sessions designed for Advocates and Service Providers; Law Officers;

Register at www.safesheltersymposium.org.
When: Thursday, April 14, 6:00-9:00PM; & Friday, April 15th, 8:30AM-5:00PM
Where: Plaza Convention Center, 1850 Industrial Circle, Longmont, CO

BIDC 2016 Annual Conference
Friday, April 29, 2016
Doubletree Hotel in Westminster, CO 830AM to 4PM
7 regular and 2 ethics credits are applied for.
Domestic Violence and its Associated Trauma-Cause and Effect on Children
Kate Booth, MA and Honorable Victor Reyes (Ret.)

Early registration is extended to April 8th, and we do give a member discount to all COAFCC, MDIC and BIDC members! Judicial personnel is complimentary, but please register early! Hope you can make it!

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6
Panel of Boulder County Safety Nonprofit Agency Representatives Serving Children in Families in Conflict and Crisis

BIDC meetings will be held at the Millennium Harvest House
1345 28th Street, Boulder, CO 80302
11:30am - 1:15pm Networking:
11:30am to Noon Lunch and Speaker: Noon - 1:15pm
LUNCH: $25.00 IDC MEMBERS • $30.00 NON-MEMBERS
You may pay at the door (cash or check), or online www.boulderidc.org
CLE credit 2 General and no ethics
The use of independent contractors by companies in the United States is now more widespread than ever. As this practice continues to expand, the number of audits conducted by various federal and state government agencies, including the Internal Revenue Service, the National Labor Relations Board, and the U.S. Department of Labor, has increased dramatically, as have the number of challenges being mounted in worker misclassification lawsuits. Among the more publicized of these are the recent class action worker misclassification suits filed against FedEx, Uber and Lyft. (The case against Uber is set to go to trial on June 20, 2016; the suits against FedEx and Lyft recently settled.)

At the crux of these numerous audits and lawsuits is the question of whether a worker is truly an independent contractor, or whether he or she should in fact be classified as an employee. A finding of misclassification can result in the imposition of significant fines, penalties, back taxes, back wages and attorneys’ fees, all of which can have a detrimental, and potentially catastrophic, effect on a business. Yet companies attempting to determine whether their workers are properly categorized must contend with a dizzying number of classification tests, which vary between federal and state law, and among individual states. For example, the factors applied by the IRS are different from the factors applied by the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment in its unemployment insurance analysis, which are in turn different from those factors considered under the Colorado Wage Claim Act.

So how can businesses, and workers, protect themselves from a potentially devastating audit, and/or costly litigation? There is unfortunately no single blueprint for avoiding a misclassification finding or claim, since every business and every working arrangement is different. However, familiarity with applicable federal and state laws, and the tests applied by each, can go a long way in providing protection.

Though not exhaustive, the following is an overview of several federal and state entities that apply tests for determining whether a worker is an independent contractor or should be classified as an employee:

**Internal Revenue Service**
The Internal Revenue Service looks at three areas in determining whether a worker is an independent contractor: behavioral control, financial control and the type of relationship between the parties. These areas are discussed extensively on the IRS website, located here: [https://www.irs.gov/Businesses/Small-Businesses-&-Self-Employed/Independent-Contractor-Self-Employed-or-Employee](https://www.irs.gov/Businesses/Small-Businesses-&-Self-Employed/Independent-Contractor-Self-Employed-or-Employee)

The factors considered by the IRS in analyzing behavioral control include whether the business has a right to direct what work is performed, the manner in which the work is performed, and/or training are provided. Generally speaking, the more control exerted by a business over a worker, the less likely it is that worker will be classified as an independent contractor.

With respect to financial control, the IRS analyzes whether the facts demonstrate a business has the right to control the financial and business aspects of the worker’s job, including the following:

- The extent of the worker’s unreimbursed business expenses
- The extent of the worker’s investment in tools and/or facilities used in performing services
- The extent to which the worker makes his or her services available to the public (in the relevant market)
- The manner in which the business pays the worker
- The extent to which the worker can realize a profit or incur a loss

Independent contractors typically have an opportunity for profit or loss, and

(continued on the next page)
Fact Sheet #13: Am I an Employee?

Employment Relationship Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)

Many of the factors considered by the FLSA are similar to those examined under the IRS analysis. Echoing the IRS provisions, the FLSA notes that “the fact that the worker has signed an agreement stating that he or she is an independent contractor is not controlling because the reality of the working relationship – and not the label given to the relationship in an agreement – is determinative.”


If a business is unable to determine whether a worker should be classified as an independent contractor or an employee, it can request that the IRS make that determination by filing a Form SS-8, Determination of Worker Status for Purposes of Federal Employment Taxes and Income Tax Withholding, which can be accessed here: https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fss8.pdf. (The IRS notes, however, that it can take up to 6 months to get a determination.)

Fair Labor Standards Act

The minimum wage and overtime requirements of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) only apply to employees. In order to determine whether a worker is an employee within the meaning of the FLSA, the following factors are generally considered:

- The extent to which the work performed is an integral part of the employer’s business
- Whether the worker’s managerial skills affect his or her opportunity for profit and loss
- The relative investments in facilities and equipment by the worker and the employer
- The worker’s skill and initiative
- The permanency of the worker’s relationship with the employer
- The nature and degree of control by the employer

National Labor Relations Board

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) has adopted an 11-factor test for determining whether a worker is properly classified as an employee or an independent contractor. These factors include consideration of the following:

1. The extent of the control over the details of the work
2. Whether the service provider is engaged in a distinct occupation or business
3. Whether the work is generally done under the direction of the employer; or
MISCLASSIFICATION CLAIMS  (continued from page 4)

is performed by a specialist without supervision
4. The level of skill required
5. Whether the required instruments, tools and place of work are provided by the employer or the service provider
6. The length of time the worker provides the service
7. The method by which the worker is paid—i.e., by the time or by the job
8. Whether the work being performed is part of the employer’s regular business
9. Whether the parties believe they are creating an independent contractor relationship
10. Whether the principal is in the business
11. Whether the evidence tends to show that the service provider is rendering services as an independent business


Workers’ Compensation Act of Colorado
The Workers’ Compensation Act of Colorado (WCAC) defines “employee” as “any individual who performs services for pay for another . . . unless such individual is free from control and direction in the performance of the service, both under the contract for performance of the service and in fact and such individual is customarily engaged in an independent trade, occupation, profession, or business related to the service performed.” C.R.S. § 8-40-202(2)(a).

In order to demonstrate that an independent contractor relationship exists, the person for whom the services are performed must not:

1) Require the individual to work exclusively for the person for whom services are performed, except for a finite, specified period;
2) Establish a quality standard for the individual; except that plans and specifications may be provided regarding the work (but the business cannot oversee the actual work or instruct the individual as to how the work will be performed);
3) Pay a salary or hourly rate instead of a fixed or contract rate;
4) Terminate the work during the contract period unless the worker violates the contract terms or fails to meet the contract specifications;
5) Provide more than minimal training to the worker;
6) Provide tools or benefits to the worker (although materials and equipment may be supplied);
7) Dictate the time of performance beyond a completion schedule and negotiated/mutually agreeable work hours;
8) Pay the worker personally rather than in a business or trade name; and
9) Combine business operations in any way with the service provider.


As noted above, documentary evidence is relevant under the WCAC in determining whether an independent contractor relationship exists. If the parties enter into a written agreement demonstrating the nine factors listed above, and it is signed and notarized by both parties, that agreement “shall create a rebuttable presumption of an independent contractor relationship . . . where such document contains a disclosure, in type which is larger than the other provisions in the document or in bold-faced or underlined type, that the independent contractor is not entitled to workers’ compensation benefits and that the independent contractor is obligated to pay federal and state income tax on any moneys earned pursuant to the contract relationship.” C.R.S. § 8-40-202(b)(IV).

Colorado Employment Security Act
Like the WCAC, the Colorado Employment Security Act (CESA), which oversees unemployment insurance, considers nine factors in determining whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor. See C.R.S. § 8-7-115 (c)(I)-(IX). These nine factors are nearly identical under both statutes.

As with the WCAC, a written document may create a rebuttable presumption of an independent contractor relationship between the parties, “where such document contains a disclosure, in type which is larger than the other provi-
MISCLASSIFICATION CLAIMS  (continued from page 5)

sions in the document or in bold-faced or underlined type, that the independent contractor in not entitled to unemploy-
ment insurance benefits unless unem-
ployment compensation coverage is
provided by the independent contractor
or some other entity, and that the inde-
pendent contractor is obligated to pay
federal and state income tax on any
moneys paid pursuant to the contract
relationship."  C.R.S. § 8-70-115(2).

The Colorado Department of Labor and
Employment provides workers who be-
lieve they have been misclassified as in-
dependent contractors with a complaint
form on the CDLE website:
https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdle/
misclassification. Employers who need
assistance in determining how to clas-
sify workers may obtain an Advisory
Opinion from the CDLE by completing
the appropriate form (also accessible on
the CDLE website) and paying a $100 fee.

Colorado Wage Claim Act
The Colorado Wage Claim Act, C.R.S. § 8-4-
101, et seq., defines "employee" as "any
person, including a migratory laborer, per-
forming labor or services for the benefit of
an employer in which the employer may
command when, where, and how much
labor or services shall be performed."

The statute notes, conversely, that "an in-
dividual primarily free from control and
direction in the performance of the ser-
vice, both under his or her contract for the
performance of service and in fact, and
who is customarily engaged in an inde-
pendent trade, occupation, profession, or
business related to the service performed
is not an ‘employee.’"  C.R.S. § 8-4-101(5).

Proper classification of workers is an on-
going and complex analysis under the
numerous federal and state statutory
schemes. Employers who familiarize
themselves with the factors considered
by these various entities, and who con-
duct regular reviews of their working re-
lationships, will be much better
protected than those who do not in the
event of a governmental audit and/or
worker misclassification claim.

Jill Zender is a solo practitioner in Boul-
der specializing in Employment Law. She
is also the co-chair of the BCBA Employ-
ment Law Section with Patricia Bellac.
SHELLY D. MERRITT
Has Been Selected For Inclusion in
2016 Colorado Super Lawyers®
in the practice area of Estate Planning & Probate
and
The Best Lawyers in America© 2016
in the area of Trusts and Estates
and
Best Law Firms

Her Practice Emphasizes
Estate Planning, International Succession Planning,
Probate, Trust
And Small Business Law

S.D. MERRITT & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
1526 Spruce St., Suite 200    Tel: (303) 413-3477
Bolder, CO 80302    Fax: (303) 928-2350
shelly@sdmerrittlaw.com
www.sdmerrittlaw.com

Consider being a leader of the Boulder County Bar Association
for 2016-2017

The Board of Directors has one opening for a 3-year term as a director.
There is an opening for the Secretary-Treasurer position.
This is a officer position who will become BCBA President in 2018-2019.

If you are interested in applying for one of these positions or have questions about the duties and expectations, please send a letter of interest to Christine at the BCBA.
christine@boulder-bar.org
by April 29, 2016

Bridge to Justice is pleased to welcome Ericka J.A. Fowler to our organization as Senior Staff Attorney. Ericka will be assisting low-and moderate-income individuals in family law, consumer debt and other civil legal matters, as well as assisting the Executive Director in the management of the agency.
Hello fellow Boulder County Bar Association Members!

First and foremost, thank you all for the wonderful attendance at this year’s Food, Wine, Jazz, Art Fundraiser! It was a wonderful evening filled with great people, food, drink and good times. I know it was a great night because there was a plethora of attorneys cutting it up on the dance floor all the way to the end of the night. Yeah, I’m talking about you Brett Landis and Jennifer Lorenz! One word for you two......nailed-it.

Second, spring has sprung and it is time to start cleaning out your file cabinet and make room for all those juicy cases that are coming down the pipeline in 2016.

Remember general private practice attorneys, you can destroy that client file 10 years after termination of representation, upon delivery to the client when there are no pending/threatened legal proceedings or no less than thirty days after given notice to a client you intend to destroy the file provided there are not pending/threatened legal proceedings. Notice to the client can be satisfied by putting your file retention policy in your fee agreement signed by the client.

You do have a fee agreement signed by the client right?

For criminal lawyers (that is lawyers who practice criminal law, not lawyers that are criminals although I guess it would apply to them too) you must retain your client files for the life of the client, five years from conviction or eight years from conviction depending on the conviction.

If you are so inclined a great way to clean up those files are to digitize your files and store them in the cloud although I think my son would rather make forts in the basement with all my old client file storage boxes.

This is also a good opportunity to take a look around your office and spruce things up a bit. Funky smell coming from the office fridge...clean that up! Dark corner looking a little boring...get a succulent! Clean up that clutter on your computer desktop screen! When was the last time you got your shoes shined? Does that old suit still fit? Is it time for a new suit? Revisit that Fee Agreement.

Clean out that email inbox! As I write this President’s page I see 10,220 emails floating around that inbox. There are a thousand tasks to do around the office and spring is the best time to do it.

But don’t clean up too much. In the immortal words of the great Michio Kaku, “It’s pointless to have a nice clean desk, because it means you’re not doing anything.” I am so jealous of that guy’s head of hair.

---

Complete Private Banking Services For Your Client. Complete Peace Of Mind For You.

You’ve earned your clients’ trust. Your reputation depends on it. That’s why we offer local, tenured professionals to meet your clients’ needs. Comprehensive solutions. And consideration for your clients’ security, not just their money. We know the value of trust. And we’ll protect yours. Give us a call, or better yet, let us come see you.
END OF LIFE OPTIONS BILL WITHDRAWN

BY AMBER REED AND LAURA MOORE

In the fall of 2014, Brittany Maynard, a young woman with a terminal brain tumor, moved to Oregon to end her life, as allowed by their Death with Dignity law. My childhood friend Jane, suffering with the same diagnosis, did not have that option. For years she lived with growing tumors, seizures, and excruciating headaches, and eventually lost her ability to read or verbally communicate as the tumors entangled in her brain's language center. Surgery, chemotherapy, radiation, and experimental treatments, could not save her life. Once again, Coloradans have been denied the choice to make an end of life medication request.

State Senate Representatives Joann Ginal (D-Fort Collins) and Lois Court (D-Denver) introduced the latest end of life bill in January of 2016. The "Colorado End-of-Life Options Act," authorized an individual with a terminal illness to request, and the individual’s attending physician to prescribe, medication to hasten the individual’s death. The proposed legislation defined terminal illness as, “an incurable and irreversible illness that has been medically confirmed and will, within reasonable medical judgment, result in death within six months.” To qualify for the medication, the proposed legislation set forth specific criteria: a capable, adult resident of Colorado, with a terminal illness, who has voluntarily and verbally expressed the request for the prescription on two occasions, and submitted a written request to his or her attending physician.

Also in January of 2016, House Representative Michael Merrifield (D-Manitou Springs) introduced an identical bill, HB16-1054. Leadership assigned HB-16-1054 to the House Judiciary Committee, and SB16-025 to State, Veterans & Military Affairs. Legislators held public hearings on the bills the week of February 1, 2016, which were well attended and included emotional testimony on both sides of the issue. On February 10, 2016, SB16-025 failed in committee and was postponed indefinitely. HB16-1054 passed through the House Judiciary Committee and moved on to the Committee of the Whole. On February 24, 2016, Representatives Ginal and Court pulled the bill off the calendar before any floor

(continued on the next page)
debate. Arguing that the votes were not secure to pass it, the bill’s sponsors elected to withdraw the legislation.

This last effort was the third attempt in Colorado for “end-of-life” legislation. In 1995, former State Representative Peggy Lamm (D-Boulder) introduced similar legislation, which failed to survive committee.6 Similar legislation did not surface again until 2015. Last year, Ginal and Court introduced HB15-1135, the Death with Dignity Act, voted down in House Committee.7

Presently, five states enacted legalized physician-assisted dying: Oregon, Washington, Vermont, Montana, and California.8 Interestingly, Montana did not pass legislation allowing for such. Instead, the Montana Supreme Court held that “under § 45-2-211, MCA, a terminally ill patient’s consent to physician aid in dying constitutes a statutory defense to a charge of homicide against the aiding physician when no other consent exceptions apply.”9

Oregon paved the way for the physician-assisted dying movement with efforts beginning in the early 1990’s, when the first law allowing dying patients to control the timing of their death was introduced.10 Around the same time, both California and Washington introduced ill-fated legislation pertaining to physician-assisted dying.11 Measure 16, Oregon Death with Dignity, passed by Oregon voters in 1994 made Oregon the first state to allow physician-assisted dying. Measure 16 differed from the laws proposed in California and Washington because it contained specific prohibitions against euthanasia by legal injection.12 Even so, Oregon’s Measure 16 faced various legal battles and resistance, including opposition by the DEA and substantial attempted interventions by members of U.S. Congress.13 On October 27, 1997, physician-assisted dying officially became a legal medical option for terminally ill Oregonians. Since 2006, Oregon’s Death with Dignity Act remains unchallenged, and as of 2012, eighty percent of Oregon citizens support the Act.14 Colorado legislators based the latest proposed legislation on Oregon law. Opponents objected that the bill’s language mirrored Oregon law, rather than Colorado.

According to Roland Halpern, Director of Community Relations for non-profit organization Compassion and Choices, sixty five percent of Coloradans favor aid-in-dying legislation. Traditionally, approximately 30% are unlikely to move on the issue due to religious or other moral/ethical based reasons.

Halpern noted the 2016 bills’ titles were changed to the “End of Life Options Act,” from “Death with Dignity,” after the hospice community objected that the previous title suggested individuals in hospice did not die with dignity.

In 2015, the disability community expressed concern that disabled individuals would be exploited or taken advantage of by other individuals seeking this medication on their behalf. To address this concern, the proposed 2016 legislation stated, “a person does not qualify for aid-in-dying medication solely because of age or disability.15 To protect against abuse, the proposed 2016 legislation imposed criminal penalties against an individual who, with the intent or effect of causing an individual’s death, purposely or knowingly, alters or forges a request for the medication, or conceals or destroys the resuspension of a request.16

Another concern in 2015 included potential dangers surrounding the statistic that 35% of the individuals who request the medication do not take it. The proposed 2016 legislation required a person with custody or control of the unused medication to dispose of it under medication take back programs.”17

(continued on the next page)
The bill would have required the prescribing physician to counsel the individual about safe disposal of any unused medication.

Significantly, the proposed 2016 legislation required the individual seeking the medication to be an adult, “capable” of making these requests. The proposed statute defined “capable” as, “in the opinion of a terminally ill individual’s attending physician, consulting physician, psychiatrist, or licensed mental health professional, a terminally ill individual has the ability to make and communicate an informed decision to health care providers, including communication through a person familiar with the individual’s manner of communicating if that person is available.” The proposed 2016 legislation included a form for the written request, for witness by two individuals, at least one who must not be related to the individual by blood, marriage, civil union, or adoption, an individual who at the time the request is signed is entitled, under a will or by operation of law, to any portion of the individual’s estate upon his or her death, or an owner, operator, or employee of a health care facility where the individual is received medical treatment or is a resident. The individual’s attending physician could not serve as a witness to the written request. If the treating physician had any doubts about the individual’s capacity to make an end of life decision, the bill required the physician to refer the individual to a licensed mental health professional to make that determination.

In spite of this latest defeat, Ginal and Court vow to continue the fight. If this issue speaks to you, contact your legislators and encourage a revised bill for next year.

END OF LIFE OPTIONS BILL (continued from page 9)

2. Senate Bill 16-025.
5. Bill Summary, Senate Bill 16-025.
6. HB 95-1308 Enactment of Referred Measure on Colorado Dignity in Death Act
7. 02/06/2015 House Committee on Public Health Care & Human Services Postpone Indefinitely
10. Id.
12. Id. and “Oregon’s Death with Dignity Act: The First Year’s Experience”, Department of Human Resources Oregon Health Division Center for Disease Prevention and Epidemiology, February 18, 1999.
13. Id.
16. Proposed C.R.S. §25-48-103(2)
17. Proposed C.R.S. §25-48-118
20. Proposed C.R.S. §25-48-103(2)
22. Proposed C.R.S. §25-48-105
23. Proposed C.R.S. §25-48-122

Amber Reed, Esq., LL.M. is an associate at Howard O. Bernstein, P.C. Laura Moore is a member of Warren, Carlson and Moore, LLP in Niwot/Longmont. Both are the co-chairs of the Tax, Estate Planning and Probate Section of the BCBA.
Pro Bono Referrals

Ten cases were referred during the month of February. Thank you to the following attorneys:

Donald Alspaugh
Howard Bernstein
Susan Bryant
Mark Detsky
Graham Fuller
Sarah McEahern
Gary Merenstein
Elizabeth Meyer
Bruce Warren

Thank you to the following mediators who accepted referrals in February:

Simon Mole

Pro Se Program Volunteers

Josh Anderson
Sheila Carrigan
Shawn Ettingoff
Tucker Katz
Brett Landis
Michael Morphew
Craig Small
Leonard Tanis

BCAP Volunteers

There were no requests for pro bono referrals for the Boulder County AIDS Project in February.

Pro Bono Corner

Interested in a Pro Bono case? Please call Erika at 303-449-2197. CLE credits available for pro bono service.

Professionalism On-Call List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Meghan Pound</td>
<td>303.443.8010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Karl Kumli</td>
<td>303.447.1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>Tom Rodriguez</td>
<td>303.604.6030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Trip DeMuth</td>
<td>303.447.7775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Professionalism Committee assists lawyers, clients and other members of the community with questions or complaints about behavior by lawyers that fails to meet generally accepted standards of professionalism and courtesy, or that is contrary to the BCBA Principles of Professionalism.

The Professionalism Committee does not address allegations of criminal or ethical violations by lawyers, as regulated by the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct, and any such violations should be addressed to the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel.
TSCERTIFIED SIGNING AGENT/MOBILE NOTARY AND CONTRACT PARALEGAL SERVICES. Litigation specialist, Civil Litigation. ADC/CJA. Roz Lynn Dorf, M.A. 303.494.6935

Former Federal law clerk (10th Circuit) seeking contract work. Legal writing a specialty. 20+ years legal exp. (as attorney and paralegal). Susan Soklin 303-548-0483 or susansoklin@ecentral.com

Office for Rent: Private office in SE Boulder. Ideal person would be a sole practitioners with family law experience or a complementary practice. Paralegal space also available. Potential overflow/contract work. Furnished, conference room, kitchen facilities. Possible trade contract work for rent. Share with family law mediator/practitioner. If interested contact Sheila Carrigan at carriganlaw@gmail.com.

Perfect office space located at 1790 30th Street, Boulder, CO. Share an office suite with three lawyers. Free Parking, two conference rooms and office space for growth, legal assistant, or receptionist. Call Scott Hamerslogh, 720.415.0322

Office space for rent: Large office (approximately 225 sq. ft.) in shared suite in Park Place Building, 3100 Arapahoe Avenue. One other attorney in quiet transactional law practice. Fourth floor - ample free parking, great flatirons view, conference room and high capacity copier/scanner available. Administrator/reception area also available. Rent is negotiable depending on space and services needed. Contact Brian at 303-449-5643.


Law Office is Southeast Boulder has an extra office that is available immediately, easily accessible to Highway 36. This office is 110 sq/ ft and includes receptionist, small conference room, as well as ample parking. Rent is $700 a month. For additional information, please call 303.449.9960

CLASSIFIED ADS
THE BCBA NEWSLETTER IS A MONTHLY ELECTRONIC PUBLICATION BY THE BOULDER COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION. ARTICLES BY GUEST LAWYERS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE BOULDER COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION OR THE AUTHORS.

COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE BY CONTACTING christine@boulder-bar.org

OR THE BAR’S WEBSITE www.boulder-bar.org