

January 1937

Meeting of the Unlawful Practice Committee

Dicta Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr>

Recommended Citation

Meeting of the Unlawful Practice Committee, 14 Dicta 70 (1937).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

MEETING OF THE UNLAWFUL PRACTICE COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Unlawful Practice of the Law Committee of the Denver Bar Association was held December 18, 1936, at 3:30 P. M. at the offices of Jacob V. Schaetzel, chairman.

Mr. Schaetzel informed the committee that there were now four suits pending in the Supreme Court involving the practice of the law by notaries public and real estate men. It was decided by the committee that the object of these suits were to obtain from the court a rule as to whether or not one not licensed to practice law can draw legal papers and advertise himself as willing to draw legal papers with or without compensation. The object of the suits is not punitive, but merely to establish the precedent, and considerable discussion was had upon the proposition whether or not we should recommend leniency in case the parties were found guilty of contempt or just leave the matter in the hands of the court. It was finally decided to make no recommendations. It was further decided that all briefs should be filed through the Attorney General, and that the committee for the Denver Bar Association should not actively appear in any of the cases, as one of the principal objects is to keep the matter as impersonal as possible.

The next matter taken up was that of lay claim adjusters, and naming Engler who was the agent of one Strubinger, an attorney in St. Louis, Missouri. The question involved in this case was whether or not lay agents engaged in settling accident claims are practicing law. Mr. Schaetzel read some correspondence to us from Boyle Clark of St. Louis and he informed us that they would take immediate action against

Strubinger and that we were to proceed against Engler in the District Court as soon as possible.

The next matter under consideration was that of the Western Credit Exchange. Mr. Schaetzel read a letter from a man near Kirk, Colorado, complaining against this organization. It was decided to send the matter down to the Bar Association nearest to Kirk.

There was then considerable discussion considering what should be done with the real estate men concerning some agreement between real estate men and the lawyers, concerning the drawing of deeds. The real estate men are perfectly willing to desist from promiscuous drawing of legal papers if we will allow them the right to draw such papers in all deals in which they are directly interested and in which they receive compensation in the form of a commission for the sale or purchase of the property. The committee was not disposed to barter with the real estate men and a letter was dispatched to Stanley Hauck asking what had been done by the American Bar Association, and this committee would like to have their suggestions. It was further decided that the real estate men would be informed that we could not at the present time enter into any such agreement with them.

An Idaho law makes it necessary to have a permit from the sheriff in order to buy a chicken after dark.

A law of the state of Connecticut permits no one to chew tobacco without a doctor's permit.

A Chicago ordinance makes it unlawful to throw away a street car transfer.

A Boston, Mass., ordinance makes it illegal to keep a dog more than 10 inches in height.

A Maine law prohibits the wearing of spiked shoes in public.

A New York state law makes it unlawful to feed a sparrow.

In the city of Cincinnati it is unlawful to throw confetti.