

RECEIVED  
9/19/02

Frank Amador  
Attorney at Law  
Union Bank Plaza Center, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
445 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

02-CV-#

-  
Tel: 213-840-6023

September 13, 2002

Mr. Peter McCabe, Secretary  
Committee on Rules of Practice  
1 Columbus Circle NE, Room 4-170  
Washington, D.C. 20544

RE: Amendment to Federal Rules  
of Civil Procedure

Dear Mr. McCabe:

SEP 19 AM 11:49

The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and the appellate courts allow an attorney who has been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, or the highest court of a state, or another United States district court, and who is of good moral character to be admitted to its bar. *See* FED.R.APP.P. 46(a).

However, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure simply give district courts the power to regulate admission to their bar. *See* FED.R.CIV.P. 83. This general power has been problematic at best and has produced an huge inconsistency among district courts. Huston, Texas, logically, follows the FED.R.App.P. 46(a) and admits any member who is admitted to any other district court in the land. However, many other district courts require admission to the bar of the state wherein they sit. Still others toy with outlandish residency requirements.

Mr. Peter McCabe  
September 13, 2002  
Page 2

---

This inconsistency among the various district courts is unmanageable and a nuisance to the profession, especially in the era of NAFTA and multi-jurisdictional practice. Most compelling, however, is the realization that federal law and practice is highly specialized and finite.

Logically, let's have a uniform rule making the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure consistent with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure with respect to attorney admission.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank Amador", written in a cursive style.

Frank Amador, Esq.