Second Supplement to Memorandum 88-33

Subject: Study L-1036 - Attorney Fees in Probate (Written Contract Between Public Administrator and His or Her Attorney)

Attached is a letter from James R. Scannell, Public Administrator and Public Guardian for the City and County of San Francisco. As a result of this letter, the staff recommends that a change be made in the recommended revision of Section 6148 of the Business and Professions Code (set out in the First Supplement to Memorandum 88-33).

Specifically, we suggest that paragraph (5) (staff suggested addition) of subdivision (d) of Section 6148 be revised to read:

6148....
(d) This section shall not apply to any of the following:
(5) Services provided to a public officer or employee by an attorney who is a public officer or employee.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. DeMoully Executive Secretary

2nd Supp. to Memo 88-33 S		Study L-1036	
City and	County of San Francisco PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR PUBLIC GUARDIAN 1212 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94102 Telephone 558-4161 April 8, 1988	PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR PUBLIC GUARDIAN: James R. Scainnell ATTORNEY: Lou Aronian	
	<pre>Mr. John H. DeMoully 7 Executive Secretary California Law Revision Commission Suite D-2 4000 Middlefield Road Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739</pre>	KI LAW REA' COMM.M	
	Re: First Supplement to 88-33 IN REPLY REFER Study L-1036 TO OUR FILE NO	APR 1 4 1988	

Dear Mr. DeMoully:

I appreciate your adding public administrators to Section 6148. The use of the term "county counsel" would seem to limit the applications solely to counties that utilize the county counsel for Public Administrator work.

The term "and his attorney" that is used in summary probate sections would be more appropriate and less likely to cause problems for counties that use the District Attorney, City Attorney, or Public Administrator's Attorney.

Very trully yours, JAMES R. SCANNELL Public Administrator/ Public Guardian/ Public Conservator

JRS:1ca