



SAN FRANCISCO PARALEGAL ASSOCIATION

AT ISSUE—MARCH 2020

2019 Student Essay Winners

EDITOR'S NOTE: At the SFPA 47th Annual Meeting in October 2019, these two selections won the Student Essay Scholarship. The essay prompt was to "Discuss whether, in the wake of the Plain English movement, it is ever ethical practice for attorneys and paralegals to use less than clear prose, unnecessarily complex syntax, and obscure jargon to communicate with clients, or to advise attorneys' clients to be less than clear in their communications with their own customers and employees?"

**"Q: Why won't sharks attack lawyers?
A: Professional courtesy."**

BY: Kathryn Hanna, CSUEB, anticipated graduation August 2020

It is no secret that many people think of lawyers and paralegals as unethical; concerned more about their financial gains than about their clients. The above joke is just one of thousands on the internet illustrating the stereotype that law professionals are untrustworthy. One contributing factor to this stereotype is the complex language of law, or legalese. Legalese is known for its lengthy sentences, complicated wording, and usage of words that have long been absent from Plain English vocabulary such as "hereforth and hitherto." One remedy to legalese is the Plain English movement, started in 1963 by David Mellinkoff and popularized in 1980 by Richard Wydick. This movement hopes to remove the shroud of legalese and replace it with language that an average person would be capable of understanding. Plain English promotes a baseline of communication between clients and law professionals that can make the difference between ethical and unethical practice.

The State Bar of California's Rule 1.4 Communication with Clients (Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018) states "A lawyer shall explain a matter to 'the extent reasonably* necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.'"

(Continued on Page 2, left column)

On Ethics: Legalese vs. Plain Language

BY: Emily Wilburn, CCSF, anticipated graduation 2020

Is it ever ethical to use deliberately confusing language to a client? I can't give you the short answer, because I don't believe in it. Most things in life don't have short, simple answers.

I have learned to be methodical in my responses. Read the problem. Read it again. Pick it apart. Separate it into smaller and smaller pieces, put it back together. Studying the law has taught me how crucial it is to understand each part of the whole.

The problem here is the "ever." If the question was instead, "*Is it ethical to use less than clear language*" (and so forth), I could give you an easy yes, some smooth and digestible arguments about justice and equal rights and access to legal services. But that word—"ever"—it's troublesome. It invites mischief.

This is what the law does. It digs deeper, settling into all the little nooks and crannies of sentences. It scouts out all the loopholes, tests all the shaky grammatical foundations for weaknesses. There are exceptions to every rule, and exceptions to the exceptions, and exceptions to *those* ... all the way down. Fractals of possibility. The law splits atoms.

We could start by reducing the question. So: is it ever ethical to conceal your meaning? That's the purpose, after all, of the jargon—to shut it out to anyone who doesn't have the code

(Continued on Page 2, right column)

As rule 1.4 conveys, law professionals are ethically required to act as interpreters of the law by providing their clients with a “reasonable” understanding of the often dense and complex language used in the legal world. This understanding is vital to the client’s ability to participate in legal matters that may have a substantial impact on their lives. The act of providing clients with a clear understanding of their legal situation aids in creating a professional relationship based on transparency and trust. However, transparency and trust are often overlooked in the legal profession, especially when it comes to contracts.

A large portion of the work done by legal professionals involves drafting contracts between and for their clients. If there is one area of law that the Plain English movement has been slow to materialize, it is contract law. Oftentimes contracts are lengthy, deliberately ambiguous, and designed to bury provisions and exclusions that favor the client. Yet, Rule 8.4 Misconduct (Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018) states: “It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to: (a) violate these rules or the State Bar Act, knowingly* assist, solicit, or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;...(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud,* deceit, or reckless or intentional misrepresentation....”. Advising clients to use deliberately unclear and complex language with their employees can imply knowledge of potentially dishonest or unenforceable contract terms. Thus, if a law professional counsels a client to use intentionally unclear prose as a way to deceive their employees, there is a violation of ethics.

In conclusion, as with most things in the legal world, the answer to whether using unnecessarily complex language with clients, or advising clients to use confusing language with employees, is ethical, is not obvious. These ambiguities, combined with the dense prose used in legalese, certainly contributes to the common perception that law professionals are untrustworthy. As interpreters of the law, lawyers and paralegals have a duty to their clients to use direct, understandable language when communicating legal rights and responsibilities. While the Plain English movement has brought awareness to the importance of speaking to clients and advising clients to use prose that can be clearly interpreted, it has not been widely put into practice. Whether this is due to ego, or to the difficulty of interpreting legalese into Plain English, the result is the same: the imposing semantics often used by law professionals creates a divide between client and lawyer that contributes to the view that lawyers and paralegals operate in an ethically ambiguous manner.

ciphers. You load up a document until it is saturated with Latin phrases and hyper-syllabic vocabulary, dripping with sticky clauses, so that no outside eyes can comprehend it. To bury the real meaning under a straining heap of language. The average reader might pick out familiar words, like sorting out pieces of a puzzle that have the same color. But the full picture eludes them. They can't quite get their fingers to grasp it.

Can it ever be right to do that to someone? Of course it can. Under Nazi occupation, people hid books, fudged ledgers, burned documents. Their records held lives in the balance. Any small act to keep information from the hands of those who would do harm became quiet heroism. Is it so hard to imagine that in times like ours, big words and lumbering sentences can become a layer of protection? Conceal, hide, obscure, withhold, mask, shelter, shroud, disguise, cover, keep secret. When your client is a real son of a gun, textbook unethical, resorting to less-than-clear language might be a refuge. You might just go wild with that jargon. There does come an “ever” in which ethical practice *demand*s opacity.

But now we're getting sucked into the swamp of moral relativism, because who's to say your client is a son of a gun?

It's a delicate thing. The balance of power is always unequal. You have the advantage over your client, and they have their advantage over theirs. You can choose to be clear or murky—that choice is in your hands alone. They rely on your goodwill to navigate on an open sea of secret codes. It would be easy to justify a little more, the benefit gradually shifting from public to private and from moral to material. The flow of information is a mighty thing to control, and endlessly tempting.

The study of law is, at its most ancient core, the study of words and their connections to the people who wield them. Their meanings, their uses, their purposes and weights and implications. “What did they mean by *this* ?” “What ways can *this* be applied?” The world abounds in complexity. Whether you clear that complexity away, and share your knowledge in good faith, or gather it thicker, will depend on who you are helping, and why.

All we can do is follow our own pared-down maxims of good intentions. Mine is simply: try to do right. The rest is just filler text.

Thank You to Our Previous Board Members

The SFPA would like to thank the following individuals for their dedication and service over the past, recent years. We greatly respect and appreciate their selfless efforts in making the San Francisco Paralegal Association a better place:

Denise Bashline

Albert Chen

Ian Elkus

Cindy Harrison

Leticia Jimenez

Dalia Liang

Barbara Occhiogrosso

Jenna Rodrigues

Vince Valle

Vincent Yasay

Fall Social Recap

On November 6, the SFPA ventured out to San Leandro for their last social of the year. Planned by Board Member/2019 Treasurer Eric Logsdon, the event was held at The Englander Sports Pub & Restaurant. Thank you to our SFPA members, our sustaining members, and other company representatives for joining us. We had a fantastic time! We look forward to seeing you at our next event, whether it be at our next social, a board meeting, a MCLE event, or at our annual events.



2020 Kicks Off Right: Winter Social at Patriot House

On February 27, the SFPA kicked off 2020 with their first social of the year at the Patriot House. We had multiple sustaining member representatives appear with our enthusiastic members and special appearance by Los Angeles Paralegal Association's President, Tony Sipp. Overall, it was great as we connected with our old friends again. [Check out our photos from the event.](#)

We look forward to seeing at our next event. [Check out our calendar for details.](#)



Wasting Time No More – The Motion to Compel

BY: Michael Schiraldi

EDITOR’S NOTE: This article provides perspective from a civil litigation, state court viewpoint.

The discovery process is both a blessing and a nuisance.

The ideal of discovery is to gather information and documents that are key and related to the case without any fuss. Discovery is necessary, because the practice allows each side to find out about the allegations and/or the defenses in a complaint. Ideally, discovery is a two-way street. The Plaintiff gets to propound interrogatories and ask for documents, and the Defendant gets to do the same. The Plaintiff and Defendant can each request depositions to take place. In the end, discovery allows each party to narrow the issues present so that a clean trial can take place (or eventually lead to a settlement).

Straightforward, right?

Wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong. Wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong.

At times, discovery is like going to the dentist, because the process is similar to pulling teeth to receive the responses and documents your firm needs. Some attorneys and their clients like to play games. They refuse to give up clearly discoverable information and documents (or what we like to think is in the realm of relevant). The other side refuses to yield.

The only option when we meet this unbreakable force is to move to compel. While this is a last resort, it is a necessary action when your opponent will not budge from their position. It eliminates the gamesmanship, evasiveness, and inadequacy of your enemy’s responses, and it allows one to receive the information needed to proceed forward.

The motion to compel (“MTC”) has several moving parts that all paralegals need to be aware of.

Requirements

Meet and Confer

Pursuant to California Civil Code of Civil Procedure (“CCP”) §2016.040, prior to filing any MTC, the parties must engage in a reasonable attempt to resolve the discovery dispute. A usual meet and confer process will involve the writing of a letter detailing the question and answer, and why the response is deficient. Telephonic conferences may also be used. If no reasonable meet and confer occurs prior to the MTC, the Court may issue sanctions. See CCP §§2023.010(i), 2023.020, 2023.030.

The only exception appears if no response is made within the thirty days (or the allotted time to respond to said discovery). This failure by the responding party waives any objections. CCP §2030.290(a) [interrogatories]. An immediate motion to compel is authorized and there is no need to meet and confer. CCP §2030.290(b) [interrogatories]. If you establish the following facts: (1) discovery propounded, (2) time to respond has past and (3) no responses were provided, you are entitled to an order compelling responses without objections. *Leach v. Superior Court* (1980), 111 Cal.App.3rd, 902, 905-906.

Setting the Date

The timing for filing the MTC is 45 days for written discovery when received at your firm (plus x days if service occurred other than hand delivery, see CCP §1013(a)) – or by written agreement specifying a later date. See CCP §§2030.300(c) [interrogatories], 2031.310(c) [document requests], 2033.290(c) [admissions]. One needs to finish the good faith meet and confer process within this period before filing. Of note, no time limit for a MTC exists where no responses have been served. See *Sinaiko Healthcare Consulting, Inc. v. Pacific Healthcare Consultants* (2007) Cal.App.4th 390, 410-411.

(Continued on Page 5)

Of course, the local rules play havoc here as well. Depending upon which county (and the Judge assigned) you are in; the parties may be mired in a Discovery Facilitator Program or assigned a Discovery Referee. Additionally, the paralegal needs to be aware of when the Court hears these types of motions, and if a particular department is assigned. Always check the local rules before proceeding.

The Rule 3.1345 Statement

A separate statement is required for any motion involving discovery responses. California Rules of Court (“CRC”) 3.1345. The only time a separate statement may be excluded are when no responses have been served and if the Court permits it. CRC 3.1345(b). This standalone document, filed and served with the MTC, provides each disputed discovery request that is subject to the MTC. The statement must identify the set and number of the interrogatory, inspection demand, or admission request. CRC 3.1345(d)

The statement must identify the entire text of the question, followed by the entire text of the response. Include the text of the definitions to the discovery requests. After the request and response, a section entitled, “REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE SHOULD BE COMPELLED” follows. This section provides the factual and legal reasons why a further response is necessary. If the party is defending against a MTC, a heading with “REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NOT NECESSARY” or something similar is included to detail why a further response is not required.

The Declaration

The essential exhibits to the MTC’s declaration include the following:

- ⇒ The Discovery Questions and Responses in Full: The entire set of the propounded and the responded discovery in dispute are included.
- ⇒ The Meet and Confer Correspondence: The exhibits will include the good faith meet and confer (as discussed above) prior to the filing of the discovery motion. Attorneys will describe their attempts in paragraph form within the declaration detailing any phone

conferences, written correspondence, etc. Finally, one may end with the classic; “I attempted to meet and confer with Defendant regarding their responses in the letter and e-mails as attached to this declaration, but was unsuccessful.

- ⇒ Any Agreement to Extend the MTC Deadline: If an extension was granted to extend the deadline to file the motion, a statement within the declaration paragraphs or a letter attached must be included to show that the motion is timely.
- ⇒ If you are seeking sanctions, the attorney should include an account of how much time he or she has spent drafting the motion, the meeting and confer process, the anticipated time of preparing and attending the hearing, and the attorney’s reasonable hourly rate.

A word here about sanctions. The code states the Court shall impose a monetary sanction against any party, person, or attorney who unsuccessfully makes or opposes a motion to compel, i.e. CCP 2031.310(h) [inspection demands] (*see generally* CCP §2023.010, *et. seq.* regarding misuse of the discovery process). The Court will not impose sanctions if it finds that the one subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or other circumstances. *Id.*

Discovery is the linchpin in any civil litigation case. Without it, we cannot proceed forward and test our theories. The motion to compel is a necessary tool that all paralegals will use at one point or another when we cannot waste time no more.

Michael Schiraldi is a paralegal at The Brandi Law Firm. A current SFPA board member and instructor at San Francisco State University, he resides in San Francisco.

New Developments in the Access to Justice Movement— West Coast Edition

BY: Barbara Occhiogrosso

EDITOR'S NOTE: The Access to Justice Movement has been gaining momentum throughout the United States. This particular column focuses on the West Coast progress and provides a number of links and resources to keep up with the changing information.

First, a general/survey article regarding the emerging position of Limited Practice Legal Professionals (including the LLLT) published in *The Bar Examiner* online:

<https://thebarexaminer.org/article/winter-2018-2019/limited-practice-legal-professionals-a-look-at-three-models/>

Do you want to learn more about the new Court Navigator position? Here is an introduction, with resources per state listed at the end of the report:

<https://www.srln.org/system/files/attachments/Final%20Navigator%20report%206.11.pdf>

Action by state:

CALIFORNIA

https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/advocates-for-law-firm-ownership-rule-change-vocal-at-caforumutm_source=rss&utm_medium=DLNW&utm_campaign=0000016c-7c1e-db91-ad7d-ff1f841f0001

CA State Bar calling for public comment ahead of a report published for regulatory reforms developed by the Task Force on Access Through Innovation of Legal Services (ATILS) in December 2019:

<http://www.calbar.ca.gov/About-Us/Our-Mission/Protecting-the-Public/Public-Comment/Public-Comment-Archives/2019-Public-Comment/Options-for-Regulatory-Reforms-to-Promote-Access-to-Justice>

Article reporting on public comments received as per the ATILS request in September 2019:

<https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/california-bar-swamped-by-comments-opposing-ethics-rule-changes>

<https://www.epiglobal.com/en-us/thinking/blog/california-looking-to-expand-legal-technology>

The latest regarding CA Legal Access recommendations at the state level:

https://biglawbusiness.com/california-legal-access-recommendations-delayed-until-march?utm_campaign=BLB_NWSLTR_BLB%20Daiy_112019&utm_medium=email&utm_source=Elogua

OREGON

<https://www.lawsitesblog.com/2019/10/in-move-to-enhance-access-to-justice-oregon-bar-oks-licensed-paralegals-and-bar-admission-without-law-school.html>

<http://www.abajournal.com/news/article/oregon-bar-to-consider-paraprofessional-licensing-and-bar-takers-without-jds>

ARIZONA

<https://biglawbusiness.com/arizona-weighs-role-of-non-lawyers-in-boosting-access-to-justice>

UTAH

<https://www.lawsitesblog.com/2019/10/lawnext-episode-55-utahs-bold-experiment-to-reimagine-legal-services.html>

SFPA's SUSTAINING MEMBERS -

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTINUING SUPPORT!

File & Serve *Xpress*™



PARALEGAL
AT
Cañada College



ALEXIS CARTWRIGHT



O'Grady Law Group, APC



CAL STATE
EAST BAY



SDL * *macro pro*



2019 SFPA Paralegal of the Year: Pam Prasad

Pam Prasad was the 2019 SFPA Paralegal of the Year.

Pam earned her certificate from CSUEB in 2012 after working as a paralegal since 1990. For the last 16 years, she has worked at Mid-Pen Housing, a non-profit that works to provide housing for low income families.

Pam has been an active member on the Community Service and Pro Bono Committee (“Committee”) since 2013. In the first few years, she provided expertise to help the Committee draft and finalize our disclosure statement, call script, and mission statement. She participated on the temporary Steering Committee to determine Committee member roles and responsibilities to draft and finalize the Chair, Secretary and Lead contact descriptions.

In 2017, Pam was voted in as the Committee’s Secretary to assist in agenda preparation and distribution and to draft and finalize meeting minutes. She has hosted many Committee meetings in her home which have included a hot breakfast, without asking for reimbursement. She has also provided assistance in communicating with several pro bono partners and is the current lead contact with the Transgender Law Center. She had a banner made for the Committee and continues to store the banner for events.

In the last two years, Pam has provided invaluable planning ideas and support for the Volunteer event. Although she recently accepted a new Senior paralegal position, she generously offered to use her time off between jobs to get catering quotes and organize food for 65 attendees on November 16 and has also offered to complete any necessary last-minute food shopping on the day of the event.

Pam completed the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training in 2015 in Foster City and Hayward to learn new skills and act as a community leader in the event of a disaster at her work or local neighborhood until professional responders are available.

Annual Meeting 2019 Recap

BY: Michael Schiraldi

On Friday, October 25, 2019, the SFPA held their 47th Annual Meeting at the SF Bar Association. In a jam packed, five MCLE session covered different subjects for our promising paralegals. There were over 50 attendees in the audience, including voting members, student members, and non-members throughout the Bay Area and California.

The day started with the President's Address from President Denise Bashline and the Annual Report, by Eric Logsdon, Treasurer, followed by our 5 MCLE speakers. The five distinguished lecturers and subjects were:

- Judge Monica F. Wiley, The Rule of Law and Why It Still Matters
- Sandra Hilton, JD, LLM - A View From the Probate Examiner's Desk
- Lauren N. Pebbles, Esq. - Estate Planning and Probate Administration: Beyond the Basics
- Paul Wright of D1 Discovery - eDiscovery Today
- Scott Herndon, Esq. and David Wolf - "Do You Even Know My Name?" Managing Client Interactions in Personal Injury and Employment Law

Our MCLE speakers spoke passionately about the topics presented ranging from estate planning to eDiscovery to



an entertaining panel discussion of ethics.

Overall, it was a great MCLE event exposing paralegals to different subjects as we continue to gain knowledge in our changing profession.

At the conclusion of the last MCLE seminar, the SFPA handed out three types of awards – dedication of service recognition, paralegal of the year, and the

student essay winner. First, we honored those individuals who have contributed to the association and have made a difference in the paralegal community. Awarded certificates of appreciation were Claude Anyos, Eduardo Cerpa, and Francie Skaggs. Their contributions over the past years have been instrumental for the SFPA in thriving and

continuing the SFPA's mission goals. Additionally, they have been pillars to the legal profession for their exemplary and outstanding contributions.

This year's paralegal of the year was Pam Prasad, who has worked at Mid-Pen Housing since 1990. Pam's qualifications (see insert) make her a worthy recipient of this award. Finally, the student essay winner was jointly awarded to Emily Wilburn and Kate Hanna. The essay prompt was the Plain English movement. Emily and Kate's essays are included in the At Issue for reading.

The final announcement of the day was the election results for 2020. After nomination and voting periods, the results for the officer positions were as follows:

Amy McGuigan – President
Bibi Shaw – Vice President
Erin Keller – Treasurer
Susan Jaffe – Secretary

Voted in for the 2020 at large board members included:

Denise Bashline
Malcolm Campbell
Gregory Johnson
Roy LeDuc
Eric Logsdon
Kimberly Louie
Cynthia Reese
Wanda Remmers
Elizabeth Terreros
Trish Watson
Michael Schiraldi

Congratulations to all of our officers and at large board members!

We greatly and profusely thank Judge Wiley, Sandra Hilton, JD, LLM, Lauren N. Pebbles, Esq., Paul Wright, Scott Herndon, Esq., and David Wolf, Esq. for speaking at this year's event. Special thanks to Thompson Reuters, D1 Discovery, Cañada College, and One Legal for our great sponsors and exhibitors to this event.

Finally, thank you to all of our attendees at this event. We hope to see you at our next SFPA events in the upcoming 2020 year.

Paralegal Lessons from The Iowa Caucus

BY: Michael Schiraldi

EDITOR'S NOTE: This article provides a paralegal perspective as the Iowa Caucus went to Hell.

You may be aware that they had the Iowa Caucus back on February 3, 2020.

Things did not go according to plan. Namely, the application created to tabulate and report the results failed miserably, as widely reported - no one had the foresight to test the application prior to the event, and zero, competent contingency planning occurred.

Three things that we can learn as paralegals from this fiasco:

1. Know and Test How Your Technology Works

Imagine you are flying and going to your favorite destination. You are sitting back, ready to sip your favorite drink and watch a film, when the flight attendant invites you up to the front to see the cockpit. You go up. The pilots greet you, show you a few of the buttons, and then say, "Hey, we are going to take a break, why don't you fly for a while?"

Madness! You would never agree to this. You go running back to your seat to the safe and comfortable confines wondering what that was all about.

As a paralegal, if you do not know how to use the computer software,

then you do not have the appropriate skills nor the correct mindset to accomplish the task. As a paralegal, we must educate ourselves to utilize the programs if we do not know how to use them. All technology requires precision and the correct foundation to operate it correctly. Practice makes perfect.

2. Have a Plan B (and a Plan C) and Keep It on the Rocks

Often in the paralegal world, chaos reigns. Paralegals are firefighters, when all hell is breaking loose; we are right in the middle of the storm.

Every paralegal knows that you need to have a second (and a third and a fourth) option. One cannot just enter the law arena with one plan in mind. You need to have choices. Putting your eggs in one basket never works. We need to be flexible, ready to adapt with that spare ace in the hole to get out of whatever mess the attorney hands us. That is what paralegals do!

Finally, panicking never helps. We need to keep calm, cool and collected in times of trouble. Just because everybody else is running amok with no clue of what they are doing, it does not mean (as a para-

legal) you should join the mob. We think better and clearer when we are in our moment of Zen. Seize it – do not go to the pandemonium side.

3. Use Your Brain

All of us are born with a tremendous amount of intelligence. Utilize it. The greatest intangible that separates us is our ability to critically combine a tremendous amount of information in a short time.

Do not, under any circumstances, forget that we have a brain. Think before we act and more importantly, consider the consequences of our decisions. No half measures. Full measures only in the paralegal world.

Long story short: As a paralegal, do not be like the Iowa Caucus 2020 and learn from their errors. Proper paralegal planning prevents putrid poor paralegal performance.

Michael Schiraldi is a paralegal at The Brandi Law Firm. A current SFPA board member and instructor at San Francisco State University, he resides in San Francisco.

About the San Francisco Paralegal Association

The San Francisco Paralegal Association is a nonprofit organization created to represent the paralegal profession as an independent, self-directed profession, to enable paralegals to enhance their professional development, and to support the expansion of the delivery of legal services in an economic and effective manner. The SFPA is a diverse, lively and engaged group of legal professionals, and our newsletter is a great way to remain informed about our presence in the Bay Area and beyond, and receive information you can use in your own practice from people actively working in the field.

The SFPA's newsletter, *At Issue* is published four times per year, and contains compelling, informative and practical information, including feature articles on a broad range of topics, practical articles on all branches of law and different aspects of paralegal practice, social updates, section event calendars and reports, a featured paralegal bio and information (to get to know individual members better), as well as any other relevant announcements of events and resources of interest to our membership.

More information about our Board of Directors, bylaws, committees and practice sections can be found in the [About](#) section of the SFPA site.

Please visit our [Calendar](#) to find out about upcoming events.

If you are interested in joining the SFPA, information about how to do so can be found in the [Membership](#) section of the SFPA site.

We also welcome content from authors within our membership and beyond. To submit an article, please send requests to info@sfpa.com.

Advertising in *At Issue*

Our advertising guidelines are as follows:

- Our newsletter is published on a quarterly basis, i.e. four times per year. The advertising deadline is the 15th of the month prior to publication of each issue.
- Publication of advertising by the SFPA does not imply endorsement of the products and/or services offered.
- The SFPA is not responsible for late or incomplete submissions being included in the upcoming issue – in these cases, publication of advertising could be moved to a later date. This includes advertisements and event announcements.
- All advertising submissions are subject to approval by the SFPA Executive Board. Please be sure to submit only content that is either owned by your organization, or properly licensed for the appropriate usage. *At Issue* bears no responsibility for unauthorized content submitted for advertising purposes.
- Please follow indicated guidelines and submit all advertisements at size in JPEG format *at a minimum resolution of 72dpi* (higher resolution submissions are acceptable - we will resize as appropriate). The SFPA reserves the right to modify ads that do not adhere to these guidelines and is not responsible for any loss of integrity that results.

LENGTH/SIZE	CARD (2" X 3.5")	1/4 PAGE (4.25" X 5.5")	1/2 PAGE (5.5" x 8.5")	FULL PAGE (8.5" x 11")
SUSTAINING— 1 ISSUE	\$20	\$40	\$60	\$85
NON-SUSTAINING— 1 ISSUE	\$35	\$55	\$75	\$100
SUSTAINING— 1 YEAR (4 ISSUES)	\$70	\$105	\$220	\$310
NON-SUSTAINING— 1 YEAR (4 ISSUES)	\$130	\$205	\$280	\$370

For advertising inquiries, please contact info@sfpa.com.

DISCLAIMER: The SFPA is published as ONLINE newsletter only – we do not publish print versions.

2020 San Francisco Paralegal Association Board Members

Amy Jo McGuigan – President
Bibi Shaw – Vice President
Trish Watson – Secretary
Erin Keller – Treasurer

Malcolm Campbell
Greg Johnson
Eric Logsdon
Kimberly Louie
Cynthia Reese
Michael Schiraldi

SFPA provides a number of opportunities to participate, plan, and shape our organization. The SFPA Board would like to invite interested members to volunteer if so inclined. Our next board meeting will be on March 18, 2020 at Wilson Sonsini, One Market Street, 19th Floor, Room 19-C, San Francisco. Come join us – we would love to see you! Please contact us at info@sfpa.com if you would like to find out more.

Calling All Cars—We Need Your Help

The SFPA is a dedicated organization made up of selfless volunteers, who in addition to their real world jobs, dedicate their time to improve this group.

We need your help. If you are interested in helping to continue to assist, sustain, and thrive this growing organization, please e-mail us info@sfpa.com we would love to hear from you. This is an opportunity to help the SFPA as well as to meet and connect with new people.

Upcoming Events—Mark Your Calendars

March 18, 2020 at 6:00 P.M.— SFPA Board Meeting, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 1900, San Francisco, CA 94105



San Francisco Paralegal Association
1 Sansome Street, Ste. 3500
San Francisco, CA 94104-4448
(415) 946-8935
info@sfpa.com

Connect with the Association:



www.sfpa.com

At Issue is published on a quarterly basis. If you would like to contribute content for submission to our newsletter, please send your inquiry to info@sfpa.com