


MaryBeth Lindsey

From: Anthony Berry <anthonyberryesq@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:29 PM
To: appellatecourtclerk
Subject: Comment on ADM2025-01538



Warning: Unusual sender <anthonyberryesq@gmail.com>

You don't usually receive emails from this address. Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed amendment to Rule 21 that would require attorneys to receive one hour of continuing legal education in mental health or substance abuse disorders every three years.

First, it is enough that attorneys in Tennessee must complete 15 hours of continuing legal education every year. Adding an additional requirement that must be kept track of in three-year increments adds an unwanted burden that will doubtless serve as a pitfall for many who will simply forget this new and unusual requirement. The stress thereby added to our lives would surely offset whatever mental health benefits the Tennessee Lawyer Assistance Program seeks to promote by its endeavor here.

Furthermore, the purpose of continuing legal education is to keep oneself informed as to developments in the law or ethical strategies for practicing it. While maintaining one's mental health is important, it is not the place of the State to obligate anyone to be a captive and regular audience to opinions on it or advertisements for relevant services. It would be just as inappropriate for the State to obligate attorneys to attend a regular CLE on gym memberships, nutrition, or weight loss even though physical health is as important as mental health.


Finally, there exists no need for a new CLE requirement for Tennessee lawyers. The Tennessee Lawyer Assistance Program is already well known, and to the extent that it is not, the Tennessee Lawyer Assistance Program can find other ways to advertise itself than by burdening the entirety of the legal profession with another CLE to keep track of.

Thus, I would ask that the proposed amendment be rejected.

Sincerely,
Anthony Berry

MaryBeth Lindsey

From:
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:06 PM
To: appellatecourtclerk
Subject: ADM2025-01538



Warning: Unusual sender

You don't usually receive emails from this address. Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Dear Court Clerk,

I am a retired attorney but have been living mental health hell with my grown daughter whose problem created a plethora of criminal, civil, and custody problems which have cost me the price of a house and continue to be resolved.

The mental health issue must be addressed. Not just for attorneys but also for their clients be they defendants or plaintiffs. There is a huge gap between the law and mental health. Mental health, as you surely are aware, is now a huge problem in our world and much injustice happens because of that gap.

I suggest that one hour CLE a year is inadequate to assure that clients are considered in order to avoid the travesties of justice that I have experienced and that are happening at all socio economic levels. A person without resources is essentially kicked to the curb without an understanding of mental health problems by the bar.

The injustices include the juvenile court system which needs it as much as anyone. My experience has been that, if a drug problem, there is a path the court follows. If a mental health problem, it boils down to whether the judge and guardian ad litem have any understanding whatsoever of the dynamics. Add a contention-loving lawyer to the mix, who is more about control, winning, and earning fees and only the child gets hurt. I have seen too many instances wherein the attorney for the plaintiffs who got a Dependency and Neglect granted, was so stuck on showing off that the child's best interest was hurt and the mother's mental health continued to decline by being kept from her child.

All this being said, I know my comments may not be considered. After experiencing the legal system from the outside, I am glad that I chose to leave the legal profession. I lived 72 years with only going to court with a divorce. I lived the last 2 with nothing but civil, criminal, and custody lawyers, some of whom have made everything worse.

Please do not post my name anywhere with this comment. It would only exacerbate the difficulty of getting justice.

Memphis Tennessee

(Where it is said that Memphis practices Memphis law)

MaryBeth Lindsey

From: h.delughter@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:48 AM
To: appellatecourtclerk
Subject: Comment on No. ADM2025-01538



ADM2025-01538

Warning: Unusual sender <h.delughter@gmail.com>

You don't usually receive emails from this address.
Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Good afternoon,

In response to No. ADM2025-01538, please, do not require one hour of mental health CLE.

That is simply another matter that attorneys must track, counterintuitively adding to their strain.


There is nothing wrong with current CLE courses including discussion of mental health, but that discussion does not need to be mandatory.

Additionally, mental health is already a well-known phrase and seemingly all members of the public are aware of it and of ways to seek assistance if desired.

Hardy DeLaughter
TN BPR 037248

MaryBeth Lindsey

From: Zachary Jones <zjones@martinjoneslaw.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 6:27 PM
To: appellatecourtclerk
Subject: Comment on Proposed Amendment to Rule 21 (ADM2025-01538)



Warning: Unusual sender

You don't usually receive emails from this address. Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Comment on Proposed Amendment to Rule 21 (ADM2025-01538)

Respectfully, the proposed amendment—though unimpeachable in intent—moves us further down a slippery slope within an already dense and expanding compliance regime. Once we carve out a mandatory hour for mental-health or substance-abuse content, why not also require stand-alone hours for technology competence, cybersecurity, financial literacy, civility, diversity and inclusion, physical wellness, domestic abuse, artificial-intelligence risk, speeding (and other traffic violations that cause injuries and fatalities on Tennessee highways), honesty, attorney advertising, and so on? Each is important. But compelled slices of curriculum for all of them would crowd out an attorney's professional judgment as to which CLE programs best serve their practice and would further—and unnecessarily—complicate Tennessee's CLE framework, especially for small firms and lawyers admitted in multiple jurisdictions.

Tennessee lawyers already have abundant access to ethics and professionalism CLE—including mental-health and substance-use programming—through the TBA and many other providers. The current framework empowers attorneys to select the ethics content most responsive to their practices and clients. Before adding a new mandate, the Court should ask: Is there credible evidence that compulsory attendance in these topics reduces impairment or improves outcomes? If the answer is uncertain, the wiser course is to preserve flexibility.

Tennessee attorneys' CLE resources are best devoted to programming that fits their individual needs, practices, and clients—not to navigating ever-more granular compliance dictates. Encourage these courses, spotlight them, even incentivize them; but do not make them compulsory.

Zach Jones (Tenn. Bar Reg. No. 34756)

Martin & Jones, PLLC

Partner

304 Main Ave South
Fayetteville, TN 37334
O: 931.532.0665
D: 931.532.7066