



Dear Clients & Friends,

Over the past year, growth has been a central theme for Brody Wilkinson encompassing new business development opportunities, streamlined internal operations and the strategic relocation of our New York City office to better serve clients.

We are delighted to publish the 2024 edition of our Client Newsletter. This issue covers a range of significant topics, including updates on the future of non-competition covenants and the Corporate Transparency Act, as well as discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of private foundations and beneficiary designations. Additionally, we welcome **John R. Bambrick** and honor **William J. Britt**, while highlighting other noteworthy news.

We hope you find this content valuable and engaging. The issue showcases the unique and complementary skills our attorneys offer to clients. If you wish to opt-in to receive our electronic update, please complete the news sign-up form on the BW website and remember to follow us on LinkedIn, X and Facebook. We are grateful for your continued trust and support.

Best Regards,

Brody Wilkinson PC

Update & Reminder About The Corporate Transparency Act

ON JANUARY 1, 2024, THE FEDERAL CORPORATE TRANSPARENCY ACT (CTA) took effect, mandating that “reporting companies” register with, and provide certain information to, the U.S. Department of Treasury’s Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN). We discussed the CTA in detail in our electronic update in December 2023 (which can be found on our website under News & Resources), but we wanted to include an update and a reminder.

The CTA applies to all entities that are created by filing documents with a secretary of state (or similar office) such as corporations and limited liability companies (even if a single member) unless otherwise exempt. Certain entities, including publicly traded companies and tax-exempt entities, are exempt and not considered reporting companies. While trusts and estates are not reporting companies, if a trust or estate has an interest in a reporting company, then individuals connected with the trust and estate may need to provide information to reporting companies (this is covered in a separate article on our website).

All reporting companies created before 2024 must file their report on or before January 1, 2025. All reporting companies created in 2024 must file their report within 90 days of creation, and all companies created in 2025 and after must file their report within 30 days after creation. Any amendments, updates, or corrections to reports must be submitted within 30 days of the change. There are penalties imposed for willful failure to comply. You may learn more about filing requirements and file reports directly on FinCEN’s website at <https://www.fincen.gov/boi>. To assist with CTA compliance, we encourage you to consider using third-party providers that we can recommend.

Recently, a federal court in Alabama ruled that the CTA is unconstitutional, but the ruling is limited to the plaintiffs in that case and has been appealed. In an online notice, FinCEN indicated that it would abide by the court’s ruling in the Alabama case for as long as it is effective but that it would continue to implement and enforce the CTA against all other reporting companies. As such, reporting companies should abide by the CTA filing obligations.

New York recently implemented its own version of the CTA, known as the LLC Transparency Act. New York’s law is broadly patterned after the CTA, but it applies only to limited liability companies formed in, or qualified to do business in, New York. It requires disclosure of information to the state by January 1, 2027 for LLCs formed or qualified before January 1, 2026. LLCs formed or qualified on or after January 1, 2026 will have

30 days to comply. It also requires annual statements confirming or updating information reported. Other states are considering adopting their own version of the CTA. The above referenced federal case has no impact on a state’s version of the CTA. *For more information, please contact Mark W. Klein (mklein@brodywilk.com), Lisa F. Metz (lmetz@brodywilk.com) or another BW attorney.*

FTC Issues Final Rule Banning Non-Competition Covenants

THE USE OF NON-COMPETITION COVENANTS

in employment agreements has been on the ropes for several years, increasingly so after the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) proposed a rule banning such covenants in 2023. The FTC has now issued its final rule in an attempt to deliver a knock-out blow for this controversial issue in employment law.

The FTC has formulated a two-pronged rule, banning virtually all employers from entering into, enforcing or attempting to enforce post-employment non-competition covenants with workers and also taking the extraordinary measure of invalidating existing non-competes. The rule is broad in its scope, prohibiting non-competition covenants with workers, which includes employees, independent contractors, sole proprietors providing services and beyond. The FTC does provide exceptions for non-competition covenants entered into in connection with the sale of a business and causes of action regarding non-competition covenants that arise prior to the rule taking effect. In addition, the rule provides a limited exception allowing the enforcement of non-competition covenants with certain senior executives that were entered into prior to the effective date of the rule (but prohibits such agreements with senior executives following the effective date).

The FTC offers a uniform national approach to eliminate non-competition covenants. While such covenants have become increasingly disfavored throughout the United States, legislation has been limited to local and state bans, which have typically targeted the use of non-competition agreements in specific industries or pertaining to specific types of workers. For example, Connecticut has regulated non-competition covenants for security guards, broadcast employees, physicians and home health care, companion and homemaker employees. Conversely, the FTC rule applies to almost all employers across all industries.

The rule is scheduled to become effective on or about September 4, 2024, barring a successful legal challenge to the final rule. Legal action to that effect is currently underway. In fact, on July 8, 2024, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas in the case of *Ryan LLC v. Federal Trade Commission* granted the plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary

injunction postponing the effective date of the FTC's rule. The decision applies only to the specific plaintiffs in that matter. However, the Court indicated that it will rule on the merits of the case prior to September 4, 2004. In the meantime, employers should consult with counsel to perform an audit of their restrictive covenant practices. All agreements, plans and policies that incorporate non-competition covenants should be carefully reviewed; employers should also review their agreements, plans and policies that incorporate non-solicitation covenants, as such covenants will remain enforceable and may offer the employer the best opportunity to protect its business interests. Employers should also be making contingency plans to comply with this potential change. Furthermore, if employers desire non-competition covenants with senior executives, such agreements must be entered into before the final rule takes effect. Otherwise, employers can wait to see if and when the FTC's rule becomes law.

Regardless of whether this rule becomes law, the trend is unmistakable – non-competition covenants in the employment context are on borrowed time. Employers must start making contingency plans and considering their use of restricted covenants in the near future. *For more information, please contact Daniel B. Fitzgerald (dfitzgerald@brodywilk.com) or another BW attorney.*

Exploring The Pros & Cons of Private Foundations

MORE AND MORE, CLIENTS ARE INTEGRATING CHARITABLE GIVING into their estate plans.

Private foundations and donor advised funds are effective vehicles for facilitating charitable wishes. However, each presents its own set of advantages and disadvantages that clients should consider.

Pros of Private Foundations:

- 1. Flexibility in Giving:** Private foundations offer a pool of charitable funds for future donations. Donors have the freedom to choose the causes they are passionate about and tailor their philanthropic efforts accordingly, allowing for a more hands-on approach.
- 2. Legacy Building:** Establishing a private foundation allows individuals or families to provide continuing funding for a cause. Generations can work together on charitable grants as a way to discuss family values.
- 3. Control Over Assets:** Donors can control all aspects of the foundation from asset management to charitable distributions.
- 4. Compensation:** It is possible to employ family members to operate the foundation.

Cons of Private Foundations:

- 1. Administrative Burden:** Private foundations often come with administrative responsibilities, including legal compliance, financial reporting, and operational management. The reporting may also open the family up to public scrutiny.
- 2. Minimum Payout Requirements:** Private foundations are required by law to distribute a minimum percentage of their assets annually for charitable purposes.
- 3. Potential for Self-Dealing:** The potential for conflicts of interest and self-dealing exists within private foundations, as donors may be involved in both the foundation and the organizations it supports. The private foundation rules impose significant financial penalties for violating the rules.

Pros of Donor Advised Funds (DAFs):

- 1. Minimal Reporting:** The DAF itself is a public charity — the family's fund is a sub-set of that charity. The DAF is responsible for all reporting to the state and federal authorities. The donor simply directs the grant to be made.
- 2. Legacy Building:** Similar to a Private Foundation, generations can work together to select charitable grants. These family discussions are a great way to shape and share family values.
- 3. Ease of Giving:** The donor's primary focus with a DAF is the selection of the grant recipients. The DAF can assist with identifying new organizations that meet the donor's charitable intentions. The organizational vetting is already done. The donor only needs to make the gift.

Cons of Donor Advised Funds:

- 1. Cost:** The DAF pays a fee to the host organization for investment management and administrative services.
- 2. Limits on Charitable Recipients:** Generally, DAFs do not allow for scholarships, international grants or grants to individuals. For some donors this limits the impact they can make. Others may find an alternative route for fulfilling their intentions.
- 3. Investments:** Most DAFs do not allow donors to control the investments. Many donors believe that they are a better steward of the funds than the charity and prefer to control the investing.

Either charitable vehicle may be right for you and your family depending on the size of the charitable fund to be established and the time you and your family want to spend. *For more information, please contact Heather J. Lange (hlange@brodywilk.com) or another BW attorney.*

Beneficiary Designations: When To Have Them, When To Avoid Them

BENEFICIARY DESIGNATIONS IN THEORY

sound like a wonderful idea. Clients are able to name individuals to receive the assets in the account upon their death without probate. However, having a beneficiary designation on an account is not always advisable. Our recommendations often depend on the family situation and the estate planning documents in place. Clients should check their beneficiary designations to ensure they are accurate every few years.

When To Have A Beneficiary Designation

Clients should always have a beneficiary designation in place for retirement assets and life insurance. If not, the account custodian may have a default beneficiary. If there is no default beneficiary, then the assets would pass to the estate and require probate. Beneficiaries for retirement assets are extremely important in order to get the greatest benefit from the account.

If a client has created a revocable trust, the trust should be named as the beneficiary of any accounts that remain in an individual's sole name and have not been retitled to the name of the trust. The named trust beneficiary would be as follows: [Name of Trustees], Trustees of The [Client Name] Revocable Trust under agreement dated [Date].

When Not To Have A Beneficiary Designation

Often people name individual beneficiaries on accounts not realizing that by doing so they are overriding the provisions they have made in their Wills or revocable trusts. This means if a client names children as beneficiaries through a beneficiary designation, the children will receive those assets outright and it will not be distributed pursuant to the terms of the client's estate planning documents. If a child is a minor, then a court would need to appoint a guardian for the child to hold such funds. Such funds would then be controlled by someone the client did not choose and the child would be required to receive the funds at age 21. Another downside to naming individuals as beneficiaries is that there might not be enough assets passing to the revocable trust to fund specific bequests that were made to individuals under the terms of the revocable trust.

It also should be noted that upon the client's passing, a named individual beneficiary has the right to the asset for personal use. This could be impactful if a client decided to leave one child as a beneficiary of the account with the thought that the child would use those funds to pay expenses. However, if at the time

of the client's passing, such child decides to keep the account for personal use or is going through a divorce or has a liability, then those funds are fair game for distribution to other individuals whom the client did not intend to benefit. *For more information, please contact Kimberly T. Smith (ksmith@brodywilk.com) or another BW attorney.*

Half A Century of Justice: Reflections On a 50-Year Legal Career



Last year, our own **William J. Britt** was honored by the Greater Bridgeport Bar Association (GBBA) at its annual meeting in recognition of his 50-year legal practice and GBBA membership. Several BW attorneys were on hand that evening to celebrate Bill's achievements. Given the significance of the occasion and his many contributions

to the firm, we asked Bill to share his thoughts on the past 50 years.

Q: What motivated you to pursue a career in law and how has that motivation evolved over the years?

A: When I graduated college in 1970, the Vietnam war was still going on and unfortunately, I had a low lottery number. The only way to continue my education and not be drafted was to attend a graduate school which offered an advanced ROTC program. I felt that if I had to go to Vietnam it was better to go as an officer. I also hoped that the war would be over by the time I graduated. I was always interested in business, so my choices were a law degree, an MBA or a master's in economics. I decided to pursue a law degree not to practice law but to gain more skills in the business world.

I attended The Catholic University of America Law School in Washington, DC, which did not offer ROTC. However, nearby Howard University did. In 1972, I received a degree in military science from Howard and a commission in the United States Army. I was able to defer my military service one more year so I could finish law school. While participating in the DC Law Students in Court program, my motivation to practice law took on another dimension. Through an experience of representing an underprivileged person in a local eviction matter, I quickly learned that there was much more to the law than understanding business. I liked representing people who needed help. It was and continues to be personally fulfilling.

Q: How has the legal landscape evolved during your career and how have you adapted to these changes?

A: The legal landscape is a lot more complicated today than it was 50 years ago. The number of laws that have been enacted since I began practicing have multiplied exponentially. There is a constant need to keep up with new legislation through continuing legal education.

Technology revolutionized how we research issues, draft documents, and communicate with clients. What we gained in efficiency, we lost in other measures of time. Technology has fostered a culture with a built-in expectation for instantaneous answers. It has also created its own set of challenges such as data privacy and security threats which we did not have to worry about when I first started practicing. Safeguarding client information has become a critical operational responsibility to manage, daily.

Q: Can you discuss a particularly challenging matter or legal issue you encountered and how you navigated through it?

A: Three years into practice, I argued a case before the Connecticut Supreme Court that tested my knowledge of trusts. The case involved a 16th century English law referred to as "The Rule Against Perpetuities." The Rule prevented people from creating trusts which lasted for too long a period of time. If a trust violated the Rule, the trust was void. When I got the case, Connecticut followed the English Rule which stated that for a trust to be valid, it must end not later than 21 years after the death of a beneficiary living at the time the trust was created. Today, Connecticut's Rule allows trusts to last for up to 800 years. In my case, I was able to convince the Court that the trust in question which held over \$2M in securities not only violated the Rule but also should be struck down immediately. The Court agreed and ordered that our client (an estate of one of the decedent's children) receive one-third of the money and distant relatives, including strangers, receive the balance. Back then, there was no technology to help me do the research. I did it the old-fashioned way — at the law library. What makes this matter stand out most for me is the fact that very few lawyers have the opportunity to work on a Rule against Perpetuities case, yet I got one in the early days of my career and I was fortunate enough to win it.

Q: How have your relationships with clients evolved and what role has trust played in your long and successful practice?

A: Most of my client relationships are multi-faceted and rooted in trust and estate planning. I represent the personal and business affairs of generational families. The relationships evolve from planning for their children and their business ventures to planning for future generations. Trust and estate planning is the glue that holds the relationships together and provides for continuity. Clients become friends and unfortunately, I've said goodbye to many over the years. Given the cycle of life, my role of planning and protecting families evolved into settling estates, administering trusts and

executing business succession plans for the benefit of second and third generations. I'm there at the start and I'm there at the end when my value is felt most by clients.

Q: Can you share a memorable milestone or highlight that stands out in your career?

A: Over the years, there have been three cases that validated why I became a lawyer. The circumstances of each case were unique but they share one thing in common. The clients were underdogs about to be victimized by the government; a pompous and overbearing trustee; and a prejudicial executor who tried to take advantage of an immigrant heir. Each case allowed me to apply my skills to help them in ways that changed their lives for the better. Over the last 50 years the law may have changed but my mission remains constant and that is to be of service to others.

Q: Reflecting on your experiences, what advice would you give to aspiring lawyers starting their careers today?

A: A few pearls of wisdom come to mind. The first, expressed to me when I was a young aspiring lawyer by our former co-founder Seth Brody, is blunt but truthful. If money is what motivates you, this is not the right career choice. There is a lot more to practicing law than earning money. For those seeking a career in private practice, I would also emphasize the importance of working at a firm where you can collaborate with and benefit from other lawyers versus pursuing a solo endeavor. Everyone needs a sounding board. Lastly, I would stress the point to never accept anything at face value. Be sure to do your due diligence. Dig deep into whatever issues and complexities are at stake to understand a matter thoroughly so you can explain it to clients and know how to proceed with the utmost confidence.

John R. Bambrick Joins The Firm



BRODY WILKINSON IS PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE THAT JOHN R. BAMBRICK

has joined the firm as an associate in the Business Group. John represents a diverse base of clients throughout the full business lifecycle, including start-up and growth companies, in a variety of industries. He

brings unique skills and experience to the firm most significantly in the areas of private equity and private credit. Having previously served as in-house legal counsel for six years, he leverages his experience and insights to benefit clients.

John works on all stages of mergers and acquisitions, including opportunity assessment, transaction planning and diligence, deal development and execution, and all post-transaction legal matters. He oversees structuring and drafting of investment and business formation documentation, including subscription agreements, share purchase agreements, loan agreements, joint venture documentation, partnership agreements and LLC agreements. John negotiates and drafts commercial contracts, including NDAs, service contracts, engagement letters and employment agreements. In addition, he has significant experience managing the legal aspects of overseas investments, including the purchase of equity in an Israeli company, a €65M loan to a German company, and the formation of a business in St. Barths.

Prior to joining the firm, John worked at the Greenwich-based holding company Eldridge as in-house legal counsel, where he led private credit transactions ranging from \$70 - \$250M, oversaw completion of a variety of types of private equity transactions and closed numerous fund investments.

John is admitted to practice in New York and is a member of the New York Bar Association. He received his J.D. from Fordham University School of Law in 2018, where he was an editor of the Environmental Law Review and a securities litigation and arbitration clinical intern. He received his B.A. from Middlebury College in 2008. Following graduation, John attended the Tuck Business Bridge Program at Dartmouth College, a one-month business knowledge and skill building program.

Representative Matters

We represented a client in the negotiation of a long-term partnership with a leading sports equipment manufacturer for the launch of a new lifestyle brand offering a full range of premium apparel and footwear. **Thomas J. Walsh, Jr.** and **Justin L. Galletti** worked on this matter.

We represented a public corporation in connection with its sale of two product lines for approximately \$20M. **Justin L. Galletti** and **Mark W. Klein** worked on this matter.

We assisted a trustee in recovering trust assets that were unlawfully transferred to a beneficiary by a financial institution without the trustee's permission. **Douglas R. Brown** and **Daniel B. Fitzgerald** worked on this matter.

We represented the owner of a leading equipment distributor with the sale of her business and the negotiation of retention agreements with key

employees. **Thomas J. Walsh, Jr.** and **Mark W. Klein** worked on this matter.

We represented three young men in removing their aunt as trustee of a family trust for their benefit. **Douglas R. Brown** and **James M. Powers** worked on this matter.

We represented a corporate client in connection with drafting and negotiating executive employment agreements in preparation for a capital investment. **Daniel B. Fitzgerald** worked on this matter.

We defended a Will contest where some beneficiaries alleged that their mother had destroyed her original Will prior to death. **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

We assisted a trustee in litigation concerning the removal of a co-trustee and recovery of trust assets that were unlawfully transferred by the co-trustee. **Daniel B. Fitzgerald**, **Alyssa V. Sherriff** and **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

We represented a sister in protecting her inheritance and surcharging her executor brother for legal fees. **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

We defended a trustee from claims alleging breach of fiduciary duty from his brother-in-law and sister-in-law. **Douglas R. Brown** and **Daniel B. Fitzgerald** worked on this matter.

We represented a daughter in protecting her elderly father's assets and recovering millions of dollars from the father's long-time girlfriend in a conservatorship proceeding. **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

We represented an IT managed service provider in connection with a multimillion dollar sale of its assets to an investment firm in a strategic add-on acquisition. **Mark W. Klein**, **Justin L. Galletti** and **William J. Britt** worked on this matter.

We represented a mother of a deceased teenage daughter in negotiating a favorable inheritance settlement with the father who had abandoned their daughter. **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

We represented an award-winning Connecticut-based professional services firm in connection with its leasing of over 6,000 square feet of office space as part of the relocation and expansion of its principal office. **Justin L. Galletti** worked on this matter.

We represented a young woman in enforcing her rights to inheritance against her aunt who was trying to take advantage of her. **Douglas R. Brown** worked on this matter.

Accolades & Credits

Brody Wilkinson was named in the 2024 edition of Best Law Firms® published by Best Lawyers®. Notably, the firm was also recognized with Tier 1 rankings in the areas of **Commercial Finance Law, Commercial Transactions/UCC Law, Litigation - Trusts & Estates, Real Estate Law** and **Trusts & Estates Law**; a Tier 2 ranking in the area of **Corporate Law**; and Tier 3 rankings in the areas of **Business Organizations** (including LLCs and Partnerships) and **Appellate Practice** in the Stamford Metropolitan region. Best Lawyers® is the oldest and most respected Purely Peer Review® research and accolades company in the legal profession. The 2024 rankings are based on Best Law Firms' proven methodology that relies on qualitative and quantitative data on legal skillset, achievements and client successes collected through a submission process managed by Best Lawyers. *For more information on methodology, visit <https://www.bestlawyers.com/methodology>.*

Fourteen of the firm's lawyers were selected by their peers for inclusion in the 30th edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*® 2024. In addition, **David R. Hermenze** was named *Lawyer of The Year* in his field of Trusts and Estates within the Stamford Metropolitan Region. **Douglas R. Brown** and **Heather J. Lange** were selected in the fields of Trusts and Estates and Litigation – Trusts and Estates; **Seth L. Cooper** was selected in the fields of Commercial Finance Law, Commercial Transactions/UCC Law and Real Estate Law; **James D. Funnell, Jr., David R. Hermenze, Edward Marcantonio, Lisa F. Metz, Peter T. Mott** and **Ronald B. Noren** were selected in the field of Trusts and Estates; **Mark W. Klein** was selected in the fields of Business Organizations and Closely Held Companies and Family Business Law; **James E. Rice** was selected in the field of Energy Law; **Justin L. Galletti** and **Thomas J. Walsh, Jr.** were selected in the fields of Business Organizations, Closely Held Companies and Family Business Law, Commercial Transactions/UCC Law, Corporate Law and Real Estate Law; and **Brian T. Silvestro** was selected in the field of Real Estate Law. For the 2024 edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*®, more than 13.7 million votes were analyzed, which resulted in more than 76,000 leading lawyers being included in the new edition. "Lawyer of the Year" honors are awarded annually to only one lawyer per practice area in each region with extremely high overall feedback from their peers, making it an exceptional distinction. Lawyers are not required or allowed to pay a fee to be listed; therefore inclusion in *Best Lawyers* is considered a singular honor. *Corporate Counsel* magazine has called *Best Lawyers*® "the most respected referral list of attorneys in practice." *For more information, visit <https://www.bestlawyers.com/methodology>.*

Ten Brody Wilkinson lawyers were recognized in 2023 by Super Lawyers. **Douglas R. Brown** (Estate Planning & Probate), **Seth L. Cooper** (Real Estate), **Stephen J. Curley** (Business Litigation), **James D. Funnell, Jr.**

(Estate Planning & Probate), **David R. Hermenze** (Estate Planning & Probate), **Heather J. Lange** (Estate Planning & Probate), **Edward Marcantonio** (Estate Planning & Probate), **Peter T. Mott** (Estate Planning & Probate), **Ronald B. Noren** (Estate Planning & Probate) and **Thomas J. Walsh, Jr.** (Business & Corporate) were named to the "Connecticut Super Lawyers" list. Based on a rigorous, multiphase peer-review process, Super Lawyers is a credible, comprehensive and diverse listing of attorneys in more than 70 practice areas. Super Lawyers listings are used as a resource guide to assist businesses and individuals in hiring legal counsel. Super Lawyers is published by Law & Politics as a special supplement in top newspapers and city and regional magazines across the country. The published list represents no more than 5% of the lawyers in the state. *For more information on the Super Lawyers selection process, visit https://www.superlawyers.com/connecticut/selection_details.html.*

Brody Wilkinson's Trusts & Estates practice and **Douglas R. Brown, David R. Hermenze** and **Peter T. Mott** were recognized in the *Chambers High Net Worth 2023 Guide*, a publication directed specifically at the private wealth market. Brody Wilkinson's Trusts & Estates practice received a seventh consecutive ranking in the category of Private Wealth Law in Connecticut. Only ten firms in the state were awarded this esteemed designation. Additionally, **David R. Hermenze** and **Peter T. Mott** received individual rankings in the category of Private Wealth Law. **Douglas R. Brown** also received a ranking in the category of Private Wealth Law Disputes and is one of only three private wealth dispute lawyers in Connecticut to achieve this ranking. *For more information on the Chambers selection process, visit <https://chambers.com/research/methodology>.*

Douglas R. Brown, Heather J. Lange and **David R. Hermenze** gave presentations on trust accountings and fiduciary fees at the bi-annual Hot Topics in Probate seminar sponsored by the Connecticut Probate Assembly and the Connecticut Bar Association. Over 200 probate judges, probate court staff and practicing attorneys were in attendance.

Peter T. Mott was recognized by the Federal Tax Institute of New England and the Connecticut Bar Association with a 2023 Outstanding Achievement Award in the fields of Tax, Trusts and Estates Law.

Mark W. Klein was elected to serve as the first vice chair of the Connecticut Bar Association's Business Law Section for a two-year term.

Kimberly T. Smith was accepted as a participant in Class II of the New England Fellows Institute of the prestigious American College of Trust and Estate Counsel. The Fellows Institute brings together young lawyers in New England to attend presentations by recognized leaders in the field and network with peers. Kimberly was also appointed to the Executive Committee of the Estates & Probate Section of the Connecticut Bar Association in addition to its Legislative Policy and Review Committee for the fifth year.

Trusted Advisors, Practical Solutions

ATTORNEYS

John R. Bambrick	Heather J. Lange
Jennifer A. Basciano	Edward Marcantonio
William J. Britt	Lisa F. Metz
Douglas R. Brown	Peter T. Mott
Lauren R. Cimbol	Ronald B. Noren
Seth L. Cooper	James M. Powers
Stephen J. Curley	James E. Rice
Daniel B. Fitzgerald	Alyssa V. Sherriff
James D. Funnell, Jr.	Brian T. Silvestro
Justin L. Galletti	Kimberly T. Smith
David R. Hermenze	Robert L. Teicher
Mark W. Klein	Thomas J. Walsh, Jr.