

From: [Nathanael Eckrich](#)
To: [SoS Rulemaking](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] CO SOS Rule comment - Addition to Current Proposed Rule 2.4
Date: Tuesday, December 26, 2023 3:54:26 PM

I hope you had a great Christmas and thank you for allowing me to speak up on this subject.

I want to go on record of being in support of Option 1, written by LTAC - called 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 by Lindy Rich

The incorporation of both are critical to our responsibilities. Without the addition of these provisions, our ability to carry out our duties effectively would be severely compromised, impacting the safeguarding of consumers' real estate transactions and other types of deals. These deals have set fees according to the client and don't increase or decrease based on the amount of notarizations. Rule 2.4 without the additions of 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 would be very bad for our industry. I am putting both 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 below for clarity:

2.4.3 RULE 2.4 SHALL NOT APPLY TO SERVICES PROVIDED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE BUSINESS OF TITLE INSURANCE, AS DEFINED IN C.R.S. 10-11-102(3), TO CLOSING AND SETTLEMENT SERVICES, AS DEFINED UNDER C.R.S. 10-11-102(3.5), OR TO SETTLEMENT SERVICES, AS DEFINED UNDER C.R.S. 10-11-102(6.7).

AND

2.4.4 RULE 2.4 SHALL NOT APPLY IN INSTANCES WHERE THE NOTARY IS ENGAGED IN A FLAT-RATE ARRANGEMENT. THESE CIRCUMSTANCES PERTAIN TO SITUATIONS WHEREIN THE NOTARY IS NOT DIRECTLY ENGAGED BY A CONSUMER. IN SUCH CASES, THE NOTARY PROVIDES SERVICES ENCOMPASSING NOTARIAL CERTIFICATES, WHERE THE FEE REMAINS CONSTANT AND IS NOT CONTINGENT UPON THE NUMBER OF NOTARIAL CERTIFICATES BUT RATHER IS INCLUSIVE WITHIN THE PREDETERMINED FEE STRUCTURE.

Thank you,

Nathanael David Eckrich



Lindy Rich Services, LLC

CLOSING LOANS THE WAY THEY SHOULD BE CLOSED TO GET US ALL MORE BUSINESS

If you have a moment, please [CLICK HERE](#) to leave us a Google Review, it

would be so greatly appreciated!