

member of the bar of this Court. Local R. Civ. P. 83.5.2(a).
See, e.g., Gateriewictz v. Gebhardt, No. 93-6804, 1994 WL 116097
(E.D. Pa. Mar. 18, 1994).

One purpose of the Rule is to facilitate the service of papers during the course of the litigation upon the party represented by out-of-the-jurisdiction counsel. See Tolchin v. The Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, 111 F.3d 1099, 1108 (3d Cir. 1997) (concluding, in connection with Rule 1-21-1(a) of the Rules Governing the Courts of New Jersey, requiring a qualified attorney to maintain a bona fide office in New Jersey, that "there is a satisfactory basis to find a rational relationship between the bona fide office requirement and the intended benefit of attorney accessibility"). The case law, however, suggests that the role of associate counsel under the Rule is more than to serve as a post office box for pro hac vice counsel. Another purpose for the Rule appears to be predicated upon a notion that familiarity with local rules and procedures advances the goal of the efficient administration of justice. See, e.g., Schreiber v. Kellogg, 838 F. Supp. 998, 1003 (E.D. Pa. 1993) (explaining that local counsel participated in a telephone conference with court); Henderson v. Weatherly, 116 F.R.D. 147, 148 (E.D. Pa. 1987) (denying motion to dismiss without prejudice where no local counsel had yet entered appearance for plaintiff); Hanson v. Shearson/American Express, Inc., 116 F.R.D. 246 (E.D. Pa. 1987) (denying motion to transfer where local counsel had become familiar with case). Thus, by retaining local counsel,

pro hac vice counsel can rely upon the benefit of associate counsel's knowledge of and experience with local rules and procedures.

The affidavit submitted by proposed associate counsel, while properly averring that associate counsel is a member of the Pennsylvania bar and the bar of this Court, does not demonstrate that she either has an office located within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania where she may be served with papers or that she is familiar with current practice and procedures in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. A naked averment of licensure in Pennsylvania and of membership in the bar of this Court does not satisfy Local Rule 83.5.2.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.