

**Faulk, Camilla**

---

**From:** Donald Horowitz [don.horowitz@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2010 2:56 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Cc:** Johnson, Justice Charles W.; Madsen, Justice Barbara A.  
**Subject:** GR 34  
**Attachments:** GR 34 as published by the Supreme Court (revised December 2008)with Horowitz suggestions.doc

Dear Ms. Faulk,

This is to support the approval and adoption by the Supreme Court of GR 34 as revised and republished by the Court. The substantive reasons are well stated in the Court's GR 9 Cover Sheet, as well as in the many letters and messages supporting the adoption of the Rule. I would only add that this Rule properly guarantees constitutionally required access to and action by the courts and the court clerks and staff who administer the courts while at the same time adopting procedures that are more effective, more efficient and more economical of time and court and legal system funds. I need not go on and repeat the excellent comments of support you've already received by so many. I concur in those comments.

Another laudable intent of the Rule is to assure statewide quality and consistency while allowing local practices that may not be uniform but that fit that locality's needs so long as those practices are consistent with statewide rules and standards. I do think the wording of Subsection (a)(2) on page 1 of the Rule needs a bit of improvement in this area to assure the Court's intent is clear. your intent. In the attachment to this e-mail, I have used the Microsoft Word Tracking tool to provide to you my suggestions for some small and clarifying word additions or changes to accomplish this. Nothing suggested changes the substance of what was proposed. It is clarification only, and is the same or similar and certainly consistent with language this court has put in other General Rules. I urge your consideration and adoption of these language suggestions or some other language that makes your intent clear. If you are unwilling to change the body of the Rule at this point, then I even more strongly urge that you include language such as I have suggested in the Comments.

I have also suggested adding two words to the Comment after Subsection (a)(5) on page 3 to clarify that meaningful access is not limited to judicial review (which certainly is not the Rule's intent) but extends more broadly to judicial services generally (trials, motions, etc.) as well as to judicial review. I believe this would not pose any problem.

Thank you for your consideration.

With your positive action on GR 34, we are together taking another step forward in the direction of equal justice for all.

Best wishes,

Don Horowitz