

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Porter, Chris [cporter@verisign.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 06, 2009 9:46 AM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Comment on Proposed Legal Technician Rule

I would like to recommend that the Supreme Court NOT adopt the Legal Technician rule. There are issues in the rule that would cause great confusion and disservice to the public. The rule contemplates that legal technicians would be allowed to ascertain whether a particular issue was within their purview, or required a licensed attorney to review. The very essence of the practice of law is ascertaining the aspects of each case and determining how it should be handled. This is clearly work that should be performed by a licensed attorney. The rule would also allow legal technicians to review and explain pleadings to the client. Pleadings often include complicated legal concepts that can best be explained to the client by an attorney. In addition, the potential consequences resulting from the application of these concepts are also issues that should be determined by an attorney, as they may fall into many areas of the law, not just family law.

In short, the rule would allow legal technicians to exercise independent legal judgment and to give legal advice based on the specific facts of a case. These are issues that have traditionally been left to lawyers due to their complexity and due to the severe consequences that may befall unprepared or ill-advised clients. For the protection of the general public in the state of Washington, I urge the Supreme Court NOT to adopt the Legal Technician Rule.

The opinions expressed herein are my own and not necessarily those of my employer or any other person or entity.

Christopher J. K. Porter, Attorney at Law  
WSBA #32925