

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Craig Andersen [candersen@mbavancouverlaw.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2009 1:31 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Cc:** sidefoe@charterinternet.com  
**Subject:** Legal Technicians are a recipe for disaster

I am writing in opposition to proposed Supreme Court Rule APR 28. The implications of a dissolution have wide-reaching consequences. As the law stands now, one must have seven years of education to represent clients in such complicated and emotional matters. One cannot learn Community Property law by reading Cliff's notes. Nor can a lay person understand the nuances of child custody from taking an eight-hour course. Those in favor of APR 28 will claim lawyers oppose this rule for reason of personal economic gain by having some hegemony over the practice of law. On the contrary, I don't practice family law. We have Rules of Professional Conduct and an Office of Disciplinary Counsel to ensure that attorneys competently and ethically represent their clients. APR 28 runs contrary to the very reason for a bar association because it places clients in jeopardy by allowing untrained armatures to handle complex legal matters. APR 28 should not be adopted.

Respectfully,

Craig S. Andersen  
Member-Manager  
Morse Bratt & Andersen PLLC  
108 East Mill Plain Boulevard  
Vancouver, Washington 98665  
[candersen@mbavancouverlaw.com](mailto:candersen@mbavancouverlaw.com)  
Telephone: (360) 213-2040  
Facsimilie: (360) 213-2030  
Sic Semper Tyranus