

April 25, 2009

Clerk of the Supreme Court  
Washington State Supreme Court  
P.O. Box 40929  
Olympia, WA 98504-0929  
Via email  
Camilla.faulk@courts.wa.gov

Dear Supreme Court Justices,

As an individual who values justice and liberty, I believe the legal technician rule should be passed. The inability to pay for legal services is the primary source of access to justice issues. If it is true that justice is achieved only in the absence of injustice, then how can one claim to be working for justice when so many people are suffering injustices because they can not afford to hire a lawyer? If the goal of law is to prevent injustice how then can more educated and trained individuals working on behalf of those who have economic barriers to representation not be good?

Sadly, I think most of the arguments being made against the rule are political and mask the true reasoning – that attorneys are concerned their monopoly may be eroded. –As it pertains to a question of law, I have yet to see a valid explanation of how a technician providing assistance with paperwork to *pro se* civil litigants is infringing on anybody's rights. If nurse practitioners can be trusted to prescribe medications, surely there is a way to formalize a means by which less expensive labor can be utilized for the menial aspects of law.

To the attorneys hiding behind the veil of "consumer safety" as a means for perpetuating the protectionism society known as the bar association - shame on you! First, the rule would limit those eligible to be served by a legal technician to those with no real estate, no retirement accounts and no business properties. To translate, the rule would restrict technicians from working with anybody who has money so you won't have to worry about competing against those on the outside of your fraternity. The fight being undertaken to prevent legal technicians is effectively a fight against civil servants. Secondly, under the proposed rule, a legal technician would be more prepared from the start to assist clients than an attorney just out of law school. They will have graduated from an ABA approved paralegal program and will have a minimum of 2 years substantive legal experience under the supervision of a lawyer. Let the individuals, not government decide from whom and to what extent they receive assistance.

My biggest problem with the rule is that as written, it lacks the breadth to provide to reach all of those in need. I believe this will be a good first step towards proving the validity of the idea and will be a launching pad for the program to expand to the point where a legal technician could subsidize on their fees for helping clients with their paperwork.

The rule is needed. It will provide low income individuals with improved access to justice and further defines what non-lawyer law practice is to restrict technicians from practicing outside the realm of their expertise.

Please pass this rule and give everybody an opportunity to access our fine justice system.

Sincerely,

Jacob C. Petz