

I would like to voice my opinion in favor of the proposed rule (APR 28) regarding a definition for the term and future occupation of "Legal Technician".

The Supreme Court of Washington, recognizing the admirable mission to accomplish access to justice for all of the state's inhabitants, rather than the few of privilege, established the Practice of Law Board (POLB) to advance that goal. The POLB, after many years of arduous labor, have answered that directive with the "Legal Technician" proposal.

Currently many Washingtonians are relying on the direction of family members and friends in order to traverse the legal process, to their detriment. The ramifications of their mistakes can be devastating to their families and they delay the Courts' ability to function efficiently.

The POLB's "Legal Technician" aids the Courts and families by providing access to forms with a competent explanation of those forms as well as the expectation of the Courts throughout the process. Much like an Escrow Officer or a Real Estate agent, the proposed "Legal Technician" aids in the ministration of legal forms.

The POLB has provided many safeguards for consumers and the legal community. The education requirements of the "Legal Technician," as well as CLEs, and continued education should alleviate concerns about legal assistance being rendered by untrained individuals (as is currently the case, for many). The proposed rule's stringent control of what types of matters are beyond the scope of the "Legal Technician" requires mandatory delegation to attorneys who are qualified to handle such complications. "Legal Technicians" are also required to be bonded to ensure the client's interests are adequately protected.

Noting the State's consolidation of forms filed in Family Law cases, to maintain order and coherence throughout, Family Law is the logical choice for the evolution of the position of "Legal Technician." I applaud the Practice of Law Board's efforts toward providing access to justice throughout our State and urge your endorsement of their proposal.

Respectfully yours,

K. Giesing, concerned Washingtonian