

**Faulk, Camilla**

---

**From:** Gary A. Preble [gary@preblelaw.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2008 8:48 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Comment re Proposed JuCR 9.2

**Comment re Proposed JuCR 9.2:**

This proposal is good as far as it goes. But if parents in a dependency or termination have a constitutional right to counsel at public expense, why not require the same of such attorneys as the proposed rule change requires of juvenile offenders' attorneys?

"the court shall satisfy itself that proposed counsel has demonstrated the proficiency, ability and commitment to quality representation appropriate to the proceedings".

And if "Standards for Indigent Defense Services as endorsed by the Washington State Bar Association and approved by the Washington State Supreme Court" do not apply to parents' attorneys in dependency/termination, why not?

Gary Preble  
WSB# 14758