

Tracy, Mary

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 4:04 PM
To: Hinchcliffe, Shannon; Jennings, Cindy
Subject: FW: Expansion of LLLT functions

Forwarding.

From: Lynn Clare [mailto:lynnclare@clarelawfirm.com]
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 3:54 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Expansion of LLLT functions

To the members of the Washington Supreme Court:

Regarding the recent proposal to extend the practices of LLLT's to negotiating procedural matters, I wish to strenuously object to ANY addition to the substantive legal work LLLT's may perform.

LLLT's are not attorneys. They do not have a legal education. They do not have licenses to practice law. Their ostensible reason for existing was to provide scrivener-like services to modest-means clients. When it was presented in that way, I was actually a fan of the idea.

No more, for I now wish that the problematic LLLT program had never been authorized. The LLLT license has mushroomed into something very different from how it was originally presented to us, and I foresee substantial potential for harm to clients and my profession. Allowing "negotiation of procedural issues" creeps uncomfortably close to practicing law without a license. I urge the Court not to approve this change to the license.

Lynn Clare
Clare Law Firm, PLLC
WSBA #47867