

Faulk, Camilla

From: Gregory J. Wall [gregwall@gjwlaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 12:04 PM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Subject: Proposed legal technician rule

I oppose this rule. I have these comments.

My experience with half-trained people rendering legal services, with the exception of real estate LPO's, breaks down into two categories: incompetence and fraud. I have seen the results of this in several contexts. Recently I was a hearing officer on a case in which a lawyer was involved with a group selling Living Trusts. This was essentially a well planned fraud operation. When the lawyer found out about this, it ended the operation, but only after damage was done to a number of people. I can't imagine how much damage could have been done if the crooks had the stamp of approval of the bar association. My other experience has been with personal injury mills run by "paralegals." The so-called paralegals were basically runners and cappers, submitting fraudulent claims. We can't always eliminate this type of operation, but I don't think they need our help.

I realize the rule talks about supervision by an attorney. In my experience this simply does not occur. I realize that the intent of this is to provide low cost legal aid, but I think the potential for harm greatly outweighs any potential good.

I also like to think that the expensive and time consuming training lawyer undergo is because the law is not simple and should not be practiced by amateurs. I would urge the Court to reject this rule.

Gregory J. Wall
WSBA 8604
gregwall@gjwlaw.com
1521 S.E. Piperberry Way
Suite 102
Port Orchard, WA 98366
(360) 876-1214