

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Mary Harvill [maryharvill@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 08, 2009 4:12 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed Legal Technician Rule

I am writing in support of adopting the legal technician rule. Providing legal technicians to members of the public who need legal assistance that would not otherwise require a licensed attorney would provide additional resources to meet the civil legal needs of individuals that are otherwise representing themselves pro se. This would help "unclog" the courts because the public are not familiar with court procedures and rely heavily on court clerks and judicial staff to assist them in legal procedures. Legal technicians could help fill that gap nicely.

I would like to make specific suggestions under C) Certification Requirements:

3) Education. The educational requirement should not be limited to ABA approved coursework or institutions. Any coursework by an accredited educational institution, whether ABA approved or not should be sufficient. Nor should the educational requirement be limited to Associates or Bachelors degrees specifically in paralegal studies.

There should be a balance of education (any Associates degree or Bachelors degree can qualify for the educational requirement) and relevant legal work experience, so that if a person has an Associates or Bachelors degree in another course of study, but does not have a degree specifically in paralegal studies, but does have 3 years of work experience in a law firm or other legal setting, that person would qualify on the basis of a combination of both education and work experience.

Rule 4) Work Experience. This requirement balances work experience and education more clearly and equitably than does Rule 3) by itself.

The Certification requirements should be broadened to permit credit towards the education requirement for individuals who have attended a law school or participated in the WSBA Rule 6 Law Clerk program, even if the individual did not complete either law school or the law clerk program.

Last, I believe it is unfair to require 20 hours of pro bono service to qualify as a legal technician. Qualification should be on the basis of education and work experience alone. However, if a potential legal technician has completed 20 hours of pro bono service, that could be given credit towards the work experience requirement in rule 4).

Individuals who are qualified to take the bar exam are not required to provide 20 hours of pro bono service prior to taking the exam. The legal technician rule should not make this a requirement.

I do support the aspiration for legal technicians to provide 30 hours of pro bono service per year once the technician has successfully passed the examination, so long as this requirement is similar to what is required of licensed attorneys.

Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to provide my comments.

Mary E. Harvill  
[maryharvill@earthlink.net](mailto:maryharvill@earthlink.net)

2828 E. Westmoreland Road  
Deer Park, WA 99006  
(509) 879-6039