

Foster, Denise

From: Esther Milner [esther@themilners.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 10:35 PM
To: Foster, Denise
Subject: Comment to December 2012 Proposed Rules, APRs

Clerk of the Supreme Court,

I would like to see an additional option for Qualification for Bar Examination under the APRs Proposed Rule 3(b)

. . . graduation from a United States law school not approved by the Board of Governors together with admission to practice law in other states or territories of the United States or the District of Columbia, in current good standing;

I graduated from a law school not approved by the Board of Governors; but as a California bar member in good standing I was able to sit for the Washington bar exam under rule 18. Under these new proposals I would have been unable to seek admission to practice law in Washington State until I had practiced in California for three years.

I graduated from a web-based law school approved by the California Bar Association. Because of the lower cost of my education, I graduated without the heavy debt burden many students graduate with and was able and willing to take work in the criminal justice system of a native american tribe here in Washington State immediately upon my admission to the Washington State Bar.

Alternative forms of law education reach a broader spectrum of students than traditional law schools do; these graduates enrich our legal community and may be able to better serve some members of our communities. Requiring these graduates to obtain an LLM or three years of practice in another jurisdiction in addition to their law degree before they can seek admission to practice here in Washington State seems overly restrictive.

Sincerely
Esther Milner