SUPREME	E COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	
	- FIRST DEPARTMENT -	
		X
	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS	
	ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	
	ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	
		Y
	27 Madison Ave	
	New York, New	York
	September 28,	2010
BEE	FORE:	
	HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN,	
	CHIEF JUDGE	
	HONORABLE ANN PFAU,	
	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE	
	HONORABLE LUIS A. GONZALEZ,	
	PRESIDING JUDGE, FIRST DEPAR	TMENT
	STEPHEN P. YOUNGER, ESQ.,	
	NEW YORK STATE BAR PRESIDENT	
	VINCENT J. PA	LOMBO
	ELLEN RUBIN	
	OFFICIAL COUR	T REPORT

	II	
1		
2	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICE	S
	THE FIRST DEPARTMENT, SEPTEMBER 28, 2010	
3		
	INDEX	
4		PAGE
5	CHRISTINE QUINN,	10
_	SPEAKER OF THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL	
6		
7 8	BUSINESS LEADERS PANEL:	
0	KATHY WYLDE,	21
9	PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE	21
,	PARTNERSHIP OF NEW YORK CITY	
10		
11	MICHAEL HELFER,	25
	GENERAL COUNSEL OF CITIGROUP	
12		
13	MICHAEL SMITH,	35
	PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE NEW YORK	
14	STATE BANKERS ASSOCIATION	
15	TOGERNI GERNARNING	4.0
16	JOSEPH STRASBURG, PRESIDENT OF THE RENT	42
10	STABILIZATION ASSOCIATION	
17		
18	KENNETH RASKE,	50
	PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE GREATER	
19	NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
25 26		
1 0		

1		
2	COMMUNITY LEADERS PANEL:	
3		PAGE
4	BENITO ROMANO,	58
	CHAIR PERSON OF THE BOARD OF IOLA	
5	FUND OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	
6		
	DAVID JONES,	72
7	PRESIDENT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES SOCIETY	
8		
	JULIE KUSHNER,	79
9	DIRECTOR OF UAW REGION 9A	
10		
	MARGARITA ROSA,	85
11	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE	
	GRAND STREET SETTLEMENT	
12		
13	SAMUEL SEYMOUR,	91
	PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK CITY	
14	BAR ASSOCIATION	
15		
16		
17 18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

1			
2	CLIENT PANEL		D.7. G.E.
3 4	MEI ANEA DICHADDCON		PAGE 98
4	MELANEA RICHARDSON, CLIENT OF LEGAL SERVICES NYC		90
5	CHIENI OF BEGAL SERVICES NIC		
6	LARS ANDERSON,		101
	CLIENT OF MFY LEGAL SERVICES		
7			
8	JULIET D'SOUZA,		108
	CLIENT OF THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY		
9			
10	JOHN BROWN,		111
11	CLIENT OF LEGAL SERVICES NYC		
12	YULIA ABAYEVA,		115
	CLIENT OF NEW YORK LEGAL ASSISTANCE GROUP		110
13			
14			
15			
16	JUDGE PANEL		
17		PAGI	Ξ
18	HONORABLE JEFFREY K. OING	121	
1.0	CIVIL COURT		
19 20	HONORABLE JAYA MADHAVEN	130	
20	HOUSING COURT	100	
21			
22	HONORABLE RUBEN A. MARTINO	138	
	HARLEM JUSTICE CENTER		
23			
24			
25			
26			

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Ready to get started.

I just want to open by saying that no issue is more fundamental to the courts and our constitutional mission in ensuring equal justice for all, the availability of affordable legal representation for low income New Yorkers is indispensable to our ability as a judiciary, as a profession to carry out our mission.

And that's why we are here today, to have the first of four hearings, here at this beautiful courtroom in the First Department.

I am so pleased that Presiding Justice Gonzalez has agreed to let us use this beautiful courtroom where I once had the pleasure of sitting, and thank you, Judge Gonzalez.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: And we are delighted to be the venue for this wonderful event.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

And the other hearings will be in the Fourth

Department on Wednesday, up in Rochester; in the Third

Department in Albany on October 5th; and in the Second

Department on October the 7th, and I want to thank all of you for being here.

I recognize that Judge Ciparick from the Court of Appeals is here, over there, as is the senior associate at the court and I'm so glad you agreed to be a

member of the task force; I see Justice Acosta sitting next to her; the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge, Fern Fisher next to him, and so many members of the task force are here, too numerous to even introduce, but I do want

Helaine, where are you?

to recognize Helaine Barnett who is the chair.

Thank you for all your hard work leading up to today. I want to thank everyone who is here, the members of the task force, citizens, witnesses, and we will have many, many witnesses over the first part of this hearing. I would say about 20 or so, and we are so pleased with that and I might also mention that Helen Weinstein, the chair of the Assembly Judiciary Committee is here. I can't see you, but they tell me you are here. Wonderful for you to be here and thank you for your support.

What is clear in everything that has happened so far in this issue of civil legal services is that the economic collapse that has taken place in the City, State and country is really -- has really had a devastating effect on the courts, on the people who come into our courts seeking justice, and the most vulnerable among us, the poor, the elderly, struggling families, the disabled, victims of domestic violence, are the ones who have suffered the most.

There's been a tremendous rise in court

proceedings, foreclosures, evictions, debt cases, family offenses, matrimonial conflict, cases involving the very necessities of life, the very roof over people's heads, their livelihoods, their well-being, the well-being of their family.

In the last year over two million people came into our courthouses without representation, without lawyers. Imagine the difficulties of that for people untrained in legal protocols. There are — with all the pro bono work that we've had with over two million hours given by the bar for pro bono activities, it is not even close to meeting the gap in civil legal services.

For every one person that is accepted by a legal service providers there are eight to ten that are turned away. There is just no doubt in our minds that as a profession, as a judiciary, that if we are to meet our mission in providing equal justice for all, we must deal with this whole issue of people coming to our courts, dealing with the fundamentals of life and not having an attorney, not having anyone you can turn to and it is our belief it is up to all of us, if we're not going to stand up to those who can't stand up for themselves, who is?

And that is why the judiciary has taken the lead in this area. That's why so many of you have agreed to testify. The information that comes out at the

hearing will be supplemented by the task force's research and surveys and the end result will be that we will be making a recommendation to the Legislature, a report and recommendation in the amount of monies needed to close the gap on civil legal services and representation of poor people and it is every bit, in my mind, and certainly in the mind of the bar and the profession, that as important as everything else that we prioritize in the State and the City, whether it be schools or hospitals, or all the other important things, it is our duty, it is our obligation as a government, as a society to be funding the poor who come into our courts with again

even playing field for everybody.

So we have a full plate today. I'm going to introduce our panel members in a second, but I'd ask everyone to, let's try and keep to schedule. You do not have to read your remarks, you could summarize them.

their very lives at stake and make sure that there is an

We'll have a short question period after you issue your remarks, and be assured that all of the written statements will be in a record.

I do want to mention that Judge Leo Milonas, one of my predecessors, the Chief Administrative Judge is here with us today. So please -- he's here and has spent much time in this beautiful courtroom, and I do want to

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING introduce to you the panel which represents the leadership of the judiciary and the leadership of the profession in this State.

Of course on my right, our host Presiding

Justice Luis Gonzalez, who I've had the pleasure to know

for so many, many years and to serve on this court with.

To my far right is Steve Younger, our great president of the State Bar Association who has had a long and fruitful relationship with the court system, and we're so pleased that he is here today representing the profession in this State which is as committed as we in the judiciary are to this issue of closing the gap in the lack of funding for civil legal services in this state.

I'd also introduce to my left is the Honorable Ann Pfau, who is the Chief Administrative Judge of this State and who I have again had the privilege of working with for the last 25 years or so, we lose count after a while, right Judge Pfau, but I do want to point out that the legislature has passed a joint resolution that has endorsed the systemic process that we put into place of holding these hearings around the State, doing a report that summarizes what's going on and what we see as the gap in civil legal services and asking us to recommend the amount of monies needed to close that gap.

We are absolutely delighted by that. Again, we

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

think it is up to all of the branches of our government

and the judiciary to ensure that everyone has their fair

day in court.

So without further delay, I am happy to introduce our first witness who I am so delighted and honored is here, Christine Quinn, the speaker of the City Council and we're just delighted, couldn't be happier that you are here and we are looking forward to hearing your comments.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you very much, Judge Lippman and everyone on the panel and everyone on the task force.

Judge Lippman, I really do want to thank you. We are very grateful at the council to be asked to participate in today's hearing and my General Counsel is with me and will submit my written testimony, but I'm going to try to sum up some different points.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great.

SPEAKER QUINN: Every year since I've been on the council, but certainly since I've been speaker we have grappled with -- and of those years some we've had surpluses and some we've had deficit budgets, but nonetheless in all of those years we grapple with how much money do we give to Legal Aid and Legal Services, how much money do we give to other legal representation

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING programs which have been created over the year, and there are tough discussions, even in the years when there is money because there's competing interest and there is no clear standard.

That is challenging in and of itself because with something like legal representation, it is good to find ways to minimize the politics that are a part of any of the discussions that go on in government and the degree to which there are clear, set standards, the easier those decisions are to make when you are weighing good things against each other.

And, Judge Lippman, you mentioned -- and I was struck by it in your openings statement -- this is as important as other issues as education and I agree with that.

There is much appropriate conversation about the goal of making every school and in every neighborhood equal, regardless of the economic makeup of that neighborhood. I worry about that a lot, but I also worry about if you live in a particular neighborhood, you might live in a low to moderate income neighborhood with a robust group of nonprofits in that neighborhood, where you can turn if you are having a problem; or you may not. That same makeup of neighborhood maybe just for whatever historic reasons haven't had nonprofits that have cropped

Where you live determines what Legal Services and support you have. That's not a plan for how we make sure every New York -- in my case New York City -- resident has equal access to representation and we are talking about mammoth issues here.

Are you going to lose your apartment? Are you going to lose your child? I mean, the power the Court has to take away things that define your freedom are tremendous. And the terror that people are in in that moment is something that they just need assistance with.

So, one, what's the standard? Right? Two, what is our obligation as government; but three, where are the areas that representation is needed?

One of the things that's happened in the past maybe eight years in the council, particularly in the years there were surpluses is in a great way council members working with advocates who come up with ideas for new representation programs to fill the gaps.

Immigration, domestic violence, families in courts where situations, where they might lose their children, and programs are created, monies given to nonprofits, representation is given, representation is taken away when we don't have the money, et cetera, et cetera.

2.4

None of these are areas that are bad to spend money on, but there is no thoughtful overall process. Is the domestic violence deficit in representation worse than those of families in Family Court? Is the immigration deficit worse than the domestic violence?

I don't know the answers to any of those questions and we are making funding decisions about precious resources that we don't have a lot of without quidance.

So in addition, and I hate to suggest work, but in addition to knowing what the money level is, I think it would be useful for the Court to look at the areas where service is needed, and where in those areas are we coming close to doing a job and where aren't we.

And I'm a firm believer of let's make the biggest list of what we need even if we can't fill it right now, because if we don't know, we will never fill it and we would be more than happy to have both the General Counsel staff and the Council's finance staff which might be more — no offense to the lawyers — more illuminating to meet with you and your staff to show you the different pocket-filling programs, so to speak, we have created and the challenged way we have used to try to determine how to prioritize funding.

So with the Immigrant Legal Services initiative

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
we are forever reworking census data about where the
services should go, except that's ten year old data and
council members are saying, but my district has a lot of
immigrants, I'm not getting any of the funding and
they're not wrong, but any guidance we could get from the
courts in that would be enormously helpful and just my —
you know, two final thoughts are the level — the areas
where people worry and feel they need legal
representation is seemingly endless.

We have a law pending now about guaranteeing seniors representation in court. It is a well-intentioned law and one that you'd love to do, but have the resources now? Really, I want to reinforce that.

Lastly, this is an issue that needs money to solve, in part, but it also perhaps needs us stepping back and looking at whether there are, in fact, more creative and different ways that we can deliver services, and I'm not a lawyer, so I can say this with great --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You are a pretty good lawyer --

SPEAKER QUINN: My partner is a lawyer and sometimes tells me to stop pretending you're a lawyer when you're down there. But maybe not every situation is so complicated it needs a lawyer. Perhaps there is other type of legal assistance that can be delivered by paralegals or whatever the right gradation is that can

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
give just as much and maybe that can allow us with an
amount of money to spread it more broadly across the City

2.4

or the State.

So thank you again for the opportunity and we would be more than happy to have our staff meet with yours to go to through some of the -- it really is tortured, but I think that would be illuminating to all of you.

just want to say your testimony is right on the money -right on the money is good today, to be right on the
money -- but everything that you said is exactly right.
And what we're trying to do is help to make that
prioritization because right now it's hit and miss.

SPEAKER QUINN: Correct.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: How it's funded, you can give a little bit, get a little bit from members items, the State legislature, a little federal money, IOLA gets a certain amount of money depending on the interest rate but it's catch is catch can and what the IOLA crisis really showed all of us is that we can't continue to do that.

SPEAKER QUINN: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And that again, if as a society and as a government we are looking at the things that

must be done, this is one of those things, I think is general agreement that this is one of those links, legal representation of the poor, but exactly the issues that you raised is what we will be reporting on, where are the gaps, where is it geographically, subject area, where is it and make recommendations on how to fill it and your last point I think is a very good one, too, which is it's

SPEAKER QUINN: Right.

all part of a puzzle.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: There's pro bono evidence efforts by lawyers --

SPEAKER QUINN: Right.

and of course this big item of providing funding for legal service providers. So it's all part of a piece and we hope to bring it together in a systemic way where the whole thing — build the plumbing where the funding is available every year as a matter of course because every year we go out, we're going to look at where the gaps are, we're going to have testimony from witnesses like you to give us the information, we're going to do surveys and pull it all together in a way that hopefully will be helpful to you and hopefully helpful to our partners in Albany in State Government.

Other members of the panel?

2.4

MR. YOUNGER: Just one quick question and thank you for coming today, Speaker Quinn.

In your perspective as a funder, what kind of arguments are most convincing to you in putting you over the threshold between a case that may be needy and one that is needy but deserving of funding? Because we haven't been able to fund all the needy cases.

SPEAKER QUINN: There's a couple of different things. One is the quality of the entity that will -- let me back up.

One thing that is always critical from our perspective first is, you know, is this a core City function? Is this a core requirement of the government of the City of New York, whether that service is delivered by a city agency or by an outside entity so that we ask our council members to think of that. Is this core?

Two, if is it a function delivered particularly asked this question by an entity outside of city government — are they doing it well? Are there reviews and analysis by the city agencies that oversee them, are they doing it well and if they're not, who else in the area geographically could do it better.

Three, what is the impact if this funding goes away? Is there someone else or something else that can

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 make it up? Is it just going to be that there are 3 slightly longer waits for whatever the service is or is 4 it that the service will disappear all together? 5 And kind of the last thing which I sum up as in 6 a time like this when you're in deficits, is it good, is 7 it great? Is it great or is it life-sustaining? 8 If it's good, it may not make it. If it's 9 great, it's more likely to make it. If it is literally 10 life-sustaining, then you are going to do everything you 11 can to keep it going. And the last test is can you go to 12 sleep at night knowing that you couldn't fund it. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Pfau. 14 JUDGE PFAU: Follow-up, when you started 15 talking about the geographic areas where some funding 16 provides for various supportive services and some not and 17 it would be very interesting to follow through to look at 18 that with case loads --19 SPEAKER QUINN: Yes. 20 JUDGE PFAU: -- that we see certainly 21 county-based and we can break it down further to see, 2.2 because we know the core areas where case loads are 23 growing so dramatically. 2.4 You talk about is it life-sustaining --25 SPEAKER QUINN: Right.

JUDGE PFAU: -- your family, your home, all of

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 2 those are things we're seeing, so you would be very

3 helpful to put those puzzle pieces together, certainly in

4 New York City and match the two.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We'd be happy to do that and one of the things I think is -- particularly as it relates to housing issues the geography becomes a critical question. So you take an area like Hells Kitchen in my district which is an area that has two very good not-for-profit housing organizations that have tenant lawyers, et cetera.

Now what Hells Kitchen was once is not what it is now. You still though have a lot of long-time tenants there who are under a lot of fear of displacement. We still have urban renewal -- there's a lot of issues.

But how do you have a process where maybe at some point their geographic area -- don't get mad at me for saying this -- maybe needs to expand and includes some other part of the borough where they hadn't been before and how do you do that; or maybe what their function was once around the urban renewal area and those type of things needs to evolve to a different type of legal representation, and how do we as government appropriately guide private not-for-profits without overstepping into their private affairs as well. Which is a complicated question also.

JUDGE PFAU: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Just one other point -- we'll let you get back to your important work. You mentioned standards before. And rest assured that one of the things that the task force is working for is who does qualify? What are the standards? What is the criteria?

The ABA has had -- done certain work in this area, but the task force is very much focusing on that because the funders, I think, have to have an idea what are we paying for, who is it? And I think there are grey lines there.

SPEAKER QUINN: Absolutely. And in addition to the standards of quality of work that's delivered and how do you define that and a challenge of Legal Services is often, you know -- myself included -- you have nonlawyers judging things. And what are the appropriate ways not -- you know, not-for-profit that represents tenants. You may not be, in fact, able to judge them by their win/loss rate. It may not be as simple as perhaps how you judge other lawyers, so guidance and things like that, but also a standard of who qualifies for the service.

So one of the initiatives the counsil created before I was speaker was a housing representation for the working poor. Folks who don't qualify.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

2.4

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 SPEAKER QUINN: And who are just outside of it. So things like that, I would love to look at also. 3 4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: There are a lot of these 5 wonderful programs for the working poor that are really 6 terrific and really need to be looked at with some focus 7 because they provide an invaluable service. 8 So anyway, we're delighted you are here. you for being such a champion in this area --9 10 SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you guys. 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- Look forward to working with 12 you. 13 SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you all very much. 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Next we're going to have a 15 panel of business leaders and I think you're all going to 16 sit down, I think, at one time. It's Kathy Wylde, 17 Michael Helfer, Michael Smith, Joe Strasburg and Kenneth 18 Raske. And -- well, they will introduce themselves, I'll 19 tell you who they are, but they will tell you who they 20 are exactly. 21 Ms. Wylde, do you want to start? 22 MS. WYLDE: Hi, I'm Katherine Wylde and I am 23 president of the Partnership for New York City which is 24 the City's business leadership organization. We -- our 25 members employ 1.3 million New Yorkers and are

responsible for several hundred billion of our gross

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

state product, so we are very concerned about the

efficiency, the functioning of our courts and also about

the justice and perceived justice of our overall legal

and judicial system.

So we thank you, Chief Judge, for calling attention to this important issue.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

2.4

MS. WYLDE: Your statistic of about two million unrepresented people in the civil system this year is really a distressing number.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And that's conservative. That's a conservative number.

MS. WYLDE: So I was just going to make a couple of points in the spirit of brevity and one is, of course, that the stability, the efficiency, the quality of the judicial system, it's fairness, it's equity to all citizens is an important consideration for business, when they look at investing, expanding, locating in any jurisdiction.

So I think, number one, the importance of assuring that as this — that the representation in the courts is clearly equitable and particularly low income people are well represented is important to the perception of our State, its stability and with that comes the next point which is that our economy continues

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

to grow based on the confidence of business in how our

3 systems are working.

2.2

2.3

2.4

As Speaker Quinn pointed out, this is one of those core services that people look to and that business looks to when they're making an investment. So I think that's another important point.

In addition, I think as we've been -- as we think about the stability of our society, recent statistics that have come out on poverty rates demonstrate that they're increasing, that over 15 percent of our population in New York State is now below the federal poverty level that that population is, in fact, growing, and we really need to make sure that that population is well represented or this will no longer be a state where economic opportunity is perceived as a reason why immigrants and why talent for the business community should be coming here.

And so I think that all those reasons represent important justification for even during the difficult fiscal time or maybe especially during the difficult economic and fiscal time we should be focusing on making sure there is adequate representation for all New Yorkers in our court system.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. I just ask, I think it's counterintuitive to some people that the business

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

community would be so interested in providing legal

services for the poor. Explain why the court system that functions for everybody is important. I mean, why does

5 the business community really care? What makes it

6 significant to you?

MS. WYLDE: Well, I think there's understanding among business leadership, certainly, that if the system breaks down for some, it is liable to break down for all. And particularly in the capital of finance and global commerce as New York is, confidence in our legal system and its fairness and its quality is one of the critical factors in what makes us a great global commercial center. And this is just a piece of that.

In addition, part of business location decisions really depends on projections of the political and economic stability of those jurisdictions and everybody knows that if you're talking about a place where you don't have a strong legal system, it is the potential of breakdown in other factors in society is very large.

So I think that's the other piece that's very important.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: When that breaks down, what's the effect on the economy? I think the issue, which maybe a lot of people don't realize is that if you have

ı	ے ۔ ا
1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	people who are poor and can't have their day in court and
3	they wind up God knows where on the street or certainly
4	with all the welfare services that are provided, is the
5	economy impacted by all of that; is that part of what the
6	business community will look at in this?
7	MS. WYLDE: Obviously the costs to society are
8	reflected in dollar expenses that if we don't pay for
9	adequate representation that solves problems, we're going
10	to pay for the consequences that the problems will
11	create
12	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Who can say one way or the
13	other.
14	MS. WYLDE: so we will pay one way or the
15	other.
16	So I think that's the main point and people are
17	smart enough to realize that and when it reaches a point
18	where the courts are overwhelmed and where the sense of
19	justice for all disappears, then we have a real troubling
20	situation that will affect our economy and will affect
21	business decisions.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Any other questions for Ms.
23	Wylde?
24	We appreciate it. Thank you.
25	Okay, Mr. Helfer.
26	MR. HELFER: Thank you Chief Judge.

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 My name is Michael Helfer, I am General Counsel 3 for Citigroup. I appreciate the opportunity to testify 4 today/ 5 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are very pleased that you 6 are here. 7 Go ahead. 8 MR. HELFER: I was asked to focus my testimony specifically on the unmet legal needs of consumer 9 10 borrowers who are facing foreclosure in New York. 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Which today I would gather is 12 more of an issue than ever before. MR. HELFER: It is a very important issue, 13 14 absolutely. Mortgage delinquencies are decreasing, but 15 mortgage foreclosure remains an important issue for Citi 16 and other financial institutions. 17 We at Citi are guided by the principle that it 18 is in the interest of everyone involved, the lenders, the 19 borrowers, and the communities at large for mortgage 20 holders to keep their homes. 21 In January 2007 through June 2010, Citi has 2.2 helped approximately 990,000 homeowners nationwide in 23 efforts to avoid potential foreclosure.

During the same period -- during the same

period our programs have helped many families stay in

their homes in New York.

2.4

25

2.2

2.4

In the second quarter of 2010, for example, the number of borrowers in New York who man-- who we helped stay in their homes exceeded the number of those against whom foreclosure proceedings were initiated by 32 to one.

In fact, we have relatively few foreclosures in New York, approximately only one tenth of one percent or 400 out of the 365,000 mortgages that we service.

We believe that there is an important role for lawyers to assist borrowers in avoiding foreclosure in New York, especially in the context of the mandatory mediation programs that have been instituted in New York and in certain other judicial foreclosures --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do they work --

MR. HELFER: I'm sorry.?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do those programs work?

Because we've been very pro-active in that area, as has some other states and cities around the country.

MR. HELFER: That's right, your Honor, and we believe that these programs are working. We believe, however, that they could work better if lawyers were involved at the mediation or settlement conference step.

In our experience, one conference is often insufficient to address the issues in a particular case creating in many situations the need for multiple court

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2.4

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING conferences and delaying a resolution. There may be many reasons for these delays, of course, but one contributing factor that we have seen repeatedly is that borrowers need assistance to prepare for the conferences in a way that makes them productive.

We estimate that 70 percent of our cases in New York require more than one settlement conference.

In the context of New York's mandatory courtordered settlement conferences, lawyers can help facilitate communication and quide borrowers through the process to work out solutions more quickly and without the need for repeated sessions.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What do you do when there isn't a lawyer? How does it work? How do you deal with someone who walks in and is on the verge of indigency? How do you deal with that? Does it make your life more difficult?

MR. HELFER: It certainly makes the life of our lawyers and others involved in it more difficult and less productive. And what we do is try to explain to them exactly what -- it's typically a documentation problem, exactly what documents are needed, where they might be able to get the documents, if we can help them and obviously we don't represent them, we can't advise, but we try to describe that, make the arrangements to come

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING back, sometimes they need a second and third or even more conferences, and this imposes a lot of costs and burdens on the borrower, on the judicial system and is extremely inefficient for us.

So if we could get lawyers, to a greater extent, to be involved in this mediation or settlement conference process, we think that we could -- we, collectively, the system would work a lot better.

Right now we estimate that only 30 percent of the borrowers in the New York City area who are involved in these processes have legal representation. The other 70 percent we're trying to work with them without legal representation.

There is a program described in my materials that the Federal Reserve Bank of New York has initiated, called the Lawyers Foreclosure Intervention Network which, I think, they and the City Bar Justice Center is a very positive program. We provided waivers to our law firms for them to be involved, and there are about 250 volunteers who have signed up to provide pro bono legal services to consumer borrowers, but there are many more who could and we reached out to law firms we hire to get involved.

We have similar experience in Philadelphia involving a Philadelphia pro bono organization called FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

Philadelphia VIP. And in July 2009 Philadelphia VIP

reported that over 62 percent of their clients who had

assistance from volunteer attorneys obtain some form of loan modification, workout loan payment or refinancing

and were helped to stay in their homes.

So it is a very high percentage. Obviously, we'd like to drive them higher, but I think that the involvement of lawyers as demonstrated by those statistics is very positive.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Talking about counterintuitive, why don't you just want the property? Aside from your good will, why isn't it better let the poor people, you know, whoever can't pay -- why is it that you are interested in this?

MR. HELFER: Foreclosure, aside from the public policy issues that are involved, which are things that we clearly do take into account simply as a business and financial matter, foreclosure is expensive, it is value destructive and we and the holders of the mortgage itself, often investors, who are servicing the mortgage are clearly much better off having people in the property, taking care of the property, keeping it as their own, creating more stable communities and making payments that they can make, consistent with what their economic situation is. It's no question that it's the

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 right thing from the bottom line it's the right thing --3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: From both sides? 4 MR. HELFER: -- from the social perspective. 5 MR. YOUNGER: Maybe you could take that a step You referenced stable communities. What does 6 further. 7 having people in their homes do for a community that's 8 vibrant? MR. HELFER: Well, among other things it keeps 9 10 property values up in the entire community and we're 11 likely to have mortgages -- again, looking at it just 12 from a pure narrow financial Citi perspective, we're 13 likely to have other mortgages, we're likely to have 14 other financial relationships with consumers in those 15 communities. 16 And when people start to see the values of 17 their homes going down, for whatever set of reasons, it 18 obviously has an effect on their spending patterns and 19 their willingness and ability to maintain their homes. 20 So it's very important for us. 21 Just to finish, if I may? 2.2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure. 23 MR. HELFER: Your Honor, there are obvious 2.4 obstacles to Citi internal lawyers providing 25 representation of foreclosure matters, as you can

understand, but I do want to stress that Citi lawyers are

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING committed to doing what we can to meet other unmet civil legal services needs in New York. Our Citi legal pro bono initiative is a formal management supported program through which Citi lawyers provide pro bono Legal Services to individuals and nonprofit organizations that serve them and Citi lawyers provide advice to low income parents in New York's Family Court, to homeless families applying for government benefits, to micro entrepreneurs starting new business and to nonprofit organizations, among others. We know the importance of ensuring the availability of civil legal services. We will continue to try to do our share. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. (Continued on next page)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much.

2.4

And I would indicate that the pro bono-type programs that you're talking about are wonderful programs, and we need them and they are very much a part of this puzzle, but do not replace, by any means can't, there's just too much needed, the public funding that has to go to the providers, but absolutely critically important.

MR. HELFER: Thank you. And I agree with you completely, they cannot replace. They can assist, but they cannot replace.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

Anything else?

JUDGE PFAU: I would just add we are looking at this as well from the court system's perspective and we have over 100,000 conferences to date and in some courts we have the majority of the filings are foreclosures now. So the idea that a lack of representation extends the conferences makes this a more difficult process, is something that we really feel every day.

MR. HELFER: I think it imposes a huge burden on the judiciary in addition to the other inefficiencies that are involved, your Honor.

JUDGE PFAU: Thank you.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: What percentage would you say, I know you have a small number, but what percentage of

foreclosures where people are represented, I mean the mortgagors are represented by counsel and those that are not represented by counsel, what percentage do you think

get a better deal, so to speak, when they are represented

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

by counsel as opposed to not represented by counsel?

MR. HELFER: Well, that's obviously a very judgmental kind of a -- to give a response, I would say that in our experience, having counsel involved will tend to prolong and delay the process, that's what lawyers do for defendants in these situations. I think that imposes burdens on us and on the judiciary. But I do not believe that we would see, in our experience anyway -- we don't get that many actual foreclosures -- but in our experience I don't think that we would see any material difference in the end result.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: The reason I ask is because if it can be shown that on foreclosures those that are represented by counsel get a better deal than those that are not represented, that may indicate as to whether or not funding for counsel will be justified.

MR. HELFER: Yes, I understand the logic of the point, your Honor. I just can't provide you any data on it.

MR. YOUNGER: Let me ask a slightly different question. We have all had pro bono clients come into our

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

offices and tell long tales of woe that may have no

relevance to the question that you want to know, which is

what is the financial issue that can help you do a workout.

What are the skills that a lawyer brings to that

kind of a process?

2.4

MR. HELFER: Well, Mr. Younger, I think that the critical skill, the one I think we all hopefully learned in law school is to know the difference between what's relevant and what's not relevant. I hope lawyers can also bring some sympathy to the client, understand the difficult situations many people face, but to bring a client back to what it is that will actually be productive in getting to a -- getting to a resolution and getting to a resolution as promptly as possible. I think that's the key skill is determining relevance and importance. I think the lawyer can also help to present a case in the most effective way for the client, which I think is also useful.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. We appreciate it.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

Chief Judge, Judge Pfau, Judge Gonzalez,
Mr. Younger, it's a privilege and an honor to be here
today. My name is Michael Smith. I'm the president and
CEO of the New York State Bankers Association. We

represent approximately 160 commercial banks and 50 institutions operating throughout the State of New York with over 200,000 employees and probably over 2500 branches in the state. I might add at the outset just a couple of observations, if I could.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MR. SMITH: And I'll abbreviate my comments.

One, I commend you for this fact-finding and what appears to us sitting here today is this requires thinking outside the box. I would also note that throughout the crisis we have been going through recently and as a representative of the banking industry, the term "bank" in most aspects as you see in the newspapers is really a generic term.

We represent the federally insured depository institutions that are directly involved with IOLA, but I might add there is a much broader segment of financial services industry and we welcome the opportunity throughout this period of your study to reach out and enlist them in an effort to create solutions.

I just wanted to cite a couple of things in my commentary, and I will summarize them, where the private sector, our industry, working with the public sector has created responses at times when public officials felt there was an overwhelming need.

2.4

First of all, stating for the record we believe that legal representation for those who cannot otherwise afford it in civil litigation not only enhances a fair outcome, but decreases the amount of time needed to resolve disputes and, quite frankly, it is in everyone's interest. To your points earlier with Kathy that we are all part of this community, we are all part of this society we live in and we have an obligation to bring forward.

We have long worked, as I noted earlier, to support financially-challenged New Yorkers. We are unique, I believe one of the only states in the United States that, for example, supported and helped shape what is called the "basic banking account" for all New Yorkers. No New York resident should be without a bank account and that exists under New York law. We support that and it's been working extraordinarily well.

We are now involved in efforts to protect the elderly citizens of our state and what we are seeing is growing financial abuse in that area. And we have also worked diligently with the State of New York, the legislature, and with the court system and Judge Pfau, on an array of programs designed to help mortgage-related issues and concerns.

I'm going to skip the basics of the basic banking account other than to say that it takes literally one

2.4

penny. And if you don't have a bank account, under New York law you can set one up to set up a checking account in New York.

We also work cooperatively with social service providers and now law enforcement and legislative initiatives in the area of financial abuse. Ultimately, we believe very strongly, and this is not always — there does not have to be always a statutory response. We believe financial literacy is the best safeguard to mitigate the need for Legal Aid in the consumer area. This is why our organization is a national partner with a financial literacy operation, Operation Hope. And so far we have deployed more than 12,000 volunteer bankers to go into our school system to teach students and young adults the basics of credit and money management. This program is targeted to go to more than 2,000 students in New York City alone on an annual basis.

We have worked diligently during this increased foreclosure situation to work with various programs and initiatives. In 2002, nine years ago, we joined with Senator Schumer in a dialogue with local community leaders and banks on the causes of many citizens choosing to enter into high cost sub-prime mortgages with non-banks. And we created a program to allow them to reach out to the traditional banking system.

2.4

In June of 2008, we supported a foreclosure mitigation initiative by the Office of Court

Administration, spearheaded by your predecessor, Chief

Judge Judith Kaye, which started to make settlement

conferences more productive for all parties. This was a precursor of subsequent state law. And we are still very much, and I know that we have already had this discussion, but the point I would make to some of the questions was, banks do not want to own homes; they do not want to be the owner of the property.

One thing that we would note, anecdotally -- and again, just like Mr. Helfer a lot of this is based on things that we know through our workings with the industry -- we probably when we look at mortgage mitigation, foreclosure mitigation, is to look at specific geographic areas where the problem is the worst. New York ranks 40th in the nation in foreclosures. The average foreclosure in the State of New York is about 420 days, 440 days. However, we do have concentrations of particular problems and why not take a look at what we can do specifically in those areas and totally aligned with the comments by Mr. Helfer that if we could get counseling up front, even before the conference -- and I defer to the judge here because she's an expert -- that would be great. We are doing this now in an organized way with small

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

business credit throughout the State of New York working with the New York Business Development Corporation.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you agree that your bottom line is better if that process works, aside from the commitment of trying to do the right thing?

By the way, we should speak as close to the mic as you can.

MR. SMITH: Sure.

Absolutely. The system, first of all, there is no positive result coming from the situation where you have deterioration of properties, deterioration of communities and deterioration of the loan. And in the very early stages of the loan, the loan would have to be classified by the regulators well before this 400-day period. And just the dislocation within the community. I would like to point out that in the mortgage arena, for example, in the latter part 2008, 2007, the banking industry that we represent had less than 50 percent, probably more like 40 percent of the mortgages in the United States. And it was a predominantly heavy concentration in what would be considered nontraditional lenders. That situation due to federal action recently, that situation is probably going to change. And now we are looking at our institutions being more aggressive in the primary mortgage area. there's no question that there would be more. It's better

2.4

We also are very much aware of the, again, the lawyers' foreclosure prevention network, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the New York City Bar and the work of our individual members, Citi, J.P. Morgan Chase, Rog Cohen is very active with us, a prominent member of the Bar here in New York City. We're all active supporters of the Legal Aid Society. And we are also very much aware of the IOLA fund. Over 90 percent of our banks support IOLA. And we are all --

THE COURT: What's happened with IOLA that's caused this crisis?

MR. SMITH: Well, the interest rate, quite frankly, your Honor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What is it? It's that the economy then drives the interest rate and the interest rate gets lower and that's why we have had this tremendous shortfall in IOLA?

MR. SMITH: Yes, your Honor, absolutely. The interest rate and market conditions generally have seen anywhere from a 30 to 40 percent haircut in almost everyone's investment portfolios. The interest rates which banks use for setting demand account interest or transactional account interest is attracting federal rates, which now are below one percentage point. So it is not due

1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	to anything I'm not aware of anything untoward or
3	anything else. What I am aware of is we are all suffering
4	from this economy.
5	We believe strongly, to your comments earlier,
6	that we ought to be looking at this in terms of, well, what
7	do we do about this? What if we are in a prolonged
8	situation now of low interest rates which affects all of
9	us?
10	JUDGE LIPPMAN: We frame it sometimes by saying
11	that, you know, access to justice can't depend upon, you
12	know, good times or bad times. It's one of the
13	fundamentals of our society that people have access to the
14	courts. And IOLA accounts are wonderful, but they're
15	driven by the economy.
16	MR. SMITH: Exactly. Right at a time when
17	probably it's counter to the whole you know, when you
18	need it more you are going to get less because of the
19	economy. And I think it warrants a look.
20	So we look forward to working with you.
21	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we do, too.
22	Any other or questions?
23	Thank you.
24	Joe Strasburg.
25	MR. STRASBURG: Thank you.
26	My name is Joseph Strasburg and I'm president of

2.4

the Rent Stabilization Association. On behalf of our 25,000 members who own or manage approximately one million apartments throughout the city, I appreciate the opportunity to appear today before the Task Force to Expand Assets to Civil Legal Services in New York.

All too often property owners and tenants, through no fault of their own, end up as adversaries in Housing Court because government agencies have failed to properly administer their programs. From the perspective of a property owner, the inability of individuals to navigate successfully through the maze of government bureaucracies has a most important and dire consequence: The failure to receive the monthly rental payment due and owning to the owner. Especially for the smaller property owners throughout the city, each month that passes without receiving rent from even a single tenant, jeopardizes their ability to pay their mortgage, real estate taxes, water bills, fuel bills and other mandatory expenses. Housing Court only exacerbates the problem with delays compounding the consequences for both the owner and the tenant.

While advocates for tenants and property owners typically have few opportunities for common ground, we believe that one area where the commonality of interest does exist is in the interest of access to civil legal services. The ability of tenants to access unemployment

2.4

benefits, healthcare coverage, food stamps, public assistance including Section 8, SCRIE and DRIE benefits and other forms of support is inextricably linked to the Housing Court case load. Simply stated, the more support that is provided to individuals at the front end of this process, the fewer cases property owners need to bring in

Housing Court for nonpayment of rents.

In these types of cases where public benefits are at issue, the eviction of the tenant is not the owner's goal, rather the goal is simply to obtain the funds which are due and owing, not to see a change in tenancy.

Providing more access to civil legal services at the front end will ease the burden at the back end.

While beyond the scope of this Task Force, we strongly believe that to further ease the burden on both property owners and low-income tenants and the courts as well, the eligibility criteria of the SCRIE and DRIE programs should be significantly broadened so that more low-income tenants, regardless of their age or disability status, can receive the benefits from those invaluable programs so that the most vulnerable persons at the bottom of the economic ladder can better be protected.

And if I just may, I just would like to make a comment outside of my role as president of Rent Stabilization, because in my previous life I used to be in

1 4

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

the legislative sector of the City Council. And one thing that I noticed, I focused on when Speaker Quinn testified about the need to determine which groups get restored during the budget process. I can only tell you from the days of — and this is going back to 1982 when I was counsel and then the chief of staff — there was always a budget game. And it was really, in my opinion, a farce that continues even to this day. And what happens is that the mayor will submit a budget and it will cut out intentionally certain groups with the full knowledge that the burden is on the legislative end, the City Council, to restore it. And that has historically occurred year and year in and year out.

I think that if we are really going to commit ourselves to protecting the poor, then it's incumbent upon the executive to make sure that certain of these programs do not get played in that kind of a power play between the executive and the City Council.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Joe -- you'll forgive me calling you Joe we know each other for so many years -- I think that's what Speaker Quinn was saying, you've got to get this out of the politics. There's got to be some kind of stability and that's what we are trying to do.

MR. STRASBURG: Unfortunately, it's occurred with every executive going back from my days when it was Ed Koch

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

to the present mayor. And you're right, to try to remove

certain groups -- certain groups from it. And

unfortunately, what occurs in an environment of diminishing

revenues, it ends up pitting all these great groups against

each other. And at the end of the day everybody gets hurt.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think you're right. And Joe, I think it's so striking, too, that you are here today and speaking on this issue because you would think, again -- you know, what people believe is so different from the facts -- you would think that the landlord, would say, oh, isn't it great. We're going to court. We have, you know, some poor person who really is vulnerable and we have them where we want them. That's not healthy for you or for them, right, or for the real estate industry?

MR. STRASBURG: That's correct.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Forgetting doing the right thing, which we are all talking about, I assume everyone wants to do the right thing, this is also about what's good for the real estate industry, right, that people have legal representation?

MR. STRASBURG: We are joined to the hip whether we like it or not. We may have other issues involving the process, but clearly I think it's in the interest of all of us. And my advocacy has always been that we want to expand many of the existing programs and to make sure that society

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 as a whole ends up shouldering that responsibility rather 3 than putting the burden on one individual entity or 4 another. And to a large extent we have moved that ball forward. Unfortunately, some of our other endeavors have 5 got caught up in a bigger fight in Albany on politics. 6 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But Joe, the real estate industry 8 supports society, you know, funding this. This is important to the broad and not just the real estate 9 industry, everybody. This isn't -- you don't look at it as 10 11 a parochial way, you look at this is important, that this 12 is one of the things that government, society the 13 obligations that we have. 14 MR. STRASBURG: That's always been my position. 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. I appreciate it. 16 Any other questions? 17 JUDGE GONZALEZ: What people also do not realize 18 is that in addition to hurting everybody, from my selfish 19 perspective as a judge it also hurts the judiciary. 20 hurts the judiciary's traditional role as the arbiter, the 21 impartial adjudicator of issues. And particularly in 22 Housing Court what happens is --23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: This is spoken from a former

2.4

25

26

Housing Court judge.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: What happens in the Housing

Court is that sometimes the judge is forced to get involved

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
sometimes in rather an impartial way because the uneven
situation with the lawyer for the landlord, whether it's a
good landlord or a bad landlord, small landlord, big
landlord, and the unrepresented. And sometimes in order to
balance the scales of justice, the judge gets involved, and
very often improperly, because that's not really the role
of the judge to become, quote unquote, a semi defender of
the lesser -- person with the lesser strength.

MR. STRASBURG: Let me just say that back in the 1980s, the industry, whether rightly or wrongly, had a perception that they couldn't get a fair shake in Housing Court because of the role of the Housing Court judge. And to Judge Lippman's credit, he had — and now being further carried on by Judge Pfau — is to change the perception of Housing Court. Because whether it's — if we believe that it is biased, it doesn't matter whether you are telling us it is not biased. And to a large extent it's an educational process of explaining. And if there is a belief that your role as a Housing Court judge is there to be partial rather than what we, many of us, believe to be impartial, then I believe justice gets served.

And that is why to a large extent many of the legislative proposals raised by either Albany or the City Council meet stiff opposition by the industry, because we are never reached out to and brought in early in the

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 process to be explained as to what you are trying to 3 achieve. And that's why there is this level of hostility. Judge Lippman, to his credit, brought us in early 4 in the process and explained exactly what he was trying to 5 do and accomplish. And we actually worked very 6 7 cooperatively in that endeavor and we still continue in 8 that direction. And it was a very simple thing to do and 9 it was never done prior to that. And I advocate and I 10 truly believe that there is a greater need of dialogue 11 between those conflicting interest groups. And I will say 12 this publicly, there are those that we have worked with and 13 talked to privately and then there are others who would 14 like to throw in a hand grenade to prevent that from 15 occurring. It's because it's not in their interest to see 16 the ball moving forward and getting things accomplished. 17 JUDGE GONZALEZ: But notice that the proper 18 funding would tend to minimize if not eliminate this danger 19 that the judiciary finds itself in when it's faced with --20 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Being an advocate. 21 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- being an advocate. 22 So the proper funding I think would tend to help that situation. 23 2.4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are supposed to maintain our

25

26

appropriate role.

JUDGE PFAU: And we are seeing it in so many more

1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	cases now in so many more courts. You know, it really was
3	Housing Court where you had so many unrepresented
4	litigants. It is now Supreme Court, the Family Court, it's
5	the rest of civil court.
6	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because of the economy.
7	JUDGE PFAU: Yes.
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's the same issue, but now it's
9	all over.
10	Mr. Raske.
11	Thank you, Joe.
12	MR. RASKE: Good morning, Chief Judge and good
13	morning to you, colleagues.
14	I'm Ken Raske, president of the Greater New York
15	Hospital Association. I have the privilege of representing
16	250 institutions, hospitals and nursing homes throughout
17	the Metropolitan area and throughout New York State.
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So why is civil legal
19	representation important to you? What's the relevance?
20	MR. RASKE: Well, sir, let me give you an
21	example.
22	About ten or twelve blocks from here is a 700-bed
23	hospital sitting shuttered. It's called Saint Vincent's, a
24	proud name in healthcare throughout the history of the City

of New York and New York State. It is empty. It is a

victim of a financial collapse. And the services that were

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 rendered are no longer rendered by that institution. 3 have to go to other institutions, sometimes farther, much 4 farther away. Now, how does this interweave with the question 5 that you asked? Well, the answer is very simply, sir, 6 7 legal services assist the hospitals in getting our patients 8 eligible for Medicaid. And Medicaid becomes a significant 9 payer, particularly in areas of New York that are 10 safety-net institutions and are serving a large indigent 11 community. So getting them qualified for Medicaid helps 12 them access services and helps the institution survive. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So again, the same theme. 14 MR. RASKE: Absolutely. 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's not just about, gee, people 16 should have legal representation. It's about --17 MR. RASKE: Sure. I could make a moral argument 18 and an ethical imperative, a biological ethical imperative, 19 but you know what? It's still in our interest. So let's 20 be clear. 21 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think that's an important 22 point, especially in this octopus of an industry that you are involved with --23 2.4 MR. RASKE: Absolutely. 25 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- so many technical aspects. 26

MR. RASKE: And to carry that theme a little bit

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

further, sir, I will take actually two more steps with it.

One additional step is that it also -- legal services helps

for those that are insured, we have to do battle with

insurance companies for services to be rendered; whether

you are qualified; is this an experimental treatment or is

this not; can I have a transplant; am I within an age group

that would perhaps rule me out. And those individuals help

us make sure that benefits that were underwritten are

actually delivered. And I -- and that is the next step.

Now, let me take you two years from now, because this is a forward-looking panel, the Task Force. In 2014 the United States will have the implementation of the Affordable Healthcare Act. Right now it's being rolled out, that act, pieces of it, such as, you know, having individuals covered that — dependents up to 26, 27. Little pieces are now being, you know, rolled out in Washington. But the big, big piece occurs in 2014.

In 2014, across the United States Medicaid eligibility will set a new bar. But in addition, there will be penalties and there will be subsidies for insurance for individuals. It will be very, very complicated, sir, very, very complicated. But we want to make sure that the Affordable Healthcare Act reaches the people and gets those who are eligible for insurance subsidies, gets them the subsidies. The penalties that exist to make sure that they

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 actually help work to force people who don't want insurance 3 to get on insurance, because it is in their self-interest, 4 and also to assist in getting people qualified for Medicaid. 5 JUDGE LIPPMAN: This has the potential to be a 6 7 giant mess without people knowing what they are doing and 8 having some help in doing it. MR. RASKE: I would say, sir, this is one of the 9 big challenges. You know, I could in sit in front of the 10 11 president of the United States and say the same thing. 12 It's true, this is what the challenge is to making this 13 thing work. JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, we understand the goals, 14 15 but how to get there. 16 MR. RASKE: Absolutely. Boy, you got to get -the rubber has to hit the road here. 17 18 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And legal representation is 19 critical to getting it. 20 MR. RASKE: Absolutely, no question. 21 MR. YOUNGER: Just a quick question. Many in the 22 medical industry don't really like lawyers because they are 23 known for suing doctors. 2.4 MR. RASKE: Oh, you noticed. 25 MR. YOUNGER: You do refer in your written remarks to what is known as medical/legal partnerships, 26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
where lawyers and doctors can get together to solve the
patient's full problems. Maybe you could just share for a
minute how that would work and how that helps somebody who
comes to your hospital with a medical problem but actually
has a legal problem.

MR. RASKE: You know, that's actually an excellent point. It's the medical malpractice part of the problem that creates the dynamic tension. But if you put that aside, lawyers are extremely important to the well-being of the healthcare community and to the population overall.

And in partnering with lawyers, a number of our institutions do it today. And it is extraordinarily helpful to our patients as a result to make sure that they get qualified for Medicaid, get qualified for other insurance when, in fact, they are eligible for it and receive their due benefits.

So we find a lot of our -- a lot of institutions do do partnering. Around here, for example, Continuum -- Beth Israel, we know it as Beth Israel, it has a corporate name called Continuum -- Mount Sinai, they deal with something called Legal Health, an agency, I assume it's a not-for-profit agency, that is -- that is extraordinarily helpful. They do thousands of cases a year in conjunction with the hospital. So partnering is very important.

2.4

MR. YOUNGER: What are some of the legal problems that a doctor can, in effect, diagnose but they can't treat?

MR. RASKE: You know, that's an interesting question.

If I understand it properly, and forgive me if I misunderstand it, but the physician community is always in a situation where they're practicing what is considered to be defensive medicine. And they will take extraordinary steps to make sure that everything is done that is proper and in some cases even exaggerate it from a standpoint of protocol for medicine in order to make sure that defensive medicine standards are actually met.

So you know, in terms of the physician community you are going to find that physicians are very much concerned about the ability, the economics of the individual patient to make sure that he or she gets the proper amount of care.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, anything else? Oh, I'm sorry, Judge Pfau.

JUDGE PFAU: I was just going to add what's been so striking to me about this whole panel and the testimony is traditionally when we think about civil legal service needs, we think about representation in court. And so much of what you're talking about for stability for the

community is long before the court process, and hopefully avoids the court process. And the civil -- the unmet needs start so early on and it's really something that we hadn't -- I hadn't focused on until I heard your testimony.

MR. RASKE: Well, you know, your Honor, if I may just to add a little bit to that thought, because it's a brilliant thought.

JUDGE PFAU: You must be a lawyer.

MR. RASKE: The fact of the matter is, is this, that you take this example of Saint Vincent's Hospital. It collapsed financially. It was serving the poor — it was serving a number of indigent patients. But you know what? It was also serving rich patients and middle class patients and now it's serving nobody.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I want to echo Judge Pfau's comment and just thank the business community in general for your support on this issue. This is so critical.

Again, we think the society and as well obviously as the judiciary and the profession, I think it highlights -- your support on this issue -- highlights the importance of it to all, to every part of our community, to our viability. And nothing is more important. And I think Kathy Wylde indicated that the business community has to have confidence in what goes on in our justice system, it's so critical. And to have people, if half the people are

i	п
1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	walking around without representation and it's chaotic and
3	you wind up with great societal costs in terms of our
4	welfare services, we are not helping anybody and certainly
5	not the business community.
6	So thank you all so much. You were really very
7	helpful.
8	Thank you.
9	(continued on next page.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

2.2

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Next we are going to have a group of community leaders. They will introduce themselves, but I'm going to ask them to come up, Benito Romano, David Jones, Julie Kushner, Margarita Rosa, and Samuel Seymour.

Okay, great to have you all and let me start with Benito Romano. Introduce yourself.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Benito Romano and I am the chair of the interest on lawyer account fund for the State of New York.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Currently known as IOLA.

MR. ROMANO: IOLA, yes.

I would like to first thank Chief Judge Lippman for conducting these hearings and making access to justice for the expansion of civil legal services to low income New Yorkers, one of the signatures of his term as Chief Judge.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: IOLA is particularly grateful for the Chief Judge's inclusion of \$15 million in emergency funding for IOLA in his OCA budget at a time of increased needs during the economic crisis, these funds are crucial for IOLA's grantees. It allowed them to provide legal services for at-risk New Yorkers while at the same time bringing in hundreds of millions of dollars in direct

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING benefits into New York, for all New Yorkers.

2.4

IOLA is one of the leading funders for organizations that provide civil legal services in New York. It collects data from all of its grantees regarding the types of legal assistance they provide, the outcomes and benefits won for their clients as well as a host of other data such as other sources of funding.

Today I want to provide the panel with a brief overview of the current sources of funding in New York, and place that funding in the broader context of the funding provided in other states and the current funding crisis.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think that would be very helpful.

MR. ROMANO: I also want to address the current service levels of civil legal services assistance for low income New Yorkers and the unmet needs in terms of those services; and lastly, and perhaps most importantly, I'd like to describe the significant economic benefits realized as a result of civil legal services in New York, as the prior panel made abundantly clear, it's in everyone's interest.

Data gathered by the IOLA fund demonstrates conclusively that the net economic impact of civil legal services for low income New Yorkers is overwhelmingly a

positive one, which in 2009 alone resulted in \$361 million of federal funds entering the State. Adding the federal dollars brought into the State along with the direct savings to New York taxpayers for homelessness prevention adds an additional \$100 million in benefits.

In all, the direct economic impact on New York from civil legal services provided by IOLA grantees was over \$600 million.

2.2

2.4

That amount rose even larger when you coupled it with the economic stimulus effect of the federal funds brought into New York. New Yorkers realized an additional \$535 million in direct economic activity when low income families who use their benefits to purchase necessities like food, rent, medicines providing an additional 5,600 jobs.

Funding for legal services programs in New York
State comes from IOLA and a number of different sources
including the Legal Services Corporation, private
foundations, state and local bar associations and state
and local funding.

There are two major related difficulties in funding that have become acute in the current economic crisis.

First, on a per capita basis, New York's dedicated funding for civil legal services, that is money

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

from the State general funds or court related fees is

significantly below that provided by other states in our

region.

2.2

2.4

In 2009, average per capita funding in New York -- excuse me, in New Jersey, Connecticut and Massachusetts and Vermont was \$23.51.

New York's per capita funding in 2009 was \$3.68, 80 percent less than our neighboring states.

Second is a crisis in IOLA funding. After 26 years of providing general support, which by definition allows grantees the flexibility to apply those funds in a manner most needed over \$285 million in total, IOLA has become a vital source of support for organizations providing civil legal assistance in New York.

To generate this revenue, IOLA relies on the interest rate provided by the banks holding IOLA accounts and interest rates are often, as we know, volatile.

Compounding this problem, a decrease in the interest rate is often associated with a downturn in the economy, and thus during periods when both the need for legal services and the actual number of indigent New Yorkers increases, IOLA's ability to fund those services decreases.

This scenario is exactly what has happened to IOLA during the economic downturn. As a result of the

1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	economic crisis and the seizure of the credit markets
3	that became apparent in the fall of 2008, interest rates
4	dropped precipitously.
5	In 2007, the largest financial institutions
6	holding IOLA accounts were providing an average interest
7	rate of 2.25 percent.
8	By 2008 that rate was cut in half to one
9	percent.
10	And in October 2009 the rate dropped again to
11	.31 or 31 basis points.
12	And last month it was down to .25 percent or 25
13	basis points.
14	In total, 88 percent drop in interest rates.
15	In the impact on the funds available for IOLA
16	grantee, grant making has been devastating. During
17	IOLA's fiscal year 2008, IOLA accounts generated
18	\$32 million; fiscal 2009, \$23 million; and fiscal 2010 it
19	generated \$7 million, a 75 percent drop.
20	We predict that in 2011 it will be \$7 million
21	representing a decline of 80 percent.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So the IOLA crisis is not over
23	by our getting funding this year with the legislature
24	coming through with that funding, that crisis is by no
25	means over.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}\xspace.$ ROMANO: We just have our figurative finger

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.

MR. YOUNGER: I think we're all very grateful to the Chief Judge for having gone to bat for the 15 million, but we all know it's not enough.

If you were to have a number -- I don't want to name a number -- but if you had more money, how would you go about spending it? What would be the needs that you think are the most critical needs that you can't pay for right now.

MR. ROMANO: Our grant system is quite good and robust in identifying our needs. We've been doing it for a long enough time, we track or guarantees, we get data from them, we will still need to fund programs that provide direct legal services which is about 80 percent of our funding.

And an additional 20 percent goes to access the justice program, the kind of creative programs in which you have intentional multiplier effects. So for small investment, you can reach many more — many more worthy individuals in need.

The -- as I'll get to in a moment, we know that we are not meeting the needs of all those who are in need of legal services. We know that there is a significant percentage, perhaps 50 percent given some of the data we

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING have collected that are out there.

2.2

2.3

We are constantly trying to find new ways of reaching those individuals, particularly outside of the urban centers where it's much more difficult to get to a lawyer --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And a lot of these providers actually survive without your money -- some of them so dependent on the money that they were fold up their --

MR. ROMANO: We hope that the infrastructure will stay in place so we could patch together some funding that will keep them in business. But many of them will not survive. We've encouraged, in some instances, for smaller programs to combine their administrative overhead so that they can become more efficient.

Of course, there's always a risk that you are sacrificing access because they cannot reach as far out -- it is our hope that we will be able to keep an infrastructure in these programs in place --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But it really is a life and death situation --

MR. ROMANO: For many of them, we are it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: This isn't like a couple extra bucks here or there. These are people who, in large degree -- services in large degree are dependent upon

2.2

2.4

MR. ROMANO: That's correct.

Just to give you a sense of how little -- how much more there is to be done, prior to the economic downturn, resources for civil legal services were inadequate.

In 2005 the Legal Services Corporation completed a study on the justice gap in America and established that for every eligible applicant who came to their office, another eligible applicant was turned away.

In 2009 LSC updated that study and reached similar conclusions.

Apart from turnaway data, which doesn't begin to capture it because you have to get to the office to be turned away, there are — there's a landmark study done by the Bar Association, 1994, which found that only — that 80 percent of the legal needs of low income New Yorkers were no— low income Americans was not being met, and these findings have essentially confirmed by later studies, including the preliminary data from the study commissioned by this task force.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And take -- they did not take -- the earlier studies didn't take into account what's going on in this the country economically and this area of the world.

2.4

MR. ROMANO: There's every reason to suspect that it's deteriorating very rapidly given the economic circumstances.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We see it in the unrepresented people who come into the courts, the numbers are just going through the roof.

MR. ROMANO: One of the proposed solutions has been the use of pro bono efforts to increase access to justice, and New York lawyers, as you know have answered this call to duty enthusiastically. In 2009 over 11,000 attorneys in New York volunteered their time with IOLA grantees, donating about 450,000 hours of service. If you value that conservatively, that is \$67 million injection of value to legal services system in our State.

As bleak as this picture may appear, I don't want to focus only on areas where civil legal services providers have fallen -- efforts have fallen short due to the lack of resources, because the results that these providers obtained with limited resources also are remarkable.

IOLA collects data on outcomes from all its guarantees. In 2009 IOLA grantees closed over 264,000 cases benefiting 520,000 people in areas such as housing, family law, income maintenance, Social Security eligibility, Medicare and medicaid cases.

2.2

2.4

One of the economic multiplier effects of the federal funds brought into New York is added in, if you add that in, the figure rises of benefits to over \$1 billion annually.

Federal funds brought into the State were calculated on Exhibit 1, you will see federal funds brought into the State were calculated by looking at back awards and monthly benefits won by clients in 2009 as well as the benefits received in previous years that would continue on an ongoing basis. Combining all of the federal benefits brought into New York along with the federal funding for civil legal services, you come to a \$361 million gain.

There are also substantial savings realized by state and local governments as a result of civil legal services. For example, savings in emergency shelter costs. Every year thousands of New Yorkers face the threat of losing their home. The impact on families can be monumental resulting in lost jobs, disruption of education, and threatening stability of the families involved.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me just say that those of you who can't see because the -- it's is blocked, it should be in your packets if you picked them up. Most of these charts are in the packets.

MR. ROMANO: There are also the tremendous costs for all of society in terms of lost productivity and all of the ancillary damage. There are also more direct -- directly captured costs such as the cost to local governments involved in providing emergency shelter costs.

By looking at the total number of cases in 2009 in which eviction was avoided, the total number of people involved and the average cost to taxpayers in providing emergency shelter in New York City suburban and upstate areas, it becomes possible to calculate the savings to taxpayer which total nearly \$100 million in 2009 and \$355 million --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So this is not just doling out money for civil legal services. This is about that money is — over and over goes into society and we get the benefits of it.

So I think the problem we all have to deal with is in trying to get a prioritization of what's important, I think -- you know in terms of funding in this particular area every dollar spent is truly well spent, is it multiplied?

MR. ROMANO: Correct. We can justify the expenditure entirely without regard to cost because of the compelling need. But -- but it pays for itself. It

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING certainly can be justified as a good investment on which there is a very substantial five-to-one return.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Return. Right.

2.2

2.4

MR. ROMANO: Just in closing, one of the jobs of the task force will be to produce a report with suggestions on how to bridge the access to justice gap in New York State, and that certainly is not something I can address here.

It is my hope, however, that I've at least identified some of those gaps and just as importantly provided some of the data, some, by the way, that's never been gathered to our knowledge before, which demonstrates conclusively that the net impact of spending on civil legal services for low income New Yorkers is an overwhelmingly and positive one.

This argues that even in difficult times the fiscally prudent course may be to look at the spending on civil legal services as an investment which results in increased federal dollars and a -- and is a positive for the State's economy resulting not only in a better outcome for lower income New Yorkers, but positive benefits for all New Yorkers.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you and thank you for the wonderful that IOLA does and certainly we are all very much aware of the danger of IOLA being underfunded and

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

also I -- we talked in the beginning, the problem that

we've had in funding really highlights this idea that you

can't have these unstable revenue streams that sometimes

are good and sometimes are not so good, and really meet

our mandate as a society if you are dependant on this

kind of up and down --

MR. ROMANO: This is not the only time in our history we've ridden this volatile roller coaster. It's happened once before and it is a terrible -- you can imagine how difficult it is for our grantees to be planning, hiring, training, all the things that you need to run a public law office can't get done because of the volatility of the source of funding --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me just say, without pontificating on this too much, this is one of the reasons that we are so intent and so pleased about the legislative resolution in this regard, asking us what we need to get funding out of the general fund. That is one of the priorities of our society that must be funded rather than depending on the hodgepodge of whether it's an interest rate or a benevolent legislator or some dollars from the feds or some dollars from here — we need stable funding. That's what this is all about and I think IOLA can't survive without it and this whole effort can't survive without it without some kind of stability

 $\label{eq:first_def} \mbox{FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING}$ in terms of the funding.

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. ROMANO: That's quite right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Any other questions?

JUDGE PFAU: I was struck at the beginning when you were talking about the level of per capita funding in New York compared to some of the surrounding states. In those states, does that meet the civil legal services needs? Are we so far below what other states are doing and even that is -- we have so far to go --

MR. ROMANO: Because the data is national, for the most part, except for the work of this task force, we will have better data for New York rather than extrapolating from the turnaway data that we do have, it's hard to say whether -- I would suspect that those programs are not fully meeting the needs --

JUDGE PFAU: I would suspect --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: One of the benefits of the task force, we hope to provide data that has never been seen before in so many areas and I think that's maybe one of the reasons why there hasn't been funding is because we haven't been able to get the information out there about what this is all about.

Thank you again. Thank you for your efforts and let's try both the panel and speakers to stay to the -- to five minutes, then we'll give you five minutes

of questioning, we're moving way, way behind schedule, but all, I think, quite telling in terms of all of the testimony and commentary, so I'm only half upset that we're behind schedule, but let's try and stick it to a little better.

All right, Mr. Jones, you are going to introduce yourself.

MR. JONES: I'm David Jones, I am president and CEO of the Community Service Society. CSS is among the oldest charities in the country. We are 160 years old plus, we've always dealt with issues of poverty in New York. We deal with it from research base, which I'll talk a little about here today. We were the founding institution of the Columbia School of Social Works, we do direct services, as well, and we founded the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York, among other things.

But we also have a team of lawyers working on critical issues. So, unlike most other charities we have the luxury or role of playing all three roles --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know, you do great work -MR. JONES: -- research, advocate and direct
service provider.

I'm just here, I'll cut short. Obviously, we've been working regularly with Legal Aid and Legal Services of New York, virtually, for my entire tenure

2.4

As you are aware from news reports, this recession is tearing through poor communities that represent more than a third of New Yorkers at a rate that is unparalleled, certainly in my career. The national numbers are also reflected in New York City.

We have tried to use data sets that no one else has. We do an annual survey, I guess the only one in the country which polls 1,800 people who are at or near poverty every year and we've been trending that data. The data sets we're getting back that were conducted in July, August of this year are some of the worst we've ever seen in the ten year history of looking at this.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But all those people -- you know, so much downer about poverty and I'm sure yours is as you say, ahead of everybody else, do all those people wind up in courts? What is happening out there that makes it even more of an issue than it was previously?

MR. JONES: What's happening is, one of the poll results we found that virtually two-thirds of the people at or near poverty have less than \$500 in reserve and about a third of them say they have zero, they have nothing.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Less than \$500 in reserve -MR. JONES: In total reserves. So when

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

something goes wrong, and we're starting to see that. In the latest New York Times Article showing that about 22,000 people in NYCHA now are more than one month in arrears, that's order of a bell weather for the whole problem in the housing arena. So that's one area that people are coming apart quickly. That's why we're seeing a dramatic increase in the number of homeless families —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it's kind of the most graphic area, if you can visualize, if you don't have -
MR. JONES: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- roof over your head and other consequences.

MR. JONES: And often without representation, things that could be worked out to give people some leeway, to hold them into a house which everyone realizes is the most critical thing to do because without that, once you destabilize housing, everything else can unravel on you. You can end up homeless, you can lose a job, a whole range of things can happen. So housing —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So basically -- housing was the touchstone of this whole collapse.

MR. JONES: The other area we're finding is particularly in healthcare. We do an enormous amount of work with Legal Aid Society on helping people navigate the healthcare arena. You heard from Ken Raske one part

of it, but what is also happening is people are finding when they go to seek healthcare that either because they're — they haven't qualified for Medicaid, or the HMO they're dealing with says they're not eligible for it in some way, whether privately insured or not, they are routinely building up incredible debt and not getting adequate services.

So this navigation problem of poor people who either have Medicaid or are just above Medicaid as they try to access adequate health care, and if that unravels on people, if they can't get anything, again, you're having a ripple effect in the ability to hold jobs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And you agree with one of the earlier witnesses that even with the new healthcare bill it only increases the need to navigate the system --

MR. JONES: Now you're going to need more help because, I think, all of us have horror stories of dealing with denials by HMOs, quite legitimately --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MR. JONES: -- the difficulty is if you're someone who doesn't speak English as a first language or if you have an elderly person who is poor, these denials, basically, the ultimate result is, well, you should appeal. If I'm a Korean speaker, good luck. You can't do this without help and sometimes that takes legal

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING representation.

We find that we do most of the cases -- Legal Aid is one of our partners in something called MCCAP, which is one of the largest Ombuds programs in the country, that program has had about 180,000 client visits over the last nine years. 99 percent of those are resolved, but only by pressure, by having a better understanding of the law, and the access point that people have a right to that no layperson could hope to cope with. And that's another catchment area.

The final one that we have been working heavily on is the whole question which, sort of, takes in both of your — which is the question of people returning from incarceration. We have, obviously, the fifth highest recidivism rate in the country in New York. We have somewhere around 60,000 people incarcerated, 23,000 on parole, but they don't even keep records any more about how many people have a serious criminal conviction.

The difficulty when they get out, even though there are all sorts of antidiscrimination efforts, we're starting to see for those hundreds of thousands of people with a record, they are basically incapable of getting work again. That it becomes, sort of, the final blow, when I don't have a high school diploma, have an incarcerated record, I want to turn it around, I can't

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING get work.

2.2

2.4

And we're starting to realize that that's having an enormous impact in destabilizing poor neighborhoods, and we need and we've sought Legal Aid's help and other help on trying to address this problem.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It is so interesting, I think, you're highlighting the linkage between criminal indigent representation --

MR. JONES: Right.

Almost 50 years ago we had Gideon versus Wainwright where the U.S. Supreme Court said to them it's an obvious truth that people who come into court in a criminal case without a lawyer can't get a fair day in court, can't get equal justice, and what this is all about is almost 50 years ago is the same issue when we come to the necessities of life; that when people come into court or encounter the legal system or all the things that require legal representation, they can't get a fair shake without having, again, someone to even playing field, to help them, and the most vulnerable among us are the ones that are obviously hurt the most.

MR. JONES: I absolutely agree.

I'd just like to leave the panel with one issue that I don't think is getting enough attention, and I've

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 been talking about this a lot now. We're just at the 3 beginning of the cycle. Despite the recession being officially over as of June of this year, our last survey 4 5 is showing extraordinarily -- jumps in the number of people without jobs. Of the people -- African Americans 6 7 surveyed and Latinos surveyed, of the 1,800, 21 percent 8 reported losing their job just in this last year. So there's a lag time that's going on, even as 9 10 the recession ends, that the job loss is so huge and also 11 the length of time people are out of work are so huge, 12 67 percent of those out of work reported being out of work more than a year, one to three years --13 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Staggering numbers. 15 MR. JONES: -- and they're all going to be 16 funneling in ultimately to keep their housing, to keep 17 some modicum of healthcare, to keep intact families. 18 They're going to be coming into interaction with the 19 criminal justice system and without representation this 20 gets to be a bad situation becoming really dire for the 21 entire city. 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for your testimony.

Okay, Julie Kushner.

Thank you.

(Continued on next page)

26

25

23

2.4

MS. KUSHNER: Good morning. My name is Julie Kushner and I am the director of UAW Region 9A, which is the United Auto Workers. And we represent over 60,000 active and retired members in New England, Puerto Rico and in New York.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So how do your people get their legal services?

MS. KUSHNER: Well, hopefully, most of our members earn enough through their good union contracts that they don't come to Legal Aid and Legal Services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So they pay for, basically, your average rank and file is able to afford legal services?

MS. KUSHNER: Most of them. Although, we clearly represent people who you've heard about today are losing their jobs, who are then out of work and we still consider those members and they are in need and then they do end up requiring the services of Legal Aid and Legal Services.

But what I'm here to talk about today is the members we represent who work for Legal Aid and Legal Services. We have two local unions, Local 2325, which is the attorneys of the Legal Aid Society and Local 2320, the National Organization of Legal Services Workers. And in there we represent everyone who works for many of the agencies here in the state, many of these programs.

We consider our members to be the first

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

responders. They end up dealing with the people who are in crisis, people who have lost their homes, people who have a family crisis. And they've been through the system and everything else has failed. And now they come our members for representation.

Our members routinely avert catastrophes that follow when a string of failures have occurred and they have a lack of meaningful access to justice.

Statistics comparing the success rates of our clients with those of the unrepresented are very clear. For example, if you look at claimants needing unemployment benefits, 80 percent win their hearings when they have representation. And that's extremely important to us.

Additionally, you've heard a lot about -- I was very happy that you covered the whole piece of the savings that the state has, for instance, in emergency shelter costs when our members protect their clients from evictions.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Your members protect those who can't help themselves. What kind of income -- do you get rich being a lawyer in a legal service provider?

MS. KUSHNER: I think you are going to hear from some advocates and I think they could probably speak to that better than I. But most of you know that, in fact, the people we represent go into this work because they

2.4

believe in it. And they aren't looking to get rich. And, in fact, one of the things I wanted to highlight today is that because of the difficulty in securing funds, we've had layoffs, we've had members who've taken cuts in their health benefits. And there have not been increases in salary even though it's much more expensive to live.

And so one of the things I want to focus on is that while it's really, really important to keep a stable legal services work force, because that really helps in representation, that people have expertise, they have experience, they know the system, they know how to do this, we don't want those very devoted, very committed advocates to be forced out of Legal Services and Legal Aid because they can't afford to be there and raise their own families.

And I think that's a really --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: If there's no continuity with those kinds of people, you know, it's not money well spent on anyone's part to be --

MS. KUSHNER: Absolutely. I mean, there are people here in the room that I recognize. I have been doing this work. I'm not a lawyer. I don't come from Legal Services or Legal Aid, but fortunately my local union, the attorneys of the Legal Aid Society affiliated to my local union in 1979. So I see people in the room that I met back then who are still doing this work. And they're

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING extremely, extremely talented in what they do.

2.4

And I think that at that level of advocacy work in Legal Aid and also in Legal Services is extremely crucial. These programs are stable programs. The people that have worked in them have been committed to this for, you know, decades, for their entire life. And it's very important to us to see that there is a steady stream of funding so that we can keep this very talented pool of workers, including everything from the lawyers to the secretaries to the social workers, that really make sure that these agencies are able to perform necessary functions.

So I think that you've heard a lot about the savings to the state. It's not just in the emergency shelter cost, but it's, you know, when our members who do family law work to stabilize families and keep children with their parents, that avoids the cost of foster care placement.

So there is lots of ripple effects beyond the shelter work.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's not just housing and health --

MS. KUSHNER: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- it's people, it's families, and their safety --

MS. KUSHNER: It's families, it's displaced workers and helping them in unemployment hearings, helping people to gain access to public assistance dollars which may keep them in their home.

So it really is --

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It all mushrooms out of control if you don't have the appropriate representation.

MS. KUSHNER: It's tremendous.

I don't think any of these programs can afford to cut any further. You already have people who have made sacrifices in their personal lives.

In these programs you also have extremely dedicated people who give many, many hours of work that is not paid for because this is their cause, this is what they believe in, and this is what they see as their avocation. So I think it's really important to see that we can't cut these dollars further and we can't take further cuts. We can't cut the programs, we need to expand them.

And I think I want to, you know, just close by saying that I've watched, I know you've talked about IOLA funds. If the funding continues to be reduced, we are going to see more bureaucratic mistakes and more -- greater costs to the state. Without a permanent funding source, programs like the ones we have representing -- our members are represented, they'll no longer be able to keep up with

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING the growing need.

2.4

You asked about other states and whether or not they would say that they are funded to a proper level. I have sat through hearings like this in the State of Connecticut where we also represent Legal Services workers and they are saying the same things, they're turning away clients. And there is an emotional toll on our members for having to turn away people that they know they could help. And that toll cannot be measured. We need to make sure these programs are funded.

I have been doing this work, as I said, for 30 years working side by side with the attorneys and the Legal Services workers. There hasn't been a year where we haven't joined them, either in Albany or at City Hall asking for funding for Legal Services. There hasn't been a single year where that hasn't been a critical issue. And every year it's up in the air. And after all the competing for funds, which you've heard about here today too, is sorted out, some of our programs find they can't continue a particular area of their work. And people are laid off. And that work is lost and it's hard to get it back.

And so it's really critical today, I would just, you know, we really want to thank you for what you are doing here today in gathering all this information and really put a plug in it, and say we fully support having

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

Legal Services and funding continued on a steady basis and really, really strongly advocate for Legal Aid and Legal Services Corporation to get the bulk of that, because I think that's where you see the really the best performance, the best legal work on behalf of our clients.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much.

Margarita Rosa.

MS. ROSA: Good afternoon.

My name is Margarita Rosa and I am the executive director of an organization that serves low-income people located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Grand Street Settlement, it's one of the old established settlement houses. It grew up when, at the turn of century, when new immigrants were coming from south and — Southern and Eastern Europe to settle in the United Stated and struggled with many of the same issues that new immigrants today struggle with, language barriers, finding ways to ensure that they have access to decent housing, medical care, obtaining employment, and finding ways to live in stable communities.

Today Grand Street Settlement's programs that range from early childhood services through after-school services to senior services, serve approximately 10,000 people in the course of a year in Manhattan as well as in the Bushwick section of Brooklyn.

2.4

Some years ago we were fortunate to have -- to partner with Single Stop, the Single Stop program, that brought to us services that enable our constituents to access social service benefits to which they have legitimate entitlement, that enable them to obtain credit counseling, to have income tax preparation services, to access earned income tax credits, and to obtain access to other social services and to legal services, which is the issue that we are here to discuss.

Last year our Single Stop center served about a thousand families. 150 received services from the lawyer who comes from Legal Services of New York City and comes to our agency every Thursday and sees people for three hours. In the course of that three hours he sees all kinds of people. I know that that's a day when we have a great deal of traffic coming through because people are really, really interested in obtaining the services of a lawyer that will enable them to basically avoid having their lives become further complicated by either the loss of benefits or the loss of housing or some of the other issues that affect low-income families.

Our Single Stop clients require a number of different interventions depending on the circumstances of their case and in all instances the Legal Services of New York City lawyer reviews the problems that the client

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 brings to them and then advises them as to either the 3 appropriate agency that they need to contact or the kinds 4 of documents that they need to fill out or the kinds of other legal information that they may need to obtain in 5 order to insure that their matters are addressed. 6 7 Often clients --8 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Can you have a viable community with that kind of services --9 10 MS. ROSA: Without those services? 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- being provided? Yes, without 12 it. 13 MS. ROSA: I don't think so, Judge. 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: In other words, our communities 15 in this city, in this state, what do they need? Is this a 16 vital -- when we talk about, gee, this is important funding 17 schools and funding hospitals and all the other things, is 18 this as important when you look at the community? 19 MS. ROSA: Absolutely, because it enables people 20 to navigate a system that many us who are actually better 21 equipped to navigate can be tripped up by. It's 22 complicated to navigate the system of benefits, to navigate 23 the courts if you're in an eviction proceeding or if you 2.4 have -- require a fair hearing because you are unjustly 25 being denied benefits to which you are entitled. And all

of that, as other speakers have noted, can destabilize

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING entire families. And when entire families are destabilized, neighborhoods are destabilized.

2.4

We sit in the middle of the largest housing project in Manhattan. So when you talk about some of the data that was mentioned earlier that, you know, thousands of residents of public housing are more than two months behind in paying their rent, you know that that's going to give rise to the possibility of the loss of housing. And therein begins a process that snowballs into the loss of stability and just basic — I guess the word is stability, for entire families.

So the issues that most of our clients bring to the attention of the lawyers often are landlord-tenant issues and immigration-related issues. The percentage that we see is something like 36 percent of the cases last year involved housing issues; 13 percent involved family-related issues like family violence and also just benefits for family members.

We often find that we see a lot of our senior citizens who are serving as parents to their grandchildren, as caregivers to grandchildren, and in order for them to be able to navigate the system not only in terms of what they need and are entitled to, but also being able to access those resources that will enable them to provide stability for their grandchildren and the rest of their families, is

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING really, really, really very critical. And we see that often.

2.0

2.4

2.5

Income maintenance issues make up about

12 percent of that caseload. And then there are issues
involving consumer finance and other related matters. And
despite the fact that Legal Services of New York provides
excellent, excellent services for our clients, the reality
is that only 150 of them get to receive services and there
probably are four or five times that many people who don't
have access. I mean, three hours a week for those of us
who have done law we understand that that has its
limitations.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Tip of the iceberg, yes.

MS. ROSA: That notwithstanding, we are very grateful to have the services and we are very appreciative of the work of this panel and the efforts it's making to gather the data to ensure that there is a regular source of support for these very, very critical services for low-income New Yorkers.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much.

Anything else?

MR. YOUNGER: Just a quick question. I'll disclose my bias along with our chief judge. We both hail from the Lower East Side.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Absolutely, and Grand Street in

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 particular. Go ahead. 3 4 MR. YOUNGER: In practical terms, you talked about navigating the system. What does a lawyer do to help 5 you navigate the system that you just can't do without a 6 7 lawyer? MS. ROSA: Well, I think sometimes a lawyer, 8 first of all, helps a layperson sort out what are sort of 9 10 the relevant issues and concerns that they need to really focus on in order to resolve a matter and helps them access 11 additional resource or services that might help them avoid 12 a bigger problem. And that's not something that comes 13 14 easily to people who aren't familiar with the system. 15 So having someone help you understand what you 16 need to do or not do, what you should do or avoid in order 17 to achieve a positive outcome for yourself and your family 18 is critical. And I think someone with legal training can 19 provide that in ways that, you know, wouldn't be available 20 to laypeople otherwise. 21 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it. 22 From Grand Street. 23 (Continued on next page.) 24

25

26

MR. SEYMOUR: Good morning, Chief Judge Lippman and distinguished panels. Thank you very much for letting me testify.

My name is Sam Seymour and I am president of the New York City Bar Association. And at the outset I want to thank you, in particular Chief Judge Lippman, for bringing such a sharp focus to the vital need to provide adequate funding for legal services and I should thank all the members of the task force, particularly Helaine Barnett for all the work that is going on.

The City Bar Association is an organization of over 23,000 lawyers and judges dedicated to improving the administration of justice.

In addition to having members who are active in legal services, and a committee devoted to study ways to improve the delivery of pro bono and legal services in New York City, we have an affiliate called the City Bar Justice Center which is mentioned in earlier testimony today, whose mission is to leverage resources in the City's legal community, to increase access to justice, particularly for low income individuals.

The Justice Center does this by using a small staff to carefully match pro bono lawyers with clients, train the lawyers and supervise their work. And we estimate that for every dollar that it spends, the City

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

Justice Center is able to deliver up to \$9 worth of value of legal services.

2.2

2.4

So back to the question of leverage that came up earlier.

The Justice Center assists more than 20,000 clients per year, we assist immigrants who have been victims of violence or crime and also conduct outreach to immigrant communities regarding their rights and options. We assist homeless individuals and families seeking benefits, cancer survivors who have insurance and employment issues, elderly New Yorkers who seek wills, living wills, micro entrepreneurs seeking basic legal help and veterans seeking disability benefits.

We also provide assistance to persons filing for bankruptcy and those seeking to defend against or prevent foreclosure, another program mentioned in earlier testimony.

We also operate a legal hotline that has assisted thousands of low income callers on a wide range of issues every year.

Despite all of this work, the need for civil legal services among those who cannot afford it far exceeds our ability to serve them.

The recession has had a major impact on our work particularly for clients dealing with debt. Our

1.3

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

bankruptcy program is busier than ever and the number of

consumer debt calls to our hotline have increased

40 percent in the last year.

Our new foreclosure project is totally booked up. We have all the work we can take.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sam, why is it important to the legal community in New York, which the city bar in so many ways represents, to have the poor, the vulnerable have representation; what is it to the profession as a whole — you see all these terrific things the city bar does, why is that important to have legal services for the poor? What does it mean for the profession?

MR. SEYMOUR: I think what it means is the profession operates on a lot of different levels. It's part of our professional obligation, it is one of the proud traditions of the American legal tradition and bar, it's one of the most wonderful things about lawyering is the ability to take your services and share them with those who can't afford it and we as an organization and I think all the bar associations in New York State fulfill that very well. It's never enough.

But I think the real professional, and indeed the social benefit comes from the results that are obtained when counsel is involved. And that's a topic that's been touched on a number of times today.

2.4

Let me just move to one program that we're most deeply involved in, which is involved with the immigrant community. There are three million people in New York City who are born outside of the United States. That's a very large community.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It is such an important issue around the country, not just --

MR. SEYMOUR: It is a major social issue, political issue and economic issue. We are dealing with it every day as many others are in New York City, and that community, like others, has special legal needs and we have an immigration program directed to that group. We help them with — some of them are victims of domestic violence or trafficking, they have other legal problems, they have prior convictions which complicate the immigration issue they may be facing, but we've worked in particular on asylum.

I want to turn to that because I think it answers one of the basic questions underlying this.

If we take the asylum cases that the City Bar

Justice Center has worked on and analyze the results, we
have found that among asylum seekers -- and looking at
the group now that is not in detention, so people who are
free --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

2.4

MR. SEYMOUR: -- who are seeking asylum -- if they are represented by counsel, they will receive asylum through this process 39 percent of the time.

If they are unrepresented, that group will receive asylum 14 percent of the time.

You have almost a three times increase in the ability -- and let me just say, your Honor, those cases are not cherry-picked, counsel are not picking the stronger cases. They are assigned cases.

So what that tells you surely is that there are people unrepresented who should have gotten and would have gotten asylum, but they were unrepresented by counsel.

Think of the social and economic cost of that process of having people -- apart from the morality of it on a sort of philosophical level -- being direct social cost. Immigration is one of ten programs. We are one of hundreds of providers, really looking at one tile in a giant mosaic of legal services, but it is demonstrable that the assistance of counsel will make a positive difference in serving justice and ultimately making right on the sort of economic and social contract we have with our own citizens.

That is a professional aspect of the answer, but it's also a social one that involves all of us and

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

I'm very proud of the work we're doing and I think that
the results of it underscore the need for greater

4 services.

2.2

2.4

There's no question, it's been said many times in testimony, the gap between what's needed and what's provided.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What's the mix, though, Sam, between -- I know the city bar and the state bar and so many of the professional groups around the State are doing so much wonderful pro bono work, what's the mix between that and the public funding that we need for civil legal services? How do you look at the frame of this whole issue?

MR. SEYMOUR: I think the figure of sort of 80 percent of unmet needs is really a starting point and how that unmet need could be addressed through both volunteers, peer volunteers, volunteers who are trained, that is the sort of leverage model that I described and the direct delivery of legal services is a pie chart that remains to be drawn.

But I think --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you think there's much more -- and I say this not rhetorically, I don't know the answer -- the bar around the State, the latest number is over two million hours. Do you think there's much more

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING we can get from that?

2.2

2.4

I think we all recognize that a significant amount of public funding for services is essential no matter what, we get a tremendous amount of pro bono, are there more hours, is there more to the puzzle from the pro bono side or have we kind of exhausted —

MR. SEYMOUR: I would never want to say we hit bottom, your Honor. Things like the emeritus program that you sponsored I think are great ways of innovation of increasing efficiency.

The leverage model is another way to do it where you can train people more effectively to take on, in effect, more work, but it's not a bottomless source of --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's almost finite.

MR. SEYMOUR: It is finite. I'm very proud of the record of the New York Bar and there will be more to come, but the solution is going to have to come from other sources of funding. This cannot be solved purely by volunteer work.

So it is a very important issue, we're proud to be working on it, but one of the things it underscores is how great need really is.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Thank you all of you for your terrific testimony and your terrific work,

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 each and every one of you. Thank you. 3 We are now going to have a panel of clients which is a little different from the kind of testimony 4 5 we've had thus far, and I think you'll find very 6 interesting, that includes Catherine Johnson, John Brown, 7 Yulia Abayeva, Lars Anderson, Juliet D'Souza and Melanea 8 Richardson. All right. Let's see. We'll start with -- why 9 10 don't we start with this end first, Melanea Richardson, 11 who is a client of the legal services for New York City. 12 Melanea Richardson who is a client of Legal Services of 13 New York City. 14 (Melanea Richardson gave testimony through a 15 Spanish interpreter.) 16 MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you want to tell your story? 18 MS. RICHARDSON: Good morning. Good morning. 19 My name is Melanea Richardson and I am grateful that I have been invited. 20 21 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You also should get close to 2.2 the Mike. Share it. 2.3 MR. SEYMOUR: I am grateful to have been invited. I am the mother of three children and I have a 2.4 25 very low income job.

In 2005 I was a victim of domestic violence and

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

for this reason I was able to apply for Section 8

subsidy. By way of domestic violence, I was able to get

the voucher for Section 8.

On the 15th of April of 2009, I was given the voucher that was due to expire in 2009, October of 2009. They asked me to find an apartment as quickly as possible, because otherwise they would suspend my subsidy.

At the end of August of 2009, I found an apartment through a real estate, who put me in contact with an apartment owner, and she accepted the Section 8.

We immediately began preparing the paperwork for Section 8. On October 9th I handed in all of my papers to Section 8 to accept it, who accepted them and said everything was fine.

In November of 2009 Ms. Nilson, she is my supervisor, informed me that she had been told that my apartment had passed inspection. Later on in December I called her to ask when I should move in, but I was never able to contact her during the month of December.

I did not receive any notice from her during that month.

Later on in January of 2010 -- later in January of 2010 she called, Ms. Nilson called me and informed me that my voucher had been suspended because there was no

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING funding for it.

At the end of January 2010 Ms. Nilson told me that my voucher had expired in October of 2009.

Shortly after receiving this notification, I contacted Queens Legal Service to get help and I spoke with an attorney about my situation. I saw many people sitting at the waiting area, waiting to speak with someone from Legal Services. I saw that they were so overloaded with people that they were sending people home because there were just too many there.

Fortunately, Queens Legal Services accepted my case. They represented me and we started a legal case against Section 8, and the Court for Section 8 said that they had canceled my subsidy, that when I had submitted my rental package, that the paperwork that — that the paperwork had already expired.

Nonetheless, my attorney showed proof that the deed had been registered up to four months prior to handing in the package.

After a legal battle of eight long months, the judge rendered a decision ordering -- ordering the Section 8 and I was given the voucher again.

Queens Legal Services worked very hard to defend this program. I am very grateful for their help, they helped me save my voucher.

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 I know that there are many in my same 3 situation, but they do not know what to do because they 4 do not have money to pay an attorney. Legal Services 5 needs more money to be able to hire more attorneys to 6 help people out. 7 If I had not found Queens Legal Service, I 8 would have lost my case: But I thank God and Legal Services for having won this case. 9 10 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you something, what 11 would -- ask her what would have happened to her if she 12 didn't have their help? 13 MS. RICHARDSON: If I had not had their help, I would have been in a very grave situation, I would still 14 15 be assaulted by my husband, because I didn't have -- I 16 have a part-time job, and I do not make enough to pay 17 rent. 18 And I thank them for having helped me and thank 19 you all. 20 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And tell her we thank her very 21 much for coming in and telling her story. 2.2 Lars Anderson, is a client of MYF Legal 2.3 Services. 2.4 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Good afternoon, now. 25 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good afternoon. 26 MR. ANDERSON: I will read this.

My name is Lars Anderson. Thank you for the opportunity to tell you about how legal assistance I received from MFY Legal Services saved my home and may have saved my life.

I am 48 years old and have lived alone in my coop apartment building in Manhattan since 1997.

Beginning in September 2004, I became seriously ill with a chronic medical condition and was unable to work. As a result, my small business collapsed and I began living on my savings and retirement account until November 2007, when the money and my credit was exhausted.

I had never previously been late with a single monthly mortgage or maintenance payment, but at that point I could no longer keep up with my payments.

I discovered through the New York City Human Resource Administration or HRA, a program that would cover my housing costs by paying my monthly mortgage payment and maintenance fees going forward so long as I met a certain eligibility criteria and provided evidence documenting my medical disability.

I applied for the HRA assistance program on February 21, 2008, and my application was accepted. In May 2008, the bank company servicing my mortgage loan began nonjudicial foreclosure process against my coop apartment, a nonjudicial foreclosure sale of my apartment

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING was scheduled for May 29, 2008.

2.2

2.4

Once HRA issued the checks to bring my account current I thought that everything would be all right.

Unfortunately, I was wrong. Although HRA was willing to pay all arrears on the mortgage and make all required payments going forward, the bank servicing company returned the payments twice. The first time the bank servicing company stated that the payments were being returned because they did not have the loan number on the check. The second time the bank servicing company returned the payment stating that the funds were insufficient.

My apartment was sold in a nonjudicial foreclosure sale on May 29, 2008, and the bank purchased the apartment at the auction. After the sale, the bank quickly commenced an eviction action against me in housing court. The housing court judge dismissed the first action but the bank commenced a second eviction against me immediately after the first eviction action was dismissed.

In order to stop the eviction action and on the advice of MFY Legal Services, I filed a pro se lawsuit in the New York County Supreme Court against the bank servicing company for negligent servicing in violation of New York deceptive practices of act.

I obtained a temporary stay of housing court eviction action from the Supreme Court justice but soon realized that I would not be able to handle the litigation on my own because the legal process and procedure was too complex for me to navigate on my own.

I returned in early in 2009 to MFY Legal
Services, which agreed to represent me in the litigation.
Over the course of the next 15 months MFY aggressively
pursued the bank servicing company to, A, set aside the
sale of my coop apartment to itself; two, reinstate my
mortgage loan with the funds from HRA; and C, accept
future monthly payments from HRA going forward; and D, to
discontinue the housing court eviction action.

MFY filed a number of motions, appeared at over 15 court appearances on my behalf in Supreme Court and engaged in countless hours of settlement negotiations with both the servicing company and HRA.

It was a very hard battle. At first the bank servicing company was unwilling to admit that it was wrong and give back my home, but MFY continued to press until the bank loan servicing company relented.

In November, 2009, MFY obtained a settlement and loan modification on my behalf. MFY was able to negotiate a settlement in which the bank loan servicing company agreed to set aside the foreclosure sale, restore

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 2.2

23

2.4

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING my ownership of the apartment, accept only half of the arrears up front, reduce the interest rate on the loan to 3.207 percent until the end of the loan term and discontinued the hosing court eviction action.

HRA has continued to make the monthly payments and the bank loan servicing company is now accepting them.

I am indeed extremely grateful for the hundreds of hours of work that MFY dedicated to my case. There is no way that I could have reached a successful resolution of this problem on my own.

MFY's work enabled me to remain in my home and has removed a major source of stress in my life enabling me to focus on maintaining my physical and mental health. Without a safe and stable home, I literally don't know if I would still be alive to be telling you this story today.

And it does break my heart to think there are tens of thousands of New Yorkers every year who need this kind of help I received but who do not receive it because of insufficient state funding of legal services.

I urge all the branches of New York's government to come together to find a fair and permanent solution to the problem for inadequate funding for civil legal services in our State.

Thank you once again for allowing me the opportunity to testify.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you one question.

What's your educational level, if I might ask?

MR. ANDERSON: I have a BFA from the

University of Nebraska.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So Legal Services is not just for people who are uneducated or maybe have language problems. In your case it was really a lifesaver and nothing to do with that you couldn't read the papers, but to navigate the legal system is not so easy.

MR. ANDERSON: No. Indeed, and actually, I came from a very poor family in the Midwest and worked very hard to achieve self sufficiency, and had a very strong 27 year work history until 2004. And I actually exhausted all of my own savings, retirement plans, and credit basically out of pride because I didn't want to go to — have to ask for help or seek help. And you know, I did.

And I have such an understanding now what it's like for people who do not have -- you know, an education or the opportunities that I had, or, like this woman here who cannot even speak the language, it was a very tough fight and if I did not know enough about how to -- or have enough friends who even when everyone told me it was

	п
1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	a hopeless case, you cannot fight a bank, you are going
3	to lose, I had other people who said, no, just go and
4	start a process yourself.
5	I found that once I actually got into the
6	courtroom before a judge, and the judge ordered the stay
7	in housing court, that that opened a lot of doors for me,
8	especially with MFY, who said, wow, you got this far on
9	your own, let's pick up the ball and, you know, get it
10	over the
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great. Thanks so much for
12	coming to tell us your story.
13	Juliet D'Souza.
14	(Continue on next page)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Juliet D'Souza.

2.4

MS. D'SOUZA: Thank you. Good afternoon.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Juliet D'Souza is a client of the Legal Aid Society.

MS. D'SOUZA: My name is Juliet D'Souza. I was born in Mangalore, Karnataka in India. When I came to the Legal Aid Society for help, I had recently escaped from my former employer's home. I needed help with my immigration status and I wanted to claim wages that my former employer owed me.

My former employer's are a wealthy family who brought me to the United States to care for their baby. I agreed to come to U.S. to work for them because after my husband died in 2002, I was left alone to support my son and my parents. My husband had brain cancer and died after four years of being sick, living me with a large amount of medical debt. The debt caused great stress for me. I began looking for opportunities to earn more money to pay off this debt.

This family told me I would be paid well and that I would work a normal work schedule during a week, with days off on the weekends. However, once I arrived they required me to care for the baby at all hours of day and night, to clean and to cook their meals. At first I was paid only \$600 a month. I was very isolated and I was only

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

left alone at their home with the baby so I could not

leave. There was no public transportation and since they

sent my wages to India for my son, I didn't have much money
in hand.

I spoke to a mutual friend in India about the situation. And when my employers found out I had told her what I was paid and that I wanted more, they accused me of being greedy and threatened that they could make me pay back all the money they spent to bring me here if I left their home. They also told me that because I did not have valid immigration status, I could be arrested if I went outside their home. I did not know at the first time that there are laws here which protect people like me. I felt I had to stay there and keep working for them. I thought I had no other options.

I knew the name and phone number of one person in the United States. A friend in India had given me the information of a relative of hers who lived outside New York City. I contacted her and she offered to help me escape. However, each time I asked for one day off my employer said no. And since I was always with the baby, I could not leave. Finally, after a few months they agreed to give me one day off as long as I agreed to return that night. My friend relatives sent her husband to pick me up. I snuck a bag of clothes into his car and we left. I did

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING not return.

2.0

2.4

My new friends put me in touch with a friend of theirs who had been through a similar situation. She knew of an organization called NYANA and I contacted them and was assigned a social worker. My social worker got me an appointment with Legal Aid.

The Legal Aid helped me to apply for a T-visa as a victim of trafficking. After interviews, fingerprints and lots of paperwork, my visa was granted. Now my son is waiting for his visa and he should be able to join me here soon.

Together with the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Legal Aid also filed a case in court against my former employers. I claimed my unpaid wages at the minimum wage and overtime rates the law requires. I also included a claim under the Federal law against trafficking. I wanted to do what I could to make sure that my employers did not do the same again to anyone else. The case is over now and I can't discuss the result because it is confidential.

I am now able to work legally here and support my son and parents in India. I never actually dreamed that all this would come true. I would not have had the courage to stand and talk here about what happened to me if it were not for the service I received. I really appreciate the

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 services that Legal Aid was able to provide me. I'm very thankful for their assistance. 3 4 Thank you. JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for telling us your 5 story. And I think that you are not the only one in this 6 7 situation. You are not the only one who has immigration issues which is very difficult to, again, to deal with the 8 system and how you navigate it. 9 So thank you so much for coming. We appreciate 10 11 it. Okay. 12 John Brown is a client of Legal Services in New 13 York City. 14 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Go ahead, John. 16 MR. BROWN: Good morning. 17 My name is John Brown and that's my wife Tiffany 18 behind me. 19 We are clients of Legal Services NYC Bankruptcy 20 Assistance Project. In February 2010 I just returned from 21 seven months in the army and was struggling to find steady 22 work, stable work as a civilian. I had worked as a 23 construction worker, a salesman and a truck driver, but the 2.4 work did not last long and I was constantly looking for the

next job. Tiffany was in college and had a very low-paying

internship at the garment industry. Tiffany's parents were

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

unemployed at the same time, and whenever we had a little money, we tried to help them out as we could. Because our income was low to begin with, the job losses really set us back, and we were forced to use credit cards to make ends meet.

When my wife and I came to the Bankruptcy Assistance Project in November 2009 --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: John, move the mic a little closer to you.

MR. BROWN: When my wife and I came to the Bankruptcy Assistance Project in November 2009, our burden of debt had reached over \$70,000. Volunteers at the project had worked with us to prepare our bankruptcy petition, but our case was complicated because I received a lump sum bonus that made us look better off than we really were.

The Bankruptcy Project attorneys didn't give up.

They found a special protection in the law for veterans

that allowed us to proceed. These attorneys went the extra

step to help us to correctly file the petition. We have

now completed our creditor meeting and other steps and are

now waiting for our debts to be discharged.

Tiffany was recently laid off from her internship, but she is going back to school to finish her degree. She is working -- but I have just completed by

1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	Bachelor's in International Law at Queens College and look
3	forward to going back to active duty in the army early nex
4	year.
5	Going forward we are in a much better position
6	now to support ourselves and to help Tiffany's parents.
7	It's a really big relief and we thank the NYC's Bankruptcy
8	Assistance Project for all they have done for us. Without
9	the Legal Services, I don't know how my wife and I would
10	have dealt with our financial situation.
11	Thank you for holding these hearings and
12	listening to our story.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much and thank you
14	for telling how Legal Services came to your rescue.
15	How does one find legal assistance? How did you
16	actually find them
17	MR. BROWN: Well
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Legal Services Assistance.
19	MR. BROWN: There is the military account, the
20	AKO account, and on there, there is a list of places you
21	can go and where you can get help for military personnel.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Terrific. And there are many
23	people in the same situation, many veterans in the same
24	situation.
25	MR. BROWN: Actually, yes.
26	When you come back from active duty, all

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

insurance, all benefits are taken away. So you lose all of

that when you come home.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you have this whole support

system that kind of isn't there anymore.

MR. BROWN: It goes away. And then you really

2.4

MR. BROWN: It goes away. And then you really don't know what to do because when you're trying to look for a job, you're going from job to job. And if you find one and the company shuts down, then you got to look for another one. That takes two, three months. Then you've got to find that job and if that company shuts down, you've got to look for another one. And even though you have a college education, it becomes very, very difficult going from job to job, because each lapse in paycheck you're taking out of your bank account, you're taking out of your savings. So you can save money, but then it's gone in three months and then you've got to start stockpiling again.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So again, Legal Services is not just for the people who either have language problems or immigrants new to the country, people have problems and people don't necessarily have the financial means to deal with them or to, again, to interface with the legal system.

MR. BROWN: Oh, yes, definitely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Thanks for telling us your story.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yulia Abayeva is a client of New York Legal Assistance Group -- good, you have the mic right there. Go ahead.

MS. ABAYEVA: Hi. I appreciate that you let me to talk today. My language is not perfect, but I try and explain everything what happened.

So I'm here today to talk to you about my story and how the lawyers from NYLAG -- who I call my angels -- changing my life and help find safety for me and my daughter.

I was married in Uzbekistan in 2002 and immigrated to USA in 2004 to be with my husband who immigrated several years before me. We had the couple -- become couples since we were 17 years old.

Prior to living in Uzbekistan my husband beat me regularly and severely, and one occasion I was even hospitalized two weeks, because of injuries what he did to me. My husband was arrested over there, but he was release from police station because he pay \$50 to tear up the police report.

I followed my husband to United States even he was hitting me because I was believe he's going to change. He promise me he's going to change, he's going to be different and so I trust him and I come here to live with my husband.

2.4

So, once -- I arrive in New York, the beatings, verbal and emotional abuse become worse. My husband was extremely controlling and would not even let me leave the house or make friends. I had nothing in New York. I spoke only Russian language and no English at all and no money at all. So, he never let me talk on the phone. Every time he used to lock me in the home. I didn't know even how to take a subway.

My husband used to have special shoes, heavy, heavy shoes, which he use, he used to put -- this was special shoes to kick me, that was special shoes to hitting me if I did something wrong.

Wrong is what? If I didn't properly clean the apartment or I breathe loud or, I do something wrong, from his opinion I do something wrong, he used to hit me with the shoes.

And also my husband used to make -- when he used to hit me he took my parents on the speaker and he let them listen how he hit me and how I'm screaming.

They ask him please stop, stop, don't hit her and he ask money. That, because I'm eating, I live in his apartment, so my parents supposed to pay for this if they want him hit me -- if he hit me.

So, first two, three months I get pregnant. Since I come America, I got pregnant. Even though I was

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

pregnant, he continue hit me. I have record everything.

Plus, he tried many times to leave my husband, but I

didn't know my rights. I didn't have language, I didn't

have money. Several nights I spent at night, was cold

outside, was wintertime. One night was in the Time

Square here in Manhattan. One time I spend it in

Brighton Beach, it was very disaster.

I knock a lot of doors, nobody was helping me.

Until I was entering domestic violence shelter, but still my husband, he find me there, so the staff who is working in the shelter, they relocated me a few times.

So 2005 I file first time order of protection but I didn't get -- I didn't go to court after first appearance because I was scared and I was alone. I didn't know my rights and nobody was who help me explain nothing, nothing, nothing. Just only that I have only one chance, just hide myself and my daughter, jump from shelter to shelter, and I was even afraid to go outside because every time he 2008 to find me, was even afraid to go outside to with my daughter to playground because being shooting by my husband.

Why I believe I can be shoot, because my husband has criminal connections in my country and some over here.

So -- but everything change in 2008, when I

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

meet my parents in airport. My husband, he find me there

and he start threatening me again. I was afraid to call

4 police, everything what he did, he went to police and lie

about me and police lock me up, they put me in a jail.

So after this I went to the Jewish Community

Center. I explain because he told me he going to lock me

up time by time every time like this and end up in

desert, he going to give me a bullet in my -- over here,

I don't know how it's called, sorry.

And so, I went to Jewish Community Center.

Right away they connect me with the NYLAG Center and since then everything change. So, change in a very, very good way and very quick.

First of all, they give me lady who speak my language who explain me from A to Z. Yulia, this, this, this. You have to do this, not this. You have to do this.

I believe I am first -- not first, one of the million people of domestic violence victim who has a lot of evidence which is -- how do you -- records of hours of threatening, he kill me, he kill my daughter and plus I have video of bruises of hitting me, and many other evidence, and just, I was near the people, the right people who can help me to bring to the judge who can believe, who listen this and decide if accept it or not.

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
I hope you understand me.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We do. We do.

MS. ABAYEVA: And so in NYLAG, they help me because the worst record was in my language, in Russian language, so right away they send it straight to the right people who translate everything.

So they convince -- not convince, they make understand the judge that this is very important and this is very, very serious case.

So, and what I like by this group, you know, before trial, each trial, it's very hard to have trial, to have testimony. Especially my husband, he was afraidthat I'm going to say a lot of bad things about him, he was afraid to go jail and he was trying many times to stop me.

So, and I was afraid every time to go police.

So the NYLAG, they make me not to make police report, go straight to District Attorney office, to meet officer,

District Attorney and make -- make my testimony in the grand jury in front of to testify, in front of grand jury.

So each documents which they used to give me which we used to bring to the Court, they give me two language. One is English and one is Russian, which is mine. Every time I used to understand what is going on,

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 and they used to prepare me a lot. They work with me 3 very hard. So my husband currently faces in Manhattan 4 5 felony charges for the intimidation and harassment of me 6 during the Family Court trial. Plus we won the case in 7 July, we won the case. I got my full custody. 8 husband has no visitation to my daughter. Plus I get my child support on time. I get my money back, which he 9 10 never paid for my daughter account. 11 So, what I can tell you, this is group is very 12 They are doing good and don't cut this one, 13 please. 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You've told us plenty. 15 MS. ABAYEVA: It's little bit, you know. 16 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We're glad to see that there is 17 a ray of sunshine that's coming, things are better. 18 MS. ABAYEVA: Thank you. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much and thank you 20 all for telling us your story and I don't think it takes 21 much translation or imagination to see what the Legal 22 Services has done for all of you and the different 23 organizations and providers that were able to help you --24 MS. ABAYEVA: Before nobody help. I used to

knock many organization, I don't want to call names, but

only NYLAG respond right away and they help me a lot.

25

26

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I can see it and we can see it in all of you, in your faces and your stories, so thank you all so much. You've drawn a picture that needs not much explanation, so thank you.

Thank you all.

2.4

Our next panel is the judge's panel which includes Honorable Jeffrey Oing, Honorable Jaya Madhaven and Honorable Rubin Martino.

(There is a pause in the proceedings.)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Your Honors, it is a pleasure to see all of you. You are the closing panel here. And Judge Gonzalez is getting a little nervous because he's supposed to preside at 2:00 over this courtroom, but we want to hear your story because you have such a critical part of what this is all about.

Where does the judge fit into all of this and what do you see in terms of legal services and what do they provide that is so dynamic of the justice system and this whole issue of providing equal justice to all.

So let's start with Judge Oing and tell us.

JUDGE OING: Good afternoon, members of the task force. My name is Jeffrey Oing and I am the supervising judge of New York County Civil Court located at 111 Centre Street.

I want to thank the Chief Judge Jonathan

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

Lippman, Chief Administrative Judge Ann Pfau and Deputy

Chief Administrative Judge Fern Fisher and presiding

Justice Luis Gonzalez for giving me the opportunity to

testify today on this very important issue.

This morning you've heard the opportunity to hear the testimony from the litigants' side and the legal service providers with respect to the issues that come before the Court.

This afternoon the three of us will give you, from our perspective from the bench side and what we face on a day-to-day basis.

The goal of my testimony is to give you a glimpse of the other side and what judges see on a day-to-day basis.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Jeffrey, let me give you a bit -- summarize, why do legal services matter? Why does it matter? You are there every day trying to dispense justice. Why does this matter. Why -- if you have an attorney, you don't have an attorney, you are still the judge, you are still going to try and do justice, why does it matter?

JUDGE OING: Well, it's very important, Chief, from where I sit because particularly in the consumer credit part that we've established there at 111 Centre Street. That part is --

 $\label{eq:constraint} \mbox{JUDGE LIPPMAN: Particularly important today,} \\ \mbox{the economy } --$

JUDGE OING: Particularly important today, that part, even before the economy started tanking, we were noticing at 111 Center Street the slow uptake of the number of cases coming into the consumer credit part and what happens in those cases, virtually about 99 percent of the litigants the defendants are unrepresented.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: 99 percent?

JUDGE OING: Yes. Pretty much every case that's called up before me, they're all unrepresented defendants.

And I'll tell you just a statistic to give you a real quick number, in the year 2009, we had about approximately 250,000 consumer credit filings, with consumer credit cases, and of the 250,000, approximately 150,000 default judgments were issued.

And then what we had from that number is virtually all the order to show causes coming in to consumer credit parts seeking to vacate the default judgments were brought by self represented litigants and many times they come into court, they're scared, they're frightened because the bank accounts have been frozen, because their employers are garnishing their wages, some employers use that as an excuse of firing or terminating

1 FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2 their employment because they have these bad -- they have
3 these debt situations and they're not resolved.

2.4

So we're facing a crisis in the sense that, you know, the economy is bad enough but with this credit crisis going on, it's actually putting more people out of work.

MR. YOUNGER: What is the impact to you and your staff of dealing with someone who is unrepresented as opposed to someone who has a lawyer?

JUDGE OING: It is very difficult from a judge's point of view because we had a very, very -- we straddle the fence. We -- where is our ethical obligations in terms of what advice we can give to the self represented defendant, because virtually all the time the plaintiff, debt collector or bank or what have you has an attorney. And we sit there and we hear what the plaintiff is telling us, yet at the same time we are really hamstrung in terms of what we can tell or offer to the self represented defendants.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because you are supposed to be the neutral in this and not the lawyer.

JUDGE OING: Exactly. Exactly. So we have a very, very tight line to draw there, except for one thing Justice Fisher has implemented in New York County and I think in the other five counties, the Volunteer Lawyers

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What do they do?

JUDGE OING: That is an excellent program. It really takes the onus off of us, because we have volunteer lawyers coming in on a daily basis signing up to actually represent the self represented defendant for the day, with respect to the conferences, and with respect to any order to show causes that they brought.

Now I say that's important because what the volunteer lawyer can do, what the attorney can do that — where we are reluctant or not ethically — or ethically challenged in the sense what we can't say is that these attorneys tell the defendants their defenses.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Can you really have -- can you be self represented as a general manner rather than the aberrational case where you have someone who can really articulate their position in general, is there such a thing as being -- truly representing yourself effectively?

JUDGE OING: You know, you can represent yourself only to a point where when it gets down to the legal issues and the defenses — you have to understand the folks I see coming into my courtroom, they're not sophisticated individuals, they're working class, many are immigrants, many don't speak the language, so they are already behind the eight ball in that sense.

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So self represented is often a nonrepresented?

JUDGE OING: Exactly. It gets to a point where there is no representation at all. It is a critical problem because these people, these folks, you know, they're up against the wall, some of them are trying to face paying off debt or putting food and keeping a roof over their head and they have children and the other part that I see is they're in our courtroom and they can ill afford to be there for any length of time because if they're working, they're going to lose their job, and it's really very stressful from where I sit to try to move the calendar along and it's hard to move the calendar along when you have 100 cases and everybody needs at least a minute of your time just to figure out what's going on.

So what the volunteer lawyers do is they're able to capture many of these cases ahead of time -- many times they do acknowledge the debt. Don't get me wrong. The defendants for the most part do acknowledge they owe the debt. So what these lawyers end up doing is helping them work out a workable payout schedule or workable plan to settle the case.

Then there are defendants who don't know they even have the debt or thought they never had a debt and

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
they're saying, this is 15 or 20 years ago, I don't
understand why all of a sudden they're coming after me --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Can you calculate, if you look at this particular volunteer program, and you look at the results that you get when they do have someone to represent them, if you had to calculate how that sets up versus when they don't have it and the consequences of not having and not being able to work something out, how do those two set up in terms of society and the costs?

because what we have at 111 is two personal appearance parts. We have one person appearance part dedicated solely to consumer credit and we have one personal appearance part dedicated to nonconsumer credit cases, and I'll tell you from my experience in sitting in both parts, with respect to the consumer credit cases, we try to get them done and get them — and end them as soon as possible, because that's only going to help the litigants. Prolonging and protracting that litigation only hurts society and hurts the defendant in more particular ways because they will lose their job.

If you contrast that to the nonconsumer credit part where it's also self represented, those cases get dragged on, they -- I mean you have the self represented defendants not having a lawyer, they get into discovery

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

process where they get bogged down in discovery so

there's no attorney there helping them try to move the

case along, and sort of ending that kind of case.

So in terms of speed, in terms of getting things done, when we have a volunteer lawyer working for the day in the consumer credit part and the volume of cases, we really get it done — to answer you question, it is a matter of efficiency.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: So the impact on judiciary is that you are not able to accomplish as much as you could if they had been represented in terms of number of cases? If you have say 100 cases and you have a nonrepresented person, more likely than not --

JUDGE OING: It's going to grind to a halt.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: That's right. You're not going to be able to take care as much of the calendar as you could otherwise.

JUDGE OING: Without the volunteer lawyers for the day, I can tell you a lot of these cases will have to come back twice, two times or three times over, which is unthinkable for many of these defendants.

With the volunteer lawyers in place I can safely say that we get done very quickly and we move the cases. Because when one case moves off, another case comes up. That's how -- that's what is going on.

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 JUDGE GONZALEZ: This program with voluntary 3 lawyers, is that enough to take care of the load or would 4 you be able to use --5 JUDGE OING: As a judge we always want more 6 lawyers. 7 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- other help. 8 JUDGE OING: We always want more people. JUDGE GONZALEZ: For example, legal services, 9 10 et cetera. So the voluntary program by itself is not 11 enough to meet the needs of the Court? 12 JUDGE OING: It is not enough, but we're cognizant of the fact that the legal services already out 13 14 there are stretched thin. They're doing other work, and 15 you know, unfortunately, it is what it is in terms of 16 what we have to deal with, what we work with. 17 JUDGE GONZALEZ: No question. For example, 18 additional funding of more lawyers for legal services 19 would definitely help to move the cases along? 20 JUDGE OING: Right, because right now we're operating on the sheer basis of good will by these 21 2.2 attorneys who recognize what we're facing with and are 23 stepping up to the plate and helping out. 2.4 If we get the funding, I can assure you that 25 our calendars will move faster and more efficiently.

(Continued on next page)

26

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

Judge Madhaven, where are sitting now, and --

JUDGE MADHAVEN: I'm in the Bronx Housing Court.

In my prior life I was a Legal Aid lawyer for about ten years, so I share both perspectives. And, you know, in my view nowhere has the dearth of legal services been felt for as hard or as long as the New York State Housing Court.

Back in 1993, a study found that over 97 percent of landlords in Housing Court were represented by counsel and just about 12 percent of the tenants were represented by counsel. You know, that chasm has only widened in the current economic climate. What we see now are increasing numbers of low- and moderate-income folks coming into Housing Court, trying to save their homes, trying to navigate the court system without counsel.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why can't they do that in Housing Court? What is so difficult about Housing Court?

JUDGE MADHAVEN: By definition New York City
Housing Court and the nature of Housing Law is highly
regulated, even for lawyers who come in. When you were
talking about, you know, are volunteer lawyers a solution?
To some degree, yes, but by the time you get up to speed on
the law in Housing, you know, it's kind of hard to just
jump in and assume a full caseload that can deal with the
unprecedented demand that you are seeing in Housing Courts,

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING especially now.

2.4

We have more folks of moderate income in Housing Court than ever before, co-op and condo parts.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you find it odd that in a society like ours when people are dealing with, you know, their very basic need for housing, for a roof over their head, that there isn't representation, overwhelmingly isn't representation in Housing Court cases?

JUDGE MADHAVEN: Well, it's kind of ironic when you think about it that, you know, even if you commit a crime, you not only have counsel, you have a roof over your head. But here you are and your only crime really in Housing Court is that you're poor or that you just fell into a bad economic situation and you find yourself homeless.

Do we know that counsel is the answer to that problem, and the answer is clear. We in the Bronx had a study recently done in conjunction with the New York City Department of Homeless Services and The United Way, which initially funded a Housing Help Program. It's a simple premise. The idea is you take the folks in the poorest neighborhood in the City of New York, you give them counsel from the very outset of the case and we see what happens.

And I can tell you between 2005 and 2008, the Housing Help Program provided legal services to 1388

2.4

families in zip code 10456. In three years the Housing Help Program prevented 91 percent of those families from losing housing and prevented 94 of its clients from entering the New York City shelter system. And when you consider the cost/benefit of that, you can get a lawyer from a legal services organization to represent a family for anywhere from about a thousand to \$2,000 a case. The cost in fiscal year 2009 of housing a family in the New York City shelter system was \$38,405.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So what's the case for legal services? Is it the efficiency? It is the moral obligation to represent these people? Is it the cost savings?

much more. It's not just a cost savings. It's also the exponential value to the family who's not displaced, to the children whose education is not disrupted. It's, you know, the value to the court system in terms of efficiency. If you take an average calendar of 60 cases or so where you have two attorneys and compare that to 60 cases where only one side is represented, it's clear that each case is going to take a lot longer when you have one side being unrepresented.

Families that come to Housing Court as well as single adults are often in crisis, not simply an economic

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

crisis but there may be underlying crises, whether it be a Family Court crisis. Some of the testimony you heard today involved folks who had domestic violence issues and other kinds of things. You know, it's not uncommon for litigants in Housing Court to also suffer other kinds of crises. They can be in Family Court at the same time that they're in Housing Court as well as Criminal Court.

So the goal is for us as certainly Housing Court judges to try to figure out what the crises are and figure out what we as judges can do without entering into the judge advocate role that, Justice Gonzalez, you had alluded to, because there is always that inherent tension between us as judges ensuring that justice is done but not crossing that line.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let's talk about that for a second then.

It really puts the judge in a strange position. You think you can -- are you meeting your responsibilities as a judge when you do have to be an advocate? One would think, what's the difference? Your have sympathy for somebody who is going to lose their apartment or their home or their house. Why is it bad for you to be sympathetic and want to, you know, play that role? Is there something wrong with that?

JUDGE MADHAVEN: Well, in terms of -- look, we're

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 all human beings. I mean, judges don't stop being human 3 beings, but yes, there is a limit --4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you have responsibilities other than being a human being, a caring human being. 5 JUDGE MADHAVEN: Well, you know, you have an 6 7 obligation to ensure justice is done. When you see that 8 there is clearly a claim that needs to be articulated but 9 the litigant is unable to because he or she is just not 10 familiar with the court or how to go about doing things or 11 is overwhelmed, you know, it's not our obligation to 12 certainly assume the role of the advocate for the litigant, 13 but it may be --14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But is it bad for you to assume 15 that role? Does it twist the system? In other words, is 16 the message here that everybody has their role? 17 JUDGE MADHAVEN: Everyone has a role, that is 18 The system works best when both sides are 19 represented. We know that. And the goal is to get to that 20 point. 21 Is justice better done when both JUDGE LIPPMAN: 22 sides are represented? 23 JUDGE MADHAVEN: It's always better done when 24 both sides -- you know, I don't have to sort of spend the 25 time figuring out how to deal with these little crises that

folks may be dealing with, some not so little. Where I

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 have two lawyers, I am just dealing with the legal issues. I have an argument and I decide the case and it's easier. 3 When I was a Legal Aid lawyer my job was simple. 4 The judges didn't hear about those crises because I dealt 5 with that end of things. The role for the judge was simply 6 7 to decide the narrow legal issue that was before the judge. 8 I mean, that's how the court should function. 9 However, we're not at that point. We're at a 10 point where judges have to be sensitive to certainly the 11 litigants and the needs that they are facing, but also 12 respectful of the fact that we have a system which is an 13 advocacy system and the role of the judge is certainly not 14 to be the advocate. 15

JUDGE LIPPMAN: To be neutral.

JUDGE MADHAVEN: Right.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

JUDGE PFAU: In Housing Court particularly, Judge Fisher's Lawyer for a Day Program, volunteer program, has been the focus of a lot of attention and a lot of resources going that way. Is that enough? Does it make a dent in what you are seeing every day?

JUDGE MADHAVEN: Those programs are valuable. And they have significantly changed the climate in Housing Court. However, given the numbers of folks that we are dealing with, you can't possibly absorb all of that into a volunteer program.

2.4

All of the programs that the courts have created, you know, are wonderful. But they are never a substitute for the direct individualized assistance that you are only going to be able to be obtain from a civil services legal provider. The bottom line is, courts couldn't do it alone. We need civil legal services providers to be the vital partners in our mission to ensure that everyone gets access to justice. And it's really the time now, it's really a star opportunity to make civil Gideon a reality in New York State and a model for national reform.

MR. YOUNGER: Just earlier today we heard from the head of the Rent Stabilization Association who represents landlords in your court. And one of the points he made was that many of the people who can't -- who haven't paid rent actually may qualify for government benefits to pay that rent.

Do you see that as a frequent problem in your court?

JUDGE MADHAVEN: It is. I mean, you know, one of the things that we certainly share with Mr. Strasburg is a view that you sometimes need lawyers to navigate that system. And that's how both sides benefit.

I mean, if you look at what we have in Housing
Court, you have two sides really who want the same thing;
tenants who essentially want to pay the rent and landlords

	П
1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	want the rent. It's just a question of how do you make
3	that happen. And the real key to that is lawyers on both
4	sides. Because as you just saw with the Housing Help
5	Program, the cases where there were lawyers on both sides,
6	the outcomes were not successful just for one side but for
7	both sides, because both sides ended up getting what they
8	ultimately wanted in the first place.
9	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Martino.
10	Thank you, Judge Madhaven.
11	Where are you sitting today?
12	(Continued on next page.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

JUDGE MARTINO: I am presiding in the Harlem Community Justice Center, a problem solving community court, but before that I was in Family Court for about a year, and before that I was in Housing Court for about ten years, so I am very happy to be here testifying and this is a topic that is pretty close to my heart, but I actually thought about a story that I wanted to share with you apart from my written remarks —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, sure. Bring the mic a little closer.

JUDGE MARTINO: -- and this happened actually when I was a senior supervising attorney at the Legal Aid Society's Bronx civil office in Hunts Point in the South Bronx, and we had an intake system and I changed -- I'll tell you why after the story -- where people come first come, first serve basis Tuesday mornings, and because of our limited attorneys they could see maybe 25 or 30 people by the end of the day.

I soon found out that people were lining up at midnight to be the first ones when I opened, and I came early, I would be there at 7:00 in the morning. The first half hour of my job was sorting out who were the first 25 people. There were fistfights I had to mediate. People got smart, they figured out let's get a list and write down names on the list. But often I'd come in and

2.4

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING say well, wait a second, there was a list but then that person over there came too late, grabbed the list, tore it up, started his own list and put the first name on and that's what I had to do every Tuesday morning.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: These people were so desperate for legal services.

JUDGE MARTINO: How desperate people were for those 25 or 30 spots. So that just sort of came to mind when I was hearing people talking about Legal Aid, Legal Services experiences.

I invite all of you and us to imagine what would happen if for some unknown reason we lost our jobs. And because of the economy we couldn't get another job. And after our savings -- like the gentleman who testified about using up all his savings -- after we did that and we were served with either the foreclosure or with the eviction case and you're sitting there in the quiet of your home watching your children sleeping or your wife or your significant other wondering what's going to happen to me, who among us would not need or want to get an attorney to represent us.

Or another scenario. Suppose we were transported to another country, forgetting about language, one that had a totally different justice system and we were sued and summoned to appear in court.

Would any of you not get an attorney who was familiar with the court systems so you can kind of navigate through?

This is exactly what the pro se litigants in our courts are facing. These are very important, substantial rights that people have at stake --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Where do you draw the line?
You say people have rights, you are dealing with cases
that are very important to them, one of the things that
we're grappling with and the task force is grappling with
is, where is it that you -- as the counterpart to Gideon
on the criminal side, we know when your liberty is at
stake you need to have a lawyer, where does "the right,"
in quotes, come in when you are talking about the civil
side, what kinds of things are we talking about when I
always use the term, oh, we're dealing with the
necessities of life, people have to have a lawyer, how do
you draw that line?

Where do people have to have a lawyer if we're going to be a just society if we're going to provide -if we in the courts are going to provide equal justice to all?

JUDGE MARTINO: That's a very difficult question for me to answer off the top of my head -- of course housing, I wouldn't want people to be in shelters,

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 1 2 living in the street, losing their homes in one way or 3 another, family cases, we don't want people's rights --4 their parental rights terminated, losing children, 5 custody battles, orders of protection, things like that, 6 forfeiture of property, I quess, in civil forfeiture 7 cases, I think that would be a significant area, so those 8 are some --JUDGE LIPPMAN: Debt collection. 9 10 JUDGE MARTINO: What's that? 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Debt collection. 12 JUDGE MARTINO: Debt collection. Also if it's 13 going to leave one -- I guess becoming a public ward, 14 going on welfare, lose everything that you have --15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Personal safety -- these are 16 rhetorical questions. We're trying to grapple with what 17 are the different areas. 18 MR. YOUNGER: Government benefits. 19 JUDGE MARTINO: Yes. Government benefits as 20 well, of course. If it is going to leave you without a 21 way to survive and eat and feed your family. 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We're talking about a broad 23 your cross-section of cases that come into our civil 2.4 justice system that really affect the fundamentals of 25 life.

JUDGE MARTINO: I believe you are correct.

26

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
That's a good way of expressing it.

2.4

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you have anything else?

JUDGE MARTINO: Oh, so why civil legal service is important to us, we mentioned very important rights are at stake, but also people, many people do not know what they're doing when they're in a courtroom. As a court we try to help. How is that? We have help centers, we have computer programs, we have pamphlets, we even have pro se attorneys who, of course, cannot give legal advice but can give information and all these things help tremendously.

But when a person steps in that courtroom it is a totally different world. People don't know court procedure, not only do they not know how to present their rights, they don't know what their rights are. They're really just kind of going along and trying to do the best they can, but it's something that —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you think that it is an equally obvious truth as the Supreme Court said in Gideon that you know, you can't -- we all -- when you are hauled into court -- I forgot what the exact language is -- when your liberty is at stake, you have to have a lawyer, is it equally obvious that --

JUDGE MARTINO: I believe that it is.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- on the civil side?

	1
1	FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
2	JUDGE MARTINO: I think we've bent over
3	backwards tremendously to try to compensate for that
4	JUDGE LIPPMAN: We're doing handstands to try
5	and compensate.
6	JUDGE MARTINO: Absolutely. And we were
7	talking about that, the dual role of a judge. What do we
8	do in the middle of a trial when a litigant turns to you
9	and says: Judge, I don't know how to question this
10	witness.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And you are the judge and you
12	are supposed to
13	JUDGE MARTINO: That's right. Or when they
14	have a piece of evidence that you know is important in
15	the case and the other side, let's say, is represented,
16	they're objecting, they don't know how to lay a
17	foundation: Judge, I don't know what to do.
18	What do we do?
19	Well, we bend over backwards, we find a way to
20	get it in. We find a way to get the witness to come out
21	with their story, but is that something that we should be
22	doing?
23	JUDGE LIPPMAN: The desired result to properly
24	fund the legal service system for the poor in this state.
25	JUDGE MARTINO: Correct.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I thank you, Judge Martino,

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
and I thank all of you, and I think the sense of the
testimony that we've heard from so many different
perspectives, from the business community, from the
providers, from the clients, from the judge, to me it
seems obvious that there is very much a counterpart to
Gideon, on the civil side of the equation and it is an
equally obvious truth that you need to have a lawyer when
you're dealing with the fundamentals and the necessities
of life and the spirit of Gideon is certainly one that
should prevail throughout our court system and I think
these hearings — or at least this first hearing has been
absolutely elucidating in terms of the information that
we received.

What we're going to be doing is taking all of this information and putting it together from all of the four hearings, from all the different perspectives and we're going to combine that with a lot of the really diligent work that the task force has done in terms of surveys and research and I think we're going to -- certainly is our every intention to have the most comprehensive report of its kind in the history of this State and this country, that will make the case to the policy-making branches of government of the need for the permanent funding of civil legal services through the public fisc and not through the unreliable catch as catch

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

FIRST DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING can kind of funding that we've had in the past.

So I thank you all, I thank the members of the judiciary and all the other witnesses today, I thank our terrific task force and everyone who attended these hearings today and we're going to let Judge Gonzalez actually go and sit at 2:00, but it couldn't be a bet, I know he agrees with me, as our great State Bar President and our Chief Administrative Judge that there couldn't be a better use of this magnificent courtroom than highlighting the need for the funding for civil legal services in this State and trying to identify where the gaps are. There is such -- we just talked about that there is such a broad spectrum of need, and we have to identify it, we have to be able to articulate what that need is, and we have to be able to bring home the funding that is going to over and over again be repaid in terms of the benefits to society, both from an ethical perspective and from a very much bottom line perspective.

So thank you all, and this hearing is adjourned.

* * *

23

24

25

26