ĺ	
1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK SECOND DEPARTMENT
2	X
3	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS,
4	ON GIVIL LEGNI GERVITGEG
5	ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES,
6	X
7	45 Monroe Place Brooklyn, New York 11201
8	October 7, 2010
9	DEFORE.
10	BEFORE:
11	HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, Chief Judge
12	HONODADI E. ANNI DEAH
13	HONORABLE ANN PFAU, Chief Administrative Judge
14	HONODADIE A CATI DDIDENET
15	HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI, Presiding Justice, Second Department
16	OFFINIAL D. VOINGED
17	STEPHEN P. YOUNGER, New York State Bar President
18	
19	
20	NANCY A. MESSANO &
21	TERESA MC GRATH, Official Court Reporters
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES THE SECOND DEPARTMENT, OCTOBER 7, 2010	
2	I N D E X PAGE	
3	LEGAL NEEDS SURVEY REPORT	
5	VICTOR A. KOVNER, Chair, Fund for Modern Courts	11
6	COMMUNITY LEADERS PANEL	
7	REV. TERRY TROIA, Executive Director, Project Hospitality, Staten Island	18
9 10	RAJIV GARG, President and CEO, Wyckoff Heights Hospital	28
11	BRAD SNYDER, Representative of Network of Bar Leaders	32
12 13	LOCAL ISSUES AND NEED FOR LEGAL SERVICES PANEL	
14	MARY A. BARBERA, Chief, Rockland County Sheriff's Civil Division	36
15 16	CHRISTINE MALAFI, Suffolk County Attorney	41
17	CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND NEED FOR CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	
18 19	HON. CHARLES HYNES, District Attorney, Kings County	49
20	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND NEED FOR LEGAL SERVICES PANE	L
21	JANE AOYAMA-MARTIN, Executive Director, Women's Justice Center, Pace Law School	56
23	LOIS SCHWAEBER,	63
24	Direct, Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic Violence	
25		

1	INDEX CONTINUED:	PAGE
2	CLIENT PANEL	
3	ALVIN THOMAS, Client of Legal Services of the Hudson Valley, Accompanied by Trevor Eisenman	70
5 6	WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, Client of Nassau/Suffolk Law Services, Accompanied by Rose Caputo	76
7	CHAKIERA LOCUST, Client of Legal Aid Society of Rockland County, Accompanied by Mary Ellen Natale	88
9	GAIL GREENE, Client of Legal Aid Society of New York City, Accompanied by Sumani Lanka	92
11	JUDGES PANEL	
12 13	HON. KATHIE E. DAVIDSON, Supervising Judge, Family Court, 9th Judicial District	96
14	HON. ELEANORA OFSHTEIN, Kings County Housing Court	102
15 16	HON. NORMAN ST. GEORGE, Acting Supreme Court Justice; Nassau County Court Judge	107
17	CLOSING STATEMENT FOR STATEWIDE HEARINGS	
181920	HON.L FERN FISHER, Deputy Chief Administrative Judge For the New York City Courts; Director of the New York State Courts Access to Justice Program	113
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning. We welcome you to the fourth hearing of the State Judiciary on the issue of civil legal services. I begin by saying that no issue is more fundamental to the Court's constitutional mission than ensuring equal justice for all. The availability of affordable legal representation for low income New Yorkers is indispensable to our ability to carry out this mission and that is why we are here today.

We've been in the First Department at the Appellate Division on 25th Street and Madison Avenue. We have been in the Fourth Department in Rochester at the Appellate Division and we've been in the Third Department at the Court of Appeals in Albany. And, now we are so pleased, due to the Presiding Justice Prudenti's hospitality, to be here at this beautiful courtroom in the Second Department which is the largest Appellate Department in the State.

Let me introduce our panel and then I will have a few words and we can get started. To my right is the Presiding Justice A. Gail Prudenti who was so pleased as again welcomed us to this large and diverse wonderful Second Department. To my left is the Chief Administrative Judge of the State of New York, Judge Ann Pfau and to my far right is our good friend the president of the State Bar Association, Stephen Younger.

1.3

The issue that brings us together is a critical one and I will introduce some of the people in the courtroom to you shortly. But, before that I just want to thank first of all everyone for being here, witnesses, citizens, members of the task force. It is particularly critical because of what has happened in our economy in the very, very recent past. The economic collapse in this city, state and country has had a dramatic effect on the people who appear in our courts. The most vulnerable among them, the poor, the elderly, struggling families, the disabled, victims of domestic abuse.

There's been a tremendous rise in foreclosures, evictions, debt cases, family offenses, and matrimonial conflict. When dealing with the very necessities of life the roof over people's heads, their livelihood, the well-being of themselves and their families, there can be no doubt certainly in my mind that they need to have an attorney in order to navigate the courts and in order to navigate all the different entities, health, educational, the different services that we provide as a society.

Fifty years ago, or almost fifty years ago, really forty-seven years ago United States Supreme Court in Gideon versus Wainwright said that it is an obvious truth that when a person is hauled into court on a criminal case they cannot get their day in court, they cannot get a fair shake

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING unless they have a lawyer.

1.3

I think it is fair to say that it is an equally obvious truth today. That when a person comes into court in a civil matter, dealing with the fundamentals of life, again the roof over their head, their safety, their security, they cannot get their day in court without a lawyer. And, there are so many issues again whether it be health and education, dealing with the housing agency, dealing with so many different entities, their rights can't be upheld unless they are able to interface in an intelligent way with those different entities.

And, last year over two million people, about 2.3 million people came into our courts unrepresented, a staggering number and very much a product of the economic problems that we have been having in the state and country.

The lawyers in our state as represented by Stephen Younger, the President of the State Bar have truly risen to the occasion, have contributed over two million hours of pro bono work towards helping the poor and the indigent in our courts. That being said it is not nearly enough. The legal service providers that hold the real -- do all the heavy work in this area, and everything else we do, the self-help programs, the pro bono work, is so important. But, again, it's just part of a puzzle.

The legal service providers are at the center of

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

this for every one person who is accepted for -- to be a

client of our legal -- civil legal service providers,

another eight to ten are turned away. It is something

that is just inconceivable to all of us in the justice

system.

Why is it that the Judiciary and legal profession are holding these hearings? Because if not us, who. If our constitutional mission is to provide equal justice for all, if we are not going to stand up for the most vulnerable in our society who is? It is our constitutional responsibility and it is our legal, it is our moral and ethical obligation to do so.

We are committed to this issue and I want to say how pleased I am that the legislature of this state has passed a joint resolution that basically applauds these hearings, says that this is the right way to systemically build the support that we need and has asked us to provide them with a comprehensive report detailing what we find and with our recommendations as to how much moneys are needed to close the gap in civil legal services.

I want to particularly thank two people who are here today who have provided such great leadership in the legislature on this issue, both of them from the Second Department. First Senator John Sampson, the Senate Conference Leader, head of the Judiciary Committee who

1.3

himself was a former Legal Aid lawyer and who has dedicated himself to this issue in every way; not only to the issue but to providing leadership in the Senate on this issue and that joint resolution was very much a product of his efforts and we are so appreciative to you, Senator Sampson, for all your wonderful efforts. I know they are so sincerely held and come from your life experience and we salute you for that and thank you so much.

And equally I want to thank sitting next to
Senator Sampson in the first row is Assemblywoman Helene
Weinstein, the Chair of the Judiciary Committee of the
Assembly who has also totally dedicated herself to this
issue, provided the leadership in the Assembly that
resulted in the joint resolution, has been dedicated to
civil legal services for so many years, really as long as
I've known her; and, on the other side, on the other house
has been such a great partner for Senator Sampson in this
effort. They have both met with us numerous times, again
provided what we need.

We need champions. We need champions in all the different communities in this state but certainly in the policy making branch of the government. And, I salute the Senator and Assemblywoman for their wonderful efforts and together I really believe we are going to make a difference in an issue that is so ironic that today with the economy

so poor and so many began the poorest, the most vulnerable in society, we have the least money for civil legal services that we have ever had at a time when we need the

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

1.3

most money.

Foreclosures and evictions and all the things -debt collection cases and all of the different areas we
have had such an explosion in the courts and I think the
IOLA crisis just really -- and again Senator Sampson and
Assemblywoman Weinstein were instrumental to get the money
to save IOLA. The 15 million dollar short fall in IOLA
just demonstrates that we cannot rely on unstable,
inconsistent means of supporting civil legal services. We
have to -- this money, this funding has to come out of the
public fisc.

It is in our mind, certainly in my mind as important as the schools, as the hospitals, as all the other things that we prioritize in our state. We are not going to say that gee, this year times are hard. We are not going to fund schools; and we can't say this year times are hard we are not going to fund civil legal services. It has to be, again come out of the public fisc and be something that we prioritize in our state.

So, without further ado I want to move forward.

Let me just introduce to you a few of the other people who are here. First the Chair of the task force on civil

1.3

legal services, Helaine Barnett who is a former head of the Legal Services Corporation and Helaine overseas a 28 person task force and thank you so much, Helaine, for your efforts and for being here today.

Steve Banks from the Legal Aid Society has been a seward in this area and again a member of the task force.

Emily Franchina, the Second Department Team Coordinator who we're so pleased. Denise Kronstadt also a Second

Department Team Coordinator. Lillian Moy. Is Lillian here? She was up in Albany the other day. There are so many people who have contributed to this effort and certainly Fern Fisher, the Deputy Chief Administrative

Judge for the New York City Courts and head of our Statewide Access Justice Staff Efforts.

Fern, where are you?

JUDGE FISHER: Right here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: She's right there. I want to thank you for your wonderful efforts and you will hear from Fern later. She will be the closing witness today.

So, I would ask that we are going to have -- try to limit testimony to five minutes for each of the witnesses and five minutes of questioning. Don't feel that you have to read your statement. You can tell us what your views are and we would be happy to then ask you some questions. So, we want to keep -- we have so many

witnesses and we want to have the input of a wide breath of witnesses today.

So, we are very pleased to start with someone who has been a champion in this area for all his life and certainly the Fund for Modern Courts that he represents has been our partner in so many a good deeds for the courts and legal profession in this state.

So, I would ask Victor Kovner, the Chair of the Fund for Modern Courts to come forward and please make your statement and I would note, too, that Dennis Hawkins, the Executive Director of the Fund, is here today and we appreciate that.

Thank you, Dennis.

Mr. Kovner, you want to start?

MR. KOVNER: Thank you, Chief Judge Lippman,

Justice Prudenti, Judge Pfau and President Younger. I want
to say it is nice to see our new Bar president up on the
bench. It becomes him.

We at Modern Courts very much appreciate the opportunity to present testimony today on this critical issue of civil legal services. And we think, we think it is really vital that you have formed the task force to expand access to legal -- civil legal services. And, I am going to take the admonition of the Chief Judge and not read my statement and turn to what I think is the heart of

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING the matter.

I mean this is an issue that Modern Courts has been involved with for a great many years and it is so helpful that you have taken the time and helped assemble those most concerned about the subject so that the public can focus on this issue.

But, as many of you know we -- there was commissioned a survey of civil legal needs which was conducted by the respected Lake Research Partners in August of this year. This was the first survey of civil legal needs in our state in 20 years and it covers low income residents throughout the state. A research for the survey is complete. The final report will be submitted to the task force shortly.

The survey followed a sample of low income New Yorkers defined as people living at or under two percent of the federal poverty guidelines as represents for family of four roughly, \$44,000 per year. Those surveys were asked about specific legal problems including housing, finances, employment, health insurance, and medical bills, public benefits, domestic and family issues, immigration issues, with schools affecting their households over the past year.

When the representative population was presented with a specific -- with a list of specific legal problems nearly half, roughly 47 percent said they had experienced

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

at least one of these problems in the past year. Applying this percentage to New Yorkers at this level of income, this translates to almost three million low income residents of New York State who have had legal problems and no access to counsel.

Within that number at least as I say three million experienced one problem a year. 1.2 million experience three or more legal problems and we have a chart here which reflects the extraordinary number of people facing, in many cases, a multiple of legal issues without access to counsel. Now, the most significant --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Staggering number.

MR. KOVNER: It is startling and it is an enormous burden not simply to those families but to all sorts of institutions throughout the state to those who you have heard testimony in your prior hearing. But it affects everyone, businesses, community, families and the courts. The last thing a judge wants to do is have a litigant that doesn't have counsel. It just — it is a burden on the Judiciary as a whole.

Now, the most significant legal problems are in the area of health insurance or medical bills. That of course is not an area that is limited to people with low income. Most people have those problems and complex problems. That is followed by finances, employment, and

1.3

housing and our chart over here on the right indicates the various categories. That is the chart on your left on my far right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you a question on that chart on the far left.

MR. KOVNER: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think that a lot of people don't realize that this is not only -- when we talk about civil legal services we are not just talking about when someone finds themselves in court. A lot of these areas are things that really precede their coming to court and hopefully never have to do so. Is that what we are looking at? These are not necessarily cases in the courthouse. They are interfacing with different parts of the bureaucracies that one has to deal with in life when you are a poor New Yorker.

MR. KOVNER: You are quite right and of course if people had access to someone with legal skills in many instances, enormous instances they wouldn't have to come to court at all.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

MR. KOVNER: Now they are coming to court. What good does that do for our society, what good does it do for our economy. Now, those low income New Yorkers most in need of legal services are the young parents of children

under 18, African Americans, Latinos, immigrants, the unemployed, uninsured and disabled. For example, 47 percent of the disabled low income New Yorkers or those living in household with someone who is disabled reported having legal problems. And, their problems like everybody else varied widely. 60 percent of poor women under the age of 60 reported having at least one legal problem in the past year. 60 percent of children living under the age of 18 reported having at least one legal problem as well.

2.0

JUDGE PFAU: Did you also find what we have been struck with in hearing the testimony is you think of this often as an urban issue. But, as we have been going upstate we have seen this so much as an issue of rural poor and in geographic distances in reaching even assistance if it is available. Did you look at that as well?

MR. KOVNER: Absolutely, Your Honor. I think the survey reflects that this is not an urban only problem.

It is a suburban problem, rural problem, downstate problem.

It is a Northern New York problem. It is a Western New York problem. This limits the ability of our Judiciary to serve effectively and the families in those areas to get effective services across the range of the state.

Now, the bottom line of course is that legal representation is the best means of ensuring adequate resolution of the legal problems of low income individuals

and families and our goal as a society of laws must be to mitigate the dangers these problems pose and consequences. Providing a significant portion of low income New Yorkers with access to equal and fair justice can only be met when the State offers secure and consistent funding for civil legal services as a core program of this State. The Lake Research Survey quantifies the needs and we at Modern Courts consider this a most urgent and critical problem. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. I think the numbers are even more staggering than one would think and you're right, that one of the problems is we haven't done one of these surveys for so many years and I think it is out of control and I think that is not — the public is not as aware of this as they should and of course that's one of the purposes of these hearing. But, I think the survey is terrific to get our arms around the breath of this problem. I mean it is staggering.

MR. KOVNER: And the other thing if I may in conclusion. This is not just an additional service to low income people. This is a service to everybody, everybody has a stake in our addressing these unmet needs. Everyone benefits if we can address it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, I think you make a very good point. We have had testimony and we are going to

1.3

have more today. Not just from the people you would expect to testify in this issue. We have had testimony from the large banks, from the real estate industry, from the health industry, saying that not only is this the right thing to do but their bottom line is affected when people, poor people don't have representation in court. Actually the money that is vested in civil legal services will redound over and over and over again to the benefit of the State economically putting aside the right thing to do, the ethical obligation to do. So, I think that it is a very good point. Anything else?

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Mr. Kovner, number one, I welcome you to 45 Monroe Place and I thank you very much for being here.

And as we who have worked in the court system for many years are well aware the Fund for Modern Courts goes out to many, many courts and they have over the last decade, I know in the Second Department, and observed court operations.

And, besides the survey when these individuals come back I know they talk to you about, and they talk to your board about the operations of the courts. Has this problem been brought to your attention over the past decade?

MR. KOVNER: The answer is yes, Your Honor, and

2.0

thank you for referring to our court monitoring programs. Yes, we do monitor courts throughout the state. We have been working in Washington and Warren and now in Suffolk County and Family Court which is a large court system and the answer is these issues do arise. They are covered in our reports which we publish regularly and hope to continue to expand that program. We try to rotate our monitoring program which is done by volunteers who come in and observe and write up their reports and are welcomed by the courts and these problems are specially apparent.

We have been to some justice courts upstate and they are also evident there where there have been basically travesties of justice where -- this is more in the criminal area than in the civil area -- but, the need for civil legal assistance is clear throughout our state.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kovner. Thank
Modern Courts for all of your leadership in this area and
in general to the well-being of the courts of our state.
We greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

MR. KOVNER: You're welcome.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, next we are going to have a panel of leaders of the community. The Reverend Terry Troia and Rajiv Garg.

Reverend Troia.

REV. TROIA: Good morning, Chief Judge Lippman and

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

Judge Prudenti, Judge Pfau and President Younger. My name is Terry Troia and I am the Executive Director of Project Hospitality in Staten Island and Minister of the New Utrecht Reformed Church in Bensonhurst, Brooklyn.

1.3

Project Hospitality is an interfaith effort that has been serving the needs of hungry and homeless Staten

Islanders for the last 28 years and I have been working with them for 26 of those 28 years.

We serve a population of people in our borough, providing food, clothing, shelter and emergency services, social and support services to people who are disabled, people who are unemployed, people who are homeless or on the verge of homelessness, unstably housed.

Many of the people we serve are also newly arrived immigrants to Staten Island, a borough which has the largest percentage increase of immigrants in the City of New York. 75 percent of the people we serve are people of color. 63 percent disabled and last year we served over 25,000 individual Staten Islanders in need.

On Mondays we provide access to free legal attorney -- legal services from Legal Services of Staten

Island and the Legal Aid Society and our soup kitchen. We are overpacked and we are booked sometimes two and three months ahead of time in order to get people in to see an attorney.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What kind of problems are they facing?

REV. TROIA: A lot is eviction prevention, debt resolution, immigration issues, domestic violence. I would say that would be the top four.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And do you think those issues have been exacerbated during recent times because of the economic problems?

REV. TROIA: Absolutely. We serve the north shore. We serve all of Staten Island but predominant poverty is on the north shore corridor which has a 21 percent unemployment rate right now and actually if you have been following Staten Island, I am not saying that anyone should follow the news in Staten Island, but if you were --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We all follow the news in Staten Island.

REV. TROIA: I thought so. We have had a whole space of hate crimes that have started in April that -- or alleged hate crimes and a lot of it stemmed from poverty and lack of jobs and the struggle of communities to find their own place and to hang onto what very little they have.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why is civil legal representation so important in that mix?

1

REV. TROIA: Well --

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE LIPPMAN: If they don't have it what happens?

REV. TROIA: Folks fall through the cracks of our legal system. We serve 640 cases that were served by Legal Aid Society and Legal Services of Staten Island last year and those were 640 of what we thought were our most severe cases that we had to get to an attorney because we saw the potential of people falling out of their homes, saw the potential of domestic violence survivors going back into situations that would imperil their families and If we don't provide that level of what I themselves. would call safety net people end up out in the streets. People end up losing their jobs when they shouldn't have lost their jobs. People don't get the back wages that they are entitled to. And, that is a --

We are trying to make the argument JUDGE LIPPMAN: or heard the argument made that in the end it costs society more than the cost of providing basic legal representation if people kind of fall off the cliff. You know, they are They can't access these different not represented. They can't access the courts. benefits. That in the end even on an economic basis really is very negative in terms of, you know, our bottom line in these difficult financial times.

REV. TROIA: If we can prevent an eviction we save a family from becoming homeless and going into the homeless care system which is a very expensive system of care. We are glad it is there. But, the goal is to not have anybody become homeless. That is the prime example of the need for civil legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, we put aside even beyond that this is the moral and ethical obligation. It really is in plain dollars and cents makes sense, doesn't it, in terms of the people you see every day?

REV. TROIA: Absolutely. I mean we are front-line workers so I have beaten off rats with a broom and I am pretty good at it. I have been in places where people lived that are simply beyond our imagination to comprehend. Where people pay \$25 a week to sleep on a piece of a mattress in somebody's basement. That's the level of poverty that we are talking about.

And, the free legal services are forced to turn away at least five people in need for every one that they can help. Even though the lawyers work long hours, high case loads and I want to say personally I have been available to myself and my staff after hours and sometimes on weekends including New Years Eve.

JUDGE PFAU: And you serve the whole community. What is the impact on the community when you are dealing,

try to prevent people from falling through the cracks and homelessness and the result that you see with the kind of hate crime issues that have been raised in Staten Island recently?

REV. TROIA: Well, people need to first of all believe that they have human dignity and respect and that they have a place for themselves where they are not going to get pushed out of their apartment, not end up out on the street and they are going to have food in their pantry to take care of their families.

I actually go into houses where there isn't any food. It is simply hard to imagine that. So, if the kids aren't eating they are not performing well in school, they become problems in school. ACS gets involved. There's family problems. When you have four and five families crammed up in one apartment all together the family dynamics are threatening and perilous to the families. Very hard to study when you don't have a kitchen table to study on, when you are sharing it with 12 or 13 kids.

So, we are not doing justice to the children who are our future generation as a result of the kind of poverty. And, the need for us to be able to provide the access to the legal services that will help them be in the right place, receive the food stamps and entitlements they

2.5

are entitled to and sometimes get denied and they need to go back and fight that are very important to some level of basic sustenance.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: To follow Judge Pfau's question up, what is the impact to the community of having large numbers of foreclosures for example?

REV. TROIA: In -- Staten Island has the unfortunate reputation of having very high foreclosure rate for the City of New York. Well, there are two effects. First it is the impoverishment of the family that is losing their home and many people rent a portion of their home to try to sustain their mortgage. So, there are also renters that are victims of foreclosures as well. So, people lose their homes.

The indignity of losing your home, losing your possessions, people being forced into the homeless system that never ever imagined that they would have to go through that. People are ripped away from their schools. They are sent to shelters in other boroughs. You lose continuity of care. People that had medical care or getting cancer treatment are ripped away from that. They lose all their stability and their roots in the community and in that case that takes years to build and that forms a part of the person's identity and dignity and along with losing their house and possessions and being relocated they

1 lose that as well.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, we are really talking about the fabric of society that holds it together. I mean is that -- as obviously the kinds of services that you provide in the -- legal services is just an integral part of keeping that community together, keeping a framework in which everyone can hopefully thrive and move forward.

REV. TROIA: Absolutely. And on Staten Island legal services and Legal Aid Society don't have enough resources to help everyone in need. And unlike the other boroughs in the City of New York in addition to us being transportation challenged we have no where else to send clients so we handle 640 cases on Staten Island but we have taken a number of cases to Queens and to other boroughs and that means taking a staff person to escort a client who may never have ridden the subway before and negotiate that in order to get some type of legal services somewhere else and then you wait hours and hours because they are already booked in Queens and we are pushing into their time and services.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: So we have a clear understanding is there an advice only component to some of the civil legal services that your group is providing?

REV. TROIA: The majority of the services -- there is like a triage because they really take the most pressing

1.3

cases. So it is not really advice. It is mostly representation and of course our priorities are the DV cases. We do have some advice only from -- CUNY has an immigration and citizenship project and we have advice only attorneys that come and advise people. But the majority of the work that Legal Services of Staten Island and Legal Aid Society do are court related.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You are -- they are actually representing them in court?

REV. TROIA: Absolutely and because of the triage, because of the numbers only the most urgent.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, thank you.

REV. TROIA: So, I -- you covered the issue of foreclosure. I again -- again hundreds of impoverished Staten Islanders faced eviction last year and housing lawyers are already forced to turn away many clients in order for them to do the meaningful help to the cases that they are able to take and despite the high rate of fatal domestic violence incidents in Staten Island many survivors do not have the legal protection they need because of the insufficient resources. Although the 18-B lawyers can be appointed survivors fear confronting their batterer without a lawyer who spent time preparing for the court proceeding. It is very, very scary stuff.

Those who are turned away have no place to go for

1.3

help on Staten Island. So, decreased civil legal services will undermine the Island's stability at a time when the overall population and the poverty rate are growing more and more rapidly than the rest of New York City. We have 21 percent of unemployment rate in the north shore of Staten Island. More people will lose their homes. More people will become homeless and homeless system is at a critical mass at this time in our city and we end up eroding the very fragile stability that we have in our neighborhoods without benefits like food stamps, unemployment benefits. We will see a high number of people plunge into a deeper poverty really creating a gap between rich and poor and more domestic violence survivors will risk serious harm to themselves and to their families.

So, we urgently ask acknowledgement of the severe situation that poor people face both in our borough and across the city and hope that there is some way to find a way to seek, secure additional services for legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for your very telling testimony. I note no one should get scared but that red light means that your time is up. The white light means that you have about two minutes. Is that what the system is here? One minute.

So, the white light means you have one minute.

Red light means your time is up but there is not a big

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING crane that comes down and yanks you off. But, you can watch the lights. It will give you a sense of how long your testimony is.

1.3

Let's take Rajiv Garg who is the President and CEO of Wyckoff Heights Hospital. Mr. Garg.

MR. GARG: Good morning, Chief Judge Lippman,
Presiding Judge Prudenti, Judge Pfau and President
Mr. Younger. I am going to take the advice for
summarizing my testimony in a substantive or form manner.

What I see in a health care institution where we see about 80,000 people who use the hospital as an alternate to private doctor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. GARG: Is the same way they view legal services. They just do not know legal services can help better with health treatment plan which would be basic health care. Examples are people come in either they are uninsured, they are unaware of the medical treatment plan which would be given to them had somebody guided them through the many ways of being able to get medical care. And that is the biggest challenge when you have a population which is at an economical disadvantage, language barriers.

And, they are going to be getting educated, at least the next ten years the education occur in that

	SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
1	neighborhood. It is going to take time to mature as the
2	younger children go to school in the American system. The
3	parents who guide them also don't understand the health
4	care.
5	JUDGE LIPPMAN: What is the effect on the hospital
6	itself. We can
7	MR. GARG: Sorry?
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: What is the effect of the hospital
9	itself when people come in and they have no idea of how to
10	let you help them?
11	MR. GARG: Well, the biggest impact is that the
12	patient becomes what we call unfortunately a frequent
13	flyer. They come into the emergency room. You give them
14	the little treatment you can. You let them out of the
15	emergency room and they are back in a week.
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because you don't cure their
17	problem?
18	MR. GARG: Well, we have to cure what is
19	immediate.
20	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right, you cure the immediate
21	problem, right?
22	MR. GARG: But to put them on a treatment plan
23	which is required for an extended period of time would mean
24	that they would understand their rights and that is where
25	legal service, civil legal services would be hugely

1.3

helpful. Especially it occurs with people with chronic disease. A diabetic, an aging diabetic with hypertension disease. They're -- for example the treatment plan would call them for a device or some implement which they could get if somebody told them how to get it. Or, for example, if you get somebody who is a victim of a rape crisis. They walk into the hospital unaware of where they need to go.

And, what is happening with the medicaid office and other insurance company, people who basically help pay for these services, is they are trying to curtail this expense by basically trying to have people wait a lot longer and that again has the same impact on making the patient even more diseased or more ill.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You are not talking about a court case. You are talking about basic access to health benefits and isn't that going to become even worse with the new health law if people don't have the assistance of legal counsel to navigate, you know, what -- the rights that they are entitled to, the benefits that they are entitled to?

MR. GARG: I definitely think so and that is becoming more and more obvious as the numbers of people who walk through doors of hospitals like ours, community hospitals, with economical disadvantage who just are bewildered as to what the next step is.

Most of the stuff which we see in a hospital like ours is three fold. It is not a court case that we are trying to avoid but some people in the system who were disadvantaged may end up in court.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

MR. GARG: And that is something to recognize and try and avoid by providing some legal services at the outset of a treatment plan. Not that everyone qualifies for it but certainly a helping hand with a legal edge to it would be immensely useful to this population.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: It strikes me so often that the medical profession and legal profession are divided. Doctors think all lawyers do is sue doctors and what you are talking about is a collaboration where lawyers can actually help you treat the patient in ways that a doctor can't.

Now, I was wondering if you can expand on that in what ways a doctor and lawyer can collaborate.

MR. GARG: Well, when the lawyer is getting involved at the initial stage of, you know, let's just take an example of a patient who comes in who is chronically ill, has a bunch of issues and doesn't know what he can get as a treatment plan. Their lawyer can actually help a doctor understand what that doctor can do within the bounds of legality, who he can go to. For example medicare.

What is the patient entitled to? What can the doctor fight for? What tests are useful in substance or form? Doesn't it make sense to push some of the boundaries?

Doctors and lawyers are divided when it comes to malpractice because, you know, if you look at it it's two sides of the same coin. On one hand you are saying well, we cannot give you the aid that is required to use defensive medicine because you can't do all the things you are suppose to do to make the patient better. If you don't do that and patient finally, you know, falls prey to either manifestation of disease later on in life or something bad happens then the lawyers on the other side are trying to sue the doctor.

I think the collaboration would actually reduce malpractice, will make the doctor I guess more bold in what he needs to do at the outset. And, it will coordinate the various pieces at least for this condition and serve the patient a lot better much early on. I think that's what --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you so much for your testimony.

And next is Brad Snyder who is the Representative of the Network of Bar Leaders.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Chief Judge Lippman and rest of the panel for having us here today. I will also just paraphrase some of my testimony although it may be

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING points where I am reading.

I am the executive director of LeGaL which is the LGBT Bar Association of Greater New York and am here today as a representative to the Network of Bar Leaders.

As you probably know the Network consists of 46
Bar Associations many throughout New York City and State of
New York and one part of our mission is the advancement of
commonly shared views pertaining to the administration of
justice and particularly appropriate for today views
pertaining to the delivery to the public of legal services.
So, this is an issue that has been obviously of great
concern to the Network for some time.

Our member associations are quite diverse. We are the County Bars, the Women Bars, People of Color Bars, Practice Specialty Bars, LGBT Bars, Cultural and Religious Bars and reason I emphasize that today is as the panel already heard in other testimony we represent communities that are particularly disproportionately affected by reductions in legal services for the work that many of our pro bono attorneys are doing throughout the city and state.

One example of that that was noted in testimony that I believe has already been presented to the panel comes from the focus on Staten Island again. The Staten Island Women's Bar Association which notes that the client populations of New York States civil legal services

1.3

programs are women and women with families over 70 percent of the time. There are a lot more statistics about certain communities who are disproportionately impacted. They certainly speak to the LGBT community at all different income levels facing lots of legal uncertainty particularly during time of crisis and what that means to our community. But, this is sort of an across the board narrative about what is going on out there in the world.

When funds are scarce the front line public interest organizations and Bar Associations and Networks at Bar Associations are forced to make some very tough choices and in many instances that means a direct reduction in services.

In other instances it means the outright elimination of services entirely. As Chief Judge Lippman noted however earlier the Bar has stepped up in many ways to meet the needs, that there is a call by Chief Judge Lippman with respect to respond to the foreclosure crisis and I believe many of our member Bar Associations met that call although, as noted earlier, the need is just too great.

So, I guess the point that I just want to emphasize is that our ability as members of the Bar who care passionately about this to connect visitors either directly to legal representation or informal ways to

1.3

2.0

connect them to resources and really reach them before it is too late because we run an attorney referral service and lots of our Bar Associations do, we run clinics, and the worst call that we get is the one where we think if only that person had had access to someone six months ago this entire situation would be different.

And, I really think there is an opportunity there for us and the work being done by the panel to try to get to people sooner.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think it is a mix of services. I think pro bono is so helpful and does so many wonderful things. But, you need that core of the providers to build around, then the pro bono efforts can be that much more effective. Because the -- there aren't enough hours in the year for, you know, pro bono efforts to begin to hit the core problem. But, I think if we had a stable funding for providers and then you had this great outpouring from the Bar around it I think then we would make a difference. Then we could begin to really cover the unmet need and what needs to be addressed by our state and our society.

So, we greatly appreciate the work of the Network. We greatly appreciate your pro bono efforts and we want to continue working with you and with the different providers to really start to crack this nut, to really start to begin to deal with the need which as was testified by some of the

people, the good Reverend, for every person taken by the providers there are so many others turned away. And, for every pro bono hour given by the Bar we can use ten more, you know.

So, I want to thank you all and it's been a terrific panel and thank you for coming in and testifying.

The next panel is about local issues and need for legal services. Local issues and need for legal services panel and this is Mary Barbera, the Chief of the Rockland County Sheriff's Civil Division and Christine Malafi the Suffolk County Attorney.

Chief, why don't you start and tell us.

CHIEF BARBERA: Thank you, Chief Judge and esteemed panel for the opportunity to speak to you today.

In my capacity as Chief of the Rockland County
Civil Division I often see what happens when there is a
lack of adequate legal representation in the cases that we
deal with and the adverse of effect felt by individuals and
families in the County where I live and where I work.

The Civil Division serves and enforces all legal mandates that come out of the Village, Towns, State,

Federal Courts. We also direct the receipt and recordings of fees for services garnishing payments, seizures,

Sheriff's sale. Our work is not discretionary. We are at the end of this process. We can't look at a family, we

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

can't stop an eviction with an elderly person. We have to
do the job that we are asked to. We have to enforce the

mark. I cannot decide not to put the padlock on their

door or put their belongings out on the street.

1.3

I think it is especially critical for my job and community's safety and economic well-being that the rights of these individuals are protected to the fullest extent. In my experience the only way to do that and make sure these rights are protected is provide legal representation to these individuals.

New York State Law, New York State Statute provides that a sheriff serve a 72-hour notice before we proceed with an eviction. That is three days. That is three days to tell somebody that they have to vacate their home. In certain instances we see, we find that it is the first time they have ever come in contact with the legal system. There is a deputy showing up on their door saying here, you got three days to get out. I am sure they are aware that they are in arrears on their rent or the foreclosure proceeding is at the end but I don't think they really know or they can really fathom what the eviction process is. It is a hard cold reality.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: They are not ready to interface with the legal system, with your office.

CHIEF BARBERA: No. I have, and this is an

example from 25 years ago when I first started. There was a couple. They were being evicted. There was snow on the ground. They had a ten-day old baby. I held that baby in my arms wrapped in a blanket while they took what they could, piled it in their car and everything else stayed on the street. And I remember walking away looking at that crib on the street and saying wow, you know, and I know they had no legal representation. But we had a job to do.

I stood on a street corner and watched children get off the bus at the end of the day and the content of their home piled out on the front and I have seen those parents who were in turmoil all day try to explain to those children, a ten year old, why everything was out on the street and where they had to go next. And all I can do is walk away.

We have experienced in Rockland situations where the deputy knocked on the door. The tenant said come in and the tenant was sitting there with a shotgun under her chin. She had no where to go. She had no one to turn to. And thank goodness those deputies moved that gun as that shot was fired and it went into a wall. I can continue on and on. I have been doing this job for a very long time. These are all situations that we have encountered and they are all heart wrenching.

1.3

JUDGE PFAU: Is it getting worse with the economy and foreclosures and evictions?

CHIEF BARBERA: It absolutely is. It absolutely is. I think that it -- we can do a better job when the people that we come in contact with are represented. When they know there is legal representation out there. When they know there is somebody who can help them.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: When you serve your notice I assume sometimes you will have someone who has a lawyer from a provider and something happens within that 72-hour period?

CHIEF BARBERA: Infrequently. Most of the time

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But generally by that point if they have gotten to the point where you are putting a --serving a 72-hour notice it's too late?

CHIEF BARBERA: Well, our Legal Aid in Rockland County usually gets involved right after that 72-hour notice is served if the person knows. There are times when we direct them there.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: That would be my question, follow-up of the question of the Chief Judge. After you serve that 72-hour notice does your office get many calls and what if anything do you do with those calls?

CHIEF BARBERA: We do get a lot of calls. We do

1.3

something in Rockland where when we serve a 72-hour notice we also put a copy in the mail to our Department of Social Services so that they have it on file and if the person goes for aid they know that they are about to be evicted.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: How many of these people does Legal Aid wind up representing?

CHIEF BARBERA: A good portion of them. I don't have statistics on that. I can tell you that our eviction calendar has from 2003 to 2009 risen three-fold in Rockland.

In 2003 we evicted 473 families or individuals. In 2009 that number has increased to 1,423. Because of the economic downturn I think in the last two years it's become a lot worse. We have seen a ten percent increase just from January to June in this year. We have also got foreclosure evictions which are much more difficult for us because it is an entire house. It is a proceeding that has gone on for a very long time and if it comes to eviction which is not usual in the foreclosure proceeding it is because they have absolutely no where to go. They have no where to turn.

It is much more difficult for the deputies to stand there and do this. It is certainly difficult for the families. They have no options left. I as a public servant and officer of the State and concerned member of my

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING community because there are times when I have scheduled evictions for, you know, friends of the family or my son's friends' families and that is a difficult thing.

1.3

I believe that the funding ensures adequate legal representation for those in debt, for those maybe facing potential foreclosure and also for victims of domestic violence for whom we serve orders of protection.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's a critical issue.

CHIEF BARBERA: In my perspective it is just as imperative to provide counseling and funding for legal representation for these families as it is for criminals.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, you see the other end. You see the consequences of not having legal representation?

CHIEF BARBERA: I absolutely do every day. We are inundated. I am here because of my working relationship with the Legal Aid Society. I respect them. I admire them. They usually come in at the last minute. They have the ability to work within the court system and get things done so that their clients aren't -- their belongs aren't on the street and they are not homeless and that's why I am here today. I think without counsel we can't be certain that these people are protected.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it, Chief.

Okay, Ms. Malafi, Suffolk County Attorney,

welcome.

MS. MALAFI: Chief Judge Lippman, Judge Pfau, Judge Prudenti, President Younger, thank you. I am very

honored to be here today.

Liberty and justice for all. It is a phrase we have all said numerous times per week since the age of five when we started kindergarten and learned the Pledge of Allegiance. Justice for all cannot happen without meaningful access to the courts. The definition of meaningful access to the court does vary depending on circumstances. But, people forfeit rights by being unrepresented either due to ignorance or inability and it denies all litigants meaningful access to the court, not only those that cannot afford attorneys.

In Suffolk County and in New York State we have been fortunate. The court system has made numerous strides, as you know and as you have effectuated, in helping get legal representation and helping those who want to represent themselves have meaningful self access to the court through your website, through forms, through links to help.

It doesn't only affect those people. It affects society as a whole. Providing legal services to people who cannot afford legal services avoids the payment by the government of Social Service and welfare benefits. It

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

avoids the use of Social Service workers, probation officers, police officers and other government workers who have to assist those who need, who become in need because they don't have legal representation. It helps society as a whole because it creates jobs in the area of legal It helps businesses in the economy and by representation. avoiding decreased productivity and increased absenteeism of employees. It helps cases flow through the court system faster. It allows the Judiciary to act for the benefit of everyone as other elected officials can do. Ιt also legitimizes the government as a whole and it avoids tragedies and reduces incidents of domestic violence.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: It I can stop you one second. One of the things that struck me is just how overwhelming these numbers are. We heard a number this morning, three million people. What kind of criteria would you offer to decide which of the cases that are worthy of a government saying you ought to get a right to counsel and where can we draw that line?

MS. MALAFI: I think the line has to be drawn not at the federal poverty level. I think that is way too low. I think that there has to be a recognition of the fact that there are working class people who for lack of a better term, working poor. They do everything they can to keep their heads above water and if they have one legal

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

crisis or legal issue where they need a lawyer that is
enough to put them in complete economic crisis.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And there are some wonderful programs around the state that require funding that are targeted at the working poor.

MS. MALAFI: Correct.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Certainly people who are not a burden on society. Who go out every day and work and because they want to be useful members?

MS. MALAFI: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: In the communities and it is so hard because all it takes is one legal issue. They cannot deal with it and maybe they don't continue to be working and they just become poor.

MS. MALAFI: Correct, and then they qualify for aid.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Social Services.

MS. MALAFI: Social Service aid. We heard a lot of testimony already and you have said domestic violence increases greatly in these households which requires police officer assistance, Social Service assistance, the Family Court gets involved, foster families. It creates a lot of expenses.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So from the point of view of county government civil legal services is not just

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING something that again is a good thing to do for the right thing to do. It really directly affects your community and county government and cost of it and the fabric of the community. All of the above.

1.3

MS. MALAFI: It absolutely does and Suffolk
County, we are in economic crisis for -- I have been
involved since January of 2004. And it is constant budget
issues and we have been able to maintain funding for
numerous projects based on the fact that funding a \$200,000
project is actually less costly than having the people who
need help not get help and then have to fund those personal
services through other areas of county government.

Also, we are very fortunate. We are -- we have a law school that is committed to public service that the county works with to provide assistance so that people's houses that are in foreclosure, we help get an order, court ordered support for children or even visitation, and other important rights. They can go there.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Just to follow up because I know Suffolk County has done a very, very good job over the years for funding Suffolk County Legal Aid Society and I know that the Suffolk County Legal Aid Society handles criminal matters and a limited amount of civil matters basically.

Are there any discussions with regard to extending

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING those services into other civil legal services.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MALAFI: The Legal Aid Society would like to I have had discussions with them. The problem is funding. The county funds the criminal end, the mandatory legal representation areas. They would like to One way the Legal Aid Society has thought to make their budget a little bit looser so they can afford to help more people is something as simple as a state law needs to be passed to allow the Legal Aid Society to participate in government health insurance which would cut down the health insurance cost to their lawyers and free up That can be extended also to other more money. not-for-profits that provide legal services to people to free up more budget money because it is -- the government does have a limited amount of money and everyone understands that. But, if we can free up other moneys to help these societies that are willing to have attorneys on staff to help that it would be beneficial.

I would like to mention that doing this does not only help the person getting the help in society but I was in private practice for over 15 years before I became a county attorney. I have been on this other side of the table for unrepresented litigants. I know my clients wound up paying more for my services because it is harder to litigate against an unrepresented person. It is harder

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

to be on the other side even in a transactional matter from someone who is unrepresented. You have to put in more time to review a 300 page rambling complaint.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It is not an effective way to go about your business or go about society's business?

MS. MALAFI: It is not. So, the people who can afford attorneys do wind up paying more for the attorneys because there is more time used in being involved with someone who is unrepresented.

particularly hard hit by foreclosures. We unfortunately know the numbers and we know what the impact is. In particular with the Legal Aid Society having taken on -- being able to take on a limited number of civil cases I would imagine that the large number of unrepresented litigants in the foreclosure cases is having the ripple effect in your community as far as what happens when houses are foreclosed and impact in the community and neighborhood.

MS. MALAFI: Absolutely. The county, we fund two different projects to help the pro bono foreclosure settlement conference through the Suffolk County Bar Association which is fabulous and to our law school. But we recognize with that money which we intend to double next year with the budget that has been proposed that helps when

a house is not empty with a foreclosure. There are a lot less acts of violence in the area in the community where the foreclosure is happening. There is less gang activity because there is not an empty house for kids to hang out in. There is less vandalism. The police don't have to keep going there.

So, we understand the greater picture of making sure that people get the legal representation they need and also it is a basic element of society that we recognize as the county that people who can't afford a lawyer should not be taken advantage of.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So the bottom line the health of your county is very much reflected in the health of our system of representing poor people. And funding this, this just isn't about helping them because it is again good or the right thing to do. The county is impacted in a very negative way if poor people or the working poor, both, don't have representation in court in accessing the health system, housing, all the other things that people run into when -- in their ordinary day lives.

MS. MALAFI: Absolutely recognize it's an obligation to not only people who need representation but all the tax payers to keep the cost down and make our community a better community.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it is very much -- I am

2.5

pleased that you emphasize that last point. It is to keep the county's cost -- providing representation for the poor betters the bottom line of not only the county but also of private entities to deal with people who don't have representation. So, it is very much a holistic approach to providing funding for civil legal services.

MS. MALAFI: Absolutely, yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you both.

I see the District Attorney is here. So, I am going to ask him to come up and he is going to talk about the criminal justice system and need for legal services.

Mr. District Attorney, we are so pleased to have you here and I think so instructive that someone who basically deals with the criminal justice system feels it important to come and testify about civil legal services.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: I must say you took part of my statement though, Judge. Very good to see you, Chief Judge.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great to see you.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: And Presiding Justice

Prudenti and Chief Administrative Judge Pfau and State Bar

President Younger. I really thank you for the opportunity

of coming today and I am a former Legal Aid lawyer so I am

proud to appear before this panel. I guess the task force

has heard mostly from people in the civil law arena including indigent clients of civil legal services. But my guess is you haven't heard much from those of us who practice criminal law and yet those of us in the criminal justice system certainly do have a significant stake in the issue before you. Namely ensuring that the poor have access and continue to have access despite the economic downturn to the civil legal services that they require.

Just last week I was in Washington DC participating in a forum on the role of the 21st Century Prosecutor. District attorneys around the country are now embracing that new paradigm of community prosecution and I am proud to say -- you know this firsthand, Judge.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I do.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: -- that my office for two decades has adopted this proactive collaborative strategy for reducing crime and enhancing public safety. Community engagement is a critical part of that strategy's success and it is clear to me that Chief Prosecutor must care about the health and welfare of community members because healthier and more stable community inevitably enhances public safety. And that's why access to civil legal services becomes so important. By providing to those who can't afford lawyer's advice and representation in court regarding a broad range of life-affecting issues

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING civil legal service providers help keep families and communities secure, healthy and stable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As the District Attorney of this county I am proud to say we have implemented many innovative programs to protect crime victims by stabilizing those who have been in the criminal justice system, reducing their recidivism and helping them to rebuild their lives. For example to divert non-violent drug offenders into treatment in lieu of prison and to assist formally incarcerated individuals to successfully reenter their communities. All of these individuals as well as their families are often wrestling with the underlying civil legal issues. Family law and immigration matters, housing problems resulting in homelessness, wrongful denial of unemployment, disability or other subsistence benefits and wrongful denial of health care assistance. Particularly mental health care services.

The administrative agencies involved in many of these issues have forms, rules, procedures and bureaucracies that can be at minimum daunting for any lay person to navigate without the guidance of an attorney. Unfortunately if the civil legal issues go unaddressed clearly they will tear down the fragile lives that these impoverished individuals are struggling to reconstruct. To ignore their need for professional assistance is to deny

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING them justice and weaken the social fabric that community prosecution depends upon for enhancing public safety.

1.3

You already know by now the single largest group using free legal services are women. Many of them struggling to protect themselves and their children from the violence of intimate partners. My office prosecutes roughly 10,000 domestic violence cases each year. These victims are all too often desperately in need of civil legal services. Our Family Justice Center which Mayor Bloomberg and I opened in July of 2005 includes a broad group of service providers and is located on the same floor as our Domestic Violence Bureau. It is heavily used by the victims in cases handled by my office.

Since its inception the Family Justice Center has seen over 36,000 clients. Currently the center has approximately 550 to 750 new clients each month. Roughly 45 percent of these clients receive on-site civil legal advocacy services and advice including paralegal screening and linkage to services. Help for drafting Family Court orders of protection petitions, advocacy with Family Court issues and assistance in obtaining U-Visas.

Among its 15 on-site agencies I am proud to say that the center has four legal services as our partners.

South Brooklyn Legal Services, Sanctuary for Families, The Urban Justice Center and Jewish Association of Services for

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING

the Aged or JASA. These four partner agencies also

provide smaller percentage of clients with actual legal

representation in immigration, Family Court and matrimonial

matters.

1.3

While advocacy services are important legal representation is a vital and necessary service for clients seeking economic justice and safety from abusive relationships and quite frankly the current legal services agencies have a great deal of difficulty meeting our center demands.

We have also seen the need for civil legal services for clients in my re-entry program which partners with the Counseling Services of the Eastern District of New York which is not patient drug treatment provider, the Doe Fund, a provider of transitional employment and housing, the New York State Division of Parole and numerous community based social service providers.

The re-entry program targets Brooklyn residents who are on parole and have been mandated to substance abuse treatment. Our re-entry initiative which has been validated by Professor Bruce Western of Harvard University has a successful cost effective crime reduction strategy, and by the way six out of ten of the formally incarcerated are without counseling, without help, are rearrested within three years and more than half go back to prison.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

According to Professor Western's study for our program it is closer to two, to two and a half. I believe we can knock it down one out of ten or maybe into fractions. But they are facing issues such as landlord/tenant, Family Court issues, child support payments, and obtaining public assistance benefits. In the past they were frequently given referrals to an attorney connected with the special re-entry initiatives sponsored by the City Bar. But that initiative lost funding in 2009 and of late referrals are made to the overworked Legal Aid Society's civil division.

The criminal justice system is extremely We all know that. The cost of housing a expensive. person in Rikers Island according to the IBO, Independent Budget Office, is now an astounding \$312 a day. providing free legal services to the indigent also carries a price tag the investment is certainly sound. in this light the Chief Judge initiatives to increase access to civil legal assistance State-wide through funding in the Judiciary's budget is not only the right thing to do in terms of fairness and access to justice, it can also have a very positive impact on services to assist the victims of crime and on services to assist the formally incarcerated and I commend you, Chief Judge, for this effort.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

2.5

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: And I am certainly available to provide additional information to help you in this effort to meet the unmet needs for civil legal

assistance. Again thank you very much for having me.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I thank you so much for your testimony, District Attorney, and I think the -- what is so interesting is there really is a very basic interconnection between providing civil legal services for the poor and the well-being of our society, particularly as reflected in crime and crime rates. I think we are feeding into by allowing particularly in these difficult times the --

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: Of course.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- feeding into --

DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: One of the problems is the frustration felt by someone who can't get help and they will turn to drugs or alcohol and then the next step is of course they will offend.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it is not only the crime but it is the bottom line for society and costs of everything that follows dealing with the legal issue and then almost going off the cliff whether it is crime or social services or all the things that as a society ultimately bears the cost. So, we salute you for all your efforts and not only in this particular area but recognizing the importance of

	SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
1	the community around, all of us, and that the criminal
2	justice system and civil justice system don't live in a
3	vacuum. We are part of the community and we recognize the
4	interconnection. So, we salute you for all your efforts
5	and thank you.
6	DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: Thanks Judge, and good
7	luck with this effort.
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. Appreciate
9	it.
10	DISTRICT ATTORNEY HYNES: Good to see you all.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: The next panel that we are going
12	to have is on domestic violence and that is Jane
13	Aoyama-Martin, executive director of the Women's Justice
14	Center at Pace Law School and Lois Schwaeber who is the
15	Director of the Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic
16	Violence.
17	MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Good morning, Judge.
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming.
19	MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Thank you very much for
20	hearing me today. I am the executive director of the Pace

Women's Justice Center of White Plains. We are located at

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And doing very good work.

primarily poor, working poor, women with children and

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN:

Thank you. Our clients are

21

22

23

24

25

the law school.

nam

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
victims and survivors of domestic violence and elder abuse.
95 percent of our clients are women with children.

What I would like to -- I have submitted my written testimony and what I would like to address today are really three points. The civil legal services in Westchester that is serving domestic violence survivors, the impact that the services have on our clients and the gaps in service.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: Before you do can I ask you a question about the law schools?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Sure.

1.3

2.0

2.5

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: It struck me. I heard statistics that said every law student on average comes out with the kind of debt load that they have to make \$66,000 to pay off their debt. Yet we have all these unemployed lawyers who can't find jobs. And we have a lot of people who need lawyers. We have been hearing three million of them in New York State.

Is there some way we can be working with a law school so we can put these law students who want to work who want to be able to help people in jobs that -- where they can still pay off this massive debt loan?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Yes. I mean it is a funding problem. I know with the current economic situation there are those -- the deferred associates I think that is a big

program that the City Bar has now. Our problem in

Westchester even though we applied for deferred associate
it is -- I don't know about the recent grants but they
don't seem to want to work in New York City. Westchester
is that -- I don't know, to New York City people,

Westchester is upstate. It is too far, and to people
upstate it is part of New York City. So, we are sort of

1.3

in that marginal area.

But what we do at the Women's Center is we rely heavily on volunteers and law students. The good thing about our program is that in fact in the domestic violence field we have training for students. They get three credits and we are -- we staff two offices directly in the courthouse, walk-in basis for emergency orders of protection in the Family Courts of White Plains and Yonkers.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What is the relationship? Explain to us. You know, the domestic violence area sort of crosses the boundary between the criminal and the civil in that a lot of it is in Family Court and where it goes into the criminal justice system is debatable. What is the relationship when we talk about the domestic violence area between again the criminal justice system and civil legal services?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Well, we work closely with the

nam

District Attorney's Office and, you know, the District Attorney's Office representing I guess the people of Westchester, you know, they prosecute the abusers criminally. But, that still leaves the civil side and domestic violence survivors they are not clients of the DA's offices. They are complainants.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is there any right to representation in domestic violence situations on the civil side?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Yes, under the Family Court Act an order of protection. Certain cases, order of protection cases, custody cases. But the problem we see with -- and, you know, the 18-B program is great but you could be in court on a return date or the second return date. That's when you get your 18-B attorney. But a lot of our work takes place before that stage and domestic violence survivors have myriad legal problems. It is not just --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, it is interconnected to their lives?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Absolutely. And what we do is when we -- and you know in some cases I mean early access to attorneys is in some ways preventive because what typically happens is say there is a call at 11:00 PM or in the evening before and the police come. They fill out a

-- they really direct the victim to go to Family Court.

They say go to Family Court. So, the next morning typically the woman is there. You know, we are able to see that person immediately on a walk-in basis. And we do a comprehensive intake because there are a myriad of problems. The protective order, part of it is the sort of the immediate emergency safety issue. But --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But it is all these issues surrounding it?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Custody, child support. If they are married there might be a matrimonial action. But the support and financial issue are really --

JUDGE PFAU: Has the lack of consistent funding and stability from year to year affected, you know, how you see your ability to support women who are in this situation?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: The lack of consistent funding is a big problem and that is hopefully as a result of the testimony at this task force there will be some permanent source of funding for civil legal services. It affects, you know, it affects our ability to plan. It affects -- right now we are sort of at really the absolute minimum in terms of operating the program efficiently. We have -- we can't take like another cut in funding without really affecting the program.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Have you been able to partner with any other providers?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Pardon?

2.0

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Have you been able to partner with any other providers?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: We absolutely partner with Legal Services of Hudson Valley. Legal Services of Hudson Valley -- me -- my center just focuses on domestic violence and elder abuse. But Legal Service of Hudson Valley is the largest sort of most comprehensive civil legal services provider. We partner with them because of all the different issues. They have more areas of expertise. We have a lot of cross referrals. We work very closely with them.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Thank you.

JUDGE PFAU: One of the things we heard particularly in the area of domestic violence is not just the availability of legal services for victims but the need for the expertise in the area and how the funding affects that, that it is not just something any lawyer is trained in. Can you just address that for a moment?

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Well, maybe it is because it is the field I am in but I do feel it is critically important to understand the dynamics of domestic violence. To give you an example. When someone walks into our

Family Court Legal Program, you know, sometimes getting an order of protection is not the safest thing for that person. So, we, you know, legal services that we provide there is the comprehensive -- we call it in-take interview where we discuss all the options. And, there are certain -- and not insignificant but certain number of clients who decide it is really not safe for them to file for protective order. So, they end up not filing.

But, you know, that's what that kind -- it is the kind of expertise that we can provide and true understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence that makes our services so critical.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think it is only in the last years that we have all had a better understanding of what domestic violence is all about and all of these --

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- and sub-issues that allow one to deal with, you know, with that scourge, really, of society.

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: In my materials I cite to a study that was done. And during the 1990s the incidents of domestic violence actually decreased and there was a direct tie. In fact one of the factors in the study that I cite is related to the provision of civil legal services. Although the study took place in the '90s I want to

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING emphasize though with the current economy and recession that is over I guess --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

2.5

MS. AOYAMA-MARTIN: -- there has been an 18 percent increase in domestic violence.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you so much. I am going to thank you for the good work that you do and ask Ms. Schwaeber to now speak. I would note that in terms of domestic violence Judge Leventhal one of the justices of this Court, the Appellate Division Second Department and former presiding Justice of the Domestic Violence Court here in Brooklyn is here. So, I am pleased you are with us.

Ms. Schwaeber.

MS. SCHWAEBER: Good morning, Judge Lippman, Judge Pfau, Judge Prudenti and President Younger. I also would like to thank you all for inviting me here. You have given me this opportunity for speaking to you --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming.

MS. SCHWAEBER: I would like to take one moment to especially thank Assemblywoman Weinstein for everything that she has done for civil legal services in the State of New York because it is critical to our programs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: She just left but I am going to tell her exactly what you said.

MS. SCHWAEBER: Okay, that's fine. Thank you is not so much to her personally but publicly to thank her for what she has done.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good. Go ahead.

MS. SCHWAEBER: I need to first correct my title.

I am not Executive Director of Nassau County Coalition for

Domestic Violence although I am introduced that way most

often. I am simply the Director of Legal Services for the

Agency. Having said that I would like to depart from my

testimony, my written testimony.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MS. SCHWAEBER: And talk to you from my heart because I really think, I am very passionate about domestic abuse. I came to law very late in life. At 53 I went to law school because I was a volunteer for my agency working as a volunteer court advocate helping victims of domestic violence. My agency has a program for walk-ins at Nassau County Family Court and has since the middle '80s. We are a private not-for-profit agency. We rely completely upon funding from any kind of government sources as well as donations and private foundations.

We had a small grant at that time to do this advocacy program and after working as a volunteer for about two and a half years I said if I really need to help, just want to help this population I need to go to law school

because they need attorneys who have the expertise as Judge
Pfau pointed out so amply a minute ago to work with them.

The ADV program is terrific but they meet with them at the courtroom for the first time. They don't know anything about them. They get two minutes to speak to them and then it is their attorney and they may do a very good job from there on, but they don't have the expertise or the information to pass them on to the many different kinds of referrals that they need, whether it be to Nassau Suffolk Law Services, for homeless, for child support, although they recently lost their funding for that and we are seeing a tremendous increase in people coming to us for child support because of that.

The population in Nassau county is reflected in the people that we see coming to us. It is not a particular population. It is everyone; rich, poor. Although, we see more and more unemployed people coming to us, or see women and they are 95 percent or better women whose spouses are unemployed, whose spouses have left them without any money and they have to beg for money.

This new legislation that has passed for the temporary maintenance I think will go a long way to helping our clients not be financially strangled during the pendency of the divorce. As a result of working with this population for years we felt that just doing orders of

	SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
1	protection and custody and visitation wasn't enough.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because it's interconnected to
3	other issues?
4	MS. SCHWAEBER: Yes. We recently not so
5	recently anymore. I guess it is three or four years ago,
6	expanded into the divorce area and are doing matrimonials.
7	Within the first year we had over 30 clients waiting on a
8	wait list to
9	JUDGE LIPPMAN: How are you funded?
10	MS. SCHWAEBER: Well, that's federally funded by
11	the legal assistance, the victims grant out of the office
12	of violence against women. That provides five attorneys
13	to us and with five attorneys I cannot keep up with the
14	case load for the family offenses, for the custody and
15	visitation.
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: What other funds do you get?
17	MS. SCHWAEBER: Well, we get a small civil legal
18	services line and our other funding is from private
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: From who is that civil legal
20	services?
21	MS. SCHWAEBER: Budget line in the New York State
22	budget.
23	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.
24	MS. SCHWAEBER: We have a small budget line.
25	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, it is like a member item line?

MS. SCHWAEBER: No, we have a civil legal services line. We also have always gotten over the last few years member items which we are not getting this year. As of January --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

2.5

MS. SCHWAEBER: As of January 1st we will not have that. That will not only impact our legal department but it will impact the ability of the agency to provide counseling for children who witness, counseling for victims of rape --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know what you are going to have one year to the next?

MS. SCHWAEBER: No, we never know what we are going to have one year to the next.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is that at the heart of the problem not having a stable source of --

MS. SCHWAEBER: There is no stable source of funding. The only stable source of funding has been federally but it's a two-year program and every two years you reapply.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And very --

MS. SCHWAEBER: And nationally competitive.

JUDGE PFAU: If you had a stable source of funding do you think that would translate into serving more clients?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHWAEBER: I can't really answer that question. Legal services right now is over capacity. Any one of my attorneys will tell you oh, my God, don't give me another case. We have recently gotten appropriations, congressionally funded appropriations to reach out to -- and try and get attorneys to work for us pro bono. And, one thing that the bad economy has done for us is that it has given us a lot of unemployed attorneys who have been admitted to the Bar the ability to work for So, we recently did a training two weeks ago on us. representing domestic violence victims in matrimonials. We had 26 attorneys attend. Will they all take clients? Probably not. But, at least we have given them not only the matrimonial law but the expertise or the information and impact of domestic violence on the cases.

But, abusers use the court system as a further means of abuse. They harass clients by constantly filing new petitions and violations. Being self represented is another way. How would you like to be a victim sitting there being cross examined by your abuser who is self-represented?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: The bottom line is that your domestic violence work doesn't exist in a vacuum?

MS. SCHWAEBER: Absolutely not.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That there are all kinds of

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING
services and victims' needs that relate to legal
representation of one kind or another that we would call
civil legal services and needs to be funded in order to let
people live a useful life and get back into society.

MS. SCHWAEBER: Absolutely.

1.3

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And continue forward?

MS. SCHWAEBER: Nassau County is thought of as a wealthy county. However, we have -- we see in my agency people from all walks of life. 30 to 70 percent of our cases are people that receive TANF funding. The self sufficiency -- the federal poverty levels makes one statement, but the self sufficiency level that you need to exist in Nassau county --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: No question.

MS. SCHWAEBER: -- is \$74,000 per family of three not for a family of four now when county executives really recently declared a health emergency because of the rate of increase of domestic abuse in Nassau County. Things are dire and it is excalating somewhat because of the economic situation.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know. Well, we appreciate your testimony, both of you, and certainly in a critical area that is so related to the topic of our hearing today. So thank you both.

(Hearing continues on next page.)

1	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Next we are going to have a
2	client panel, Alvin Thomas, William Schneider, Chakiera
3	Locust and Gail Greene, please come to the witness
4	stand.
5	Okay. Thank you all for coming. Don't be
6	intimidated by the courtroom or the red lights. All we
7	need you to do is just tell us your story as to, you
8	know, as clients of legal service providers.
9	I'll start with Alvin Thomas as a client of
10	legal services of the Hudson Valley and accompanied by
11	Trevor Eisenman.
12	Alvin, go ahead.
13	MR. THOMAS: Good morning, Judge.
14	My name is Alvin Thomas.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning.
16	MR. THOMAS: Good morning.
17	My name is Alvin Thomas.
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Tell us your story.
19	MR. THOMAS: Okay. My story is my name is
20	Alvin Thomas. I live in Mt. Vernon, Westchester County.
21	I served in the United States military from
22	1972 to 1979, when I was honorably discharged and
23	received a good conduct medal. After my discharge I was
24	admitted to the Medical Pavilion Hospital Center where I

went to psychiatric treatment for more than

25

1

one-and-a-half years.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Over the decade I do have many problems. had between 100 and maybe 150 hospitalizations. only recently that I have been able to put the pieces together in my life. I truly believe that if it was not for the representation that I had gotten from the legal services of Westchester County and Hudson Valley I would not have been ever able to do so.

First came the legal service situation with Hudson Valley. I had got an eviction. The paperwork was given to me at 5:30 in the evening, p.m. I was not in court that day. The court did not open that day. The attorney, Mr. Eisenman, who represented me from this had the papers in court and had made a complaint in the court the next day and the negotiations were successful in bringing me time to move.

Another situation that I ran into was over the next three years I was faced with relocating many a time, after which I used the services of Hudson Valley attorney services. Mr. Eisenman had represented me in court again, maintained stability in difficult situations. The legal firm has represented me.

I was in my apartment for about four months when the landlord sent me an eviction. I had already paid two months rent and the security down payment. And the first month I had significant income to pay my rent because of my veteran's benefits. The landlord would not work it out with me. Payment schedules with me was hard to get.

The Department of Social Services refused to give me a one shot deal, which was really, really not understanding to me and they showed no compassion to me as a person.

The legal services had got with me at the time to move me into a new apartment.

My new apartment --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We all have them, --

MR. THOMAS: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- for better or worse.

MR. THOMAS: I am sorry.

My new apartment, Social Services chose to give me money to get it, and I could not believe it. My legal services got me to move in and found me an apartment. The new apartment turned into a nightmare because I was only able to see that apartment during the morning hours from eleven, being early. After I moved in the building I was hanging out with prostitutes, drug dealers and gangsters, finding myself in another dark and hard situation while trying to maintain some type of standard lifestyle and renting. I was very frightened

to leave my apartment.

Again services came, they helped me.

They asked the people up in Mt. Vernon in the courts to hold onto the lease, which would give me a chance to find another apartment.

So the very next time I said I am not going to find any more apartments. I am going to deal with realtors. I went to the realtor, showed me an apartment, took my money, and gave me keys to an abandoned, unlivable apartment. I could not believe it. I withheld my rent.

Legal services assisted me in finding another and safer apartment. Legal services also represented me in the Small Claims Court with the dispute with the realtor where they were able to return -- get my precious money back. I live on a set income and it would have been very, very more devastating, make a longer homeless period of time if I didn't have these people to advocate for me.

My housing problems went on for more than two or three years. But by the time I knew it the court just recognized me with little sympathy up there when I was in front of him with these cases with hardly no compassion. Unfortunately, the workers from the VA only offered -- so here we go, my legal services offered me

the the stat stat as 1 medi

the most basic and in a difficult situation he always listened to me with the details of the situation and thank God he offered me encouragement, because I, as I stated, went through a lot of pain, maybe just as many as 150 hospitalizations, just as many with the different medications when I had got the right one to deal with it.

But basically it comes down to stability to put my life together. I had just recently gotten married, which I feel very good about, because if somebody had told me when I came home something like that was possible it wouldn't have mattered. But I fought back and I would not give up.

And basically why I am here is because I really feel that the money and the resources are needed or may be more increased. As you know, I am a man, soldier of arms, and veteran. These guys are going to be coming home. I would not like to see these gentlemen be misrepresented or pushed away or even locked up. It comes down to we have not had anyone that can represent us, and make our case, make our life, make our story heard.

I was very happy and very pleasurable when I was asked to come here to talk about the situation that affected me. If it wasn't for this attorney and legal

services I didn't know what was going to happen.

OODGE HITTPAN WHAT

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What would you have done

3 without legal services representation?

MR. THOMAS: I think I would have been in the street and I would have been homeless, and with my condition of paranoid schizophrenia, which has been uncontrolled for many years now, it was like a bad situation.

But not only that, also reached out, they called back and checked with me. They took interest in making sure that I was okay.

As I said, I went to the Veteran's

Administration. They had no resources other than I was getting. And what really shocked me was the DSS or the housing preservation that puts money out for social work, they wouldn't even look at me. They made me feel like come on, what's going on with this.

But the point I am saying, time after time but the calls at night, Thomas, how are you, how are you doing, that's what got me through to get me here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's fair to say as an ex-military guy, someone who served his country, really legal representation is what's allowed you to now live a useful life and to go about your business and not be, you know, a burden to society or who knows what would

1 have happened.

MR. THOMAS: Well, sir, I am going to say this and I know we have to move along.

Some of us guys come back so wounded we like a little saying, you have to put a whole bunch of little pieces together just to get a little piece to make a big person.

Like I say, I am so very happy now. I have a wife that I can sit across the table from and have lunch and dinner with. I never thought these things were possible. But with the encouragement they showed me I can do it and they reached out to me and actually made me feel like somebody. I am a taxpayer. I was refused --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are so glad you are here today and glad that you are here to tell your story and to demonstrate really the need for funding for civil legal services.

So thank you, so much.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, sir.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: William Schneider, a client of Nassau/Suffolk Legal Services -- Law Services, accompanied by Rose Caputo.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Mr. Schneider, glad to have

1 you here.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

As a preface I would like to state that the circumstances involve me and my wife and we had home ownership in one place for about 40 years and were able to maintain ourselves in the community, in the neighborhood. What happened is I got older, went on Social Security, could not obtain the level of employment I had previously, and we, we were having trouble paying the property taxes which went up at a very steep rate in recent years.

And as a second part there were issues between my wife and myself which made things much, much worse and brought it to the point of not knowing what to do, not being able to find a path that would allow us to solve these problems. It's quite possible, given the circumstances, if everything had been simple that we would have taken stock, sold the house, and moved to a place that would allow us to take care of our obligations.

I have here a prepared statement which I would like to bring before you because it explains some or most of the reasons for this kind of problem and it brings into the equation the role that Nassau/Suffolk Legal Services Senior Division played in helping us

overcome these difficulties, not without some serious consequences to the family, but they put us on the path where I couldn't find ways to deal with it previously.

If you don't mind I will read the statement.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Go ahead, sure.

MR. SCHNEIDER: My name is William Schneider.

I am 84 years old and I have lived most of my life on

Long Island, New York. I have an undergraduate degree

from SUNY Albany in math and science and a teaching

degree from Harvard Graduate School of Education.

I worked most of my working life as a mechanical draftsman and since the -- since about the 1950s. I married my wife Adele in 1953. We have two daughters, Linda and Catherine.

About 10 years ago, when I was 74 years old, I became employed as a consultant to help develop a marine collision avoidance system based on infrared radiation. This was for an engineer/designer/inventor who had some very unique and important ideas. Although the inventor had procured funding by raising capital for this endeavor, at some point we couldn't get any more funding or attract capital. Consequently, at about 190 -- 2003, after two or three years of advancing the job, we were unable to continue to the extent necessary.

My role was as a -- as a consultant, because

the company was small and couldn't have employees. So I was in that role.

Because the inventor who formed the corporation was a personal friend as well, he and I having worked a number of years, an association that went back about 20 years, there was great trust between us. And I volunteered my, my work after the corporation was no longer able to pay me for it. There are a couple of reasons of this; one, as I mentioned, we had a close association and trust. I was in -- as a Social Security recipient and at this point in my life I really wasn't able to get a regular job for myself. When I worked with him I worked out of my house because of various infirmities and whatever.

So, in addition to this project, of course, we had Social Security and between my wife and myself it probably was in the order of 20, 22 thousand dollars income. But, nevertheless, I continued working for reasons just mentioned, because there were goals, there were promises, I had trust, and it would have been a greater thing to complete it.

I continued on this direction for about three years or so after the ability to pay me directly had stopped. And at some point in that time I sought independent or other employment as a necessity because

of our personal circumstances. My wife and I were coming to the point of great difficulty.

I went on numerous job interviews, but despite my efforts I was unable to find another job. As a result, I was unable to meet household expenses and the increasing Nassau County property taxes.

My financial difficulties worsened as a result of a difficult relationship between my wife and I. It had been somewhat adversarial, perhaps independent of money, but money entered into it to an extent.

My wife was diagnosed with bipolar disorder in 2003. She was hospitalized for a short while. And she had previous indications of mental illness of maybe not such a serious nature before. And the important thing financially there is she was unable to distinguish the reality of our situation; one, that we could not maintain the home, pay the taxes, and keep up. And so the situation financially worsened.

And we -- I sought help, began seeking help from various county agencies, from the Nassau County Assessor regarding the property taxes. And because our names were both on the deed of the house one party could not make any kind of decision without the other.

By 2008 our property taxes had become increased to about \$11,000 a year. You measure that

against 20 to 22 thousand dollars on Social Security
income and it was an impossible situation.

I entered into credit card debt, which at the largest point got to be about a hundred thousand dollars. And although I was able to make payments and never missed a payment, the realization was that our circumstances were such that it was going to be impossible.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So what did you do, at what point did you come in contact with legal service providers?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, okay, in 2008 I met my lawyer, Rose Caputo, at Nassau/Suffolk Law Services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: In relation to this whole debt situation?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

I had contacted other agencies before, including Nassau County legislature, and one got sympathy maybe at certain times but nothing tangible.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: How did your lawyer help you?

Tell us in your own words, you don't have to continue reading, you can tell us what happened.

What happened, you were having a debt problem, you went to see legal services, how did she help you, tell us in your own words?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Can I please read it because it's a little --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You can, but we have a lot of witnesses waiting.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I will try to be quick.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure, go ahead.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I made her aware of the circumstances of the debt, and most importantly, told her about the property taxes. Consequently, a lien was placed on our home. If I were unable to pay the property taxes with interest within two years our home would go into foreclosure. The mortgage itself had been paid off in 1979.

Rose advised me to convince my wife, Adele, that we had to sell our house and/or get a reverse mortgage. I was unable to convince my wife to sell, or obtain a reverse mortgage.

Rose advised me of other options to resolve the situation. The first was we explored the possibility of a guardianship, a limited guardianship over my wife. That didn't need any more where after some study because it's just not the way the law works in New York State.

Consequently, the one that I had to go by was to file for divorce as really the only possible

solution, she and I both being deed holders.

here.

2 -

Several months after filing for divorce on my behalf my wife's behavior became increasingly erratic.

Sometime in December of 2008, after attending a church function, my wife left her car in the church parking lot and walked to a nearby hotel. Right in the hotel she told the staff that she was there to meet some rich relatives who were going to give her a lot of money.

Because her behavior was disruptive the hotel staff called the police. The police arrived, removed her from the premises and brought her back to the church, instead of taking her to the hospital or in custody. An officer then came to my house to notify me where my wife was.

We went back to the church and I drove her home. I attempted to obtain a police report and the police were uncooperative.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: How did your lawyer help you out of the situation?

That's really --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Right now this is the crux

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's what we want. Go ahead.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I informed Rose, who understood what -- that what had transpired might be

helpful in filing for a guardianship proceeding.

With my permission Rose called the police the next day, which allowed Social Services to come into the picture. Again with my permission Rose made a referral to the Nassau County Department of Mental Health.

Shortly after, on December 29, 2008, the Department of Mental Health team of social workers came to our house.

As a result, my wife was involuntarily admitted to this hospital in serious condition due to tachycardia, congestive heart failure and hypertension. In addition, the mental health crisis team immediately diagnosed my wife as suffering from dementia, a diagnosis that was confirmed when she was admitted.

Just one note, and not reading, and that is we had tried for a number of times to get, in other instances, to get the police to take my wife to the hospital for all I can say is testing to determine if she was mentally ill to the extent of needing --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But your lawyer helped you to get a guardianship of your wife?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We are right there and I should --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are going to have to -- we have a number of witnesses waiting, so all we really want to know, and we so appreciate you coming here, what

did the lawyer -- in the end how did she resolve your problems for you, your wife had a guardianship and what about your debt issues?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Rose helped me find an organization that could help me with the debt issue to the extent of getting a reduction and clearing up the debt that way.

There were many other things she did. She filed the timely withdrawal of the divorce action because we didn't need that anymore, and securing proper assessment and treatment of my wife.

In addition, Rose helped us secure Medicaid funding for my wife's nursing home care, helped me and my daughter gain more time for an appropriate nursing home for my wife after an early discharge order seemed to forgo that, attended to the guardianship hearings with me, drafted a will, healthcare proxy and power of attorney for me and transferred the title of my home to me to facilitate the sale of our house.

In addition, she took over the contract for the sale of the house from an unscrupulous real estate attorney, a closing attorney, prepared all the documents for the closing and attended the closing. She also tried to help me secure senior housing. And since I am in the position of working on the credit card debt

1	because of Rose and her referrals and instruction.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I gather that you are on your
3	way to putting your problems behind you
4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, we were able.
5	JUDGE LIPPMAN: thanks to the
6	representation by legal services.
7	MR. SCHNEIDER: So strong.
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I gather this is a probler
9	that had many different tentacles to it.
10	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
11	And there were no ways, we couldn't we
12	couldn't go to a private attorney. They wouldn't work
13	on, what do you call it, contingency.
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: We understand.
15	MR. SCHNEIDER: You know, why should they or
16	whatever.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a wonderful story and I
18	see how we see how legal services really allowed you
19	to have your life back.
20	MR. SCHNEIDER: We had nowhere else to go and
21	they found a path for us in many directions.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I see in a multitude of many,
23	many legal entanglements.
24	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, and even given my wife's
25	health, the fact that she was diagnosed with dementia,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

got nursing home -- good nursing home help, all of that that were things aside from direct financial that --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree and I think the moral of the story, and I don't mean to cut you short, but I think that the moral of the story is that it's not -you are an educated man and obviously have had a fine career and a home and that legal services is not just for people who never had a job or are uneducated or who, you know, have language problems or immigration problems. They are for normal people, good people, who work their lives and have some material things and there comes a point in life where there is no money and no ability to pull your life together on your own.

And we see how essential legal services can be to getting on with living and enjoying life and because of legal problems you can't, no matter how educated or sophisticated you are, you can't necessarily navigate the legal system.

So we thank you for your story and definitely can see how instrumental legal services are in terms of so many different people from all walks of life in our community. So, thank you. We appreciate it.

And now we go to Chakiera Locust, client of the Legal Aid Society of Rockland County, accompanied by Mary Ellen Natale.

Go ahead.

MS. LOCUST: Good afternoon.

My name is Chakiera Locust and I am pleased to tell you how the Legal Aid Society of Rockland County was there for me when I needed help.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Maybe you ought to bring the mike closer to you.

MS. LOCUST: Sorry.

Is this better?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good.

Go ahead.

MS. LOCUST: I live in Rockland County, New York, with my two children. My son Xavier is five and my daughter Kaylah is two.

I had been working as a telemarketer in -- I had been with my company for about three years, but in 2008 things started to fall apart. First, I lost my job when my business was closing. One day my boss came and told me to pack up my belongings and leave. I did so and then I applied for unemployment benefits. I told unemployment exactly what happened and I was denied when my boss said that I had quit, which was not true.

So I called the Legal Aid Society of Rockland County for help and that's when I met Mary Wallace, the advocate assigned to my case. She represented me at the

unemployment hearings. She fought for my rights. 1 2 finally awarded benefits in the spring of 2009. that wasn't before that ordeal had an effect on the rest 3 of my life.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You see, I had fallen behind in my rent payments due to the fact that I wasn't working while my unemployment case was going on. So my children and I lived in a private rental apartment, one of the few that we can afford. The Section 8 waiting list is closed, so we have very few affordable options. So it was very important that we were able to stay in our home.

My landlord brought an eviction proceeding against me in the Spring Valley Justice Court in May of 2009 and I contacted Legal Aid again. This time I was represented in court by Miss Mary Ellen Natale. negotiated up enough time for me to be able to pay off the back rent with the help of Social Services, and I was able to pay the ongoing rent now that I was receiving unemployment benefits thanks to Miss Wallace. So I felt that I was back on my feet and that everything would be okay from that point on. And I was wrong.

In November of 2009 I was served with yet another eviction petition and I had been paying my rent. But this time I was being sued by someone I had never met, a temporary receiver for my building. My landlord

was in foreclosure and a receiver had been appointed.

My landlord was supposed to be turning over my rent

payments to the receiver, but he didn't, and the

receiver thought that I didn't pay.

I didn't know any of this until I contacted my lawyer at Legal Aid again and she did some investigating to find out what was going on. Miss Natale represented me again in court and the eviction was dismissed. Plus the judge had told the receiver to find someone to manage the property as long as we were renting there.

I was thrilled that the eviction was dismissed but my problems still were not over. My furnace broke a couple of weeks after the proceeding and I called my landlord to fix it and he refused. I had contacted Legal Aid. Miss Natale put me in touch with the Health Department and contacted the receiver, and before the day was over we had heat again.

But my housing problems were still not resolved because in May my landlord filed an eviction proceeding against me. He claimed that I had not been paying my rent, when, in fact, I had been paying the court appointed receiver. So I contacted Legal Aid once more. Miss Natale represented me again. She contacted my landlord's attorney. The case was withdrawn without me having to go to court, which was really important to

me because I am now working, so I can't miss a day of work. And she also advised me of my legal rights against my landlord and told me that Legal Aid would help me if I wanted to pursue them.

But I am very hopeful that things will be looking up for me and my children. We are still in our apartment and it's a comfort to know that I have affordable housing at least, you know, for now.

In the past year I obtained my GED and am hoping that this will help to open doors for me. I am back at work. And I don't know what I would have done or what would have happened to us if Legal Aid hadn't fought for my unemployment benefits or prevented our eviction or helped me even with just heat in the winter.

I sat here and I listened to a woman that worked for the shelter and just listening to what she said, her client could have been me, and if they hadn't stepped in at the time that they stepped in, every time that they stepped in, I was one step away from being that lady's client.

So I just want to say that, you know, what they do, it really makes a difference in people's lives, and I have been, you know, someone she represented. So it's very important that we continue to have their services and I felt great to know that my rights are

1 protected and that I have someone to fight for me.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: The same as Mr. Thomas and Mr. Schneider, really, legal services helped you to pull your life together.

MS. LOCUST: Most definitely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And things are looking up?

MS. LOCUST: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Next is Gail Greene, client of the Legal Aid Society of New York City, accompanied by Sumani Lanka.

MS. GREENE: Good afternoon.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Hi.

MS. GREENE: My name is Gail Greene. I am currently a client of the Legal Aid Society. I am here today to share my experience with you, and in doing so I hope to convince you of the importance of continued funding for the Legal Aid Society and other civil legal services programs.

I currently reside in East Elmhurst, Queens, with my 25-year-old son and my 19-year-old disabled daughter. I have lived in my home for over 10 years. My home is extremely important to me because it is handicap-accessible for my daughter, who suffers from spina bifida, a birth defect that involves the incomplete development of the spinal cord.

My troubles started in 2007, when I was
looking to refinance my home. The mortgage broker,
Atlas Home Equities, promised me a fixed rate mortgage
of eight percent and mortgage payments of approximately
\$3,000 per month, including taxes and insurance.

Instead, I was tricked into taking out an adjustable
rate mortgage with a bank at an initial rate of
12 percent and mortgage payments starting at
approximately \$5,000, which included taxes but not
insurance, despite the fact the lender and broker knew
that I would be unable to afford to make such payments.

Inevitably, I ended up defaulting on my mortgage payments, and the bank instituted an 18 percent default interest rate on the loan. At that point I knew that I would never be able to catch up on my mortgage payments. Despite my attempts to work something out with the bank, I ended up in foreclosure.

When I first came to the Legal Aid Society for assistance I was in foreclosure proceedings. I was desperate to save my home, but I did not know my legal rights or even if I had any. My friend advised me to go to the Legal Aid Society, and I am so grateful that I did. I met with a foreclosure prevention attorney, who reviewed my case, patiently answered questions, and explained all of my legal rights.

The Legal Aid Society agreed to represent me in the foreclosure action. The Legal Aid Society submitted defenses on my behalf and as a result of their representation the bank decided on its own to dismiss the foreclosure action against me. Without Legal Aid's direct representation, assistance, and advocacy I have no doubt that my family and I would have already lost our home.

The Legal Aid Society later informed me that many homeowners have similar stories to me, that they were also deceived into taking out high interest adjustable rate loans with banks. However, due to the lack of resources, many of those homeowners would not be able to get much needed legal representation.

The Legal Aid Society is now representing me in an affirmative litigation case against this bank and Atlas Home Equities in the Eastern District of New York, in the hopes that the rights of other homeowners may be protected.

I am extremely lucky to have a Legal Aid
Society attorney represent me because otherwise I would
not have a home and my daughter would be at a huge
disadvantage. I feel that the Legal Aid Society
provided me with the support and knowledge to fight back
against an injustice that was done to me. All I wanted

was the opportunity to save my home and thanks to the
Legal Aid Society I believe that I am being given that
chance. However, I know that there are many other
individuals out there, not just homeowners, that need
access to legal resources in order to protect their
rights.

The Legal Aid Society is an extremely important resource for New Yorkers who would otherwise lack the ability of obtaining representation or legal assistance in a variety of civil litigation issues. I am here today in support of continued and increased funding to civil legal services in New York.

Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Your story is certainly not untypical, particularly today with the economy the way it is. And again, another example of, I think, the value in people's everyday lives, that being able to function in our society in having representation.

So I thank you, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Schneider, Miss Locust and Miss Greene for your testimony, it's greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, guys.

Have a nice day.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Now a judges' panel, Judge

Honorable Kathie E. Davidson, Honorable Eleanora
Ofshtein, and Honorable Norman St. George.

Well, we have turned the table on the three of you, now you have to look at the red lights.

Anyway, so delighted to see all of you.

Judge Davidson, you want to start.

JUDGE DAVIDSON: Good morning -- I mean good afternoon, Judge Lippman, Judge Pfau, Justice Prudenti, and President Younger.

I did prepare a speech. I will probably go between the both of them.

Thank you for this opportunity to discuss the importance and the necessity of civil legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming.

JUDGE DAVIDSON: As the Supervising Judge for the 9th JD, Family Court, and also presiding over the neglect and abuse part, I can't imagine being able to even function without the assistance of civil legal services.

As you are aware, the forum for many of the legal matters are those where families and children come before the Family Court. Family courts can provide such a forum only if there is justice accessible to the citizen and in the case of the Family Court usually that's provided by our 18B panel or in fact, by the

civil legal services.

Generally, most of our litigants are low income or indigent and as they come before the court, the cases of the proceedings of the family offense petitions, neglect/abuse cases, custody, visitation, juvenile delinquency, and PINS petition.

Generally most of the litigants, once they come into court are, in fact, assigned counsel.

Otherwise they may come before the court through the justice center which ultimately will refer the case to the Hudson Valley Legal Services.

Interestingly enough, I just had a case this week where there was a case where the parents were separated, divorced, and the subject child lived in Virginia with her mother or with cousins and family and she was on her visit up here in Westchester for the summer with the father, a teenager. During that time she disclosed to her father that she had been sexually abused by the husband of her cousin whom she was living with. He was actually a sex offender and that was, in fact, documented.

As a result of that, her father, who was basically illiterate, tried to come to Family Court, was unaware of the process, and in fact, was unable to gain access. As a result he went to the Hudson Valley Legal

Services, they filed an Order To Show Cause on his behalf and the matter was brought before me.

jurisdiction.

As we researched we found that this case was a case originally before Judge Cooney and, in fact, that she had an action on that matter. Clearly I signed the Order To Show Cause and obtained the emergency

As we reviewed the file it was clear to us that because there was a previous proceeding regarding this matter and we were back and forth between Virginia, he had assigned counsel, but as stated from the previous testimony, because of his inability, even though we have probation who assists in filing petitions, because he was illiterate, can't read or write, he couldn't even get into the door. So without the assistance of legal services of the Hudson Valley who knows what may have happened, in fact, with this young girl, who, in fact, did disclose, our Department of Social Services went out, indicated the case and, in fact, the case is before me now. Just some of the interconnection between the legal services on these emergency applications, especially with the litigants that we face.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: This is really what you face everyday.

JUDGE DAVIDSON: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Each one of these cases has

all these other tentacles, interconnections, as you call

them, that requires legal help and legal representation.

JUDGE DAVIDSON: Absolutely. Every single stage.

As I sat and listened to all the litigants, at some point that was some litigant before me or in my days of representing clients were clients before me.

When I pooled my court attorneys and the other staff that I talked with just to say what would they like me to tell you, our support magistrates really wanted to tell you that generally they are not allowed to, not allowed, but usually it's as discretionally and they allow assigned counsel. And now with the dire situation with the economic crisis, the highest -- one of the highest numbers of filings come in the support cases.

In addition, most of my complaint letters are now with the support matters. And generally the complaint is not that one doesn't want to pay what they have, but because the economic circumstances.

Westchester County has the highest paying taxes in the nation.

So the support magistrates are so frustrated because when we talked about it they say I know that

-TMcG-

1	there is testimony or evidence that can deviate from the
2	support guidelines. However, we can't elicit the
3	testimony. We can't jump in. So either they get
4	inadequate orders, the petitions are dismissed, lack of
5	evidence. And likewise on the other side, when the
6	litigants know, when the parents or the custodial
7	parents know that there is income out there but they are
8	unable to document it.
9	So in those cases I ask them, in light of the
10	economy, when they can and if they can, to assign
11	counsel. And then we do have an up and thriving pro
12	bono committee in the 9th JD, we assign counsel.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's really a combination
14	of all different things.
15	JUDGE DAVIDSON: Absolutely.
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Obviously, the providers, pro
17	bono assistance.
18	JUDGE DAVIDSON: Right.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Whatever we can do with
20	helping them in the courts,
21	JUDGE DAVIDSON: Exactly.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: it's all part of this
23	picture.
24	JUDGE DAVIDSON: Exactly, exactly.
	II

And especially when we have a family petition

and the litigants come before us, many of them are just unaware of the process. So a judge is required in five minutes or less to explain the constitutional concept of notice, opportunity to be heard, where many of us had to take a whole course on understanding.

So within the system itself, and I will just sum up, especially in Family Court, it doesn't really just begin when you come to the -- when you get into the court. It really starts with the clerk's office, because they are unfamiliar with how to file the petitions. There are unfamiliar language barriers that I haven't even begun to discuss and I won't discuss now. There are litigants who are non-speaking -- are non-English speaking litigants, and the culture issues.

So all I can say --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Which is a whole other area.

JUDGE DAVIDSON: Absolutely.

So, I will nip this in the bud. To make a long story short, clearly, without access to civil legal services, the 18B Panel, Attorney/Children Panel, all of which I have served on, Family Court would just come to a grinding halt.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: Are there particular kinds of cases in your court that aren't getting assigned counsel that would benefit from it?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE DAVIDSON: Clearly in the support matters, in those matters.

And I would also like to say sort of the middle class, middle class is suffering from cases. So, for instance, maybe they can't afford a divorce but they will come into Family Court and get everything else. they get custody, visitation, but they don't fit into that area where they quite qualify for assigned counsel. You know, maybe you will get the attorney for the subject child who ultimately ends up being the power broker to have the deal. You know, clearly that's a section that -- and obviously we again try to get pro bono.

But those two areas I say is a big gap, the support matters and also those on the custody matters and the modification of your divorce proceedings that come into Family Court because we are easier to access and quicker to get to us and you will get a court date quicker.

> Thank you, Judge Davidson. JUDGE LIPPMAN:

Judge Ofshtein, you have an area very graphic in terms of the need for civil legal services, the Housing Court. Tell us a little bit about how legal services affects or hurts if you don't have it.

> JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Thank you, and good

∥ after

afternoon.

I have been very lucky to wear three hats in the Housing Court. At first as a practitioner in a small landlord/tenant firm. Mostly we represented landlords, a few tenants. Then as a court attorney in the Housing Court for nine years in Manhattan. And then now recently as a judge in the Housing Court.

What we are seeing, and through all three of those hats what you are seeing is what you have seen in this prior panel. You have seen the ex-vet, the elderly person going through debt, the woman dealing with eviction notices. You see all these people every single day times 70 cases.

You have people coming in unrepresented, vast majority unrepresented. You have, as a practitioner, a few minutes to speak to them and you have a complete conflict of interest because you have to represent your client in the best way that you can, at the same time you have a person in front of you who has no idea what you are talking about.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, you know it's very interesting that you say that. We had representatives of the landlord bar who are saying how destructive it is to them, too, to have people who are, you know, not represented. There are rent stabilization associations.

SECOND DEPT. CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES HEARING 104
We had representatives of the industry as a whole just
saying that the last thing they want is to come into
court
JUDGE OFSHTEIN: And that is true
JUDGE LIPPMAN: and see tenants without
representation.
JUDGE OFSHTEIN: across the board.
How do you in five minutes that you have to
talk to these people, before you run and do your other
10 cases, explain jurisdiction, laches and various
others, and are you allowed to explain that, isn't that
legal advice, where a person is standing there asking
you questions.
JUDGE LIPPMAN: And as the judge it really

eally is -- you are not supposed to be an advocate, yet what do you do.

JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Well, you can rubber stamp everything, that's about it. Otherwise you are going to answer questions and you are going to ask questions and you are going to open up Pandora's boxes that you don't want to open up.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it really compromises our system of justice certainly in the Housing Court.

> JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Absolutely.

And as a court attorney the same thing. There

is a lot of tensions that it causes and it causes

tensions, it makes the court look inefficient. There is

that appearance of impropriety.

All of these things across the board for every

All of these things across the board for every person, walk of life, not just your poor person who is on public assistance, you are talking about an incredible increase in the working poor. People are trying to get to work, they can't come back to court every five minutes. You are talking about middle class people.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: The working poor is very much a product of this.

JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Absolutely.

And as the judge stated, we are not even talking about the issues of cultural background, language background. You have to get through all that to find out the story.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

Anything else?

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: Let me just ask you, you said the vast majority of the litigants on the tenants' side are unrepresented.

I assume most of the landlords are represented --

JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Most -- sorry.

PRESIDENT YOUNGER: -- and I have heard from one legal services provider here in Brooklyn that when they have lawyers, when the lawyers show up and they get assigned, that then 90 percent of those cases get worked out.

What is it about bringing the lawyer into the equation with this in this dynamic that helps that to get worked out and leaves the person in their apartment as opposed to getting evicted?

JUDGE OFSHTEIN: So many things. You are talking about an attorney having already spoken to their client, best case scenario, has gone through all these issues, whether it's cultural, language, finding out the strategical issues in that person's case, coming to talk to a second person and being able to just cut through all those things that take time, time we don't have.

You have people trying to explain their life stories, their frustrations, their anger. How do you get through all that to ask them when are they going to pay their rent, or what are the issues about repairs. Or what about timidity, imagine your elderly grandmother coming into court, an immigrant, and barely speaking English, and trying to explain to that person do you have issues, what are your issues. They may not be able to get them out unless you ask questions. And at some

point your questions are going to lead you to legal 1 2 advice and they have consequences. 3 So when two attorneys meet they know those things already. You don't have to go through law school 4 101 to explain those issues. They already know them. 5 And they are able to negotiate on a level playing field, 6 7 they are able to discuss the true issues of what's 8 happening in that case. 9 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think what you are 10 demonstrating is the whole system breaks down --11 JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Absolutely. 12 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- without legal 13 representation for the poor, working poor, all the 14 others who really can't defend themselves. 15 JUDGE OFSHTEIN: And it affects the way the court is viewed as well. 16 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: No question. 18 Thank you, Judge, appreciate it. 19 Judge St. George. 20 JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Good afternoon, Chief Judge 21 Lippman, Chief Administrative Judge Pfau, Presiding 22 Justice Prudenti and President Younger. 23

My name is Norman St. George. I currently serve as the presiding judge over the Integrated

Domestic Violence Court for Nassau County, hearing a

24

combination of cases related to Family Court issues and divorce cases.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So really you structurally are dealing with the relationship between the need for civil legal services and the criminal, --

JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- the different issues involved, very much a part of your everyday.

JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Yes.

And I have sat through a number of their prior panels and all of the testimony comes to play in my court everyday. So I am well familiar with the effect that a reduction of legal civil services will have on our legal system.

It's my opinion, and it's the sad, unavoidable truth that litigants who appear in court without an attorney obtain an inferior result than those who appear in court with an attorney. I think that's a fact we understand. We accept that principle in criminal cases and therefore we make sure that indigent defendants are represented in criminal matters.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What do you think conceptually, I know this is a hard question, but certainly one of the premises you know of these hearings and really what we are trying to do is that there is an

analogous right, in quotation marks, that people have to
a lawyer when they can't afford one and you are dealing
with things that go to the very necessities of life and
certainly in your part people are dealing with the
well-being of their families, their personal safety, do
you view it from a judge's perspective as people have
that right to representation?

JUDGE ST. GEORGE: I believe that they do have the right to representation because you are dealing with as severe an issue as you would be dealing with in Criminal Court.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's on a parallel track to when you are dealing with someone's liberty.

JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because here you can certainly lose certainly the equivalent of your liberty.

JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Absolutely.

Dealing with custody and visitation issues, it goes to the essence of our families and a lot of the Family Court petitions involve violations of court orders of protection which carry with it jail time and we have a screening system that we use. And I have sat in Family Court for a year where we ask if someone has a home, and if they have a home they do not qualify for an 18B attorney.

Unfortunately, with the down turn of the economy, many people may have a home but are either in foreclosure or upside down in their mortgage and do not have money. So at that moment they are prevented from an 18B attorney. They could look to civil legal services if it's available. If those monies are cut then that is not available for them.

The judge mentioned something that's interesting; the inequity starts at the filing process, appearing in the clerk's office and not knowing how to draft a complaint, how not to draft a family offense petition. I have family offense petitions that allege incidents that occur in the future and obviously those have to be dismissed. I have violations, allegations of a violation of a court order of protection which happen after, actually before a judge signed the court order.

So these little problems in the accusatory instruments or the filing of the complaints and petitions have great devastating impact on families and it also increases the case load where these people, it's my view, obviously, if they consulted with attorneys you would have a better quality of accusatory instrument in the beginning and you wouldn't waste time many months getting to a point where it would have to be dismissed at trial based on a technicality, which is unfortunate

for the system, but more unfortunate for the families and the litigants and especially victims of domestic violence. And there is no way around that.

Obviously, as a neutral magistrate we cannot prompt people, we cannot assist them in their litigation.

After the filing process one of the inequities is that unrepresented litigants cannot subpoena witnesses. Many times they are unfamiliar with the process. They cannot sign off on a subpoena like an attorney can. So a lot of times their entire case relies upon their testimony which is normally unedited and is usually just a flow of consciousness.

Another inequity comes when one side is represented by an attorney and the other side isn't. I had a case two weeks ago where an attorney made an objection and the unrepresented litigant stopped her testimony, don't know if she was embarrassed, don't know if she was confused, and sat down. And I asked her a number of times would you like to continue and discuss some of the issues pertinent in this case. She said no. And then that case was over.

So just those little procedures that an unrepresented litigant does not know in the court realm leads to inequities and it goes back to not having

1	representation, and it's at every point of the
2	litigation process from beginning to end.
3	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And, of course, before the
4	litigation at all.
5	JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Absolutely, before the
6	litigation at all.
7	So it's my belief that a further reduction
8	would have a detrimental effect on our legal system and
9	those who come before us in civil cases.
10	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Any other questions?
11	We thank the judicial panel.
12	JUDGE ST. GEORGE: Thank you.
13	JUDGE DAVIDSON: Thank you.
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: You have a unique perspective
15	a bird's eye perspective, I think, on the need for
16	additional funding for civil legal service.
17	Thank you.
18	JUDGE OFSHTEIN: Thank you.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I appreciate it.
20	Our final witness for today, our clean up
21	hitter, so to speak, is Judge Fern Fisher, who has done
22	such a fabulous job statewide in promoting access to
23	justice in this department and the other three
24	departments around the state and I think also has a

unique perspective on the need for stable funding for

25

civil legal services.

_

So, Judge Fisher, it's a delight to see you.

JUDGE FISHER: Good afternoon, Chief.

Good afternoon, Justice Prudenti, Judge Pfau and President Younger.

Initially I want to acknowledge the hard work of Helaine Barnett, Marsha Levy and all the task force members who contributed to insuring that many voices have been heard at the four hearings across the state on this most important issue of stable and adequate funding for civil legal services.

Today I would like to add the voice of the New York State Courts Access to Justice Program and my own voice as a Deputy Chief Administrative Judge of the New York City Courts to the harmonious inquiry. I may echo a lot of what you have already heard, but I think I do have some new information for you.

The primary mission of the Access to Justice

Program is to insure equal access to justice to everyone

who has a case in one of our courts or a legal problem

outside of our courts' jurisdiction. Our number one

goal is finding long term solutions to chronic lack of

civil legal assistance for people of low income and

modest means in New York, including and foremost finding

a permanent public funding stream for civil legal

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

services.

At a time when many in this country are expressing discontent with government it is essential the third branch of government, the judiciary, address the inherit inequity that individuals experience when they must deal with life effecting legal issues without access to civil legal assistance.

The most compelling voices that we have heard at all of the hearings are the clients whose lives would have been dramatically impacted had they not been fortunate enough to obtain legal assistance. extremely proud to be part of a court system led by a chief judge who understands the human consequences of injustice.

Our court statistics support that New Yorkers are in crisis. The crisis is reflected by the volume of cases filed that affect everyday people's lives. cases, matrimonials, consumer credit, foreclosures and landlord/tenant cases comprise 70 percent of our civil filings. Growing foreclosure filings from 2005 to 2009 illustrate the increased pressures the economic down turn, that down turn has caused for individuals.

The statistics are very grim. In Kings County filings have increased 300 percent. In Nassau County, the wealthy county supposedly, the increases have been

_

419 percent in filing. In Suffolk the increase was 375 percent. In Queens 370 percent.

This year foreclosures continue to increase. In Queens this year approximately 5,000 conferences have been held with 3,000 owners represented, meaning 2,000 were not represented.

Since legislation was enacted requiring preliminary conferences in foreclosures there have been over 75,000 conferences in the Second Department alone and the numbers are growing throughout the state. For example, in Orange County there were 129 conferences in February of 2010, last month there were 750.

In the Civil Court of the City of New York in 2009 241,594 consumer credit cases were filed. The inability to pay debt starts the spiraling down of people's lives leading them to other legal problems, such as evictions and foreclosures. Economic pressures are affecting families. Judges and clerks see more angry, crying, desperate, hopeless litigants.

Family Court statistics are staggering; last year 742,365 Family Court filings. We are seeing more people of all incomes faced with potentially life altering legal problems.

In a recent survey of our judges face -- excuse me. In a recent survey of our judges, 42 percent

of our judges indicated that there have been an increase of chronic low income unrepresented litigants in the courtrooms, 67 percent indicated there have been an increase of unrepresented litigants who have recently become low income due to the economic down turn, and 53 percent of the judges reporting indicated that there has been an increase in unrepresented litigants of moderate income.

The human consequences of the outcomes of these cases have been amply established by the oral and written testimonies of clients and legal services providers.

It should be noted that the Access to Justice Program staff uses the term unrepresented litigants and not self-represented litigants. The latter term seems to indicate that individuals who appear without attorneys have elected not to be represented and not that they have no access to one. It is a misconception that litigants choose to be pro se. The overwhelming majority have no choice.

The numbers of unrepresented litigants in the courts are tremendous. In Family Court in the City of New York 93 percent of both petitioners and respondents in child support cases are completely unrepresented.

Another four to five percent had counsel for a part of

the case. So, effectively, 97 to 98 percent of individuals dealing with child support issues in New York City do so without benefit of counsel. Overall, approximately 74 percent of all litigants in Family Court are unrepresented.

In 2009 in New York City consumer debt cases -- in the consumer debt cases approximately one percent of consumer defendants had counsel, while a hundred percent of plaintiffs had counsel. A five-day survey of all of our counties in New York show that in Richmond County not one defendant had an attorney. In New York County a small number of litigants were represented by the Volunteer Lawyer for the Day Program, which is cosponsored by NIKLER, but no other defendants had counsel.

The numbers in landlord/tenant are similar.

In outside of the City of New York about 98 percent of tenants do not have counsel. Inside the City of New York about 90 percent appear without counsel.

It should be noted that there is a growing number of lower income small owners who appear without an attorney. Owners are now frequent users of our help centers. Outside the City of New York about 30 percent of owners were facing foreclosures and other problems are unrepresented by counsel.

The economic crisis had very long tentacles.

There are many unlikely individuals affected by the economic crisis.

The consequences of unrepresented litigants appearing in our courts are many. The negative effects of unrepresented litigants on the efficiency of the court operations has been supported by the testimony of trial judges. I wish, however, to focus more on the indicia that unrepresented litigants have difficulty obtaining equal justice.

A recent survey of judges indicated the following; 63 percent of judges responding felt it was difficult to ascertain facts, as evidence is not properly presented; 73 percent indicated unrepresented litigants failed to present necessary evidence; 64 percent felt that there was ineffective witness examination; and 67 percent felt there were ineffective arguments; 70 percent felt there was confusion over issues; and 84 percent felt that there was lack of knowledge about the law.

Well, nationally the role of a judge in an unrepresented litigant case is slowly evolving to be a neutral but engaged figure. Neutrality is central to judging. Many judges feel it stretches neutrality when they attempt to be engaged in a case involving

unrepresented litigants. When a judge is unengaged a litigant without a lawyer will have great difficulty. Judges are grappling with where the line should be drawn and they are stressed by the difficult decisions they must make.

The court System also understands that the legal problems that individuals struggle with in our courts are only a partial reflection of the legal problems experienced by individuals who have no access to civil legal services. Problems individuals have with administrative agencies or private entities prior to litigation requires lawyers.

Our judges are flooded with cases such as landlord/tenant cases which would not have ripened into litigation if government benefits, unemployment insurance, wages and immigration issues were resolved by lawyers. For example, numerous cases in the New York City Housing part would completely disappear if individuals had adequate access to lawyers to resolve financial issues that fuel nonpayment housing cases.

The court system, owners and tenants all benefit when underlying legal issues are resolved by attorneys without the need to file housing papers. The court system would see far less cases in other substantive areas of law if lawyers were available

pre-litigation to assist individuals.

Civil legal services attorneys are necessary also to insure that rights are achieved that are intended and guaranteed by our state legislature in housing foreclosure and family and other areas.

You have references to pro bono efforts to assist unrepresented litigants and self-help measures. We are very pleased with the progress of court sponsored volunteer programs, such as the Volunteer Lawyer for the Day Program. However, these programs address only limited types of uncomplicated cases and reach a small percentage of the total needs of litigants. We have learned that pro bono attorneys are excellent sources in limited types of cases. The more complicated cases with multiple legal issues require attorneys who are both experienced and knowledged and have the time to devote to such cases.

Civil legal services attorneys are uniquely able to address the full range of legal problems experienced by their clients. In the Second Department pro bono attorneys from local bar associations, such as the Nassau County Bar, Suffolk County Bar, Queens County Bar, Brooklyn Bar Association, Richmond County Bar have devoted numerous pro bono hours to foreclosure cases.

Bar Associations and other pro bono attorneys must be

applauded for their efforts.

Even with the surge of pro bono efforts in foreclosure and the assistance of legal services providers, 44 percent of homeowners in foreclosures still remain unrepresented. In other areas in need, such as unemployment, immigration, housing, consumer, divorce and family there are far fewer pro bono attorneys.

In some areas in the state, particularly rural areas, the private bar is insufficient to meet the ever growing need.

While we must continue to encourage attorneys to serve, we cannot rely on pro bono services to stem this crisis, nor can we rely on self-help measures. The help self -- help centers operated by the courts provide some basic relief to unrepresented litigants, but staff there can only provide legal information. In some courthouses the need is so great we are forced to turn litigants away. In most counties there are no help centers or the help center is able only to provide assistance in certain types of cases.

The do-it-yourself computer programs that we have developed provide legal information and they help litigants fill out forms. But a computer cannot give legal advice, nor can it calm the fears of an individual

facing crisis.

Pro bono and self-help measures, while necessary and helpful, cannot insure equal access to justice. Civil legal service attorneys alone are able to shoulder the majority of the need, they must do the heavy lifting.

Obtaining a stable state funding stream in New York State for civil legal services should be our first priority. Legal services programs should not be forced to guess each year if they will continue to remain open.

We must, as a state, accept that there is a price to pay when individuals are denied equal access to justice in civil cases. The price includes the cost of cleaning up the results of cases where people could not access assistance. But most important, those denied justice lose faith in our system of government.

In figuring out what the dollar amount should be, if you allow me, Chief Judge, using the Chief Judge's words, we must put together the pieces of the puzzle. We must fit together the civil legal services needs of the public combined with setting priorities and with exploring all models of delivery of legal services via legal services providers. We must fit in maximizing the use of pro bono attorneys and self-help measures where it's appropriate. And we must insure that all

civil legal services are delivered efficiently and effectively.

In closing, I quote from the last speech of
Hubert Humphrey in 1977, the moral test to government is
how that government treats those who are in the dawn of
life, the children; those who are in the twilight of
life, the elderly; those who are in the shadows of life,
the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Our justice system must meet the moral test of providing equal access to justice which can only be achieved through stable and adequate civil legal services funding. Our citizens and residents who face loss of healthcare, home, child or United States residency, who are unable to protect their incomes or who are trapped in untenable violent marriages are in danger -- excuse me, are as in danger of being in prison in their lives as Mr. Gideon was in jeopardy of being put in prison. The time is now to embrace the spirit of Gideon in the civil arena and move forward toward a more perfect world.

Thank you, Chief Judge, for your efforts in this regard.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Judge Fisher.

Your passionate and compelling testimony, I think, sums up very well what we are dealing with here

and the breath of it and the comprehensive nature of really this problem and the approach we are going to have to take to it. And I do very much agree with this idea that this is a puzzle and we have to find, I think, the core part of that puzzle certainly is the people who are on the line everyday providing civil legal services to the poor and the indigent and the working poor and those fighting the battle each and everyday in this city and this state.

I think that what these hearings really demonstrate is the breath of the problem. Think about all the things we have heard today and all the things we have heard at the other hearings, that everything from divorce to domestic violence, to housing, to education, to job employment, to the health of our businesses, to crime, to the effect on crime, to the elderly, to poverty here in New York City and in the rural parts of our state, immigration, language problems, the disabled, minorities. It really impacts not only on the most vulnerable in our society, the lack of meaningful civil legal services, or not only impacts on those who, again, are the poorest, those who need help, who need a helping hand, but on the well-being of our communities, our society, our economy, our state government.

The strength of New York as a beacon for this

country is so deeply affected and impacted by the lack of sufficient legal representation for the poor. And as Judge Fisher just laid out, some of the numbers in this city and around the state in terms of the cases in our courts, which are only a part of the problem, because so much of this has to be done before there is a court case or to avoid a court case or just as matters of basic human decency.

So I thank everybody who has testified at these four hearings; the clients who are so important to this equation, the judges who, again, have a bird's eye view of what it's all about, and all the different constituent parts of our state, whether it be the business community, the health people, the education communities, each and every part of it, domestic violence people who may have made that a lifetime goal to eliminate that scourge in our society, our Family Courts, our Housing Courts, all of it.

I think this issue of legal representation for the poor impacts every part of our society and I thank the panel today for overseeing this hearing.

I thank all of the people who have made their life's work to correct this inequity and help those who can't help themselves, Judge Fisher for all your wonderful efforts around the state.

-TMcG-

We, this is just the beginning, we have got our work cut out for us. And Helaine Barnett, the chair of our task force, is working day and night preparing with her group, preparing a report that will digest what happened at these hearings and the surveys we have done around the state and all the information that we gathered. And rest assured that every witness' prepared testimony will be a part of the report, as well as the transcript of the remarks here that you made at the hearings.

And I do believe, and I kid Helaine about it, but I do believe that the report that we will put out will be the most comprehensive and informative report that's ever been done in this country about the unmet need of civil legal services.

And I emphasize again that I do think that there is a moral and an ethical obligation here.

Certainly as a judiciary and a profession we absolutely are committed to providing equal justice for all and that we cannot do that without addressing this problem.

But I would emphasize again that this is not just about doing good deeds. This is about the well-being of a society, the bottom line of our society, the well-being of our communities around this state. I don't think as an ethical, moral society or as a State

of New York, a City of New York it's going to thrive in these difficult economic times, that we can be who we are supposed to be, be the Empire State, without addressing this fundamental issue of justice, of morality and of well-being for our state, absolutely expanding access to justice and increasing many, many fold the funding for civil legal services in a stable, consistent way that doesn't depend upon the vagaries of whether the stock market is up or whether the economy is good on any given day.

> So I thank you all, I appreciate it. all in this together and we go forward.

> > So thank you so much.