SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
-- SECOND DEPARTMENT --

-----x

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS

ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES,

----X

New York State Judicial Institute 84 North Broadway White Plains, New York 10603 October 16, 2015

BEFORE:

HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN,
Chief Judge, New York Court of Appeals

HONORABLE LAWRENCE MARKS,
Chief Administrative Judge

HONORABLE RANDALL T. ENG,
Presiding Justice, Second Department

CLAIRE GUTEKUNST,

New York State Bar President-Elect

CAMI L. LANDAU Official Court Reporter HONORABLE LIPPMAN: Good morning. Good morning. We're going to get started. Everyone please find their seats.

2.1

2.3

I want to thank you all for being here. This is the fourth and final legal services hearing for this year. We have had hearings in the First Department in Manhattan, the Third Department in Albany, and in the Fourth Department in Syracuse. And the purpose of these hearings is to insure that New York is doing everything that they can to close the justice gap that exists in our state and in the country between the finite legal resources that are available, and the desperate need for legal services for the poor in, again, our state and in the country.

There is a justice gap. There is a crisis in access to justice, and we want to make sure that we do everything we can so that people don't fall off the cliff in difficult economic times because of a lack of legal representation. These are people who are fighting for the necessities of life, the roof over their heads, their physical safety, their livelihoods, and the well-being of their families.

We recognize that equal justice is central to the constitutional mission of the judiciary, and we have tried to use these hearings to make a public record of the need for the public funding for legal services and the need for

more pro bono work by the bar.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

We're very proud that New York, we've been able to obtain \$85 million this year from the Legislature and the Executive to give out in grants to legal service providers, but that's the tip of the iceberg in terms of the need. is, by far, the most in the country in terms of public funding, but certainly the need is so great, where legal service providers are still turning away more people than they can help in terms of providing legal assistance. the height of the fiscal crisis, providers were turning away as many as eight out of ten people who came to see them. we know that the best investment that the state can make is in legal services for the poor. We had an economic report just this year in the New York area that indicated that for every dollar invested in legal services for the poor, \$10.00 is returned to the state in terms of decreased social service costs, incarceration cost, and more federal dollars coming to New York.

In New York, we've not only looked to public funding, but we've looked to pro bono work, and that includes lawyers of Meritus programs, that concentrates on the baby boomers that are winding down their practices and trying to get them to do more pro bono work, the Empire State Counsel Program that the State Bar has been so terrific in implementing. The new lawyers, you know that

2.3

they're now required to do 50 hours of pro bono work before they can be admitted to the bar, with the bottom line being that if an aspiring lawyer is not going to embrace the core values of our profession, then they are not going to be lawyers in New York. And those core values obviously are, first and foremost, helping people in serving others. And we also have the Pro Bono Scholars Program that lets aspiring lawyers take the bar exam in February of the last year, and in return, they give the last term of the legal career over to pro bono work.

So I think there is a revolution in access to justice taking place in our state and in our country. We are re-prioritizing what's important in recognizing that legal services for the poor is as important as schools and hospitals and housing and all the other things we hold dear in our society. We're working towards the point we hope where in the resolution by the State Legislature this year that basically says that everyone who's in need should be able to get legal representation or effective legal assistance, and that is now, pursuant to that resolution, the public policy of our state.

So, we're going to get forward with the hearing.

The end result of the hearing is, we will make a Permanent

Commission on Access to Justice shared by Helaine Barnett,

who's sitting right over there.

2.

1 4

2.3

Helaine, you want to raise your hand?

Helaine is the former Chair of the Legal Services Corporation in Washington, and has done a wonderful job.

The Commission will do a report on December 1, which will coordinate with the introduction of our budget, and it will provide a basis upon which we will seek additional funding this year for legal services for the poor.

I want to also mention the other people from the Commission who are here today, in addition to Helaine.

Barbara Finkelstein, who has done such great work in putting together this hearing here in the Second Department, as she always does. Fern Fisher, the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge, who is right up there, from New York City, and the Director of Access to Justice Program. Adriene Holder is right over there, from the Legal Aid Society. Denise Kronstadt, from The Fund for Modern Courts. Marcia Levy, who is -- Marcia -- there she is. Lillian Moy, a Third Department person, but we've let her come over here to the Second Department. And Ron Rasmussen, who is also in the legal services community, and is also on the Board.

So, we thank all the Board members for being here, the Commission members for being here.

I also want to introduce to you the panel who is here presiding over this hearing with me. To my right, the

2.3

Presiding Justice of the Second Department, the Honorable Randall Eng. Randy. To my far right, the President Elect of the State Bar, Claire Gutekunst. And to my immediate left, our wonderful Chief Administrative Judge, Lawrence K. Marks. Together, we will preside over this hearing representing, in a real sense, the leadership of the profession in the Judiciary here at this hearing.

So we're going to start today with a relatively crisp schedule. The hearing starts, it started at 10:00. We will end it at 12:00. We have some terrific witnesses. I would ask the witnesses, they can either read their testimony if they want to, or they can just, you know, that testimony will go in the record, so they can either tell us the testimony just informally, or they can read it; whatever is better for them. We will, either during the testimony, occasionally interrupt them with questions, or certainly at the end of the testimony, certainly we'll have a few questions.

We'll try and stay on schedule. We don't have the red lights here, Mr. District Attorney. Don't get worried, there's no red lights, although we did use the red lights in Albany at our last hearing, and as Lillian will account, the only ones who we didn't hold to the red lights were the clergy, who answer to a higher calling than the red lights that we have. So, we let them give their testimony.

So, again, all great folks, all our witnesses, and
I'm very pleased to introduce as our first witness, the
Honorable Thomas P. Zugibe, the District Attorney of
Rockland County. We're honored by your presence,
Mr. District Attorney, and the floor is yours.

MR. ZUGIBE: Thank you. Good morning, Chief Judge Lippman and members of this distinguished panel.

Can you hear me okay?

2.1

2.3

HON. LIPPMAN: Yes, we can.

MR. ZUGIBE: I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to appear this morning to speak to you about the importance of civil legal services and the critical need for counsel for those less fortunate than ourselves. I am the District Attorney of Rockland County. Rockland has a population of approximately 320,000 people and combines suburban, urban and rural geography with an economically, racially and ethnically diverse population of residents.

I understand that this is the last in a series of hearings on the need for access to lawyers in civil cases.

I want to personally thank the Chief Judge for his efforts in increasing funding for civil legal services, providing keen focus and awareness of the desperate need for civil legal service programs, and for addressing the need for civil counsel in many cases before the courts, whether it be privately retained, government provided or volunteered. I

arenas in our state, and that funding civil legal services

know that other District Attorneys have testified during

prior hearings, and I echo their calls that there is more to

be done to increase the opportunities for counsel in civil

2.1

2.3

is important to law enforcement and a civil society.

The continued need for more resources for civil legal services and the need for counsel in civil cases extends from the single mother who has been forcibly evicted from her home, without due process of law, in a local city or justice court, to the domestic violence victim who cannot imagine leaving an abusive spouse, because, quote, "I can't afford to leave," to the family that must sue in Supreme Court to obtain the benefits that they deserve because one governmental office or another has unjustifiably denied the benefits. Access to competent advocates who will speak for the poor to obtain the help that they deserve and desperately need remains an important mandate for our state.

The Chief Judge has invited District Attorneys to these hearings to ask what we believe is the importance of civil legal services. The unfortunate reality is, as District Attorneys, we cannot do much to provide counsel in civil cases. Our jurisdiction limits our responses in this arena. We can, however, and do, vigorously enforce the criminal laws in many areas where the civil and criminal lines actually intersect. Because of this intersection, we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

understand the impact and the importance of all funding and civil legal services and fostering partnerships and collaborations to create programs and opportunities to provide support for the needs of legal services and their clients.

For example, soon after I took office, I was approached by the Legal Aid Society and apprised of an While most residential landlords appeared ongoing problem. to be law abiding, some landlords were engaging in self-help by forcibly and unlawfully evicting tenants without the due process the law affords them. In many of these cases, landlords were taking advantage of our most vulnerable residents, including the elderly and domestic violence victims. Now, Section 235 of the Real Property Law makes it a criminal offense for a landlord to willfully withhold necessary services such as utilities or to lock out a tenant without a warrant of eviction, but the law was rarely Through the intervention of my office, we were enforced. able a protect these victims from further victimization. Without the vigilance of civil legal service providers in our community, the information needed to properly prosecute these cases might not have ever been reported.

Another example concerns victims of domestic violence. As every member of this panel is well aware, the biggest obstacle that prevents the effective prosecution of

domestic violence cases is the unwillingness, or more appropriately, in most cases, the inability of victims to cooperate in the process. And we know that this inability is not the product of unwillingness, it's the product of the cycle of violence and control that defines this scourge.

In addition to vigorously developing evidence-based cases that minimize and often eliminate the prosecution's reliance on the victim's cooperation, my office has begun a pilot program that amounts to a victim support network, to support them through what in many cases is the most difficult time in their lives. Our Special Victim Center, built through the generosity of local businesses and donated union and private labor, provides a safe environment for these victims. Their in-home visits with victims, specially trained detectives and my special victims prosecutors meet with these vulnerable victims to provide the support they need to follow through on their complaints. The preliminary results of this pilot program are very encouraging, demonstrating thus far a significant increase in the number of victims who are able to follow through with their cases.

Yet, the problem of access to counsel persists in these and other vulnerable populations. There is no doubt in my mind that in the above example, an attorney's presence, legal expertise and guiding hand would most certainly increase successful outcomes. In fact, we are

2.3

working now with one of Rockland County's Family Court

Judges to recreate the concept of our Special Victims

Center, with its concomitant support structures, in the

Family Court setting. This will allow civil victims the

same access to counseling and attorneys that we currently

provide to criminal victims. These and other very admirable

pilot programs statewide demonstrate how a holistic approach

of the problem of access to counsel and support services

leads to better outcomes for many people in New York.

But there is more that can be done. Having read portions of prior testimony before this Commission, I'm aware of Chief Judge Lippman's concerns regarding potential right to counsel in civil cases. And I am pleased to see the Legislature, because of the Judiciary's advocacy, has adopted a resolution declaring that the fair administration of justice obligates the state to insure that all New York residents have adequate and effective legal representation for matters pertaining to the essentials of life.

Now, your Honor has mentioned Gideon versus

Wainright, a United States Supreme Court case that

guaranteed, for the first time, the right to counsel in

criminal cases. There is no such right in civil cases. In

fact, the Supreme Court has stated as recently as 2011 that

the Fourteenth Amendment's due process right to counsel only

is implicated in civil cases where there is a possibility of

incarceration as a remedy. New York has also recognized that at least some civil cases require counsel. For example, the Second Department has found that a person facing a hearing pursuant to the Sex Offender Registration Act, known as SORA, has the right to effective counsel at that proceeding.

There is one other consideration that uniquely falls within the purview of the Legislature and the courts. Courts in New York have never shied away from applying more broadly the protection embodied in the New York Constitution. In fact, the Court has consistently ruled, in both criminal and the appropriate civil cases, that the Due Process Clause embodied in New York's Constitution provide greater protections than its counterpart in the United States Constitution. Perhaps the time has come for the Courts and the Legislature to closely examine the need for quaranteed counsel in areas that have not before been known to require such representation. At a minimum, I would advocate for such counsel in domestic violence cases that have a civil component to them, such as concomitant child support or divorce proceedings. This would result in significantly better outcome in both the civil and criminal cases, and, most importantly, lead to better outcomes for the victims and the abusers alike.

The United States Constitution sets forth the basic

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

laws and rules that guide our society in order to, as the Preamble states, "form a more perfect union." That Preamble also announces to the world that the Constitution was devised to "insure domestic tranquility." While these three words most certainly do not allude to the scourge of domestic violence in this country, they could.

Another founding document strongly reflects the work of the Permanent Commission on Access to Justice and the purpose of these hearings. The Declaration of Independence states that it is self-evident that all people are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. language and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the New York State Constitution combine to provide an umbrella of safety over the people who make up the United States of America and live in the great State of The application of these great principles has New York. resulted in a country and state that embodies the freedom of our country. Throughout the two-and-a-half centuries of our existence, we have established and expanded the rights of our residents for the better. I know that going forward we will continue to advocate for our most vulnerable citizens. I am proud to be part of a system in the greatest state and greatest country our world has ever known. Supporting civil legal services, the right to counsel, and providing poor

people with legal assistance is a critical part of how we continue to make sure the words of the founding documents remain alive and continue to apply to our present society and the reality of the day to day lives of the people of our

I thank you very much.

2.3

State.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you, District Attorney Zugibe. We really appreciate your interest in legal services for the poor, and your action, and I know you're being honored by Legal Services in Rockland County, and it's not every day that District Attorneys get honored by legal services.

MR. ZUGIBE: And I am proud of that, Judge.

HON. LIPPMAN: We're very proud of you that that's the case.

Let me ask you just a couple of short questions. You know, this idea of a civil Gideon, that Gideon versus Wainright, obviously the seminal case in the United States on criminal representation, and people talk of a civil Gideon. Is that feasible? Is that possible? As you indicate, the United States Supreme Court has very recently indicated that that's not the case, but as you know, 20 years before Gideon versus Wainright, the United States Supreme Court indicated there is no right to representation in criminal cases. And during those 20 years, the dialog in America changed, and the public started to get it, that when someone's liberty is at stake, it's so important. Do you

think it's conceivable that in a civil case, there could be just as much of an impact on a human being by what happens in a civil case than with a criminal case, which has the loss of liberty itself? Can you analogize the two?

MR. ZUGIBE: The right to counsel enunciated in Gideon was based on the fact that this is possible deprivation of your liberty. It's a very severe penalty, but our experience has been, especially dealing with not just criminal defendants, but victims, the far greater implication to their lives happen in the civil sphere and not in the criminal sphere. Oftentimes the criminal side of it, where they have the right to counsel, is minimal compared to the trauma that's inflicted on these individuals during the civil process, where the rights are not protected, and they wind up with results that affect them for their entire life, as opposed to the criminal case, which is oftentimes very short lived.

So I believe that the Constitution, it would be constitutionally supported. I think most D.A.'s that I speak to would be certainly in favor of that and recognize that the criminal side is not always the penalty you think it is. The civil side is really where the damage is done.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. District Attorney. I knew the answer, but I knew you did too.

MR. ZUGIBE: Glad I got it right.

HON. LIPPMAN: The impact of a civil case on housing, the roof over your head, your family, the trauma that can come, can be every bit as severe as the loss of liberty, and that's why there's this ongoing movement in the United States.

MR. ZUGIBE: But it's especially true with regard to victims of crimes. We hold their hand through the criminal proceeding, but then they're left high and dry on the civil side of it.

HON. LIPPMAN: And you're exactly right. Jumping off from that point, you know, you mentioned domestic violence victims, and I think another area where you mix the civil and the criminal, at least by impact of what's happening with the criminal case, we recently had last week a summit in New York on human trafficking, and there's another area where I think so-called defendants, you know, are really victims, and need help in terms of so many civil issues dealing with their very lives themselves, you know, having a helping hand to get out of a life which is of abuse and victimization. Do you think human trafficking is one of those areas that cuts across the lines of criminal/civil?

MR. ZUGIBE: It is. It took awhile for law enforcement to truly understand the effect of human trafficking. You have a person labeled as a defendant, when in fact, in a percentage of cases, they truly are victims.

2.1

2.3

But how do you get there, how do you establish that? And we do fortunately today have our detectives, our special victims detectives are trained to be able to meet with the victim. They are not their attorney representing them, but they're meeting them to assess are they a victim or are they an offender. Unfortunately, because of that same control and combination and cycle of violence, we have these victims that we are convinced that are victims, are not defendants, but refuse to cooperate, go into court and immediately plead guilty to avoid even any influence on them because they're more concerned about the people who have imprisoned them as traffickers than they are the criminal justice system. So many of them will, despite the fact they're victims, refuse our assistance and go in anyway.

So, yes, I think having available counsel for them too, counsel is provided to them in most cases, but it's provided by the johns, by the traffickers, and they send them in with a single purpose in mind when they meet with them.

HON. LIPPMAN: What's clear from the conference we had just a short while ago is that the science tells us today that prostitution is not a profession of choice, and that trafficking comes whether it's around the world or around the corner here in Westchester, Rockland, or, you know, across the ocean. It's the same issue.

2

_

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

1112

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

2.3

24

25

MR. ZUGIBE: It's far more prevalent in the sleeping bedroom communities than people would ever imagine.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you.

Presiding Justice Eng?

HON. ENG: Thank you very much, Chief Lippman.

The Chief Judge has given me a wonderful seque into something I had on my mind, and that is, Rockland probably has a dearth of multifamily housing. I would think that most of your residential landlords are probably owners of two and three-family houses. That's probably the situation, I would think. I learned of situations where you have, you have landlords that have been victimized by tenants, in that the landlords themselves might be elderly, they might have heavy financial commitments. They're landlords nonetheless, but they've had abusive tenants, and then the landlords may have a lack of access to civil legal services because they're the landlord in that sense, oh, you have a home that's worth three, four, \$500,000.00, don't qualify. wonder if you've run into that, where you've had a situation that's sort of turned on its head there. What relief can these marginal landlords have in those kinds of situations?

MR. ZUGIBE: I happen to have seen it first hand, not as a D.A., but I served for 18 years as Village Justice up in Haverstraw, New York. Landlord/tenant was a big part of it, and a good percentage -- I'm glad you mentioned

2.3

that -- a good percentage of the cases was that, where the landlord was being physically or economically abused, and oftentimes, the tenant would be represented and the landlord not. And oftentimes, they'd be seeking, the landlord would be put into a situation where the judge was imposing a stay for three, six months where they -- but the landlord has a mortgage to pay, was in tough financial straights, could not afford his bills. Yet, courts were imposing, at the request of counsel, a stay, allowing, basically, the tenant to stay there rent free, further victimizing the landlord. And it was a problem we saw all the time.

I agree with you. I think you have to look at each case differently. We've had many cases with tenants where landlords are just, as I mentioned, been involved with self-help. They've just thrown all the property out in the street, locked the doors, which is a crime, and the police departments wouldn't act on it.

So, yes, we've seen both. I think we have to be open-minded to it. If a landlord is being abused, yes, they should have the right to counsel as well.

HON. MARKS: One question. Mr. Zugibe, given that crime victims can also have civil legal problems that, in fact, may arise from the fact that they've been victimized by crime, clearly, you recognize that and you should be commended for that. Has the statewide District Attorneys

Proceedings 1 Association actively supported efforts to get, in Albany and 2 elsewhere, to get more money for civil legal services? MR. ZUGIBE: You know, I don't believe it's ever 3 been an issue presented to the D.A. for support. Just 4 5 talking to them anecdotally, I know all D.A.'s I know have 6 stepped forward and tried to provide that within their own 7 jurisdictions. It's certainly something the D.A.'s would I'm not aware of whether or not they've actually 8 9 taken a public position on that. HON. LIPPMAN: I think it's a great issue, and 10 11 maybe we'll talk to the leadership and see what we can do. 12 MR. ZUGIBE: I'm the President Elect of the 13 Association. 14 We knew that. HON. LIPPMAN: 15 16

That's a great idea. It's very powerful, you know, and I think the law enforcement comes forth just as it is. I know you're equally supportive with indigent criminal defendants on the criminal side of the equation. It's very powerful when D.A.'s come and say we need a level playing field, and it's so important, so I think that in civil issue, I think that's really a great idea. So, we will talk more.

MR. ZUGIBE: Look forward to it. Thank you. HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. District Attorney.

Such a delight and pleasure --

2.3

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

24

25

1 MR. ZUGIBE: Thank you very much. I'm honored. 2 HON. LIPPMAN: To have you with us. Thank you. Our next panel is a Corporate Leaders Panel. And 3 I'm going to ask Edward J. Sebold, Shawn A. Miles and David 4 5 Yawman to come down and sit at the front, and we'll have a 6 chat about legal services in the corporate community. 7 Now, I have the same suggestions for all of you. Vanessa, you are going to replace Shawn? 8 9 MS. WATSON: Yes. 10 HON. LIPPMAN: Okay, you can read the testimonies 11 or just talk to us about the, you know, your individual 12 commitment in the context of the corporate community, and 13 don't be upset if we interrupt you and start asking 14 questions. We don't want to interrupt the District Attorney. Careful not to do that. 15 16 So we're going to start with Edward J. Sebold, 17 Esquire, the Vice-President and Assistant General Counsel of 18 I.B.M. 19 And let me start by saying, Mr. Sebold, what's the 20 connection? It's counterintuitive. Why does the corporate 21 community care about legal services for the poor? 22 MR. SEBOLD: Absolutely, your Honor, and I'm happy 2.3 to answer that. I think for several different reasons, and 24 I can speak from my own experience in that regard. 25 I'm, even though I'm in-house now, I'm what I call

1 a recovering trial lawyer --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

HON. LIPPMAN: I've heard there are a lot of those people around.

MR. SEBOLD: Exactly. So for many, many years, I represented a number of the major companies in the United States in their litigation, touching on banking, health care, real estate, what we would call the essentials of life. And I can say that some of my toughest cases were actually cases involving pro se plaintiffs. Plaintiffs who are unrepresented in court. And when I say tough, I don't necessarily mean on the merits; and I can assure my paying clients out there that I didn't lose any to pro se But I think in a way we all lost in those plaintiffs. situations. Everyone in the system lost when you have a pro se plaintiff. It's not good for the clients, it's not good for the court system, and it's certainly not good for these folks who are unrepresented in court, because they often have unrealistic expectations about the legal system and about the merits of their case. And so it's actually more difficult to resolve those types of cases. For --

HON. LIPPMAN: Do you find it wastes everybody's time because you're trying to do the right thing and yet someone isn't trained to?

MR. SEBOLD: Absolutely, your Honor. Not just our time, but the court system's time, because, you know, the

2.3

court system has to bend over backwards in many ways to make sure that the pro se plaintiffs are having their day in court and those types of things, so it's incredibly wasteful for everyone. And as you said, from the corporate perspective, it's obviously wasteful because our lawyers are back and forth in the court system. You don't get a speedy resolution and those type of things. So, certainly from that standpoint alone, we're interested in that issue.

HON. LIPPMAN: And do you think that in the long run, and I know you do, but that's a rhetorical question, but that everyone benefits when there is legal representation for those in need because, again, they get their day in court, and yet, society benefits because there's a level playing field? Whatever issues there are, are able to be resolved by a neutral arbiter, so the Judge is not acting as, really, in effect, acting as a lawyer for somebody that needs a lawyer? Does it work for everybody?

MR. SEBOLD: I think you're absolutely right, your Honor. It goes back, really, to the rule of law and the respect for the rule of law, I would say. In part, that's what sets the United States apart, and one of the things that I've seen in my practice now, having more international exposure, is the tremendous respect for the rule of law in our country. And that's really a cornerstone of our capitalist economy too, and that's why it's important.

1 HON. LIPPMAN: But that's a really good point. 2 does a place like I.B.M., one of the seminal corporations in the United States, why does it place, when you talk about 3 the communities -- and look, people in the corporate world, 4 5 they want people to buy their product. Whatever it is, why 6 would it be important to I.B.M. that people in the community 7 are not falling off the cliff in difficult economic times? How does it help I.B.M., putting aside the ethical and moral 8 9 commitment that so many of our big corporations have to do 10 the right thing? Why is it good from a bottom line 11 perspective of a huge enterprise like I.B.M. for people not 12 to, again, just have their life totally sidetracked and go 13 off a cliff, literally, you know, because they can't get 14 legal representation?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. SEBOLD: Absolutely. It's important for several different reasons. One is this respect for the rule of law situation that we were talking about. But it's also particularly important for our clients as well. And that's why at first I struggled a little bit, because oftentimes we don't directly provide government services, obviously, for banking or things like that, but our clients are certainly right out there doing that. For example, our computers help the bankers make their mortgages, for example. The mortgage system, we talk about foreclosures and things like that.

The banks can't process the loans, the mortgages, the things

2.3

like that if you can't get through the court system, if both sides aren't adequately represented, let's say, in a foreclosure proceeding. So there is a situation where the essentials of life are implicated, and so it's dramatically important, not only for us, but for our customers to make sure that there's this equal access to justice.

You could look at it in the healthcare arena, government benefits, where we provide computer systems for many of the major welfare benefit programs. But if people are denied those benefits, you can have the best computer system in the world, but if the benefits are denied because there is not adequate representation, the system breaks down. So those --

HON. LIPPMAN: Can people buy your product if they, you know, they're on the street, and they don't have money to put in the bank, and they can't go to the local store, and they can't go to the local community, whatever is happening? If they're not meaningful members of the community, they can't be helpful to your bottom line; can they?

MR. SEBOLD: That's certainly true. We don't always sell directly to our customers. Let's say, you know, our customers that provide food and essential products like that. So, in turn then, our customers can't buy from us. And we're getting more and more into certain areas. For

1 health care, you may have seen some of the commercials on 2 That's an area where, the health care system, where we want to help with cancer and those types of things, and if 3 the end users and their customers can't buy, then, you know, 5 everyone is harmed in society. HON. LIPPMAN: And I want to commend all 6 7 corporations like yours that don't really need to do this, but understand the connection between, again, the right 8 9 thing, what helps the economy, the bottom line. All of it fits together. 10 11 Let's talk to the second person on the panel. 12 Vanessa, you're representing Shawn Miles? 13 MS. WATSON: Yes. 14 HON. LIPPMAN: Executive Vice-President and Associate General Counsel of Global Public Policy for 15 Mastercard Worldwide. 16 17 And Vanessa, you're the Senior Managing Counsel of Mastercard Worldwide. 18 19 In the same vein that I asked Mr. Sebold, what 20 possible connection does Mastercard have to civil legal 2.1 services? Why is this important? 22 MS. WATSON: Well, your Honor, I feel like as 2.3 attorneys, our responsibilities follow us regardless of 24 whether we're inhouse or at a law firm. So we have a

commitment corporate-wide to Mastercard to giving back, and

25

1 to corporate social responsibility.

MS. WATSON: It's good for the corporation?

MS. WATSON: It's good for the corporation because if we are able to help those who are in need, for the same reasons that you've just stated, to provide them with services that, with legal services that can help them in that critical stage in their life, then they're the ones who will be able to utilize all the services that are being provided by the corporation. That's the bottom line. If there are indigent folks and more people aren't able to meet the basic needs that they need in order to function in our society, we won't have corporations.

HON. LIPPMAN: How does Mastercard meet that particular commitment to legal services for the poor?

MS. WATSON: Well, Mastercard is committed to financial inclusion, for example, and so we educate youth and others about the importance of using credit cards responsibly and understanding how to get out of debt, as an example, and in doing so, you know, folks are able to utilize our services in more responsible ways. So it's important to educate as well as to --

HON. LIPPMAN: What about your employees? What happens when they have legal problems? How do they get it? Do they utilize the services of legal services' entity?

MS. WATSON: I'm not sure of everyone's

2.1

2.3

circumstances, but there could be people who are in need of services as well that could utilize those services, so it goes beyond the community at large, but also employees of Mastercard itself.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you.

2.3

We have David Yawman, Senior Vice President and General Counsel of PepsiCo North America and Quaker Foods North America.

MR. YAWMAN: Well, I would tell you that Pepsico admits its global scale and all the money that we make around the world, we do it one transaction, one consumer, day in and day out. If you look at Pepsico, if you look at every man on the street and how they're doing in the economy, and I think we represent or recognize that there is essentially a symbiotic relationship between our corporation and the broader society, and we operate very clearly under a concept of performance with purpose, and performance is the idea that we can do good from a business perspective with purpose, which is by doing good --

HON. LIPPMAN: So you're also on two levels; the commitment of Pepsico is, one, because obviously you want people to buy your product, and if they can't defend themselves in issues relating to the basics of life, it doesn't help to sell soda or anything else, all the

different products that you sell. And then the commitment
of the corporate community to what you -- and how do you

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

3

need it?

Well, our relationship is even more MR. YAWMAN: I would take it from not just a consumer lens, but also a customer lens, and also our employees, to your prior question to Vanessa. From a consumer lens, exactly. people don't have the wherewithal to spend the buck to get a water or a Tropicana juice, Pepsi or Gatorade or what have you, it hurts our business. But ultimately, we operate at a very local level. Our warehouses are in virtually every community. Our trucks drive through every town. Our products are on every shelf. So we need the consumer population ultimately to provide us a source of employees. We need a healthy access to talent in those markets that speaks to a broader need for a healthy society. Once we get folks that we bring into our fold, a lot of the employees that we have work long, work hard, they operate the trucks, they work in the warehouses. They're front-line employees. A lot of them are hourly employees. Faced with a legal matter, as much as they work hard and earn a living, they don't have unlimited resources. And when they have a civil legal matter that is complex, it's intimidating, it's They're hourly employees; they take time off overwhelming. from work to deal with it. That ultimately impacts how much

2.3

money they're bringing home to their home and families. It can affect their livelihood. For us, on days they have to take off, often unexpectedly, we have to find labor at cost to us, so it hurts our productivity. There's a consumer element to it, there's an employee element to it.

HON. LIPPMAN: So it all kind of plays together.

MR. YAWMAN: Also our customers. A lot of our customers are mom and pop shops, delis, convenient stores, often sole proprietorships. They have landlord-tenant issues. Sometimes they're the landlord, sometimes they're the tenant, but oftentimes these places live or fail based on the efforts of a single individual. And if those individuals are burdened by some legal matter, if they don't have the means to hire an attorney, it damages their business. That can shut down their business in some cases, and that leaves an empty store front, one less customer for Pepsico, and certainly the damaging impact on the individual.

HON. LIPPMAN: This is a terrific panel. People don't understand the significance of the corporate world in this area, and I really think your support is very, very helpful, because what we found in New York is that when we go for an issue like legal services for the poor and just have our hands out and say, you know what? It's right thing and it's the moral thing, and people need help, the answer

we get is, well, we have a lot of competing interests in our state and in our cities and in our communities. Everyone needs help; get in line. When you make the argument that we are committed to the right thing, but also, we want you to understand that the well-being of our economy, and our state, and our society is helped by doing legal services, supporting legal services for the poor, we get a much more, what should I say, full responsiveness, recognizing it's not just -- and believe me, it should be enough that it's the right thing and that's what we should be doing, but the help of, particularly, the business community has been instrumental to our being able to get really very generous public funding. Not as much as we need, but certainly to get public funding.

Any questions?

Presiding Justice Eng.

HON. ENG: Yes, thank you. I've noticed something that I've seen in records and briefs and in my own experience, and that is, a forum selection clause in consumer relationships. Some contain mandatory arbitration. Is that good for the consuming public? Is it better for the corporation? Does that have an impact on access to justice?

I can't have stumped you all.

MR. SEBOLD: I can take that one first, I guess.

Again, ours are traditionally more in larger client

2.1

Z 4

2.3

relationships, so it might not be exactly apples to apples, but I think in some ways, the informality of an arbitration process can actually benefit folks, because you don't need as much representation. At least theoretically, it's supposed to go a little quicker, and those types of things, so I actually think there are some benefits along those lines that you do get perhaps a quicker, maybe more informal access and process and things like that.

HON. ENG: But is it fair? That's just it. I'm just looking, from the point of view of a consumer, particularly a marginal consumer, is this really a fair process or not if they're mandated to participate in it?

MR. SEBOLD: Well, I guess, you know, as we're looking at the alternatives though, if you're not getting the access and it's challenging to get into the court system and it's intimidating to go to the courthouse and those types of things, I actually think potentially the arbitration process or a more informal type of process could give, could give access along those lines.

HON. ENG: And regarding forum selection, it always seems to me to be forum non-convenience, like there's a certain theme park in Florida somewhere, and you have an issue with them, you have to go to, you know, the central district of Florida. Have you any insights into that?

MR. SEBOLD: I don't on that particular --

other larger companies, so I may have to defer on that.

HON. ENG: I'm not picking on you. The record should not reflect that I'm picking on you.

MR. SEBOLD: No, no, I appreciate that because that's usually not our situation. Usually we're selling to

don't know if anyone else has a view.

2.3

MR. YAWMAN: We also don't sell direct to consumers but just as a comment, I would say that I think any team would rather play home than on the road. I think, faced with the decision as to, do I want to win, I think anybody with resources would want to play in a venue where resources matter and give you an advantage. In that context, if you're fighting a pro se plaintiff and you're a corporation and you're on your own turf, do I think that's fair? I think there's an imbalance in who's got a right or a chance to win. If you're to put some odds on those cases to perhaps a prior comment about the record against pro se plaintiffs, I think that's probably reflective of some element of —

HON. LIPPMAN: It's a very interesting issue. We could go for days on it.

There have been some commentary on some of the Supreme Court decisions, U.S. Supreme Court relating to these kind of arbitration agreements as they relate to consumers, you know, and what the -- and I think that's what

2.3

it.

the P.J. was driving at. And certainly in some of the -again, this isn't necessarily the forum for it. In some of
the access to justice pieces that I've, you know, forums
I've been involved with, there's talk about how to make sure
everyone gets their day in court. And I think what we can
all agree to is that legal services for the poor in so many
different ways help people get their day in court. And I
think there are a lot of different forums, which I think is
what the P.J. is referring to, and we have to insure in all
those forums that everyone gets the level playing field that
they're entitled to.

You're all great. We congratulate you on your commitment to this issue, and again, I have to say, I can't tell you how important your support has been for our ability to get public funding for legal services, because we have to be creative in terms of the basis that we're asking for that. And it can't just be, as much as it should be that, gee, this is what society should do. It's very helpful when you all come and tell the partners in government that, you know, this helps all of us, and helps, in the end, our

Any other questions for the corporate panel?

The next panel is a Veterans Services Panel, and I'm going to ask Linson Bailey, Kiron Dawkins and Rogerlyn

economy and our society. So, thank you so much. Appreciate

Velez to come down to the main table.

2.3

So what we found is that there are different niches, different people, different kinds of people who need legal services. And one of the groups which has really gotten the attention of the legal services community in the last years have been veterans, because they have unique problems in terms of civil legal services. They come back with so many traumatic experiences in their lives, afflictions that maybe don't relate to the rest of the general public. So we've been trying to figure out how to assist them, and this is a great panel for just that.

Linson Bailey, you're the Executive Director of HELP USA's Supportive Services for Veterans Families.

What is that? What kind of work do you all do for veterans?

MR. BAILEY: The Access V.A. Program is a V.A. funded initiative to help veterans who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. So we're charged with -- and there are about, maybe 400 programs of its kind across the country, and we're charged with helping veterans essentially become housing stable. We've been focusing on homeless veterans, and we've found that civil legal services is a significant part of that, just because of the chaos and dysfunction that homelessness causes, in addition to the issues of, you know, military service and reintegrating back

1 into the community. 2 HON. LIPPMAN: Let's first find out what the other panelists do. 3 Kiron Dawkins, Regional Director of Employment, 4 5 Training and Community Services, Westchester Community 6 Opportunity Program. 7 Kiron, what does your organization do? MR. DAWKINS: So we've been in business for about 8 9 50 years. We were birthed out of the war on poverty. 10 a multi-service organization that ultimately serves 11 individuals from the cradle to the grave. 12 In 2011, we saw the need increasing for serving our 13 veteran families. We were already servicing about ten 14 percent of our population, which is about 30,000, and as we 15 saw the need increase, we saw the opportunity for the V.A. 16 funding, we went after it and partnered with civil legal 17 services, and to this day have served more than 2,000 18 veterans and their families in the Hudson Valley region. 19 HON. LIPPMAN: I want to introduce the third member 20 of the panel, Rogerlyn Velez, Esquire. 2.1 You're the Founder and Chief Executive Officer of 22 Angels for Warriors. What is Angels for Warriors? 2.3 MS. VELEZ: Angels for Warriors is a 501(c)(3) 24 resource in advocacy center for veterans. I founded the

organization three years ago after my brother was severely

25

2.3

injured in Afghanistan. As an attorney, I was able to navigate through the very confusing aspects of his treatment, and as a result of that, I took my experience and started Angels for Warriors. Currently, we connect service members with resources in the community and in the V.A., and we also provide, promote our legal assistance to veterans.

HON. LIPPMAN: Let me ask the first question to the panel, and any of you jump in, and then I'll open it up to the rest of the panel here.

Why are veterans different? Why do we need special services for veterans in terms of civil legal assistance as opposed to the rest of the population?

MR. DAWKINS: One thing I can say, the number one thing identified for our veteran community is that they have difficulty navigating community services, and at this point, what we've seen is that there are strong differences between what they're doing inside of the military community, which is very structured, where they can understand their points of progression, their points of promotion. They understand how everything works. And then at the point of reintegration back into our civilian society, it doesn't seem to go that way. We constantly hear the complaint that, you know, I'm told to go here, and this system is not working for me, this is not working for me, that's not working for me. And civil legal services has become

imperative for our veteran community. And oftentimes the needs that they have from psychosocial needs to even deeper psychological needs are different than what's being faced by the average civilian.

HON. LIPPMAN: A lot of times I don't think people understand that when I talk about legal services for those in need, it doesn't necessarily mean that you're going into the courtroom. To represent somebody, it often means that you're having exactly what you're saying, Kiron. You're having trouble interfacing with all the different bureaucracy that are out there in the community, and how you do that is not the simplest thing, whether you're a vet or anybody else. You know, I think it's intimidating and difficult, and I think particularly when you have a group who comes back with re-entry problems, you know, it's even more exacerbated.

So, what other questions do we have?

MS. GUTEKUNST: Clearly, Mr. Bailey, you've identified homelessness as the key issue that your group is identifying and working with. For the others of you, with a veteran population -- particularly, we're here in the Second Department. With a veteran population here, what are the principal issues that you're seeing where civil legal services can, are most needed for veterans?

MS. VELEZ: Well, primarily, I find child support

2.3

issues. Also foreclosures, evictions, landlord-tenant.

Additionally, license restoration. A lot of our veterans come home, they don't have jobs, they, some of them have experienced numerous issues while overseas, most of them come back with PTSD, a lot of them come back with various injuries to their bodies, and it's very difficult for them to reintegrate. And so what happens is, they lose their lifestyles, they lose their homes, they lose their families because they can't reintegrate. So, a lot of the issues that I have personally seen revolve around matrimonials, child support, and that sort of thing.

MR. DAWKINS: We also are support services for veterans and their families. We're the largest provider in the Hudson Valley, so we deal with homelessness primarily, but prevention, which involves a lot of eviction assistance, is really a primary need to make sure that individuals do not become homeless.

We also see the child support issue. Certainly debt mitigation is a major issue, and finally, I would say veterans achieving their benefits and sometimes change of their discharge status. There are many different definitions of what a veteran is, which is something that all of us had to find out on the ground in terms of what type of benefits they're entitled to. And sometimes also just based on the discharge, which often involves civil

legal services to be able to change.

2.3

MR. BAILEY: I just want to add that all of those issues impact on homelessness, including student loans, advocacy for benefits, whether it's V.A. benefits or public benefits, and family law issues on custody. When someone goes away to war, to the military, when they come back, their lives are often different than when they left. So a lot of that involves where their children are and where they're just kind of, how they're going to meet their basic needs of finding employment and that kind of stuff. And people make bad decisions in challenging situations, and so legal services is very important.

HON. LIPPMAN: There's also been, in relation to veterans, there's been an attempt both at the local and national level to have legislation that makes it easier for veterans to be able to deal with some of their legal problems; particularly some of the family-related problems that come up.

Do you think that, you know, one of the things that's come up when we talk about veterans is, well, gee, why are veterans different from everybody else? You think that veterans are entitled to special consideration even beyond the average person? Is that a fair thing to say really, because of the service that they've done for their country?

MR. DAWKINS: Absolutely. Unless they were defending our civil liberties, we wouldn't be here to be able to have this discussion. So I think it's our patriotic duty, and I think therefore some of the things that have happened, certainly have been egregious in the veteran community. As far as I'm concerned, the United States should have considered this a state of emergency.

HON. LIPPMAN: And a lot of the commitment to veterans by so many, all of you and other people, we've had this in hearings over the years, that certainly in the last, I'd say, five years or more, a whole subset of the legal services assistance which is provided, is in relation to the unique, again, unique problems that veterans have.

Other questions? Judge Marks?

HON. MARKS: Following up on that question, so on the criminal side, in the state court system we've set up specialized veterans courts which you may be familiar with, which are really, I think, sort of operated on that premise that veterans are different. They often have distinct problems as a group that may be more prevalent for veterans than other groups of people. And so in the criminal courts they sort of operate more as problem-solving courts and seek to address the underlying problem that may have led the veterans to commit a crime, drug problem, a mental health problem, and so on. I'm just wondering, and I don't know if

1 -- I'd be interested in your thoughts on this, if you've
2 thought about it at all, but should we be rethinking our
3 civil courts in the state court system and should, in terms
4 of how they deal with veterans, when veterans are litigants
5 in civil cases and come into the state courts on civil
6 cases? Should we be rethinking the way that we, as the

7 court system, approach those cases?

2.3

MS. VELEZ: I have personal knowledge as to Suffolk County, Suffolk County Long Island Veterans Court. They're an amazing court. Judge Toomey is the judge there. He is also a veteran. It stems mostly from how the drug courts ran. And so the veterans get tested once a week for about a year or so, and if they're compliant and they see their social workers, they graduate from Veterans Court, in parentheses. I don't think personally that we should establish a separate court for veterans, a civil court for veterans, but I do think that more money needs to be funded to help veterans so that they can access the services and the legal representation that they are entitled to, that they've served our country for.

HON. LIPPMAN: And often I think, to your point, often, as we talked about before, it's before you get to the court that you need the assistance, and you don't get to the court if you have the legal services. I think so much of what you all do does that. That it's sort of preemptive in

1 terms of not having to go to court.

2.3

MS. VELEZ: Exactly. I just want to make a point that we, as a society, don't realize there are over 22 veterans a day, 22 veterans a day that commit suicide stemming from homelessness and their lack of legal assistance. That is double, double the population, the general population. That is, in my opinion, despicable. That should not happen in this country.

HON. LIPPMAN: And I think it goes to the question that we asked the D.A. before about, could it be that civil legal assistance in some ways is even more important than the possible loss of liberty in a criminal case, because it can have such a traumatic effect when you're dealing with these very basics, and you can't get legal representation.

HON. ENG: I think I'd like to know a little bit more about --

HON. LIPPMAN: Let me add that Judge Eng knows very much about veterans and the military.

HON. ENG: Thanks. I'm a retired army guard --

MS. VELEZ: Thank you for your service.

MR. DAWKINS: Thank you for your service.

HON. ENG: -- and I've had training with legal assistance and benefits and everything else, but I'm trying to recall now the differences in the provisions of service based on characterization of discharge. Generally, it's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

honorable, general, dishonorable. I think the general has some subsets too, regarding general under honorable, general under less than honorable, but how different are they? And that you're entitled to benefits based on your character of discharge -- because some people who have received generals really are in need of more services than anyone else because they left service with greater problems.

MR. DAWKINS: Well, in terms of what's happening with discharge status, it's discharge status and it's time. So for instance, for us serving homeless veterans, we, the individual has served active at least one day, you know, we can approach that individual. For individuals that are going to the V.A. and are seeking medical benefits and service, generally they have to have served at least 24 Then here, frequently in the Hudson Valley we have a lot of National Guard and others. These individuals, even though they are service members, they are not considered So unless they've been activated for a national disaster or they've actually spent some time overseas, this is one of the discrepancies in terms of who's considered a veteran, even though there has been some military service. So it's not just the discharge in terms of general other than honorable, dishonorable. Generally, if it's a bad kind of discharge, none of us can touch the individual, but there are different reasons why that happens. So even for that,

civil legal services can step in and potentially get the discharge changed.

2.1

2.3

As I close I just want to say quickly in terms of the question you asked about the civil court, I think that it should be a key consideration, and I think that one of the things that needs to be really looked at is the supportive services connected to it. The existing criminal court works well because of the process and everything that's working together. And what works for us now that we're going into general court is that legal services and supportive services are working together with the veteran to go in and be able to answer some of the needs. But it's not always cohesive, so if there was a process in a separate court, it may very well be even more coordinated.

HON. LIPPMAN: Any other questions?

MS. GUTEKUNST: Mine is not really a question, it's more of a comment, because I'm not sure you're necessarily aware that I know that the New York State Bar Association and I believe a number of the local bar associations have veteran committees. It was one of the priorities of one of the past presidents, Vincent Doyle from Buffalo, that the State Bar Association had a committee. And I just want to encourage you to come to us with some of the things you're talking about where it isn't necessarily getting an individual lawyer, where you're going to turn to our

2.1

2.3

phenomenal legal services in the Hudson Valley and elsewhere. But where it goes to more systemic issues where you think changes could be made in the law, I would just encourage you to come to the bar associations because that's something that we can do, we can at least try to do very well, because we do have, you know, people about, lobbying, and have developed legislation. So that's just something to pass along to you and other organizations who are working with veterans, that we would welcome your input, because you're the ones on the ground who really are seeing the veterans and seeing what they need. And if we can help, we would love to do that.

HON. LIPPMAN: Okay, this is a terrific panel too, and I think you see the wide diversity of this issue in terms of legal services. I think today we've demonstrated that. We have a criminal justice system, headed by a District Attorney who testified from Rockland County, we had the corporate leaders who showed the support of the community that, you know, people think, gee, what's the connection between the corporation and legal services for the poor, and there is such a direct relationship, and then we have this veterans panel. The panels, I think, demonstrate that there are so many different people who have specific needs that may be different than others, and we have to target legal services.

Proceedings 1 And we're going to have our last panel for today, 2 which I think brings it all together. And that's going to be a panel, a client panel that tells you the stories of 3 human beings who have been helped by legal service providers 4 5 and by those who provide assistance in the civil legal 6 services area in so many different regards. 7 So, thank you for your panel, and now we're going to have, I'd ask George Harris, Irma Silva and De Ping Song 8 9 to come up. This is the final panel, and I think you'll see 10 what all of the previous witnesses were leaning towards, in 11 terms of providing direct assistance to human beings in 12 need. 13 Each of our clients is accompanied by a legal 14 15

service provider, or someone who assisted them. So, let's start with George Harris, who's a client of Legal Services of the Hudson Valley, accompanied by Rachael Halperin, Esquire.

So, Mr. Harris, you want to tell us your experience with legal service?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. Good morning.

HON. LIPPMAN: Good morning.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. HARRIS: My name is George Harris. veteran of the United States Armed Forces. I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about how important access to high quality, free civil legal services is for low income veterans to insure that we are able to protect the basic necessities of life, including housing and benefits.

2.1

2.3

I served in the military for six years; the national guard, army and navy. After being honorably discharged and my health deteriorated, I suffer from PTSD, I also have two dislocated shoulders, diabetes and diagnosed with prostate cancer one year ago. In addition to health problems, I have experienced housing instability for decades. On three occasions I found myself homeless, having to turn to the V.A. facility in Montrose for emergency transitional shelter.

Eight years ago I was lucky enough to be awarded a Veteran's Affair Supportive Housing voucher from HUD. I found a nice apartment in Peekskill, and it was such a relief to have my own apartment. Despite my low income, I live only on disability and food stamps, I was able to pay the rent and feel stable. Having stable housing enabled me to focus on and improve my health and give me a sense of peace.

My security was threatened when my landlord served a petition on me trying to evict me. This happened right at the time that I was diagnosed with prostate cancer and starting treatments. The petition claimed that I had violated my lease by having too many guests over and making too much noise. I was shocked and upset. I live alone and

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

rarely have guests in my apartment. I knew that the allegation in the petition was not true. I also knew that without an attorney to assist me, I could very well be evicted. I had once been to housing court when I had fell behind on my rent, and I didn't understand the court process and was very stressed out. I didn't know my legal rights, and I didn't know how to fight this petition.

I knew that Legal Services of the Hudson Valley had an office right down the street from my apartment in Peekskill. I walked into the office with my petition and completed an intake. My case was taken, taken -- my case was assigned to an attorney, Mihaela. She met with me and went through the allegations in the petition. She also, also interviewed other tenants in my building and confirmed that the noise and the quests were not coming from my apartment, but other tenants in the building. Additionally, she got a copy of police reports that included noise complaints from other units. With this information, she filed an answer to the petition. The next thing I heard from Mihaela was that the landlord had dismissed the petition against me. I was thrilled to be able to keep my apartment.

Having Legal Services of the Hudson Valley represent me relieved me from so much stress and pressure.

I know I would not have been able to fight and win this case

2.3

without Mihaela's assistance. If I had lost my apartment and VASH voucher, I know both my physical and mental health would have seriously deteriorated. I am glad that I served my country and that the agencies like Legal Services of the Hudson Valley are available to help veterans ensure that they are able to maintain basic necessities of life. I continue to work with Mihaela on other issues, and I'm grateful to have this wonderful organization in my neighborhood. Thank you.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harris. I can't tell you how helpful it is to have you come in, tell your story. All the other witnesses are so terrific, but nothing really demonstrates what we're talking about than someone who has actually been a client of a legal services organization. And I think it's fair to say that your life was dramatically changed by the help of legal services.

MR. HARRIS: I would say so. There is so much more to it. So much more to it.

HON. LIPPMAN: Well, again, I couldn't be, we couldn't be more grateful to you for coming in and explaining what it means so that when we go to the places in Albany where they fund legal services for the poor, we can really demonstrate that human beings' lives are dramatically changed through legal services, like you receive right in your community, literally down the street. And fair to say

that you wouldn't have known where to turn without being 2 able to go to legal services? MR. HARRIS: Say it again? 3 That without legal services, what 4 HON. LIPPMAN: 5 would you have done? MR. HARRIS: Committed suicide. I would have went 6 7 ballistic, believe me, put it that way. I wouldn't be here now; I'll tell you that. 8 9 HON. LIPPMAN: You look terrific, and you're in 10 great shape, and we thank legal services for their 11 assistance, and thank you again for coming in. Thank you so 12 much. 13 Okay, so now we're going to go to Irma Silva, a 14 client of Pace Women's Justice Center -- and you know we're 15 right here, we're at Pace Law School -- accompanied by 16 Bertha Rodriguez, Esquire. 17 Irma. 18 MS. SILVA: Good morning. My name is Irma Silva, 19 and I live in Mahopac, New York, in Putnam County. 20 like to talk about how much the Pace Women's Justice Center 21 helped me and my children from the horrible situation of 22 domestic violence which we had been living with for many 2.3 years. 24 For years, my husband made me think that I was not 25 worthy of anything, and I would be nothing without him. So

I thought that if we get married, he will change. After all, he was only like that when he would drink. But he didn't stop. Yes, we got married and had a couple of kids, but his drinking and his behavior did not change.

Excuse me.

2.3

He had terrible mood swings. He would call me bad names and always want to know where I was and accuse me of being with other men even when I was out with our children. He would raise his hand, as if to hit me, but then hit and break things around the house, and once put his fist through the wall. And no, he never actually hit me, but he threatened to do so and always reminded me that I had no worth in his eyes.

The worst was the next day when he would get up, did not say a word about the night before, but come and hug me as if nothing had happened. I would forgive and forget, but deep inside me I knew things would never change. I knew I had to leave him for good when I saw him treating our son in the same mean and derogatory way. But I didn't know how to do it because he told me I could never leave him, and that he would take the kids from me.

I have always wanted my children to do well in school, and one day when I was at the library, I found a card for the Women's Resource Center, a domestic violence agency in Mahopac. After speaking to a social worker there,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I knew I had to take my children away from this abusive relationship, but I still needed the courage to do it and didn't know where to start. I also couldn't afford a My case worker told me I could get free legal help from the Pace Women's Justice Center, and she helped me to get an appointment with Bertha Rodriguez. When I met Bertha, I could see right away that she understood what I was going through and was even able to explain things in Spanish and English. She clearly explained my rights and the legal process for getting a divorce and keeping my She assured me that my husband's threats to take the children were just threats. She kept in touch with me every step of the way and was always only a phone call away. For example, when my husband was served with the divorce papers, he tore them up as soon as he received them. panic and immediately contacted Bertha, and she told me that even though he did not read the papers, he was still on notice and should appear in the case and it would not prevent me from getting a divorce. Even though it was so uncomfortable for me to live with my husband during this time, I felt stronger knowing that Bertha was helping me.

After Bertha submitted the divorce documents to the court, she explained to me that the judge scheduled me for an inquest. When the court date arrived, I was shaking. I didn't know if he would show up. When I saw Bertha at the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

courthouse, I felt immediate relief. As we waited for my name to be called, I anxiously peered around the corner watching the elevator doors open and close, wondering if my husband would appear. My name was finally called, and we proceeded into the courtroom. We started the inquest, and as Bertha asked me questions, under oath, the door to the courtroom opened, and my husband walked in. He was called up to the bench, and the judge asked him if he had any objections to being divorced from me. He responded that he was sorry, and that he still loved me, and that he was trying to change. He started telling lies about why I wanted to get divorced, and I burst into tears and couldn't stop crying. I was so confused and didn't understand what was happening, and I thought I would never be able to get away from him. My attorney continued to press for a divorce 16 to be granted immediately. I know if she wasn't with me there, there was no way that I could have continued. The judge granted my divorce.

> My attorney helped me obtain sole legal custody of my children, child support, and allow me and my children to stay in our home. Most importantly, she saved us from the ongoing cycle of abuse that we had been living through.

I am very grateful to the Pace legal team for their help navigating this process. They really helped me change my life. Thank you.

2.3

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you. And again, your story says it all in terms of a need for legal support and services, and we're so thankful that you're here and that you have the courage to come in to tell your story.

And how did you initially find out about the Pace Center?

MS. SILVA: At the library, my local library. I was paying for some printing material, and the cards were right next, on the counter. I looked at it and I picked up a card, and I didn't call immediately. I just kept looking at it. I couldn't believe that would be a solution.

HON. LIPPMAN: I think it shows sometimes the legal services are down the street, and sometimes you find out about it at some kind of public community area like the library. And again, I think fair to say that your life was turned around by having legal assistance.

MS. SILVA: Absolutely. Absolutely.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you both. The first two witnesses have certainly demonstrated what legal services mean to individual human beings who have a problem that needs to be resolved. And that brings us to our third client, which is De Ping Song, a client of the Legal Aid Society, accompanied by Karen Cacace, Esquire, and Aaron Heluga (phonetic), Esquire, who will translate Mr. Song's testimony.

MR. SONG: (Translated) Good morning. My name is

De Ping Song. I am here to support continued and increased

funding for civil legal services in New York. I am one of

six nail salon workers who filed a lawsuit against the

owners of the Babi Nail salons because they did not pay us

the minimum wage or overtime pay that the law required. We

first worked with the Chinese Staff and Workers Association,

who then referred us to The Legal Aid Society.

2.3

Legal Aid filed a lawsuit in federal court on our behalf in 2009, and we were all fired. The case went to court in 2012, and we were awarded a judgment of \$474,000.00.

I had worked at nail salons for over three years without being paid the wages I was entitled to. I routinely worked more than 40 hours per week and was never paid any overtime compensation. At some points I was not even paid the minimum wage. Then after we filed the lawsuit, my employers fired me. The Legal Aid Society did an excellent job of representing us, and after a trial we were awarded unpaid wages, damages for retaliation and liquidated damages. We've collected some of the money owed, and Legal Aid is continuing to try to collect the rest. Recovering the money is important, but our case is also important because it exposed the exploitation that is rampant in the nail salon industry. What happened to us is typical of how

many nail salon workers are cheated out of the wages they are owed. Our case has impacted the industry and has led to change in the laws protecting nail salon workers.

I'm grateful that the Legal Aid Society agreed to represent us in this case and is continuing to help us collect the money. We did not have money to hire lawyers and would not have been able to pursue our claims without The Legal Aid Society. We are grateful for the excellent representation that we have received. Our lawyers have always made every effort to understand our situation, to explain the laws to us, and to advocate for us.

I know that there are many other low-income workers that also need this type of representation. It is very important to fund The Legal Aid Society and other civil legal services programs. This will allow workers who are being exploited to challenge their employers' illegal practices. Without civil legal aid, we would not have been able to stand up for our rights and force our employers to pay us the money owed to us for our hard work, and we would not have been able to expose the wage theft that so many nail salon workers are subjected to. Thank you.

HON. LIPPMAN: Thank you. And I think this is really a story that's pulled from today's newspapers. We see everyday stories about this particular industry and the problems that you've had, and some of the laws have been

2.3

changed to address it. And I want to say that your story, as with our other two clients on the client panel, have been just so powerful and really tell us what all of this effort is all about to help get funding for real people who have real problems, and we all have it, and we're all entitled to our day in court. And I thank you for coming in. You've been terrific.

De Ping Song, Irma Silva, George Harris, again, you've pulled together all the testimony that we've had today, from the District Attorney, from our corporate leaders, from the Veterans Services Panel. It all comes down to all of you. Where you've really shown, I think, all of us, why it's important that we keep fighting for legal services funding, so that people like yourselves and other people who need legal assistance and legal representation get it, so that we have, in every sense, equal justice in our state and in our country, where everyone gets justice, regardless of the amount of money that they may have in their pockets. That's what our country is built upon; that's what these hearings are all about.

We're going to take the information that you've given us, our other witnesses and the clients, we're going to make a record from all of that, and we are going to provide that record to the Legislature when we seek funding this year for legal services. And you've been terrific, and

| 1 | we are so grateful to you. And I want to thank all our |
|----|--|
| 2 | witnesses, the audience, and the Permanent Commission on |
| 3 | Access to Justice for all of their efforts. And we will |
| 4 | continue to move forward in terms of getting to the day when |
| 5 | everybody who needs legal representation and effective legal |
| 6 | assistance gets it. |
| 7 | So, thank you so much, and thank you all for being |
| 8 | here. Thank you. |
| 9 | (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED) |
| 10 | |
| 11 | * * * * |
| 12 | |
| 13 | Certified to be a true and |
| 14 | accurate transcription of the |
| 15 | within proceedings. |
| 16 | CAMT TANDALI |
| 17 | CAMI LANDAU Senior Court Reporter |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |