PROCEEDINGS

2

21

22

23

24

2.5

1

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning everyone. It's a pleasure to welcome you all and for many of you this is the third year of the Civil Legal Services hearings. We have our distinguished Attorney General who is going to be the first witness. And let me just explain what the purposes of these hearings are. And first I'll have to say I'm concerned as the Chief Judge of the State that there's nothing more important to me, than civil legal services for the poor, and for the those most in need. The template we have developed in New York is a first and foremost for public funding of civil legal services and this year we were able to get 40 million dollars in funding which is the most in the country, but yet is the tip of the iceberg in terms of the need.

These hearings are supported by the task force to expand civil legal services in our state headed by Elaine

Barnett who a sitting here today, and she

2.5

has done a lot of work that's gone into that and basically the reason why we've started this effort is because of the reduction in funding for civil legal services at a national level, in legal services corporation that's now been devastated by cuts in Washington as has our IOLA program, that has gone from 36 million dollars in funding coming out of interests accounts to down to about to six million dollars. judiciary and the professional entire legal community recognize, that if we don't stand up for those who need legal services in these terrible economic times known will. And so, there's two parts to what we're going to do and one is to raise funding on the public Fiss, and two to enhance pro bono services for the poor. As you know we have just announced the 50 hour requirement for law students or aspiring lawyers to do pro bono work to embrace a culture of work for others before being admitted to the Bar. For us, this is our mission, and our responsibility is our reason for being and that is for equal justice in our

2.5

Courthouses, we might at well close the doors. The economy effects the most vulnerable in society, now, above all other times, it is necessary to support legal services for the poor, equal justice is fundamental to our society, and something of which our country -- well differentiates our country from others and other places in the world and that is access to justice is not a luxury in good times and it's something that now more than ever, given what's going on in our state our country is so necessary. Every civilized society is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable citizens and that is what this hearing is all about to ensure that in this state, equal justice prevails in every way. We have a resolution of the Legislature, that puts its imprimatur on the hearing and asks for our recommendations as to what the justice camp is in our state, and that's what is first of the four hearings and is intended today to find out so we can make a recommendation to the Legislature, for additional funding. I'm so pleased that to the open this particular

2.5

hearing and how appropriate the hearing is here in Albany at the Court of Appeals we have our great Attorney General Eric Schneiderman the chief law enforcement officer of our State, who has dedicated his life, in the fight for equal justice, in the state in this country, and equal justice in the so m of the good deeds that the Attorney General does every day, applies whether he is talking about the victims of gun violence, those who are most hurt by the economy and fighting for the necessities of life and their safety and the livelihood and the well-being of our people and their families, the roofs over people's heads, that what more fundamental basic issue is there for all of us, the Attorney General has lead the way in the entire United States in terms of this terrible crisis facing our state and country for foreclosures, and the robo signings and all of the things that have now become common knowledge, in the waive of foreclosures here in New York and around the country has been handled. is all about fairness. The Attorney General

24

2.5

just announced I'm sure he'll talk about it sixty million dollar program to fund legal services, counseling efforts in housing, that we are so proud of his efforts and what he's doing for people who are just desperate and again there's nothing more fundamental, so I'm honored the attorney general comes to us today, and we will our first witness in this first hearing of the year here in the Court of Appeals where you're used to hear the attorney general and his staff argue cases, but I think he's got the best case of his life to argue today, which is, to talk about civil legal services, for the poor, so, attorney general Schneiderman, thank you so much for coming to speak to us.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Chief

Judge Lippman. Thank you for inviting me

here. It's an honor to be here with you,

and presiding Judge Peters, Deputy Chief

Administrative Judge Marks, Seymour James as

our great leader of our Bar Association. I

do know that I'm sitting in the spot

reserved for appellants that I haven't

experienced that in my argument, although I

think it's a friendly bench.

THE COURT: I'm sure you prefer this counselor.

MR. SCHNETDERMAN: ob T appreciate the opportunity to be here to speak about something that is tremendously important it me personally as an attorney, and as a New York State Attorney General. But I have to state at the outset more important than that I appreciate Judge Lippman in focusing the attention of both our State government and the private Bar on the catastrophic lack of legal services for low and moderate income New Yorkers. I attend meetings of Attorneys General all around the country, and there is no judiciary and there's no legal division of the judiciary, in any state, that comes close. Judge Lippman is a national leader on the issue. I think it's important at the outset to provide that while we're dealing with the problem facing a very serious problem that New York has made a some major strides in improving access to legal services over the last few years in large

1

2.5

part thanks to the creative work of the our judiciary. Similarly our government have taken steps and I'm proud to say the office of the Attorney General was among them. But frankly the judiciary has stepped into areas why they are used to relying on other branches of government to deal with the problems, and stepped in has called attention of all to the problems and I'm looking forward to more action in the years ahead. I honestly believe that we have long way to go but that the path ahead is clear and we have to continue working together, to close the gap between the need for civil legal services, and the availability of those services which has appropriately been called the justice gap. We know that among the most essential founding principles of our Republic is that every American receive equal justice under law. We also know that without access to legal representation equal justice under law is just and empty slogan. In the criminal Courts we have established the right to counsel and there are many flaws in the system which we need to

2.5

correct. I'm very committed to that as well but no one faces of loss of their liberty without some access to an attorney. In our State today, with the complexities of day to day of life even for the people of most moderate means, you need an attorney if you want to keep from losing your home or health care or custody of your child, your right to stay in this country or access to public benefits, it allows you to put food on the table. Essentially matters like these hang in the balance in our Courts every day. And millions of New Yorkers today cannot meaningfully protect their rights because they can't afford to hire an attorney. I know that we have here more about the 2010 report of the task force to expand civil legal services, and among its designated findings is the fact that two point three million mostly low income New Yorkers are unrepresented in civil proceedings in our state in Court every year, and we all understand that this is the decade of deep cuts to legal services coming through. This is not a problem that we got into in a year

2.5

or two years and we will not get out of it in a year or two years but we need to turn it around quickly. Funding for the legal services corporation as the judge mentioned, the primary source of federal support peaked in real terms in 1979, and funding has been cut 60% in real dollars, since then, and there's been periods of reprieve but the budget in dollars, adjusted for inflation, is now at a all time low. The issues that people in America have to deal with get more complex and the need for a lawyer grows when the federal funding for legal services again is at a all time low. And I must also add, because I am spending some time with our federal counterparts these days, I'm very concerned about the possible revision to the distribution formula that will hurt New York and it's I think we have to be clearly alert, and all our colleagues in state government about. Putting aside federal issues and the state funding for legal services in New York has been fragmented and most of the important sources comes from the interest on the IOLA account funds, the IOLA

2.5

account that's produced a lot less revenue in last few years because of the recession and low interest rates around 32 million in 2008 to just 6.5 million in 20120 and 2011, and then into this grim picture steps our heroic chief judge and that really is where the progress is that I spoke of earlier and progress has been made. New York judiciary provided an emergency lifeline of fifteen million dollars for the last three years to the IOLA funds that prevented the IOLA funded from falling off the cliff along with interest rates. Our chief judge gave us 12.5 million dollars fund for the civil legal services office out the judiciary's own budget at a time when all of our budgets are being squeezed and increased that funding in 2012 and 2013. We know how much of an impact, we know how much of an impact these funds have had, from all of our dealings in the Attorney General's office with both providers of legal services and the people they serve. Without the leadership of the judiciary and without this funding many many people who would be

2.5

homeless who would be without benefits to which they're entitled would not be able to enforce their right to be free from the domestic violence, you have funded the lawyers to protect New Yorkers and we have to follow that lead. I have to also note the innovative programs that have been introduced here in New York to resolve problems before litigation, expand pro bono representation and taken the visionary step that has kicked off very recently making pro bono work a mandatory requirement for admittance to the bar and this is really a matter of national leadership and there's no one in the United States close to our chief judge when it comes to innovation and commitment in providing legal services for So, thank you, for your amazing work and I want to state clearly that my office is a committed partner in the struggle for equal justice. There is really nothing as a lawyer that should be more important than the idea that there's one set of rules for everyone, that the American commitment to equal justice under law is s strong as it

2.5

was at the founding of the Republic as I travel around the State, many people have lost confidence in our government and to one set of rules for everyone and equal justice under law. My own experience confronting the justice gap almost immediately after I game Attorney General was pretty dramatic and when I was sworn in, there was a set of negotiations also underway, between the major banks that had been involved in services, mortgages, there was a crisis of foreclosures and other Attorney General and federal agencies were trying to negotiate a settlement. At that time, we had 345,000 mortgages either in default, or delinquent if our state and in number of homes underwater that; home owners owed more money on a mortgage than the home was worth, was unprecedented, and in the middle of this wave of foreclosures, I learned that had half of the people who were facing foreclosures at that time were forced to do without speaking to a lawyer at any phase of the process. We heard tales of abuse and we gathered evidence of the abuse, as we

2.5

investigated the foreclosure crisis and working with my federal colleagues, we found overwhelming evidence all across the country mortgage services and law if I recall representing services had committed numerous violations of state and federal law. they couldn't keep up with the volume, because of the rationale of mortgage backed security market and they were foreclosing on people using robo signed documents, often not serving people with serving services and people have the right to renegotiate their mortgages were unable to exercise those rights, ten of thousands of New Yorkers were unaware they'd those rights and the abusers of the system were only able to engage in these practices like robo signing and sewer services because they were able to safely assume, that New Yorkers or other Americans were going to have no access to an attorney and not going to have the legal advice they needed for a fair fight and for a clear disposition, and to exercise their rights. So the point at which I entered office I raised some objections to the proposal for a

2.5

1

national mortgage settlement and wanted to focus on two issues: First of all, I was adamant that we had to pursue two goals simultaneously or I wasn't going to sign on. First we had to get a down payment that would provide immediate relief to struggling home owners including legal assistance. issues on the table had to be restricted to the abusers in the foreclosure process and we had to preserve all claims related to the actual conduct that blew up the American economy. So we did get a substantial down payment but we preserved all of our other claims to hold wrongdoers accountable which we have to do and that's the kind of meltdown that took place in 2008 and I hope it never happens again. In addition, to hold wrongdoers accountable and getting further relief to those that are hurt. Some of the objections the Banks raised were significant but they were all dealt with in the final settlement on mortgage services fraud and required the banks to put in place unprecedented new mortgage loan standards to commit 25 million dollars to resolve

2.5

violations of state and federal law, and we were able to preserve all the claims related to pre-crash conduct that we were concerned about. There's New Yorkers eligible for reductions in mortgage rates and to me most importantly, as the state's chief law enforcement officer, we are providing immediate significant funds for legal services. We know in New York we have an innovative and creative and talented judiciary, and we know we have actually pretty good laws to protect people from wrongful foreclosure, if you have a lawyer so you can get the information about those laws that you need. At the beginning of this hearing we were able to I'm proud to say address the crisis because all the state money for foreclosure prevention work was set to dry up on April first. There was no money allocated in this years budget for such service and in March my office was able to, announced that we can dedicate fifteen million dollars from the national mortgage settlement to save foreclosure prevention services this year. And its as the chief

2.5

judge noted, we are dedicating an additional sixty million dollars all coming from this first settlement regarding foreclosure abuses, and over the next few years to a home owners protection program, which will funds provides housing counseling and the legal services, to help struggling families stay in their homes. Just 3 days ago, we announced the first round of grants of twenty million dollars for the first year going to organizations across the state, to protect home owners rights. And in keeping with the theme the Chief Judge mentioned earlier which home owners are represented by counsel it not only benefits the home owner it makes our Courts more efficient for everyone and it saves the State money. task force to the extent it accesses the civil legal services found that judges -and this found that pro se litigants a all this the only experience in pro se litigants not only fail to present relevant evidence or question witnesses effectively, that they have, they often clog up the Courts with procedural complications created by a lack

2.5

1

of knowledge on how the system operates and they make our judicial system less effective and that prevents settlements of matters that could be settled and delay trials. This that this is a matter of cost savings as well as a matter of ensuring that their rights are protected. With counsel on the case, issues are sharpened, resolutions strengthened and frankly we heard from bank lawyers and they are very excited about the prospect of having counsel to deal with as they seek to implement a settlement and it wasn't their idea to pay out 25 bill they will rather have a lawyer to deal with, and we know that this saves money, we know that this makes our judiciary more effective. So, my commitment to you, is, as I pursue the cases related to mortgage fraud and mortgage securities fraud if I have anything to do with it, no New Yorker will ever been wrongfully foreclosed on because of a lack of legal representation. That's the least those of who brought this on our economy can provide for those who have suffered and I want to close by coming back to the

2.5

procedure problem and to the fact that in a way in my mind it's very clear in New York, in a lot of the country, over the last few decades in the last five years they're emphasis in many circles and giving people procedural rights, but not nearly as much emphasis as providing the resources, that enable those people to effectively and easily exercise foreclosure rights and this an issue, that I speak of with my colleagues in the Legislature frequently and as New York State lawyer I'm proud of the fact as I travel through this State and I often speak to the right to counsel. As the right that's enabled us to protect all of our other rights. For the home owner, the immigrant and the elderly victims of domestic violence and the risk from the lack of representation are profound. The need is vast and our commitment to meeting that need must be unwavering. We need every level of government at the state local and federal as well at the private bar to attack the justice gap with the same urgency and creativity that our judiciary has and we

2.5

need to take all legal services out of the annual budget battel in Albany and I'm committed to work with you to identify a dedicated stream of revenue to do just that. As the state's chief law enforcement officer, both in defending the State and prosecuting and enforcement of the state law, I can attest, that eliminating the justice gap is not only a matter of fundamental fairness, it will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our judicial system and improve the quality of the outcome and will save the state money. Everyone in evert part of our government on both sides of the aisle should be in favor of an independent stream of funding so that no New Yorkers is denied legal services that they need. That's path forward working together and I know, that we can and we must fulfill the quintessential American ideal of equal justice under law for all the people Thank you very much. of our state.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you attorney general Schneiderman and we could not have a better partner for the fight for

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

equal justice just to eliminate the justice gap that so obviously exists in our state and our nation between the dire need for resources available and I just want to ask a few questions and I'll ask my colleagues if they have any. You've done such a terrific job coming up with sixty million dollars that will go such a long way in the battle for fairness in the foreclosure process, and how do you determine those monies going to do the most good? What where is it going and what for process can you tell us a little bit about that?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Sure we have identified two anchor partners the Empire Justice Center and the Center for New York delivery of legal services and there was there's a lot of data about where people one of the great sources of information for that in fact are that housing counsel, and legal services providers, they were

24

2.5

the national mortgage foreclosure settlement, a federal monitor in place and the banks have to report to us regularly so we get feedback on the status of their loans all over the country. Our partners in the federal department of housing and urban development are working closely with us to make sure that he we've identified where the problems are worse and make sure that the funds get to those problems. We are just beginning the process but I'm very confident that this is the most sophisticated approach to the problem that I have ever seen and we are urging everyone in the state, and it's sort of an odd situation because we're urging everyone to come forward and the bank contacts to say we have to renegotiated your mortgage and a lot of people are hesitant to contact the bank and we're using the folks in housing counsel and legal services to try to educate people and they now do have the right to renegotiated and they will have lawyers there to help that in that.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: That makes such a difference as the banks want to see a

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

lawyer there and it's such unequal playing field that it now it works to everyone's disadvantage. Staying on the federal level for a second I think you're the co-chair of President Obama's working group that's dealing with the crisis and the after effects of where do we go from here on which this whole process that came out of the mortgage backed security, where is that now?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: The working group was set up, beginning in February and announced in the President's State of the Union address, and it took a few months to staff up, but there are quite a few investigations under way and I think you can look for action, in the very near future. The beginning of acts because it's a long way to go. And I would like to, underline the fact that the working group, is focused on, pre crash conduct. The working group is focused on the packaging rules and the marketing of the mortgage backed securities that are particularly responsible for inflating the housing market and that lead to the crash. In addition to that, they're

are still more banks that we will welcome on board with the foreclosure settlement and provide more money, for relief for home owners. Under the time that we're providing, all right because of the first five banks, that signed up the first foreclosure settlement only includes the five largest banks and there are more banks that will be getting on board and things that we are seeing and further -- and I'm confident and we see further action from the mortgage banks securing group in the weeks ahead.

about thank you. You talked about on the criminal side we have this Constitutional guarantee while not perfect and we all know there are issues around the state and country as to criminal representation but you have that guarantee, what did you see on the future in terms of civil legal services will we ever get to the point with a similarly recognized right in quotes, or where people have as a very basic part of their lives, if they can't afford a lawyer,

they can get one in a civil case that's something what been referred to as a civil remedy is that on the horizon? What do you say?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm not sure we will get it from, the current Supreme Court, but I think that there is, that the idea is something that is becoming increasingly clear to people like me, in all parts of the politic spectrum and it's something very appealing to state government, because, the areas in which people are not represented commonly are with credit problems, tenants in housing problems, unrepresented, unrepresented victims of domestic violence, people with problems with receiving funding or services or entitled to which they're supposed to have access, all of their costs in our state government and this money all of this results in a reduction of benefits to the people in our state, and it's in our own interests and in the interest of our own government to ensure they're provided counsel. Funding for health care increases

2.5

Thank you

Ι

1 when you have more lawyers representing 2 people so then their right to health care 3 funding for education, for housing similarly 4 increases when people know what their rights 5 are and I believe we will get there not by a 6 Supreme Court ruling but as a matter of 7 public policy as it is against everyone's 8 self interests, to have the justice gap that 9 we have today. 10 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: 11 Attorney General. Justice Peters? 12 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: 1.3 just have one question you know you're 14 correct that when one creates a legal right, 15 it's a hollow act unless one has the 16 opportunity to exercise that right. And you 17 mentioned the national mortgage settlement 18 proceeds that you used to fund several legal 19 services I'm just wondering when those will 2.0 expire, and if there any thoughts on a 21 long-term funding stream? 22 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well we have a 23 three year commitment, so that's -- I know 24 you're filling in a lot of the gaps, filling 2.5 in the housing, and the legal services for

housing issues, and we can take care of that for three years out of this settlement, and I do believe that there will be more money forthcoming, from other banks in the first settlement and also from the work we're doing, in the cases that I anticipate working on.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: I was hoping you would say that.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: But its also the case and I enjoy getting good results for the people of the State of New York, that we shouldn't be dependant on the recovery on a specific case for the judiciary taking a part of their own thinly stretched budget for this -- this is the situation where we really do need to have a dedicated stream of funding in the state. I'm committed to working toward that and I am to happy to work with our colleagues in the Legislature and executive branch and any sort of a creative approach, but we can -but this will make this a much better and more just frankly -- a richer state if we can.

1

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Justice

Marks.

MARKS: One question you talked about in the context of foreclosure cases, there being an ineffectiveness and inefficiency which is apparent in self-represented litigants. That your office handles a tremendous amount of litigation in the State Courts so do you find that those problems carry over to the whole range of litigation that your office is involved with and to the lawyers in your office, that they prefer to have a lawyer representing a party, rather than an unrepresented litigant?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I think yes, there's a very clear distinction that you can make with the lawyers in our office, they would always rather be dealing with opposing counsel because -- and that's not inconsistent with our view or as to our ethical obligations that we have to make sure that our people know what's going on and its up to the judge and opposing counsel to make sure thing are done properly.

2.5

There's a big distinction between cases, with respect to the a robo signing, for the fraud that takes place, where no one knows up in Court at all they're default judgements which, some these abusers of the process actually like it in cases where you have a pro se litigant. No one -- no lawyers likes to be dealing with pro se litigants and that takes a lot more time to get a simple result. I think that it's, been proven to be true to say and judge so yes we favor having counsel for everyone in every case. And it's something that I realize that it's tough to get across to other people in the government, that they say well, we really don't have enough money for health care and not enough money for housing, having legal representation for all New Yorkers and will get us more funding for health care and housing and keep more people in their homes and avoid the collateral damage of homelessness and eviction and what happens to children, pulled out of school because their parents have lost their home and there's so many benefits, and there's no

1 bigger bang for the buck than providing 2 people with legal services. 3 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know it's so true that you say that, you know the 4 5 task force has concluded for every dollar 6 spent on civil legal services five dollars, 7 are returned to the state. And I think it 8 speaks the truth, and to say it's 9 counterproductive, that the -- to let people 10 fall off the cliff because of a lack of 11 representation. The results work to 12 everybody's detriment and it seems so obvious. 1.3 14 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well we have 15 to continue our efforts to make it clear to 16 even those who HAVE trouble seeing it today. 17 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: President 18 James, anything? 19 MR. JAMES: You indicated 2.0 attorney general you believe there ought to 21 be a permanent dedicated funding stream and 22 that this is something that you envision 23 being automatically renewed annually? 24 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I think so, 2.5 and there have been various efforts to come

2.5

up with strategies for this in the past and we do have dedicated funding streams for some programs, in the way they structure the tax code and budget and it just seems to me that that is, first of all, the numbers are a lost smaller than for a lot of other areas of the state budget and the cost benefits to the state as the Chief Judge just noted are really tremendous. I think that ultimately that this is something that requires just raising the visibility of the issue and raising the consciousness of the public about it, and getting, the bar actively engaged, and establishing an atmosphere that is obvious to everyone, that there are benefits and obviously that we're not complying with our moral obligations to provide equal justice under the law if we fail to do this the dedicated source of funding is absolutely essential and we have to continue our campaign and following our chief judge's example to make sure that everyone understands that the benefits and everyone understands the need for fundamental justice.

1 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 2 Thank you for your time and your honesty and 3 for your presence, thank you so much. 4 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Not at all. 5 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. 6 next witness will be Michael Keegan, the 7 REgional President of the Albany Hudson 8 Valley North division, senior Vice President 9 of M&T Bank. Mr. Keegan, nice to see you, 10 and with me I'm sure you've figured out by 11 now is Chief Justice Peters, first 12 department chief administrative judge 13 Lawrence Marks and Seymour James president 14 of the State Bar Association. And we're 15 glad to have you here, and we welcome you to 16 begin your testimony. I note in the 17 audience that there are a lot of the members 18 of the task force, to expand civil legal 19 services and in addition to Elaine Barnett, 20 and so, you have an audience ready willing 21 and able to hear your testimony. Thank you 22 so mush. 23 MR. KEEGAN: Thank you, Your 24 Honor and good morning everyone. I did 2.5 provide some written testimony and I'll try

1 to be brief.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: We have it.

MR. KEEGAN: And I'm certainly open to any questions you may have. approach that I really took in terms of preparing for this was from the banks charitable foundation perspective and M&T has a charitable foundation that distributes millions of dollars every year to its several communities. And what we have found along the way, is we're so involved with the different organizations, and that there is a dire need for these services. So, the work that you have done Chief Judge, is honorable and its gone a long way, but in each case when we meet with the Empire Justice Center, the Legal Project, and Legal Aid Society, is that there's a shortage of funds and they're grappling to fill those gaps. So what we see is that, we hear the demands consistently. We also see it in the world of houses and what we look at it is the basic needs that are citizens our people in our community need, from housing, food and shelter and those organizations are also

2

2.5

struggling so this boils down to the what the Attorney General just suggested and that the fact that people who are just struggling to get by don't have access to legal services so they don't know where to go and how to resolve a matter. And what you appropriately and accurately said is that in all of our organizations including banks, legal representation is a benefit to all. It's a benefit to the bank in terms of resolving matters, and it's a benefit to individuals, who need those services, and it's a benefit to our community. Lastly I would suggest, is that in what we're talking about today, doesn't just extend to housing, and things of that nature. It's also domestic violence, families that are profoundly effected by abusive relationships and their need to seek counsel and I to have a network of -- a support system a safe network if you will. To try to provide them with a way out of a challenging problems. And the reason I raise that with you is because when I was a young child my parents were both psychotherapists and we which all

1 had a lot of fund with that reality.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You seem

none the worse for wear.

MR. KEEGAN: So far, thank you. But toward the end of the Vietnam war we heard stories from my mother, with clients who were victims of domestic violence and their inability, to access the legal system, in a way where we could we matter appropriately. And one community in particular, they took on that cause, it's a city of Quincy Massachusetts, where the court system and judges made an example based on restraining orders and working with law enforcement, to make sure that the people who were abused were not continuously harassed by those people abusing them. have a history of really trying to understand why banks are relevant in a community that we serve. Why the bank that I work for, is, I'm particularly proud of the fact that the organization, from housing and legal services, that we get involved with not getting their share and -- and there's certainly a need for a money stream

2.5

1 2

4

3

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22 23

24

2.5

of funding that can be provided to do that on a consistent basis and that would certainly be a benefit to everyone.

Thank you CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: so much. It's really effecting and I would ask I would like to ask you, let me acknowledge right now before I do anything else, the presence of my colleague Victoria Graffeo who is here today, so I'm pleased se was able to stop by and Judge Graffeo just headed or advisory committee on the 50 hour pro bono requirement and thank you Vicky for being here and it's a pleasure to have you here. Let me ask you Mr. Keegan, on a very parochial level why is it that important to M & T Bank or to any bank or area of expertise that that is your bottom line impacted by whether people in the community that you serve, get legal services from funded providers and in all these different issues that they deal with in their lives, whether that be housing or physical safety or their entitlements or other well-being of the families or credit cards, consumer credit cards, why does it matter or does it

help your bottom line, when people receive

civil legal services in a community that you

serve?

MR. KEEGAN: So, let me start with the basic foundation of --

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Putting aside your ethical high standards which we so much appreciate.

MR. KEEGAN: Well thank you. think if you start with the notion that we all have an obligation to the informed, we all have the right to legal representation. But one of the challenges that we've found as an organization individually is we get involved in organizations like Habitat for Humanity and some of the housing groups they're many of them that do wonderful work. And the financial literacy is inconsistent and on an across the board basis is lacking in our state. There is no mechanism for the in grade school or college or even with young adults people can go and become more financially aware, of what their rights are, what are their responsibilities are, and how they should manage themselves and it's a

24

2.5

huge challenge. And so we're on that bubble out into where we start to play, that we're supporting organizations that are entering the fray and trying to help people out when they don't understand the interest rates on a credit card or don't understand if you rent from one ever these rental places that that couch may cost you several thousand dollars when it could be only a couple do dollars a week. So, that we're entering this process late in the game. So legal representation to kind of really cut that problem off, is very very important and I don't know if its just that we don't have enough people that are doing pro bono work so that the notion of mandating certain amounts of hours in order to be admitted to the Bar and stay, I think is a wonderful idea. I think there needs to be from my perspective with all due respect, a sense of urgency around what the business community needs to be more actively involved in this problem. And hopefully we can get more people to engage in a process of services. CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Did it.

hurt you when people loose their jobs or
have to go on welfare or families
disintegrate and does it hurt your industry
banks and the banking business, it is
harmful to you?

MR. KEEGAN: It hurts everybody, a broken family, a lost job, a sense of insecurity, domestic violence, that destroys the fabric of our community and there's nothing worse than to have this disintegration among us and if you look at the financial crisis I think that if you look at what the financial crisis did for all Americans is that it raised a profile on the issues that are very relevant to how we should live our lives and the fact that, there were abuses that did occur and the attorney general appropriately points that out and there's also an opportunity for us to look at this crisis and provide a better remedy for how we move forward, financially and literacy is currently one, equal access to legal representation is certainly one, and the list goes on and on.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

1 Any other questions from the bench? 2 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: 3 Mr. Keegan, we met before and I actually am a Hudson Valley resident and a client in 4 5 fact. Previously so I have to disclose 6 that. 7 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think 8 the bank is very good shape if you're a 9 client. 10 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: 11 just want to thank you for the incredible 12 efforts of your bank that it's made in our 1.3 community and in the Hudson Valley. I know 14 fully the extent to which you do fund 15 raisers and get involved in community 16 organizations, the YMCA the YWCA, the 17 woman's shelter in both Ulster County and 18 Albany and I want to thank you so much for 19 encouraging your employees to do pro bono 2.0 work. It's really wonderful. 21 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Anything 22 Thank you so much. Its so important 23 that I think our business community and the 24 banking industry speak out about these kinds 2.5 of issues because I think its as you

1 indicated, that this effects everybody, and 2 yet it's not a good sense this is not just gee, people with their hands out saying we 3 4 need public money to fund this. It's impact 5 is overwhelming on not only those 6 individuals, but on the whole economic 7 well-being of our state including you know 8 the bang and the bust around the state and 9 the fabric holding them together so we have 10 prosperous and a vibrant community too for whether it's M&T Bank or a local business or 11 12 any of the different things that make our 1.3 economy the envy of the world, but we cannot 14 afford to let people bleed with the beliefs 15 transforming a crisis without legal effort. 16 So, thanks you. 17 MR. KEEGAN: Thank you for your 18 leadership on this. 19 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 2.0 It was a delight having you. Thank you. 21 Next Judge Coccoma Deputy chief 22 Administrative Judge for Courts outside the 23 city, he couldn't be with us today, but he 24 sent a terrific emissary, in justice Vito 2.5 Caruso administrative judge for the 4th

judicial district, judge Caruso do want to 1 2 come up to the table? Judge Caruso is used 3 to not testifying, but presiding but today 4 he's going to testify. 5 JUDGE CARUSO: Its unusual to be 6 on this side. 7 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes you 8 were at one time. 9 THE WITNESS: At one time, 10 correct. 11 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Go ahead 12 Judge Caruso. 13 JUDGE CARUSO: It's great to be 14 here, I appreciate the opportunity given to 15 me by our Deputy Chief judge to speak in 16 this very important area and to convey his 17 remarks. I certainly will do that and I will actually read his remarks exactly as he 18 19 presented them so you can get the full 2.0 context. I can tell you that this is an 21 area that I personally have been very 22 supportive and strongly in favor of and 23 would be happy to answer any questions as 24 pertains. We interact in these areas and I 2.5 also would like to add my own voice to that

of many others in our judicial legal community, in praising or Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman for championing this cause and it's not a popular thing and it's not necessarily popular even with judges in term of the money that is necessary, but it's an important thing, and it takes a big man to stand up in this state, and champion this issue in our state and also nationally and no one stands up to you chief judge in this regard.

judge I appreciate it, and appreciate your being here and if you could give your testimony, and we may break in a little bit, during it, so I want to ask you particularly, and one to start giving your testimony about the local situation in your area, what you see in terms of the need for legal representation, because, it's really the ground level that this is issue is so apparent that you can have all the pontificating about it but you see it at a very direct level so I don't want to interrupt so you bring your testimony and

thank you for your kind words.

24

2.5

JUDGE CARUSO: You're welcome and I'd like to read this as he wrote it, and it starts with, good morning and introduces himself as Michael V. Coccoma, and he's the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Courts outside of New York City. Also an elected Supreme Court justice, in Cooperstown. I have been asked to address the panel about the impact of this years funding awarded to 56 civil legal service providers in New York State. I will confine my remarks to addressing the providers in the Third and Fourth Department, as my colleagues the Honorable Fern Fisher and Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Courts within the City of New York will be addressing the panel regarding providers of the First and Second Department. Let me again with he quote from the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, its whether we provide enough, for those who have little. quote certainly sums up what we're trying to

2.5

do with civil legal services. involved in civil legal services are trying to provide fundamental legal services necessary to assist them in the essentials of life. In just this short period of time, that civil legal service funding has been made available to the judiciary, that has begun to make a profound difference in the lives of those who cannot afford legal representation. In upstate New York, 27 providers have begun utilizing their funding, to provide direct client services, as well as initial activities which assist those who have a need of obtaining and maintaining the essentials of life. Housing, health care, better opportunity at employment and my remarks are not just about the programs and the stats, I would like to focus on some of the up close and personal stories of direct client contact which has made a difference and certainly justifies continued efforts to fund these programs. The funding providing was awarded to a cross section of providers, in order to cover a broad structure of needs across New York

2.5

State. Awards were granted to providers in urban locations, as well as our rural areas. You will see the differing needs of these desperate populations and how the awarding of funds to go best meet the needs of clients. Their needs range from those involved in litigation, health care benefit issues, domestic violence matters, unemployment benefits, and discrimination claims. The individuals receiving assistance through civil legal services have all but one thing in common, without this funding, they would have no way to pay for this badly needed legal advice, not only have no way to pay for it, they have no where else to turn. Outside the City of New York, in the Third and Fourth Departments, civil legal services provides and has assisted clients in a variety of ways. Some provided direct legal assistance such as representation in our Court proceedings, other providers use the funds to assist clients using a more broad based methodology. Free education programs, distribution of information and materials,

2.5

helping them by having help lines hot lines for referral services. Let me first take the example of rural law center of New York in St. Lawrence County, this program has assisted with the most serious matter of child neglect abuse, termination of parental rights in our Family Court. By diverting the most appropriate cases away from the Courts, into a voluntary need agency. The rural law street has used civil legal services funds to go promote mediation coverage between parties and local departments of Social Services, in an effort to find mutually agreeable solutions to these often painful and difficult problems. The rural law center is also part of an innovative program which partnered with the New York State Bar Association, in subcommittees with Courts on Appellate jurisdiction. The partnership with the rural law center created a practice that assists low income clients with appellant representation in the areas of child custody, child support, shelter and housing, and subsistence income and benefits as well as health and education matters.

2.5

This partnership is also developing an appeals guidance for unrepresented in central New York. The legal aid society mid New York used its funds to support its central New York legal help line, which has provided advice and brief services to over 13 hundred low income people in central New York. This help line also provided almost 3,000 brochures and referrals to legal and non legal resources. The Frank H. Hiscock Legal Aid Society in Central New York used its funding to award funding awards to retain attorneys in paralegal positions that were due to be lost, as a result of cuts in funds from other sources. As a result, the Hiscock Legal Aid Society was able to provide representation that benefited 824 persons and these cases involved domestic violence, evictions and foreclosures and unemployed benefit cases, and helping clients maintain income and security for their families by helping families overcome obstacles, the long term benefits will be seen for generations to come. The numbers are impressive, but numbers aren't the only

2.5

part of the equation. What do the numbers represent? Here are some examples of what funding to the legal services providers really mean. In Buffalo, New York the city brought a foreclosure action against a single mother who owed less than \$500. volunteer lawyer project attorney and a pro bono attorney co-counseled to represent her and negotiate a repayment agreement, that kept the woman and her children in the home and prevented them from being homeless. Also in Erie County, a pro bono attorney assisted a maintenance man being bullied by public employees. As a result this man lost his job, and the pro bono attorney assisted him in obtaining much need unemployment benefits, even successfully representing him through an appeal by the employer.

me stop you there, I know they're are particularly good things that these moneys go for, and we're going delve a little later in the program with the client panel, but tell us when they first can experience, tell us from your firsthand experience what did

1 you see out in the 4th Judicial district and 2 explain, what your geographic of your 3 jurisdiction and what you see out there, 4 what's the need you know. 5 JUDGE CARUSO: As you know --6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: At ground 7 level. 8 JUDGE CARUSO: Thank you. I'm 9 the administrative judge for the 4th 10 Judicial District in which Judge Peters is 11 the PJ, Judge Peters Department, and we are 12 the largest geographic district in the State 1.3 of New York. And by being the largest 14 geographic district, we have some disparity 15 between our urban, rural and suburban areas 16 and some --17 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: People 18 think some people think that all of the 19 poverty in our state is down state, in the 2.0 New York City area, do you see it in a big 21 district that is your up state. 22 JUDGE CARUSO: One of our largest 23 we go up to the Canadian border. We have 11 24 counties and one of our largest counties is this district is Hamilton County. Hamilton 2.5

1	County probably has and not counting the
2	Summer time when he people go up to enjoy
3	the beautiful lakes.
4	PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: Or
5	cows or anything else.
6	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Not many
7	lawyers, right judge?
8	PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: That's
9	one of the problems.
10	JUDGE CARUSO: Probably 5,000
11	permanent residents in the County and it's a
12	huge county. And probably five lawyers in
13	the County.
14	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: How do you
15	deal with I assume that there is a good
16	share of poverty.
17	JUDGE CARUSO: What we have
18	found
19	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: People of
20	both modest means?
21	JUDGE CARUSO: Our district we
22	also have urban areas where there's poverty
23	and people of dire needs and modest people
24	and terrible things happen. You wouldn't
25	expect it, perhaps in rural areas but there

in Hamilton County, our least populated 1 2 County it has one of the highest rates of 3 spousal abuse in the our district. It has a tremendous group of people who pray on those 4 5 few people who live there, and take them 6 through various aspects of not being able to 7 afford what they're providing for them, 8 sharp practitioners in a sense in the 9 business sense, and these folks are really 10 without the ability to hire attorneys and 11 without attorneys that are available. 12 have seen an increase in our rural law 1.3 center in sending pro bono attorneys into 14 the areas to assist in these day-to-day, 15 living situations. Yes there are major 16 events in these folks lives that need legal 17 representation. 18 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: They come 19 judge to get an -- they come from -- so we 2.0 bring in the lawyers from outside the 21 county? 22 JUDGE CARUSO: They will. 23 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And 24 provide a lot of assistance and they get is 2.5 especially pro bono lawyers.

That's why I used that as an example. There you have a, you have somebody you have just a few lawyers there and you have a judge, who does all of the courts one judge, you have a District Attorney, Public Defender and County Attorney, and pretty much that takes up all of the attorneys. So, you have to bring in, you have to bring in attorneys who want to go to this very rural area, or who volunteer to go to this very rural area and provide pro bono legal services. In a civil sense as well as a criminal sense.

think it's a mix that you need both the public funding the Keyser programs, that were in Judge Coccoma's testimony where we give grants to a particular area, do you also have, in that mix, lawyers — that you just volunteer to do pro bono work and private sector lawyers?

JUDGE CARUSO: Absolutely,
absolutely, I think that I think our numbers
are under reported in the pro bono sense and
that's my personal feeling. I think that

our lawyers do take this to heart. And many times don't report their efforts at pro bono but as judges we see them, we see them in the courtroom and they may not report it or work through a network, but they were there doing that as well.

mentioned in your testimony the New York

State Bar Association Committee the Court of

Appeals jurisdiction which I used to sit on

before I became presiding judge, and they

have a wonderful program that you described

in brief in which members of the State Bar

Association take on appeals pro bono for

several clients who just don't meet the

minimal standard but can't afford an

attorney, and I mean I have -- for one thing

that's -- I'm very grateful that private

attorneys are willing to do that for country

litigants.

JUDGE CARUSO: They're -- it's a specialized field, appellate practice is a specialized field and to have attorneys who step up to take on the people who cannot afford that representation but need it, it's

1 a great things.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS:

There's a large group of people and it takes a lot of time. It's not just a couple hours.

that's correct and I think also it's true
that this funding that we have, has done in
areas other than providing attorneys,
providing information, is sometimes as
critical and vital as particularly in rural
areas. Its critical to have brochures
available and help yourself information
available how to contact attorneys, how to
get involved with pro bono representation,
and that is done with this money as well and
that's another aspect of how this money is
being spent by our various legal service
providers, is they're providing information.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: So all the money we get it's really to spread all around the state and it's not what we're making or saying geez, its terrific look at what we accomplished, and it's not a hell of a lot of money but what I want people to

2.5

understand is you're dealing with really
human beings lives and they're not all, down
state in the big -- counties of New York
City, but that this need for funding is so
obvious in almost all rural areas, and
consistent with this need for pro bono

assistance, so --

JUDGE CARUSO: Absolutely and the money as you said, its so, its at lot in terms of the big picture but it's more than we had, but it's so inadequate and in so many ways that we need to have a permanent funding stream for this vital thing because people, truly need it in all areas of our state. Not just the rural not just the urban all areas of our state. The other thing is that the money goes for such different thinks. Training of young attorneys and old attorneys, training to represent people in these niche areas of civil legal representation, education law to help a family with a handicapped child get through the individual education program the IEP process, and it's sometimes you have to have an attorney to get the benefits that

1

2

you're entitled to.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's

people dealing with the necessities of life

the education or housing or family disputes

or some of these things are so critical I

think that the most fundamental message that

anyone could bring so we have Judge

Coccoma's testimony, and we will give it

some weighty thought and it's most important

to let people see as you see it every day in

the field.

JUDGE CARUSO: I think that's why he asked me to come and present my example and hopefully that we would be able to expand on the remarks.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a huge district that covers so much of New York State. Any other questions from the panel? Judge Caruso, thank you so much for coming down we appreciate it, and please tell Judge Coccoma how pleased we were that he selected such a great emissary to come down. Thank you and we appreciate it. We are trying to stay on schedule so, I would ask each of the panel left the next two are

1 Hugh Humphry and Nancy Sunukjian, who are 2 going are judges on the panel. Hugh 3 Humphreys is a retired County Court Judge in Madison County and adjunct professor at 4 5 Syracuse University and Nancy is a Waterford 6 Town Justice, Saratoga County and acting 7 director of the office of Justice Courts and 8 special counsel to the deputy chief 9 administrative judge of courts outside of 10 New York City. And what we would like you 11 to do is, tell us what you have to say and 12 let's leave a little time for a dialogue 1.3 back and forth and hopefully to hear 14 firsthand what your view is, we have 15 submitted written testimony we have but 16 don't feel constrained to read it to us, 17 tell us in your own words. Who wants to go 18 first? 19 JUDGE HUMPHREYS: I think judge 2.0 would you like to go first? 21 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: I'll go first 22 as we're sitting at the table I was told not 23 to be nervous and so of course that's the 24 first thing that you do. 2.5 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Tell us, I

think that's the point, let's hear from you, what is from a judge's perspective, what is this all about?

JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: First of all I would like to tank you for inviting me. I'm very honored to be here in this beautiful room before you all. As was mentioned I am acting director of the Office of Justice Courts Support and Special counsel to Judge Coccoma as well as the Waterford Town Justice so in presenting my remarks which you are already have, I presented them from those two different perspectives if you would as director of the office and with the Courts and then secondly as the judge in the Town of Waterford. What the office does, is we support we provide the we're helping the law clerks and the county, village judges the throughout New York State among other things and we do -- we provide and aid and assist in training, for all the town and village judges throughout New York State. Which there are many as you know many that are not attorneys and I think about 45% or 35% of the judges, on the town or villages

2.5

1 are attorneys, and the rest are not. 2 have found through my twenty years working 3 for the office Court of Court Administration 4 and attorneys, and non attorneys, is they 5 are very consciousness, hard working, 6 dedicated men and woman who I have been 7 incredibly proud to serve over the last many 8 years. 9 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: Would 10 you agree that, town and village judges see 11 more pro se litigants than any other Court 12 in the state? 1.3 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: Undoubtedly 14 judge, the town and village judges are 15 dealing with pro se litigants and I would 16 suggest more than any other person that you 17 here from today, that's submitted 18 information to you. 19 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And how 2.0 that impacts on the judge's job. 21 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: The impact upon 22 the judge is tremendous. As you already 23 heard, we would also prefer that the parties 24 be represented by attorneys. It makes the 2.5 system itself, I believe, work better to

fulfill a mission it needs to fulfill. 1 2 a judge is confronted with unrepresented 3 litigants, it creates a myriad of issues for 4 the judge not only ethical but certainly 5 more difficult for the judge him or herself 6 to get through the proceedings. Obviously 7 we're you know, one of the main proceedings 8 I would like to discuss would be the summary 9 proceedings and revision in the town village 10 Court when individuals actual roof over 11 there head is at stake. 12 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Can they 1.3 get justice without an attorney? 14 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: I believe they 15 get justice it's just -- some of the 16 information is -- that's on line, is the 17 availability to these individuals on line 18 and has been helpful. They can get justice 19 in the local courts, if you've got a judge 2.0 who is willing to do their job to the best 21 of their ability which is to make sure that 22 the litigant is heard, and has access to the 23 justice they need to have. 24 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is it 2.5 difficult though to do your job when you are

also not that your actually doing it, but in some ways, you feel like you need to represent the person who appears before you as much as a judge and there is that

inherent conflict with that.

JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: It's incredibly ly difficult, there is an inherent conflict, and a potential ethical conflict that the judge has to be cautious of all time whether there's an attorney judge or non-attorney judge. We have had this argument or this conversation around for years now and doesn't matter, I think there is it a ethical conflict that the judge needs to be concerned with, whether an attorney or not. It's crossing ing over the line of giving legal advice and not giving legal advice and which we have to be careful to do. judge needs to remain unbiased. The judge needs to remain neutral but when you have an unrepresented litigant before us, we're the Courts and we're the closest to the people we want to help the people. standing before us without an attorney and I want to be able to help somebody. And while

2.5

2.5

our role does help as we are the judge we have to be sure we don't cross over that invisible line, being an advocate for the unrepresented litigant. And I think it's a very difficult line for the judge. Judges call our office, and the first question is is the individual represented and when we find they're not, the conversation takes on a different turn, because they're asking for help, from these judges, not simply when they're standing before the judge but because if they even get to court they're contacting the court.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I

don't mean to lead you, legally, but I'll

ask you a leading question, doesn't that

skew the whole process when you really had

to do either job, correctly, being a judge,

which is a fairly you know, looking at the

different sides, you can't as you say really

represent litigants, the whole judicial

process is distorted with that?

JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: Judge I would agree, it does become skewed, all we're asking for is that everyone has a level

playing field that they're entitled to. And whether the litigant is unrepresented there's an inherent conflict that exists for the judge the judges to act in his capacity or her capacity as the judicial arbiter or then to assist, when the requirement is that you need to advise litigants of the procedural requirements before this.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And that's the reason why we wanted to have the two of you here, is to make the point, that a lack of legal representation not only effects the individual litigant it effects the entire system and particularly with the heavy volume that you have in town and village courts or down state, big city, you know, metropolitan courts, the time that is spent dealing with these kind of cross currents that you are trying to figure out how to handle a situation and the impact on the whole judicial process efficiency and its quickness, its fairness the ethics of a very basic judicial procedure which would, are not as simple as just okay call the case you come up, and we'll hear both sides, and you

2.5

know, make a air resolution. So I think --JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: I will agree judge, and I apologize to you judge, I would absolutely agree in the smallest of the town and village courts, the issues they're facing with the unrepresented litigant is far reaching throughout the state and all courts are dealing with this. I would hope there could be resolution and when I took the bench several years ago and I have been doing this job for years and I very feel competent in the law and what I quickly learned as the unrepresented litigants come before me it simply is not. And to the time that it takes to get through those procedures with the unrepresented litigant, it has an effect on the entire court system.

DEPT. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Quickly and this is an important point, in the town and village courts where you as you said, as many as two thirds of the judge are not lawyers, and where you have many or a disproportionate number of

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN:

Let's.

litigants who appear without lawyers,

doesn't tat compound the problem, that most of the judges are not lawyers? A party doesn't have a lawyer and the judge him or herself is not a lawyer? Doesn't that make it worse?

JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: I believe it does but I believe that you can gain perspective to a certain extent and certainly the judge can ask or reach out to our office for legal guidance and we do our best to educate the Judges and help them conduct the proceeding and if they have questions, but when you have a non-attorney judge and you have an unrepresented litigant, the issue of a potential unethical or conflict that exits is paramount. At a trial the judge wants to help so maybe certainly advising an unrepresented litigant and to be quite blunt, it may be inaccurate. The unrepresented litigant before the judge, the other litigant may be represented by an attorney and the represented litigant certainly could object to the judge going too far over that line and that creates a problem and the entire proceeding itself so

1 to have an unrepresented litigant facing, a 2 non attorney judge --3 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Ιt 4 complicates. 5 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: It makes it more difficult as I said I think the 6 7 non-attorney Judge in the town and village 8 courts are incredibly conscientious. 9 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: They do a 10 god job. 11 JUDGE SUNUKJIAN: In our office 12 we get a lot more phone calls from non 1.3 attorneys than we do from the attorney 14 judges and under the circumstances it's a 15 simple fact that --16 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let's hear 17 from Judge Humphreys and see if the panel 18 has any further questions. Judge, what's 19 been your experience over the years with 2.0 non-represented litigants and how that 21 effects your -- how did that effect your 22 tenure on the bench? JUDGE HUMPHREYS: Well, it wasn't 23 24 as bad as being in the justice court, I mean 2.5 I have been doing this business for over 50

1 years now.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You look so young.

JUDGE HUMPHREYS: I know I did, and I feel young, but there are times when I get disappointed. I have been with the legal aid society in Utica for the last twelve years this week and I was in three cases this week, two larcenies --

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You've seen it from both sides.

JUDE HUMPHREYS: I've seen it as a private lawyer before the town and village justice, and frankly, I can think of many instances where I would prefer to appear before some of the local judges that are not attorneys, than that are attorneys. As the judge said there are some sterling non lawyer judges in those cases. But what I am finding now, is that this help line that Judge Coccoma referred to, that I referred to previously, is running out of our office really, and Utica we're reaching about 13 counties except for Syracuse and Utica, Binghamton, and to some degree Cortland and

Norwich and the rest is rural. I live in 1 2 Madison County and that is where I served. You have no idea what they're doing with 3 4 that help line. We have last year, over 5 4,000 direct legal advice is given to clients and a lot of clients that are coming 6 7 into the judges courts for evictions is 8 tremendous advice. We tell them what to do, 9 we tell them what their rights are and they 10 tell them like you have to get out of the 11 Sheriff will try to you get you some more 12 dates or the thing is wrong, but we're able 13 to do what the local judges can't do and on 14 the telephone. We can't get down to Green, 15 New York, we can't put a lawyer over in 16 Delhi, but we can sure tell them what's 17 happening. 18 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: How's that 19 funded judge? 2.0 JUDE HUMPHREYS: Well it's 21 funded, it's funded out of our general 22 funding as far as I know and I can't answer 23 that question when I try to do that a lawyer 24 answers. 2.5 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You can

1 use more bodies to manage this? 2 JUDE HUMPHREYS: Oh, man, excuse 3 me, oh, Your Honor we could use, far more 4 bodies, we have people that are working 5 there for \$38,000 a year, lawyers, who are 6 getting a 7 percent cut and we can't hire 7 lawyers to fill the slots we have. 8 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Lawyers 9 are part of the working poor in the state. 10 JUDE HUMPHREYS: When they come 11 to our office they are, but judge, 12 paralegals and everything in our whole 1.3 office, if we could have a stream of funding 14 as the officer from the M&T Bank said, and 15 Mr. Schneiderman said the same thing that 16 would be a vast help, because what happens is the faucet gets turned off and one of the 17 18 providers says we can't come up with any 19 more money, and so we have to -- we wonder 2.0 how are we going to -- what will the fall 21 out be when the grant expires and it was 22 renewed. 23 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Violence 24 against woman. 2.5 JUDE HUMPHREYS: When these

2.5

questions come up for example on the immediate stuff like evictions we get in there. Yesterday or the day before yesterday, we were involved in one and there were lawyers in that office one who had been there twenty years, myself and it was called in because there was a question, and I won't get into the legal side of it, but we were able to resolve it, and get an eviction set aside really, because we got the lawyer in there, the judge had already made a ruling, but we went back, and we were able to open it up.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS:

Judge, I read your testimony, and thank you so much for coming and as I said I read it and you talked not only about the challenges that sitting judges fails with pro se litigant you also talk in your testimony about the challenges even the Court clerks face, and would address the problem in addressing the problem of pro se litigants wanting to file cases or petitions?

JUDE HUMPHREYS: Exactly.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: Do

1 you have any subject on a method of dealing 2 with that problem? 3 JUDE HUMPHREYS: Well, it's like 4 the Town Justice, you get a good lay person 5 whose committed to help, and you put that 6 person outside out front, like we did in 7 Madison County, we know you're going to get 8 the right results and if you get a person 9 who is going to go down and look at 14 (a), 10 and (b) subsection (7), forget about it. 11 Because a lot of these people, need to know, 12 all they, they're smart, they don't know the 13 legal process, they're nervous as cats, and 14 they the clerk can be aiding him. Look, put 15 your data birth here all you have to fill in 16 these five questions and we'll get this to 17 the judge. And there's an emergency 18 application for an Order of Protection, so 19 they can be a tremendous help and they are 20 part of a system, which is why I put it in 21 here. 22 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: 23 Correct. 24 JUDE HUMPHREYS: And not just the 2.5 judges that's the office of Court

2.5

Administration and the training they're giving. That I find I don't think I could have done it in Madison County, when I would sit as the Family Court judge I would be sitting on a criminal case with a jury and I will look at the back door of the room and in pops the Department of Social Services attorney with a couple o case workers and I know they're there and they want to pull a child, and I'm going to have stretch the noon hour on that. Now, that's fine, when they have the attorney coming in, but what about the person coming in downstairs, who has been beaten or has been harassed.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: So in essence it's critically important that the clerks be receptive to pro se litigants?

JUDE HUMPHREYS: They have to look like we're here to help you. We're not here to be a road block on some of the people in our court system as in our life, are that way.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know the problem with it too is as we all know the clerk is also walking a tight rope, as

2.5

1

indicated, the judge indicated before, that the clerk can't give legal advice and yet he or she has someone in front of them, who desperately needs help and the question you raised about it may be usually a non-lawyer clerk trying to be helpful, and it's just very difficult. I mean the bottom line is that, there's two strands of this, for more public funding, for legal service providers and to have more volunteer lawyers, willing to perform pro bono work is so essential to this overwhelming need. You know, it differs in all parts of the state but to give an example, Steve Banks was sitting here from New York City, in New York City the legal aid society, turns away 8 of 9 people, who come to them seeking assistance. And it's not that, it may manifest in a way in a different way in a rural area and there's no lawyer to be sent or no help line sufficient to -- sufficient to provide assistance needed but, regardless of how it exactly comes to the floor, the need is so much greater than the resources that are available and that's why, we're seeking as

1 the Attorney General framed it before a 2 systemic permanent funding stream that's for 3 civil legal services that's what I'm trying to do with this hearing, hearing the two of 4 5 you really I think graphically I know you 6 will separates the problem from a different 7 side of it, but it really does, we thank you 8 for being here and coming up, and thanks so 9 much and it was great to see both of you. 10 JUDE HUMPHREYS: Thank you. 11 Can I make a suggestion. 12 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You can. 1.3 JUDE HUMPHREYS: In response to 14 Judge Peters question, when somebody is in 15 there, and that clerk knows they really need 16 help, but the clerk knows they can't give 17 legal advise I think there should be an open 18 line, between the clerk and the judge. 19 know some judges don't want to get involved 2.0 in that; I didn't mind it. That's within 21 the court system. 22 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's 23 something that you don't have a problem 24 with. 2.5 JUDE HUMPHREYS: It's not a real

1

probable but something that would help.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great.

Thank you both. Okay. Our next panel is the statewide partners panel, and we have Steve Acquario, Executive Director New York State Association of Counties, Karla Digirolamo, Chief Executive Officer, New York State Community Action Association and Joseph T. Farrell, Director of Training New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault. All I think partners in this effort, and recognize and see so many of the problems that confront us. So, who is going to start? Karla you want to sit in the middle? Do you want to start? As we indicated feel free, we have your testimony, most of you submitted written testimony, tell us what's on your mind so we can maybe engage you with some back and forge of what the real problem is.

MS. DIGIROLAMO: Thank you very much. Thank you very much to chief Judge
Lippman, Judge Peters, Judge Marks and
Mr. Seymour, I really appreciate the opportunity to testify before you, to talk a

2.5

little bit about the forms of civil legal services in New York and particularly, in the impact on the community that we serve at the Community Action Association. I am Director of the Community Action Association which is a statewide association representing the network of community action agencies. The community action agency in New York as around the country are federally designated anti-poverty agencies in each County. They have been in existence for over 45 years in New York State. In 2011, as I noted in my testimony we received over 60 million dollars in community services, block grants money which came into the community to provide a foundation for services to low income people. As I know you're well aware and we've heard throughout the day, the problems facing poor people in New York State throughout the country, are growing worse every moment. Despite good work done by other networks of community action agencies in New York and around the country, poverty remains abundantly high and devastating to communities in New York

2.5

State. Over 46 million Americans live in poverty. And in New York State over 14% of our residents live in poverty. Of particular concern is the rate of poverty among children that children are particularly hard hit with over 25% of our children in the state living in poverty and more than 30% living at 150% of federal poverty line. Those poverty rates are even higher in the upstate communities. People living in poverty presents a daunting array of challenges, from the need for legal services to assist to maintain their housing, to access their legal rights and entitlements, and to encounter and overcome the barriers that poverty creates for them in every day living. Each percent rise of poverty directly leads to a heightened need for legal services. People living in poverty, face foreclosure, evictions they face credit and bankruptcy needs, they face homelessness and the rapid need for rehousing needs and community support, debt collection, unemployment.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Hold on,

and I correct and do I understand that,

people in poverty or people of modest means

these -- see these types of issues much more

than the rest of the population?

MS. DIGIROLAMO: Absolutely they do. I think that the fact of being in poverty also contributes to this that if you can't pay your rent you face eviction, when you can't pay your bills you face debt collectors, when you can't negotiate your legal rights, when you don't understand your -- that you have actually have a right to housing, that you have a right to receive assistance it creates this growing mountain of legal challenges, that then you're even more overwhelmed in trying to address and trying to find affordable legal services. So yes I think that the problem that we see in the poverty that we have, are the same legal issues that many of us might face in difficult time plus a whole mountain of additional problems is created by the facts of living in poverty.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: You talk about the more forward, is it -- are

24

2.5

you describe is those individuals who previously had full time employment, and consistent income who are now struggling to just stay in the home?

MS. DIGIROLAMO: Yes, I think what we're seeing now at least in the community action, and I believe throughout the state and country is that the -- that you have those folks who traditionally thought of poor people, and now you have a new population of people who have lost their jobs, who have seen their wages stagnate or who are facing foreclosure, and financial challenges, who are now swelling the ranks of our poor and working poor and creating an even further challenge to our system which --

We're seeing is, that these people who never did come into Court before, because as we talked about, the poor are the ones who face or know — but it's the ones who face or mostly new indigents and are frightened and come to the Court house not really knowing what you're facing or being able to deal

2.5

with.

MS. DIGIROLAMO: Exactly ad one of the things that we've learned in doing poverty work, is that people who have experience living if you will -- living in poverty, have experience in the navigating those systems. Frankly sometimes we in the system, get frustrated at how good they are at navigating the system, they have learned to survive. Those who are the new poor as the judges have noted have no experience. They don't understand, how to navigate through that.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: How do you interject with the legal service providers?

How does that work for an entity like yours?

You're around the state is there a very close relationship with legal service providers, this work?

MS. DIGIROLAMO: We have a very close and long held relationship with the legal services entities, such as Legal Project in the Capital Region and legal aid societies throughout the state. And many of our programs have longstanding partnerships

with the legal aid providers. And clearly,
as you know better than we do, those legal
aid providers are increasingly unable to met
the needs of the poor.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Can you do your job when they're unable to do theirs?

MS. DIGIROLAMO: No, if the fundamental issue, and we've seen this happen, someone is facing a foreclosure, eviction, a garnishee of the wages, any range of things, they may actually be legally entitled to remain in their home. They may have a legal entitlement to defend against those things, but we can't access those services without the legal support to do that. And as you discussed here, we don't have an attorney at our program. have lay people who try to learn everything they can about what legal services people are entitled to, about what general services people are entitled to, but without the ability to even consult with an attorney that's what we're hearing in many of our communities, not only do people not have an opportunity to have an attorney represent

2.5

them this Court proceeding, they don't even have an opportunity to talk to an attorney, so you have people who are going to defend an eviction proceeding, who may have a solid legal defense, but without some legal aid.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And no ability to get to it.

MS. DIGIROLAMO: Even minimal advice that says you're right, you have a right to be there, these people are losing their homes, their livelihood and sometimes there's children, and again, our program serve beyond those kinds of victims of domestic violence, you know, a wide range of people and the impact of that.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

Let's hear from your colleague here on the impact -- Steve how does it impact on the counties and the association of counties have to do with all of these people falling off the cliff, and as with Karla's different groups and you can't help them because they can't provide legal services. What do the counties and what's the impact Steve?

MR. ACQUARIO: As the

representative of the 57 counties and the
City of New York, part of our organization,
we would prefer that as an enforcement
agent, and that's what we do is enforce the
law, that's foreclosures, serve notice the
Sheriff, District Attorney on te side, the
County Attorney on the civil side is often
in Family Court proceeding and we would
prefer to have adequate civil legal defense.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why?

MR. ACQUARIO: Because it is better for the government to make sure someone gets due process and justice is given to those that don't understand these complex systems, whether it's foreclosure, whether the needs of bankruptcy or needs of housing, their home and then only to find out there was something that could have been done to save that home, and that the government went through five years of tax payer funded initiatives, to get a tax collected to go through all these measures and all this staff time, it helps the system work. It helps the law make sure that the purpose for which they work drafted, and

enacted into law serves their purpose to make sure they're being followed and that's that kind of process where --

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: The process were you go lieu the time and the effort and the money. People are hurt in the end who may well be able to survive if they he had representation and all that doesn't do much good for the economic health of our counties or state, does it?

MR. ACQUARIO: No. And I appear here today on behalf the counties and government, they are doing their part and we have a role and we have responsibilities, and we are in the middle of an entire criminal justice system as we are in the civil justice system as well. And as human services providers, Medicaid, human services the safety net, the backbone of help of public assistance that what we do, food stamps, and if individuals are entitled to these benefits, are entitled to the benefits, they may not know that they're entitled to the benefits or they don't know now to access the system and it's good to

2.5

make sure they get their benefits whether we're paying for that or the federal government or state government is paying for that. Why? It helps a human being number one but number (2) it helps the local economy and state economy which is an economic return on investment in civil legal services. It's not just -- just whether it's paramount but also its economic and it helps our economy to homes, to families. And so that's why I chose to come here today. I was asked by two board members from the southern tier, Steuben County and Westchester County, William Ryan a legislator asked me to appear here today which is out of character for what we would normally do in County government.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think

Steve it's important, people don't

understand that this is not just about doing

the right thing, but this the about an

investment that serves our entire state and

the economic health of our state, that again

we I think I mentioned it before that every

dollar invested get \$5 back to our state,

2.5

it's allowing people lives to fall by the wayside and be dependant on government for, their subsistence, and that isn't helping in this case or their families is, and isn't helping the kind of robust and vibrant communities that we would like to see. think it's so very important that, in some ways as you say it's counterintuitive when the counties or the banks or the you know whatever it might be or the housing authority or the no one benefits when people are left without legal recourse and without legal representation. So that's really and that provides a whole different vantage point, and Mr. Farrell, where do you fit into this coalition with sexual assault? Where does this fit into the whole puzzle?

MR. FARRELL: Good morning and first of all I'd like to thank you Judge Lippman, Judge Marks and Judge Peters and Mr. James for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. You have my testimony, and the facts and figures there, with regard to the cost of a sexual violence across the country and what the sexual violence does

2.5

cost us as a community, and thus as a state relative to individuals not being able to access services and the long term effect of not being able to access services. Approximately 60 percent of sexual assaults are reported. But if you take a look at the numbers that I have in the testimony, in a point in time, rape crisis programs serve over 27,000 new individuals as opposed to, excuse me, 19,000 new as opposed to 27 hundred reported, to law agencies. being said, victims still seek some from of justice, and accountability or reparation and they do so through civil legal systems, that they access sometimes long after the Statute of Limitations has expired from the criminal standpoint even though there are, that the Statute of Limitations on certain sex offenses within New York state that's been changed, and that been very positive. By an individual who looks to access the services are most often, disenfranchised and marginalized and not served in the communities and that are -- victimized because of their stature, within the

2.5

community. They can't access these services because they don't have the resources to look to programs such the legal project that we talked about earlier and the civil legal aid society that was referred to earlier, we partnered with the legal project in the capital district in early 2000 on a project that afforded civil legal representation and access to systems that they might not have been able to access prior to engaging the Legal Project and we would act as a referal for the 76 or 77 rape crisis programs across New York State.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: The Legal Project which I'm very familiar with, does a terrific job. So what about when you don't have a Legal Aid Society or whatever that group might be that fills this gap, what happens to the people? What's the impact on our society?

MR. FARRELL: Someone that could not access the program, rape crisis and may not decide to come forward until two or three after an assault, maybe longer, seeking some form of accountability

2.5

sometimes some form of justice, the rape crisis program may not have the ability to refer to a local level, to a legal project or a legal aid society, and if they do, geographic concerns come into play with regard to the rural areas so they call us, at the coalition, what can this individual do, how can we help this person? Have you talked to you know the Legal Aid Society have you talked to any resources in the area and exhausted and they're still unable to come up with a solution for that individual . So will turn to the Legal Project, and without funding --

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: What happens to the individual if you don't?

MR. FARRELL: They now fall into a situation where they aren't or can't become whole they are seeking justice or getting justice and there's no accountability for what happened to them so through now unable to work, unemployment rolls go up, you get into the loss of income you get into the separation of families because in a lot of instances it's the

1	partner who has committed the crime.
2	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Those
3	problems fester and lead to tragic
4	consequences.
5	MR. FARRELL: Also become as we a
6	burden on the county, a burden on the state
7	and a burden on the community that the
8	people are in, and it further emphasizes the
9	need for legal services civil legal services
10	not in just a major metropolitan areas where
11	the problems do they but rurally as was
12	referred to earlier by the Judge were there
13	is none.
14	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, any
15	questions?
16	MR. JAMES: Mr. Farrell, you
17	both work in collaboration in the legal
18	services provider referring to, and are you
19	finding that a great percentage of those
20	individuals are not able to be serviced by
21	the legal services provider.
22	MR. FARRELL: Yes.
23	MS. DIGIROLAMO: And in my
24	experience yes not because they're not
25	willing to do it, but in a majority of the

1 people who seek help and are not able to get 2 There's simply not the resources help. 3 available. And throughout the state, whether it's legal aid, the State or 4 5 attorneys that we call, for advice and 6 assistance, they're very concerned --7 they're very, you know, wish they could help 8 but in reality there's no resource. 9 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And this 10 has gotten worse because of the economic 11 crisis. Did you see a difference? 12 MR. FARRELL: Yes we do. 13 MR. ACQUARIO: Yes, yes. 14 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. 15 Thank you so much. 16 MR. FARRELL: We appreciate the 17 opportunity. 18 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Coming 19 from three different points of view, but 2.0 arriving at the same point. We appreciate 21 all of you coming in. 22 Our next panel a client panel is 23 really kind of on the front lines. I would 24 ask Sherry DeShane, accompanied by Victoria 2.5 Esposito, Shari Chireno, accompanied by

2.5

1

Sarah Maida, Heisily Rojas, client of the Legal -- the Legal Project, accompanied by Natalie Birch-Higgins and Holly Ovitt, clients of the Legal Aid Society of New York accompanied by William Niebel. Are there chairs for everyone? Okay. What I'd ask you first is don't be nervous, all I want you to do is just tell us your story, and you can read from your statement or tell us, what happened, and we may, don't be insulted if -- we may cut in and ask you questions because we know, that you have got serious legal problems and we want to get a sense of how it was dealt with, and how it impacted on your life. Let me ask, Sherry, first, do you want to tell us what your story is? You have Ms. Esposito with you.

MS. DESHANE: Yes.

My name is -- first of all good afternoon, good morning Judge Lippman, its still morning, and members of the panel, my name is Sherry DeShane, and I live in Massena, New York and I live alone. I was originally referred to Legal Aid, by either the renewal house or mental health, for my

2.5

divorce, and -- in 2004 and 2005. I had worked off and on as a health care aid when my husband allowed me to, and I liked it. I would have kept working if I had been able to but because of my anxiety and depression and PTSD I had to stop being able to work at about that same time. I started getting SSI. After the divorce, I got half of my ex-husband's 401K, I reported that money to the Social Security, right away as I knew I had to. Since my husband had been very controlling, and had not allowed me to work much, I had no savings, and no prospects of a pension. I had hoped to keep my money for the future. I heard nothing from Social Security for years and then my payments stopped because of the money I had received from my divorce. I had to go on public assistance. I felt terrible having to ask for that and I felt like I had hit the I was told that once I show I had spent all the money from my divorce, I would start getting my SSI again. I had nothing and I spent the money that I had thought would be my savings, on a vehicle, a bed,

2.5

furniture and basics for my home. After I spent the money, I went back to Social Security to get my payments back, they told me that I would have reapply and start the process all over again. I filed a new application, and I thought all I had to do was file the application, and I would get my SSI back. Instead my application was denied because they said I wasn't disabled and they never asked my doctor what he thought and my depression got worse after that. I couldn't stand being torn down again and it felt as though my dignity had been taken away. I couldn't leave my house or talk to anyone. I talked to my counselor about getting legal aid help again -- legal aid for help. Just knowing that I had someone who would listen to me was a help. Once I had a lawyer Victoria Esposito I felt more at ease with my case and Legal Aid made he feel like they would take care of my case. I was more secure knowing I didn't need to worry about my case by myself. I will always have my depression and anxiety, but knowing that I have someone helping me made me feel better

that I could live in the house and I could get out of bed. We appealed the decision and went through the hearing. Victoria explained what we were here to do.

Even though it was two so hard for me to sit in the room and have to explain to someone what my problems were. was really nervous and shaky, I didn't want to talk about my problems, but when I had no choice -- I even had a panic attack at the hearing and had to step out of the room. still gives me chills thinking about it now. I got my SSI back after the hearing, because I -- I am disabled. Unfortunately, Social Security said I have been over paid, and when I had my ex-husband's 401K, and they threatened to take the money from the retroactive award that I was entitled to because of the long delay and re-qualify for SSI, I can believe they wanted the money back. Now I felt they owed me for the year I had lost my SSI. I had no lawyer, I was very upset and Victoria took all of my receipts and added them up and we filed an affidavit, and I explained that I had

2.5

reported the money, and then spent it on the necessities that I had bought, and the receipts and done everything they have told me to do and after a little while I was told that I did not have to pay the money back and that the overpayment was waived. my back payments I was able to replace my car, which had been totaled and without it I had to pay for a taxi to get to the doctor appointments and to get to the store and to shop. If I had not had a legal aid lawyer, I would still be on public assistance. I would not have a car and I would have nothing. I have things now that are mine. I can go into my apartment, and feel the comfort and security of a home. I can pay my bills, my food and medicine and gas for my car and I have a little bit of money left over and I am more independent than I was on public assistance. I would not have been able to go through the hearing process or to get a waiver for the help. People in my position don't know anything about Social Security, or SSI, and we need legal aid to see us through otherwise I would be

1 clueless. 2 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sherry so what you say, having a legal aid lawyer, 3 dramatically effected your life? 4 5 MS. DESHANE: Yes. 6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It must be 7 -- it's good to be able to turn to with a 8 legal problem? 9 MS. DESHANE: Yes, definitely. 10 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: 11 without it you would have no idea how to 12 deal with Social Security. 13 MS. DESHANE: Absolutely and when 14 you're not --15 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's verv 16 gratifying to hear you talk about your 17 disability and how a lawyer enhances so much 18 in your life. Thank you so much. 19 MS. DESHANE: You're welcome. 20 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: Tt. 21 seems to me, that from your testimony, that 22 not only did you get back the funds that you 23 deserved but you feel empowered and 24 apparently you are sitting here very calm, 2.5 with us giving testimony where it would seem

1 historically you would not have an ability 2 to be so calm, and secure, and to appear 3 before people like us; have I got that 4 right? 5 MS. DESHANE: Yes. 6 PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: 7 Congratulations. 8 MS. DESHANE: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Shari, do you want to 10 tell us about your story. 11 MS. CHIRENO: Good afternoon. 12 name is Shari Chireno, and I'm a former client of the Legal Aid Services of the 1.3 14 Hudson Valley. The story that I'm about to 15 tell you began with my family and that we 16 had the misfortune of renting a home in a 17 neighborhood that was devastated by the 18 floods from the Hurricane Irene. Our home 19 was flooded and we lost all of our 2.0 belongings, when the flooding consumed 21 several feet of our basement and many of our 22 belongings were there and when we contacted 23 our landlord to see what we -- how we --24 what we can expect with all the water damage 2.5 and for it to be repaired. We got no

24

2.5

response. We were watching efforts taking place at other homes on our street and we had the added misfortune of coping with my brain tumor that had metastasized because of my breast cancer. We knew that the mod would be particularly dangerous to me, because of my surgery went through my nose, and the exposure to all the environmental hazards that I would breathe were through my nose. At this time, I didn't know the legal services of Hudson Valley and I didn't know that I could to educate myself, with my rights as a tenant. We waited for the landlord to do what he is supposed to do, to make our home safe for me, my husband and our two children, when I ultimately learned from internet research that we have the right to withhold rent to live until the necessary repairs are made. When my doctor told me the mold in the apartment was potentially dangerous to anyone exposed to it, obviously I was concerned for not only the safety of my children, but the risk to me was particularly acute at this time. made the decision to withdraw our presence,

and because we did not know what else to do
my husband, who is the only one employed,
and who was already having his wage
garnished because of medical bills. We also
lived with the knowledge that my headaches
would continue --

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Take your time Shari.

MS. CHIRENO: And that we would face other judgements because of the -- resulting from the continued need for my medical care.

A short time after contacting our landlord, we are received eviction papers.

We had to appear in a Ellenville Justice

Court as a result of our decision to withhold our rent. Still unaware of the services that could be provided by the Legal Services of Hudson Valley, we proceeded to -- we prepared to go to Court, without representation. Well I felt confident that I knew my rights, I knew nothing of the Court procedures, and how to effectively advocate for myself and my family. I went to Court on the date listed and on the front

24

2.5

of the petition and despite my best efforts my landlord got a warrant of eviction, with no stay, meaning the Sheriff's office could ask us to leave any time, with the three days notice. Also we had a money judgment awarded against us for the rent, from the months we had withheld. I was shocked and saddened by the result of our day in Court and tried to get more information, about what recourse we may have and the reality of our situation is we could have been homeless in three days. My daughter was a week from graduation and my children endured so much, that not only from my health, but being told that we had to leave our home. I contacted the two attorneys immediately from legal services and they immediately started working to help us. They began to file emergency applications, called an Order to Show Cause, when the Judge in Ellenville was unavailable to read the papers we took the papers to Ulster County Court and the Judge signed the Order which is called a Stay, and we were temporarily prevented -- the landlord from having us thrown out of our

24

2.5

home and it gave us a Court date and to appear in Ellenville to be heard regarding the assertions contained in the Order to Show Cause. Legal Services, Sarah, appeared in Court with me and she was successful in getting the Court to vacate the warrant and a money judgment, that had been entered against us and the judgment was even dismissed on the landlord's petition. this was a temporary reprieve we new that the landlord would re file if we remained in the apartment so but we had time to find a safe place to live and the money judgment against us would be vacated. It also meant that if we went back to Court the attorneys from Legal Services of the Hudson Valley would be there to advocate for repairs to make the apartment habitable. Thankfully we were able to find a new home and our situation is better than it was and I'm grateful, so very grateful for the Legal Services of the Hudson Valley, they provided to me, and my family. I'm grateful to the Office of the Court Administration for providing the funds to make it possible.

And I just want to say, too, my husband goes to work every day, my husband is a federal employee and we were in a position then, we don't meet the qualification of the poor, yet without the services, I couldn't afford an attorney.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: So what you're saying, what you're saying is that this isn't necessarily people who have no resources whatsoever, this is average people trying to go about life and yet when you're confronted with a life transforming legal crisis you need help and you can't -- you don't have the resources.

MS. CHIRENO: Not just resources, you have to already figure the situation that you're in, and you're already robbing Peter to pay Paul. So, at that time, I'm as I said I have a doctor and the doctor said I just can't work at this time.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's so instructive to see that people, you know, that the people get legal services, don't necessarily have this -- are in a position and are people -- people with jobs, they are

1 assisted, that not all the cases --2 MS. CHIRENO: No and I think 3 there's the category that's not on the poor 4 put people in the middle class -- people who 5 go to work every day and do the right thing, 6 and they just get one paycheck behind and in 7 my situation, all it took was a storm and we 8 had to evacuate from our home and you come 9 back and you've lost everything. And how do 10 you recoup? 11 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And 12 dealing without. MS. CHIRENO: I couldn't have 1.3 14 done it and we had -- I had used all of my 15 husband's retirement money for medical 16 needs. So, without them, I would have been 17 ready to take our children and go to a 18 homeless shelter. 19 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you 2.0 for telling us your story and it really 21 graphically illustrates the good done for 22 human beings which find themselves by 23 circumstances in a difficult situation. 24 MS. CHIRENO: Not only that but, 2.5 they have give, a -- a feeling that there's

somebody that really wants to help you for the right reason. And they give you that dignity back. Especially when you go to Court, without an attorney, and they basically belittle you that, you just didn't want to do something, and what are you going to do to about that. It moral principle, and without somebody giving you the respect as a human being, and it makes a difference, and I when we talk to Sarah the first time she was going to be out of the office, but she said come over within an hour, we are leaving there with a piece of paper that said I was not hot going to have to move overnight.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for telling us your story and we appreciate your coming in.

 $\label{eq:MS.CHIRENO:} \mbox{I appreciate your}$ hearing me.

I appreciate so much, that the stuff that's out there is available to people like me, and I hope that you continue funding it because being the way the economy is going and you see people working winding

1 up in the same situation. I've never been a 2 court of law in my life and I could only 3 imagine the terror of somebody else who 4 didn't have someone and what were you going 5 to do. 6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: We'll keep 7 trying, that I can tell you. 8 MS. CHIRENO: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Heisily Rojas? 10 MS. BIRCH-HIGGINS: (INTERPRETER) 11 First I'd like to say hello and thank you. 12 THE COURT: Why don't you move to 13 mic closer to the two of you if you can? 14 MS. BIRCH-HIGGINS: I want to 15 tell you a little bit about what happened to 16 me in my life. And the life of my children. 17 I came to this country from Costa Rica. We 18 came here and my husband was already here so 19 he had an attorney for immigration, and all 20 the paperwork for that. We came here 21 legally and my ex-husband said that he had 22 an attorney to do all of her paperwork for 23 immigration. So he said that he needed 24 money to help pay for the attorney, for all 2.5 of the legal papers so I started to work to

2.5

to be able to help him financially. So some time passed and before we realized it that he received his documents and his work permit but just for himself. Not for anyone else. So we believe we can continue to live together, but then after some time he wanted to send me back to Costa Rica with my children. My children came here when they were very small. My children didn't want to go home and they said this is my country and I love this place. We continued living together but the arguments and the abuse in

the household continued.

It's very difficult to explain
the story because there are so many things.
He tried to abuse my daughters, sexually.
An example daughter and my little girl. So,
the day that I came home from work and I saw
with my own eyes, what he was doing to my
little girl only two years and 7 months old.
And that's the moment that I began to get
strength you can say that, from something
terrible that's when I was able to get the
strength to move forward and for me and my
children. So, we called the police, that

2.5

was the first thing and the they came and took my husband from the home. And thank God that since that moment he's never come back to my home. I tried to move forward with my children the best I could. But it was very difficult because I was not married legally. I couldn't ask for help from DSS or Medicaid or any place. It was very difficult for me to continue. So one of these days my ex-husband wanted to ask for the legal papers for just my older son, because I have three daughters and one son. He only wanted to ask for his son. So, I accepted for the good of my son, and we met with an immigration attorney. That's where I met the immigration attorney Steven We had our first meeting. And Lawrence. after that first meeting, the attorney Lawrence, Steve, contacted me saying he wanted a meeting alone with me. So I said yes and we had our first meeting with Steven Lawrence. And so, when I met with him and luckily he spoke Spanish so he could tell me and I can tell him my story in Spanish and a when he found out what he wanted he wanted

2

4

3

5

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

to send me to the Empire Justice Center. That's when I came in contact with the attorney. He's an immigration attorney who I have a lot of -- I really care for him. And I thank him. Thanks to him and his program as we start to move forward, me and my children. And thanks to him and his good job they do for me and my children to stay legal -- legally in the country. And when I was with -- when I wanted to get a divorce. My answer was yes and he sent me to the Legal Project. And that's how I heard of the Legal Project and Natalie and Karla, and other friends. I'm very thankful for the help and the programs that offer help in this country. It's admirable having come from another country me and my children are and we have -- we can get the help from so many people and so many friends. The Legal Project helped me with my divorce and that I have at the moment. I am divorced now. there's something more -- more than to me that I would like to point out at this moment. And that's because of my youngest daughter. And I would like to point out

3

5

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2.5

custody of my youngest daughter. I'm

so important to me that I have custody full

that with the divorce documents, that it's

thankful to the Legal Project and I feel

that my youngest daughter, being she is so

young she's safe now. You know that the

hearing the schools require documents, so

that certain people cannot pick-up this

children from school, especially fathers.

And parents. The document that I have

that's signed by the Schenectady Court, says

that he cannot pick my daughter up from

school that is something very valuable to

me. He can't come close to her. This a

something that the Legal Project has done

for me and my family and I'm very grateful.

The divorce was very important, but it was

also very important that my daughter is

safe. These programs like Legal Project

that are accessible to those of us that

don't have the means to pay for them for

legal services. I know that you know how

important these programs are. But I want to

come here and talk about the things that

have happened in my life and how important

2.0

these programs are. Now today, we live better. My children are very good, they're excellent children. They continue to study they will get their careers. And even though what we've lived through this and it will effect our lives forever, we keep fighting to be better every day. Without forgetting then and being thankful with our hearts to everyone that's helped us, we're thankful and to God and to everyone who is in that -- that higher position, to help us, that God bless them and so they can continue to help us.

Thank you for that beautiful statement and we can see that -- that your life has been touched by being able to have help from the Legal Project, and from the other legal services that you received, and this is exactly the story that we want everyone to understand. As to how legal services, for those who can afford it, can't afford it really effect their lives and gives them a new life. And thank you so much for coming in. Okay. Holly Ovitt, accompanied by

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

William Niebel. Thank you very much for coming here today, for such an important cause.

MS. OVITT: And it's very quite an honor for me. My name is Holly Ovitt and I am a single mom, I have two boys, they're 8 and 11 years old Dylan and Payne. I work as a rehabilitation specialist at the Washington County ARC. I assist mentally and physically disabled individuals to more enrich their lives. And I help with their daily tasks. Earlier this year I had a legal issue arise in my life that required professional help. I couldn't afford a lawyer, so I called Legal Aid Society of New York and I was referred to them by friends, I have a unique situation, and I wasn't exactly sure what my rights were. I needed expert advice. On my first call I spoke to a couple of different people, and they graciously listened to my predicament and referred me to the most appropriate lawyer which was William. I was being evicted along with my two boys from our home of ten years, and I have never been in that

24

2.5

situation before. And Mr. Neibel guided me through the whole legal process. explained to me the problems with my landlord's case, my legal defenses, my rights, and the process that my landlord needed to go through in order to -- to proceed with the eviction. He told me what the landlord was -- what he was trying to do, when he was evicting me for nonpayment of a new rental amount, that I had not agreed to. I was originally paying \$400 a month and he upped it to \$750, and I thought that was an unreasonable increase. Instead since I didn't agree to pay, the landlord give me one month notice to terminate at that time. When I was finally served with Court papers for eviction, I was given a very short time, about two weeks to leave the premises. I lived there for ten years. It's not a lot of time. My lawyer used my defense to fight so that I would be able to remain in the home, for the remainder of the school year. Which was very important to me, had he not done that my kids would have been uprooted and probably would have had to

2.5

change schools with just a couple of months left to the school year. My older son has autism and this would have been especially devastating to him. I also attend classes as ACC and am working toward an accounting degree. I'm a single mother so of course money was another important issue, and he helped me negotiate a reasonable rental payment that was far below the landlord's requested amount for the months that we continued to live there, which saved me hundreds of dollars, and the Legal Aid Society, helped me with that money and I was able to turn around and use that as a deposit on a new apartment. There's also a huge relief to have a third party, communicate with my landlord since he was my ex-fiancee and the father of my two children. Mr. Niebel spoke on my behalf and shielded me from unwanted intimidation. was uncomfortable to say the least. When I was served legal documents it was very scary and I -- I didn't have the knowledge of the legal system to comfort and to handle my case or fully understand exactly what steps

1 I should take and again what my rights were, 2 because of the Legal Aid Society's help, the 3 helped me and my children and I had a very favorable outcome to the case. I was able 4 5 to save money and they were able to stay to 6 finish out the school year. I didn't have 7 to be in direct contact with my landlord. 8 Legal Aid Society was hugely beneficial to 9 me and I really hope it continues to be 10 funded as a resource for individuals faced 11 with difficult legal situations, such as 12 mine. 1.3 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well thank 14 That's another example of why legal 15 services is really a lifesaver in so many 16 ways. 17 MS. OVITT: Yes. 18 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: I assume 19 without their help, you just wouldn't have been able to deal with that? 2.0 21 MS. OVITT: Well my situation 22 was unique, but I was part of the process in purchasing the house, we did it together, 23 24 and then throughout the course of our 2.5 relationship we split up, I remained in the

house, so I felt like entitled to it and
when I really had no legal -- right to it,
essentially.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it's so much the case with intimate partners, and it gets very complicated and --

MS. OVITT: There was a lot of emotion involved and he was able to steer me toward the legal aspect and what I could and could not do, and he made everything good.

CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well thank you for all your stories as I think they all graphically illustrate what this is all about and what we are trying to do and I think that your stories really cap off our day in that we heard from the Chief law enforcement officer of the State and the banking industry, and the judicial community, and some of the different entities that try and help people who have limited resources, and in part in other words to try and deal with the issues and no one tells the story better than you and we're going to -- and the purpose of the hearing will be to go back and figure out

24

2.5

when the Attorney General talks about the justice gap and the need that you and so many others have in our state and yet, the limited amount of financial resources that we have, and what we will try and do with the task force members, and some of them are here today, Barbara Finkelstein, Fern Fisher, Lillian Loy of local fame, and Mary Moan the counsel to the task force, have all done a terrific job of setting up the hearings for all os us here so we can figure out, what moneys we need to ask for, to provide the resources that you need in the situations like all of you are in. The help that you're entitled to, and we want to make sure you get it. I want to thank everyone for being here, Justice Peters and Seymour James the President of the State Bar and Judge Marks, and we will take all of your testimony, and we have three more hearings to go and take a good look and talk with the task force and see what we can do to continue this fight. And this really is a fight to make our partners in government, and the public understand, the dire need,

1

2

for assistance and what it means to real human beings with real problems, and do everything within our power to ensure that the resources and there -- that this issue is a priority in our State. It's as important as housing and education and medical care, that legal services is so important, and such a vital part of human being lives. So, we thank everyone for coming and everyone who testified and thanks especially this last panel you all are really are terrific and so appreciate your laying out your personal issues, which we know are not so easy to tell in public, but it does graphically illustrate the problem.

PRESIDING JUSTICE PETERS: you to the lawyers for your dedication and we know that you don't make a great deal of money for doing that job and we are so very grateful.

1	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
2	
3	I, CYNTHIA A. WEST, a Shorthand
4	Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
5	State of New York, do hereby CERTIFY that
6	the foregoing record taken by me at the time
7	and place noted in the heading hereof is a
8	true and accurate transcript of the same, to
9	the best of my ability and belief.
10	
11	
12	
13	Cynthia A. West
14	
15	Dated: September 28, 2012
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	