1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK		
2	- FOURTH DEPARTMENT -		
3	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
4	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS		
5	ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES		
6			
7	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
8	Ceremonial Courtroom		
9	Old County Hall 92 Franklin Street Buffalo, New York		
11	October 6, 2011		
12	BEFORE:		
13	HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, CHIEF JUDGE		
14			
15	HONORABLE ANN PFAU, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE		
16	HONORABLE HENRY J. SCUDDER,		
17	PRESIDING JUSTICE OF THE FOURTH DEPARTMENT		
18	PAUL MICHAEL HASSETT, ESQ. PAST-PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOC.		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

# THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

THE FOURTH DEPARTMENT, OCTOBER 6, 2011

2

25

## 3 I N D E X

## 4 CLIENT PANEL

5		PAGE
6		1.0
7	BERNARD DENT CLIENT OF WESTERN NEW YORK LAW CENTER	10
8	MICHELLE KILIAN CLIENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES, INC.	17
9	, and the second	22
10	GABRIELLE THREET (BY ROBERT ELARDO)  CLIENT OF ERIE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION  VOLUNTEER LAWYERS PROJECT	23
11	JACK HAGEN	30
12	CLIENT OF LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY, DISABLED OR DISADVANTAGED OF WESTERN NEW YOR	
13		
14	COLLABORATIONS AND SHARED COSTS PA	NEL
15		PAGE
15 16	ADMILLID A DILGG ID	
	ARTHUR A. RUSS, JR.  PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY;  OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP	<b>PAGE</b> 38
16	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP	38
16 17	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  JUSTIN L. VIGDOR CHAIR, TELESCA CENTER CAPITAL CAMPAIGN;	
16 17 18	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  JUSTIN L. VIGDOR CHAIR, TELESCA CENTER CAPITAL CAMPAIGN; PAST PRESIDENT, NYS BAR ASSOCIATION and MONROE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION;	38
16 17 18	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  JUSTIN L. VIGDOR CHAIR, TELESCA CENTER CAPITAL CAMPAIGN; PAST PRESIDENT, NYS BAR ASSOCIATION and MONROE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION; SENIOR COUNSEL, BOYLAN CODE LLP	38
16 17 18 19	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  JUSTIN L. VIGDOR CHAIR, TELESCA CENTER CAPITAL CAMPAIGN; PAST PRESIDENT, NYS BAR ASSOCIATION and MONROE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION;	38
16 17 18 19 20 21	PRESIDENT, BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY; OF COUNSEL, PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  JUSTIN L. VIGDOR CHAIR, TELESCA CENTER CAPITAL CAMPAIGN; PAST PRESIDENT, NYS BAR ASSOCIATION and MONROE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION; SENIOR COUNSEL, BOYLAN CODE LLP  BRYAN D. HETHERINGTON	38

		THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL	SERVICES
1		LAW SCHOOL DEAN	
2		LAW SCHOOL DEAN	PAGE
3	MAKA	U W. MUTUA	74
4	1111111	DEAN and SUNY DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY at BUFFALO LAW SCHOOL	, -
5			
6		JUDGES' PANEL	
7			PAGE
8	HON.	PAULA L. FEROLETO	89
9		ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICO-CHAIR, EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT	ICT;
10	II () N	PRO BONO COMMITTEE  DEBORAH H. KARALUNAS	99
12	non.	SUPREME COURT, ONONDAGA COUNTY	99
13	HON.	E. JEANNETTE OGDEN BUFFALO CITY COURT;	107
14		ACTING JUDGE, COUNTY AND FAMILY COURTS	
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

#### THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Proceedings commenced at 11:06 A.M.)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning. Pleasure to see all of you at this fourth hearing on civil legal services in New York this year. You know, these hearings are the second year that we are trying to figure out the gap in civil legal service representation for the court. genesis of the hearings is really because we in the judiciary and the legal profession understand that it is our constitutional mission to foster equal justice for all in the state, that it is the professional obligation of the bar to do so, and essentially if not us, who is going to do this? The judiciary and the profession feel that this is, again, essential in terms of the civil justice system, that the poor, that the working poor have representation in matters affecting the necessities of life, the roof over someone's head, freedom from domestic violence, their livelihood, consumer debt cases, entitlements that subsistence -- entitlement that people are supposed to have, all of these things require a lawyer, and in our courthouses and in our courtrooms, if we can't foster equal justice, a level playing field, then we might as well close those courthouse doors.

This is particularly important in the difficult economic times that we are facing in New York and around the country. As you know, the recent poverty statistics

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

tell us that 15 percent of our citizens in New York State

are under the poverty level, living under the poverty

level. More in many parts of the state. And this is

certainly a moral and an ethical imperative to provide

representation, to stop people from falling off the cliff.

Every civilized society is really judged by how it treats

its most vulnerable citizens, and providing legal

representation in matters affecting, again, the very

essence of life is fundamental to the well-being of a

society.

And we have had, in the early hearings, testimony from business groups, landlords, hospitals, banks, saying that not only is it the right thing to do, but that their own bottom line are served by having people represented in those foreclosure proceedings that you see today: the banks don't want the properties back, they want to work things out, and I think that's systematic of all of our major institutions, would rather have people represented and have, again, a level playing field, and be able to help people and at the same time help our basic institutions in this state.

These hearings have been put together by the

Task Force to Expand Civil Legal Services. The chair of

that Task Force is Helaine Barnett who is the former chair

of the Legal Services Corporations. And Helaine, would

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

you just stand up for one second? And Helaine, thank you,

Helaine. Helaine and the Task Force have done a

spectacular job in putting into these hearings independent

research around this whole issue of providing civil legal

services for the poor and figuring out, again, the gap.

We have determined in last year's report that, at best, we're meeting 20 percent of the civil legal service needs in New York. We're talking about eligibility for people at 200 percent of poverty level, that's for a family of four, approximately \$44,700 a year. Our goal is to provide a permanent, dependable, systemic way of funding civil legal services. Last year we were able to obtain \$27 and a half million for civil legal services. Coming out of these hearings, and the judiciary budget, there is a legislative resolution that asked to hold these hearings and to submit to the Legislature our recommendations.

You'll see that at today's hearings, you'll hear from clients whose lives have been salvaged by having representation; you'll hear about collaboration and a shared costs in terms of providing civil legal service representation; you'll hear from the dean and SUNY distinguished professor at University at Buffalo law school, Makau Mutua; and you'll hear from a judge's panel that will tell you the problems that the judges have when

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES there is an uneven playing field and when people are unrepresented and come into their courtroom.

We've learned from these hearings that in many parts of the state, for every person accepted for civil legal services, eight or nine people are turned away.

We've learned that 98 percent of people in eviction cases are unrepresented, 95 percent of litigants in child support matters are unrepresented, and until recently, two-thirds of homeowners in foreclosure proceedings were unrepresented.

Seventy percent of civil matters in New York involve family law, consumer credit, landlord-tenant and foreclosure cases, again, the essentials of life, and the bottom line is, again, that civil legal services is a good investment for New York. For every dollar spent on civil legal services, five dollars come back to the state in terms of decreased costs of Social Services, incarceration, homelessness, and increased dollars that come into New York from federal funding entitlements.

I think that the situation around the country is such that the Federal Legal Service Corporation is under seize, the IOLA funds which typically came from interest-bearing accounts that lawyers maintain or escrow accounts is way down, from \$32 million to now about \$6 and a half million. And these hearings are basically

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES conducted under the premise that you all should understand, make no mistake about it, nothing is more important to the judiciary and the profession than to meet our constitutional mission, our ethical obligation, to foster equal justice. So that's the spirit of these hearings.

Don't be taken aback, on the people who are testifying, if we interrupt you, maybe ask you some questions. We have your written statements so it's not necessary to read your statement, we want you to tell us, you know, why you're here and what you have to say. I will ask you some not-too-intimidating questions, but this panel that you have here is an intimidating one.

On my right is Judge Scudder who is the Presiding Justice of the Appellate Division-Fourth Department. Judge Scudder is withering in his cross-examination so be very careful when Judge Scudder asks a question.

To my left is Judge Ann Pfau who is the Chief Administrative Judge of the State Court System, and she may not look like she's tough but you wait until she asks you questions.

And then really the most difficult one among us is at the end, Paul Michael Hassett, who is the prior head -- president of the State Bar Association in New York

OFFICIAL SUPREME COURT REPORTER

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES and who has a long history of being involved in the affairs of certainly the western part of our state.

And together we represent the judicial -- the leadership of the judiciary and the profession in this state and we think important, at the very least symbolically, that this kind of a panel, including myself as the Chief Judge of the state, preside over these hearings.

There is a red light that can go on if you overstate your time, and take it with a grain of salt, no one's coming in to arrest you if you go over the time.

But we're going to keep a relatively tight schedule, and if the Chief Judge will stop talking, maybe we'll be able to do that.

So we're going to start with our witness list, and I ask Karen and Bernard Dent, clients of the Western New York Law Center, accompanied by Joseph Kelemen; Michelle Kilian, client of Neighborhood Legal Services, accompanied by William J. Hawkes; Gabrielle Threet, client of the Erie County Bar Association Volunteer Lawyers Project, accompanied by Robert M. Elardo; and Jack Hagen, a client of Legal Services for the Elderly, Disabled or Disadvantaged of Western New York, I think, accompanied by William F. Berry. Would you all come up, please? Okay. So take your time.

All right. Mr. Russ, you're going to start us off? Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Dent. Karen or Bernard Dent.

MR. BERNARD DENT: Good morning. I'm Bernard. My wife isn't here today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're going to carry it alone.

MR. DENT: I'm sorry?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're going to carry it alone.

MR. DENT: Yes, I think I can handle it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, go for it. You're up.

MR. DENT: My name is Bernard Dent, I live in Cheektowaga, I was born and raised in Buffalo, New York, I have three children, and an elderly mother that also stays with us.

Around 2009, I spent -- I just want to back up.

I spent most of my career in the banking industry. My
last position in that field was regional manager/
vice-president of the bank. Unfortunately I got laid off,
and since then it's been an ongoing struggle. Did have
some temporary work as a manager in the census when that
was here, and off and on I've been working temporary jobs
and trying to find something substantial.

In the meantime, my mortgage fell behind. It was two months behind when I sent a payment to the mortgage company. They sent it back to me. They said we want everything or we're going to put your house in

OFFICIAL SUPREME COURT REPORTER

foreclosure. I spent some time trying to borrow the money, they gave me a short deadline, four days to get it, I was unable to get it at that time so they put my -- foreclosure proceedings began. So when they contact -- I contacted them, they wanted all the past due payments plus \$5,000 in legal fees. Trying to negotiate with them, I was definitely in -- not in a position of power. They wanted the entire amount, even though no legal proceedings had begun.

So I tried to negotiate with them, they said they would get back to me. Sent me a modification paperwork. I sent it in, a couple weeks went by, I called them and I asked them did they receive it. They said, yeah, we're working on it, we'll get back to you.

A couple weeks passed, I called them again, they said they lost my paperwork and I had to send it in again.

So at this, fees are still accumulating on my account, they would not accept any monthly payments, so they re-sent the modification paperwork to me again, we filled it out, sent it in again. This time I waited a week and I called them, they said they hadn't received it. Even though I had someone's -- had someone sign for it, they said they didn't have it, and I had to send the paperwork again.

So they sent the modification paperwork out a

third time, I sent it back in, waited a week, I called them, they said they're working on it. I continuously followed up with them. Somehow my paperwork got lost again. So it was very frustrating at this point --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You think this is a frustration that a lay person rather than a lawyer often feels when they're dealing with essentially a legal problem with a big institution?

MR. DENT: Absolutely. I felt you need an attorney with expertise to deal with them and I thought, you know, reasonably intelligent person, educated person, I worked in the banking industry for many years, I felt -
JUDGE LIPPMAN: This is who you're dealing with.

MR. DENT: And I'm dealing with the bank, I thought that I would be able to negotiate a reasonable settlement, but that didn't happen.

So at a certain point now, it was -- because they wouldn't take any payments while this is going on, so at this point my house was about five months past due.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. DENT: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know you're in trouble but you can't go out and get it.

MR. DENT: So I'm on the Internet, I'm searching. Like I said, my mom is elderly, my dad is -- I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't have anyone to borrow money from and I had exhausted our savings with a daughter in college and two young children, you know, I had exhausted our savings trying to keep them in school and trying to keep the house afloat so I really had no one. So finally, I was searching on Internet and I came across the Western New York Law Center and I decided to give them a call.

Oh, excuse me, let me back up a bit. One last time I called the bank and I said is there anything you can do, can we negotiate, you know, different fees, something to bring me current. They said, well, we'll get back to you. Three days later they sent me paperwork, and instead of my mortgage payment being \$900 a month, they said give us \$4,000 for all the legal -- they reduced the legal fees at that point, give us \$4,000, plus all the back payments, and your new payment's going to be around \$1,800 a month. And I said, well, right now this is the situation, I've having trouble paying the \$900 a month, there's no way I -- I can sign this agreement with you but there's no way I can realistically maintain it. Thev said that's all we're going to do for you, take it or leave it. So I said, unfortunately, I can't sign this in good faith because I'm not going to be able to pay this.

So that's when I contacted the Western New York

Law Center and I spoke to an attorney named Amy and she

worked on our behalf with the mortgage company. They -she was able to reduce the legal fees by about 800 or
\$900, she also got them to eliminate the \$4,000 immediate
down payment that they wanted, she also got them to
readjust my interest rate, instead of having a variable
rate, the Western New York Law Center got me a fixed rate,
and I was able to resume my payments. And even though I'm
still struggling to find a position -- a permanent
position as far as employment, I'm able to maintain the
mortgage with my unemployment. They were invaluable. I
don't think --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Basically the world changed for you once you had legal service representation.

MR. DENT: Absolutely.

JUDGE PFAU: And did the banks start treating you differently?

MR. DENT: Yes. It was unwavering, their -- how rude and abrupt they were when I was trying to negotiate.

And I thought to myself, I've been in the banking industry for 15 years, I know the banks don't want my house.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But that's the point, they don't want your house, they really don't.

MR. DENT: But they were acting as if they did.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Because you needed a lawyer to talk their language.

MR. DENT: To speak on my behalf. And once they spoke on my behalf, everything changed. When the bank would call me, the mortgage company would call me, they had a different attitude.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And let me ask another question, you know, and I don't mean this in a way to embarrass you, but people think when we're talking about civil legal services for the poor in the state, that we're talking about -- only about people who are walking the streets without a home or whatever it is and have no way to put a dollar in their pocket, they're living in shelters. We're talking about regular people who have regular jobs and in this difficult economy are having a problem right now, put yourself in that category, not an uneducated person who, you know, has held a job for a long time and yet you find yourself in this predicament, just like me and you and everybody in this room, we're not just talking about, gee, the outcasts of society, you know.

MR. DENT: No. Your Honor, absolutely right. I never would have imagined a few years ago --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That you would be in that -
MR. DENT: -- that I would be in this position,

but I am. And if you pretty much have anyone unemployed

long enough, they're going to feel the crunch. And at a

certain point, because it's been off and on since 2009, I

maintained it as long as I could but we're talking about regular people.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you one more question. Is there anything more important to you than this house and the roof over your head?

MR. DENT: No, absolutely, it's the most important thing that I had. I felt not only it was my frustration very high, you know, I was worried about what's going to happen to my children, what's going to happen to my elderly mother, she can't take care of herself and, you know, as a man, we're supposed to take care of our family and I didn't feel like I could do that. So, you know, they were -- the Western New York Law Center was a Godsend for me.

JUDGE PFAU: If you didn't have them, do you think you would have your house today?

MR. DENT: No. The only other option would have been maybe bankruptcy, I don't know, but other than that, no, if I did not have them, I would not have my house today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But, again, and not to gild the lily or beat a dead horse, but you take a person who has a responsible job, who thinks they know how to deal with the basic things that one deals with in life, and yet when you're dealing with the legal problem, you really need a

1 person trained.

MR. DENT: Yes, you need an attorney, absolutely, Your Honor, you need an attorney. They didn't want to talk to me, even though some of the things I knew they were telling me was untrue because I worked in the bank, I'm in no position to say, hey, that isn't true. They want what they want. And until I got an attorney to represent me, that's when everything changed.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thanks so much, appreciate it.

Michelle Kilian. You're on, Michelle.

MS. MICHELLE KILIAN: My name is Michelle Kilian. I am 29 years old and I'm the mother of a beautiful two-and-a-half-year-old daughter named Eva.

In April of 2010, while my now ex-husband was away for the weekend for military training, I packed up my belongings, myself and my one-year-old daughter Eva and sought refuge at the Haven House --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Michelle, put that mike a little closer.

MS. KILIAN: -- at the Haven House, a domestic violence homeless shelter, because I was a victim of domestic violence. I had no money, no safety plan, and I was in a panic and worried about the life I would be able to provide for my daughter now that I left my abuser. All

I took from my marital home were my material possessions, my child, and my damaged self-esteem.

Once at the shelter, they instructed me to apply for public assistance and food stamps. I went and applied. After 30 days I received my public assistance grant of \$90 a month for me and my daughter. I also received \$45 a month in food stamps for the both of us.

My stay at the shelter was challenging and scary and I was always concerned about our personal safety. I wanted to get out and try to make a go of it on my own, and after being at the shelter for two-and-a-half months, I finally found permanent housing in Cheektowaga.

I vigorously continued my job search because I did not want to be reliant on the public assistance system. I had never been on public assistance before, and although I was grateful for the assistance when I needed it, I really wanted to get off public assistance and work. After months of searching, the temporary agency finally found me a place at Neighborhood Legal Services.

My income from employment quickly affected my public assistance grant and my case was closed due to excess income in about two months after I started working. Although it felt like a success to get out of shelter and off public assistance, once off public assistance, I faced many economic challenges that made it difficult to make a

successful transition from welfare to work. That's what I would like to talk to you about today.

Without the assistance of Neighborhood Legal Services, it is likely that I would have been unable to maintain my housing, utilities and day care, and thus my employment, and would have then been forced back on to public assistance. I truly feel that God has placed me in this position at NLS for a reason. Because if I weren't at NLS, I would never have gotten the legal advice that I needed to get off and stay off public assistance.

I was in a tenuous financial position once my rent came off voucher. I fell behind on my rent. I did not know that DSS helped with rent arrears. NLS informed me that DSS has a legal obligation to help prevent the eviction. NLS represented me in court and was able to stop the eviction. NLS was able to help me get the rent arrears from DSS and the eviction was avoided. I was able to stay in my home.

My next financial crisis occurred when I fell behind on my utilities. Although I was working, the gas bills in Buffalo in the winter are really high and I could not afford to pay the entire bill each month. I fell behind on my utilities and received a shutoff notice from the gas and electric company. I did not know that DSS could help with utility arrears and shutoffs. NLS advised

me about the availability of HEAP and emergency HEAP. I applied for both of these benefits and was found eligible. The shutoff was ultimately avoided and I was able to stay in my apartment with my daughter.

I was barely staying afloat financially and my child's father was not helping us financially at all. He never paid any child support. Previously, I had been advised by a private attorney that I was not eligible for child support from my ex-husband because I was a public assistance recipient at the time of the divorce. NLS advised me that that was not correct and the family law attorney from NLS advised me of my legal rights to obtain child support. She helped me fill out the necessary paperwork in order to get the support that I needed. I was granted the support award and I'm now getting money from my child's father.

My third economic crisis occurred when I received a notice threatening to discontinue my child care benefits because I was no longer receiving public assistance. DSS sent me the notice stating that because I was no longer participating in a DSS work program, I was no longer eligible for child care benefits. I was not participating in DSS work program because I was employed at the time. I told my worker that I was employed and I provided documentation regarding my employment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nonetheless, DSS tried to discontinue my child care benefits. NLS informed me that this was an illegal discontinuance. They contacted DSS on my behalf, advocated that the discontinuance be withdrawn, and as a result, I continued to receive my child care without interruption so that I could maintain my employment.

Recently, I received another notice from DSS threatening to discontinue my child care benefits again, this time due to excess income from employment. subsidy from DSS, my child care costs would have been prohibitive and would have forced me to quit my job at NLS in order to care for my child. The day care center would have charged me \$800 a month. My net pay every two weeks is \$699. After paying for child care, I would only have about \$564 to pay for the cost of living, rent, food, diapers and utilities. I could not have paid day care and worked. I would have had to make a choice. NLS advocated on my behalf. They contacted DSS and told that the discontinuance was illegal and they had not evaluated me for transitional child care. DSS withdrew their notice and issued a new one, agreeing to provide me with the transitional child care benefits that I am legally entitled to. Although I pay a parent share of \$318 each month, I am able to keep my job.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Michelle, let me ask you a

question. The basic idea that you're telling us is you're a domestic violence victim but what comes along with that is a lot of other legal problems, it's not so simple as saying the victim is taken out of that daily threat to, you know, violence and life is then going to be perfect. Life has all kinds of tentacles and complications. And for someone like you, was there any place that you could have turned on any of these issues? No, you don't have a lawyer, what would you have done?

MS. KILIAN: Without NLS, I don't really know where I would be right now.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Or where your child would be.

MS. KILIAN: With my -- right. I -- I can't fathom the thought of it because I didn't know where to turn. I was fighting with Social Services at every turn and I'm smart and I was fighting with them, I handed in my paperwork on time, and --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And you had told them you wanted to work, you wanted to be a contributing member of society.

MS. KILIAN: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you have all these legal problems and that you don't have the ability to deal with them.

MS. KILIAN: Yes.

	MO. MICHEBEE KILIAN
1	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is that the long and the short
2	of it?
3	MS. KILIAN: Um-hum.
4	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And, you know, so I hear the
5	bottom line is, your life would be very, very different
6	today without civil legal services to help you.
7	MS. KILIAN: Yes, I would be on public
8	assistance still and not be able to work because I have no
9	family here, I'm just by myself. So
10	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Instead of having a job where
11	you're a contributing member of society.
12	MS. KILIAN: Yes. And even if I was on public
13	assistance, I still wouldn't be able to make it because
14	you don't you can't really survive on it.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know. Thank you, Michelle.
16	MS. KILIAN: Thank you.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: That was really instructive, I
18	think, in terms of how civil legal services can change
19	someone's life in so many different ways.
20	Gabrielle Threet.
21	MR. ROBERT ELARDO: Your Honor, Gabrielle Threet
22	is not able to be here this morning. I'm Bob Elardo, the
23	managing attorney from the Erie County Bar Association
24	Volunteer Lawyers Project, and with your kind permission,

I can quickly summarize what she would have said.

25

## MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why don't you summarize what her issues were and how legal services helped.

MR. ELARDO: Okay. She came to us for a problem with unemployment insurance benefits. She had worked for three years in a clerical job at Erie Community College and --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me stop you for one second. But that's a common problem, right, with civil legal services, that people are entitled to certain things but yet can't access it, they don't know how to do it.

MR. ELARDO: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: They don't know how to interface with the institutions that --

MR. ELARDO: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- determine their fate.

MR. ELARDO: And I think this is a perfect example, this case. As you'll see from the facts of what happened, she was told originally that her position was eliminated, and she was laid off, but then when she applied for unemployment, her employer said that she was actually discharged for misconduct for falsifying time records.

And what happened is that she had gone out for surgery, she had had surgery at Roswell Park Cancer

Institute and was out of work for a couple of weeks.

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET)

The -- and during those weeks, she did, on her handwritten time sheets, put down hours that she had worked. Seems like a slam dunk for the employer. A misconduct in these cases, as you probably know, is doing something that you knew or should have known could get you fired.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. ELARDO: I mean, that's basically the standard. And the employer had an experienced attorney representing them at the hearing, seems like she should lose. She shouldn't have done that.

We got a young pro bono lawyer to represent her in the hearing and that lawyer really put a lot of time into this. He was able to establish -- he subpoenaed records from the employer, responded to their subpoenas, and represented her at the hearing and was able to establish that, first of all, the employer allowed flex time, although it was very unclear as to how that was supposed to work.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. ELARDO: The time sheets didn't have any place to mark that it was flex time. Her supervisor who -- he actually got the supervisor in there to testify to these things, the supervisor had actually told her to write the time sheets out that way and he had allowed her to work extra hours before she went out on surgery and

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET)

extra hours after she came back to make up for those

hours, and he testified that that's his understanding of

what flex time meant there and that's how he had been

doing it for a couple of years.

And so the ALJ on the case found that what the employer said about her time sheets was absolutely true, but the additional facts that the pro bono lawyer was able to bring out --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And explain.

MR. ELARDO: -- and explain meant -- made the entire difference and he awarded her benefits, and I think rightfully so.

And what Miss Threet wanted to tell you is that without that lawyer, she would have been in a terrible spot. You know, because she had the lawyer and she continued her benefits, she did not lose her home, her and her young child stayed in her home, they didn't have the gas, electric or water shut off like this lady was talking about. The shutoff notices, you know, can be very threatening to a family, especially here in Buffalo in the winter. She was able to keep her job -- I mean -- I mean her car, wasn't repossessed, and she was basically able to stay afloat while she continued to look for work. And now, even before finishing receiving all of the benefits that she was entitled to, she's found work, and

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET)

better-paying work. She's actually an ideal candidate for explaining what we're trying to do in legal services, to keep families afloat and productive in society. She actually now has not only found a job, she's actually found two jobs and they're better jobs than she had before.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Literally her life was dramatically altered for the better --

MR. ELARDO: Absolutely, Your Honor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- by the simple act of a relatively small investment -- at least we think so -- in civil legal services, to have a lawyer who could represent her with what we're calling the necessities of life, the very basics. You know, she wouldn't have been able to have those necessities, and then you become a burden on society and with all the attendant costs that go with that.

MR. ELARDO: Right. She would have been showing up at the Department of Social Services, requesting public benefits and food stamps and she might have ended up in a homeless shelter, it goes on and on.

JUDGE PFAU: And she was represented by a volunteer lawyer --

MR. ELARDO: Yes.

JUDGE PFAU: -- who took on her whole case. Not

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET)
just a lawyer but really stayed with her for the whole
case, which is wonderful, shows the partnership that has
to happen between civil legal services and the bar which
is really so special up here, I think up in Upstate New
York.

MR. ELARDO: Yes, I totally agree. You know, every year we have about 400 lawyers in this community handle about a thousand cases pro bono for our clients, and it really makes a difference to supplement what the staff lawyers are doing.

JUSTICE SCUDDER: Is that growing all the time or not, as far as the number of lawyers that will participate in pro bono?

MR. ELARDO: In the last few years it's stayed pretty level for us, and we are trying to work on ways to increase it all the time.

JUSTICE SCUDDER: I was going to ask that. Have you come upon ways that -- that have worked to increase it?

MR. ELARDO: Well, the best way for us is to do trainings, to entice the lawyers in, and to have a staff member, who is a lawyer, who is out there talking to the lawyers in the law firms about the opportunities for pro bono, the -- what they can get out of it, not only in terms of training but, you know, just in terms of human

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET) satisfaction for having helped someone. And I -- you know, the lawyers are very responsive in this community to hearing that, and more and more we're working, and we have been for many years, to change the culture in the bar. It's not a quick fix, it's a long-term commitment to change the culture.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think what he's trying to explain is clearly the civil legal service providers have to carry a great weight of this and, you know, the bulk of the representation, but even with all of the efforts that we've all made, you know, there just isn't enough money certainly in this economy to cover the whole need and that there needs to be this component of pro bono representation, volunteer representation by the bar that fits in to this -- this puzzle, really, of how to provide civil legal services for the poor. So the bottom line is we need a permanent, dependable, consistent public funding, and then we need this volunteerism by the bar to sort of complete the package, and at best, even with the -- you know, the funding that we've gotten and all of the efforts, we're meeting, at best, 20 percent of the needs of civil legal services of the poor in this state and that's why we need to hear these stories and understand what exactly this is for.

So thank you so much, and you've been very

MR. ROBERT ELARDO (ON BEHALF OF GABRIELLE THREET) helpful.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HASSETT: I'm sorry. As you know, Bob, I had the privilege to serve on the pro bono committee which was part of ProBonoNY and the funding for that program died; along with it, the services of the coordinator which the program paid for. Was that -- I assume that was very helpful to you and the other counties in the Eighth District in providing pro bono volunteers.

MR. ELARDO: Absolutely. The coordinator was an employee of our program, because we're the biggest pro bono program in the district, but she worked to help the programs in the entire district to recruit, train and support lawyers, and was really initially concentrated mostly in the rural areas that needed the most help and was making a huge difference there.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We've had this in other locations, where the coordinators have gone with the decrease in funding and it just makes it that much more difficult to get done what needs to be done.

Okay. Thanks so much.

Jack Hagen.

MR. JACK HAGEN: Thanks. Thanks, Your Honor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

MR. HAGEN: I would like to thank you personally, all of you, for that statement you made in the

24 25

beginning. I didn't realize the size of the numbers, the 20 percent number of people who are represented but really the 80 percent who aren't. It's pretty stunning. I would say that I was lucky to find representation.

I was diagnosed with leukemia in 1999 and I had two transplants at Roswell Park. I was covered by my employer's health insurance for several months -- or actually I think 29 months after I was diagnosed and left the company, but my health insurance ran out and I had to find either a private health insurance or -- or none.

My main problem after both transplants was the cost of my drugs, the cost of the drugs to protect me from various issues, primarily what's called Graft versus Host disease in which the -- anyone who has a transplant -- I had a blood transplant, I had leukemia -- faces the possibility that almost anything, because of your weakened immune system, can attack your body. And most people who die as a result of transplants, whether they are blood transplants or what we think of normally as transplants, livers or kidneys, that sort of thing, die of Graft versus Host disease. The drugs are incredibly expensive.

Initially after -- after the transplants, my monthly bills were in the range of \$6,000. Those diminished over time but not actually much, not that much, let's say. I had -- after my second transplant, I was

helped by the assistant attorney general who was located at Roswell Park to get Medicaid qualification in order to pay for -- or assist me in paying for my drugs. After about four or five years, five years of being helped by Medicaid in Niagara Falls where was my permanent residence, my permanent legal residence, they decided -- I had moved in with my mother during my convalescence, she helped me with a lot of things, things like she drove me to Roswell every day essentially immediately after each of my transplants in order to obtain follow-up treatment, and many other things that -- she cooked dinner for me. You know, it's a tremendous number of things that you need that you're unable to deal with.

Once DSS in Niagara Falls realized that I was actually not physically living in Niagara Falls -- my mother lives in Tonawanda -- they decided that I don't qualify for Medicaid in Niagara Falls, that I should be in Erie County. Well, except the problem was that my legal residence was in Niagara Falls.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's right.

MR. HAGEN: And I happened to be talking to my lawyer -- my mother and I went to have our wills done -- and he mentioned he -- Tom Keefe is his name -- turned out to be the president of Legal Services for the Elderly and Disabled, and he suggested that I talk with Legal Services

for the Elderly and Disabled and see if they could help me in dealing with DSS which wanted to discontinue my Medicaid.

I talked to them, I met Bill Berry, and we filed an appeal with the DSS, went to a hearing, fair hearing it's called, and they couldn't prove in any way that I didn't live -- or my permanent residence was actually in Niagara Falls and that I fully intended to move back there once I was able to recover. So we won that case and my Medicaid was continued.

Several more years went by during which Medicare Part D was enacted, January of 2006, and that helped me tremendously in paying for the drugs and also reduced vastly the amount of money that Medicaid in Niagara Falls had to pay. So I thought this -- I'm in pretty good shape.

About -- in 2010, DSS in Niagara Falls changed everybody, and decided once again that since I did not live in Niagara Falls, I was unqualified for their Medicaid. I went back to Bill and we said -- I said, let me just change my residence to Erie County. Erie County, it turns out, where actually I thought this would be a simple piece of paperwork but it wasn't because Erie County does things differently than Niagara County does, which I was totally unaware of, and I was actually told

that they do things differently than the rest of the state does. I'm not -- I don't have the facts on that but it was interesting. But they didn't want to accept me either and Bill got into negotiation with my representative there, significant negotiations that I -- I may -- also take one step back.

In the five years, in the last five years or so, I've been having recurring issues with my skin on my head, (Mr. Hagen removes hat) and for whatever that's worth. It's very debilitating for me. It also requires drugs that are, again, pretty significant in addition to the ones that I still have, even though I'm in remission from the leukemia.

We worked -- we didn't work it out, Bill worked it out. Legal Services for the Elderly supported me in this situation and got me reaffirmed and approved for Medicaid in Erie County. Had it not been for that, the drugs that I have to take now, I'm still in the classification, even with Part D, of having to pay several thousand dollars a month for drugs, with part -- or with Medicaid support, I get -- I get ex -- what's called extra help for Medicare Part D which reduces the copays that I have to pay. In addition, I don't have to pay the so-called doughnut hole money which is about \$3,000. Without that money, I would be in a position -- or without

that aid, even though they don't pay much money, Medicaid, but their support of me allows me to get the extra help which reduces my --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But the bottom line, though, is really, in a different sense dealing with a medical condition, the same thing as everybody else's story.

MR. HAGEN: It is.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What would you have done, these are benefits that you're entitled to but you just could not figure out or deal with the bureaucracy that determines, again, your fate. Is there any other -- anything other than civil legal service assistance that could have helped you through this, this literally life-threatening crisis?

MR. HAGEN: Not to my knowledge. I -- as I say,
I was very lucky that my -- my lawyer happened to be, at
the time, the president of this organization. And I had
no idea that it existed and/or -- I mean, I --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Jack, let me ask you one thing. So when you take a case like yours, we're not talking about someone who tripped on the street and wants to bring a lawsuit. We're talking about someone who is confronted with a life-threatening situation, with no way out, without -- because it's really a legal problem, it's being able to access the benefits that you're entitled to and as

a lay person, as a non-lawyer, you just don't know how to do it.

MR. HAGEN: Yes, exactly.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Very few of us in this room know how to do it without a trained person who understands that they're dealing with someone's very survival, and that without the assistance, there's no life.

MR. HAGEN: My choice would have been to not take the drugs that have kept me alive for the last ten years, and it's really as simple as that, I couldn't have afforded them.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a very graphic description of what this is all about. Each of you in your own story, really, has defined what this is all about when we talk about civil legal services that will affect the necessities of life. Not, gee, maybe I want to bring a lawsuit about something. But about being able to live and be -- you know, have a meaningful role in our society and in our local community.

So I thank all of you for your --

JUDGE PFAU: If I could just add, it's interesting, generally we think of civil legal services in the context of representing you in court, and we've had this whole panel this morning with all of the different life situations and none of them have been court cases.

## MR. JACK HAGEN

They've all been accessing the things that you either have a right to or negotiating with a bank, but none of them fall within what one would think stereotypically of what civil legal services are for but they've totally changed your lives. So it's been a very interesting panel. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you all, appreciate it greatly.

MR. BERRY: Thank you.

MR. ELARDO: Judges all, thank you very much for being here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for the good work that you're doing.

The next panel is Collaboration and Shared Costs Panel, and I would ask Arthur Russ, Jr., president for the Bar Association of Erie County; and of counsel to Phillips Lytle LLC;

Justin L. Vigdor, the chair of the Telesca

Center Capital Campaign; the past president of New York

State Bar Association and Monroe County Bar Association;

and senior counsel, Boylan Code LLP;

Bryan Hetherington, president of Monroe County Bar Association;

 $\label{eq:And Stephen Johnson, member of Bond, Schoeneck $\&$ King, PLLC.$ 

So Arthur Russ, do you want to get started?

MR. ARTHUR RUSS: I would like to say good
afternoon.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good afternoon. And thank you so much for coming here and for representing the Erie County Bar.

MR. RUSS: Thank you for the invitation.

I am counsel at Phillips Lytle, and current president of the Bar Association of Erie County. We have 3,800 members -- over 3,800 members here in Erie County.

I am also a former board member of the Erie County Bar Association Volunteer Lawyers Project and a current member of the New York State Bar Association House of Delegates.

I want to thank Judge Lippman and the Task Force for conducting these hearings and raising the awareness of the overwhelming need for civil legal services for low-income people.

With such overwhelming need, collaborations and cost sharing efforts are essential for making every dollar go further. This is especially true here in Buffalo where there's such a high level of poverty. Buffalo, the second largest city in the state and the third poorest large city in the nation, with 30 percent of its population running below the poverty level, 38 percent of Buffalo children under the age of 18 are living below the poverty line here

in Buffalo.

Here in Buffalo we have five legal services and pro bono programs serving the eight counties at the western end of the state, including the Cities of Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Lockport, Jamestown, Albion and Dunkirk. The area is both urban and rural. Erie County is the largest county in the region, with a population of over 900,000. It's 91 percent rural -- I'm sorry, 91 percent urban and 9 percent rural.

I want to tell you about some of the terrific collaborations occurring here in the Buffalo area.

Some of the best collaborations have included the courts as a partner, like the Volunteer Lawyers Project and Neighborhood Legal Services, representing low-income tenants facing eviction, and the Eighth Judicial District Pro Bono Committee which works to recruit, train and support pro bono attorneys. It's my understanding that Judge Feroleto, administrative judge for our district, will be describing those efforts so I will concentrate on other efforts.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, she will.

MR. RUSS: The five local programs are:

Legal Services for the Elderly, Disabled and Disadvantaged, this was incorporated in 1978 to provide free legal services to seniors, disabled and low-income

people in the six-county area and the Seneca Nation of Indians reservation. They also provide guardian services to an additional 67 elderly and disabled individuals, and are trustees for another 300 disabled persons utilizing the Western New York Coalition Pooled Trust. Their goal is to use the legal system to help their clients live independently and with dignity. Their current priority areas are health care, housing, veterans' support, income maintenance, grandparent's advocacy and elder abuse.

The Erie County Bar Association Volunteer
Lawyers Project has a dual mission: To provide quality
free civil legal services for low-income people and
similar not-for-profit groups; and also to effectively
involve volunteers in the delivery of those services. VLP
recruits, trains and coordinates the efforts of pro bono
attorneys, its staff attorneys and volunteers to provide
representation in a wide array of civil legal services
cases. All of the VLP services are available in Erie
County, while an increasing array of its services are now
available to clients throughout the entire Eighth Judicial
District.

Further, the Western New York Law Center is a nonprofit legal organization established in 1996 that provides legal and technology assistance for the benefit of low-moderate income clients and legal assistance

OFFICIAL SUPREME COURT REPORTER

organizations. The Law Center engages in fair lending advocacy and direct representation of homeowners facing foreclosure and has initiated class actions on behalf of public assistance recipients in Western New York whose benefits are illegally being delayed or denied.

Fourthly, Neighborhood Legal Services provides legal services to the poor and disabled in the five-county region of Erie, Niagara, Wyoming, Genesee and Orleans.

Services are provided in the areas of family law, including custody matters, domestic violence, divorce, and legal assistance to victims of HIV or cancer; housing law, including landlord-tenant, public housing, and housing discrimination; public benefits advocacy for people cut off or denied government benefits, including public assistance, food stamps, Medicaid, Social Security Disability and SSI. Neighborhood Legal Services also provides community education and training to over 3,000 clients, attorneys and community advocates each year.

Finally, the Legal Aid Bureau of Buffalo was founded 100 years ago and provides free legal services, representation for children and criminal defense work for low-income people. Their civil unit handles family law, housing and unemployment cases.

These five programs work together to keep people out of homeless shelters by providing an eviction defense

and mortgage and tax foreclosure defense. They keep people off the welfare rolls by helping people with SSI benefits, unemployment insurance claims and child support cases. They keep kids out of expensive -- the expensive foster care system by handling adoptions, representing grandparents and other relatives that step in to seek custody when families becomes dysfunctional, and parents, for setting up standby guardianships so when they become incapacitated or die, the standby guardian seamlessly becomes the guardian. They help people with fresh starts financially and emotionally by providing assistance with bankruptcies and divorces, including victims of domestic violence.

These programs cumulatively served more than 11,000 low income and elderly clients last year. These efforts saved taxpayers an estimated \$7 and a half million in tax dollars by keeping people out of homeless shelters through representation in evictions, mortgage foreclosure and tax foreclosure, and by getting people off the welfare rolls by winning SSI benefits and unemployment benefits.

In addition to taxpayer savings, our five local programs resulted in an estimated at least \$9 million coming into the pockets of low-income people by winning these SSI benefits, unemployment insurance benefits, and child support cases. I cannot overemphasize the

importance of bringing that money into our local struggling economy. Putting extra money into the hands of low-income people immediately stimulates a wide variety of sectors of the local economy. Low-income people cannot afford the luxury of saving. Studies suggest that such lower income and credit-constrained recipients increase their spending substantially more than the typical recipient.

One reason that the local programs are able to serve so many clients is that four years ago, all five programs co-located in one building here in downtown Buffalo. Three of the organizations share common space, including a library, a student/volunteer clinic room, two conference rooms, a reception area and a lunch room.

They also share a telephone system, and all of the organizations share various types of technology. The shared telephone system is administered in-house, long-distance billing is allocated between the organizations sharing the system. At that time each of the three programs was in need of an updated telephone system. The system they bought collectively is at the same level as they would have each needed individually. So the phone system alone, they collectively saved over \$45,000.

They have taken their collaboration, though, to

another level. As the three organizations are now also on a shared phone bill which saves \$5,000 a year, share Internet bandwidth, saves another \$1,200 a year. The shared phone system not only saves costs, but is convenient in connecting misdirected calls to other agencies.

By working together, they were able to raise special funding to buy all the shared equipment and furniture. This special funding allowed them to pay for the build-on costs of the new shared space which amounted essentially prepaying over \$120,000 in rent and thus reducing their rent over the life of the ten-year shared lease. All these cash savings allow the programs to put more dollars into hiring more staff to represent more clients in need. All of the organizations are exploring other cost-savings ventures, such as joint purchase of supplies, insurance and audit services.

In addition to the cash savings, there are other several benefits that flow from this arrangement. Because all of the organizations are housed in the same building, clients have been provided a one-stop option. The organizations maintain and share referral lists by organization and by case type. Clients who walk in asking for assistance are quickly directed to the next correct organization so that they don't have to go from

organization to organization seeking its services.

The five programs' lawyers and paralegals all being in one building facilitates the advocates from different programs working together on issues and cases.

Rather than having to spend time going across town to meet, they can simply go down the hall or up the elevator to work together.

In addition, VLP has a wonderful collaboration within our local bar association. Each year about 400 lawyers handle about 1,000 pro bono cases through Volunteer Lawyers Project. The collaboration with these pro bono lawyers complements the efforts of the staff lawyers to provide more and better service for their clients.

However, even with all these superlative efforts and collaborations, the need remains overwhelming.

Statistics gathered over a sample two-month period indicate that 40,000 low-income clients in the Buffalo area per year are being turned away and facing their important legal civil problems without the help of a lawyer. It's a black eye on the principles of justice that we hold so dear, that people in need are being denied access to justice concerning basic human needs such as housing, public benefits and family matters.

In conclusion, I want to close by thanking the

Chief Judge and the Task Force for your exemplary efforts and results. In these difficult economic times, the state must be more vigilant, more active and more aggressive in making sure that people in need do not fall prey to the denial of life-sustaining benefits, loss of their home, or further injustice. I think you just heard examples of that in the testimony preceding. Your leadership is expanding our investment in civil legal services, ensuring greater access to justice.

Access to justice, funding for legal services, is not a special interest. Providing legal assistance to the poor and the elderly is a fundamental public interest.

Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for your very interesting testimony.

You know, this model that you have here and we've seen in Rochester in the Telesca Center, there's obviously one that makes so much sense in terms of pooling resources and being able to work together to meet the need. With all of the efforts that you've made, it seems what's consistent here in the western part of the state, and particularly here in the Buffalo area, is that we still are meeting only a relatively small swath of what we need to do, is that a fair estimate? With everything that you've done, with all of the collaborations, we still need

more dollars in the end to make this work?

MR. RUSS: When we're turning away 40,000 potential clients and poor individuals, you certainly do.

I would also like to say that under my term, my one-year term as Bar Association president, one of the things that I'm trying to do is to show both the bar and the public, to the extent that I can, of how lawyers in our community are giving back, that it's not the big accident cases that everyone reads about. We're trying to show the people that dedicate their lives to giving back. And as Vince Doyle said at his inauguration, "Lawyers, that's what we do for a living, we give back". Well, we also have to give back to the well if we're going to take from the well.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: There's no question, and lawyers do, and I think we've demonstrated at these hearings that the pro bono efforts are an absolutely vital, necessary complement to the providers; that, you know, it goes together, that there's no question about it.

One final question for you, that one of the points we've been heard at these hearings and that we've made in last year's Task Force report is that an investment in civil legal services is a wise investment, that the bottom line, aside from the judiciary and, in fact, profession's obligation to foster equal justice,

aside from the ethical and moral imperative that we have to help those who can't help themselves, that the bottom line is that society, local and state government, gain money by investing in civil legal services rather than its just money, you know, put out there into the -- into the -- a worthy cause but it has no return. You agree from your -- I gather from your testimony, from your experience, that that's the case, that it's an investment that brings far more than we give to it?

MR. RUSS: There's no question about that. It's a very efficient investment because what we're doing is those dollars get leveraged so that we're not using tax dollars or the welfare dollars to take care of these people, where they want to take care of themselves, and we're giving them the ability to do that and it's a very, very, efficient use of taxpayer funds.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much for your testimony.

MR. RUSS: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And now I'm going to ask someone who has such a rich history in this area and who has contributed so much to this -- to his community and to this state, in particular in regard to this issue with regard to access to justice and equal justice for all, so Justin Vigdor, it's an honor for you to come and testify

in front of us today.

MR. JUSTIN VIGDOR: Chief Judge, it is really my honor to appear before you and Presiding Judge Scudder, Judge Pfau, Past President Paul Hassett. And thank you so much for your kind words.

I have had many years the pleasure and stimulation and gratification of being involved in pro bono activities of the bar. I was chair of the IOLA fund from the time of its creation for five years, I co-chaired with Judge Vincent Marrero Judge Wachtler's special committee to study mandatory pro bono, I chaired a special task force of the state bar, all of which I think have made real contributions to the provision of legal -- civil legal services for the poor. But as you've observed in your remarks, truly, only a dent has been made in the overwhelming need. We have all known that a very small percentage of the need has been served.

My task today is evidently to talk about the origin of the Telesca Center in Rochester, New York and I'm very, very happy to do that.

Bryan Hetherington, who is here at the table, I gather will also speak about the operations of the Telesca Center, and chances are we will, to some extent, overlap and I hope we'll be forgiven for that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You will be, I quarantee it.

MR. VIGDOR: The Telesca Center is the realization of a vision that Monroe County bar leaders and legal service providers in Monroe County have had for several decades. Monroe County -- if I may be permitted to boast a bit -- statistically had, and I think may perhaps still, has the largest percentage of volunteer lawyers serving the needs of the poor. But we knew that efficiency was lacking for a variety of reasons. One of the most vocal proponents of bringing all of the providers together was Hanna Cohn, whom some of you may remember her, she was the founder and original head of the Volunteer Legal Services Program in Monroe County which has several hundred lawyers acting for the poor, and is now headed by Sheila Gaddis who is a member of your Task Force.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

MR. VIGDOR: For years the providers in Monroe

County were scattered around the city in really quite

shabby quarters because that was all that they could

afford. Very old buildings, many times lacking -- well,

I've been told by some of them that they did not have

enough heat in the winter and that there were rodents in

some of the facilities. They did not present the very

attractive site for poor people to come to. And the poor

people coming to them were faced with the problem of going

around town by shuttle, by buses, and finding when they got somewhere, that they were in the wrong agency.

Because of the variety of funding sources, each agency was limited to providing only certain types of legal services.

So unfortunately, someone might come to one and find that they have to get on a bus and go to another. And this was a dreadful situation.

When I was president of the county bar in 1977, we thought we might be able to get at it by creating a telephone intake system, and we established that, but it really did not prove to be very effective. People were encouraged to call a central number and told where to go, that didn't work very well and eventually discontinued. Our providers were very eager to cooperate and they met annually to discuss their programs and to address problems and see how they could solve them collectively, but that did not work very well.

In 2005, the Monroe County Bar Association, which is a very old bar association, goes back to 1896, moved to a ten-story building right at the four corners in the center of downtown Rochester, which was quite functional, and nearly vacant. It had only a bank on the first floor and a tenant on one other floor, so that basically about eight floors were vacant. The thought was that the bar and the bar foundation and the providers

could all move into that building if they could negotiate leases with the owner. Now this gave them a great deal of leverage because of the vacancy in the building. And they were able to negotiate very attractive 15-year leases with the owner of the building which contained two very important provisions: One, the owner of the building would front the renovation costs and the build-out of about \$500,000, \$550,000; and secondly, would give us the right to name the building.

Fortunately and serendipitously, the leases of all of the providers were about to expire or had expired, or they were there on month-to-month basis in their old quarters, and we were able to take advantage of that bargaining position, negotiate those leases, and arrange to move into the building.

The providers and the bar, bar headed by Mary Corbitt Lowenguth, who most of you know and who was a dynamic person, met and decided to see, could the money be raised to repay the owner the \$550,000, and \$200,000 in move-in costs, relocation costs. The agreement was that if we could repay the \$550,000, we would lock in a \$10 per square foot rental for 15 years, which is really quite a remarkable sort of rental anywhere these days.

They decided that a -- a feasibility should be investigated, conducting a capital campaign to raise that

money, and I was asked -- I was honored by being asked to chair a campaign for that fund. I had chaired a similar campaign for not-for-profit agencies in the collaborative co-location scheme a number of years ago and I was glad to do it.

We formed a campaign cabinet, we began planning to create what we hoped would be a unique national model for delivery of legal services. We started by drafting a very formal partnership agreement among the providers, the Bar Association and the Foundation, in which each agreed to suspend their own fundraising for the period of the campaign, to contribute solicitors to the campaign, to share their existing donor bases, to provide whatever assistance in personnel would be needed during the course of the campaign, and we had all of the board and all six of the entities approve and sign a partnership agreement.

We had an allocation formula in the agreement so that the first 550- would go to reimbursement of the owner of the building, the next would go to the moving and relocation costs of the agencies, and then we provided \$200,000 for campaign costs, and the balance would be going to the Foundation. The Foundation, being a 501(c)(3) entity, and was used as a conduit for the funds so that contributors would have a tax deduction.

That being done, we thought we needed to give

the building a compelling identity. And we asked our senior federal district court judge, who I'm sure all of you know, Michael Telesca, for permission to name the building in his honor. His life's work has epitomized equal justice. He is, I think, admired and respected by all of the practitioners in Monroe County and in Western New York. Finally, he agreed to allow us do that, we renamed the building the Telesca Center For Justice.

We engaged a consultant to do the feasibility study which confirmed that we could be successful in the campaign. We proceeded to design a campaign structure and named chairs and committees to solicit the various categories of potential donors, that in large law firms, medium-size law firms, small law firms and individual practitioners, corporations, banks, title companies, the boards of each of the parties, local foundations, well-known philanthropists, and friends of Judge Telesca.

And with the enormous dedication of the staffs and executives of the providers and of the Bar

Association, we proceeded with the remaining groundwork.

We designed a campaign solicitation which contained a statement of the case, pledge forms, news releases, frequently asked questions, history of the agencies, and other material. We held training meetings of solicitors, and we moved forward to raise the funds.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Within a year or so, a year or two, from among the members of the cabinet, the law firms behind those members of the cabinet, their boards, and friends of Judge Telesca, we received pledges of approximately \$600,000. I'm happy to say that 400,000 of that 600,000 was from the legal community, because we felt the legal community had a stake and an interest, before we went to corporation and banks and others. By -- in January of 2007, we went public, so to speak, and we launched a public phase of the campaign. We raised the goal to 1.2 million. By the end of 2009, we had raised \$1.8 million. I'm delighted to say that we had support from corporations, from banks, from local foundations, from individual philanthropists, from friends of Judge Telesca, the New York IOLA fund gave us \$200,000, the New York State Bar Foundation gave us \$25,000. We had enthusiastic support from the Mayor of Rochester, the County Executive of Monroe County, the Rochester Business Alliance, and the Rochester Downtown Development Council. They were very pleased about the fact that we converted a virtually vacant building --JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. VIGDOR: -- into an income-producing busy center with over 100 lawyers and paralegals in a part of town that they were worried about that was loosing tenancies.

The Telesca Center has exceeded all expectations. Providers have up-to-date facilities, numerous efficiencies have been realized, Bryan will talk more about it. It's also a centralization. There is a Center for Education in the building which can seat up to 125 people, it's used for CLE, for community forums for training purposes. Each agency, importantly, has access to the donor banks that resulted from this campaign, and now an annual ongoing planned giving program is now contemplated.

I'm pleased to report that we received the

American Bar Association's Harrison Tweed Award in

recognition of extraordinary achievement to develop or

significantly expand access to legal services for

low-income and indigent people. We have been visited by

other bar associations who seek to replicate the Telesca

Center and we have seen happen what we had hoped would

happen.

Lastly, let me report that the fund raising has continued. We've received several hundred thousand dollars in state grants which have been obtained for technology within the building and for renovation of the building's lobby which was not part of the original plan. The total committed to date is approaching \$2.4 million.

We are very grateful to you, Judge Lippman and

the Task Force, for focusing the spotlight so intensely on the need for expansion of civil legal services, and we pledge in Monroe County to continue to work with you in this endeavor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you so much. And the Bar Association and the providers in Monroe should be very, very proud, I think, of Telesca which I've seen in action, it's quite a place.

Let me just ask you, do you think it's a certain size community, type of community that this kind of approach works? We see that here in Erie, they've replicated to a significant degree the same kind of approach that you have in Telesca. What makes it work and how transferable is it or replicable around the state?

MR. VIGDOR: Well, I certainly am not an expert on that, Judge, but my guess is, that if you have a very committed bar, it can be done in most communities. Maybe the level and the scale would vary, but I think if you have --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, clearly.

MR. VIGDOR: But I think you have a real organized bar that is truly committed, I think the smaller cities in the state can do something very much like it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it doesn't have to be every provider.

	MR. JUSTIN VIGDOR
1	MR. VIGDOR: No.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: It can still be a center of
3	gravity that's going to work in terms of sharing services
4	and costs, you know, and everything else.
5	So, again, I salute the Monroe bar and your
6	efforts with Telesca, and particularly, again, thank you
7	for all of your efforts in this area. We've just begun,
8	you know, we're just getting warmed up so you've got a lot
9	more to do. Okay? We've got a deal, right.
10	MR. VIGDOR: Yes, indeed.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.
12	The next speaker is also from Monroe County, is
13	Bryan Hetherington, and you're on.
14	MR. BRYAN HETHERINGTON: Thank you.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: We'll forgive him for talking,
16	I'm not sure so be careful.
17	MR. HETHERINGTON: Really. He can be my truth
18	squad, Judge.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Go ahead, I'm only kidding.
20	MR. HETHERINGTON: Chief Judge Lippman,
21	Presiding Justice Scudder, Justice Pfau and President
22	Hassett, it's an honor to appear before you as president
23	of the Monroe County Bar Association to talk about the
24	fruits of the effort that

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- Justin has described to you, because that effort bore good fruit and we've --JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I might say, not to interrupt you, but just to be there and see it is graphically all one needs to see the fruit its borne.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. And we've really had four kinds of outcomes from it that -- that have made things better for clients and the lawyers who are trying to do pro bono services.

First, the co-location allows us to provide better services to individuals who are seeking help, and better quality services to people who are receiving help. It has saved an immense amount of money for the providers which then allows us to invest those savings into additional staff and additional services.

We have structured this to promote pro bono participation, make pro bono recruitment and training and service easier for members of the bar, and this has allowed the legal services providers to obtain additional funding because of the co-location that they would not have individually been eligible to receive, thereby providing additional services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you kind of piggyback on each other, right?

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. Because

	MR. BRYAN HETHERINGTON
1	collectively, we can do more than any of the providers
2	could do individually.
3	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Particularly with the bar as the
4	centerpiece already there at the heart of this.
5	MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. And Justin so
6	ably led this effort and brought everybody together.
7	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you know what, but every
8	community doesn't have a Justin Vigdor, I think that's
9	that's what we need to replicate and get some people who
10	can put these things together.
11	MR. HETHERINGTON: No community has a Justin
12	Vigdor of Rochester.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I stand amended, go ahead.
14	MR. HETHERINGTON: But every community has a
15	lawyer of stature who other lawyers
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree with you.
17	MR. HETHERINGTON: listen to
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree with you.
19	MR. HETHERINGTON: and who can serve as the
20	honest broker who brings everybody together in this kind
21	of cause.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's exactly right.
23	MR. HETHERINGTON: He or she will have a
24	different name.
25	The four legal services providers who are now

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

co-located each provide services to low-income people in different areas of the law and have long done that. And as Justin explained before co-location, clients needed to go to different places, they needed to call different phone numbers, they would spend long times telling their problem to the wrong receptionist who would then send them to tell their problem to the right receptionist and they would spend more time doing that. Now all of the telephone systems are connected. Indeed, the receptionists sit in the same area and your call is randomly answered by one of the receptionists --JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's quite striking, it really

is.

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- by one of the receptionists and if you call the wrong number, what you are told is: I'm sorry, the Legal Aid Society of Rochester does not do that; however, one of the partners here in the Telesca Center does, would you like to be connected to the person who talks to their new clients? And if the answer is yes, which it is 99 percent of the time, then it's a direct connection. It's not, here, you know, call another thing, call between 3 and 5 on Tuesdays and be the third caller at, you know, this number to get some services.

And there were savings in that. Before we all

had receptionists, every single one of the providers had a receptionist and one had two. Now two and a half receptionists can handle the calls for the entire building which is a substantial savings.

In addition, the clients receive better services, better quality services, because — because each of the providers was specialized, when problems occurred outside of the specialty that the provider provided representation in, there were glitches in the need to talk to people who you didn't know and the difficulties of that. Now that everybody is co-located, it is, as the former head of the executive director of the IOLA fund said, you are like a large law firm with many departments.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you have people wandering in off the street just saying this is a place we know we can get help, they have no idea what the different groups do?

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. And Mary
Lowenguth, our executive director at the bar tells this
compelling story of walking into the lobby of the Telesca
Center one day and three's a mom and she's got one kid in
a stroller, one kid in her hand, and a five- or
six-year-old kind of running around, and she was looking
for legal services, and Mary said, well, I'll take you up
to the reception area for all of the legal service
providers in the community, I'm sure they're going to be

able to help. And the mom said, oh, I am so grateful, I was afraid that maybe nobody would be able to help me and I would have to take my kids across town to someplace else to get help. And that's, you know, what we are trying to, through the co-location, avoid.

One conversation with one person, the savings then come back. And because people are working in their areas of expertise and working together, like you heard earlier in the testimony from the client, somebody who has an eviction problem that is being caused by a Social Services problem, an incorrect withholding of Social Services benefits. Back in the old day, the Legal Aid Society, who would represent the people in the evictions, would need to connect with somebody from Monroe County Legal Assistance Center who represents people --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we found that most of these people have multiple problems, I mean, that's clear.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. And this allows us to put together teams of lawyers and paralegals across the organizations to provide seamless high quality services to the clients.

Because of the below market rents and because of the shared space and because of the economies that you heard about in Art's testimony, joint purchasing and those kind of things --

JUDGE PFAU: Has it also had a spill-over effect on the bar because you're collated with the bar association so that it's had an impact on the pro bono response from the bar?

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely, Judge Pfau. And what we have done is to put the pro bono office, Volunteer Legal Services, which is really one of the finest pro bono programs in the nation, we put them right next to the Rubin Education Center where we hold our continuing legal education events, and we did that mindfully, deliberately, and we did it so that it would be easier for their recruiters to walk next door and if they needed, you know, more lawyers to do wills for people with HIV disease, they could come next door to a T & E section meeting and say, hey, we need folks, would somebody sign up, and it's a visual reminder, every time you come in to CLE, if you haven't taken a case recently, you have to walk right by the office, the guilt hits you.

JUDGE PFAU: A little quilt isn't so bad.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Guilt is very good, guilt is good for us. And you can go on in and -- and they will sign you up right then and there on your lunch hour while you're getting your next CLE with your next case assignment. So it has promoted that. It has made it easier because in our community, much of the training for

the attorneys who are doing the pro bono representation is actually done by attorneys who are employed by the other providers who are expert in those areas of law, it has made it easier for that support.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And training is so important to this effort.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. Because we don't want to give low-income people who are being represented by pro bono lawyers lesser services. Those lawyers need to be trained to give them high quality service.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You can have a well-meaning and generous member of the bar who has no idea how to do this particular kind of work, whatever is necessary.

MR. HETHERINGTON: And the foreclosure prevention work is an excellent example of that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, it is, exactly.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Judge, we, you know, have traveled all throughout the state providing training to attorneys, and I remember one of the attorneys employed by Empire Justice Center going to a bar-sponsored training at the beginning of the foreclosure crisis and raising her hand at the end of the training and said, excuse me, but nobody's talked about any defenses to foreclosures in this training, and being told by the trainer, oh, there are no defenses to foreclosure, that's why we haven't talked

about it. Well, there were and there's -- and training is now being provided to volunteer lawyers and staff lawyers throughout the state.

And then the final way that this has benefitted all of us in the Telesca Center is that it has allowed the organizations in the Telesca Center to be eligible for funding that they would not have been able to receive otherwise. Many of the funding sources are for representation of categories of clients: Veterans, people with HIV disease --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- people who are homeless, and they want to provide a full range of legal services. Well, none of the providers did that --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Themselves.

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- in and of themselves so the alternative was to ask lawyers to do cases in areas where they weren't an expert and it would take them longer and they would do them worse, or to work collaboratively, and by being in the Telesca Center, we can now give people the highest quality of representation most effectively, and there are at least six funding applications that had been approved for services, for collaborative services that probably would not have been able to be done if the co-location hadn't occurred. So this is all great.

And, you know, our community has done a fabulous job and our lawyers raise over \$235,000 a year for the legal service providers, they have contributed generously to the campaign, the providers have worked with the bar to get out all the efficiencies that we can possibly get out, and yet, as in Erie, every day if you were to go and sit in that waiting room, you would hear that there are people who cannot be served.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And again, I assume you would agree that the bottom line of all of this is that it's wonderful to have a generous bar, it's wonderful to have all the pro bono work that our members do around the state, but that we need a permanent system of funding civil legal services out of the public fisc in order to make this, to even begin to address this problem, and then we can combine with the pro bono efforts and the generosity, the private bar and all of that.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Absolutely. And I think it's also really important to recognize that there needs to be funding for the infrastructure of the pro bono system.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, clearly.

MR. HETHERINGTON: So even when you talk about -- about, you know, those folks who say, well, the solution here is in expanding pro bono, we all ought to work to expand pro bono and we have over 1,500 lawyers in

our community who are on the VLSP panel, and that's an extraordinary number, the highest, you know, per capita --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You've done good work.

MR. HETHERINGTON: But we need people who can screen those clients, determine which ones -- cases have merit.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

MR. HETHERINGTON: Because you don't want to assign cases without merit to pro bono lawyers, that gets them into a place where they don't feel good and don't want to come back and volunteer again. We need people to supervise them and support them and be experts to them and train them and make sure that the cases actually get done, because that's important, too, so we need resources even on the pro bono side, as well as on the staff side, to make this work as a Telesca.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Scudder.

JUSTICE SCUDDER: One of the things I was talking to Sheila Gaddis before was, as you know, I'm from Bath, New York, Steuben County, and I'm sure there is a lot of attorneys that would do pro bono work but exactly what you're talking about, we don't have, in Steuben County, there is no structure for them to go and give their services to people that really need it, and I have — unfortunately, I believe that's got to be a

function of money, you have to have the money to put those people in place so that the lawyers can help out. And I look at it like in Monroe and Erie, you're so lucky that you have the numbers to be able to structure and to fund that in order to do that, and I just think that looking at the outlying counties, they ought -- there ought to be a way to help them as well.

MR. HETHERINGTON: I absolutely agree with you, Presiding Justice. And I think the trick here is you have three things: You have recruitment, you have matching, and then you have support. And the system, if we want our attorneys to step up to and be successful in their pro bono obligations, we have to deal with all three of those and those have to be funded activities. You know better than I do that we cannot ask our rural bar associations to take on that as an additional voluntary activity. They are small, they have no resources, they have no paid staff. These are activities that our court system, our justice system, has to fund that in order to achieve that access to justice —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think --

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- that I talked about.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think this whole idea, too, I think Judge Scudder is commenting on, there has to be a hub of -- that's able to weal out services even, you know,

beyond the geographic areas, certainly in conjunction with the areas, you know, around, you know, a particular community, a particular city.

MR. HETHERINGTON: And we have to address the fact that some of the types of cases are ones that are -- just don't work for pro bono lawyers. The Social Services cases --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Absolutely without question.

MR. HETHERINGTON: -- as the Second Circuit has observed, that the law is more Byzantine than the tax code, so asking generalist practitioners, whether in Bath or Rochester, to make that deep dive into, you know, statutes that are 602-823(b)(4)ii --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Of course what we've also learned, and you're entirely right, that you need providers in certain types of cases. In the more rural areas in the state, the wide geography, you know, the large areas result in people have to travel -- lawyers have to travel great distances, or the client, to get serviced, and it's very difficult, and in some areas of the state civil legal providers are few and far between and how you get it from the hubs, again --

MR. HETHERINGTON: That's right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- where you maybe have the people and the resources and how you get it out to the

## MR. STEPHEN JOHNSON

most rural areas of the state is very, very difficult, and some of our providers in the most rural areas are really having a terrible time. In fact, they have so little money that the attorneys who work for some of our rural providers qualify as the working poor, you know, and barely above poverty level.

But thank you and I thank the Monroe County bar,
I thank the Erie County bar for all of your wonderful
efforts and for this whole concept of sharing resources
among the providers.

And now I ask Stephen Johnson from Bond, Schoeneck & King.

MR. STEPHEN JOHNSON: Good afternoon. I would like to report on our efforts in Syracuse, New York and the One Roof Committee that we have. At the request of Judge Lowe, a couple of years ago, I agreed to serve as counsel to this committee that's become --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Who's sitting right there, I note.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, he is. He actually called me in 1990 on a matter and he keeps calling me in Syracuse, I have a lot of fun working for him.

So the members of our committee are the president of the Bar Association, the coordinator for the Onondaga Bar Association's Volunteer Projects, a

## MR. STEPHEN JOHNSON

representative of the Syracuse University College of Law's clinical programs, a representative of the Federal Court Bar Association for the Northern District of New York, and the executive directors for the legal services providers in Central New York: The Hiscock Legal Aid Society, Legal Services of Central New York, and Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York.

Now, two of these offices are now located in one building and the others are scattered. And for years, I think Judge Lowe and others had wanted these entities to be in one building. And we did visit Justin Vigdor and his son about a year ago and received the report that you received today, very impressive, and that gave us impetus to keep going. Each of the boards of directors has passed a resolution endorsing this concept, we've received advice on how to put the space together and have it shared. We aren't as fortunate, however, on the expiration of the leases. The leases expire in 2014, we're hoping to do it in 2015 but we have one going on.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So logistical issues to really get them --

MR. JOHNSON: It is. And we are still working on a request for proposal, we certainly could go to the landlord of that one building and get a proposal. We do think we can put a proposal together, we think we can get

# MR. STEPHEN JOHNSON

the proposal out, I think we'll get responses, but then we come to the Justin Vigdor factor, how do we put the money together to cover moving expenses and build-out costs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Not so simple.

MR. JOHNSON: So even though we've been at it for a while, we're at the beginning and we're going to continue forward.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you buy into this concept that --

MR. JOHNSON: We absolutely do.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- that the goal of providing civil legal representation for the poor would be so enhanced if you're able to share costs, resources, and be in just for convenience purposes.

MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes. So I think that the -this part of the state, the Fourth Department, Judge
Scudder's bailiwick, are certainly -- all seem to be of a
like mind in terms of how to get this job done and, again,
Erie, Monroe and Onondaga certainly are at the forefront
of this new, I guess, piece of this, which is we're so
much stronger when we collaborate and do things together
on every level, not just the courts, but also what you're
doing for the -- what you can put back into the clientele
that we're serving.

So I'm greatly appreciative to all of you, all of your efforts, and thank you for being here and you're all terrific and I say that with total sincerity. Thank you so much.

And now I'm going to ask Dean Mutua to come up and testify.

Dean, it's a delight to have you with us today and so pleased that you've come here to testify at the hearing.

DEAN MAKAU MUTUA: Thank you very much, Judge.

Am I alone here, am I going to face the four judges by my lonesome?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're it, and Judge Scudder is very difficult so be careful, Dean.

DEAN MUTUA: Well, thank you very much, sir, for calling these hearings. I think that all of us, you know, law schools, the bar, the bench, the state, have a responsibility to provide legal services to our neediest citizens. In my view, no democracy can succeed and flourish without a functional legal services infrastructure that is well supported and well funded, because not all citizens can afford to pay for legal services out of their pockets.

But I just wanted to say that we, all of us, have different roles to play in this process. And I just

want to focus my attention today on law schools, and in particular on what UB Law is doing in this area.

But before I do so, let me just say that lawyers start their journey in the profession in law school.

That's where they get their values, that's where they get their training, and that's where they're taught how to think and act like lawyers. So in a sense, as law schools, we have a unique obligation as the people who sit at the front line of the pipeline in the legal profession to imbue in our students particular values of empathy --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you think the generation -- I know this is a generalization -- but the law school population of today gets it? That they have an obligation beyond earning money?

DEAN MUTUA: Well, I think that there's always a risk of looking back in one's generation and blaming the current or the future generations for not getting it, certainly that's what parents do with their children. But I do think there is something to be said of a certain sense of loosening of social obligations in society today that I think makes our citizens today, both young and not so young, feel less indebted to their fellow human beings.

I also think that with the emergence of all these technologies that really, you know, they alienate, they are called social networkings, you know,

infrastructures, but they also alienate people from one another and I think that we have to work hard to make sure our students do not fall prey to those influences.

But I think, you know, as law schools, we have an obligation to impart certain values to our students, and I think the most important one, in my view, is to teach our students that both also in our lived examples as professors, as deans, as educators, to teach them that, you know, the law lives at the intersection of power and powerlessness and that the law should be just but it cannot exist in a vacuum. It must do justice. And that it must do justice I think for the least of our citizens, otherwise our system would lose its credibility as a democracy. And so even as we try to keep the scales of justice even, I think we have to teach our students that they must have a social conscience, and that they have obligation to society to serve the least among us.

TUDGE LIPPMAN: Dean, do you think that the -the great debt that many law students have when they come
out of law school makes it difficult to get them to focus
on, as you say, their social obligation that they have to
those less fortunate? Does the economics of going to law
school today work against having our -- the new lawyer
come out and either work in the public sector, helping the
poor, or meet their pro bono obligations as lawyers?

DEAN MUTUA: Well, I think, you know, unfortunately, of course I don't tell you anything new when I say that the cost of education, legal education, law schools has gone through the roof, it's very, very high. Now admittedly in a law school like mine, we are still well priced for our students and we're very happy about that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

DEAN MUTUA: But even then, people still feel that burden is to high to carry. I know that in some other law schools, the costs are very prohibitive, and so when a person graduates from law school, they carry enormous burden, sometimes in excess of \$200,000 in debt. And so there's a compulsion, I think, for people to feel that they've got to go to the highest paid jobs to pay back, you know, these debts.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You think you get more people going to -- wanting to get into UB because the cost isn't so staggering --

DEAN MUTUA: We certainly have --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- in this economy?

DEAN MUTUA: Yes, that is happening, you know, but I think students tend to choose law schools not purely for the cost, but for where they think are the best, you know, legal education to place them in good position to

get a good job, to make a living. You know, I think that is what is happening.

But just to go back to your earlier question, I think what students do after law school really depends pretty much on the kind of legal education they get and the kind of values that get imparted to them.

I will just, you know, let you know that I went to Harvard Law School myself and I do remember, you know, you will expect a lot of students there to go to high paying corporate jobs but actually a lot of us went into public interests after law school, and that was because of what we're taught by people like Gary Bellow, who was a professor there and who headed up the clinics at Harvard, and so, you know, I think there is a great deal of that that is happening because of what law schools do.

I just wanted to say that at UB Law, we believe that we have an obligation to produce a lawyer who has or feels they owe a duty to society, to the public good, to serve the public in whatever capacity they are functioning as a lawyer, whether as a judge or, you know, a prosecutor, a private lawyer in a law firm, one can find a way to provide legal services to our citizens in a pro bono capacity, as a member of the bar or otherwise. And we try to incubate these values and through our various legal skills and the clinical programs at UB Law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, you know, with your permission, I would like to just, you know, mention some of those. You know, but before I do so, let me just, you know, say a few things about why I think what you are doing is so important in these hearings.

I want to state very clearly for you, Judge, and for the fellow judges and the audience, that I think there is a dire need for both political and financial support for programs and initiatives in this state that enhance the ability of New Yorkers to access our courts. that need is clear, it's demonstrated and it's urgent. Many of our citizens cannot afford to pay for legal services. The consequences, at least for them and for their inability to pay for legal services, are dire. Sometimes, you know, the consequences could mean the difference between life and death. And as I said earlier, the ability of our democracy to function effectively to give meaning to the lives of our citizens depends on their ability to vindicate their rights. But those rights cannot be vindicated unless ordinary people, you know, ordinary moms and dads and others have access to legal services. And, you know, that's why I believe that raising awareness on all these obligations that we have on ourselves, because I consider law schools, the bar, the bench, to be very fortunate, we have a singular obligation

to our fellow citizens.

Let me just say what we are doing on our part at UB Law to help with this process. We have, like most law schools, a clinical legal education program, and our clinical legal education program is one of the most robust in the state, if not the country. It allows our students to study law while providing needed free legal services to individuals and organizations throughout this community.

I know that, Judge, you'll be very interested in the notion of outcomes for legal education, you know, how law schools train lawyers and how prepared they are to become lawyers. We believe that experiential learning environments in law schools are extremely important to produce lawyers who are able to function effectively once they graduate, and our clinical legal education program is designed to do that. But a great benefit of these clinics is that they can provide live client assistance to our citizens and so our clinics are organized to utilize the need in our community to teach our students to provide those services. And I will just outline a number of the clinics so that you have a sense of what we do.

The Women, Children & Social Justice Clinic places students in supervised community placements and projects, and these include placements in government agencies, legal service agencies, law enforcement

agencies, social service agencies and community outreach programs throughout Western New York.

In addition, we have the Domestic Violence Task

Force that has traditionally assisted with onsite legal

assistance program at Haven House here in this community,

and the Haven House is the largest local shelter for

female victims of domestic violence and their children.

We are very deeply involved with Haven House.

The William and Mary Foster Elder Law Clinic provides services through a working agreement with Legal Services for the Elderly, Disabled or Disadvantaged of Western New York. The clinic handles individual cases of clients who walk in. At clinics, student attorneys are responsible for all aspects of such cases, of course under the supervision of a professor who is an attorney. They participate in client counseling, informal advocacy in the negotiation to settle problems.

And then we have one of our most successful, I think, clinics which has received national recognition and the support of many law firms and lawyers in this community, and that's the Affordable Housing Clinic which I think is well known to some of you, and that clinic works with local organizations to create, you know, needed housing for the elderly, for the disabled, and for the homeless. I think at last count we had built homes or

participated in building homes to the tune of \$200 million over the past 15 years for this community.

We have a Community Economic Development Clinic which assists community development corporations and other non-profits with legal transactions, with particular emphasis on child care policy and helping low-income families build assets, because we believe that unless one, you know, can earn a livelihood, you know, their ability to vindicate and protect themselves in the legal system will be compromised.

And then, of course, we have Environmental Policy Clinic. The environment is a big thing these days and we will not be left behind. This clinic focuses on environmental policy issues that have direct impact on this community. It deals with hazardous waste problems and solid waste landfills formerly used by defense sites or defense contractors, and which are under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Region 9 which is comprised of Niagara, Erie, Wyoming, Chautauqua, Cattaraugus and Allegany Counties.

And then Mediation Clinic -- and I'm coming to a close -- Mediation Clinic which works on cases referred to by local courts or other mediation agencies, and students in my school help resolve disputes in a context of this

clinic in family law, small claims and other small questions.

Our students also serve many organizations and individuals seeking justice through our externship program, as well as our judicial clerkship program.

Placements that we have made through our externship programs in the recent past include the Empire Justice Center in Rochester, the Legal Aid of Buffalo, the Monroe County Public Defender, the New York State attorney General's Office, and the US Attorney's Offices.

But we also have, you know, a community-based, law school-based fund raising effort called the Buffalo Public Interests Law Program in which we leverage resources from professors, from staff, and from members of the bar mostly through an auction that we hold every year. I think many lawyers in this community have come there to bid for items and to raise money to be able to support fellowships and grants for students. And every year we have supported at least 25 students through that particular effort.

Finally, you know, the law school does emphasize pro bono opportunities in a number of ways. We publicize pro bono opportunities through e-mail, through postings, information tables in the law school lobby and, for example, we have something we call the Law Student and

Action Projects which is an Equal Justice Works program that, you know, holds frequent information sessions at the lobby of our law school to educate students about opportunities in pro bono work. We also publicize the Volunteer Lawyers Project which is a program of Erie County Bar Association with postings for assistance who are able to take on some of our students.

And, of course, we work with Neighborhood Legal Services which is an important provider for legal assistance in our community.

My belief as dean is that, you know, our clinical efforts are modest but they do make an important contribution. But I think our efforts alone are like a drop in the ocean because I think the needs that we face in this community are just vast and they're huge, and that's why I don't think that any one of us is able to tackle this issue by themselves. I think it's very important that our Legislature in particular funds the programs that provide civil legal services.

I think -- obviously I appreciate the fact that we live in difficult times, the economy has been severely damaged but, you know, I think that it is at moments like these when we can measure the soul of a country, and in my view, the soul of a country is measured not by how the country treats its most powerful citizens but how it

treats its most vulnerable citizens, and I think the people who are served by pro bono and other Legal Aid services are most vulnerable citizens and the moments like these in particular, we owe them a special obligation, so I thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Dean. And I congratulate the law school on having so many -- and you personally, on putting together so many programs that I think, as you say, teach law students to the values that they have should and the understanding of what you just said, that every society is basically, in the end, judged by how it treats its most vulnerable citizens.

In terms of the clinical programs that the bar -- that the law schools put together, do you think their ultimate value, and maybe it's both obviously, is the actual work that they do while they're students, or the fact that doing that work, then sort of they carry that with them when they go out to their communities and into the bar? And what's the real value of the clinical program?

DEAN MUTUA: So I -- clearly our mission is to educate great lawyers, to produce prominent lawyers. And I think, Judge, you've had our graduates appear before you and I would like to think that you can testify to their, you know, great skills.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I can, yes.

DEAN MUTUA: Yes, thank you. I think that, you know, as a law school, what we try to teach students is to think, you know, like lawyers, in a very complex way, to apply obviously, you know, the law to the facts, to segregate issues from non-issues, you know, but to do so in a context.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

DEAN MUTUA: Because you see, Judge, the law doesn't exist in a vacuum, it can never exist in a vacuum, and that's why, in my own view, I think when you expose students to a real live situation where they can see a client, you know, who maybe is a battered spouse, maybe it's a person who has lost a home, you know, maybe it's a person who has been abused by authorities, whatever the case is, where you put them in that situation, I've often found that it is transformational, it transforms, it -- it reminds them why they came to law school. You didn't come to law school to go make a lot of money, I like to tell my students that, and I tell them that openly, you came to law school to learn how to be a good citizen, to support our democracy.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you can't necessarily, and I guess this is what I was driving at, in your terms, to teach the law students to have a soul, or more directly,

to have a commitment to equal justice, you can't necessarily learn that in a lecture room.

DEAN MUTUA: No. No. And I think it's actually a huge mistake to think that we can do that solely in a classroom room. You know, we send students as far away as London and Cape Town and Sao Paulo to work with pro bono lawyers in other countries, it's not just in this country, because we believe that is really the nexus between -- it's like a higher moment, you get there and you see what's going on with real live people and it never leaves you, whether you become a judge --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

DEAN MUTUA: -- whether you become a prosecutor, it just never leaves you. So I think that, you know, I know that you've been a part of discussions about, you know, pushing law schools to create a more --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

DEAN MUTUA: -- how shall I put it,
outcome-based, you know, legal education program in place
in which students are taught, you know, actual skills, and
I think there is no better place to teach them those
skills than in clinics.

But also in addition to that, I just want to say that as they learn that experience and they get transformed by that experience, they also do some good,

1	because they're affecting a real life in that process.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: They do some good and it stays
3	with them.
4	DEAN MUTUA: They do some good and it stays with
5	them.
6	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So thank you, Dean. We really
7	appreciate you coming in, and again, appreciate your work
8	in the law schools and recognizing this tie-in between
9	this academia and this pursuit of equal justice that I
10	think we're all involved in that's so central to what the
11	law school is about, what the profession is about, and
12	what the judiciary is all about.
13	DEAN MUTUA: Thank you, Judges, and thank you
14	Chief Judge. We are at your service and whenever you need
15	us, we shall do what's necessary.
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. Greatly
17	appreciate it.
18	DEAN MUTUA: Thank you so much.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Pleasure to have you.
20	DEAN MUTUA: Thank you.
21	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Our last panel for the day is
22	the judges' panel.
23	I'd mention before I do that that the other
24	members of the Task Force who are here today, Bob
25	Convissar is here, and Steve Banks is here, all the way

from New York City, and Sheila Gaddis is here, and

C. Bruce Lawrence is here, all on the Task Force, along
with the Chairperson Helaine Barnett and all doing a
spectacular job, and I know that firsthand what a great
job this Task Force does.

And I also know firsthand what a great job our judiciary here does and we have the privilege of having Paula Feroleto, who is the administrative judge of the Eighth Judicial District, and the co-chair of the Eighth Judicial District Pro Bono Committee; Honorable Deborah Karalunas from the Supreme Court, Onondaga County; and the Honorable Jeannette Ogden, E. Jeannette Ogden from the Buffalo City Court, an acting judge in the County and Family Courts, to come up and tell us about how being a judge intersects with this obligation that we have to foster equal justice in our state and our courtrooms.

Okay. And Judge Feroleto, we're delighted to have you here, and you want to start off the proceedings, at least for the judges' panel?

JUDGE PAULA FEROLETO: Absolutely. Thank you very much. And thank you and the Task Force for conducting these hearings and elevating the court's -- the level of the court's role in ensuring access to justice and raising awareness of the overwhelming need for the civil legal services for low-income people.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you in a general way, just like you do on the bench before the lawyer can get a word out of their mouth, you know, we ask them a question. You think judges here in this judicial district are conscious each and every day that what they're doing in the courtroom is all about equal justice? That that being our constitutional mission, that sometimes I think we all as judges have a tendency to get so lost in a particular legal issue or, you know, whatever is the order of the day that we're carrying out, do we, all of us, and I ask you as the administrative judge who is speaking for the judiciary here in this room, do we get that if in our courtrooms there isn't a level playing field, that there isn't a commitment to equal justice above all other things, that we're not doing our job?

JUDGE FEROLETO: Oh, absolutely. And I think all of the judges here are very aware of how to deal with pro se litigants when they come in because it happens very frequently. Just in our Erie Supreme Court I know that we had over 2,000 unrepresented litigants last year, I asked my clerk for a census, and that's the Supreme Court.

Obviously in our city courts and rural courts the numbers are much higher than that.

So as I go through, I think the judges realize when pro se people come in, they're aware of how much

longer the proceedings take, making sure that the witness is able to get the testimony out and --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And that makes your job hard, right?

JUDGE FEROLETO: It makes it much harder from a judge's perspective. In terms of even trying to negotiate a case, if you were in the Supreme Court where you have a pro se litigant and an attorney, you want to make sure that everything is on the record instead of being able to have the attorneys in and speaking.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But what's the judge's role?

The judge is supposed to be a neutral. What do you do in a situation where you -- one side has an attorney, the other side doesn't, you're the neutral in these proceedings, you're not supposed to be the lawyer for the, you know, person who doesn't have one. How do you deal with that? What's the impact on the justice system on equal justice when the judge is kind of caught in this dilemma?

JUDGE FEROLETO: It makes the proceeding go much slower. Many times you will grant an adjournment for them to try and get an attorney, or politely suggest that they should do some research or checking or come back or consult with someone before they come back again, or instead of trying to ask themselves questions when they're

testifying, it's so much easier to have someone else in an attorney there representing them.

In this district we are lucky to have the cooperation of many local legal services and pro bono programs. For more than 15 years here in Erie County, the Volunteer Lawyers Project and Neighborhood Legal Services have worked cooperatively with Buffalo City Court to operate the Attorney of the Morning Program.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Which I saw this morning, there's such a great program that really so obviously works on a very basic level, you know.

JUDGE FEROLETO: Absolutely. We -- both you and Judge Pfau were over there this morning and it was a typical morning, the attorney from Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority was there, he had started the morning with 120 cases, by the time Judge Pfau and I were there at 10:30, because there were attorneys there, he said he only works with attorneys and he makes sure there's going to be an attorney there when he's there with his cases, they were down to 40 cases. One hundred twenty pro se people in front of a judge would not have been done in an hour and a half.

JUDGE PFAU: Judge Feroleto, you cover not just urban Buffalo but a lot of very, very rural counties. How does this work in a rural county where you must have -- I

would guess, but you would know better than I do -- the same increasing number of unrepresented litigants, probably one judge and not the same kind of network of probono services available?

JUDGE FEROLETO: Unfortunately we don't have the same network available in all our counties. We were fortunate some time ago to have a pro bono coordinator who was helping us with our outreach to our more rural communities. When she was working with us, we were able to do outreach to Chautauqua County and we managed there to get a pro se divorce clinic going as well as coordinate services with Southern Tier Legal Services. But it was the help of a person who'd coordinate the attorneys there who knew there was a need.

In fact, I sat on the bench there for two years and I had been a practicing attorney here in Buffalo before I was assigned to Mayville and was very familiar with the Volunteer Lawyers Project since I was the coordinator for our pro bono services in my law firm with Mr. Hassett at Brown & Kelly, and I got there and I had a consumer credit transaction and I said this person needs an attorney, is there a Volunteer Lawyers Project here, I need to assign somebody, and they said, no, there is no such program there. So I immediately realized the need for a program and for attorneys to assist.

We attempted to get a group of attorneys together that we could then call on where you felt that there was a need for an attorney to try and ask them to represent them but it's so much easier if you have a concerted effort, for example, with the Volunteer Lawyers Project, they can give ethics credits as well for service which makes it very attractive to the attorneys.

So it is as you mentioned, Judge, much harder in the rural communities because they're so far apart. While you have people willing to serve, they don't know how to go about it.

I can give you an example, though, in Chautauqua County through the efforts of the pro bono coordinator and what we did with the judges and offering free LEs -- free CLEs, someone else mentioned you want someone to know what they're doing, so we did CLE on basic handling matrimonial, we did a CLE on landlord-tenant matters so that these attorneys could get educated on how to do it and then they agree to take a case. And we got 33 attorneys from Chautauqua County, after a letter writing campaign, who all agreed to take cases and it worked out very well there.

I would point out in Allegany County, we're also making some strides, and that is very rural, very close to where Judge Scudder's from. With Judge Parker and our new

court building down there, there's going to be space where we're going to dedicate a room to a Volunteer Lawyer Project where the attorneys will have set hours and litigants will be able to come in and work with the attorney in terms of completing paperwork for either Family Court or Supreme Court matters where they need to consult with an attorney, it makes it so much easier for the courts where the paperwork is actually done correctly when it comes in, it saves a lot of time.

JUDGE PFAU: And it saves a lot of time for the judge --

JUDGE FEROLETO: Absolutely.

JUDGE PFAU: -- who even though it's rural, has a very big calendar.

JUDGE FEROLETO: Because then the judge doesn't spend the time going through the papers and having them sent back.

So I guess in short what I would say is, yes, we do have a need in our -- oh, I wanted to mention, too, our in rem proceedings that we also did here in Buffalo last week and that was also another project coordinated with all of the volunteer legal service providers here. In one week we were able to work out orders on almost 1,500 cases, and that meant during that one-week time frame before Buffalo did its tax foreclosure sale, 1,500 people

came into the courts in a one-week period of time, dealt with attorneys for the City and they all had access to a volunteer lawyer, either through Neighborhood Legal Services or the Volunteer Lawyers Project, got orders taking their property off the in rem list and we were able to save their homes from tax foreclosure. It was an amazing effort with no overtime.

JUDGE PFAU: Thank you.

JUDGE FEROLETO: So I think I really just want to thank you all so much for highlighting the need for pro bono legal services, and while we are truly blessed here in Buffalo and Western New York area with so many attorneys who will volunteer and are willing to take the time, it is so very helpful to have a core group of legal service providers who can help channel and funnel that energy so it gets in the places where it needs legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you, Judge Feroleto, for your leadership in this area. I think what's clear is that in the western part of the state, there really is a partnership among the providers, the bar, the judiciary, that and academia -- the dean was here -- where I think that, you know, I was asking before, do we get it, and I asked the different players do they get it, I think pretty much everyone up here gets it. I think the issue is that

we need, as a foundation, for all of these collaborative efforts, not only in the state courts, in the federal courts and with our friend Judge Lowe here who, you know, who has done such good works, we need a core of funding for the providers that provides the -- the center of which all these other things can spin around, that needs to be a publicly-funded endeavor that recognizes that -- that that funding is repaid, you know, so many times over because of the consequences of not funding civil legal services.

So thank you for your central role in this kind of team and partnership that we have here.

And I now ask Judge Karalunas --

MR. HASSETT: Can I just say --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MR. HASSETT: -- my former partner here,

Judge Feroleto, I think in all honesty that she was the

instigator of the pro bono program at Brown & Kelly when

she was our partner and it's continued to today largely

because of what she started.

You mentioned the pro bono coordinator, and I mentioned earlier in a different context, but what that coordinator was able to do in Chautauqua County points out the difference between Monroe, Onondaga, Erie and the infrastructure that we already have in place here and what doesn't exist in the rural areas where the pro bono effort

is probably -- the attorneys are willing to do it but it takes somebody to start it, and that program that you were part of in Chautauqua County is an example of the necessity, not just in the urban areas of New York State, but particularly in the rural areas, to have some source of continuing reliable funding for services for the poor in the civil area, so thank you.

JUDGE FEROLETO: Thank you. And I should also bring up, and we were talking about public defenders as well at arraignments, it's a shame that we don't, even in many of my city courts in this district, not have public defenders available at the time of arraignments.

know, it's so important, and as you know, we've been talking about that, particularly this last Law Day, and making sure that there is representation at arraignment, and I think it ties together the criminal issues, you know, as the clarion call of Gideon versus Wainwright, that people have criminal representation as a constitutional right, and even with that we sometimes fail in our mission and the execution of that right. But I think sometimes, and this was pointed out at some of the other hearings, that on the criminal side, where we say that loss of liberty, one's loss of liberty is so severe a consequence that you have a constitutional right to

representation, the issues that we're talking about are the necessities of life: the roof over one's head, freedom from physical violence, your livelihood, your family's subsistence benefits, the consequences can be even as great or greater than the loss of liberty in the civil area and that's why I think we all make this effort to raise the public's consciousness of the consequences of not having representation in the civil matters that sometimes deal with just life itself, just as the loss of liberty on the criminal side.

So anyway, Judge Karalunas, you're up.

JUDGE DEBORAH KARALUNAS: Thank you.

Good afternoon, Chief Judge Lippman, Chief

Administrative Judge Pfau, Justice Scudder, and

Mr. Hassett. Thank you for inviting me to give testimony
today on the topic of access to civil justice.

As you may know, for 20 years I practiced law with Bond, Schoeneck & King and George Lowe, large upstate law firm. During that time, primarily through clinics organized by the Onondaga County Bar Association and the Central New York Women's Bar Association, I devoted many hours representing the poor in civil legal matters. For the most part, those were the good years. Families were more stable, unemployment was low, foreclosure actions were sparse, and the economy was stronger.

I also am very active in an urban Syracuse church whose mission is to serve and assist members of our community who live in poverty, are undereducated, and face unique physical or mental health challenges. I believe in the goodness of people and the strength and power of community. I believe in helping people help themselves.

In 2002 I was elected Supreme Court justice in the Fifth Judicial District. For my first two years on the bench I was assigned to the matrimonial part. In that part I dealt with issues of divorce, child custody, and equitable distribution.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you to stop for a second, Judge. You know, in Family Court we know that we have certain areas where people are entitled, at least under New York statutory law, to representation. In a matrimonial proceeding for divorce which is, you know, in the Supreme Court, is there any such right to representation?

JUDGE KARALUNAS: Well, certainly there are the law guardians who are representing the children in those cases.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But what about the person who comes in and is seeking a divorce?

JUDGE KARALUNAS: In the Fifth Judicial District, to my knowledge, we didn't have people who were,

through one of the agencies, provided with legal services.

With that said, I would say in less than five percent of the matrimonial actions that I presided over, contested matrimonial actions where the individual's, one of the party's unrepresented.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And they got representation from a provider when they didn't have money?

JUDGE KARALUNAS: In the matrimonial context, in the absence of a custody dispute, no.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: No.

JUDGE KARALUNAS: They were unrepresented.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Um-hum.

JUDGE KARALUNAS: In the uncontested divorce proceedings, the number was significantly -- significantly greater.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

JUDGE KARALUNAS: In January 2005, I was assigned to the general civil part. I continue in that part, although I now also serve as the commercial division judge for Onondaga County. My cases include business disputes, a variety of tort claims, and foreclosure and consumer debt actions. Generally, the parties who appear before me are represented by counsel.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Would you say that's typical in the higher courts, you know, at least within our court

structure, that there are more people represented than, let's say, in the City Court and the Family Court?

JUDGE KARALUNAS: My experience has only been in the Supreme Court. I would certainly surmise, and based on conversations with other judges in the Family Courts and City Courts, agree with that, Judge Lippman, that in the Supreme Court we are less likely to see people who are unrepresented. The exceptions or the cases where we see people who are unrepresented are generally people seeking ex parte applications for name change -- changes, petitioners seeking early access to structured settlements awards, defendants in foreclosure and consumer debt actions.

In the latter categories, the pro se litigants generally do not dispute the validity of the underlying loans or debts, they simply are unable to make the required payments.

New York's current economic condition is poor.

Indeed, the budget of the Executive and Judicial branches of government and many governmental and nonprofit organizations have been slashed. Nonetheless, the Legislature has imposed many unfunded mandates on the court, and increasingly, we are being used to resolve pressing social issues. The judiciary is asked to do more with less, so too are the three organizations in Central

New York that represent the poor in civil legal matters.

These organizations, the Hiscock Legal Aid
Society, the Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York, and Legal
Services of Central New York, are staffed with quality
lawyers who provide quality legal services. Those
organizations and the Volunteer Lawyers Project which we
have run by our Onondaga County Bar Association, similar
to what's in Erie County, work tirelessly to ensure
justice for the people that they serve. Traditionally,
these organizations were funded by federal, state, county,
local governments, various grants, the United Way, IOLA,
and private contributions. More recently, however, some
of those funding sources have been cut or slashed. For
example, I understand that in the last year, the state
pulled most, if not all, of the funding for the Hiscock
Legal Aid Society.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And IOLA has gone from 32 million to 6 and a half million dollars, and the Legal Services Corporation in Washington is having its trouble, constantly under seize.

JUDGE KARALUNAS: Yes. While I support access to legal services in civil matters involving the essentials or necessities of life, I have concerns about increasing the role of the courts in funding and administering programs to meet that challenge. The

judiciary is a separate and coequal branch of government. Generally the role of judiciary has been to protect private interests and the role of the Legislature is to safeguard broad public interests. In other words, the judiciary's empowered to determine the rights and obligations of parties in discrete cases and controversies and the Legislature is empowered to make policy decisions and to allocate limited public dollars consistent with those policy decisions. By taking on responsibility to fund and administer civil legal services, the judiciary assumes the policy-making role of the Legislative branch and the managerial role of the Executive branch.

Moreover, when the judiciary pays for a lawyer to represent one of the two sides in our dispute, I believe our role as a neutral arbitrator is severely compromised.

With that said, as I understand, the Task Force has asked for us to think outside the box and to come up with ideas to ensure that we meet the legal needs of the poor in matters concerning the necessities of life. The Legislative branch and Executive branch can and should do more. Recognizing that many matters can be kept out of court if civil legal assistance is provided before a legal problem escalates in a court case, among the various options available to the Legislature and the Executive branch are: Establishing Know Your Rights community legal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

education programs; establishing programs and other means to provide preventative legal assistance; mandating some form of pre-action ADR; authorizing fee shifting in various actions; and providing a reliable, dedicated source of funding, independent of the judiciary, targeting legal assistance for matters concerning the necessities of life.

I believe the judiciary also can and should do more to ensure access to justice in civil cases, and among the options that I can come up with are: Simplifying forms and procedures and rules in the Family Court, landlord-tenant and foreclosure cases; dedicating staff to assist pro se litigants in understanding and completing those forms and procedures; waiving or reducing attorney registration fees for attorneys who devote, for example, 60 or more hours bi-annually to pro bono service in areas involving the necessities of life; mandating that all practicing attorneys provide a fixed number of pro bono hours of service in areas involving the necessities of life; working with lo -- with local bar associations and law schools -- we have Syracuse Law School here and that does a lot with clinic work, and I heard the dean speak with all the wonderful work that the Buffalo Law School is also doing -- but working with those bar associations in the law schools and Legal Aid organizations to train pro

bono lawyers; expanding the program that allows retired lawyers to practice law; and allowing judges and their law clerks to engage in pro bono work outside of the court.

In these hard economic times, we have unemployed and underemployed lawyers who would, with adequate training, address and meet the needs of the litigants in areas involving the necessities of life. While the burden of addressing these needs should not fall solely on the soldiers — shoulders of the legal profession, a profession that consistently has stepped up to and beyond the plate, I have focused my comments today here on what I know best, the strength, integrity and compassion of the many men and women who serve as lawyers and justices in our great state.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Judge. Appreciate

it.

And the cleanup hitter here, or the last witness for the day, is going to be Judge Ogden who is a City Court judge, an acting judge of the County and Family Court. And I note, because, Judge Ogden, that you have such importance in this system, that Judge Pigott has made — our colleague on the Court of Appeals, has made sure that he's here to hear your testimony because he told me earlier today that he expected great things from your

testimony. We don't want to put pressure on you,

Judge Pigott, we just, you know, think a lot of

Judge Ogden.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, Judge Ogden, with Judge Pigott listening and the rest of the audience, and the only one keeping them between lunch is you, so with that, with that intro, you're on.

JUDGE E. JEANNETTE OGDEN: Let me first say thank you for allowing me to participate in this process, because it is very important to me and very near and dear to my heart. Because I sit on the City Court, which is a high volume court that handles both criminal and civil matters, and in the City Court the civil matters that we handle often involve the landlord-tenant proceedings which you may have observed and we certainly are blessed to have the Lawyer of the Morning Program, but I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that sometimes the landlords are senior citizens, living on a fixed income, they are not eligible for the assistance of the Lawyer of the Morning, and they really need the rents that they are receiving, and sometimes the tenants may have created these situations that result in Housing Court problems and things of that nature, and for those individuals, there is no legal representation.

And the purpose of the judge is to ensure

justice and fairness to everyone that comes into the courtroom. So when one party does not have access to an attorney, they don't have access to justice, not really.

JUDGE PFAU: And what does that do to your role as a judge when you have so many cases coming in front of you, your time is limited, and then you see just what you're talking about happening in front of you.

JUDGE OGDEN: That compromises my position as a judge because I am required to be a neutral arbiter of the law, and it's very, very difficult, and I have to be very mindful of the ethical ramifications that can result if I lean one way or the other. And certainly I can make suggestions, I can make recommendations, but at the end of the law, my job can be compromised and the whole concept of justice can be compromised as well.

JUDGE PFAU: And also the perception of what you're doing, even if not the reality, right?

JUDGE OGDEN: That's correct, it creates a perception, an appearance of impropriety. That's just in the landlord-tenant area.

Then we also have the same dilemma when we're dealing with debtor-creditor situations because so many people are unable to pay their credit card bills, and that doesn't even address the rent-to-own people who are regulars in the City Court as well as people who are

already paying twice as much for items that they are renting and they cannot afford attorneys either, same problem arises.

small claims matters where most of the litigants are also unrepresented, or one party may be unrepresented.

Fortunately, here in Buffalo in Erie County, the bar, if a lawyers is present for another matter, they can count on the judge calling on them to see if they will be willing to lend some pro bono assistance in the courtroom, and often if it's a minor matter, they will, they certainly — and we wouldn't ask them to take on more serious matters.

Then in the City Court we have the issue of the

That's just a part of the City Court problem when you don't have free and equal civil legal services.

Also, City Court judges issue civil contempt orders when persons are not in compliance with information subpoenas relating to the debtor-creditor actions, and as a result, we actually take away the liberty of someone. So it is very, very important, in addition to depriving them of their, perhaps, a place to live.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge, would you agree that we're talking about the Supreme Court versus some of the other courts and the type of litigation, but you see, when you sit in City Court, you really see every day this issue upfront and center, right?

OFFICIAL SUPREME COURT REPORTER

1 JUDGE OGDEN: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Of lack of representation and in so many different kinds of cases --

JUDGE OGDEN: That is correct.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- that are critical --

JUDGE OGDEN: Yes.

 $\label{eq:JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- to the individual person and $$ society.$ 

JUDGE OGDEN: Yes, I do. I agree wholeheartedly. And so I would echo what everyone else said because we certainly see that.

Now in the Family Court context, being mindful of the time, in the Family Court context, I was assigned, to a large extent, to handle custody and visitation disputes. In our Erie County area there are many grandparents who are coming in to court petitioning the court to seek custody or visitation of their grandchildren. There is a distinction in the eligibility requirements for an individual seeking visitation and seeking custody. So a grandparent who is seeking custody can avail themselves of the free civil legal services that are offered by our Grandparent Advocacy Program as well as an Assigned Counsel Program; however, if that same person is asking for guardianship, or visitation, they are ineligible for the same services. Many times the need to

come in and petition for custody arises as a result of an inability of a parent to care for that child, maybe because the parent is on drugs or has gotten into some kind of trouble, it's often a temporary arrangement.

Often the grandparent is low income or lives in subsidized housing and they can't take custody of the child because to do so would jeopardize other social benefits that they may be receiving. So in that slight instance, that is an injustice that I see often. Because of the request, the nature of the request, and sometimes maybe someone may suggest to them that you should go seek custody, but it's not like a parent's shoes. When you seek custody of someone, there are a lot of other ramifications to the child, to the system as a whole.

In the end, if we had those civil legal services available to low and moderate income people, the system may not have to pay to support that same child in other arenas that would cost twice as much and I think some consideration should be given to that, and that's just in one area, as I think it would be a cost-saving measure in many other areas.

And if you take the instances that you observed in the Supreme Court and you triple them in the city urban centers, that's what you will see in the City and the Family Court. So it creates, overall, an adverse impact

to the court because it compromises our ability to do our job and be a fair and detached and neutral arbiter.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You can't be the judge and the lawyer for somebody at the same time.

JUDGE OGDEN: That's correct. You affect the perception of justice because people on the outside come in and they want to see the judge being in the middle, they don't want to see the judge leaning, because if you're leaning in this instance, how will they know that you won't lean in every other instance? The judge can never be the lawyer, that's why there is a difference.

And I think that it is so important that people realize that every individual that steps into a court in New York State has an individual fundamental right to fairness, and you achieve that when you allow equal access to an attorney, because that's the first step in equal access to justice.

Thank you very much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you, Judge Ogden. I think that eloquently, you know, sums up what this is all about.

And I thank our judicial panel, and really, we've had a very interesting day. I think the clients that we had to start out really graphically, you know, demonstrated that we're talking about issues affecting the

# JUDGE LIPPMAN

necessities of life, and each of those clients', really, lives were salvaged by having the civil legal services representation; I thought that the testimony from the collaborations here in the western part of the state, in Monroe and Erie and coming soon in Onondaga, sharing services, sharing costs is certainly a wave of the future in terms of how providers are going to meet the challenges of the day; I think the dean was quite eloquent in terms of what he called teaching students to have soul and to understand that they have an obligation to equal justice; and I think each of you on the judges' panel certainly demonstrated that — that commitment.

I think the bottom line, and this is the fourth of our series of legal civil service hearings this year, certainly what's clear is that funding civil legal services is a good investment. As we indicated, for every dollar that is spent, the public spends on civil legal services, at least five dollars are returned to the state in reduced Social Services, homelessness, incarceration, and additional federal funds that comes to the state. So on so many levels it's a good investment from the bottom line perspective, and obviously as we've talked about so much today, each and every society, and certainly every civilized society, certainly is judged in very significant degree to how it treats its most vulnerable citizens, and

# JUDGE LIPPMAN

for us in the judiciary and the legal profession, obviously we feel a particular commitment and obligation to meet our mission of -- and our responsibility to foster equal justice is really what we're all about, it's our very reason for being.

So I'm very happy to be here in Albany with this last hearing of this --

JUDGE FEROLETO: Buffalo.

THE COURT: -- series of hearings, we will be -the Task Force and Helaine Barnett, and some of your
members are here today, will be completing their report in
the coming month or so, a little bit longer, and then we
go forward again with I think what is a -- certainly a
noble endeavor of the judiciary and the bar to -- in
this -- in pursuit of justice, in pursuit of equal
justice.

I want to thank Judge Feroleto for her hospitality in having us here in this beautiful setting, and being here, ordered a perfect day of weather, I know that Judge Pigott had something to do with that, Paula, to have the beautiful weather today. And we thank you all and very much appreciate you coming. Thank you so much.

(Proceedings concluded at 1:55 P.M.)

\* \* \*

# REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic minutes taken in the matter of The Chief Judge's Hearing on Civil Legal Services. BARBARA F. CULTRARA, CSR, CMR, CRR, Official Supreme Court Reporter. October 7, 2011 Buffalo, New York