# In The Matter Of:

FIRST DEPARTMENT HEARING - September 29, 2015 v.

Mayor De Blasio, et.al. September 29, 2015

Supreme Court State of New York - Civil Term
60 Centre Street, Room 420
New York, New York 10007
(646) 386-3012
Harristshams@aol.com

Original File 092915 OCA Hearing.txt

Min-U-Script®

UPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

- FIRST DEPARTMENT -

-----X

HE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS

N CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES,

----X

7 Madison Avenue New York, New York September 29, 2015

E F O R E:

HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, Chief Judge

HONORABLE LAWRENCE MARKS, Chief Administrative Judge

HONORABLE LUIS A. GONZALEZ, Presiding Judge

DAVID MIRANDA, ESQ.,

President of the State Bar Association

RACHEL C. SIMONE, CSR, RMR, CRR SHAMEEKA HARRIS, CSR, RPR, CLR Senior Court Reporters

2	I T N E	SS LIST:
3		HONORABLE BILL DE BLASIO, Mayor of the City of New York
4	JOHN	JOHN R. SILKENAT, ESQ.,
5		Past President, American Bar Association; Partner, Sullivan & Worcester LLP
7		JOHN SEXTON, ESQ,  President, New York University; Dean  Emeritus, New York University School of Law
8		Emeritus, New York University School of Law MARTIN LIPTON, ESQ.,
9	9 Executive	Executive Committee Member and Former Co-Chair, Partnership for New York City;
Founding Partner, Wachtell, Lipton, Ros & Katz	Founding Partner, Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen	
11		ERIC WEINGARTNER,
12		Managing Director, Robin Hood Foundation
13 14		NEIL STEINKAMP, Managing Director, Dispute Advisory & Forensic Services, Stout Risius Ross, Inc.
15		DEBRA L. RASKIN, ESQ., President, New York City Bar Association;
16		
17 18		SARA E. MOSS, ESQ.,  Executive Vice President & General Counsel,  the Estee Lauder Companies
19	LIEN	T PANEL:
20		FATIM KAMARA, Client of The Door, a Center for
Alternatives, accompanied by Rebecca Wil Heller, Esq.	Alternatives, accompanied by Rebecca Wilson Heller, Esq.	
22		STACY SNOWDEN, Client of The Legal Aid Society,
Harlem Community Law Office, accompani Evan Hasbrook, Esq.		
24		CASSANDRA WILSON, Client of Legal Services NYC, accompanied by
25	Tanya Douglas, Esq.	
26		
		Rachel C. Simone, CSR, RMR, CRR

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning and welcome to the first Legal Services Hearing of this year.

As you know, hearings are held in each of the four judicial departments. This is the first hearing in this beautiful courtroom at 25th Street and Madison Avenue, a place that I have been before and remember sitting in this seat. It is, obviously, a beautiful setting for a very serious topic.

I want to introduce Presiding Justice Gonzalez from the First Department sitting to my right, State Bar President David Miranda to the far right, and Chief Administrative Judge Lawrence Marks.

I want to say, first of all, that this hearing is central to our efforts in New York to close the justice gap between the finite legal resources that are available and the desperate need for legal services by the poor and people of modest means. There is clearly a crisis in access to justice in this city, this state, and this country. People literally threaten to fall off the cliff in difficult economic times when they are battling for the necessities of life, for the roof over their heads, for their physical safety, for the well-being of the families, for their livelihoods and they cannot afford the cost of legal representation.

We recognize in judiciary that equal justice is

central to our constitutional mission, very much at the heart of it. That's why over these years the Judiciary has put money directly in its budget to support legal services for the poor.

We are very proud of the fact that this year we have \$85 million that we give out directly to legal service providers, by far the most in the country and yet the tip of the iceberg in terms of the needy.

We are very grateful to the Commission, the

Permanent Commission on Access to Justice headed by chair

Helaine Barnett who is here today.

Helaine, where are you? Thank you.

Helaine does a terrific job, the former president of the Legal Services Corporation. Many members are here today including Bob Sheehan from Skadden Arps and so many others, so many other members of the Commission.

We thank them for their work and for hosting these hearings, for doing a record of the hearings, and then a report in which we determine what monies we need to close the justice gap and what other efforts and new initiatives we will take in the legal services area.

As you know, the reports over the years have shown that legal service entities turn away more people than they can accept. We also know from the Commission's Reports that for every dollar invested in legal services

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

for the poor, six dollars are returned to the state, to the economy in reduced social services costs, more federal dollars flowing to New York.

We recognize that money is not in itself the answer, although it certainly made a difference. And pro bono work on the part of the bar is so important. why we have our Attorney Emeritus Program to attract attorneys, baby boomers ending careers to do pro bono work. That's why we allow corporate counsel to practice in the New York courts even when they are not admitted here when they are doing pro bono work. That's why we have a 50-hour rule in which no one is admitted to the bar in the State of New York unless they have done 50 hours of pro bono work with the understanding that if the new lawyers, if our aspiring lawyers do not embrace the core values of our profession, then they will not be lawyers in the State of New York; the idea being that the one thing that distinguishes this noble profession is service to others, helping others. That's what lawyers do, and that's what we expect of lawyers in our state.

We are delighted to be here at this hearing. We are attempting to change the landscape for legal services here in New York and around the country to get people to understand that legal services for the poor are as important as everything else we hold dear in our society,

whether it be housing, hospitals or schools. We don't say that we can't teach our children this year because, Gee, the economy is bad we can't have schools. We don't say that we can't tend to our sick because, Gee, we don't have money this year.

We have to make priorities in our society, in our government, in all of our branches of government. And certain legal services for the poor is, again, equally important to every other thing that we fund, that we nurture, that we feel is so vital to the well-being of our society.

So we have made great progress, but we have a long way to go. These hearings are, again, critical in moving us forward in terms of a civil Gideon, the idea that everyone who is battling for the essentials of life is entitled to a lawyer if they cannot afford one.

You know, on the criminal side of the ledger there is the seminal case of Gideon versus Wainwright that says when your liberty is at stake you are entitled to a lawyer. That case 50 years ago has not been replicated in civil matters where the issues involve the necessities of life. Again, what could be more important than a roof over someone's head? Their safety? Their well-being? Don't they need a lawyer too? That's the point, and that's what we are moving towards. These hearings have about so

helpful, and I am so delighted that in New York State and in New York City we get it and understand it and are doing everything within our power with our partners in government -- the Judiciary, the legal profession -- to get us to that day when everyone has a lawyer who needs one.

So, with that introduction, who could be a more spectacular lead-in than the Mayor of the City of New York, Bill de Blasio, who uniquely understands that everyone regardless of their station in life or the size of their pocketbook is entitled to justice and the essentials that every human being should have. He has been a leader in New York City and in this country in the battle to help the most vulnerable in society, the disadvantaged, those who most need our assistance, and to treat them with dignity and respect.

I would mention in particular, and I am so glad to see our friend Steve Banks sitting next to the Mayor, how just terrific could he have been in -- and I know he will be talking about it today -- putting monies, consolidating monies for legal services in HRA under Commissioner Banks' leadership that deal with this particularly difficult issue of housing. Evictions can be such a traumatic event for a family, for a human being, but consequences are so grave. And this Mayor, again, has been just so commendable and so wonderful in understanding this

2 problem and dealing with it.

I will not embarrass him any more. I will ask him to please provide his testimony. Again, we are so honored you are here with us today.

MAYOR DE BLASIO: Thank you, Chief Judge. And good morning to everyone. I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you.

I must say, Chief Judge, I don't think I ever had the honor of being in this particular chamber before. This is a New York City jewel and it is quite striking. So thank you for exposing me to the beauty of our city.

To chief administrative Judge Marks, to First Presiding Judge Gonzalez, and to State Bar President Miranda, thank you to all of you.

Thank you for a chance to speak with you today about the role that civil legal services play in providing access to justice and to update you on New York City's commitment to expanding those services.

I also would like to acknowledge and thank

Helaine Barnett, Chair of the Permanent Commission on

Access to Justice and all of the Commission members who are
in attendance today and have done certain work.

From my team, as you know, Human Resources

Administration Commissioner Steven Banks is here and knows

a thing or two about the subject matter.

I want to thank as well here in attendance my counsel, Maya Wiley, Special Counsel Henry Berger, and the Chair of the Mayor's Advisory Commission on the Judiciary, Carmen Ciparick. I thank them all for the great work they do for the people of New York City.

Chief Judge, we greatly appreciate your ongoing leadership and dedication giving all New Yorkers fair and equal access to our civil justice system. The Task Force to Expand Access to Civil Legal Services that you established in 2010 and your annual allocation of civil services funding in the Judiciary's budget have supported thousands of New York State residents each year who otherwise navigate the State's legal system without representation, including thousands in civil cases here in New York City.

It's difficult to overstate the importance of civil legal services. By providing representation to New Yorkers who would otherwise appear alone in court when other parties like landlords are represented, we give New Yorkers fair and equal access to our civil justice system, and in the process we fight poverty and in-equality which are core goals of this Administration. These services help low-income New Yorkers keep a roof over their heads, helps keep families together, helps keep food in the cupboard, things as essential as that. Legal services help children

stay in school and continue in education that otherwise could be disrupted by a loss of a home and a need to move out of their own community. In short, we are helping those who need it most gain and maintain the basic building blocks of a life lived with dignity and security.

Investing in access to justice is also smart economics. Proof of this can be found in New York Task Force's finding that for every dollar invested providing civil legal services, taxpayers see a return of more than six dollars in federal benefits such as federal disability benefits. These benefits not only improve the living standards of the people who receive them, but lift up local communities as well and put more resources into neighborhood economies.

Further, the City sees tremendous savings in averted shelter costs by investing legal services to help prevent evictions, homelessness and domestic violence. Providing legal services also reduces the cost of litigation and increases court efficiency which benefits all litigants regardless of income level.

Our commitment to expand civil legal services to more New Yorkers and making those more effective can be seen in the action and investments of my Administration over the past 21 months.

One year ago, HRA Commissioner Steve Banks

testified before you regarding my Administration's consolidation of multiple civil legal assistance programs previously spread out across several agencies into a single streamlined operation at HRA. Bringing all services together in this way has enabled the City to utilize existing HRA mechanisms to claim available state and federal reimbursement for legal services, avoid duplication of effort, maximize resources, better address service gaps, evaluate emerging legal needs, and be responsive as possible when emergencies arise.

My first budget as Mayor of the City of New York for July 2014 through June 2015 allocated an unprecedented level of funding for low-income New Yorkers. That year we spent a total of \$18.5 million to protect tenants facing eviction and harassment by unscrupulous landlords, which is a major cause of homelessness.

I will take a moment to note at this juncture to say, and I say this always, the vast majority of landlords do follow the law and do their work appropriately. They treat tenants with respect. But there is also, unfortunately, unscrupulous landlords who have a disproportionate negative effect on their tenants. That's why these legal services is so crucial.

In fiscal year 2015, we vastly expanded the anti-eviction tenant protection program. We made a

\$5 million down payment on the creation of our new anti-harassment program for areas that would be rezoned by the City of New York. We focused resources in particular on those areas that would be rezoned. That initiative by fiscal year 2017 will grow to \$36 million a year, specifically focused on areas where there will be land use actions by the City. This program is focused on ensuring that almost 14,000 of our City's low-income residents can stay in the neighborhoods that they built as those areas grow denser and seek considerable investment for the coming years.

In my second budget -- the current year's adopted budget, fiscal year now -- I again increased our commitment to fund tenant protection for legal services for low-income New Yorkers, helping to prevent homelessness and disruption in the lives of thousands. This year's budget already includes over \$33 million to help New Yorkers before they are forced to turn to shelter. That is the ramp-up of our efforts to focus on rezoning areas and additional efforts citywide that come with those threatened with eviction. That was the number that we had put in the budget.

Yesterday I announced that we are deepening this commitment, we're going further. We're allocating an additional \$12.3 million to the anti-eviction legal services program to be divided among providers already hard

at work so we can reach more New Yorkers as quickly as possible. This brings the total investment in tenant protection legal services in this year's budget, my second budget, to nearly \$46 million.

Next year in my third budget, fiscal 2017, that number will grow to more than \$60 million annually when you combine all these efforts. \$60 million-dollar annually.

By way of comparison, that is literally more than ten times the \$6 million that was spent as recently as fiscal year 2013.

It is by far the largest initiative of its kind in the nation, enough to give more than 113,000 New Yorkers each year legal services to protect against harassment and unnecessary eviction which also has the benefit of protecting our affordable housing stock, which is a crucial point.

Every time we help somebody legally stay in their rent-stabilized, rent-regulated apartment, it also preserves that apartment as part of our affordable housing supply. It is good for the individual and good for the family, but it has a bigger impact on the availability of overall affordable housing in this City.

It is important to note that these commitments to provide access to justice for low-income tenants are complemented by other major initiatives to prevent

homelessness. Among them is HRA's new Homelessness

Prevention Administration, which includes an Early

Intervention Outreach Team that seeks out families and individuals on the verge of losing their home and who could be helped by legal assistance or emergency rental assistance.

Tenant protection is the cornerstone of our initiatively to provide access to justice for low-income New Yorkers, but we are also working on a number of other fronts by investing, for example, \$4.3 million for Executive Action legal assistance programs for immigrants operated by HRA in conjunction with the Mayor's Office and of Immigrant Affairs and CUNY. We are vesting \$3.2 million in comprehensive legal immigration assistance. That will begin to be implement through a new RFP process during this fiscal year. We are investing \$2.1 million for civil legal services for seniors, and \$2.6 million for legal services to secure federal disability benefits for those who are eligible.

When all of these programs are fully implemented in fiscal 1917, New York city will be allocating a grand total of \$74 million annually in our baseline budget to provide access to justice for low-income New Yorkers. No other municipality allocates even a small fraction of what New York City is committing to provide for access to

justice. But given the widespread need, we certainly welcome and support increased Judiciary resources to complement and further leverage our expanding services. This is one of the best investments we can make because it can so clearly change lives for the better and will all be seen across the City.

For example, Legal Services in New York City and Legal Aid have already received \$5 million through our anti-harassment program, and working together have supported more than 1,100 households in all five boroughs, a number that will dramatically increase in the coming months when the program is fully implemented.

In the Bronx, legal providers went to court on behalf of 121 tenants at 111 Gerard Avenue. The landlord there raised the rents in violation of the Rent Stabilization law while also providing leases and letters to tenants stating that the apartments were no longer subject to rent stabilization. After Legal Services and Legal Aid represented the tenants, the landlord admitted to overcharges, and a settlement is underway which will return tenants to their legal rent and restore their rights.

In Brooklyn, Legal Aid is representing residents of 702 Rockaway Avenue where the management company divided 18 residential units into 55 units while also pressuring tenants to sign a waiver of their rights under the Rent

Stabilization law and neglecting the building until it reached nearly unliveable conditions. When the management company stopped paying the landlord, the landlord then attempted to evict all of the tenants. Legal Aid worked is working to stop these evictions, enforce the tenants' rights under Rent Stabilization, and return the building to an acceptable state of repair for approximately 40 people, including ten children who live there.

I also want to express my appreciation and acknowledge the deep commitment of City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito and the entire City Counsel. They are truly committed to expanding access to justice.

In fiscal year 2016, the current fiscal year, HRA is overseeing an additional \$19.1 million in discretionary funding added by the City Council during the budget process for a diverse slate of civil legal services, including family reunification immigration defense, assistance for domestic violence survivors and for veterans, and anti-eviction and SRO legal services among those.

I also recently signed a legislation passed by City Council establishing the Office of Civil Justice at HRA to further advance our efforts to provide access to justice civil legal matters. Through this office annual reports on the need for civil legal assistance will be issued allowing us to evaluate quantity and quality of the

services that are currently available and the volume of need we must still meet.

We recognize that the challenges low-income and vulnerable New Yorkers are facing are complex and deep-rooted. But we know, too, that we have powerful tools at hand to address those challenges and lift up our neighbors who need it most. Every family or individual who can keep their home with the help of legal assistance is spared the trauma of homelessness including the disruption of education, employment, and medical care. The City is spared the expense of emergency shelter services, and together we become a stronger and more just city.

Finally, on a personal note, as your retirement approaches at the end of this year, I want to say what I think a lot of people feel in this city and state. I want to express my tremendous appreciation to you, Chief Judge. You have provided a powerful version of the leadership we need to keep addressing the needs of all New Yorkers. You have been a great voice of conscience. Your commitment to access to justice has been extraordinary as has been your ability to turn that commitment into action. Thousands of our City's low-income families and individuals have you to thank for helping them stay in their home, for helping them to receive unemployment and disability benefits assistance, for helping them escape from domestic violence. On their

behalf, I offer my deepest thanks for all that you have done.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I am touched and honored by the remarks. I truly appreciate them and feel good about our efforts. We have a long way to go. I have a little more trouble to make until the end of the year.

MAYOR DE BLASIO: We're counting on that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me say, first of all, the array of funding initiatives that you mentioned in your remarks are staggering, as is that \$74 million that in short order will be put into place to commit access to justice.

I want to say that this issue was one that -- and I think your testimony shows it. We have had testimony over the years from the Attorney General, the Controller, Cardinal Dolan, the heads of our biggest banks, the heads of our largest business associations, the landlords, the hospitals, from every conceivable part of our society. And the City Council president last year was here testifying.

I want to say that the universal support across all lines that we have had has been so wonderful, and I think your testimony today for the great City of New York and all that is involved in running this city and to come here and to spend your time talking about the things that

you did today and to back it up with action is so important and so critical. So let me now ask you a couple of questions.

First of all, you have done wonderful things. We think and hope and believe that the state court system has done good things with our partners in government at the state level. As you mention, the City Counsel is doing, you know, lots of good things in relation to access. How do we coordinate these efforts? This is such a heavy lift. You know that there is so much that needs to be done. As I said in my opening remarks, with all the things that everyone has done, more people are turned away by legal service providers than they can accept. How do we make sure that we are not going in all kinds of different directions and that what we are doing is coordinated on the same page, on the same track?

MAYOR DE BLASIO: I will turn to Commissioner

Banks in a moment, but I will simply say that part of why

we consolidated so much of this work under one agency was

we recognize that given that there are no perfect

resources, it was really important to get them to where the

need was greatest. And I think this is work we have to

keep doing on many fronts. There are still a lot of

things, a lot of areas where we can be more streamlined,

more effective, more targeted.

Part of why we made a particular commitment, for example, to fight harassment and eviction is because we saw evidence that that would be an area of sensitivity. We want to get ahead of it. I think that's a particularly efficient use of funding to get to a problem before it begins. So we are striving to make resources go as far as possible to get to where the need is greatest.

I will now let the Commissioner talk about some of our efforts to really make sure that the efforts are coordinated.

(Continued on next page)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Pleasure to see you, Commissioner
Banks.

COMMISSIONER BANKS: Pleasure to see you too. I think to pick up on the Mayor's point, the program that we are clearly focused on are very targeted to, for example, community funding. I think the commitment the City has made, the commitment the Judicial System has made, these are opportunities for us to work on and to coordinate in some fashion to ensure that.

JUDGE LIPMANN: You view the Commissioner as one pot, that we have to make sure that it goes to the right place where it's needed. Can we get to that point where we are so in this together that we all understand.

COMMISSIONER BANKS: We would love to do that.

JUDGE LIPMANN: It goes to the need.

COMMISSIONER BANKS: We would love to do that. We had made such a tremendous commitment and we're making a commitment as well.

MR. LIPPMAN: For an example, the coordination the Commissioner notes so well is the poverty justice solutions where we are taking young lawyers who are given the last turn of their tenure in law school to all do pro bono work and then through the nation and the City of New York we enable them to continue on to legal service providers as they start their legal careers. That's a perfect example of

how we work together, and I hope that all of the other players in this can sort of parlay it into something that's going to, obviously, serve those needs.

COMMISSIONER BANKS: Certainly, the condition of poverty justice, the lawyers to add this muscle assistance to the legal services, and the resources for the Mayor to put it into the budget.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Mr. Mayor, we talk about this big area, this access to justice, the legal services putting money in, how is it actually getting in by vesting money in this particular area? Do we actually effect the fabric of our communities here in New York City?

MAYOR DE BLASIO: Absolutely. I had put it through a very human lens here. Just think about a family that is in an affordable apartment, is connected to everything that their neighborhood has to offer, many, many cases, of course, families and friends in the same neighborhood, schools that the child goes to where they have continuity and where they are known and braced. All of that, we all strive for that. We all want that for our families. We want that security and think about what it means for a family to have that suddenly ripped away. It is horrible in any circumstance. It is particularly horrible if it was done illegally. What it means, before you even think about the economic costs, you have to think about the human costs.

You have to think about a child who has to go to a different school. You have to think about a family that's torn away from their loved ones and all of the services that they know, health care services that they know, and then you have to deal with challenges of being in a shelter setting.

This is not, what I think, the greatest city in the world. We should not be comfortable with any of our citizens who could be preserved in the home they're in having it slipped away from them because of our scrupulous actions and illegal actions. We have to fight back. The human cost is obvious. We want, for a lot of folks who are in a situation where they may be threatened with eviction, they have a number of challenges already in many cases. We are trying to address those by improving our schools, by increasing the amount of good jobs, quality jobs, available in our city and a number of other problems.

That mission of increasing the quality and opportunities that we all face, think about it. Every family that slips out of a decent affordable housing and into a shelter we are taking a step away from that and getting them on the correct path. The notion that someone has profited illegally in the process makes it so much more troubling. That's the human reality. I also always speak up for the taxpayers to say this is -- all that we put into legal services, legal aid services is a tremendous

investment on behalf of the taxpayers because some of the statistics we cited earlier it makes the entire judicial system work better for everyone. It leads to better outcomes. It ultimately -- every time someone is kept in their home, it costs the taxpayers a lot less and for much better and more humane outcomes so there is so much to recommend this investment. It's a huge multiplier of fact and we're very proud that we are making a precedent level of investment and we expect it to improve the quality of life in the City.

guestions. I know you have a busy day ahead. You talked before about the investment of the City and it's been terrific. You know what we are seeing today is federal money is drying up for access to justice. From the floor, the Legal Services Corporation, Glenn Barnett, the president of The Door, that's gone from \$375 million to \$300 million for the entire country to support legal services for the poor and it seems to me -- and I know you have the same attitude -- that it places so much of a greater burden on the state and the cities around the country to fund legal services. Can we do it at this level? Should we write off the federal government because it's so much gridlock in Washington that you read about in the papers every day.

MAYOR DE BLASIO: I appreciate it. That is an essential question. Where is this going? Chief Justice, I would say this, no, we cannot afford to write off the federal government's role. I think there is a difference in being clear about the barriers that exist now and likely will exist for at least several more years versus being willing to say that such an injustice can stand.

I think the obligation of all of us, whether it's those of us at the local government or those of you at the judiciary and certainly leaders of the legal profession in general, it is to sound the alarm in Washington and to make clear that we can't have a just country if we don't have federal support for access to representations. There is no way that localities can handle all of the needs on their own. It's just a factual statement.

Unfortunately, it parallels a lot of other reality we face. Not so long ago and certainly in the course of both my career and your career it was a common place for the federal government to be deeply involved and expansively involved in affordable housing, in mass transit and funding human education initiatives, research. There is a whole host of areas where there has been a retreat from deep federal role and that is holding back our country. So I would argue it is, in effect, critical to turn that dynamic. I don't think it will happen overnight. I think, as with

most social change, voices will gather, starting at the local level, and grow and grow and grow and that is how change is made.

So we will and, you know, to borrow from the biblical phrase, we will light a single candle rather than curse the darkness. We will do all we can do. We won't stop there and say Washington is not part of the equation. We will work with you and others to keep insisting that Washington re-engage this crucial area.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree with you entirely. I think the action is in the states and the cities today but that can't be the exclusion, the role in the federal government, and again the legal services corporation is a perfect example of something that so obviously requires a large amount of funding and yet it is going in the wrong direction rather than expanding the funds that are being cut.

One last quick question. This is in terms of -- I know you are an optimist by nature. Do you think we are going to get to the point where every person who's in need of legal representation can have it in this country just as we take it for granted. If you asked a person on the street if your liberty is at stake, do you think someone should have an attorney, they know from watching TV, from Miranda warnings, and all of this that your liberty is at stake. You are entitled to an attorney. As we have discussed so

many times at these hearings, the affect of not having an attorney in a civil case can be equally serious to the loss of liberty itself, your home, your family, your job. Do you think we can get to that point where in the foreseeable future where everyone gets an attorney if they needed one?

MAYOR DE BLASIO: Well, again, I think you're

MAYOR DE BLASIO: Well, again, I think you're asking where is this country going.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

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

26

MAYOR DE BLASIO: My personal analysis, I am an optimist by nature. I do think a lot of change is on the horizon. I don't think it will be the fastest change we've I do think a lot of change is on the horizon. ever seen. watch with greater appreciation here in the year 2015 as our national debate evolves rapidly. It was a much more honest discussion going on about the economic ramification the people face. I asked the underpaid of the change you're talking about. I think as our country comes to grip, comes to grip with how many people are struggling economically, how many people who cannot afford representation and what the ramifications are of that, I think the door will open to federal investments in appropriate representation. should put, in my opinion, a date certain on when that will happen but the trend is, in my view, a very positive one. Something is changing in our national discussion that opens the door for a very different conception of what the federal

government role should be. It's hard to see it in the first instance and certainly the events over the last few days in Washington could easily provide problems for the economy of world views.

My view is that everything is ultimately moved by the public discourse and the dues of the people and I think the people are looking for a more just society and looking for more economic fairness and that will eventually say where a person's representation is more likely welcomed.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I think the point you make is such a strong one. The public discourse, the public dialogue does lead to the changes in society and it can lead to changes in the law as you know. We evolve, the legal system evolves, but I just want to say it has been an honor and a privilege to have you here. You graced us by your presence and thank you so much. It's been an absolute delight to have you in this justice system.

MAYOR DE BLASIO: Thank you, Chief Justice.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you,
Commissioner Banks. I now have Martin Lipton from the firm
of Wachtell and Lipton, the former co-chair of the
Partnership of New York City, one of the outstanding lawyers
in our city, in our state and in our country. I am
delighted to have you here.

Mr. Lipton, we welcome your testimony. And, again,

Proceedings

given your distinguished background in such a lifetime

commitment in your profession, it is an honor to have you

here.

MR. LIPTON: Thank you, Chief Judge. It is an honor to be here. At the very outset, I would like to associate myself with the comments made by Mayor De Blasio with respect to your service as chief judge in the state of New York, it has really been outstanding and I think the reason -- one of the reasons why we're here today is all of the things you have done in order to improve the access to justice for all.

JUDGE LIPMANN: Thank you so much.

MR. LIPTON: Let me say good morning to the members of the Permanent Commission on Access to Justice. I appreciate this opportunity to provide testimony today on the important topic of ensuring that all New Yorkers have access to justice.

As a long time member and former Chair of the Partnership for New York City, I am a firm believer in the importance of ensuring that our city provides fairness and opportunities to all of our residents, no matter what their income.

Civil legal services for those who cannot afford them are critical to help low-income New Yorkers secure the essentials of life, shelter, safety, income security, and

access to education and health care, that those of us with means can take for granted and to provide fairness and opportunity to those who cannot afford it.

To create the city that we all want to live in, we need to be helpful to those who are less fortunate. Free civil legal services, and pro bono legal services to low income New Yorkers, are critical not only in their lives but also in the health and vitality of the city itself.

The Chief Judge commenced last year's hearings by emphasizing that access to legal services for the poor is an issue that has such great consequences for our society, for our communities, and it is at a tremendous cost that we fail to provide legal representation for all, equal representation, equal justice for all. The Chief Judge is absolutely correct to emphasize that access to legal services for the poor is something that affects not only the poor, but the community at large, and that we all share the cost of a judicial system that fails short of this core mission.

The economic vitalities of our state depends on the strength of our court system. If businesses do not believe that New York is a jurisdiction where disputes are resolved efficiently, economically, and, above all, fairly, then they will try to avoid New York. One cannot overstate the importance of a first-class court system to the state's

economy. The strength of our court system, in turn, depends on all of the members of society having access to the courts, and with real representation. Businesses and individuals, rich and poor, are looking for the same thing, a court system that treats all sides fairly. If the poorest members of society do not believe that they can receive justice from the courts, or if the courts are perceived to close their doors to large portions of the community, then the court system will lose the respect of all members of the community. The court system that does not provide access to everyone is a frail system that has failed in its fundamental duties, and businesses will take note of it.

Access for all is not just a matter of providing fairness. The court system is overburdened. Dockets have ballooned and cases have grown more complex, but judicial resources have not kept up with these demands. The increased work force -- the increased workload delays the resolution of all cases. Our judiciary must be properly funded to handle the cases that comes before it. One important tool that can help to increase courtroom efficiency is providing access to counsel. Pro se litigants lack the legal knowledge, and as a result the courts have to spend time helping them to navigate the system. Judges and the court staff are, of course, sensitive to the fact that unrepresented litigants are at a disadvantage and they often

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

26

spend additional time assisting the litigant with courtroom basics, diverting already scare time and resources away from their crowded dockets.

It is also important that potential litigants receive such access to representation and advice early in the process, not when it is too late to make a difference. Access to counsel at an early stage of a dispute can help parties identify mutually agreeable paths to resolution.

I commend the Commission for already considering options for legal services that go beyond the traditional courtroom representation at the beginning -- at the fore of most people's mind. The pilot program for an on-line dispute resolution mechanism in consumer credit cases, for example, is an innovative approach that utilizes new technologies to help potential litigants resolve their disputes in on-line chat rooms with the help of mediators. More than 90 percent of business disputes end in settlement, but because the parties do not start exploring settlements early in the process, excessive litigation costs are incurred leading up to the point of settlement. The on-line mediation program that the Commission is exploring is just the sort of innovative, forward-thinking approach that makes the New York court systems one of the most effective in the world, and it sends a message that the New York judiciary is focused on providing services that actually work for

litigants. I also support the Commission's consideration of other innovations, such as the simplification of court forms, that will make our courts more efficient and more accessible to law.

Finally, while I firmly believe that a well-funded court system that provides equal access to all litigants is a fundamental responsibility for all, I also recognize the special role that law firms and lawyers play in ensuring equal access to justice. Our firm is a strong supporter of organizations that provide legal services to the poor and disadvantaged, and many of our lawyers take on a range of cases on a pro bono basis. It is the obligation of lawyers to play an active role in their community and to give back to their community in many different ways. We should be proud that the lawyers in New York take this obligation seriously. The work of the members of this Commission is yet another example of this important tradition.

In short, the problems that the Commission has set out to address are of great importance, and not just for those members of our community who are unable to afford counsel. Our state will retain its preeminent standing only if businesses view our justice system as one that is open and available to every member of society. By ensuring access to robust legal representation, and by identifying efficiencies in the litigation process that can help reduce

1	Proceedings
2	the costs of civil litigation, we are not only fulfilling
3	our ethical duties to those who cannot afford counsel.
4	We're also maintaining New York's continuing status as a
5	place where companies and individuals want to do business.
6	Thank you again for inviting me to testify.
7	MR. LIPPMAN: Thank you.
8	(Continued on next page)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. We greatly appreciate, Mr. Lipton, your remarks. You epitomize the legal community.

I have a question. What do you think is most important for the legal profession in the business community in terms of helping in this fight to solve the justice gap that we have? Is it funding, is it pro bono work? Is it speaking out? Is it all of the above? How can the legal and business community be most helpful in supporting access to justice in our own city and state and around the country?

MR. LIPTON: Clearly it is all three. I think funding is the single most important and it is an obligation to provide it.

I think pro bono activity can really be provided in two ways. One is by lawyers devoting time to pro bono work, and the other is by the legal profession and law firms and lawyers supporting the organizations that provide services to the poor so that we are not relying just on lawyers volunteering their services. In fact, lawyers employed by those organizations that provide services will provide service. So it is all three, obviously.

Also, I do think that the business community and the legal profession, while doing a good job, could do a better job.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We could all do a better job out there.

Are there any questions from the panel? Yes, Judge Gonzalez.

JUDGE GONZALEZ: Do you think it is realistic or doable that bar associations can get together and lobby the Legislature of the branches of government that deal with the purse strings to see if they can provide funding for this, or you don't see that as a role of the legal profession?

MR. LIPTON: Well, I think it is everybody's role.

The Legislative process has not been working as well as it should on all levels of government, and the efforts to improve judicial services, improve the courts and so on have not been received the way they should be received by the State Legislature. I do think the City government has done a better job than the State has done with respect to making sure there is access to the courts and to legal services. Clearly, the court is lacking in the kind of support it should receive both in terms of judicial manpower, in terms of assistance to the judges in the courts, and to the facilities themselves. So I would hope we continue to do those efforts.

When I was Chair of the Partnership for New York

City we made a strenuous effort to achieve justice for the justices by getting the Legislature, the Governor, to provide salaries that were consistent with the federal system and also reflected inflation taking place. Years and years went by without our being successful with great effort. So I think yes, if effort is made we will make some progress; but I really think that it is up to both the Governor and Legislature to recognize the importance of what we are talking about.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Anything else?

MR. MIRANDA: Mr. Lipton, thank you very much for your testimony here today and for your commitment to Access to Justice.

As you know, the legal profession is held to a higher standard than other professions in that we are expected to provide pro bono legal services, and, naturally, that is how it should be.

Our bar associations look for ways to help coordinate pro bono efforts so that they are most productive. The Mayor spoke before about tenant and housing matters that so much necessary attention is being provided to. After that, in New York City where do you see the need that is most underserved?

MR. LIPTON: Well, I don't know that I have a personal scope of knowledge to see where the need is most.

I think clearly the housing and healthcare and food are the needs that are most important.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: The basics.

MR. LIPTON: It is those areas that are most lacking in access to service.

I think the bar associations do a very good job, an outstanding job in encouraging lawyers, particularly young lawyers, to provide that service and organizing the effort to make sure it is done in a fairly efficient manner. It is not easy to provide services to the homeless, to people who are in need of healthcare. It is a continuing need that needs to be focused on by the bar association and by the lawyers and law firms, but it is not a need that can be just, sort of, delegated to lawyers and bar associations. It is a need of the community. The funding that Mayor de Blasio talked about is an important aspect. The funding on a national basis that the Chief Judge talked about is a critical element of it.

So yes, bar associations can do a great deal to alleviate these issues and problems, but I think it is a community issue, and the community has to rise to the occasion.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lipton. It has been an honor to have you.

MR. LIPTON: It is an honor to be here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I have been remiss. I notice the presence of my colleague Sheila Abdus-Salaam who is a member of the Commission who is sitting there in the corner, Judge Fern Fisher who is the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge of New York City and head of our access to justice efforts, Justice Rolando Acosta, a member of the Appellate Division First Department, along with Dianne Renwick, and John Sweeny sitting right next to her, also Appellate Division Justices. We thank you for being here.

Karla Moskowitz? I did not see her. She is hidden, yes, right over there. Karla Moskowitz, Justice of the First Department. And some guy next to her looks very familiar. I think he is related in some way to Justice Moskowitz.

So I am now going to ask James Silkenat, the former president of the American Bar Association and a partner in Sullivan & Worster for his testimony. His tenure as ABA president put a real focus on the access to justice issue.

Thank you for doing that, and thank you for being here.

MR. SILKENAT: Good morning, everyone.

I am James Silkenat. I'm a former President of the American Bar Association and currently a partner in the

New York office of Sullivan & Worcester. I have been in practice in New York for more than 40 years.

I applaud the important work of the Commission in exploring and evaluating the access to justice currently afforded to New Yorkers and the significant unmet legal needs that exist here. For our justice system there is really no priority that is more important.

Given my national focus over the past several years and because of my role at the ABA, it is clear to me that despite the significant pro bono efforts of private sector lawyers and the innovative approaches adopted by strong state court systems like New York's that we still have a huge gap in our legal system.

Within the American Bar Association and within the legal community here in New York, we know that access to justice is more than a catch phrase. It is what our Constitution guarantees and what our current practice does not deliver.

While we lawyers as a profession have made much progress in promoting the rule of law, we live in a world with many injustices and many pockets of deep poverty.

Growing up in the United States, we all learned and many of us recited on a daily basis one of the fundamental principles upon which America was founded:

"Liberty and justice for all," yet our nation is failing to

fulfill this important, this central promise.

Bryan Stevenson, the widely acclaimed public interest lawyer who has dedicated his career to helping the poor and incarcerated, said: "The opposite of poverty is not wealth. In too many places the opposite of poverty is justice."

The need for legal services for the poor has never been greater. Nearly one in five Americans now qualifies for legal assistance.

Every day across America and right here in New York, victims of domestic violence seek protection, veterans try to avoid homelessness, unaccompanied child migrants seek refuge, and many others are forced to navigate the legal system alone because they can't afford a lawyer. And it's not just the poor. Less than four out of ten moderate income people turn to the legal system to resolve their legal problems. Many give up and do nothing. Too many low- and moderate-income people cannot access legal representation. As a result, they are denied the justice they deserve.

The organized bar, and we talked about that already a bit this morning, can help to bridge this justice gap. We serve as representatives of our great profession, and we have the unique ability to call upon lawmakers to improve our justice system and advance the rule of law.

The New York State bar, especially if you are David Miranda, is quite vigorous in pursuing this goal.

For nearly four decades the American Bar
Association has visited Capitol Hill in Washington to
support funding for the Legal Services Corporation. We
call it ABA day, although it now stretches to three days
every year.

ABA day has been about more than those three days. We go to Washington annually, but we do not stop caring about access to justice the rest of the year.

The law is a vehicle for fairness, peace, and justice. Our basic social and civil liberties, civil order relies on the legal system and public respect for it. We cannot abandon the principles of fairness and due process.

During my tenure as President of the ABA, one of my first actions was to create the ABA's Legal Access Job Corps to address what I call "an access to justice paradox."

While the number of Americans eligible for LSC-funded legal systems continues to be at an all-time high, many recent law school graduates are without good jobs or the practical experience they need to be effective lawyers. It has become increasingly difficult for graduated law students to compete in the job market.

Nationwide only 59 percent of law students from the class

of 2014 were employed full-time nine months after graduation at a job that required passage of the bar exam.

The Job Corps committed itself to looking at the dearth of legal jobs and unmet legal needs as one problem rather than two separate ones. The Job Corps has been cataloging the full range of programs in place that help struggling new lawyers meet the legal needs of the under served. These range from rural outreach programs and nonprofit fellowships to modest means programs and incubators.

We also launched an ABA Catalyst Grant Program to support innovative programs to enlist recently admitted lawyers in providing legal services to persons of modest means. We have awarded ten grants to bar associations, law schools, and legal groups from coast to coast. I have devoted much of my presidential budget to this over the last several years.

Lawyers have an important role to play in maintaining our democracy and ensuring that justice truly is for all. We can all be proud to be part of the profession, the tenets of which include the responsibility to provide services to those who cannot pay.

From the ABA, I want to thank the Commission and Chief Judge Lippman for the leadership you continued to show on access to justice issues. There is a great deal of

important work left to do, and I am proud that New York's legal community is so committed to successfully addressing these issues.

Thank you for letting me join here today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Let me now ask a question.

Being the President of the ABA and traveling around the country from one end to the other, what is the climate in access to justice today? In New York we put such a focus on it, but do you feel it across the country, particularly within the legal profession, that there is a commitment to this issue? I know you indicated in your remarks such a focus of your presidency, but what is feeling among the profession?

MR. SILKENAT: Well, I grew up in Kansas. I went to law school in the midwest. I managed to get to 37 states during my tenure.

I think the feeling is as strong out there among lawyers, bar associations, among just the communities -- whether it is educators or doctors or business people -- that this is a priority issue. I think we need to move, as we discussed a little this morning, toward civil Gideon. I think that is a responsibility that government has. We all need to play our role here. Pro bono is an important part of it, but we need to convince legislators that this is a

greater priority and that this is what our Constitution requires and it is worth paying the money to get it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

Panel, any questions?

JUDGE MARKS: In your experience with the American Bar Association in dealing with Congress, is your sense that the lack of financial commitment from Congress for the legal services and reductions in money allocated for the legal services corporation; is that just, kind of, another casualty of federal budget cuts or do you feel within the coffers there is -- is there an indifference towards this problem or even hostility about this among some members of the Congress, what is your experience?

MR. SILKENAT: Part of it is financial, but I think there is another component to it. Among some members of Congress there is a misreading of their constituents. In going around the country, what I see is a strong popular reaction on this issue, but for political reasons some members of Congress do not see that. ABA leaders are not supposed to take positions on political issues and I still don't do that; but we need support, legislators who support the principles that we hold most important, and civil legal services are among those.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, President Silkenat.

Thank you for your strong leadership in the ABA and your

commitment to this issue.

The next speaker is my President and my Dean from New York University John Sexton who is a giant of academia, giant of the legal profession, someone so committed to the ethical strictures of our legal profession and to that nobility which I talked about before.

President Sexton, it is great to have you here with us.

MR. SEXTON: Thank you very much, Chief Judge. I trust your reference was not a reference to the few pounds that I put on.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It was not, I assure you.

MR. SEXTON: It's a great honor to be here. I'm very pleased to appear before you and to testify in support of expanding legal services and expanding funding for those services.

This expansion, which you have been so noble in supporting would help address the unmet need of low-income New Yorkers, but it would also confirm the pledge that we as a society have made and are still striving to honor.

I speak to you on this topic from several perspectives. As you mentioned, I am a professor of law who also has had the privilege for fourteen years to serve as the Dean of NYU's Law School; as the President of New York University for the last fourteen years; and as a

father whose pride knows no bounds as my daughter Katie begins her professional career at the Legal Aid Society. That's what is, perhaps, most emotional for me today because it is in this room that she was sworn in several months ago. She has chosen to spend her life in that which we are talking about today.

From each of these perspectives I applaud the work you have done on this over the last decade. Your innovation, your commitment to the increased access of civil legal services, and I urge that that effort be continued.

(Continued on next page)

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

26

Let me start with NYU, the largest private university in the nation, whose very founding almost 185 years ago sprang from a desire to expand opportunity to those who had been excluded to open wide the doors of higher education beyond the tight circle of the elites of the day or the clergies who were being educated in universities of that day to the sons and daughters of the emerging class and to women and blacks and others first among universities in this nation. Indeed, NYU's model, championed by our founder, Albert Gallatin, was unusual not only in whom it included but where it was located. We were founded at a time when this courthouse would be in the pastoral setting, that the northern boundary of Washington Square Park and the red houses that are there were the summer homes of the wealthy who would come to the country from downtown. above 14th Street which is the barriers for those who were below had not yet been established. We were founded to be in and of the city in Gallatin's words. That's our commitment. That's our commitment to this day.

As a result, the ensuing decades have seen NYU develop an academic profile that addresses head-on broad issues of urban society and issues like equal justice under the law, alleviating poverty, expanding health services, and encouraging public service. So many of our schools, as I indicated in my written testimony, have been dedicated to

1

26

2 various aspects of the problems that I have just spoken. But I think, perhaps, most of all, our law school is 3 dedicated to the topic we highlight today. I saw firsthand 4 a professor beginning in 1981 and running through my time as 5 dean and now subsequently I observed a more distant 6 approach, the deep dedication of our faculty, our students 7 8 and, of course, as a result our alumni. Not only through the first and to this day the most robust clinical programs 9 in the nation, but through externships and through community 10 11 service most of which are dedicated to overcoming the legal 12 hurdles facing New Yorkers who are marginalized by low 13 incomes, the immigration status or lack of educational opportunities. Our students have a commitment and a 14 passion; they provide, while they are students, many 15 thousands of hours of work. I'm talking just about our law 16 17 students of volunteer assistance to those who need help with housing issues, with immigration issues, with access to 18 19 It's interesting. They're often hard-pressed, notwithstanding the fact that we have the most generous low 20 21 payment system in the program, the program, perhaps, I was 22 proud to have founded. They are working hard to continue to 23 serve those populations among graduation because of the lack 24 of opportunities. These go directly to the topics we are 25 talking to.

NYU is one of the 15 New York law schools that work

in collaboration with legal service providers, pro bono coordinators at law firms, the bar associations, and the courts to promote civil legal services and law school efforts to narrow the justice gap.

Similarly many of our law graduates, beneficiaries of the Law School's scholarships and loan forgiveness programs for those who enter the public interest sector are drawn to this work and others like Martin Lipton, one of our graduates donated countless hours to pro bono assistance. They all join me -- I'm speaking for the entire NYU community. I'm speaking for our nearly five hundred thousand graduates and alumni, living graduates and alumni when I say they all join me -- in support of the mission that you, Chief Judge, has laid out; providing legal services to those who are in desperate need, especially those who are in danger of losing the essentials of life, including a place to live, access to health care, access to food, access to education.

The Chief Judge has gone one step farther. You've put your values in your budget and by one final recommendation it is that the next Chief Judge continues in the spirit that this Chief Judge set to allocate funds from the annual Judiciary budget for civil legal services funding. So it's a wise investment with savings down the line. The findings of the Task Force to Expand Access to

Proceedings

Civil Legal Services make it clear, and I quote, the provision of civil legal services reduces the costs of litigation, increases court efficiency, saves taxpayers millions of dollars, and has a profound effect on the lives of low-income New Yorkers.

On a personal note, my daughter Katherine Sexton, after attending Yale and then graduating from NYU's School of Law had many career choices before her and she carefully considered an array of options. But when she came to me and said she had decided on one job, as the job she most wanted to work for, Legal Aid Society, my heart with filled with joy. She starts this Thursday in Brooklyn. She is eager to join the front lines of some of the issues that you are grappling with.

What is notable is that there were nearly 300 applicants for that position. That's how many young people out there eager to devote their lives to this. But 299 have been sent in another direction. I close on another personal note. I remember the day, it's now getting close to 30 years ago that we've met for the first time. I was struck then by your extraordinary intelligence and your manner. I associate myself with everything that the Mayor said about you and Martin Lipton said about you and I'll add, how can we have reached 70. How could that be? It's better than the alternative, but I think of us as much

2 younger.

My friend, Chief Judge, you have been a standard-bearer for the cause of providing legal civil services, for encouraging preventive and early intervention efforts. As president of a major university, as you pointed out, your university, which bears the name of this city, as a member of the legal community, as a proud father of somebody who has been here, I applaud what you've done. And I recommend to your successor that this path be paved with even more attention. Thank you for the honor to appear before you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, President John Sexton.

It is an honor to have you here. I note you quote the Legal Aid Society, Seymour James is here, Adrian Holder, Lillian Molar. There are so many stars, more from the open area, here and they do God's work as do you and thank you for your loved one for having comments about me.

Let me ask you a question, two questions that go to your academic role. As a father, we know that you have hit a home run with a daughter who's made the right choice in terms of her first job. But, you know, not all academician share, I think, which is certainly our vision, of the importance of the legal profession, to access the justice issues. I know I've talked with deans of law students from around the country that have gotten into a little bit of a

back and forth where the dean would say to me, you know, in all due respect, Chief Judge, we are not in the access of the justice system. And I'd say, in all due respect, dean, you are. And if you make them take torts and contracts and property, you have to make them learn about values and what it means to be a lawyer.

What do you think of the law school culture? Has it, around the country, recognized each role in this array of a legal service access to justice supporters? Is that the -- do you feel it or do you think places like NYU and so many others really get it? Are we unusual or around the country are law schools across the board starting to get it.

MR. SEXTON: With the caveat that when I left legal education in 2001 to take this assignment, I deliberately extended myself since I was in the unusual position of appointing my successor. I felt the need to get out of his way.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it was a great success.

MR. SEXTON: It was a great success but the -- so there's a little bit of danger although I have the kind of pervasive friendships that continue. I don't think the picture is as bad as your encounters. I am kind of startled that deans would respond to you that way. It's professional litigation that concave the value of service, it's essential and is a core element of an American legal education. It's

one of the things that makes American legal education distinct and salutatory to legal education which was the keynote to the 2,000 aviator convention in England who spoke about the fact that American legal education had to embrace even more deeply the notion of the Jeffersonian Pavilion, the lawyers of the communities, the lawyers' conscience of society.

It may well be the dean that you are talking to or reacting to is a very, very dangerous phenomenon that I remember developing for the first time in 1995. I saw a memo, which was supposed to be a confidential memo, to the political candidates. I was the president of the association of the American Law School at the time. I actually wrote the pastor a letter because this memo said the most successful campaign strategies you can have as a candidate is to attack lawyers and you pay no price for this.

I remember writing at the time that this was

America's sacrilege because this is a society where the

words, the rules of law means something divine. It doesn't

mean that in all societies. In some societies, you have the

fear of the law. It is the rule of hypocrisy. But here,

this is what has made our nation the nation that it is. I

think that American legal education does capture that at a

core and that the people that you have been speaking to are

## Proceedings

the exceptions. I can't think of a law school these days
that doesn't give a substantial amount of time to clinical
legal education and services for the board.

JUDGE LIPMANN: One other quick question, going back to the legal education community, can you separate the teaching of the discipline from the access issues? You go into a conference a few years ago with one of the law school communities, professors from around the country, and there was a whole debate about whether access issues should be incorporated in each of the disciplines when you teach them. Is that possible? What do you think of that?

MR. SEXTON: Do you mean is the separation possible?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

MR. SEXTON: It's mind-blogging to me that someone would think that even the study, for example, of John Walsh or Ronald Morgan or John Mabel may be separated from the underground issues that your commission is discussing.

We're a profession, okay. Now, even in a research unit like NYU, okay, where we take great pains not just to teach the "is" of the law but the "or" of the law, the reason we moved from the "is" to the "or" is precisely because of the values that we gain.

If you introduce law is nothing other than efficiency, it's not the law we signed up to do. It's not

the law of the society promised. So I think you got to get to the "or" and in order to get to the "or" it can't just be theocratically "or" it's got to be how this work out in real life with real clients. We are a profession that serves clients first and foremost.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I am with you. I follow the teaching of my president and I agree entirely, and I am delightful to see you here, President Sexton. It's an honor.

MR. SEXTON: It's an honor to be here. Your Honor, thank you so much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let's go to Eric Weingartner who's the managing director of the Robin Hood Foundation and let me say that we are extremely appreciative of the Robin Hood Foundation's commitment on access to justice and to legal services and I mentioned earlier in our session we were so pleased and delighted by Robert Hicks, who applaud the poverty justice solution where again we are trying to get past this idea that all of these -- all of these young people who come out of law school and can't find jobs and yet there is such a tremendous need to fight poverty with lawyers and how do we make this work together and you play such a significant role in this, the latest innovation that we've had and we are greatly appreciative. Not only that but, obviously, of the good work that Robin Hood does in

Proceedings

2 fighting poverty in so many different ways so it's a 3 pleasure to have you with us.

MR. WEINGARTNER: That's very gracious of you.

Thank you so much. I came in a touch late. I did hear some of the remarks you had back and forth with the Mayor about some of the programs we fund but with you and with this City Hall in particular, Commissioner Banks, thanks very much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

MR. WEINGARTNER: Good morning and thank you for inviting me to address you Chief Justice and the distinguished panelists on Access to Civil Legal Services in New York. Again, my name is Eric Weingartner. I am a Managing Director at the Robin Hood Foundation, which makes grants of about \$150 million a year to over 200 community-based organizations to fight poverty in New York City. Our programs run the gamut of poverty fighting, pre-kindergarten programs, K-12 programs for students, job training for disconnected young adults, domestic violence shelters for abused women, health initiatives, low-income housing, micro-lending. The one common element to all of these programs is that they work and when we make sure they work.

Robin Hood is well-known for its rigorous evaluation and of its grants and we rivet on the outcomes that our grants have on poor New Yorkers, placing full

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

26

emphasis on the impact that services have on earnings and health. In a nut shell, we make grants to raise the economic living standards and quality of health of the poor. And it is for these reasons that we are more aggressive than ever in our support of legal services for poor New Yorkers. In considering the benefit cost associated with access to legal services, we're increasingly convinced that our funding to expand access is smart grant making, effective, cost efficient, and impactful.

This calendar year, alone and in partnership with

This calendar year, alone and in partnership with Single Stop USA, Robin Hood will spend over \$10 million a year to help about 20,000 city residents handle civil legal disputes. Most of the cases involve housing disputes, access to government programs and immigration problems. And in the past two years, we have expanded our investment substantially, turning our attention to support unaccompanied minors, immigrants without access to counsel, a ramped up investment in support of women who are the victims of violence, and an intensified investment in support of an already robust portfolio focused on New Yorkers facing eviction, deplorable housing conditions, and homelessness. And with your permission, I'd like to give you a window into how we look at our investment in legal services, in effect following a pattern that is consistent across our grant making. Simply, we identify

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

26

thorny policy problems that adversely impact our neighbors, and then we try to determine what intervention could reverse the condition. In this formula, we are looking to see where new dollars can raise living standards, and in the next few moments, I will mention a few instances where we think we have gotten it right, and where an expansion of legal services was the difference.

So with your permission, I'd just like to give you three examples.

JUDGE LIPMANN: I would love to hear them.

MR. WEINGARTNER: Let's start with housing. might know something about this one. This year, Robin Hood entered into a unique partnership under Chief Justice Lippman's leadership, in support of the Pro Bono Scholars initiative. In partnership with the New York State Unified Court System, the New York City Human Resources Administration, HRA, and the Center for Court Innovation. By providing qualified yet relatively inexpensive legal support to low-income families that are at risk of eviction, the partnership attempts to address the growing housing crisis in New York City, a record-high 250,000 eviction filings by the end of 2014; a homeless population of nearly 60,000 individuals, including 25,000 children, also an all-time high, and one-third of those in homeless shelters entering the system immediately after an eviction. The

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

26

model, similar to those of Teach for America and the Immigrant Justice Corps, which I'll talk about in a little bit, deploys recent law school and college graduates, called Pro Bono Scholars, to non-profits across the city to help low-income New Yorkers who are at risk of becoming homeless stave off eviction.

The impact of the program, we believe, as you know, Chief Judge, could be significant. Currently, only 5 percent to 10 percent of low-income tenants sued in housing court have legal representation, but more than 90 percent of landlords do. The upshot, according to Robin Hood funded legal providers, tenants without representation win only about ten percent of their cases. And our support of this program will help even the playing field. research indicates that having a qualified attorney can significantly improve a tenant's prospect for a successful legal outcome. Based on a randomized controlled trial conducted by the Boston Bar Association and Harvard Law School, low-income tenants with counsel win their cases 67 percent of the time, compared with only 30 percent for those without a lawyer. The impact can be substantial, staving off eviction means that parents keep their jobs and avoid mental health issues. It means that children will not miss school, will not suffer from depression or will not be placed in foster care. It is these metrics that we use to

gauge the impact of this initiative.

Further, as the city runs out of shelter space for homeless New Yorkers, it is increasingly turning to "scatter site" shelters for support, that is, regular apartments where people who would otherwise be in a shelter are placed by the city. Increasingly, landlords are trying to evict all of the tenants in a building, often by asserting fraudulent claims, so that such buildings can be converted to scatter site housing and in effect they can be charged more money. And here again, with no counsel, the families that we aim to help have no recourse without an attorney.

And while this program has just begun, the policy case for added counsel is clear and we hope to keep the Court up-to-date on this program as it evolves.

Let's take a look at one other -- actually two other examples and think about domestic violence. Across New York City and the country, Domestic Violence continues to plague families in record numbers, and despite epidemic violence, access to legal supports is still critically low. In response, Robin Hood has invested in the City's infrastructure, again turning to lawyers to lead the way. The City's Family Justice Centers streamline assistance for victims of domestic violence by providing wide access to services under one roof. Essentially, the lawyers are in the middle. The centers are located in the Bronx, Brooklyn

and Queens, assist over 1,500 people every month, and over 50 percent of the people who seek services from the centers are immigrants. For victims of domestic violence, their immigration status can be used against them, used to instill fear and prevent victims from leaving their abuser or from seeking help. Gaining legal immigration status is a critical first step to gaining both safety and self-sufficiency for the victims.

For context, In New York City, the police respond to over 255,000 domestic violence incidents each year, or about 700 incidents a day. In response, the three existing Family Justice Centers assist about 20,000 people on an annual basis. Because all domestic violence cases in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens that involve the police are routed through the centers, the victims with the most violent and horrific cases are served through the centers. Robin Hood tracks outcomes for the programs in three main areas, that might be interesting to the Court, immigration legal services, connections to benefits and connections to education and job training programs. And for the purposes of today's discussion, I suggest how we value the legal intervention in the Robin Hood way.

In the first nine months of our contract with the City, the centers provided immigration legal services for 1,411 individuals and are on track to handle over

1,650 cases by the end of the year grant period. Of those cases, about 850 cases will be new cases opened during the 2013 grant year. The F.J.C.s will close about 660 cases during the year with a success rate of over 95 percent.

After gaining legal status, some participants become eligible for benefits, including Medicaid. The F.J.C.s screen all families for benefits after a change in legal status. They are on track to enroll 83 individuals in Medicaid, 67 individuals in food stamps, 45 individuals in public assistance and 28 individuals in rental assistance. The program is also on track to assist 33 people in obtaining an apartment through NYCHA. Again, none of these supports would have been eligible without a legal change in status. Benefits are accessible or may be possible without a legal intervention and in terms we monitor that and that's how we think about the investment. I will give you one more example and talk about immigrants.

In 2014, we developed a program called the Immigrant Justice Corps in partnership with Chief Judge Katzmann. Note some similarities to the Pro Bono Scholars model that I discussed earlier. Immigration status is directly linked to economic well-being. Legal assistance can help undocumented immigrants obtain legal status, which enables them to gain lawful employment, receive financial aid for school, and access health insurance and temporary

64

1 Proceedings

2 public benefits. Preventative detention and deportation can

- 3 also keep immigrant families from losing a primary
- 4 breadwinner and children from being funneled into foster
- 5 care or suffering educational and other disruptions.
- 6 However, less than 20 percent of the legal needs of
- 7 low-income New Yorkers are currently being met. And here,
- 8 considering these factors, Robin Hood invested. The pattern
- 9 should be clear at this point, find the gap, insert a
- 10 solution, and again, quite frequently, lawyers to the
- 11 rescue.
- 12 We believe that the I.J.C. will ameliorate this
- 13 shortage. In part and beginning in the Spring of 2014, the
- 14 I.J.C. recruited 25 law-school graduates and 15 college
- 15 graduates from around the country, trained them in
- 16 immigration law, and placed them in non-profits to serve
- 17 immigrant New Yorkers. At capacity, the I.J.C. will see
- 18 | 14,000 cases each year, directly helping over 20,000
- 19 individuals, at 20 percent lower cost than existing Robin
- 20 Hood immigration legal services grantees. As we enter our
- 21 second year, the team has grown to 15 layers and 30 college
- 22 graduates. For context, nearly \$4 million people,
- 23 49 percent of New York City's population, are either
- 24 immigrants or the children of immigrants. Immigrants and
- 25 their children also make up nearly half of the New Yorkers
- 26 living in poverty, with higher rates of poverty among

2 non-citizens than for the city overall percentage, 3 29 percent against 21 percent.

However, an estimated 40 percent of immigrants nationwide who are eligible for citizenship have not yet naturalized, leaving them vulnerable to detention and deportation. Recent legal data have revealed that undocumented immigrants are often unaware that they are eligible for permanent legal status. Furthermore, between 2005 and 2010, the parents of over 7,000 U.S. citizen children in New York City were deported and over 10,000 were detained without bond, causing families to lose breadwinners and children to become vulnerable to foster care placement or educational, health and mental health complications.

Only 20 percent of the legal needs of low-income

New Yorkers are served each year as I said. The shortage is

particularly acute for immigrants threatened with

deportation. Sixty percent of detained immigrants facing

deportation in New York City lack counsel. As non-citizens,

they have no right to representation. And immigrants who do

have lawyers receive inadequate or even grossly inadequate

representation 47 percent of the time, according to

prominent judges.

Immigrants, particularly the limited English proficient, often hire fraudulent legal providers, who take thousands of dollars in fees and can mishandle cases with

diestrous consequences. Having a qualified attorney can dramatically improve an immigrant's prospect for a successful legal outcome. In deportation, immigrants with counsel win their cases 67 percent of the time, compared to only eight percent for those without a lawyer.

To give you a sense of the scope of the program, and the year one numbers are just being tallied now, the I.J.C. expects to handle over 6,500 cases. Based on the average time required for adjudication, we expect that half of the less than complex cases and one-third of the more complex cases will close within one year. We also assume that 80 percent of cases will close successfully, a conservative estimate considering that Fellows will be placed in premier legal services providers where success rates averaging above 90 percent. All in all, we expect to report over 2,500 successfully closed cases by the end of year one of the fellowship programs.

My objective and in our discussion today I think was simple. I wanted to make clear that in Robin Hood's view, legal services are a cost effective, critical tool in our fight against poverty. And, secondly, though three examples, the Pro Bono Scholars, the Family Justice Centers and the Immigrant Justice Corps, to give the Court a summarized explanation of how the legal interventions that we support fight poverty. I hope that my case has been

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

26

made, this is as close as I will ever get to being a lawyer and I would be happy to take any questions.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: On that note, let me ask you one question. Robin Hood'S record in fighting poverty in helping us with legal services is just suburb. There are no words to express our appreciation. I am very familiar with Judge Katzmann and I'm good friends of Judge Katzmann's It's a great program. Let me ask you a question. Given that Robin Hood in so many different ways fight poverty, you know, we believe in a very focused way that legal services are so much a part of the puzzle of fighting poverty. When you look at the board it expands, are we being very parochial in focusing so much on legal services, what's the piece of the pie, you know, that in fighting poverty. I am sure there are so many things, so many areas where one can invest money and resources and time. How important is legal services to this bigger battle to end poverty to fight poverty here in New York sitting around the country?

MR. WEINGARTEN: So we're all in. And I say that after thinking about two sort of colliding tensions. We have a very matter of fact way of looking at the world as it relates to fighting poverty. If you fight poverty, two consequences should happen. There should be a change in purity and a change in health. If the intervention that we

support doesn't impact one of those two buckets, we are probably not going to fight it.

The way I structure the discussion today was to talk about the influence that a lawyer could have in three conditions, housing, domestic violence and immigration and each one of those cases we calculate a number so that if we pay for "X" number of lawyers we believe that we will get "Y" amount of impact for poor New Yorkers. We think the benefit cost to that is somewhere between 8 and 15 to 1. It's very good.

Increasingly, we think the lawyers are better met than lots of other things that we fund. But before I was here, I was raising money for Robin Hood spending some time with a guy in the garment district who wrote us a check for \$100,000 and what I explained to him is that Robin Hood is divided in slots. We have programs focused on hunger, immigrants, veterans, etc., but it's consistent. Rarely do you notice people living in poverty where there is only one thing hooked up. It's usually a series of things, but if you can't get status, then you can't get health insurance and you can't get food stamps and so if you attach a lawyer that puts -- that gives some counsel so they can actually become legal to get public benefits.

Just as a start, the modernization of what that means for people living in poverty is enormous. Then so

# Proceedings 1 2 many of those benefits are recurring year after year. if you just think about food stamps, 270 a month over 3 12 months over ten years, that's a big number, medicaid is 4 5 the same thing. So I don't think your view is parochial at We tend to agree with you. And I think that you'll 6 7 probably see us ramped up even further. 8 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You give us great pleasure. think that what we feel, and obviously we are on the same 9 10 wave length about this, a lot of people who think about 11 legal services may think about going into court and 12 representing somebody. A lot of it is interfacing 13 bureaucracy, giving people the benefit that they deserve. 14 There are so many ways a lawyer can contribute to fighting 15 something as overwhelming and difficult and combative as 16 poverty. 17 (Continued on next page) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

26

MR. WEINGARTNER: One of the examples that was mentioned today sort of in the running was what we did with veterans.

We started a veterans fund four years ago. And one of the most successful if not the most successful program that we have done in support was to co-litigate lawyers at VA hospitals to help vets whose benefits were a mess to reinstate their benefits primarily establishing their right to healthcare and housing supports.

We are at capacity. We have a waiting list. And when we monetize the impact just on housing and healthcare, it is through the roof. That's partly because -- I think the VA is often too maligned, but if the VA puts you on a path where you can't get access to healthcare or housing and is deserved to you, you frankly need a lawyer to be reinstated. It is super important.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Thank you for all of Robin Hood's efforts. You are terrific. Thank you so much.

MR. WEINGARTNER: Thank you for having me.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Gonzalez is, actually, going to leave to hear some cases, so we are going to let him go to the Bronx to hear oral argument.

I also want to mention other members of the commission, Christopher O'Malley is here and Marcia Levy is

2 here, and we have a strong stalwart group on the Commission.

Let me now call our next witness, Neil Steinkamp,
Managing Director of Dispute Advisory & Forensic Services
at Stout Risius Ross.

Mr. Steinkamp, great to see you, sir. Thank you for all your efforts. Thank you for being here today.

MR. STEINKAMP: Thank you, Chief Judge, for the opportunity. It is an honor and privilege to be before you today. I am very much humbled to be here and to talk about numbers.

As you said, my name is Neil Steinkamp, I am a managing director at a firm that commonly goes by SRR. We are a valuation firm, investment bank, dispute advisory firm; but more important and pertinent for today, I lead SRR's pro bono practice where I oversee all of our efforts to take the skills that we have and the talents that my colleagues have and apply that in the context of helping low-income individuals and not-for-profit organizations.

In that context, we are often working on impact analysis as well as working with lawyers to assist individuals sometimes in the course of litigation and sometimes otherwise. We do that both in New York and around the country.

Today I would like to take a few moments to talk

about what the economic impact of the legal services in New York are valued at. I want to start by saying it is difficult to quantify life-changing impact, which is what we have heard today and what I know you know is the case. So many of the things that legal services provide make a dramatic impact on the lives and people and lives of families. That is simply difficult to precisely measure. That said, we do have a growing body of evidence and documents and information that allow us to estimate what the economic impact of these services are.

I also want to note that while I have measured certain things, there are many things I have not measured. I think that is important before I start talking about the details of what I have measured because it will help you appreciate the understatement that is possible with the numbers that I have calculated.

As we heard today, and which I know you know, there are so many ways in which civil legal services are impacting people. Some of the things I have not yet measured are: Criminal record modification cases, the value of criminal defense, juvenile justice and representation, veteran benefits mentioned today, related discharge cases in veteran benefits, assistance to low-income entrepreneurs. So as I talk about the numbers, appreciate that the actual economic impact probably is much

greater than what I am about to share.

You mentioned in your opening statement a prior estimate of six dollars of return per dollar of funding. The numbers I calculated, and I will go through them in some detail, suggest that not only the direct implementation of the legal services but the leverage from both the legal community as well as the business finance community that has achieved an appreciation for the scope of those I think is improving every year. I believe that a more reasonable estimate for the impact is ten dollars for every dollar of funding, and I will walk through how we get there. And it is important to understand that month after month, year after year the magnitude and value of the services that are being provided adds up to significant amounts.

The areas that I have looked at include the long-term financial impact associated with social security and disability, Medicaid and other federal benefits. Those are, obviously, opportunities to make a significant change in a person's life, but also one that has long term effects.

In my analysis I have looked at the combination of value associated with ten years of those benefits which is what's available when someone applies for those benefits. Those amounts alone depending on how you look at

it, if you just focus on the amounts in 2014 related to both extended representation and brief representation cases, you are looking at around \$350 million or \$400 million in value provided just for cases closed in 2014.

Those cases, there are dollars flowing into New York this year from cases for which civil legal services provided those benefits eight, nine, ten years ago. So the impact into New York this year from legal services over the last ten years is estimated to be close to \$275 million. It is an amount that can grow every year. Medicaid is similar. Ten years of benefits can be available for people if legal services can assist in providing those benefits.

As you heard, in years past there has been an economic multiplier effect to these amounts. Dollars that are made available to people in the form of benefits or other compensation are spent in communities. Studies have shown that there is a multiplicative effect when people are provided those dollars. And when taking the amounts that I have calculated with respect to those benefits and applying to what research has shown that factor is, approximately \$1.45 billion of economic benefit was created in 2014 as a result of civil legal services. That's over and above the amounts that are associated with the actual benefits themselves.

We have expanded the analysis this year, and I think there are tremendous opportunities to expand this analysis in coming years as we gather more information on those areas that I mentioned in my earlier statements that we have not yet measured. As an example, this year we have looked at the value of the wage impact from work authorization for immigrants.

So it's a tremendous opportunity when you have the ability to provide or assist with authorization for immigrants, and we calculated almost \$60 million in value just in 2014 from cases in which civil legal services called for that authorization.

As in years past, we have also estimated the value associated with the decreased usage of emergency shelters. That amount is estimated to be \$260 million including both brief and extended representation cases.

New studies have shown the value of brief representation. There is obviously a tremendous amount of activity that goes into those representation cases across a wide variety of these difference areas of legal service, and I think it is a great enhancement to the analysis to be able to more completely understand the value of brief rep. We have done that with respect to both emergency shelters as well as social security and disability benefits and Medicaid.

Taking in total, as I mentioned before, there are many ways to analyze these numbers. There are many ways to think about the value to consider whether those benefits will accrue over five years or ten years, whether we should apply retroactive analyses. There are many different ways to look at the value. But taking in total, I believe an estimate in the neighborhood of \$3 billion is reasonable to consider, and that is approximately ten times what the funding level was for the applicable services.

I think it is particularly valuable to consider that you have an opportunity with very limited resources to try and find ways to make the biggest impact. I think the calculation of these numbers provides us with more and more clarity about where and how we can dedicate limited resources to make the greatest impact. These numbers could be particularly helpful going forward as we learn more about the impact that these services are making in the lives of New Yorkers and in people across the country.

Thank you again for the opportunity to talk to you today. I very much appreciate it, and I am humbled by the chance to share our findings with you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: First, let me say that we appreciate your pro bono efforts in this regard. I think the numbers here are staggering. I think if we could get a copy of your efforts to every member of the New York State

Legislature, we would probably be in pretty good shape. I am going to try and do just that.

I do think that to get a recognition of how this multiplies in terms of investing in legal services, it should be an apple pie and motherhood to recognize that it is a direction that serves everybody and serves society.

I want to thank you. Rest assured we are going to use what you have done in every possible way to get across our message.

Any questions? No?

Okay, thank you again. Really terrific. I can't tell you how heartening it is.

MR. STEINKAMP: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Our next witness is Debra Raskin, the President of the New York City Bar Association and partner with Vladeck, Raskin & Clark who has done such a terrific job as the president of a great, great venerable bar association. We thank you for the support of City Bar in every conceivable way.

Welcome, President Raskin.

MS. RASKIN: Thank you so much. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the City Bar Association at this hearing addressing access to justice for New Yorkers who can't afford attorneys in crucial civil legal matters.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me just say one thing.

Though some of the crowd may have dissipated, our

enthusiasm to hear your remarks have not.

5 MS. RASKIN: Not quite last, not quite least. It 6 is fine.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are listening to every word.

MS. RASKIN: Thank you so much.

Let me start by thanking you, Chief Judge
Lippman, Helaine Barnett, and the Task Force -- now a
Permanent Commission and we are thrilled at that -- for
your unwavering commitment over so many years to the cause
of access to justice. The work of this Commission has been
a true game changer. It has improved the lives of
thousands of New Yorkers and provided much needed support
for our courts. And please know that you have the
gratitude of our bar association and, I think, the
organized bar as a whole for this issue going forward.

The City Bar has long been committed to providing access to justice through our policy and advocacy, through our initiatives in support of legal services organizations, for court funding, for a right to housing, a right to counsel in Housing Court, and a right to counsel in immigration cases for those who are detained, and also for direct legal assistance provided by our public service affiliate which is the City Bar Fund.

The City Bar Fund has the City Bar Justice Center which leverages the efforts and resources of the whole legal community to increase access to justice through both our own employee staff and through pro bono representation.

Through Chief Judge Lippman's and former Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti's outstanding leadership, the Judiciary budget now includes \$85 million for civil legal services, and we urge that you stay the course to the \$100 million for annual civil legal services.

This is a vital element of any effort to provide legal assistance to those who can't afford it, and there are still far too many unrepresented people facing threats to their basic needs every day.

Of course adding \$15 million to the funding is a necessary but not sufficient condition. We deeply understand the importance of pro bono representation as well as the need to find innovative ways to leverage the volunteer efforts of our legal community. The City Bar has supported pro bono reporting, the 50-hour pro bono requirement for new lawyers, and the innovative Pro Bono Scholars Program.

Through our Justice Center's activities, we have engaged volunteer lawyers to assist homeless individuals, cancer survivors, immigrant women and children who have been trafficked or abused, families facing foreclosure and

veterans, among others.

And just to address for a moment Judge Lippman's question about coordination. We try very very hard to focus our Justice Center's programs in areas where for one reason or another, oftentimes funding, the regular legal services programs don't address those needs. And, actually, to give you one example; we have a pro bono program for trusts and estates. You may thing, My goodness, why do people need T and E advice? Well, you have situations where people who never had money in their lives come into money because of a death or an inheritance, and need legal services through experienced trust and estate lawyers for that problem. That's an area that, for obvious reasons, LSC programs are not going to be addressing. So we do try to deal with that issue of coordination that the judges brought up.

Our legal hotline is the largest free legal services hotline in New York City. And now, thanks to this additional funding, hotline attorneys are able to provide brief or limited legal services to folks who call in such as helping them create court papers for pro se litigants, or assisting them with filling out forms for critical benefits.

These services will be the focus of my testimony today because they provide a good framework for our talking

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

26

about what has been called unbundled legal services in civil cases to those who otherwise would be without representation.

First let me give you some more statistics, although the ones we just heard were quite heartening.

The City Bar Justice Center helps about 25,000 New Yorkers annually. Last year we closed approximately 13,000 cases and engaged approximately 1,400 pro bono lawyers to work on cases and conduct trainings in the community to advise people of their legal rights. included in those numbers are thousands of New Yorkers who rely on our legal hotline. Now we have expanded that to include limited service or unbundled services to callers. Unbundled or limited services refers to an attorney agreeing to provide only one part of the legal services that a client may need. This has become somewhat less controversial in recent years and certainly is no longer questionable ethically so long as it is clear to the client that the nature of the services is limited and that there is a clearly-worded and understandable retainer agreement setting that out.

At the Justice Center we use limited scope services for many of our projects such as elder law and consumer bankruptcy, as well as on our legal hotline. We also are operating two new programs using limited scope

representation: Legal Assistance to the Self-Represented, LASR, nice acronym, which an extension of the brief services we provide on the legal hotline; and in the Eastern District Federal Court, federal pro se legal assistance. I will, however, focus today on state court matters.

Since November 2014 the Justice Center has handled approximately 2,300 limited scope services. Representation in these matters depends on the need of the individual and can include providing answers over the phone, sending callers "know your rights" information, reviewing a caller's faxed legal documents and providing advice about that, setting up in-person appointment with a caller for more extensive assistance. Limited scope representation of this nature often results in avoiding or settling litigation, helping an unrepresented individual assess the values, for example, of a settlement offer that they might not be able to do very well for themselves, or to help them more effectively move forward with a pending case. And let me give you a few examples of that kind of limited representation:

Assisting a disabled client with drafting and sending a cease and desist letter to creditors in order to stop harassment. Then guiding that client through the steps on the court's website to help pro se individuals in

vacating default judgments that are inappropriately entered; helping a single working mother to file an uncontested divorce and secure child support and healthcare for her two children; demanding the return of more than a year's worth of rent overpayment to a senior citizen who didn't know that his adjusted rent amount was about twice what he should have been paying; and coming to the aid of a widow by drafting an Article 78 proceeding to correct her husband's death certificate so that she can get death benefits to which she was entitled.

Such quick, brief representation in these kinds of cases can result in credits and refunds to clients and end the threat of litigation.

Although the vast majority of the Justice

Center's limited scope cases don't involve court

representation -- and the panelists have spoken about the

importance of legal services prior to litigation in

avoiding litigation -- we are also aware that not all

judges have embraced this idea of attorneys taking only one

part of a case. And we are also aware of pro bono

attorneys being concerned that they may be asked to stay to

work through a whole case even though their personal

resources may not allow them to do that.

We would ask that the court should continue to educate judges which is an essential part of bridging the

justice gap, and that attorneys should ethically be able to do this and end their services after they complete a discrete and helpful portion of the matter.

The ability to do this obviously varies by practice setting and by the court or administrative agencies, and we ask that judges be encouraged to permit this. Attorneys will not volunteer for limited scope representation in court or in administrative settings unless they think that they can end their representation at an appropriate time as per the limited scope retainer.

There is also a concern that pro bono attorneys who are handling only a part of the case may fail to identify interconnected issues. We have heard a lot about how in poverty so many legal issues are intertwined and interconnected. This increases the burden of careful supervision of these attorneys by experienced lawyers, oftentimes experienced legal services lawyers, and the obligation to explain carefully to the client the nature of the limited representation and that it will focus on only one particular aspect of the problem. And in some cases it is simply inappropriate and could worsen a problem to deal with only one issue, and those cases wouldn't work for this kind of representation.

The City Bar's Justice Center's experience today with such unmuddled legal services representation is quite

heartening. Our surveys of client satisfaction, while we don't have the economic wherewithal as the prior witness, we have done some amount of studies of how this has worked out from the client point of view. And what we have learned is that the clients have been extremely happy to have this kind of representation and feel that it has given them more authority, more control over their situation.

The cases we have handled so far show a potential to help even more people who, despite our wishes, are not going to be able to obtain full representation from a legal services or pro bono provider.

We believe that pro bono attorneys will be pleased to take on limited scope representation as long as it is appropriate and an appropriate retainer is signed. It is our hope to be able to encourage more lawyers to take on these pro bono activities given this kind of limitation of scope. We also hope to continue working on innovative collaborations and other new resources for these kinds of problems.

I want to end my testimony by talking about and thanking some of these other programs that have been instituted under your leadership, the Pro Bono Scholars Program in this particular case. This past spring the City Bar Justice Center had two pro bono scholars, and it was a terrific experience for everyone involved. Our scholars

came from New York Law School and Cornell Law School and provided invaluable assistance answering hotline legal calls, providing brief services to callers. These scholars received training from the experienced supervisory attorneys, and provided concentrated support in particular to elderly and veterans needing assistance. We believe this program holds great promise, and we look forward to continuing our participation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify here on behalf of the City Bar Association, and a very special thank to the CJ for all he has done to improve justice in this state. Your leadership has not only moved the needle, it has permanently altered the playing field. We thank you four that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, President Raskin, for those lovely remarks and kind words. I appreciate it.

I have one quick question. The City Bar commitment to this issue has been so terrific over such a long period.

Do you see today many young lawyers coming to you without jobs and looking to do something useful? And we have talked so many times about channeling them into doing good deeds for people in need and getting some practical experience even though they can't find a permanent job. So do you still see a lot of that?

MS. RASKIN: My predecessor, Carey Dunne, chaired a task force on this problem of new lawyers and lack of employment but under service of so many populations.

The City Bar has instituted a number of programs to address that. For example, we take a class of 40 or 50 young attorneys who have just graduated and put them through various kinds of substantive training and job search training. And certainly in that and, really, in all our other efforts to help lawyers find jobs, we don't miss those opportunities to preach the gospel of pro bono, public service and so on. I mean, this kind of funding obviously supports and provides opportunities for more of those recent lawyers to do that kind of work.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for preaching the gospel. I know that State Bar President Miranda agrees with me that the City Bar does a spectacular job in the area of access to justice, and we are greatly appreciative of your leadership and the City Bar's efforts.

MS. RASKIN: Thank you so much.

MR. MIRANDA: I do have a quick question.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: A quick question from the President, one to another.

MR. MIRANDA: I do appreciate your testimony today and the leadership of your association. You have many wonderful innovative programs.

How do you think we can replicate some of these programs that are working so well for the City Bar with other smaller bars that might not have the infrastructure that your association has?

MS. RASKIN: In a sense, this measuring client satisfaction is a part of it. We try to, sort of, very consciously evaluate these programs at every stage. And part of it, although I hate the word "scaleability," is trying to figure out: Are these programs we can package and take on the road and share with other bar associations? So that is really something that is kept in mind.

And, you know, to the extent you are outside of big cities where you have more smaller practitioners, solos, although we do focus on our solos and small practitioners in New York, but to what extent, for example, is unbundled legal services more possible for someone who has a solo practice? Perhaps they can't take on a prolonged litigation pro bono but could well do a piece of it. That would be enormously helpful to the litigant. Can the bar organization in that smaller community leverage that example to make pro bono more appealing to people in that community?

So that really is something that we think about in these programs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sharing good ideas and good

mottos. It obviously is such a good idea for all of us.

Judge Marks, I believe, has a question.

JUDGE MARKS: Yes.

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

26

So separate and apart from the new lawyers who have trouble finding employment, is it your sense that there has been an uptick in pro bono participation in New York City? Related to that, the difficulties in the legal profession, did that result in more pro bono, less pro bono, or did it have any impact on pro bono participation? What is your sense of that?

MS. RASKIN: It is a little bit hard to say, but I think what I would say is that there is a certain level in which from 2008 on, the crisis in many lawyers' recent memories of folks coming out of law school and not being able to get jobs perhaps made people more conscious of the fact that on a certain level we are all vulnerable. know, Wall Street has had its problems, the Lehman Brothers of the world laying off large numbers of people. Does that kind of experience raise consciousness at a certain level that we are all in this together? Those of us who are fortunate enough to have jobs, fortunate enough to be somewhat secure in our firms, don't we have an obligation now that we have seen this kind of unfortunate economic situation to help others? You know, that's a little bit of a sense of what I get.

Unfortunately I don't have any apparent skills to do a study, but that would be my view, and, really, starting with things like Carey Dunne's task force of how do we help not just new lawyers who are without jobs. You know, very experienced lawyers sat on that task force and put their heads together about what do you do about all these unrepresented people and these lawyers who are not employed. So wiser heads at all levels of the profession were thinking in those terms.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, President Raskin.

Thank you again for your leadership and the bar's efforts.

(Continued on next page)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thanks. Sarah Moss, Executive Vice President and General Counsel of The Estée Lauder Companies which is a name that is familiar to all of us. Thank you for your patience too as well. You are one of the latest speakers before our client panel. We are delighted to have you and we're so pleased to have the visions you represent to me today.

MS. MOSS: Thank you, Chief Judge Lipmann and distinguished panel. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. Chief Judge Lipmann, I want to echo Mayor De Blasio and others who have thanked you for your extraordinary leadership through our profession and it is really an honor to be here.

I thank Chief Justice Lippman, you set the framework right when several years ago you said that in speaking of the importance of being the civil legal needs for our citizens, quote, there are certain fundamentals for a civil society, for a moral society, and this is one of the priorities. That's exactly right. And I could not agree more. That is a framework that I think we look at this and the lens that we look at it through.

I am General Counsel, chief legal officer, of the Estée Lauder Company and in that position I have a responsibility for the role I have on legal functions for the company. Throughout my career, I have a lifetime

commitment to public service and pro bono work, particularly, serving low-income New Yorkers. In my current legal position, I supported providing legal counsel to a wide variety of service organizations, including the women's career and development programs, sexual assault crisis centers, and substance abuse and rehabilitation centers.

I have the privilege of serving on a number of non-profit boards including the Board of Directors of the New York Common Pantry, the Board of Directors of M.A.C. AIDS Fund, and the Board of Directors of NYU Law School and I know John Sexton was here. I supported Nazareth Housing which supports homeless women and through Estée Lauder I am an active volunteer with The Young Women's Leadership School in Harlem.

Throughout my legal career and my board and volunteer work, I have seen firsthand how difficult it is to see justice served when people do not have legal representation. This is especially acute when the legal issues impact low-income people who are facing eviction in housing court or domestic abuse or struggling to access public housing, disability and unemployment and other benefits. And we all know as we see this every day.

Today there are more than 58,000 homeless

New Yorkers in the City shelter system, and we face an acute affordable housing crisis. I see this at the New York

Common Pantry, the working poor who have lost their homes struggling to feed their families and house their families and maintain their jobs. We see it in the M.A.C. AIDS fund, many low-income people living with aids trying to find stable, supportive and safe housing. Moreover, as the need for affordable housing increases among this population, the available resources have continued to lag behind. Legal services are critical to secure an increase access to government benefits, reduce barriers to health care and treatment, and promote family stability for future care and custody planning for families and pro bono assistance can only do so much.

We see the legal service programs, attorneys triaging cases, making the difficult decision on who to serve and who they cannot serve and turning away people who need their help. The continuing unmet need for civil assistance in all areas of the state has a negative impact on businesses. There is a significant economic and social value to providing services to poor New Yorkers to help them deal with civil legal matters. As someone who works in the business world, we appreciate the economic value that is realized by expanding civil legal services in areas such as housing, health immigration, family rights, housing, health care, again, obtaining child care and education. The burden that is placed on low-income New Yorkers who lack

representation reduces their ability to contribute to our economic growth, and surely limits their productivity wherever they may work. My company, Estée Lauder, shares these values and perspectives and we strive to be good citizens of our city and our state by supporting legal services which secure these essentials of life but no company or pro bono work can do it and can do it alone.

The work of legal services organizations often has far-reaching effects, well beyond a specific case, in advocacy such as changing public policy or the law on issues concerning low-income New Yorkers, the recent divorce law is an example of that and these shifts in policies could not happen without the advocacy of providers of direct legal services with the hard evidence of the individual needs of New Yorkers, especially vulnerable populations like domestic violence survivors, who often find leaving a battering partner subjects them to extreme poverty. Civil legal services form a safety net that must be strengthened and expanded. Increased support for these programs is essential if those New Yorkers without resources are to be accorded equal justice under the law.

Thank you again for your work Chief Judge Lippman and the panel to meet the critical needs of the citizens of our city and state. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much for your

2 testimony and again thank you for your patience. Let me ask

3 you one question. Why is legal services important to the

4 business community, what it would seem kind of

5 counterintuitive? Why do businesses in this city, the

6 state, this country, why do you care about legal services?

7 Why is that important?

MS. MOSS: Well, first of all, I started from the fundamental panelist that I read in the beginning that this is critical to a normal society, to a justice society. On a more practical level --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: The bottom line.

MS. MOSS: The bottom line level, if someone loses their home, they can't come to work. If someone -- if a child doesn't have a home, can't get education, can't become a productive member of society. If someone is the victim of an abusive relationship, they can't come to work or they do come to work and they can't function and we see this. How many New Yorkers are there who have these tipping points that something happens and they unjustly lose their housing or their health care or whatever is keeping their family together. We have workers at Estée Lauder in factories in Melville, often tens of thousands of employees in this state in Melville, primarily in Melville and New York City and they can't support the work and the company if they don't have these fundamentals and the civil legal services are

2 critical.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: On two levels, you need people in the local communities who have money to put in the bank and go to the store and buy products, Estée Lauder products or some other products.

MS. MOSS: Not other products.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And they can't do that if they don't have assistance with basic fundamental issues and on another level within your own family. You need your employees who have these different problems, housing, consumer credit, whatever it might be, healthy in the best sense in that way in getting the legal assistance that they need.

MS. MOSS: I have to say we are a great company and have great employers. We cannot provide those services. We simply cannot. They must be provided. Thank you again.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. We appreciate your testimony. Okay. For our final witnesses, we are going to have our clients of panel and let's see. We are going to have Fatim Kamara, Stacy Snowden, Cassandra Wilson. Come up. Okay. Fatim, you are a client of The Door, a Center for Alternatives. You're accompanied by Rebecca

24 Wilson Heller. Tell us how has legal services affected your

25 life.

MS. KAMARA: I am going to start by saying good

1 Proceedings

2 afternoon to you and the individuals. Thank you for having 3 us be here today.

4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Speak into the mic.

MS. KAMARA: My name is Fatim Kamara. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to tell you how the legal services at The Door, I received, have given me a secured guardian and for my life back on the right track.

I was born in Togo South Africa. I am 19 years old. I came to New York City with my father when I was 11 who returned back to Togo two weeks after. When I come to New York, I was living with my aunt and she and her husband had two kids but still treated me like a burden. She would start fights with me. She would argue with me about everything. And when I talk back or do not talk back, she will still hit me. Sometimes it left bruises but it got to the point where once she hit me I would just look at her and I couldn't cry anymore.

I take time to take care of the house, clean, take care of the kids and go to school. I was in high school. I was very uncomfortable at her house, but I had nowhere else to go. One day at school, one of my classmates told me about The Door and brought me over to become a member. There I was able to talk to a lawyer who told me that I could qualify for Special Immigrant Juvenile status but that I need a guardian because I was too young.

Happily, I went home. I asked my aunt if she could be my guardian. She said that she was too busy and like always that I was going to get myself into more trouble. I was very discouraged by her answer. And I abandoned my case for a year now. I kept living at her house because I had nowhere else to go.

So one day I was on the train and I ran into a friend of mine from Togo she told me that her family had moved to New York City and she invited me over to her house. So there I was explaining to them how life was at my aunt's house. And her father decided to be my guardian from there. So he came to the The Door. He spoke with my lawyer who explained to him how everything would work. He also invited me to come and live with them at their house but first we had to go to the Family Court.

At the Family Court, my lawyer filed a petition in Bronx Family Court to have my friend's father appointed as my guardian and to let the special factor findings that would allow me to petition for an immigrant award, Special Immigrant Juveniles status or SIJ.

The SIJ is a way for children who have been abused, neglected, abandoned to receive protection of the Family Court that will eventually help them obtain a Green Card. The process was confusing at first, but my lawyer took care of everything. My guardian needed a French interpreter

which the Court had. My lawyer conducted the hearing. The judge granted the guardianship and special findings. It was wonderful to have a place -- safe place to live at and also a family that welcomed me. The Door helped me with my immigration application. I didn't have the document so I couldn't have worked and supported myself so I had to -- and or go to file financial aid for college. After The Door filed my SIJ application, I got my work authorization and everything started to flourish.

I started working for \$8.25 an hour. I started buying myself clothes, food, school supplies. I was a much more happier person because I knew everything was going to be okay and the same year I graduated from high school.

When I got my Green Card, wow, by then I moved out on my own with my own roommate. The Green Card made me realize I could do so much better in life, so I start by getting a job at a restaurant on 42nd Street but still that job wasn't enough for me to support myself. So a lawyer told me at The Door that the health center was hiring. The health center at The Door was hiring peer educators. I went down. I present myself and I got the job.

I am going to Bronx Community College now. I am studying biology. I have a lot of ideas for my future, to finish college, be a doctor and volunteer in non-profit organizations. I am grateful that I found The Door and that

Proceedings

the findings and the capacities they had to help me obtain a guardian in Family Court and immigration status that allowed me to become working and support myself. Without the legal services I received at The Door, I wouldn't be where I am today. Thank you. Thank you so much for providing funding for civil legal services in our state and thank you so much for the opportunity you have given me to testify before you today. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for telling us your

story. It's fair to say that legal services changed your

life.

MS. KAMARA: It did. Thank you so much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Such a great example of why you are seeking this funding and this help so legal services can help people who just need a hand and we thank you for coming.

18 MS. KAMARA: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Stacy Snowden, client of The Legal Aid Society, Harlem Community Law Office, accompanied by Evan Hasbrook.

Stacey, move the mic close to you.

MS. SNOWDEN: Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak about the help I received from The Legal Aid Society. It was a very frightening experience to almost be homeless.

Without their help, I might have been homeless and me and my son wouldn't have a place to go. I want to say good morning or good afternoon now. My name is Stacy Snowden and a lifelong New Yorker who came to The Legal Said Society for help. I had been living at 485 Lenox Avenue with my son for more than 17 years. And I'm also a former health care worker that became disabled so I was getting help to pay my rent through the Section 8 program.

Last year we got new management and out of nowhere they said I owed them arrears of like \$10,000 and they took me to Housing Court to evict me. My son and I, we were terrified. My son was in his senior year of high school. He was thinking about having to quit high school to get a job. He wanted to help me. I was afraid. I was ill. We didn't know what we were going to do; we were going to be on the street. They were like you got to get out now. You got to get the money. They had a three-day notice on the door.

The next thing you know, I was in court. I had to sign some paperwork saying I had to move because Social Service gave me 30 days or get out, but, luckily, there was a lady in court. She told me not to sign anything. I came home. I told my son I was going to try to get help at The Legal Aid Society and that he should focus on going to school finishing high school and not worry about getting a job but I was going to try to get some help.

When I met with my Legal Aid Society, my lawyer explained to me that the most rent I could owe was a couple of hundred dollars. They said \$10,000. No, they said a couple of hundred dollars and that the landlord had not, they thought, not legally entitled to the money because the arrears that have piled up was because they had lost their subsidy to collect the rent because of penalties that they received for repairs that were not made in my apartment.

So The Legal Aid Society agreed to take my case and to fight for me in the court. And after we went to court and The Legal Aid Society raised this defense in court about the subsidy and that they weren't entitled to the money, they gave me back my Section 8 and my son finished high school and now he finished his first few weeks in college so I am so grateful to The Legal Aid Society for helping us because without them I could have been evicted. I could have signed that paper. I could have probably been homeless and The Legal Said Society is an incredible resource to New Yorkers like me and people that experience difficult times.

You don't know how scarey it is you are going to come home and you are not going to have no place to go and you have no one to help you and there is no resources and you have no money and I just want to tell you how grateful I am for The Legal Aid Society helping me and my attorney explained to me that this investment from you guys, the

103

Proceedings

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 Chief Judge and OCA, for increased funding, I'm just -- you don't know how difficult it was for me, it was for the 3 increased funding and to make this help work. It was the 4 reason why I was able to get assistance and other families 5 6 will be able to get assistance because it was a dramatic, dramatic experience for me and without someone's help, I am 7 8 so grateful that The Legal Aid Society -- and I hope you 9 give the guys more funding and more help so that they can help other families that may have the same situation and may 10 11 not know where to go and might not have funding or services 12 to get help and move on so I am most grateful. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are most grateful to you for coming in and, you know, you see these ads on television about health care and so and so, hospital give me back my life, legal services can give you back your life, right?

MS. SNOWDEN: Yes. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much for coming in. Cassandra Wilson, client of Legal Services NYC, accompanied by Tanya Douglas.

MS. DOUGLAS: Good afternoon. I am actually Tanya Douglas. Miss Wilson had a medical emergency and were not able to come today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We are happy to have you here.

MS. DOUGLAS: I am happy to read her testimony or submit it. You tell me what fits.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: However you want to do it. You can read it, whatever works for you.

MS. DOUGLAS: I will read it. It is an classic example of the holistic work that we do at Legal Services. Miss Cassandra Wilson came into our office for help, to present an eviction, and also to submit social security benefits. She is 50-years-old and had worked for over 20 years as a security guard. She lives at 163 West 133rd Street, apartment 3C, New York, New York and had lived there for over a couple decades.

In January of 2013, she was diagnosed with Stage IV uncurable breast cancer and underwent major surgery. She had no other source of income and, therefore, had to go back to work after the surgery. She was unable to meet the demands of work. However, her employer accommodated her disability by cutting her hours and reducing her duties but that led to her falling behind in her bills including her rent and her Con Edison.

Over time she was became sicker and sicker, suffered from fatigue, shortness of breath and was in severe pain due to her Stage IV cancer. She had to stop working because she applied for social security and SSI benefits. Her case was denied, her applications. She filed an appeal and was waiting for a decision. Then she was brought -- she received -- brought to court for nonpayment of rent. She

attempted to represent herself in Housing Court but to no avail. By the time she came to Manhattan Legal Services, her case had been adjourned nine times for her to pay back rent and she couldn't get the money. She had went to public assistance for help but was turned down because she could not afford to pay the future rent because she wasn't working at the time.

She was desperate to have the social security case approved. And while she was waiting, she received a notice from the city marshal stating that she would be evicted. She could not afford to pay for an attorney. Manhattan Legal Services staff was able to help her. Our housing attorney, Miss Patel, filed emergency papers in Housing Court to demonstrate her severe illness and that we were trying to help her get money through social security and social security benefits.

Miss Patel was able to hold off her eviction and provide -- the Court provided more time for her to pay her arrears. Miss Valentine, who's a volunteer in the Disability Law Unit, fought with the social security administration to get a hearing. Miss Valentine was able to gather all of the necessary medical documents including reports from the doctors. It's often difficult to get a doctor to write a report.

Then the social security administration said it

# Proceedings

would take months or years before a hearing would occur.

Miss Valentine requested an expedited hearing and was able
to submit evidence so that her case would be approved on the
record without waiting for months or up to a year for a
hearing. She now receives social security and SSI benefits
so she can prove that she can pay her rent going forward and
was able to get a one-shot deal from public assistance with
help from Manhattan Legal Services. So money from the
one-shot deal combined with the retroactive social security
and SSI benefits allowed her to pay for rent arrears and
save her home.

Manhattan Legal Services is now working with her for her to qualify for disability, rent increase exemption, to keep her rent affordable. We, Manhattan Legal Services, were each able to help her get money to pay her Con Edison arrears. Legal Services has made a huge difference in her life and she knows that many other people were able to get help because of Legal Services. She fully supports continued funding with civil legal services in New York City.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming in and telling us this. There is another story of life, being imaginably helped by New York City. We greatly appreciate you coming in.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank.

TUDGE LIPPMAN: That's our last witness. I want to thank all of you, the stewards who stayed to the very end. This is not for the short winded and, you know, rest assured, we are going to go through these next three hearings in different parts of the state and I have every confidence that the Commissioner is going to come up with a great report. And as we indicated earlier, while we are very pleased and happy that you have been able to achieve, much more needs to be done and we are all going to work very, very hard, including the State Bar Association, and all of us working together, to get where we need to go which is every person in need of legal assistance get the representation that they deserve. So thank you all. Greatly appreciated. Thank you.

16 \* \* \* \*

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic minutes taken within.

RACHEL SIMONE, CSR, RMR, CRR
SHAMEEKA HARRIS, CSR, RMR, CLR
Senior Court Reporters