STATE OF NEW YORK

SECOND DEPARTMENT HEARING

THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

October 4, 2012

Nassau County Supreme Court

100 Supreme Court Drive

Mineola, New York 11501

BEFORE:

HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN

Chief Justice of the State of New York

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI

Chief Administrative Judge

KENNETH G. STANDARD, ESQ.

Past President, New York State Bar Association

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning. It's a pleasure to see all of you. This is the third year of our hearings on civil legal services. I want to make clear at the outset that there is nothing more important to me as the Chief Judge than civil legal services for the poor and those most in need in our state.

The template that we've developed in New York is a combination of more public funding for civil legal services, that this year we are so pleased that we have \$40 million in funding for civil legal services; by far, the most public funding in the country. We're very happy about that, yet it's just the tip of the iceberg in terms of the need for civil legal services in our state.

These hearings are held every year through the hard work of the task force to enhance civil legal services, headed by Elaine Barnett -- Elaine, you want to stand up -- who's the former head of the Legal Services Corporation, and we're so pleased that she's here with a number of the members of the commission: Steve Banks, Barbara Finklestein, who's here somewhere, who did such great work at pulling this together; Fern Fisher, the state-wide Deputy Administrative Judge for Access to Justice; Emily Franchina, from here in Nassau County; Denise Kronstadt I think is here. And -- there's Denise. I know you're here.

So the task force put together these hearings every year. They have been necessitated by the loss of funding in Washington from the Legal Services

Corporation, by the reduction in IOLA funding in New York State, which went from 36 million to \$6 million in one year due to the financial crisis in our state and country.

For the judiciary and the profession, we understand that it is our responsibility, our mission, to stand up for civil legal services for the poor, and that this is really our very reason for being, equal justice for all. This is what we're all about. And this is what these hearings are all about.

In addition to public funding, which, as I said, we're so pleased to have \$40 million this year from Governor Cuomo and the legislature, we also believe that the crisis that we have in legal services requires volunteer service on the part of the bar.

And, as many of you know, we've instituted a new 50-hour pro bono requirement for law students to serve before they could be admitted to the bar. And the whole purpose of this is to let aspiring lawyers understand that being a lawyer is all about, at least here in New York, is all about a culture of service. And serving others has been so much a part of our profession

from time immemorial, and it is very important that law students at the very inception understand that this is what we are all about in this profession.

The bar has stepped up to the plate in terms of giving over two million hours of pro bono service, and it's our hope that we are able to imbue in a new generation of lawyers that same culture of service. And, again, this is all about core values of our profession, and certainly pro bono service is a part of that.

Again, equal justice is the focus of this hearing. The economy has hurt the most vulnerable in our society. Certainly they're the ones most impacted by the poor economy. And equal justice for all, high and low, rich and poor alike, is what our society is all about and certainly what our court system is all about. Every civilized society is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable citizens, and we certainly will be judged accordingly.

We are delighted -- let me just introduce the panel.

Chief Administrative Judge A. Gail Prudenti from Suffolk County, Second Department. She never gets any applause, so it's good. So we're so pleased that she's here.

And Ken Standard, the former president of the

State Bar Association, is here. Equal justice.

I do want to recognize Appellate Division

Justice Peter Skelos, who's here. Thank you, Peter, for being here, from Nassau County. Judge Tom Adams is here sitting in the back. And I want to welcome you all to the hearing.

And we are particularly pleased and honored to have as our lead witness today the District Attorney of Nassau County. She has dedicated her life to this concept of equal justice for all. It is particularly appropriate that she be the lead witness, in that her role as the District Attorney here in Nassau County is so fundamental to this idea that everybody is entitled to their day in court, so to speak, and everyone is entitled to equal justice, and it doesn't matter what their station in life is, this concept of the rule of law, a society based on a system of justice that doesn't favor one side or another, and that it is so appropriate that our terrific District Attorney here in Nassau County be the lead witness.

And we welcome you, District Attorney Rice. We're so pleased that you're here.

D.A. RICE: Thank you very much, Judge.

I want to thank you Chief Judge Lippman, Judge Prudenti, former state bar president Ken Standard, for

your invitation to be here today and for your admirable concern for and dedication to our state courts' steadfast commitment to access, fairness and superior legal representation for all New Yorkers.

Some people out there may not understand how someone like me, a criminal prosecutor, fits into a proceeding like this, a hearing on civil court access and representation. Thankfully, under the guidance and with the vision of this esteemed panel, those of us in this room and those working on this issue across the state do understand why this issue matters to law enforcers and to progressive criminal justice policymakers like myself.

DAS like me are truly fortunate to have judicial and state bar leadership who understand the interplay and the connections between local and state public policy, our civil courts, our criminal courts and our various jurisdictional law enforcement and criminal justice theories. As our court leadership and like-minded advocates know, New York needs comprehensive, multi-disciplinary public policy responses to complex individual and family cases that in many instances will not only dictate the future of a life but also the safety of that person's community and family.

Our courts, both civil and criminal, often fall at the nexus of our government's public policy

breakdowns. They often serve as the last stop in a long, vulnerable, tortured road for someone who needs our help. They are frequently the setting for our community's last stop for helping litigants achieve remedy, the last stop for protecting members of our community from wrongdoing and from injustice.

Our courts in many ways also represent the pillars of our nation's greatest commitments, to fairness, to equality and to justice. They can also represent a microcosm of our state's unparalleled appreciation for reformation and transformation, for second chances, for dispositions that honor the wealth of the human contribution and the value of each person to our communities, no matter their condition, their past or their wealth.

Courts are the guardian of our nation's promise to value people more than it values politics, power or process. At the heart of that commitment is access, equal access, access without regard for wealth or social standing, court access and access to professional counsel, access and counsel that uphold the spirit of what we have promised to each other and what we say to the world, and access and counsel that acknowledge both the role the courts play in the lives of our people and also the unfortunate moments in their lives in which the

courts are of most importance.

Access to civil courts and legal counsel for indigent New Yorkers don't only uphold our commitment to fairness and justice, they also make more real our search for broader, more sustainable public policy solutions to some of New York's most vexing challenges. When this access is denied we have broken our promise to each other. We have failed to live up to the standard of our nation and of our social contract.

And let us be clear; when that access is denied or when professional assistance is made unavailable, we have made our communities weaker, more dangerous places. Because courts don't only serve as the last line of defense, they are also frequently the first line of security against victimization. They are also the first line of prevention against exploitation. They are frequently the first opportunity for remedy of what could eventually turn into a disaster. Courts are, therefore, not only the adjudication of public policy and societal failures, but also many times the gateway to them.

And that's why I'm here today, to support your attempts to shut down that gateway and reaffirm and support unfettered civil court access and legal representation as a way to turn lives around and strengthen New York communities. I am here to support a

theory and a belief that access to civil courts and legal counsel can often close that gateway to future personal or public safety crises for many New Yorkers.

Improved civil court access can make these courtrooms the first and the last stop for families in distress, rather than the first stop in what is all too often a long continuum of personal and community suffering. Access and quality representation for all of those in front of the court is at the heart of a preventative front-end public safety strategy.

As a DA, without such a strategy and without such civil court access and representation I can tell you that our communities will be more dangerous and will be eschewing a sustainable model with a long-term vision for a theory that will continue to repeat public policy failures at great financial and human cost to New Yorkers.

The most obvious scenarios in which civil court access and success can help dissolve future public and private crises centers around family settings. Whether they are matrimonial or Family Court proceedings or whether they are in integrated parts or child custody cases, these fluid, dynamic cases are frequently the first interactions with situations that can deeply disturb families and eventually pose grave safety risks

to the litigants involved.

We see the results of these failures in our domestic violence courts and in the victim care rooms of our child advocates and child abuse prosecutors. Failing these families and these children in civil court by not guaranteeing their access or their professional representation sews the seeds of future criminality, future criminality that will not only victimize those involved in these things but that will very often cascade down a violent spectrum, possible even to future generations.

Another typically civil court issue with a public safety impact is in housing. Foreclosed and abandoned homes erode the cohesion and physical state of safe neighborhoods and provide easy targets for those seeking illegal shelter or from those looking to steal from or vandalize these properties.

Access and professional representation in our civil courts can mitigate the impact of our nation's foreclosure crisis. This is a crisis -- make no mistake -- that has, unfortunately, hit our community here on Long Island especially hard. By guaranteeing access and representation to litigants in foreclosure situations, we can better help law-abiding families stay in their homes and we can keep neighborhoods cohesive,

The connections between family and housing

inhabited and vibrant. These qualities are frequently the cornerstones of neighborhoods that are also safe neighborhoods.

crises and the eventual crises in the public safety and criminal justice community are unmistakable.

Guaranteeing court access and representation at the earlier stages and the eventual outcomes of these legal matters are equally related. And that is why I'm here today, to make sure that our state understands these relationships, to make sure that we understand the opportunity we have in front of us and also the price we will pay for inaction.

The public safety price we will pay for eroding access and representations in these courts is steep and the moral price of such erosion is unaffordable. It is my sincere hope that other DAs will join me in supporting civil court access and guarantees of representation.

It's smart on crime, and it's this type of forward-thinking progressivism and comprehensive understanding of modern criminal justice theory that I believe will mark the future of the 21st century prosecutor's job.

Here in Nassau County I have tried to breath some of that preventative community-oriented progressive style into our local criminal justice system. Whether

it's our involvement in reentry for ex-offenders, our drug market diversion initiative -- which has since been adopted by DOJ -- our creation of a one-stop social service access point for the community, our mentorship programs, our development of a peer counseling network for those with justice system interactions, or whether it's our work with the court system in setting up a youth court or a veterans court, I want those allies and advocates of criminal justice reform, including improved civil court access and representation, to know that they have a partner in our county.

I am proud to support and defend civil court access because it fits in with our commitment to prevention, our need to address the root causes of crime and our focus on the type of long-term crime reduction strategies that, quite simply, work and that help us dismantle the revolving door system of decades past.

I want to thank you for your time here today, to this distinguished panel, and I want to thank you for coming to Nassau and hearing from us on the ground about how we can best keep our neighborhoods and our families safe. Thank you very much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, District Attorney Rice.

You really, I think, eloquently have described

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the connection between your role as the District Attorney and everything else in this community. Do you think you can be a District Attorney today without having this kind of wholistic approach, that tries to put the different pieces together that ultimately may result in the defendant who winds up in your courtroom? But in understanding how that all comes about, is that what being a District Attorney is today?

D.A. RICE: I can tell you that I don't know how you can be a District Attorney with any other philosophy in mind. You know, every single one of my colleagues, all 62 of us DAs throughout this state, are facing decreased resources and increased issues. And I think when you have a time like we are going through now, the worst thing that you can do is squander the opportunity that we have to all get on the same team, on the same page and work together so that -- I'm a big believer in front-loading, putting the money up front, because every dollar that you spend now is going to save immeasurable dollars down the road, whether it's the adolescent diversion part -- that, Judge Lippman, I give you enormous credit for starting, and I thank you for hearing my literal begging to allow us to have it here in Nassau County. It's using progressive policies, partnering with agencies that already exist, that have

the services that we need to get these early intervention programs off the ground so that we stop this cycle of recidivism, because that is the way that we keep crime down and we keep communities safe.

And I literally cannot think -- I don't understand the argument against or for precluding people representation when it comes to civil matters that I've discussed just here, just a handful of them, that have such a role in eroding families, eroding communities, eroding public safety. So I think it makes sense, and I think that a lot of my colleagues probably feel the same way. I'm proud to be the first one to come out and state this publicly.

I'm a firm believer in civil access to -because I think it makes sense. I think it makes my job
easier. I think it -- the cost, the human cost -- forget
about the financial cost, we don't know what the
financial cost will be. But at its core we have a moral
obligation, starting with kids at a very young age. So I
believe it's the only way to be a 21st century
prosecutor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you think particularly that this economy plays into all of this, that when you talk about civil access and people falling off a cliff, and God knows what happens, and some of them wind up in front

of our courts, and the District Attorney prosecuting, do you think the economy has had an impact on all of this?

In other words, is it more dangerous today not to provide civil legal representation to deal with so many of these problems than maybe in more plush times?

D.A. RICE: What the enormously difficult economic situation that we face right now has done is increased the need to offer civil access to people.

Because people are without jobs, they're facing losing their homes. There are so many issues that -- you know, look, I get it. When times are plush, you say, oh, everything is fine. But I truly believe that we are all going to be defined not just as professionals in public service but as human beings.

When we go to meet our eventual maker we're going to be judged not by how we treat each other during the good times, because that's easy. It's how we treat each other during difficult times. Unfortunately, economic crisis very often estops that whole conversation about coming up with creative solutions to problems, because it's all a money issue. I think we have to kind of reframe it and put it in terms of the human toll that it's taking and focus more on the fact that issues like public safety, that no one would really make the connection to if you're talking about civil access in a

vacuum -- people don't think that way.

So I think it's important for people in my position to come out and remind people about the nexus between the crises that families are facing all across this state and the issue of public safety that everyone cares about.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we've tried to make clear to our partners in government that now is the time when you need the funding for legal services, not the -- gee, times are tough we'd love to help you, but -- this is the time, because the impact is so much greater during these times.

One other question I have for you particularly. It's an issue that you spoke about in your comments but I think is so relevant to your particular role. And that's family issues, in particular domestic violence. And it's been our experience, and at least in the testimony that we've had in going around the state, that domestic violence issues don't exist in a vacuum, and domestic violence victims have just a panoply of civil legal crises in their lives that have to be addressed at the same time that there may be a criminal aspect in a domestic -- can you talk a little bit about that and what you see on that issue?

D.A. RICE: I can speak from personal -- I

think everyone can speak from personal experience. Each one of us, I'm sure, knows a family that has gone through a divorce, that implicates potential domestic violence issues, child abuse issues, custody issues. These are really, really complicated issues. And I can just, from my role as prosecutor in trying to get women the help that they need to address domestic violence issues, very often those issues are compounded by all of the other court appearances that they have to make and the lack of representation that they have. I think they all -- it all goes hand in hand.

And a loss in this whole thing is the victim's -- not only the victim's -- status of the person in the domestic violence situation, but the children that are the primary victims, in my opinion, of all of these issues.

I think that especially when it comes to domestic violence issues, because they are often coupled with all of the other civil legal proceedings that are going on, I can't think of an area where there is more of a desperate need for civil access to representation than in that area. You're dealing with so many family issues, individual issues, financial issues, physical safety issues.

And I get the whole, you know, concern with

money, money, money. But if we're not willing to invest now and show by our investment the value that we place on people and families -- you can have laws on the books and say this is what we care about. But in practice, in everyday dealing, if you are ignoring and not hearing the cries of families and individuals that are in need, then really what is it all worth?

So the investment that -- you used that word,

Judge Lippman, and I think it's a very important, if you

focus on that, how everyone gets it, if you're making an

investment now pays off in the future. That's where

people make investments. You don't invest in the stock

market and expect a return right now, you expect a return

20 years from now.

So it's bringing that whole issue home. But, yes, we see that issue very often, every day in our cases.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: From a practical perspective, how do you deal with that? What do you do with someone who comes to you on obviously a, you know, what could be a very, very serious criminal matter? Is there an infrastructure in Nassau County to get these people the vital legal service? What do your people do, who do they go to?

D.A. RICE: We created a place called The Safe

Place here in Nassau County. The whole concept behind that -- it was really incredibly groundbreaking -- was to address issues -- there's a first-time coalition between the organization that advocates on behalf of the domestic violence victims and child abuse victims. It's one-stop shopping; law enforcement, medical doctors, psychologists. Totally service-oriented.

But right now the only thing that we can do for someone who says, "I have a court date in civil court" is, "Go to the bar association and see if you can get representation there." Obviously we cannot get involved for the — obviously the ethical restrictions that we have in representing people in those matters. But that is really what we're left with.

And it's difficult, because very often they meet with an inability, they call up or they say, "No one's going to help me there." You know, because they're dealing with a lot of other psychological issues. And getting them -- our primary focus is to keep them involved in the case that we're trying to prosecute.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you can't do your job unless you get that kind of assistance.

D.A. RICE: They need the representation, and we just are not able to give it to them. We can help them, we can try to give them access to, you know, other

service providers that may be able to help them. But the only thing we can do right now is point them in the direction of the bar association.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Prudenti?

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Just one quick question,

District Attorney Rice. I'd like to take this

opportunity to commend you on these problem-solving

courts. And I know recently you were very supportive of

the veterans court that has been started here in Nassau

County. And I was wondering if your assistants have

reported back about how they feel that court is running,

as well as the need for representation of veterans in

that court.

D.A. RICE: Well, I'm happy to report that I think the part is going very well. I don't think that anyone doubts that there are specific issues. The whole goal behind it was to get people in services that they need.

Everyone knows how difficult it is for veterans coming back or veterans who have served stateside in terms of getting the services that they need. So I think it is going well. But, obviously, people who find themselves in that situation, a lot of veterans who are coming home are dealing with a lot of psychological issues as well as physical issues. They then often morph

into drug dependency, alcohol dependency, and that leads to the breakdown of the family and civil access necessitated in that respect, as well.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Have the assistants told you that these individuals are represented or are not represented?

D.A. RICE: Well, most of them are represented in criminal court, but again, a lot of them do have corresponding civil cases and they don't -- criminal defendants are specific practitioners. They don't often cross over into the world of marital issues or custody issues; things like that. So I think it's -- anyone who comes into the criminal justice system has the potential to need some kind of civil access and legal representation. My hands are tied. There's not much that we can do.

We try to -- this is why I think the specialty parts are so incredibly important, because it is -- as I talked about getting to the root causes of problems and crime, this is what we're talking about, addressing the specific day-to-day needs that people have in their individual lives and their family lives.

We're not talking about recreating the wheel, social services that our tax dollars pay for. What we don't pay for is civil access and legal representation.

And I think it's incredibly shortsighted not to, since we offer all of these other services. Yet in the one area where they actually need a professional to represent them -- because most of you people are not lawyers and don't know their way around the court system -- we are falling woefully short.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We heard testimony Tuesday in Syracuse about a lot of specialty legal service providers starved for funds but have sprung up just to serve the needs of veterans, because they have so many more problems coming out of -- not only medical ones that come out of their service, but so many related civil matters that particularly need representation.

D.A. RICE: You know, look, the veterans part, I think, is -- it's important that it be a success, because I think if you talk about how we want to define ourselves as a community, as a state, as a nation, if we can't protect those who risk their life on behalf of our democracy and us so that we can live our lives every day with the freedoms and the benefits that we do, shame on us.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I'm with you.

Ken Standard, do you have any questions?

MR. STANDARD: Yes, I do have one.

Thank you for coming here today and for having

LMP

such an encompassing view of your role and not viewing yourself as someone out there simply to prosecute people and do justice in that way, but looking at the bigger picture.

One of the long-term concerns that I've had has been with the collateral consequences of people becoming involved with the criminal justice system. And with your view I'm wondering if there is something that the District Attorneys Association -- and I understand you're going to be leading that association relatively soon -- could do with the defense bar, to be sure that criminal defendants, for example, are advised -- and I know we have limited civil legal services available -- but are advised of the consequences of a conviction, of a plea, and what that means for them in the future, and their reentry into the system and what that means about recidivism.

D.A. RICE: My office, the assistants that serve the great people of this county of ours here, know that it is incumbent upon them that any time there is an ancillary implication as a result of a conviction that they are to make sure that that is stated completely on the record in open court with the judge present. Because I just don't think that you can take -- you can assume that they are being given all of the information in ways

that convictions can possibly affect them. I don't know if you're also talking about in terms of record expunction?

MR. STANDARD: Records, loss of voting rights, employment opportunities lost.

D.A. RICE: Well, the one-shop stopping that I have set up in the Village of Hempstead is all about that. It is to help people who are trying to re-enter their communities and those who have never come into contact with the criminal justice system and want to prevent themselves from doing that. It's marrying them up with all the Social Services they have.

But I also came out in support very vocally of the concept of expunging defendants' records after a certain period of inaction in the criminal justice system, just for that reason, to allow them to go and get hired, get a job. I wrote extensively -- I was asked by a local lawyer here who was on the committee, the State Bar Association committee talking about the sealing of certain convictions, because I -- a misdemeanor conviction can prevent someone from getting a family-supporting job.

But, of course, under certain circumstances, if someone can stay out of trouble and they understand that there is this possibility for them to stay out of trouble

and have their record expunged, I think it's important that they know that up front and have that explained to them. Short of my assistants doing that, it really is up to -- I think we could probably do a better job working together with the defense bar to -- when you're working out a plea, as most cases are disposed of through pleas, where you make it very clear about what the ramifications are of a plea.

But I'm a big believer in giving people a second chance. I think that if people make a mistake and they've shown that they want to turn their life around, it's incumbent upon the community to do what we can to put them on the right track. Not for the rest of their life, I'm talking about giving them that hand to help them get up and back on track.

I think there are a lot of conversations going on about that right now, and I'm looking forward to being the head of the DA's Association next year. I'm serving as a deputy to Cy Vance right now and working on a lot of issues, some of which relate to what you're talking about. And hopefully the DA's Association will be able to come out and be a progressive voice in that area.

MR. STANDARD: Thank you. We're hopeful.

D.A. RICE: With me there will be, and with Cy.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Absolutely. I have no doubt.

I want to thank you, District Attorney Rice, for coming and talking to us and for being our lead witness, and for all the creative things you're doing here in the veterans court, adolescent diversion court, sex-trafficking part which will be opening soon. It's a pleasure to work with you. Thank you so much for being here.

D.A. RICE: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know that Judge Phoenix is here today somewhere. There she is. Norman St. George was here, Judge St. George. And the former president of the Nassau Bar, Doug Good, is here somewhere. Okay. And Judge Kase just walked in. Okay.

Our next witness, I'm so pleased, is Steve Bellone, the Suffolk County Executive. And I'd ask you to come into the witness box, County Executive.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: I'm not accustomed to this, judge.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I'm so pleased. I know the county executive for many years, and he is a creative and resourceful leader. And in his former roles I think we put a very effective community court out in Suffolk, and clearly an outstanding county executive who's dedicated to equal justice for all the residents of his county, and particularly, I think, so important in our state and in

all of the county, and particularly, I think, in Suffolk County and the economic crisis. He confronts every day the problems of people who need civil legal services, whether it be the roof over someone's head that's threatened, or their livelihood, or the physical safety or their right to entitlements. It's an everyday fact of life for the County Executive in a large, important county like Suffolk County.

So I'm so pleased that you're here. We're so pleased that you're here, and delighted to hear from you today.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Thank you very much, Chief Judge Lippman, and it is an honor to be before you in this setting. As you had mentioned, we've had the opportunity to work together, and you truly are an innovator.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: And your selection as Chief Judge, when it happened, I can tell you you couldn't have had a happier person than me knowing that you were leading our court system in New York. We are in very good hands as a result of that.

And Judge Prudenti, as well, it's great to see you, of course.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You like to see fellow Suffolk

County --

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Yes, even though we're in Nassau County.

Mr. Standard, a pleasure to be here with you.

Thank you for the invitation to join you this morning to talk about this very important subject.

Meaningful access to justice, which includes being represented by qualified and effective counsel, the ability to understand court proceedings, and the opportunity to have claims heard is of paramount importance to everyone for a number of reasons. Access to legal representation can be the difference between losing a home or keeping it, succumbing to an illness or obtaining a cure, remaining in an abusive marriage or finding refuge, or remaining hungry or securing food.

In most civil cases a person is not entitled to an attorney notwithstanding that civil actions can result in the loss of custody of a child, loss of a home, loss of some benefit that puts food on the table. Essentially we are talking about the essentials of life.

Many low- income individuals are not even aware that they have legal rights in our county or that an attorney can help them. Lawyers are critical to advise clients of their rights that they may not know they have and to help them navigate through our judicial system.

Lawyers can also help clients solve problems before they turn into court cases, saving time and money. Every day legal services are provided to individuals who can afford them, and low income people deserve those, as well.

Having unmet legal needs can impose substantial financial burdens on local, state and the federal government, and society as a whole. For example, the low-income person who's abused and unable to get a divorce and continues to live with the abuser may need emergency medical care at an emergency room that he or she cannot afford, with the taxpayers ultimately absorbing the cost of the medical expenses associated with that care.

Moreover, the county and/or state may have to pay for emergency shelter for a low-income person who was wrongfully evicted from his or her home as a result of having no legal representation and being unaware of his or her legal rights.

Providing legal services to the low-income community not only benefits those individuals but also benefits the courts and society as a whole, I believe. Said services help to do the following: Lower the incidence of domestic violence, as you were discussing; assist survivors of domestic violence to obtain protective orders; regain custody of children and obtain

child support; decrease the amount of pro se litigation in the courts, which is time-consuming for the adversary's attorney and, of course, as you know, the judge on those cases; help pro bono cases flow through the court system faster; save taxpayer money by lessening the reliance of low-income individuals on government assistance as a result of wrongful evictions, improper foreclosures, domestic violence and the like; lessen the financial strain on health care of the criminal justice system and the social welfare system; and lessen the strain on employers who experience decreased productivity and increased absenteeism due to employees' inadequate access to the courts.

With the 2008 collapse of the stock market and the economic crisis, the decline in Suffolk County has been severe, affecting all residents, both wealthy and poor. However, the poor, having been hit the hardest, are left with, among other things, being evicted from their homes, having their homes foreclosed upon, having to go on public assistance and/or being forced to discontinue health insurance.

In my former role as Supervisor of the Town of Babylon, in communities like Wyandanch I witnessed the aftereffects of the economic decline and the devastating impact that it had on that community. Suffolk County has

been one of the hardest hit counties in the state in the foreclosure crisis. According to the Federal Reserve Bank, as of March 2011, 12-1/2 percent of Suffolk County homes were seriously delinquent or in foreclosure already.

The situation is worse in poorer communities in Suffolk County, where the rate of homes with a mortgage that was seriously delinquent or in foreclosure was 20 percent. The impact upon these neighborhoods is severe, and overall property values suffer as a result. The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project analyzed the Department of Financial Services data on 90-day pre-foreclosure notices in 2011, and in its 2012 report found that 52,378 notices had been issued. Suffolk County had by far the highest number of notices issued in the downstate area, including all of New York City, Nassau and Westchester County, 15 percent of the statewide total.

The foreclosure crisis hits the low income population of Long Island in two ways. Those who purchased homes with unconventional mortgages or predatory mortgages during the mortgage are losing their homes in record numbers, at the same time non-delinquent tenants are being evicted from their homes because of foreclosures on their landlords.

According to the New York State Unified Court System's 2010 annual report, Suffolk County District Court handled over 10,000 evictions in 2010, the highest of any county or city outside of New York City. This statistic does not even include the case loads in the justice courts which exist in the five eastern-most towns in Suffolk County.

My County Attorney, Dennis Cohen, who is here, who served as a District Court Judge in Suffolk County and handled landlord-tenant matters, has informed me that tenants who were represented were much more likely to settle their cases, allowing them to remain in their homes for at least some period of time or to prevail at trial.

In addition, as a result of the economic downturn, county government is experiencing significant financial issues that are unprecedented. And I'm sure that is something that you've heard around the state. Sales tax revenues and mortgage tax revenues are down as people are not spending money or purchasing real estate as they would in normal economic times, while government health care expenses and pension costs continue to rise at enormous rates. In light of this fiscal dilemma, it is more difficult for the county to provide needed funding to support legal services programs.

But notwithstanding the economic challenges that we face, the County of Suffolk is and has been committed to providing the necessary funding to assure access to our legal system. And I'm keenly aware that the cost to run county government is lowered, and, therefore, the cost to the county's taxpayers is lowered by providing attorneys to those in need.

The following services are provided by the County of Suffolk in order to provide low income persons access to lawyers and our judicial system:

A pro bono foreclosure settlement conference project, where we commit \$45,000 to the Suffolk County pro bono foundation to provide assistance.

Elder law assistance, where we have a contract with Touro Law School to provide legal services for the elderly.

Child support services programs where the county has budgeted over \$45,000 for 2012 for paralegal services under the guidance of a panel of volunteer attorneys for all residents on matters of child support, enforcement of court orders for child support.

Other criminal and legal services that we provide, the county contracted with the Suffolk County Legal Aid Society in 2011 and 2012 for services for the needy, at a cost in excess of \$11 million each year.

In addition, since 2011 the county has contracted with Legal Aid to provide legal services for the poor through its defender advocacy program. The total county commitment there is over \$360,000.

And, additionally, the county on average commits approximately \$4 million each year towards the 18-B program for the retention of prior attorneys on those cases where Legal Aid has a conflict.

In an environment in which Suffolk County is facing and has faced this year a deficit in the hundreds of millions of dollars, unprecedented in the county's history, where virtually everything in county government has been cut, we are taking great pains to make sure that funding for Legal Aid and the associated funding like that has not been cut because of the importance. And we recognize the importance of that funding.

The county has a contract with Nassau-Suffolk Legal Services covering the period from 2012 to 2014 to provide legal services for Social Security housing, accessing medical care, Medicaid, food stamps, TANF, the mental health advocacy and family court representation where 18-B services and Legal Aid are not available. And nearly \$200,000 was budgeted for fiscal year 2012.

Judge Lippman, I want to commend you for requiring prospective lawyers to perform at least 50

hours of Legal Aid -- of law-related pro-bono services before being admitted to the New York State Bar. I believe this requirement could go a long way in providing low-income individuals with representation that they need.

In conjunction with this requirement, I wonder whether we can convince local law schools here on Long Island, and perhaps across the state, to create clinical programs which would represent low-income persons in civil matters and require all students to participate, while, of course, receiving credits for their work.

I'm a lawyer but I do not practice, as my county attorney reminds me when I offer legal opinions on some things in the county. I would have welcomed the requirement in law school that I participate in a clinic that would have provided me with real legal experience while at the same time helping those less fortunate navigate the legal system.

I want to thank you again for giving me the opportunity to participate in this hearing and to express my views and support on this very important issue. Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. And I'm so pleased that your testimony, which so recognizes -- what we've gotten from some people is, you know, times are

bad, we can't afford civil legal services. And the point is that access to justice is not a luxury that's only in good times.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I think you recognized it and made that connection. But maybe we can talk about it a little more, about the bottom line.

I think, you know, we had testimony in Albany from Steve Aquario, the Association of Counties, and he was making the same point that you're making. Maybe you could spell it out a little bit for our audience, that this is not just about that you feel an ethical obligation and a moral commitment to doing this funding, which I know you do --

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- and which we all feel, but that this idea that we try to get across, that for every dollar invested, you know, if we turn so much to our economy, that this -- putting everything else aside, a bottom line issue, that we estimate every dollar, that's a return for lots of reasons, because if you don't help people to deal with their life-threatening problems you have more homelessness, incarceration.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: That's right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're not getting entitlement

dollars from Washington that come into our state. But, literally, you believe that the economic health of the county is better by having an infusion of public funding, or whatever else is needed, or volunteerism, into representing those people who have these life-threatening legal problems?

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Judge, I think that's absolutely right. And I think it's probably a combination of those two things that is necessary to deal with the staggering problem that we face.

I think, first and foremost, it is the right thing to do, it is a moral issue, and I think that is important to state, and I do believe that it is important. But we have to justify to the entire county what we do and how we do it and how we spend every single taxpayer dollar.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: And what I have said, repeatedly, and what you were just speaking about, is that this makes financial sense for the county, that making this kind of investment at a local level or at the state level is critically important, because the impacts that have happened as a result of the economic downturn, the worst recession that we've had since the great depression, are felt in all the ways that you listed.

But oftentimes they're hidden costs because they're diffused throughout our system. And oftentimes the agency that is responsible for a certain function, the costs are resulting from another source or another agency.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: So, for instance, you know, the lack of legal representation may cause people to end up in emergency rooms. Well, that may not necessarily be an issue for the county, per se, in its bottom line this year. But that is a significant cost for all of us in Suffolk County and all of us across this state.

So I've always felt that we need to look at these problems in a comprehensive manner. You know, we have, obviously, different branches of government and many different levels of government. But I truly believe it is critical that we are working together and planning together, because each of the things that we do is different branches and different agencies impact each other. That's why I've been talking with our county attorney and working with Suffolk County court system to move more closely together, integrate some of our problems and work together.

The people that we are talking about, low

LMP

1 income individuals that have been impacted here, are the 2 same people that we see all the time in our social 3 services programs, that we see in many cases that are in the criminal justice system, that we deal with on parole. 4 5 So I think it is so important that we look at 6 these things wholistically and comprehensively, and when 7 we do that understand that we are doing something important and significant for taxpayers, because when we 8 provide those services like that we are reducing costs, 10 without question. 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I think, aside from -- I 12 think it's such an important issue to understand that 13 this is not the time to say we can't spend on civil, this is exactly the time to spend it. 14 15 I think your point about collaboration, and 16 certainly between the branches of government, is so true. And we talk about equal justice, while in some ways that 17 term, obviously -- justice talks about our court system. 18 You're in the business of equal justice, too. 19 20 COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Certainly. JUDGE LIPPMAN: And obviously what you're 21 22 trying to do as the executive in charge of your county. 23 COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: That's right. 24 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So I think we're all in this

together, which is the point which you so rightly make.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: I take that oath to the constitution as well, and I take that very seriously. You know, at the end of the day we want to do what's right for the county and what's the right thing to do.

And, you know, the District Attorney was here before and she's put forward some really innovative programs that we've used. I think she gets it and understands that we have to look at things in a comprehensive way and stop, you know, sort of working in vacuums.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly.

we do with the county don't impact the court system and vice-versa, and the things that happen in the state are not impacting at the local level. We have to think -- particularly in times when funding is limited and there isn't a lot of money, that we need to take that opportunity to figure out how we can do things better and more efficiently. I think the collaboration is important.

I'm looking forward to, as we've in the last nine months, my first nine months as county executive, been dealing with really on a crisis level, being able to get in and work with the court system more closely on these programs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Oh, we look forward to that, too.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Talk about collaboration, one other question. I see the dean of Touro Law School, Patty Salkin, is And we're hoping that -- they're one of the two in the state that require pro bono work. But we really are hoping with the new 50-hour requirement sort of highlights everyone's sensitivity to this issue to have collaborations between the local law schools, particularly out here, where you have Touro and you have Hofstra down here in Nassau County, to provide the kind of assistance that may be, if there are limited public dollars and we're all trying to get as much as we can get. But I think that's an area that's so ripe in this economy, and, again, emphasis on pro bono. And I know with you as the County Executive and Dean Salkin, who I know so well for many years, this will be a great alliance, I think, in terms of helping the county.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: I agree. And Touro Law School has been at the forefront of this, and we've enjoyed a great partnership with them. And I think, as you said, with this new commitment of 50 hours that there's going to be opportunities for even deeper collaboration that I think will be beneficial for everybody.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know it and I hope so.

Judge Prudenti?

JUDGE PRUDENTI: Well, I concur, and I have to just say, County Executive Bellone, I want to thank you for your commitment to maintaining the legal services as existing and expanding upon them. I couldn't be more delighted with your choice of county attorney, because he'll will always be Judge Cohen to me.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: You know, I have to work with him. Thank you, Judge.

tell you, as we're preparing our budget to go forward for the next year, and in that budget, as you know, the Chief Judge is so committed to our civil legal services, that we are going to be requesting some additional moneys for civil legal services. And I would just ask you and your county attorney, if you have any questions, we need your support, we ask for your support, but if you have any questions with regard to that budget, please don't hesitate to contact me. And I would love to share any information that we have about what we've done in the past with that legal service money and what we plan to do in the future.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Thank you, Judge.

And I would say the same thing; anything that we can

provide in terms of assistance or support or answering questions, we're prepared and ready to do so.

JUDGE PRUDENTI: I appreciate that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Mr. Standard, do you have anything?

Bellone.

MR. STANDARD: I have one question for you, Mr.

I want to congratulate you on what you've been doing. But what's your secret? How have you gotten the voters in Suffolk County to support what you've been doing in light of the economic situation that we're in?

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Stay tuned, they haven't had an opportunity to vote again. We will see.

But I've always felt that you cannot just, as a leader, say this is the right thing to do, therefore we're doing it, that you have to take the time to explain to people why it makes sense, and why not only is it the right thing to do but that it makes sense for our community and our society. And I think when you take the time to do that -- and we did this in Babylon, where we've made huge investments in Wyandanch, the most economically distressed community on Long Island, and we had widespread support for those investments from the communities throughout Babylon. The reason was we took the time to explain why this is not just about investing

1 in Wyandanch, which is the right thing to do and 2 important in and of itself, but that it affects you and 3 your family and your property values. MR. STANDARD: Out in East Hampton? 5 COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: I didn't quite make 6 the argument that far when I was in Babylon. But that's 7 exactly right. I always made the case that what happens on the east end and the investments out there, even 8 though Babylon, we're a fully developed town, investing 10 in open space even though we don't get those dollars, it 11 makes sense. I really believe that we do best when we 12 think of our systems as integrated systems and not 13 separated. 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I want to thank you, County 15 Executive Bellone, for coming and for all you're doing in 16 this critical area, in these really very difficult economic times for all of us, and for -- again, for lack 17 of a better word -- for your wholistic view on this issue 18 and on collaborative issues for all of us working 19 20 together, and we really appreciate it, and it's such a 21 delight that you're here today. 22 COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Thank you, Judge. 23 It's an honor, and thank you for your leadership. 24 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE: Thank you.

1 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Appreciate it. 2 I note that Anne Erickson, who thinks she's leaving the room, who's on the task force -- I want to 3 make sure and introduce her. Now, Anne, you can do what 5 you have to do. 6 Our next witnesses will be an immigration and 7 language access panel, and we have: Martha Maffei, Executive Director of the Services For the Advancement of 8 Women, SEPA Mujer, Inc.; Rose Leandre, Executive Director, Haitian American Cultural and Social 10 11 Organization, HASCO; Alizabeth Newman, Director of 12 Immigrant Initiatives and Clinical Professor of Law at CUNY Law School. 13 Great to have you all here. Why don't we start 14 with Martha Maffei. Am I pronouncing it right, Martha? 15 16 MS. MAFFEI: Yes. 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're on, Martha. 18 And don't feel, with any of the witnesses, 19 don't feel that you have to read your prepared statement. 20 We've read it already. You can just tell us, you know, what you're here to say and we'll ask you a few 21 22 questions, and however you'd like to proceed. 23 Martha. 24 MS. MAFFEI: Thank you very much for having me 25 here today to address the concerns from my community.

I am Martha Maffei. I am Executive Director at Services for Advancement of Women, a Latina immigrants rights organization. We are located at the advocacy center of Touro Law in Central Islip.

In addition to the community education and empowerment to Latina women, we also offer legal assistance for survivors of domestic violence through immigration relief, like self-petition under the Violence Against Women Act and U-Visas. I will say that 99 percent of my clients, they have limited English proficiency, and 40 percent of them have a minimum education and have problems even in their own language.

Every day I hear the complaints, frustrations and confusion of my clients after they go to Family Court. As we all know, understanding the court system is hard for anyone, but it's worse for someone who is suffering domestic violence, because many times they are still intimidated by the abusers and threatened with deportation. The lack of sufficient number of attorneys, advocates, and interpreters means the women cannot express themselves, don't understand the process, and often give up because of continued threats from the abuser. These pressures combined often mean that those who most need assistance are not getting served.

The lack of communication for those with

1	limited English proficiency make an already difficult
2	task harder. When victims go to court they are seeking
3	protection, and safety is the forefront of their minds.
4	They are worried if they can key keep the children with
5	them and how they will be able to raise them. They are
6	not thinking about how to explain the situation in a
7	foreign language because their emotional state does not
8	allow it. When they are unavailable to communicate what
9	happened in the home leading to the need of protection,
10	many cannot use the process. If these woman had an
11	attorney in court with them, this kind of situation would
12	not happen.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: How many attorneys do you work
14	in the office?
15	MS. MAFFEI: How many what?
16	JUDGE LIPPMAN: How many attorneys do you have?
17	MS. MAFFEI: We have we work with pro bono
18	attorneys.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: In all, how many volunteers?
20	MS.MAFFEI: We have five pro bono attorneys,
21	immigration attorneys.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And they all have their own
23	private practice and they're doing it on their own?
24	MS. MAFFEI: One of them were some of them
25	are private practice. The chief of my Alizabeth

Newman, she is director of CUNY law school. And we also work with pro bono students from the Touro Law that they are willing to help our organization.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you really depend on probono work?

MS. MAFFEI: That's true.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Go ahead.

MS. MAFFEI: Even if a woman can speak some English, her communication is not likely to be fluent and much will get lost. She will not have limited her information to the parts of her story that she does have the vocabulary for, which means that the judge will hear a very distorted, partial and often toned-down version of the facts.

Judges can also be frustrated by the lack of communication and may think a woman is uncooperative. I remember a case in which a woman was seeking for an order of protection. Her children had been taken away because of the domestic violence inflicted on her by her husband. The judge asked where the children were, and the mother answered day care. The judge got very angry. And the advocate said, I think she means foster care. The mother was trying to participate but was unable to come out with the right word because of the language barrier.

Women with limited English proficiency cannot

fully protect their rights in court with the assistance of an attorney, interpreter and bilingual advocate. And certainly when the abuser is also present and is proficient in English, he's usually advantaged in the process. His story may often seem more plausible, not necessarily because it's true, but because he can express himself more clearly and has a stronger grasp on the process.

In addition to the difficulty of expressing herself without an attorney or a bilingual advocate, the lack of a lingual information often impedes an applicant's ability to use the Court process. Many times orders of protection fail because the clients had no -- doesn't know how to fill out an application, and there is nobody available to explain it to them. Women do not have a basic understanding of the Court procedures and don't know what constitutes a family offense, much less how to meet the legal elements of claim. There is little information given to women on what to expect in the process.

I remember a time where a woman filled out a request for an order of protection in Spanish and it was only noted when the judge got it in his hands. This women was waiting for a whole day in that court, and finally when she saw the judge he told her, you have to

go back to the clerk's office. Many women who are seeking help at the court without counsel have to go back two or three days and nobody helps them.

Only after failing to get relief, women come to SEPA Mujer, where they are fully described their situation in their native language. Sometimes our staff is able to accompany women back to court or provide referrals to an attorney at Nassau-Suffolk Legal Services. However, these referrals are not enough because Nassau-Suffolk Legal Services doesn't have enough staff, and unfortunately there are not enough attorneys to fully explain the court process to them. This extra service must be provide by our already overextended nonprofit because it is basic information not being provided by the Court in Spanish.

To file for custody in the Family Court, clients are advised by court personnel to bring someone to speak English. Otherwise they are often unable to file for custody due to the shortage of bilingual assistance. This is a huge problem because most of our clients don't have anyone that is fluent in English who they can trust and who can leave work or family responsibilities to help her.

My clients often reported that when they approach personnel in court to ask for information, the

staff member simply chants at them, English, English, English, adding a hostile tone to the already difficult language barrier. Again, with an attorney or a bilingual advocate, this kind of difficult situation would not take place.

Lastly, many women with limited English proficiency are immigrants who are still being harassed by their abusers. Several women have simply given up on petitions for child support in order to stop abuse or harassment. It is common that when the courts serve an abusive father with papers to pay child support, he finds ways to harass the mother in retaliation. While technically it is not requested from her, the abuser knows that she has initiated the process. The difficulty that women with significant language barriers face when using the court system without representation of an attorney and with the continuing threats of the abuse or harassment prevent many women from using the legal system.

In addition, my clients said that some attorneys who were not working through Nassau-Suffolk Legal Service, private attorneys, they are advising to stop requesting custody of their children or to not pursue an order of protection because of lack of immigration status. When we work with our local civil

legal service office this does not happen, so we need to make sure that our vulnerable clients receive counseling from lawyers who are trained to bridge the gap between Immigration Law and the New York State family law.

From SEPA Mujer's perspective, the best way to do this is, one, greater support for civil legal services, and, two, more training for attorneys. When there are not enough attorneys, competent interpreters and advocates for women suffering from domestic violence, the costs are high. Women suffer because they cannot protect their children, their homes or their safety. Courts suffer because they cannot make accurate findings and because the community loses faith in the justice system.

I still have faith in the justice system. This is why I'm here today. I know that the provision of adequate services to immigrant women suffering from domestic violence is critical, and I applaud Chief Judge Lippman for opening this dialog and giving us the opportunity to speak for my community that I represent. I know you will pay attention to these issues that I bring here today. I would be willing to help you, and I look forward to working with you. And thank you very much for this opportunity.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you for being here.

1 Appreciate it. 2 So really the problem is the language problem mixed with, obviously, a lack of knowledge of the legal 3 process. So it's -- we have to attack both of those 5 problems together. 6 MS. MAFFEI: Yes, and the big gap that exists 7 between Immigration Law and New York State Family Law, that has created fear to women to apply for --8 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We have heard that in other 10 cases. 11 MS. MAFFEI: It's very hard when I hear a woman 12 that calls me back to let me know that she was advised, 13 don't apply for an order of protection. They already have had many, many difficulties in their life, lost 14 15 their apartment, don't have transportation, don't have 16 the language. Some much of them, much of them, they are living in shelters. They don't know where to go and they 17 18 don't have protection. JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's kind of -- in addition 19 20 to the legal and the language barriers, there's also -they need nurturing, they need emotional support. 21 22 MS. MAFFEI: Yes. 23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: They're hesitant to -- they 24 need bilingual advocates. 25 MR. STANDARD: Attorneys, interpreters.

1 noticed to get equal justice. 2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But in your particular organization, you're very dependent on volunteerism as 3 opposed to help from a provider directly, where those 5 moneys -- and, you know, we're trying to do both, to 6 increase the public funding so that the providers can 7 specialize in different areas like the one you're talking about, and yet at the same time emphasize the importance 8 of pro bono work and volunteerism. And that's what we're trying to do with the law students. And you have some of 10 11 them, probably a perfect example of where it can work --12 MS. MAFFEI: That's right. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- with supervision, assisting people with these kind of very difficult life crises that 14 15 they have. 16 MS. MAFFEI: That's right. 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you. 18 MS. MAFFEI: Thank you very much. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 20 Okay, now, Rose Leandre from the Haitian American Council. 21 22 MS. LEANDRE: Good morning. Thank you for the 23 invitation to be able to speak to you all today regarding 24 this important issue.

As you said, my name is Rose Leandre, and I'm

1	the Executive Director for the Haitian American Cultural
2	and Social Organization, d/b/a HACSO Community Center.
3	HACSO was founded back in 1974 to serve the needs of the
4	immigrant community in Rockland County. Our mission has
5	expanded to serve immigrant and low income families that
6	are underserved in the county.
7	Our mission is to partner with existing
8	services, including civil legal services, to increase
9	access to immigrants with language and cultural barriers
10	and families that are underserved.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you work with providers?
12	MS. LEANDRE: Yes.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Providers help your
14	organization?
15	MS. LEANDRE: Yes. We do referrals, we refer
16	we're a multiservice organization. We're mostly a
17	social service organization. So families come to us with
18	diverse needs.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But that's so important, and we
20	want people to understand that. People will come to an
21	organization like yours, people will come to the church.
22	MS. LEANDRE: Yes.
23	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But they're dealing with
24	problems that you're not
25	MS. LEANDRE: Exactly.

1 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- totally fit to work with 2 them on, because you need that legal assistance. MS. LEANDRE: Yes. 3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's what we're trying to 5 In so many different aspects of life people have 6 problems, they don't know where to turn, but they turn to 7 sympathetic entities, whether it be an organization like yours, the church, whoever they might come to. And there 8 needs to be off-ramps to go to a provider where you can 10 send them to be helped on that. 11 MS. LEANDRE: Yes. And I'm very excited to be 12 here today because of that specifically, really just to 13 make the connection of the importance of having bilingual, bicultural civil legal services for 14 underserved communities. 15 16 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So not any provider can help you if there's that language issue; right? 17 MS. LEANDRE: It's very difficult. 18 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Or you need to have an 19 20 interpreter. 21 MS. LEANDRE: An interpreter, which kind of 22 opens up the door for a lot of other complications 23 sometimes. 24 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But if you have a lawyer who 25 speaks the language, it's really a tremendous asset.

1	MS. LEANDRE: You know, in my testimony I have
2	a couple of examples of organizations that we've
3	partnered with as a result of support, and hopefully
4	continued support, for their legal services, to be either
5	able to hire or maintain existing bilingual providers
6	that we have on staff, that we're losing because of
7	budget cuts.
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's not so simple to just
9	say, okay, we're going to give money to a provider, or
10	we're going to get a volunteer. It has to
11	MS. LEANDRE: Or an interpreter. Exactly.
12	JUDGE LIPPMAN: It has to fit into your needs.
13	MS. LEANDRE: Exactly.
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think that's the point.
15	There's so much need but in so many different forms.
16	MS. LEANDRE: Yes.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we have to be able to
18	target the services, whether it's coming from a provider
19	or coming from a pro bono basis, that meets the
20	particular need at issue.
21	MS. LEANDRE: Yes. Yes.
22	You know, I couldn't I wouldn't be leaving
23	here too happy if I didn't provide some specific
24	statistics in terms of the changes in the population that
25	we're seeing.

1 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Please do. Sure.

MS. LEANDRE: Rockland County is considered to be one of the smallest counties in New York State.

However, it is the 13th largest -- has the 13th largest population in the world ---in New York State outside of the boroughs of New York City. And 11.4 percent of Rockland County's residents, which is about 33,000 people, live below the poverty level. And it's up 9.5 percent from -- in 1999, 9.5 percent. It's up from that.

According to the 2010 American Community
Survey, 23 percent of Rockland's population was foreign
born, with more than 31 percent of its people entering
the United States in the year 2000 and later.

In addition to that, according to the 2008-2010 ACS survey, in the village where our organization actually operates, 48 percent of the population of that village is made up of immigrants, people with language and cultural needs.

Between 2000 and 2010, in the Latino population only there was an increase of 145 percent in that village. The county of Rockland's linguistically isolated households grew 99 percent from 1990 to 2009. That just shows the drastic changes in the population that we're dealing with and the need for having linguistically and culturally appropriate legal services.

99 percent of our clientele, they need -- even though we're a social service organization, they come to our office with a multitude of civil legal services needs, to include eviction, mortgage modification, Social Security disability issues, unemployment issues, divorce, domestic violence, landlord-tenant, and immigration services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think the list of problems that you raise demonstrates that this is not only about lawyers to go into court with people, many of the problems never go to court.

MS. LEANDRE: Exactly.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Their entitlements, or they're dealing with a bureaucracy, or whatever it might be. So it's not this vision that the only thing that's involved here is getting a lawyer to accompany you to court, it's really just one part of this.

MS.LEANDRE: You know, we talk about investment into prevention, and having local civil organizations, and I'll bring a perfect example.

In Rockland County we have the Legal Aid

Society of Rockland County. We work a lot with them. 90

percent of our referrals are made to that organization.

And they actually had a Creole-speaking -- and make sure
that they hired a Creole speaking attorney. They have

Spanish-speaking attorneys to help with the process,

understanding the dynamics of the community. And most of the issues result in having attorneys understanding the issue and getting these referrals in advance and being able to call the landlord and try to stop an eviction before a family of four is out on the street with five children. And now trying to, with the cost of living in Rockland County, trying to rehouse them, when it's just a matter of I just had a job, I had an emergency, I need a couple of months to make up my rent arrears. And it has proven to work a lot.

I mean, I have examples in terms of mortgage modification. I have an example of a woman, we're talking about, again, going back to, you know, dealing with immigrants. She was married here. Somehow her husband was able to get a divorce outside of the country, that she was not aware of. Her mortgage — the mortgage is under the husband's name but the deed of the house is under both their names. And being able to get a modification — because now she's living in the house with her children, and the husband is not paying the mortgage, and she's having a hard time getting a mortgage modification.

I don't want to compare the importance of having Legal Aid to a private attorney, I don't want to go into this, but being able to come into our office

cannot resolve her issue. But being able to say, here, call this organization, they will sit with you and figure it out. And they had to work with divorce, Family Court, in addition to her coming just for a modification.

So, again, having that entity -- and we do get a lot of support. We work a lot with the Empire Justice System. They do legal clinics for us. We have a lot to do with TPS, so they do a lot of legal -- we get a lot of pro bono service, but having an entity that we're able to refer people to certainly makes a big difference.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.

MS. LEANDRE: Other issues, I mean, I don't want to give a bunch of examples, but it's very, very, very important. We have clients that are preyed upon. They're charged exorbitant fees when they try to access legal services, and they're taking away money from food and shelter to pay, because they're not -- you know, they're not aware that they may be eligible for free civil legal services.

So having entities involved in the community, making outreach, educating people so people can access and not have to take food and shelter money away from the children to pay for civil legal services, it is -- it becomes beyond civil legal services, it becomes an economic issue, where spending exorbitant money or

1 waiting until the problem becomes worse impacts their 2 economics also. 3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: No question. MS. LEANDRE: Also basic survival, life skills 5 are impacted for -- by not having civil legal services. 6 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank so much. 7 And, you know, I think it graphically illustrates the testimony of the problems, and they're 8 multifaceted and not so easy to resolve, and we've got to 10 target where the need is. 11 I now ask, Professor Newman, to hear your 12 thoughts. 13 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: I hope you didn't get tired of hearing the thanks from the presenters, but I'm 14 honored to be here today and a part of this fantastic 15 16 effort that you've been leading for the past several years to address this really important issue. So thank 17 18 you. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 20 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: So, again, you know, my testimony will focus on one of the most vulnerable groups 21 22 to go without representation, those with limited English 23 proficiency, an immigrant. 24 While I understand that immigration and civil 25 services are not a part of this being federal, the

1 intersection area that was mentioned becomes really, 2 really important, and I'd like to highlight that for you. So first a couple of statistics, as well. 3 New York State the percent of the population with limited 5 English proficiency is now about 15 percent. Nearly a 6 third of families in New York State speak a language 7 other than English in their homes. And about more than 8 percent of New York State households are considered 8 linguistically isolated, meaning that no adult in the household is proficient in English. And that's at least 10 11 double what the national rate is for New York State. JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is there a co-- do those 12 13 statistics coalesce with poverty statistics? Are a great part of that population of very limited means, or we 14 don't really have the correlation? 15 16 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: I don't know. I'd have to look into it. But I would assume that there is a 17 correlation. 18 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: To at least some significant 20 degree. PROFESSOR NEWMAN: I think also our immigrant 21 22 population is also growing. Statewide we're at about 21

population is also growing. Statewide we're at about 21 percent. Nassau and Suffolk counties, I think, are about 20 percent and 15 percent. I think New York City statistics, were I think this was a combination of

23

24

immigrant and their offspring, are up to 55 percent of New York City's population. So it's --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a very diverse state, and becoming more so.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes. And particularly for immigrants, there's a large -- there's many types of cases in which the immigration status itself becomes part of the civil proceedings. I think it's very important that counsel -- that they have counsel to be able to contextualize that for the Court and make sure that the opposing party isn't, you know, exploiting that in a way that doesn't really make sense.

when it went really badly and another time where it went much better. So in one case, a custody dispute, and the father was bringing a petition for custody, stating that the fact that his wife was in removal proceedings, the new deportation proceedings, that meant that she was about to be deported, and so he wanted custody. And the Family Court Judge was alarmed at the situation and said that she would wait for the Immigration Court to finish its proceedings before she made a determination, because it was important for her to know.

Meanwhile, back in the Immigration Court, the Immigration Judge wanted to hold off on the results

because he was weighing different factors of hardship, including the hardship to the U.S. citizen child, and all of the factors when that judge was making a determination on whether or not to give the mother legal permanent resident status. So the two courts were waiting for each other.

Fortunately, she was represented and was able to convince the Family Court Judge that, A, as scary as removal proceedings sound, first, they could take years and nothing is imminent, and, second, it's actually an opportunity to present relief. It doesn't mean that you're about to be dragged out.

So the Family Court Judge was willing to make a decision based on the facts of the family presented before her, knowing that she could give the right to either party to come back to the court if there was a drastic change in circumstances. So that turned out very well. The judge made a decision in the Family Court giving the mother custody, and the Immigration Judge also gave her status.

Where it can be stickiest, I think, is in situations of domestic abuse. And this is something that Martha Maffei had referenced. So in general immigration law, if an immigrant marries a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident, it's the spouse with status that has

almost total control of the petitioning process, so they can decide whether to petition, if they're ever going to petition, or to stop that petition midstream.

And so if you superimpose a situation of domestic abuse, you have a recipe for disaster. And, unfortunately, it's very common for abusers in that situation to use -- to leverage the immigration status, to say, if you tell anybody about the abuse I'll have you deported. If you don't drop that civil suit for child support you're going to lose your work authorization and you'll never see your kids again. It's very effective. Doesn't leave any visible marks. And often times the judge isn't going to be aware that that's going on behind the scenes.

So without counsel, you have a terrible situation where the courts are actually becoming an instrument of abuse unknowingly.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What does the law school do, in terms of your particular area of initiatives, to deal with these kind of situations? Where do you go? Do you get from your own resources within the law school, do you reach out to the bar? How do you help people in these situations?

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: So first CUNY law school has a particular mission towards public interest that

attracts students who are like-minded. So we have a very active student body. I teach in the clinical program, and one thing that we do is, in addition to teaching the traditional litigation skills, all of our students take on community projects. And so this definitely is one area that — the area of gender violence and immigration has been an area that I've been working in for many, many years.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Who oversees the kids?

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: I would.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You would oversee on these types of issues?

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes. And we also create partnerships with many small organizations. Usually we've found not so much legal services necessarily, although we do support legal services groups, but we like to work with ethnic-based groups that have the trust of the community and then capacitate them with the legal parts that they don't necessarily have. So the combination of doing community education, working with the staff of the organizations to make sure that they can recognize the different beliefs, and doing the legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: This is exactly -- the kind of programs that I think are second nature to you at CUNY

are exactly what we'd like to have all the law schools doing. So we're not talking about, when we put in this 50 hour requirement that the people do 50 hours and they meet their requirement, but more a recognition of how important pro bono work is to this next generation of lawyers so it's built into their DNA.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes.

And I think, too, like previous panelists had said, not just the pro bono work, but if we're really going to reach into these very, very vulnerable populations, to work through the organizations that already know the community and can fill in the cultural pieces.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Cultural and, obviously, the language pieces.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes, obviously.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That is so critical to this.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes.

I don't know if I -- I should go through this, since it's in my testimony. Just other examples of when abusers who are citizens can use the element of status very effectively.

You know, in one case, in addition, the abuser had him and his wife arrested for a shoplifting charge, and then he told her that it was all resolved and she

didn't need to go back to court. Unknowingly, there was
an outstanding warrant. So he learned that. When she
finally left him he used this when she was presenting a
case for an order of protection in Family Court pro se.
He was resourced, hired an attorney to go in, adjourn the
proceedings while he called ICE, the immigration
enforcement branch. And they're thinking, oh, we have a
fugitive here, I have an outstanding warrant. They
showed up in Family Court and arrested her and whisked
her off to a detention center out of state, leaving an
elderly mother and three children. We were able to come
in and get her out.
But there's so many times when the abusers can

But there's so many times when the abusers can try to use the court system against their spouses, and it makes such a difference for the courts to be aware, to know what to ask and to have counsel to --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And that also borders on the issue that Mr. Standard asked before, on the criminal things with the collateral consequences issue. Same milieu, that immigration problems are used as a weapon --

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- in one fashion or another.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It gets very complicated and we need legal services to help.

1 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Right. My point exactly. 2 So in juxtaposing that in another case that --I love the decision from a Bronx Family Court Judge who, 3 after the U.S. citizen's spouse, insisting on bringing up 5 the wife's status throughout, started to inquire, and why 6 is she undocumented, let's look at this. In fact, he was 7 the cause of that, that he stopped the proceeding -stopped sponsorship. So she actually was savvy about it 8 and cited that fact of him interrupting the relationship between the mother and child as a negative factor in the 10 custody dispute. So when it works well, it works well. 11 12 JUDGE LIPPMAN: What part of the SUNY -- CUNY 13 curriculum is a clinical program? I know you have an awful lot because --14 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: We do. And we have a 15 16 requirement, every student who graduates with -- has to do a clinical program. So we have students for at least 17 one semester, and in my clinics it's two semesters, 8 18 credits each. So it's a significant time to work with 19 20 the family, be with them, to be able to hone their skills, show different ways --21 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You say most of the kids at 23 CUNY do either series of clinics or internships, 24 externships?

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes. It's a requirement for

1 graduation. 2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: The clinical? PROFESSOR NEWMAN: Yes. 3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good. 5 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: If I might say one more 6 thing. 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure, go ahead. PROFESSOR NEWMAN: So in experimenting over 8 much time with how to meet the needs in the different communities, one thing I'd like to open up is the 10 11 possibility of New York State revising the ethical code 12 to expand the possibility of more services. And I'll 13 explain what I mean. So where there's a group of people that have 14 15 similar claims -- say 12 new people walk in with housing 16 problems to Legal Aid. Either they've got to wait for the already burdened attorneys to get to that part of the 17 waiting list or train pro bono counsel to volunteer. 18 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right. 20 PROFESSOR NEWMAN: But the possibility of working with them in group -- and it's something that 21 22 I've been working with and having to be very careful, of 23 course, with regard to confidentiality and of the other 24 obligations of an attorney.

Now, in some places New York State's ethical

1 code has already been revised as far as conflict checks 2 for pro bono counsel, where it doesn't make sense, as far as giving some assistance and letting the person go pro 3 There are different places where we've been 5 tweaking. I would encourage us to look a little more 6 about that. 7 For example, those 12 people, if we could work with them in a group to at least do some of the education 8 that an attorney would do individually, if we can work with them on what type of evidence they're going to need 10 and why, what elements that meets, and help them do data 11 collection --12

> JUDGE LIPPMAN: It gets very interesting. you have anything in writing?

PROFESSOR NEWMAN: I do. There's an article that I wrote last year. It works particularly with domestic violence survivors, where in addition to efficiency it also gives some of that support to help them not give up in the process, it's too hard.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Send it to me and send it to Elaine Barnett, head of the task force, and we can take a look at that.

Judge Prudenti?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE PRUDENTI: No.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Mr. Standard?

Civil Legal Services Hearing 1 MR. STANDARD: No. 2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great battle. Thank you so 3 much. Appreciate it. The next panel is dedicated to collaboration. 5 We're not going to go to the collaboration panel next, 6 we're going to go to the judges' panel. So can we have 7 Judge Diamond, Judge Hinrichs, Judge Phoenix and Judge 8 Fairgrieve, come on up. And then we'll go to the collaboration panel. 10 As unaccustomed as you are to being in the 11 witness box, we'll see if we can make this work. 12 Standard is particularly anxious to see you all in the witness box. So watch out for cross-examination. 13 I think what some people don't always 14 15 16 17

understand is the impact of the lack of legal services on judges in the courtroom and how it affects the whole process of our justice system. And so we have four judges today who are going to give us an idea of how this all fits together. And we're going to start, unless you have any prescribed order, we'll start with Arthur Diamond.

Judge, a pleasure to see you. Judge Diamond is a Justice of the Nassau County Supreme Court and a member of the New York State Judicial Advisory Counsel.

Judge Diamond.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 JUDGE DIAMOND: Yes. Good morning. Thank you 2 for inviting me. As you said, I'm in my 9th year on the bench, 3 and I just -- I don't want to be rude, but I have a jury 5 deliberating so I'm going to excuse myself after I 6 finish, if that's okay. 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You are absolutely excused. Tell us -- you don't have to read the testimony. Tell us 8 what your thoughts are. JUDGE DIAMOND: I read the testimonies of some 10 11 previous people, and the one area that I would like to 12 spend my few minutes on is the area of quardianships, and 13 indigent people who are the subject of Article 81 proceedings. 14 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right. 16 JUDGE DIAMOND: I won't use shorthand, but I'm 17 going to assume that both of you understand the mechanics 18 of the Article 81 proceedings. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Definitely. 20 JUDGE DIAMOND: Okay. So we have real difficulties in three scenarios. 21 22 The first scenario is where the alleged 23 incapacitated person from the outset, when the petition 24 is brought, we have no money to appoint a court 25 evaluator. Now, we do have a public quardian program,

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I'll talk about that in a minute. So our initial option is to appoint Mental Hygiene Legal Service as evaluator to report to us. If we do that, there is no money to appoint counsel if the alleged incapacitated person requests counsel. So a person with Alzheimer's in a hospital or a nursing home who requests counsel in a period of lucidity when they're served with the petition, then can't get counsel because we have no money to appoint and we need Mental Hygiene Legal Services to serve as evaluator. If we appoint them as counsel then we have no money to appoint an evaluator. Without an evaluator we don't have access to medical records, we don't have access to doctors, we don't have access to neighbors or assets. It's a terrible, deprived -terrible deprecation of a right for these people who are often not of sound mind or body. So that's the first instance where we may not have an evaluator.

The second instance is where we find somebody to be a personal guardian, to make personal decisions, but we can't get the person a property manager because our public guardian program will not be co-guardian with someone. So now we have no assets, so I can't appoint a special guardian to go out and get the person even qualified on Medicaid. So the person's in a nursing home or a hospital, can't get benefits that they may be

entitled to, can't get on Medicaid, and I have no money to appoint a guardian for them. Again, it's a very, very difficult issue.

The third example, and one that is, unfortunately, becoming increasingly difficult, is where we have a poor person who has no one. So we have no money, they're in a nursing home or a hospital, long-term, no prospect of coming out. Public guardian will not take them because they're not in our community. They will not take someone who's in a facility. So if you have no money to appoint an evaluator, personal or property guardian, and the person is totally alone in the world, sometimes can't communicate to anybody because they're either —

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

JUDGE DIAMOND: And so now the facility wants us to appoint a property guardian to get them on Medicaid or other benefits. We have no money to appoint someone.

I have recently at a -- really, I'll say, out of sheer frustration begun to appoint facilities to be property guardians and bring the application. Now, they don't want to do that because technically that may be a violation of the statute, because they're a creditor and we're not supposed to appoint creditors as guardians.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

JUDGE DIAMOND: But my answer to that, and I say this -- I'm sorry to say it, but I say to them, listen, I have no alternative and you're getting all the money. So there's no conflict in terms of that. So they're unhappy, but I've begun doing it.

The final thing is that we passed -- the legislature passed the Family Medical Decisions Act two years ago. What's recently happened where we don't have personal guardians is that the facilities -- our public guardian takes the position that if the person is in a facility long-term they don't need a personal guardian because under the Family Decisions Act the facility can make medical decisions for them. Okay?

I reject this. I wrote a decision that appeared in the September 7th Law Journal, where I said that this is a terrible situation, where you have a facility making medical or other decisions for an incapacitated person because we don't have money to appoint a guardian. A facility that mistreats somebody is not going to bring a lawsuit against themselves on behalf of an incapacitated person if they're serving as guardian. That's really unlikely. And if it comes time where they want to move the person, the family decisions, that gives them no authority to do that. We need a guardian to do that.

So because of the lack of funds, you know, we see all of these kind of attempts to, I will say, end-run the legal issue.

Now, I obviously agree with the tremendous need for law services for everybody that really needs them and qualifies. Every judge, from Housing Court to debtor creditor to matrimonial -- which I did for five years -- raised excellent points about the need. But these people, this population that I'm talking about, unbelievably -- listen, a person can go to landlord-tenant court and speak. These people can't speak, often. We need somebody to speak for them. You know. We need money to be able to appoint lawyers as evaluators and guardians and as counsel.

Every case carries with it the potential to need three or more attorneys. And, you know, it's not just legal, you know, if you think about the situation these people are in. I think it's as much of a moral issue as it is a legal issue.

So maybe it's the time of the year -- you know, our new year just finished. I went to the Red Mass the other night. And I just want to leave you with this quote, if I could. This was both Martin Luther King and Abraham Lincoln. He paraphrased a minister who lived in the 1800s. This is the quote that Martin Luther King

1 used.

"I do not pretend to understand the moral universe. The arc is a long one, my eye reaches but little ways. I cannot calculate the curve and complete the figure by the experience of sight, but I can divine it by conscience. And from what I can see it bends towards justice."

I really believe -- and I'm not trying to be melodramatic, but I believe that in our legal universe we have to just not be legal, we have to be moral. We have to bend this universe to do justice for these people.

Otherwise we're really doing ourselves as judges, the system and these people a great disservice.

Thank you very much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Judge. I think you highlight, again, the breadth of this problem, and it is an area where these people are so just out there with no one to turn to, and there's so much need and it's so great, and in particular areas it's almost a crime.

JUDGE DIAMOND: Well, they turn to us and we have no resources. So thank you very much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, judge. You can go back to work now. Thank you. Okay.

Our next judicial speaker or witness will be the Hon. Randall Hinrichs, who is the District

Administration Judge from Suffolk County.

Randy, great to have you.

JUDGE HINRICHS: Thank you very much, Judge
Lippman, Judge Prudenti, Mr. Standard. Thank you very
much for having me speak here today. It's a privilege to
be here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Honor to have you.

JUDGE HINRICHS: Thank you very much.

I would just echo, the guardianship parts in Suffolk County -- just to follow-up on what Judge Diamond said -- have voiced the same frustration. I know we're in the middle of setting up a CLE program in early November through the guardianship program to try and get increased pro bono attorneys for the exact situation that the judge was mentioning, so I would just echo those sentiments. And I thought the best place to start would be, just briefly, sometimes there's a tendency to think that the need for unmet civil legal services, it's a city problem or it's a problem in rural areas in upstate New York.

Just very briefly, some brief statistics about Suffolk County. It's a county of 1-1/2 million people. We have close to 200,000 people on Medicaid. Roughly one sixth of the population, around 250,000 people in the county, are within the -- what's considered double the

poverty line, you know, \$45,000. And that's for a family of four. \$45,000 for a family of four on Long Island is not going to go very far. It's double the poverty line, but just within the cost of living. So there are some significant unmet needs.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we use that example, judge, that the 200 percent, the poverty level, a family of four earning that kind of money, if you have significant legal problem in your life you're not going to be able to resolve it without some kind of legal service.

JUDGE HINRICHS: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's an obvious thing. You need to put food on the table. And if it's a foreclosure issue, it can be a real problem.

JUDGE HINRICHS: What I'm trying to get at, when you talk about a county this large, you talk about a quarter of a million people in that category, so there's a significant need here. And also just sometimes when you look at a Family Court and you look at the number of filings in Family Court, while it's not -- it's indicative of people that have a need for civil legal services.

And the filings, for instance, in Suffolk

County, they're the fourth highest in the state. They're

higher than Queens, for instance. They're a lot closer

to the Bronx than they are to Nassau County, for instance. So just to give you an idea, there is, by way of background, a significant unmet need here.

I don't want to repeat things from my written statement or to repeat what others might say about the pro bono and legal services structure in the county. But just very briefly, you have Nassau-Suffolk Law Services, you have Touro, both their public advocacy center and their clinical programs, and you have the pro bono foundation at the bar.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do they work closely with you in -- I mean, you have -- is there a regular collaboration?

Was going to say, actually, is that they work, first of all, well with the courts. And, very importantly, when it comes to funding issues they work incredibly well with each other to avoid any duplication of services, or legal services. They have quarterly meetings between the principles that I just said; you know, Touro, the different groups at Touro, Nassau-Suffolk Law Services. They meet quarterly with the pro bono foundation just to see what is the most pressing need and to avoid any duplication of effort. They work incredibly well, you know, with the courts. I've met with all the people in

1 my office. They all participated in a Law Day event. 2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But on the ground, Judge, the need is far greater than what you have to work with, even 3 though I understand the efforts are Herculean. 5 JUDGE HINRICHS: Absolutely. And I think maybe 6 the best is if I touch on some of the areas where there's 7 the biggest unmet need, if that would be appropriate. I'm not going to bore you with statistics about 8 foreclosure numbers from Suffolk County. 10 JUDGE LIPPMAN: No. JUDGE HINRICHS: They're through the roof. 11 12 There's been great efforts through the Bar Association to 13 have attorneys, pro bono attorneys, at the foreclosure settlement conference at the initial stage, the CPLR 3408 14 15 conference. They have pro bono attorneys covering those conferences trying to work out a resolution. It's really 16 just a fraction, though, of the legal need in the area of 17 roughly close to 14,000 foreclosure cases pending in 18 Suffolk County. Under 2,000 are in the conference part. 19 20 Also, filings are up this year compared to last year. JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know. 21 22 JUDGE HINRICHS: And when you get -- when they 23 leave the conference part they go to an individual,

through the IAS system, to a Supreme Court judge.

Each of these cases has individual nuances.

24

25

The case doesn't end when it leaves the foreclosure conference part, but, unfortunately, the legal representation does. And the homeowners in that situation, when they're before -- when it's getting closer to the end of the case, there is, despite all the great effort, there is no representation. And very often in that setting, if there was representation, it may be able to work out a resolution other than a judgment of foreclosure. It increases the likelihood of what would be better for everyone.

So that's a -- you know, the foreclosure area -- JUDGE LIPPMAN: In so many parts of our state, not only Suffolk.

JUDGE HINRICHS: So that's one particular area.

Also, when you talk about the critical needs that individuals have, when you talk about in the area of -- also in the housing area, you know, the last two full years there were over ten thousand eviction proceedings in our district courts. And Nassau-Suffolk Law Services has a couple of attorneys that go from district court to district court to cover these proceedings. Again, they do an incredibly great job doing that representation. They could use a lot more than what they have.

In answer to your question that you posed at

the beginning, effects on the court system, the resolution of the matter is so much easier, better, actually, for all concerned, whether it's the landlord or the tenant. The potential resolution is so much better if there's an attorney involved. So there is in that also housing, also a significant unmet need.

Another separate area that I would address deals with the domestic violence area. I mentioned how busy our Family Court is. Just to keep it simple, if you've got -- on average you have like a hundred family offense petitions, BO dockets being filed every week. That's what's coming into the system on a weekly basis. Law services has an attorney that can pick up the tiniest fraction of these cases.

For all those cases, over 5,000 of these cases a year that come in, there is just -- because they have no other resources, there's one attorney to pick and choose among all those cases to try and identify the most vulnerable victims, the individual that might need help with -- obviously there's a lot of related proceedings very often when somebody is in Family Court. So one attorney for that volume of cases is just, you know -- it speaks for itself, I think, that clearly there's a need there.

Also in the matrimonial area, through the pro

bono project, there is a significant effort to make -get pro bono representation for people. And one
unfortunate -- obviously no one's fault, but unfortunate
fallout from the \$170 million cut that we sustained was
that the -- and individuals that work with the bar
association in Nassau-Suffolk Law Services as a pro bono
coordinator and recruiter were eliminated. And that
position, for instance, gives the benefit -- it's like a
multiplier effect, to get an exponential amount of
services from one person coordinating efforts, you know,
among other pro bono attorneys. So there's a significant
effort to try and get representation in this area.

I know one of the things that was mentioned about the hearing was about the new funding that came in this year. We're moving forward. I've spoken with Judge Fisher, with Tom Maligno from Touro Law School. We're hoping to get up and running, in the not-too-distant future, a clinical program through Touro to deal with uncontested matrimonials. Because even in that area, we hear uncontested, it's not that simple to have the paperwork done.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a collaboration between all the providers, the law school, the volunteer efforts.

JUDGE HINRICHS: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And they all dovetail together.

1	I know as Administrative Judge you get to see this kind
2	of synergy between
3	JUDGE HINRICHS: They work incredibly well
4	together. They make incredibly good use of the
5	allocations that they're given. They do an absolutely
6	super, super job.
7	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, and I think I'm
8	going to ask Dean Salkin to come up now. We'll mix and
9	match a little.
10	I know she has a tight schedule today but I
11	think she'll fit in right here, will be perfect in terms
12	of
13	JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: I have a courtroom of people
14	waiting for me in the criminal part.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, come up. We're going to
16	go Judge Phoenix, you can stay a little while?
17	JUDGE PHOENIX: I can stay.
18	JUDGE LIPPMAN: All right. We're going to take
19	Judge Fairgrieve quickly and so that he can get to his
20	work and then we're going to take Dean Salkin so she can
21	get where she has to go but let's start with the judge
22	because we don't want to leave anyone in the courtroom.
23	JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: Scott Fairgrieve,
24	District Court, basically, landlord tenant four months.
25	I'm in Part 9, Part 9 or 9L because I'm a County Court

1 judge so, basically, I do proceedings of the landlord-tenant and I've been there for about five or six 3 years.

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Legal services is absolutely essential for protection of the people. We average about between 60 to 80 cases a day.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What percentage are unrepresented?

JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: You know, it's a gut -- it's a -- I'd say 50 percent. Well, more than that. I would say more than 50 percent of the people are unrepresented and --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's pretty good compared to New York City on the representation. They have 90-some odd percent in evictions.

JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: You know, I never really counted but the bottom line is we do have complex legal issues involving landlord-tenants, Section A, whether families are going to get evicted because of allegations by the landlord of criminal activity.

You also have, you know, the Collier's syndrome You have seniors who have mental illness. You have a whole gamut of people and legal services provides absolutely essential protection, frontline protection for these people so that the rights are protected.

1 JUDGE LIPPMAN: It would be hard to run the 2 part --JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: You couldn't. To be blunt 3 about it, most cases are settled out by stip but when 4 5 people are unrepresented, a lot of times they just don't 6 understand the legal ramifications, that if they violate 7 a stip and you have -- one of my jobs, you know, is to 8 make sure that people are not being taken advantage of. JUDGE LIPPMAN: What we've heard a lot from 10 judges is that the lack of representation compromises our 11 role as neutral arbiters --12 JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: That's correct. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- because it's so hard. You feel, you know, you have to protect the person and that's 14 15 not what you're supposed to be doing and it's kind of --16 it creates a tension. 17 JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: Yes, so you need legal 18 services there. I mean, they are only there four days a week. On Fridays we have a lot of people come in who 19 20 need the services on Fridays and we have to adjourn all the cases because -- to another day when legal services 21 22 are going to be there. 23 The problem is landlords are being also 24 impacted by this too. You know, landlords are owed 25 money. They have mortgages to pay and a quick resolution

1 of cases is good for both sides. 2 What I was going to say --JUDGE LIPPMAN: Landlords don't want to be in a 3 situation when there is an unrepresented tenant. They 5 want them to have legal representation. 6 JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: That's right, and also 7 actually for the attorneys representing the landlord, to make their life a lot easier to be able to deal with an 8 attorney who can negotiate a deal. 10 As I said, very few days cases ever go to 11 trial. Maybe one percent goes to trial. Everything is 12 stipped out. We absolutely need legal services to 13 provide the necessary representation for everybody there. JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate 14 15 Thanks for the tight schedule coming in. it. 16 JUDGE FAIRGRIEVE: Thank you. 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 18 Now to the good graces of Judge Phoenix, we're going to take Dean Salkin and take her a little bit out 19 20 of order and Patti, so good to see you here. 21 DEAN SALKIN: Good to see you. 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We look forward to working with 23 you on this issue and I know Touro is also doing a lot in 24 the whole area of pro bono work by students and also just 25 active in the community, in general, in terms of

1 providing representation. 2 DEAN SALKIN: I want to thank Judge Phoenix for 3 yielding some time to me, so thank you very much and saying hello to my friends on the panel. 5 Judge Lippman, we've worked together, as you've 6 noted, for a long time in the past and I look forward to 7 working with you to do some great things in my new space as Dean of Touro Law Center. 8 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I can't wait. 10 DEAN SALKIN: And Judge Prudenti, we've 11 recently become acquainted and I look forward to your 12 continued engagement with the law center and our 13 relationship with the state bar is just going to go 14 stronger than ever. 15 MR. STANDARD: I welcome you to downstate. 16 JUDGE LIPPMAN: She thinks this is New York 17 City. 18 I want to point out that two of DEAN SALKIN: my colleagues from Touro Law Center are here together, 19 20 Tom Maligno, Director of the Public Advocacy Center and Professor Marianne Artusio, director of our clinic. 21 22 Neither one of them had to be here. They both wanted to 23 be here and I think their presence speaks volumes for 24 Touro.

I have a lot of statistics in my prepared

25

testimony that I'm not going to share with you now because Steve Bellone did a great job of laying out the background of what's going on in Suffolk County and why there is a dire need for civil legal services. So what I really want to focus on is the highlight, how Touro Law Center has really become a national leader in providing a collaborative model in order to help our community better access civil legal services and I use the word better. It's better than not at all but we still have a long way to go, all of us working together.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Rest assured, Dean, that we view the law schools in our state at the center of this effort and, you know, we recently had that forum at Cardozo Law School talking about what is the role of law schools in filling this justice gap that we have in our state.

DEAN SALKIN: So in 2007, Touro Law Center, when we moved into our new state-of-the-art facility in Central Islip, we created an experiment and we established the William Randolph Hearst Public Advocacy Center. This center fosters a unique partnership between the law center and local non-profit agencies and it was designed to also provide a unique educational training program and training for our law students while having a real-time impact on social justice, legal resources and

the lives of countless individuals in and beyond the local community.

Housed within the law school, the center provides furnished offices to local non-profit agencies at no cost. While the services of each agency are varied, each participating non-profit must develop a plan to engage Touro law students who can then work with the organizations to satisfy their pro bono requirements while developing an understanding of the problems facing the local community within a local, state-wide and federal context. We are the only law school in New York and, in fact, the only law school in the country to offer such an innovative program.

The Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center offers a progressive program rich with practical learning opportunities to a student body already engaged in the community and the world around them. Taking advantage of our location adjacent to both the federal and state courthouse, we offer innovative courses for law students that bring together the academy, the bar and the bench to ensure that students are prepared for the practice of law. Collaboration is the cornerstone of the success of these programs and our curriculum is dependent on such collaboration as we continue to develop more opportunities to involve the bar and the bench in

teaching our students about the reality of practicing law in today's ever changing global society.

Our law school has a rich tradition of teaching the moral and ethical obligations of law while promoting social justice and community service and, as you noted earlier, Judge Lippman, Touro Law was among the first in the country to require pro bono service hours of students, mandating 40 hours, and up until your recent mandate on pro bono we were only one of two law schools in the state to have instituted the requirement and, by the way, under our existing 40-hour rule, Touro law students provide 30,000 hours of pro bono work. That's based on a number of about 750 students in our student body.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Dean, one thing I think is important and I'd ask you to -- you know, we don't believe that the 50-hour requirement, that students are going to put down their pen and say, "Gee, I've done 50 hours. I've met my requirement. That's the end of it."

Has it been your experience at Touro and your prior experience in Albany that once the law students get involved in pro bono, they don't just say, "I'm meeting a requirement," or anything else? It gets into their system. Some understand the benefit of serving others as

a member of the legal profession?

DEAN SALKIN: Yes, and I agree with your comments earlier that you hope that it will get into everybody's DNA and my experience has been that once students get over the hurdle and actually do it, that it does become a distinct go in a very positive way and the minimum requirement really becomes the bare minimum and most students do go well above and beyond that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's what we're hoping for.

Go ahead.

DEAN SALKIN: So to further Touro Law's early mission, it planned for and built a wing of the new law school building to be dedicated to the Public Advocacy Center and the center is now a working example of a collaboration of legal resources to serve the community and provide opportunity for law students developing an extension of professionalism and responsibility to serve the community. As I mentioned, it's the only one of its kind in the nation and serves as a statewide and national model for successful collaboration of legal services and resources to serve the community while providing hands-on opportunity for --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What are the organizations like? Are they providers or what are they exactly in this?

DEAN SALKIN: Many organizations that you are familiar with -- in fact, SEPA Mujer who testified earlier is one of our tenants. Empire Justice Center is one of our tenants. We have a combination of legal service providers and we also have organizations that provide advocacy work and public policy work.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So this is very much the kind of synergy that we're hoping will go in all the law schools and the providers because it's everyone's responsibility together.

DEAN SALKIN: One of the unique things about our center, one, if you look at the cost of operating and we all know that these legal service agencies operate on a shoestring budget --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

DEAN SALKIN: -- and we're always going with our hands out to keep paying the rent for the next month. So the average rent in Suffolk County is 20 to \$25 per square foot for office space.

Our Public Advocacy Center consists of about 2700, 2800 square feet of office space which saves these non-profit legal service providers approximately \$61,000 per month in rent --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's great. They live hand to mouth and this is great.

DEAN SALKIN: -- as part of our collaboration and partnership at the law school.

So I want to tell you a little bit about what the center actually does and how the students get engaged.

As I said, the center, which we call the PAC, has proven to be a powerful partnership with the law school. The agencies working within the PAC have seen many benefits and the PAC has provided enhanced legal educational opportunity for students and this is important for legal educators to take note of as well.

The PAC has enabled the law students to learn about the way public interest law works. It doesn't mean that all of our students will become public interest lawyers, nor do we want them to, but because public service is every lawyer's responsibility we at least want our students to have a firsthand look at how it works.

We choose agencies for the PAC that present our students with the diversity of subject matter; for example, landlord-tenant, immigration law, education law, to name a few, and the diversity in the way they provide their services, so we want our students to understand that not every public service lawyer goes to court everyday. Some conduct administrative hearings. Some organize community education. Some draft legislation.

Some do research and advocacy while others do represent clients and bring class actions. The point is for our students to see the variety of areas of practice and provision of legal services.

Our students can be involved in the PAC through several avenues, either working with the agencies to complete their pro bono requirements, for academic credit or for pay through work study, through a funded fellowship that Touro offers or occasionally by being paid through the agency itself but I'll say that's more rare with the economic outlook.

A critical part of developing the PAC into a successful model for delivering legal services and enhancing legal education was the integration of the PAC into the academic life at Touro Law School and this has been achieved in several ways.

PAC attorneys have become adjunct professors teaching classes at Touro Law that incorporate the practical work of their affiliated agency.

Law school professors have used the PAC agencies by bringing them in as guest speakers or by tying their class work to the work of PAC agencies and professors have been engaged in the work of the PAC agencies. For example, one professor is now on the Board of Directors of one of our PAC agencies.

agencies, as well as other outside agencies, to hold conferences and meetings in the building at no charge, only the promise to allow Touro law students to attend the events at no charge. This philosophy has brought major conferences and smaller meetings to the building that have had an impact on our students as well as legal services provided. For example, the Keys to the Homeless Conference annually brings 500 advocates, community leaders to the school to talk about legal, social and political issues that surround homelessness and our students can participate. In many cases, the students have presented panels or led discussions as part of these public events assisting both their legal education and their connections to our community.

A true center for public service housed within and working with a law school has obvious benefits.

However, there are other benefits that have and continue to occur that should not go unnoticed.

More agencies than can be housed in the PAC applied for space, resulting in a dedicated group of affiliate agencies. These affiliate members meet with PAC agencies regularly and enjoy the benefits of collaborative working partners, although they are not housed within the law school. As a result of this

dynamic group of agencies who strive to work together to provide legal services efficiently and effectively, some great things have happened. Clients are able to walk down the hall from one service provider to another to get a complete legal solution. Agencies are working together to service clients most effectively and are aware of each other's work through regular updates.

The Center -- as a result, Touro Law Center has become known within the local community as an effective resource. Many agencies have partnered together on an issue to serve the community and the PAC has been called upon to provide solutions and/or guidance.

Funding for legal services on Long Island has increased as a direct result of the PAC. Some PAC agencies never had funding for a Long Island or Suffolk County office but received funding in order to be part of this venture and others. Many came in the form of grants written jointly with various agencies in the PAC, including donations, private foundations and government agencies and they have all contributed to this effort.

We're not here to replace legal services

programs. Not only are they our strongest partner and
they are strongest in the PAC but they are the main
placement for our students who do public service work and
fellowships. Some of the best experience the students

get are at agencies that need to be funded in a strong and appropriate way. We have strived not to compete with civil legal services funding for resources but attempted to bring new sources for structure for the work we all do.

Lastly, Touro Law Center is honored that you, Chief Judge Lippman, has designated our former Dean and Professor of Law, Lawrence Raful, for the implementation for the 50-hour pro bono requirement. We know that Professor Raful will apply leadership for pro bono.

We plan to work on, among other things, a guide to best practices to assist in the development of working levels between law schools and public interest providers.

As the new dean, part of my vision for Touro

Law Center includes strengthening our commitment to the

PAC and to research and advocacy, to civil legal

services.

I invite each of you to visit Touro Law Center and the PAC. I urge the Office of Court Administration to further examine our model and to partner with us to further our knowledge and further advocacy and leadership so that together we can make a meaningful difference.

I also want to respond to some of your questions to some of the earliest panelists and some of the topics that come up.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On language barrier issues, what I've observed being at Touro for nine weeks, our Latin-American Law Students Association put on a street law project in the community presented all in Spanish. What a wonderful way for our law students to do outreach to our community and then I noticed two weeks ago that there was a sign up at the law school. If you wanted to practice your Spanish during lunchtime, the student groups were setting up tables in our cafeteria for students to get together and practice their Spanish regardless of what their proficiency level is. This is something that's sorely needed and that our students are taking upon themselves to promote. So if you want to ask where the action is, the future leadership of this profession looks fantastic, based upon the law students we have at Touro.

I also want to mention that we have six clinics at Touro Law Center. One of them is not operating this fall, our Veterans Clinic. We hope to bring it back in the spring but on average we have about 60 students each semester that have a clinical experience plus about another 75 that do externship experiences all helping to provide civil and criminal legal services.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you, dean, and I think it really is a terrific model.

I mean very much, as I said, what we have in

mind in terms of this collaborative relationship that there must be between the academy, the profession, the judiciary and certainly the providers. There are some examples around the state of the providers being together in one place so they can provide this kind of one stop shopping but I think housing some of it at law schools is a great idea and I think a great model, you know, so thank you so much for being here and welcome to Long Island.

DEAN SALKIN: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, downstate is -- great to see you. Thanks for being here.

MR. STANDARD: Patty, do you have another moment?

DEAN SALKIN: Sure.

MR. STANDARD: What your students experience in this market where it's so difficult to gain employment, are they benefiting from the fact that they had this extensive opportunity to get some practical training in the law school, your clinical programs?

DEAN SALKIN: You know, I have to say anecdotally the answer is yes and I base it on two bits of information and the first was my personal search in deciding to come to Touro Law School. I called a lot of the legal service providers and the County Attorney's

Office, DA's office, private law firms in Suffolk County before deciding whether to make the move and I asked them about Touro's reputation, about Touro students, and they all said to me that they would hire a Touro law student immediately because they come with more practical hands-on experience and they know how the court system works and they know how the courthouse works because as part of our curriculum, every first year student is inside the federal and state courthouses because of our location and the curriculum that we've developed before they finish their first year in law school so they have a different kind of comfort level, a different kind of knowledge, a different kind of understanding. So part of that is what employers have told me.

The second part is the statistics, and the unemployment statistics in the New York Law Journal in June shows we are number four in the state for recent grads having jobs out of law school that required a JD and so, on one hand, it's great news that Touro Law School was number four in the state. You know what's not so great news? The number was 55 percent so we do have a major problem within the profession and within the legal academy but a discussion for a different day, I think.

MR. STANDARD: Last question: Are you able to state whether the students who gained an interest in

1	providing pro bono service while they were students,
2	whether they have a high incidence of providing pro bono
3	service after they enter the profession?
4	DEAN SALKIN: I think that's a great question
5	and my answer is anecdotally I say yes.
6	JUDGE LIPPMAN: We're going to have to track
7	that. I think that's a very good question and we're
8	going to have to make that connection.
9	Thank you, dean.
10	DEAN SALKIN: Thank you, and thank you, Judge.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Now Judge Phoenix, I know you
12	have nothing else today than to be with us but thank you
13	for your patience and you're on.
14	JUDGE PHOENIX: Thank you, Judge Lippman, and I
15	want to say thank you, first to you and Judge Prudenti
16	and to past President of the New York State Bar
17	Association, Kenneth Standard.
18	I won't be long because by this afternoon I
19	will have a very, very busy
20	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I know. I know.
21	JUDGE PHOENIX: calendar, but I have some
22	prepared testimony but the prepared testimony will not
23	take long so if I can proceed
24	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure. Absolutely.
25	JUDGE PHOENIX: I'm here today and I'm very

honored to be here today to present testimony on perhaps what is the cornerstone of our court system and that is access to justice.

Before being elected to the Nassau County

District Court bench and sitting by designation as an

Acting Nassau County Court Judge, I was an attorney in

private practice handling mostly Family Court cases and I

was an active law guardian and what is known today as the

attorney for the child.

Notably, I was a staff attorney at Nassau

County Legal Aid Society and a staff attorney at

Nassau-Suffolk Law Services for quite a few years. In

this capacity I have represented poor people who are

disadvantaged and oftentimes disenfranchised in all

phases of litigation. I have provided representation for

legal issues involving food stamps, public assistance,

Medicaid and homelessness prevention.

I had the client who couldn't afford bus fare to return home from court. I had the client who used her last disposable diaper at noon that day. I represented the man who had been turned down a bed for the night in the middle of January and it was me on the telephone searching for his lodging sometimes until almost 7:00 p.m. on a given evening. I understand that when the food stamp allowance is reduced abruptly, that children

don't eat. These were my clients and their access to the justice system overall was very slim and I give you their background so you can know how close this issue of expansion of legal access for the poor is to my mind and to my heart.

In the District Court I sit in both a civil and criminal part. With respect to the criminal part, I preside over the Nassau County Mental Health Court, adjudicating both misdemeanor and felonies. All of the court participants have representation, as the private bar and Legal Aid play a key role in our court.

The participants are persons accused of a crime who are mentally challenged and they range on the economic scale but many are low -- in the low income scale bracket and are Medicaid recipients. We have found that access to civil legal services outside of our court has been difficult for them. Reapplication for Medicaid after being incarcerated, access to civil legal representation for other civil issues and the like have proven to be a difficult road for my Mental Health Court participants. But most of my time is sitting in a civil part in the District Court presiding over cases that involve credit card theft, medical necessity of medical testing such as an MRI, contracts and infant compromises where I see small children in my chambers. The

jurisdictional amount is \$15,000.

I must explain to many pro se litigants that I see, that my court is not a small claims part and it is a true civil part where pro se litigants must either hire an attorney to represent their interests or, alternatively, be held to the standard of an attorney; knowing how to present testimony, cross-examine witnesses and the like.

These are the things that they will have to know if they choose to represent themselves. The people that I'm explaining this to are in my court each day and are there in the presence of a courtroom filled with attorneys on other matters. They squint when I speak to them and have a baffled look upon their face.

Instructions about filing, affidavits of service, motion schedules and orders to show cause fall upon ears and eyes that simply don't understand.

The majority of orders to show cause that I read are from pro se litigants. They are oftentimes poorly written with misspelled words and run-on sentences and sometimes have to be deemed legally insufficient for execution of my signature.

The District Court is a court of first impression for many. I see the senior citizens who could be my grandparents at a loss for words, unprepared to

present any plausible legal issue and who are on a fixed income and unable to afford an attorney.

I see the woman who is the head of a household taking off from work without enough time to do so because she simply can't afford an attorney. I see the people who are now way over their head in credit card debt and can't even negotiate a settlement that they can pay because they are out of work. Oftentimes, the debt consists of things like food, essential clothing and other items of necessity. I see cases with cars repossessed and families now compelled to use one car or take public transportation. Before me come litigants with serious legal issues and no income to retain an attorney or to even pay to consult one. Most of the legal issues are too complex for pro se representation in my court part. An attorney is almost always essential for litigants to navigate well in a civil part.

In my part it is not uncommon to have a nervous, anxious individual unable to properly comport themselves before me or to articulate their legal issues and problems. I am always unnerved by the tears I see fall. The tears don't fall in English. They don't fall in Spanish and they don't fall in black nor white. They just fall from the faces of those Americans plagued with the impoverished condition preventing them from acquiring

legal representation.

There are a myriad of problems associated with access to justice for the poor. The national recession making overtime in our court system a rarity is a big problem. Having an extended calendar would give judges and support staff more time to sort out the issues of the unrepresented.

Another serious concern is the loss of funds for the day care centers in our courts. The District Court in Nassau County now has many more children of poor and unrepresented litigants in courtrooms and court settings because the parents can't afford child care.

Yet, perhaps the biggest problem is the lack of pro bono or free representation for poor people saddled with complex litigation issues. There is no such thing as a free attorney to help them if they can't afford one and alas, there's no such thing as a free lunch.

So what do we do? We continue to support the task force to expand access to civil legal services. We as legal professionals committed to justice form a critical mass to address pertinent and timely issues affecting access to justice. We must provide pro se desks in all of our courts to ensure a more equitable access to courts for the poor and the underserved.

Finally, I humbly suggest that we support all

efforts for legal services funding and staffing.

This past Thanksgiving eve I delivered fully cooked meals to some of the poorest families on Long Island on behalf of We Care, the charitable arm of the Nassau County Bar Association. I witnessed children shivering under a blanket in a poorly lit small apartment above a store with no food other than the basket I delivered. I entered homes colder on the inside than the outside because there had been no heat for two weeks. I can tell you stories. In fact, we all have stories to tell. We know the poor will always be with us and they are usually the most vulnerable with respect to a loss of funding and services.

Together we must forge ahead to continue to mold the legal system that brings access to justice for Americans at every income level. I have every confidence just by virtue of this proceeding that we're well on our way towards this success and I want to thank you for allowing me to present testimony today.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Oh, thank you, Judge Phoenix for your eloquent testimony.

Let me ask you one question. Particularly in this economy, the consumer credit cases, do you see a lot of them? More people coming in on credit issues, credit card issues?

JUDGE PHOENIX: Yes, I do. The courts are flooded with these issues.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And generally, those people are unrepresented?

JUDGE PHOENIX: They are unrepresented and many times I will conference the case and I will have to conference it in open court because they are pro se litigants and we try to reach some type of settlement.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But you wind up not quite being the neutral arbiter that you'd like to be.

because as you said earlier and you noted it well, it's very, very hard to preside over cases when you know in your heart, in your mind, that one or both of the litigants are saddled with not being — not having an attorney and not understanding legal issues, thereby not being — being able to navigate the legal system with any type of ease so many times that does lap and many times they walk into my courtroom thinking that this is small claims and that they don't need an attorney and after five or six people — attorneys come up and present cases and we go through motion schedules and things of that nature, by the time they walk up there they understand that they are not prepared to present their case in any reasonable manner because they don't have the legal

1	representation that they need.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.
3	Anything?
4	MR. STANDARD: I'll just mention one thing. I
5	think it's also a disadvantage for the attorney.
6	I've defended a number of cases where I've had
7	a pro se plaintiff against me and I also have felt that
8	conflict, not wanting to take advantage of the pro se
9	plaintiff at the same time having the obligation to give
LO	my client full representation and it's just a burden for
L1	everyone involved.
L2	JUDGE PHOENIX: Absolutely, I agree with that
L3	and many of the litigants who come in and are pro se and
L 4	there is an attorney on the other side, many times they
L5	even refuse to speak to the attorney because they have
L6	the perception that the attorney is going to take
L7	advantage of them and they are looking to me in many ways
L8	to help them with their legal issues because they don't
L9	have an attorney and they don't understand all of the
20	legal issues that they must deal with.
21	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you.
22	JUDGE PHOENIX: I appreciate it. Thank you
23	both.
24	MR. STANDARD: Thank you, Judge.
25	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thanks for being here. Thanks

for taking the time.

We're just going to finish off the collaboration pro bono panel and then we'll go to the client's panel so William Silverman from Greenberg Traurig, and the Shareholder and Head of the Pro Bono Program and John McEntee, the First Vice President and member of the Board of Directors of the Nassau County Bar Association and partner at Farrell Fritz.

Mr. Silverman, you want to start?

MR. SILVERMAN: Gentlemen, thank you very much and thank you for inviting me here today. It's an honor to be here today and with everyone here today.

I have a different perspective or maybe we do, in the sense that everyone devotes their entire career to public service and at least for me it's more of a hobby. You have my written testimony. I'm not --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, we do.

MR. SILVERMAN: I'm not going to read it but what I want to talk about is a legal clinic that works very well in New York City Family Court and enlists your continued support to expand throughout the entire state. We provide one-on-one counseling with unrepresented litigants. Each session lasts about 30 minutes. We make a big impact with a limited -- I think it's a very good model for finding pro bono commitments from private

attorneys. Our volunteer attorneys are from big firms and companies. They are trained by the Court. We have dedicated court attorneys who supervise them. The court services can provide information to unrepresented litigants but for the reasons you stated cannot provide advice to litigants and that's something we can do.

We started in 2006 and now we're in every borough but Staten Island. We have 34 firms, over 200 attorneys and we've helped thousands of people. I think it's a great example of a public-private partnership and, again, I think what I'd like to do now is just talk about the kind of expansion that I think we can accomplish

First, we're not in Staten Island but I believe as of January we will be and we're going to do that through technology. Our volunteer attorneys will be in Manhattan and they will be helping unrepresented litigants in Staten Island through Skype or some other kind of computer technology. I think that this — hopefully, it will work and it will be a model that we can use in other parts of the state.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Family Court, that's such a difficult place.

MR. SILVERMAN: Absolutely, and in some Family Courts there will be local attorneys where we can replicate this kind of program. In other parts there is

not -- the only way to help those unrepresented litigants is through technology so, hopefully, this is just the beginning, this expansion, and I do want to recognize Judge Fisher who really has been the example of this expansion and an inspiration for all of us who are involved in this project. We're looking at other sites and, obviously, we need to rely even more on public service organizations, law schools, and we need to lean a little bit harder on the private sector and I think -
JUDGE LIPPMAN: We're trying to do that.

MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I have a couple of

MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I have a couple of suggestions but I think just a general observation.

You know, we all want more judges, more resources, more legal services attorneys. We all want a truly unified court system. I agree with your Honor that 16 and 17-year olds should not be in Criminal Court.

These are all great goals that we should all continue to work for no matter how difficult they are because they happen to be right but, in my view, we can't wait for the legislature. We can't wait for the governor. We can't wait for the economy to improve. We need to do something now. We need to do something in our control and I think the beauty of this project is that it's absolutely in our control and it's absolutely --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's a great project. There is

1 no question.

MR. SILVERMAN: Some standing throughout the state is something that I think we can do so what I hope is that we all together can come up with sort of -- we've been in existence from 2006. We can come up with sort of a five-year plan where this can be expanded, you know, throughout the state or at least in the areas of the state where we feel in Family Court the needs of unrepresented litigants are the greatest. Perhaps even having some kind of summit where you call in the heads of pro bono programs of major firms or companies and give them a challenge. "I'll pay for lunch." Tell them that, "In order for this expansion to work, we need your help." You need to do a little bit more because if you don't, these litigants really don't have, at least outside of New York City, don't really have any hope.

Another general observation is that what I see sometimes is a sense of resignation among advocates, pro bono minded people, that this is the way Family Court always has been and always will be and I also see sometimes a resistance to change that, frankly, I don't understand. I think that we need -- we should not accept things the way they are. I think we should not accept the notion that there should be two court systems, one for the kind of cases that I take in my day-to-day world

1 and another court system for those who can't afford 2 attorneys. It's really not something that we should 3 accept. This project is a relatively low cost way that 5 we can improve the administration of justice. It's not 6 the perfect solution but I believe it's something that we 7 should definitely do. If I can just make two other general 8 observations --10 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure. 11 MR. SILVERMAN: In my experience in these 12 clinics, obviously, we help people who aren't entitled to 13 the appointment of counsel. 14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right. 15 MR. SILVERMAN: We also help people who are entitled to the appointment of counsel and for whatever 16 reason they don't take advantage of it and to this day I 17 18 don't understand why. I think some people, some unrepresented litigants feel that they would rather talk 19 20 directly to the judge or maybe it's not communicated to 21 them as clearly as it should be and that's one thing we 22 do in the clinic. 23 Sometimes the best thing we do is to tell

someone who is entitled to the appointment of counsel,
"You should take advantage of it," because it really does

24

25

make a huge difference if someone is aware of the rights that they are entitled to.

I want to plug one other thing while I'm here.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MR. SILVERMAN: Equal Justice works

fellowships. My firm funds 12 to 15 of these fellowships

which are two-year fellowships for people right out of

law school to do public interest work. I'm a very strong

supporter of pro bono which is great, but I also think

firms and companies should be doing more to fund these

positions that are so rare and whenever we look for

applicants we get a stack this high (indicating) and they

are all tremendous applicants and it's a great way to

make an impact.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, number one, I think the last idea is a very good one and all firms should do the same thing. It would be wonderful and the Family Court program is terrific and Judge Fisher has done such a fabulous job with it. It's an area often neglected because, as you say, people take the position oh, it's Family Court and, you know, the Family Court has evolved so greatly in the last 50 years with all the celebrations that we've had recently as to the anniversary of the Family Court Act and, you know, there was a time that due process was involved in the Family Court and this is very

much the final piece of making sure that it's truly a system where people get all the rights and the representation is so important so, you know, I agree with you. It's a great program and I know Judge Fisher will have this done statewide in no time. Next one, she's got it, no problem, but it's terrific and I compliment you and all the people involved in that program with Judge Fisher and we really should see to it that it's expanded throughout the state so thank you so much.

MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Mr. McEntee.

MR. McENTEE: Yes.

Good afternoon, Chief Judge Lippman, Chief Judge Prudenti and Past President Standard:

I'm honored to be here today. I'm going to dispense with any discussion for the need of civil legal service. It's in my remarks and been discussed here already.

What I'd like to do is discuss what the Bar Association, particularly the Nassau County Bar Association is doing.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, you've had some great presidents. You've been very active in this and the Nassau Bar should be congratulated and Emily Franchina is here and so many others are involved in this around the

1 state, Bill Savino, one of your former heads and so you 2 know the Bar Association has a lot to be commended for and why don't you tell us what you're doing today. 3 MR. McENTEE: I'd first like to say that our 5 current president, Marian Rice, is doing a great job as 6 president here. She's here today. 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I should have started with the 8 present president. MR. McENTEE: Yes. One of the things that you 10 did, Judge, is when District Attorney Rice was 11 testifying, you asked her, you know, what do you do in a 12 situation where you have somebody who needs civil legal 13 services but can't provide that? Obviously, she cannot. What she said was, "I send them to the Bar Association." 14 15 Okay? What it seems is that everybody in the 16 situation where they don't know what to do is they send 17 18 them to the Bar Association so what's happened is the Bar 19 Association has become sort of the clearinghouse. People 20 come in who don't have the ability to pay for services 21 and what we try to do is marshall pro bono services from 22 our members in order to try and fill at least a portion --23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Not every bar association does 24 that, I can tell you.

MR. McENTEE: At the Nassau County Bar

25

Association, it's part of our DNA.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: As it should be, yes.

MR. McENTEE: What I'd like to do is describe a couple of these programs that we're doing and then at the end I just argue that attorneys providing pro bono services cannot fulfill the vast needs for these services.

The first project to talk about is actually the project that Judge Fairgrieve spoke about, so the Volunteer Lawyers Project Attorney For the Day program, which is operated by Nassau-Suffolk Legal Services, provides representation to tenants facing eviction in the Nassau County District Court. The tenants are screened for eligibility for these services. The project is staffed with pro bono volunteer members of the Nassau County Bar Association who appear in court four days a week. These pro bono attorneys are supervised by an in-court paid supervisor.

To help pay for the costs of that supervisor, the Nassau County Bar Association every year has what we call a "Probonothon" where the officers, directors, committee chairs and others call the 5,000 or so members asking them to donate an hour of billable time, the cost of an hour, that amount to be able to fund this position.

In 2011, the project handled nearly 850 cases.

Of those cases, 324 evictions were prevented and 420 were delayed giving the tenant time to find alternative housing. I have to say my firm and I have participated in this program for a number of years now and one thing I'd like to emphasize, it's not a one-way street. Obviously, we provide services to them but we obtain things in return. Aside from feeling good about ourselves, it allows me to get associates in my firm out of there, out from behind their desks, out of the library, in court on their feet interviewing real people, real litigants with problems, challenging the facts, negotiating settlements, going on the record and putting on stipulations so there is a benefit back and forth. I think Bill and I both struggle sometimes with

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trying to get in-court experience for some of our younger associates but this is an opportunity where people get into court doing good but it's also helping our firm.

The Nassau County Bar Association Foreclosure Project serves Nassau County residents in two ways. First, the Association has, for more than three years, held a monthly clinic where an average of 50 to 60 people are helped by an average of a dozen attorneys. Bankruptcy attorneys are also available at these clinics.

Second, volunteer attorneys attend the mandatory conferences in residential foreclosure actions in the Supreme Court to help indigent defendants understand the legal process, identify and accumulate documents to support their defenses and identify their options. To date, volunteer attorneys have appeared at more than 850 conferences.

One of the preceding panels talked about access to justice issues involving language barriers. Indeed, increasing diversity of our community has been reflected in the attendance at the Nassau County Bar Association's clinics. Several years ago, the Association accepted the challenge of meeting the needs of this diverse population by instituting our Bridge Over Language Divides program known by it's acronym BOLD. Among other things, the BOLD program provides pro bono attorneys who speak languages such as Spanish, Korean, Haitian Creole, Russian and Urdu in an effort to assure that access to justice is not limited to those who speak English.

I will add that task force member Emily Franchina was one of the key supporters of this program.

There are a variety of other programs and clinics where others are providing pro bono civil and legal service. For example, the Nassau County Bar Association holds a senior citizen clinic every month, an annual

pro bono fair and, in conjunction with the Nassau-Suffolk

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Legal Services, a bankruptcy clinic six times a year. Ιn the past year it has also held a clinic for victims of domestic violence and a clinic for children with special needs. These are just a few of the many pro bono programs that the Nassau County Bar Association and its sister associations in the Second Department hold every year in an effort to meet the civil and legal needs of our society. So pro bono attorneys can assist indigent members of our society facing evictions from their homes. They can assist indigent members of our society facing the foreclosures of their homes and pro bono attorneys can assist indigent victims of domestic violence but what they cannot do is meet all the civil legal needs of our society, as the need is great while the ability of attorneys to bring pro bono services are limited.

I recognize that our state legislatures have a very difficult burden in allocating scarce resources among the needs of our society but just as there is a need for roads, tunnels and bridges, there is also a need for something less concrete but equally vital, meaningful access to justice for all members of our society and meaningful access to justice typically requires legal representation.

In closing, I can state confidently that attorneys throughout the Second Department are providing

pro bono legal services to meet the civil legal need of the indigent members of our society but they cannot shoulder the entire burden of this obligation. As a result, our legislature must find a way to provide consistent and meaningful funding for organizations such as Nassau- Suffolk Law Services and Legal Services of the Hudson Valley who everyday struggle to meet the civil legal needs of the most vulnerable members of our society.

Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you, counsel, and I think you stated it very well that this is a puzzle which has different pieces and I think the bulk of this needs to be public funding for civil legal services and to have providers all over the state funding that allows them to begin to meet the needs.

Absolutely vital, critical is pro bono volunteerism by the bar and the kind of wonderful work that you do in the Nassau Bar. It's a piece of the puzzle and when there -- and there isn't enough money in the world to fund the need so it's a combination and I think you are exactly right in calling on the legislature and the executive branch to fund civil legal services and then in our great noble profession to rise to the occasion and provide volunteer services, so as we've

talked about so many times they are so much a part, as your great Association recognizes, so much a part of being a lawyer and one without the other is not going to work so we need to do both. I think this particular panel and the two of you very much represent that spirit that we have in the bar that has really been so terrific and what we're trying to do with the kids -- you'll excuse the expression, but with the new generation of lawyers is to inculcate them with the same spirit of service to others at the very beginning of their careers so that they can be as they go through their careers, be so much a part of this, what we think this great profession that does so much because it recognizes that our obligation, particularly to stand up for those who can't help themselves so I thank you both so much.

Judge Prudenti, anything? Mr. Standard?

MR. STANDARD: I just want to salute these

gentlemen what they do and what the firms do because they

are going above and beyond and helping to keep us our

profession rather than an industry as so many people see

us.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

Now for our last panel, we're a little bit beyond schedule but it's been worth the wait because now

we're going to get four clients who will come up: Tenzin Choezom, a client of the Queens Legal Services, accompanied by Jennifer Ching; Pamela Sandousky, client of Nassau- Suffolk Law Services, Inc., accompanied by Hannah Abrams; Mamie Copeland, client of the Legal Aid Society, accompanied by Diane Lutwak and Felicia Essix, accompanied by Linda R. Hassberg.

(Brief pause in the proceedings.)

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. So now we're going to hear a little bit about what legal services or pro bono has done to change the lives or certainly impact significantly in the lives of human beings facing legal issues so I'll take Tenzin Choezom, client of Queens Legal Services to be our first witness.

TENZIN CHOEZOM: Hello, your Honor.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Don't hesitate. You can either read your statement or tell us; however you want to do it.

TENZIN CHOEZOM: My name is Tenzin Choezom. I live in Queens, New York City. I'm the mother of a four-year-old daughter. I work as a housekeeper in a Manhattan hotel. I'm here today because I was very lucky to find a lawyer and social worker at Queens Legal Services and I believe the services I received should be available to everybody who needs them.

1 For many years I was married to a very abusive alcoholic and gambling man. He did terrible things to me and I stayed with him because I thought this is what my responsibility as a wife and I also respect my religious and my culture and my community in New York. He did not let me work and he would not let me talk with any other people. He did not help me with my daughter and he did not help me and our needs. But I did not know I had other choices and I was very afraid of him.

> In 2011, after my husband beat me and I tried to call the police -- sorry -- but he grabbed my phone from my hand and he called the police. The police did not understand me and I was -- my husband spoke to them in English and my husband left our house and after a few days I receive a lot of paper from Family Court.

> > JUDGE LIPPMAN: Take your time.

Go ahead.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I could not read and TENZIN CHOEZOM: understand the papers but my neighbor told me he was trying to get order of protection against me. I could not believe this and for so many years he did terrible things to me and now he was using American court against me.

My neighbor found the Queens Legal Service for me and services. The Queens Legal Services helped me to learn everything what was happening in the court. When I did not understand something, they will stop and explain it to me so many different ways to make me understand and even they brought an individual to our meetings so I could understand everything in my language.

When I met my social worker, Tobi, and my lawyer, Debra, I was afraid of losing my daughter to my husband. I was very afraid of my husband. I had no money, no money, and my landlord was telling me she was going to kick me out.

I was very grateful for the work the Queens

Legal Services did for me. We went to court together and
we won. They help me find my voice so I could plan my

future and be totally independent. It was very tough

time to feed myself and my daughter so without that, with
their help I was able to get food stamps and find stable
housing. They help me with my immigration status and
also put me into ESL classes.

Before last year, my daughter would not speak and I was pretty worried about her. Since I separate from my husband, my daughter has started speaking and has become very happy girl. She and I are now free and can do what we want to do now. I have choices now and I'm very grateful to Queens Legal Services for helping me.

I did not know anything about the American

courts before coming to Queens Legal Services. I thought I had to pay for lawyer and I had no money and I did not think lawyers will understand me and my culture or everything that happened to me.

I know there are many women suffering. I hope we can make the services like Queens Legal Service more available to these women and to anyone who is living in fear and thank you everyone and thank you for Queens Legal Services. I would never forget your help and this is unforgettable in my life in helping me out and thank you so much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much.

I think that your testimony really graphically illustrates what this hearing is all about and why the legal services are not some abstract concept but are all about human beings who have problems and difficulties and you are dealing with issues that are central to the fundamentals of life.

This is not about, you know, someone who tripped in front of the courthouse and needs a lawyer.

This is about living, what everyone should be entitled to so thank you so much. I appreciate your coming in and telling your story.

TENZIN CHOEZOM: Thank you so much.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you.

LMP

Pamela Sandousky, client of Nassau-Suffolk
Legal Services.

PAMELA SANDOUSKY: My name is Pamela Sandousky. I currently reside in Southampton, New York, and I am originally from California, reared in New Jersey and came to New York to study marine biology at Southampton College. After college, I never left the area.

I was married but have been divorced now for eight years. My ex-husband got the house when we lived -- that we lived in as part of the divorce settlement. The house is now in foreclosure and after the divorce I became a renter. I am a single parent of two children.

My legal woes began in June of 2012 and I was sent an e-mail from my landlord that I was to vacate the premises in 30 days, by July 4th. She also put a paper on the fence requesting that I vacate the premises. She did this because I was behind in some of my rent. You see, my ex-husband had moved to Florida, lost his job and was behind on child support so I was unable to make the payments alone.

I started making phone calls to see if the landlord had a proper rental permit and if she had outstanding code violations. I also made phone calls to see if I could get assistance in handling this matter. I called the Southampton Town Attorney's Office and the

town attorney referred me to Nassau-Suffolk Law Services.

I called Hannah Abrams and she agreed to assist me. Serendipitously, Law Services received funding from the Office of Court Administration which enabled them to fund an attorney to represent clients like me in landlord- tenant proceedings in the east end Justice Courts.

Ms. Abrams was the attorney assigned to that position.

This was a great relief because I was, because I received this notice in the middle of the summer and I knew how difficult it would be to be able to find affordable long-term housing in Southampton in the summer.

After I received the notice, the landlord made our life miserable. She turned off utilities, disconnected cable and internet. The police were called several times and this disruption marred the celebration of my daughter's high school graduation.

In the midst of all of this, we were planning a celebration for my daughter and guests were invited from out of town and we had to deal with the turmoil of being evicted from the home.

I met with Ms. Abrams twice before going to court. She reviewed all the relevant documents with me and researched the rental permits statutes and code violation statutes.

Ms. Abrams represented me in court. First, the landlord claimed I owed her \$3,500. She claimed I owed back rent and utilities and then she dropped the case.

The landlord refiled the case five days later saying I owed her more than \$10,000 and she claimed as a result of my non-payment she had incurred other expenses. During the questioning, the judge determined that the judge did not have jurisdiction over the matter because I was improperly served the prerequisite rent demand. The judge declined to determine whether the landlord did or did not have the proper rental permit or accessory apartment permit until I determined whether I wished to waive the defense that had surfaced during the cross-examination of the landlord.

Ms. Abrams advised me of the advantages and disadvantages of having the case dismissed at that point in the proceedings. She explained that I could still be sued in Small Claims Court for other alleged expenses the landlord had incurred. I asked that the case be dismissed.

The matter is still not settled. I now have to face the landlord in Small Claims Court. However, with the advice given to me by Ms. Abrams, I went to the town's attorney and code enforcement division to inform them that the landlord was renting the apartment without

1 a rental permit and required accessory apartment permit. 2 As a result, the town has cited her for numerous code violations and they rarely follow-up 3 because tenants don't ordinarily have the proper documentation or knowledge of the relevant law and 6 statutes. Had it not been for Ms. Abrams' legal counsel, I would not have known what the law was and what the 8 recourse would be. 10 My landlord was unscrupulous. Rather than 11 cooperate with me until I could stabilize my financial 12 situation, she chose to try to evict me, a single mother with two children. 13 Thank goodness I have a place to live and, 14 15 hopefully, I will prevail in Small Claims Court but, at 16 the very least, the landlord will have to face consequences for her actions. 17 Without Nassau-Suffolk Law Services, I shudder 18 19 to think what would have happened to me and my family. 20 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. Appreciate it, and another example. When there's no place to turn, 21 22 you turn to people who are able to give you the 23 assistance you need to again maintain. 24 I assume nothing is more important to you than,

you know, having a place to live and decent conditions so

25

thank you so much for coming in.

Our next witness is Mamie Copeland and the client of the Legal Aid Society.

MAMIE COPELAND: Good afternoon. My name is Mamie Copeland. I'm a 68-year-old widow. I live alone in an apartment at 774 Driggs Avenue in Brooklyn. I don't know where I would go if I had lost this apartment which I have lived there for 25 years.

I retired last year from working full-time for many years at different jobs, first as office file clerk and then most recently as a home health aide. When I turned 60, I received a widow's pension from Social Security. From 2010 till last year I was working part-time just four hours a day. Now I receive Social Security benefits. Now I receive Social Security retirement benefits and two small pension checks every month.

I have been a widow since 1990, the same year my youngest son sadly passed away from suffering a massive stroke at 17.

In 2010 I fell behind in my rent because I was only working part-time and I suddenly had a problem with my Social Security benefits. My checks stopped coming for over a year and by the time I sorted out the problem and started getting my check again, I was very far behind

in my rent. The only way I was able to eat and survive during this time was because of my little check from my part-time work as home health aide.

At the same time I was having problems with the Social Security checks, there was a lot of problems in my building. The ownership of the building changed hands but there was a disagreement between the new owner and the old owner that made it hard for us tenants to know who was the real owner that we should pay our rent to.

Oh, sorry. In August 2010 I received a letter from two different companies each telling me to pay rent to them. Meanwhile, there was a terrible condition in my apartment and neither the old landlord or the new landlord would fix it.

In April of this year the new landlord sued me for non-payment of rent in the amount of \$15,555.50 dating all the way back to November 2009. I know I owed the landlord back rent but I did not agree with how much the landlord said I owed. I went to court by myself to answer the non-payment petition and I disagreed the amount owed and also mentioned that I need repairs in my apartment. I was given a court date of April 16th, 2010 -- 2012. On that day, I went to Housing again by myself. The landlord was not there but his lawyer was there. He now claimed that I owe \$17,251.80. I gave the landlord's

lawyer three months rent on the spot and also agreed to sign the rest -- and I also agreed to pay the rest of the money the landlord said I owed by the end of May. The agreement I signed gave the landlord a final judgement and a warrant of eviction, with execution of the warrant to evict staying through the end of May as long as I paid my May rent by May 18th, paid the amount 3,000 by May the 15th -- I'm sorry.

Okay. I'm sorry -- pay my rent by -- pay my

May rent back May the 18th, pay my addition, 3,000 by May

the 25th and pay the rest the landlord said I owe,

\$11,975.85 by May the 30th, even though I have mentioned

in my answer to the landlord's petition that I need to

repair. The agreement was signed and nothing about this.

\$2,500 of the payment of 3,000 on time but I could not pay the rest. I applied -- but I could not pay the rent so I applied for help from the city. After that, I received a call from a lady at the Department of Social Services named Ms. Greenaway. She gave me the name and the phone number for the lawyer of Legal Aid and said, "If she can't help you, nobody can." By that time I had almost reached the payment deadline. If I did not pay all the money soon, I will be evicted. Because it was an emergency, the Legal Aid lawyer agreed to meet with me

right away but because she was so busy, the only time she could give me was on the afternoon of Sunday, May 27th. The lawyer listened to my story. She looked at all my papers and she told me she would start to write an order to show cause to present to the jury. She gave me an appointment to come back to sign the affidavit.

Later on that week, June 12th I went back to court for a hearing on the order to show cause; this time with my Legal Aid lawyer. This time I walked out of court with a much more fair agreement. The amount of back rent I owed was reduced and the agreement included the landlord had to send someone to make a repair in my apartment. After that, the landlord did make the repair and I paid my June and July rent by myself. On July the 18th, my lawyer paid the back rent to the landlord and the case was discontinued.

Not only that, but my Legal Aid lawyer also contacted the New York City Department of Finance for me where I had applied in 2009 for SCRIE, Senior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption. I know I was eligible for SCRIE because I am a senior citizen. I pay more than one third of my income for rent and I live in rent stabilized apartment but I had received no answer to my application.

I was very happy when my Legal Aid lawyer called me in the middle of August to tell me that my

SCRIE application had been approved and my share of rent was frozen at the amount of my old lease all the way back to 2009 when I applied.

I am so grateful that Ms. Greenaway sent me to Legal Aid and that the Legal Aid agreed to take my case. Without the Legal Aid, I am sure I would have lost my apartment. I know that I'm very lucky because now I can pay my rent in full and on time. I have no more fear of eviction and all the repairs I needed was done but I know there are many other New Yorkers like me who also need the same type of legal help I was fortunate enough to get.

I am here today to ask you to support the civil legal service in New York and to increase the funds for organizations like the Legal Aid Society.

Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much.

It is clear that the Legal Aid Society has really made a giant impact on your life and that's what we're trying to allow others to do because, you know, there are lots of people who come to the Legal Aid Society in New York who are turned away because they just don't have enough resources, so we're so glad that you were able to be helped and thank you for coming in.

Our last witness is Felicia Essix, a client of

1 Empire Justice Center. 2 FELICIA ESSIX: Yes. Good afternoon. Thanks 3 for having me. JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thanks for coming. 5 FELICIA ESSIX: My name is Felicia Essix and I 6 live in Freeport, New York. When my daughter was 9 and my son was 6, I 7 applied at the Department of Social Services for child 8 care for the summer. I needed child care while they were 10 not in school so I could find a job. My son and daughter have two different fathers. 11 12 My son's father was always contributing financially for 13 his care. My daughter's father has never paid child support, even though I have a court order against him. 14 When I applied to DSS I was told I could not 15 16 get child care service for my daughter unless I took my 17 son's father to court for child support. I did not believe that I should have to sue my son's father to get 18 child care for my daughter. I also did not want to 19 20 jeopardize the support and relationship that my son had with his father by suing him when he was already 21 22 contributing. 23 I first contacted Nassau-Suffolk Legal Services 24 and a representative agreed to request a fair hearing for

me and represent me at the hearing. I lost the hearing

25

but the representative referred me to Empire Justice

Center. The Empire Justice Center wanted to take my case

because they believed that people in my position should

be able to get child care benefits without having to go

to court against the child's father.

Susan Antos and Linda Hassberg filed an appeal on my behalf. The Empire Justice System also worked on changing the law that required me to sue my father's -- my daughter's father and while my appeal was pending the law changed. This led to the resolution of my appeal and I started receiving child care services and was reimbursed for some of the child care I had paid out of my pocket.

As a result, I found a job and was able to work. I also obtained justice and fairness for the other parents in similar situations. I was glad that

Nassau-Suffolk Law Services and Empire Law Service could help me win my case and proud that I was able to obtain justice for other parents, and I'd also like to just include that I thank the Empire Justice System for their consistency, their honesty and, you know, just whatever elements it may concern that was -- that makes it possible for people like myself to get the assistance they need without money because I know a lot of places that you go, it's always about what type of insurance do

you have or how much money do you have and when you don't have, you get services that are not good quality, you know, so I'm really appreciative of Ms. Susan Antos and Ms. Linda Hassberg that were there for me and they really, you know, did all the paperwork. They helped me because I had no clue, you know, that it was possible for me to obtain services for my daughter and I was able to get a job. I worked for quite sometime and the relationship for the both of them, son and daughter, turned out well and I'm just so thankful for the Empire Justice System.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, thank you so much and, again, I know that nothing is more important to you than your children and where do you turn to and you found the Empire Justice Center can help you as no one else could, you know, so I thank all of you and I think your stories, again, are the greatest advertisement we can have for legal services because everyone sees how it affects people's lives and changes their lives and in the most basic and fundamental ways so I want to thank everyone for coming to this hearing today.

We've had a daunting day. We had our two public official s, the District Attorney of Nassau County, Kathleen Rice and County Executive Bellone come in and explain how their jobs are so much involved with

this idea of justice for all and how do the different parts of government work towards that end and both made crystal clear that without civil legal services, the district attorney couldn't do her job and the county could not maintain the fabric of its communities.

Then we had the immigration panels which emphasize the need for not only legal services but the language recourses to deal with particular problems of immigrants and just critical to again saving lives and the law schools and the bar talking about what they are doing to enhance legal services and pro bono work in our state and the judge's panel, which I don't think is quite crystal clear to everybody how it affects judges and what they are supposed to be doing in their jobs when people don't have the legal services, and then all of you which really I think made our day in terms of explaining really what this is all about.

So what we're going to do now is take the results of this hearing along with the three other hearings that we've held around the state, figure out or try to quantify what the need is in our state, what we call the justice gap between the need as all of you demonstrated and the resources that are available and try to figure out what they should be asking the legislature and the governor for in terms of help for legal services

and also figure out what we can be doing further in the way of providing

pro bono services and how to energize our wonderful lawyers in our state to give even more pro bono services and try to find creative ways to do that and we thank you all and, again, I just would go back to what we started with, what these hearings are about is equal justice.

Whether you have rich and poor, high and low, whatever one's station in life, everyone is entitled to help when you are dealing with the necessities of life, if it's over someone else, physical safety, the well-being of your families, your livelihood, the right to entitlements. These are things which are very basic in our society and they can't happen without having legal services to those who need it so it is our hope that these hearings and our efforts to provide funding for civil legal services and the efforts of lawyers and law students and everyone else to volunteer their time towards giving people the help that they need will be fruitful and productive in the year ahead and we thank you all for being here.

On December 1st, the court system, or thereabouts, will put out the report, the third report of the task force to enhance legal services and put in our new request for this year for monies from the governor

1	and the legislature for legal services so this has really
2	been helpful.
3	Thank you all, and it's been really an honor
4	for us to be here today. Thank you.
5	(Hearing concluded.)
6	* * *
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	