



Admission on Motion a Useful Bar

I wanted to write a quick note in response to Mr. Bolick's commentary regarding admission on motion (ARIZ. ATTORNEY, April, 2003).

I came to the law after spending the first part of my working life running a business. I have been licensed and practicing law in Illinois since 1991. In February 2001, I sat for and passed the Arizona bar exam. In May 2001, I attended the swearing-in ceremony and obtained my license to practice in Arizona.

At age 40, did I enjoy reading through all the course material and listening to hours of audiotapes to prepare for the examination? Absolutely not. Did all that studying cost me valuable billing time as I worked to establish my solo practice? Absolutely. Did I change my area of prac-

tice or adopt any new practice areas due to all the studying? Again, no.

However, unlike Mr. Bolick, I do not fault the State Bar of Arizona for forcing me to make that effort to obtain my Arizona license. I found the bar preparation to be a tremendous intellectual challenge. I felt a real sense of accomplishment sitting in the audience listening to the various Arizona judges and dignitaries speak at the swearing-in ceremony. My children—four teenagers preparing themselves for college—saw and I think appreciated the hard work their “old man” put in to obtain this goal.

I believe that Arizona should maintain its requirement that lawyers seeking their Arizona license sit for and pass the Arizona bar exam. I do not believe that the bar exam requirement is unfair or an added burden. I do believe that it certainly

caused me to be sure of my commitment to become an Arizona lawyer. I am sure that it will cause others to do the same. In my opinion, the practice of law requires full-time dedication and a knowledge of the limits of your practice ability. I am concerned that a retirement destination like Arizona would eventually attract less than committed practitioners if it were easy to obtain a license to practice.

I am also licensed to practice in Wyoming, which allows admission on motion, and I have experienced firsthand the difficulties caused by undedicated, part-time practitioners in retirement areas like Jackson Hole. I am sure we have all advised clients led astray or worse by advice from lawyers practicing outside their areas of expertise. I believe that lessened licensing requirements would only degrade the quality of Arizona practition-

ers and thereby potentially harm the public who would become their clients.

—*Thomas D. Laue*
Drost & Laue, LLC
Barrington, IL

In response to Mr. Bolick's commentary, I say: "Would you like some cheese with that whine?"

—*Gordon David*

UPL Reform Misguided

I must disagree with the Executive Director's message in the April issue that "With the adoption of these new [UPL] rule changes (effective July 1, 2003), the seas are tranquil for the moment."

I suppose that is true if you don't consider battered women who cannot afford or cannot find appropriate legal services. Legal advocates work tirelessly helping vic-

tims get orders of protection, filling out divorce packets, completing child support worksheets, filling out forms for government benefits, submitting VAWA applications to be free from an abusive husband, etc. The Arizona Foundation for Legal Services & Education even has a grant to hire and train legal advocates. I do trainings and distribute over 300 Lay Legal Advocate Manuals annually. Several courts have self-help centers where hired staff help pro pers fill out forms and navigate their way through the complex system.

But the passage of the new rule says that filling out a form in any format for submission to any tribunal to secure any right is unauthorized practice. So who is going to help these victims? Are there hundreds of attorneys statewide who will help them for free? We all know the answer to that. I have already had questions from

service providers who hesitate to write grants for legal advocates not knowing if they can do anything. I have already had legal advocates ask me to change the name of the county on a form for fear that if they did it, it would be unauthorized practice.

I brought this problem to the attention of the Bar before the rules were submitted. I brought it to the attention of the Supreme Court when they considered it. All was ignored, and now we are here with battered women being told they can't even have someone help them fill out the child support worksheet, which is akin to filling out your tax return. The seas are not tranquil. Battered women and poor people are drowning.

—*Dianne Post, J.D.*
Director of Systems Advocacy
Arizona Coalition Against
Domestic Violence