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Dear Attendees to the Second Annual Conference on Access to Justice:

On behalf of the Illinois Supreme Court, it is my privilege to welcome you to this Conference on Access to Justice. The Commission was created on June 13, 2012. Over the past 16 months, the Commission has been hard at work on a number of important projects addressing access to justice for everyone in Illinois, with a particular focus on the poor and vulnerable in our communities.

The theme of today's conference involves pro bono work, a subject that goes to the heart of our professional responsibilities. We hope that today’s conference will prove informative, and we strongly encourage you to provide input and ideas to the Commission.

Our Court is extremely pleased to have this Commission in place. We stand united with you and others in the legal community in a desire to do everything that we possibly can to improve justice for everyone in Illinois.

Thank you so much for attending today, and for your commitment to the principles of the legal profession and the enduring goals of our system of justice.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride
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Program

1:30 p.m. Welcome
Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP and Chair of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice

1:35 p.m. Overview of the Commission's Work
Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, Illinois Supreme Court

1:40 p.m. Keynote Speaker
Bryan Stevenson, Executive Director, Equal Justice Initiative

2:10 p.m. "State of the State" of Pro Bono in Illinois
Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP and Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice

2:30 p.m. Panel: Illinois Innovations in Court-Based Pro Bono Programs
Moderated by Judge Thomas More Donnelly, Circuit Court of Cook County
Judge Dinah L. Archambeaut, 12th Judicial Circuit
Chief Judge Rubén Castillo, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois
Judge Barbara Crowder, Third Judicial Circuit

3:20 p.m. Break

3:35 p.m. Panel: Partnerships and Strategies for Success
Moderated by Maria J. Minor, Professional Development and Pro Bono Manager, Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Margaret C. Benson, Executive Director, Chicago Volunteer Legal Services
Chief Judge Elizabeth A. Robb, 11th Judicial Circuit
Judge Jorge L. Ortiz, 19th Judicial Circuit
4:15 p.m.  Questions/Reaction/Discussion
Moderated by Timothy W. Kelly, Kelly Law Offices, P.C. and Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice

4:40 p.m.  Presentation of Commission’s First Annual Service Awards
ATJ Lifetime Award: Joseph A. Dailing presented by Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, Illinois Supreme Court
ATJ Beginnings Award: Dina C. Nikitaides presented by Justice Rita B. Garman, Illinois Supreme Court

4:50 p.m.  Presentation of Illinois Judges Foundation Externship Award for Work with the Commission
Illinois Judges Foundation Externship Award: Devin T. Mapes presented by Judge Laura C. Liu, Circuit Court of Cook County, Co-Chair of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Language Access Committee, and Chair of the Illinois Judges Foundation Access to Justice Committee

4:55 p.m.  Closing Remarks
Danielle Elyce Hirsch, Executive Director, Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice

This conference will be videotaped.
Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride
Supreme Court of Illinois, 3rd District
Chief Justice Kilbride was elected to the Supreme Court of Illinois for the Third District in 2000 and was elected Chief Justice in 2010. Before his election to the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Kilbride practiced law for 20 years in Rock Island, including seven years with Prairie State Legal Services. He is a graduate of St. Mary's College in Winona, Minnesota and Antioch School of Law in Washington, D.C. Chief Justice Kilbride is a past board member, past president, and past vice-president of the Illinois Township Attorneys Association; a past volunteer lawyer and charter member of the Illinois Pro Bono Center; and a member of the Illinois State Bar and Rock Island County Bar Associations.

Jeffrey D. Colman
Partner, Jenner & Block LLP, Chicago
Mr. Colman is the Chair of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice. He has focused his 38-year career on complex civil and criminal litigation at the trial and appellate levels. He has been active in a number of programs designed to increase access to justice, and has served as president of the Chicago Bar Foundation. Mr. Colman previously served the Illinois Supreme Court as chairman of its Committee on Post-Conviction Review of Death Sentences, and as a member of the Court's Committee on Pattern Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases.

Bryan Stevenson
Executive Director, Equal Justice Initiative
Mr. Stevenson has won national acclaim for his work challenging bias against the poor and people of color in the criminal justice system. Since graduating from Harvard Law School and the Harvard School of Government, he has assisted in securing relief for dozens of condemned prisoners, advocated for poor people, and developed community-based reform litigation aimed at improving the administration of criminal justice. Mr. Stevenson is on the law faculty at New York University School of Law.

Jennifer T. Nijman
Partner, Nijman Franzetti LLP, Chicago
A former president of the Chicago Bar Association, Ms. Nijman concentrates her practice in environmental law and litigation and previously was partner and chair of the environmental practice group at Winston & Strawn. In 2001, she was honored with the CBA's Alta May Hulett Award for highest standards of professional ethics and excellence. Ms. Nijman was honored with the Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois award in 2005 for leadership in the Cause of Equal Access to Justice.
Judge Thomas More Donnelly
Circuit Court of Cook County
Judge Donnelly is an Associate Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, First Municipal District, where he currently presides over civil juries. Before becoming a judge, he clerked for the Honorable Mary Ann G. McMorrow and served as an assistant public defender for 13 years. Having served as a judge for nearly 14 years, he has presided over hundreds of jury trials in both criminal and civil matters. He recently authored opinions in *City of Chicago v. Alexander*, a highly publicized First Amendment case involving the Occupy Chicago protests, and the Second Amendment case *City of Chicago v. Patrick*. From 2009 to 2010, he served as a member of the American Arbitration Association’s National Task Force on Issues Related to the Arbitration of Consumer Debt Disputes. Judge Donnelly has taught at Loyola Law School for over 26 years as an instructor and adjunct professor; he currently teaches Illinois Litigation and directs the Philip H. Corboy Trial Advocacy Fellowship.

Judge Dinah Lennon Archambeault
12th Judicial Circuit, Will County, Domestic Relations Division
Judge Archambeault was appointed Associate Judge in the 12th Judicial Circuit in February 2007. Before becoming a judge, Judge Archambeault practiced law with the law firm of Spesia, Ayers & Ardaugh in the area of civil litigation from 1988 to 2007. Judge Archambeault is active in local bar associations. She currently serves on the Board of the Will County Bar Association as Treasurer and co-chairs the mentoring committee. She is also a member of the Women’s Bar Association, Illinois State Bar Association, and the Illinois Judge’s Association, serving on the Associate Judge’s Committee. She was appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court to serve on its Study Committee on Complex Litigation. She is a trained mediator and facilitator for Judicial Performance Evaluation Initiative, and she is involved in the Peer Judge Mentor Program. Judge Archambeault is also trained and presents to schools “Seven Reasons to Leave the Party.” She developed and chairs the extern program for the 12th Judicial Circuit, which provides law students extern experience in the courtroom setting. Judge Archambeault developed and conducts “Pro Se Day” for self-represented litigants appearing in her courtroom twice per month.

Chief Judge Rubén Castillo
United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois
In July 2013, Chief Judge Castillo became the first Hispanic Chief Judge of the Northern District of Illinois. Upon graduating from Northwestern University School of Law in 1979, he joined Jenner & Block as an associate attorney. In 1984, Chief Judge Castillo joined the United States Attorney’s Office for the Northern District of Illinois. He left the U.S. Attorney’s Office in 1988 to become the director and regional counsel for the Chicago office of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), where he served as an advocate for the Hispanic community, working to
address issues including employment discrimination, voting rights, education, and immigration. He returned to private practice as a partner at Kirkland & Ellis in 1991. In 1994, President Clinton nominated him to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois as an Article III federal judge; he was unanimously confirmed. From 1999 to 2010, Chief Judge Castillo served on the United States Sentencing Commission, an independent agency in the judicial branch whose purpose is to establish sentencing policies and practices for the federal criminal justice system. In 2011, MALDEF awarded him its Lifetime Achievement Award.

Judge Barbara Crowder
Third Judicial Circuit
Judge Crowder is the Chair of the Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee and serves as secretary of the ISBA Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services. She serves on the board of directors of the Illinois Judges Association and is a past president of the Illinois Judges Foundation. She is also a chair of the Third Circuit Family Violence Prevention Council. Judge Crowder is a member of the ISBA Civil Practice and Procedure Section Council and the ISBA Standing Committee on Legislation.

Maria J. Minor, Professional Development and Pro Bono Manager, Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Ms. Minor is responsible for Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg’s pro bono and community service programs and all aspects of attorney professional development, from first-year orientation to leadership training for the firm’s senior leaders. Ms. Minor collaborates with the Pro Bono Committee, Diversity Committee, and Women’s Network in developing programming and maximizing the impact of the firm’s efforts in the community. Prior to taking on her current role, she was a partner in Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg’s litigation group, during which time she was active in pro bono activities and served on the Diversity, Hiring, and Associate Review Committees. Ms. Minor currently serves on the Pro Bono Committee of the Illinois Supreme Court Access to Justice Commission and the Board of Chicago Volunteer Legal Services; is the Programming Co-Chair for the Coalition of Women’s Initiatives in Law; and recently completed her service on NALP’s Pro Bono/Professional Development Task Force.

Margaret C. Benson
Executive Director, Chicago Volunteer Legal Services
Ms. Benson is the Executive Director of Chicago Volunteer Legal Services (CVLS), a pro bono agency that provides free legal services to nearly 10,000 low-income people each year through the use of more than 2,300 active volunteer attorneys. While responsible for overall program management and funding, Ms. Benson also coordinates CVLS’s bench, bar, and law firm relations. An experienced family law litigator, Ms. Benson helped draft substantive changes to the Illinois Probate Act and still steps in on minor
Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice
2nd Annual Access to Justice Conference

Speakers and Panelists (Cont’d.)

guardianship and custody cases from time to time. She regularly speaks on pro bono issues and writes a bi-monthly column on pro bono for the *Chicago Lawyer*.

**Chief Judge Elizabeth A. Robb**
11th Judicial Circuit
Judge Robb was appointed Associate Circuit Judge in 1993, elected Circuit Judge in 2000, and has served as Chief Judge since 2005. She has worked collaboratively with departments in the criminal justice system and community organizations in establishing the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council of McLean County, the McLean County Drug Court and Recovery Court (a mental health court) and the Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare Roundtable, as well as developing a pro se small claims mediation program. She is the Vice-Chair of the Conference of Judges, Chair of the Study Committee on Juvenile Justice of the Judicial Conference, a member of the Supreme Court Advisory Committee for Justice and Mental Health Planning, a member of Center of Excellence Advisory Board, and a member of the Future of the Courts Criminal Law Committee. Chief Judge Robb also serves on the Legislative Committee of the Supreme Court and the Judicial Mentor Committee, and is a member of the Executive Committee of the Court Reporting Services Agency. She is a member of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice where she currently co-chairs the JusticeCorps Committee.

**Judge Jorge L. Ortiz**
19th Judicial Circuit
Judge Ortiz served as an associate judge from December 2002 until August 2008, when he was elevated to the circuit bench by the Illinois Supreme Court. Judge Ortiz was elected on November 2, 2010. He presently serves in Lake County’s Law Division. He is a former presiding judge of the Family Division, where he was involved in creation and implementation of programs serving indigent as well as pro se litigants and in provision of interpreter services in conjunction with the court’s child support enforcement court call. Judge Ortiz serves on the board of directors of the Illinois Judges Association and the Healthcare Foundation of Northern Lake County, and he is a member of the Office of Child Support Enforcement, National Judicial Child Support Enforcement Task Force. He served on the Illinois Child Support Advisory Committee and on the Steering Committee of Illinois Legal Needs Study II.

**Timothy W. Kelly**
Founder and Partner, Kelly Law Offices, Bloomington
Mr. Kelly concentrates his practice in litigation and is a member of the Illinois State Bar Association, the board of managers for the American Trial Lawyers Association, the McLean County Inns of Court, and the McLean County and Chicago Bar Associations.
He is a fellow with the Illinois Bar Foundation and a former staff attorney with Prairie State Legal Services. Mr. Kelly also served as McLean County assistant public defender.

**Judge Laura C. Liu**
Circuit Court of Cook County, Chicago
Appointed to the Circuit Court of Cook County by the Illinois Supreme Court, Judge Liu is the first Chinese-American female judge to serve in Illinois, and the first Chinese-American judge in Cook County. Prior to her appointment, Judge Liu practiced as a civil litigator for 19 years. Judge Liu is a graduate of Youngstown State University and the University of Cincinnati College of Law. Judge Liu is fluent in Mandarin Chinese, and is actively involved in community programs encouraging diversity education and awareness.

**Danielle Elyce Hirsch**
Executive Director, Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice
Ms. Hirsch is responsible for leading and managing the Commission’s work to promote, facilitate and enhance access to justice in Illinois. Immediately prior to joining the Commission, she served as Director of Advocacy at the Chicago Bar Foundation (CBF). While at the CBF, Ms. Hirsch developed and managed an innovative new program, Illinois JusticeCorps, which places college and law students in courthouses to provide procedural assistance to people without lawyers. Ms. Hirsch continues to direct the program as part of her work with the Commission. Ms. Hirsch graduated from Oberlin College with high honors and earned her JD from the University of Illinois College of Law where she graduated summa cum laude and was elected to the Order of the Coif.
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Award Recipients

Joseph A. Dailing
Lifetime Service Award

Joseph A. Dailing has been involved in Illinois legal services efforts in a number of capacities. For more than three decades, he was involved in the administration of two legal aid programs: Western Illinois Legal Assistance Foundation and Prairie State Legal Services. In January 2006, he left Prairie State Legal Services to become the first full-time employee and Executive Director of the Illinois Coalition for Equal Justice, an access to justice entity created by the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. The Coalition's activities are overseen by an Executive Committee and it operates as a project of The Chicago Bar Foundation, which provides administrative support and oversight. Since May 2007, Joe's work has concentrated almost exclusively on setting up legal self-help centers around Illinois for unrepresented litigants, working in collaboration with Illinois Legal Aid Online and local court, community and social service agency representatives. In mid-January of 2013, the Illinois Coalition for Equal Justice and Illinois Legal Aid Online opened up the 98th and last legal self-help center in Randolph County. All 98 centers are maintained and updated by Illinois Legal Aid Online. With the conclusion of the legal self-help center project, Joe retired from full time employment. He continues to work periodically as a consultant in evaluating legal services programs, with the national Legal Services Corporation. In the past six years, he served as an LSC temporary employee/consultant on more than a dozen different Program Quality Visits. He has also worked internationally, most recently in April 2013, when he returned to the Republic of Georgia to consult with legal aid programs’ management systems.

Dina C. Nikitaides
Pursuit of Justice Award

Dina Nikitaides is the Interactive Content Manager at Illinois Legal Aid Online where she oversees the development of interactive legal resources for use by self-represented litigants and legal advocates. She applies usability design skills learned in her prior career as an interactive graphic designer in combination with advanced technology to present legal content in an easily consumable format. Ms. Nikitaides previously worked as the Program Coordinator for the Center for Access to Justice & Technology at Chicago-Kent, where she managed several technology related grants, oversaw development of the A2J Author software used to create automated documents, conducted nationwide trainings and outreach, and supervised the Self-Help Web Center in the Daley Center. Since the launch of the Access to Justice Commission Forms Committee, Ms. Nikitaides has lent her expertise to establishing the statewide form development process and style guidelines, as well as the forms themselves. Ms. Nikitaides holds a J.D. from the Chicago-Kent College of Law and a B.A. from the University of Michigan.
Devin T. Mapes  
Illinois Judges Foundation Externship Award  

Devin Mapes is a third-year student at St. Louis University School of Law. Graduating in May 2014, Devin has interests in litigation and international law, and hopes to work in Chicago upon passing the Illinois Bar. This past summer, he volunteered for the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice and externed for Justice Jesse Reyes of the First Appellate District, and this fall, Devin is serving as the Illinois Judges Foundation’s inaugural extern with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice.
2001
The Illinois Supreme Court creates the Special Supreme Court Committee on Pro Bono Publico Legal Service ("Special Committee") and appoints Belleville attorney Russell K. Scott as chair.

2003
The Special Committee issues a comprehensive report to the Supreme Court. The report recommends the adoption of a mandatory pro bono reporting rule, but after serious consideration, rejects requiring mandatory pro bono service.

2006
The Illinois Supreme Court adopts Rule 756(f), which requires all attorneys licensed in Illinois to report, in connection with the attorney’s annual ARDC registration, pro bono legal services provided and qualified monetary contributions made during the preceding 12 months to support legal aid.

Supreme Court Rule 756(f) contains a broad definition that illustrates four distinct ways in which lawyers can use their unique training, experience and skills to help the public on a pro bono basis. Under the rule, qualifying “pro bono legal services” include (a) legal services to a person of limited means; (b) legal services to an organization designed to address the needs of persons of limited means; (c) legal services to certain charitable, religious, civic, or community organizations; and (d) pro bono training intended to benefit legal service organizations or lawyers who provide pro bono services. According to Rule 756(f), “persons of limited means” are not only those persons with household incomes below the federal poverty standard but also the “working poor.”

The rule also encourages attorneys to make financial contributions “to an organization that provides legal services to persons of limited means or which contributes financial support to such an organization.”

The reporting requirement consists of two questions that were added to the annual Illinois ARDC registration form, one that asks about pro bono hours and one that asks about financial support. All attorneys must respond to both questions, even if they did not perform any pro bono work or make a qualified monetary contribution in the preceding 12 months.

2008
Amendments to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 716 and 756 go into effect. These amendments:

- Provide that retired, inactive and in-house attorneys with limited admission status may do pro bono work – work without charge or expectation of a fee – for individuals of limited means or charitable, civic, community or other similar groups

- Include safeguards to ensure that clients are receiving high quality legal services and that the legal profession is adequately protected
2010
Rule 6.5 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct goes into effect, allowing a lawyer to undertake short-term, limited scope pro bono representation without performing a formal conflict check so long as the lawyer is unaware of any conflicts of interest and the other requirements of the rule are met. The Rule applies only to pro bono engagements obtained through programs sponsored by a court or nonprofit organization.

2013
Building on the 2008 amendments, additional amendments to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 716 and 756 go into effect. These amendments:

- For the first time, allow attorneys admitted in another state, but not in Illinois, to provide pro bono service subject to the same safeguards that apply to retired and inactive counsel

- Provide that in-house attorneys with limited admission status under Rule 716 may perform pro bono service without additional registration or affiliation requirements

- Ease annual registration requirements for sponsoring entities

In addition, several Illinois Supreme Court Rules go into effect that address broader access to justice issues, but positively impact pro bono as well. Specifically:

- Amendments to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711 allow law students to engage in pro bono service earlier in their law school careers (after earning 1/2 of the required credit hours)

- Amendments to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 11, 13 and 137 allow lawyers to represent clients in litigation for only a portion of a case, creating the potential for additional pro bono opportunities for attorneys who want to make a more limited time commitment

- Illinois Supreme Court Rule 10-101 and an accompanying Administrative Order go into effect, creating Standardized Forms and a process for creating them, which will make it easier for pro bono and legal aid organizations to train and support pro bono attorneys
The preamble to the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct, Section 6(a), states as follows:

It is also the responsibility of those licensed as officers of the court to use their training, experience, and skills to provide services in the public interest for which compensation may not be available. It is the responsibility of those who manage law firms to create an environment that is hospitable to the rendering of a reasonable amount of uncompensated service by lawyers practicing in that firm. Service in the public interest may take many forms. These include but are not limited to pro bono representation of persons unable to pay for legal services and assistance in the organized bar’s efforts at law reform. An individual lawyer’s efforts in these areas is evidence of the lawyer’s good character and fitness to practice law, and the efforts of the bar as a whole are essential to the bar’s maintenance of professionalism. To help monitor and quantify the extent of these activities, and to encourage an increase in the delivery of legal services to persons of limited means, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756(f) requires disclosure with each lawyer’s annual registration with the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the approximate amount of his or her pro bono legal service and the approximate amount of qualified monetary contributions.
RULE 756. REGISTRATION AND FEES
(RELEVANT PORTIONS)

* * *

(f) Disclosure of Voluntary Pro Bono Service. As part of registering under this rule, each lawyer shall report the approximate amount of his or her pro bono legal service and the amount of qualified monetary contributions made during the preceding 12 months.

(1) Pro bono legal service includes the delivery of legal services or the provision of training without charge or expectation of a fee, as defined in the following subparagraphs:

(a) legal services rendered to a person of limited means;

(b) legal services to charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental or educational organizations in matters designed to address the needs of persons of limited means;

(c) legal services to charitable, religious, civic, or community organizations in matters in furtherance of their organizational purposes; and

(d) training intended to benefit legal service organizations or lawyers who provide pro bono services.

In a fee case, a lawyer’s billable hours may be deemed pro bono when the client and lawyer agree that further services will be provided voluntarily. Legal services for which payment was expected, but is uncollectible, do not qualify as pro bono legal service.

(2) Pro bono legal service to persons of limited means refers not only to those persons whose household incomes are below the federal poverty standard, but also to those persons frequently referred to as the “working poor.” Lawyers providing pro bono legal service need not undertake an investigation to determine client eligibility. Rather, a good-faith determination by the lawyer of client eligibility is sufficient.

(3) Qualified monetary contribution means a financial contribution to an organization as enumerated in subparagraph (1)(b) which provides legal services to persons of limited means or which contributes financial support to such an organization.

(4) As part of the lawyer’s annual registration fee statement, the report required by subsection (f) shall be made by answering the following questions:

(a) Did you, within the past 12 months, provide any pro bono legal services as described in subparagraphs (1) through (4) below? _____ Yes _____ No
If no, are you prohibited from providing legal services because of your employment? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, identify the approximate number of hours provided in each of the following categories where the service was provided without charge or expectation of a fee:

(1) hours of legal services to a person/persons of limited means;

(2) hours of legal services to charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental or educational organizations in matters designed to address the needs of persons of limited means;

(3) hours of legal services to charitable, religious, civic or community organizations in furtherance of their organizational purposes; and

(4) hours providing training intended to benefit legal service organizations or lawyers who provide pro bono services.

Legal services for which payment was expected, but is not collectible, do not qualify as pro bono services and should not be included.

(b) Have you made a monetary contribution to an organization which provides legal services to persons of limited means or which contributes financial support to such organization? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, approximate amount: $_____.

(5) Information provided pursuant to this subsection (f) shall be deemed confidential pursuant to the provisions of Rule 766, but the Commission may report such information in the aggregate.

* * *

(j) Pro Bono Authorization for Inactive and Retired Status Attorneys and Attorneys Admitted in Other States.

(1) Authorization to Provide Pro Bono Services. An attorney who is registered as inactive or retired under Rule 756(a)(5) or (a)(6), or an attorney who is admitted in another state and is not disbarred or otherwise suspended from practice in any jurisdiction shall be authorized to provide pro bono legal services under the following circumstances:

(a) without charge or an expectation of a fee by the attorney;

(b) to persons of limited means or to organizations, as defined in paragraph (f) of this rule; and
(c) under the auspices of a sponsoring entity, which must be a not-for-profit legal services organization, governmental entity, law school clinical program, or bar association providing *pro bono* legal services as defined in paragraph (f)(1) of this rule.

(2) Duties of Sponsoring Entities. In order to qualify as a sponsoring entity, an organization must submit to the Administrator an application identifying the nature of the organization as one described in section (j)(1)(c) of this rule and describing any program for providing *pro bono* services which the entity sponsors and in which attorneys covered under paragraph (j) may participate. In the application, a responsible attorney shall verify that the program will provide appropriate training and support and malpractice insurance for volunteers and that the sponsoring entity will notify the Administrator as soon as any attorney authorized to provide services under this rule has ended his or her participation in the program. The organization is required to provide malpractice insurance coverage for any attorneys participating in the program and must inform the Administrator if the organization ceases to be a sponsoring entity under this rule.

(3) Procedure for Attorneys Seeking Authorization to Provide *Pro Bono* Services. An attorney admitted in Illinois who is registered as inactive or retired, or an attorney who is admitted in another state but not Illinois, who seeks to provide *pro bono* services under this rule shall submit a statement to the Administrator so indicating, along with a verification from a sponsoring entity or entities that the attorney will be participating in a *pro bono* program under the auspices of that entity. An attorney who is seeking authorization based on admission in another state shall also disclose all other state admissions and whether the attorney is the subject of any disbarment or suspension orders in any jurisdiction. The attorney’s statement shall include the attorney’s agreement that he or she will participate in any training required by the sponsoring entity and that he or she will notify the Administrator within 30 days of ending his or her participation in a *pro bono* program. Upon receiving the attorney’s statement and the entity’s verification, the Administrator shall cause the master roll to reflect that the attorney is authorized to provide *pro bono* services. That authorization shall continue until the end of the calendar year in which the statement and verification are submitted, unless the lawyer or the sponsoring entity sends notice to the Administrator that the program or the lawyer’s participation in the program has ended.

(4) Renewal of Authorization. An attorney who has been authorized to provide *pro bono* services under this rule may renew the authorization on an annual basis by submitting a statement that he or she continues to participate in a qualifying program, along with verification from the sponsoring entity that the attorney continues to participate in such a program under the entity’s auspices and that the attorney has taken part in any training required by the program. An attorney who is seeking renewal based on admission in another state shall also affirm that the attorney is not the subject of any disbarment or suspension orders in any jurisdiction.

(5) Annual Registration for Attorneys on Retired Status. Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 756(a)(6), a retired status attorney who seeks to provide *pro bono*
services under this rule must register on an annual basis, but is not required to pay a registration fee.

(6) MCLE Exemption. The provisions of Rule 791 exempting attorneys from MCLE requirements by reason of being registered as inactive or retired shall apply to inactive or retired status attorneys authorized to provide pro bono services under this rule, except that such attorneys shall participate in training to the extent required by the sponsoring entity.

(7) Disciplinary Authority. Lawyers admitted in another state who are providing legal services in this jurisdiction pursuant to this paragraph are subject to this Court's disciplinary authority and the Rules of Professional Conduct of this jurisdiction, as provided in Rule 8.5 of the Rules of Professional Conduct of 2010. Any lawyer who provides legal services pursuant to this rule shall not be considered to be engaged in the unlawful practice of law in this jurisdiction.


Committee Comments
(April 8, 2013)

Paragraph (j) is not intended to apply to attorneys who are otherwise authorized to provide pro bono service in Illinois, including house counsel admitted under Rule 716.
RULE 716. LIMITED ADMISSION OF HOUSE COUNSEL
(RELEVANT PORTIONS)

A person who, as determined by the Board of Admissions to the Bar, has been licensed to practice in the highest court of law in any United States state, territory, or the District of Columbia may receive a limited license to practice law in this state when the lawyer is employed in Illinois as house counsel exclusively for a single corporation, partnership, association or other legal entity (as well as any parent, subsidiary or affiliate thereof), the lawful business of which consists of activities other than the practice of law or the provision of legal services upon the following conditions:

* * *

(g) Authority and Limitations. A lawyer licensed and employed as provided by this Rule has the authority to act on behalf of his or her employer for all purposes as if licensed in Illinois. The lawyer may not act as counsel for the employer until the application is accepted and approved by the Court. A lawyer licensed under this rule shall not offer legal services or advice to the public or in any manner hold himself or herself out to be engaged or authorized to engage in the practice of law, except such lawyer may provide voluntary pro bono public services as provided defined in Rule 756(i)(f).

* * *

RULE 6.5. NONPROFIT AND COURT-ANNEXED LIMITED LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

(a) A lawyer who, under the auspices of a program sponsored by a nonprofit organization or court, provides short-term limited legal services to a client without expectation by either the lawyer or the client that the lawyer will provide continuing representation in the matter:

(1) is subject to Rules 1.7 and 1.9(a) only if the lawyer knows that the representation of the client involves a conflict of interest; and

(2) is subject to Rule 1.10 only if the lawyer knows that another lawyer associated with the lawyer in a law firm is disqualified by Rule 1.7 or 1.9(a) with respect to the matter.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a)(2), Rule 1.10 is inapplicable to a representation governed by this Rule.


Comment

[1] Legal services organizations, courts and various nonprofit organizations have established programs through which lawyers provide short-term limited legal services—such as advice or the completion of legal forms—that will assist persons to address their legal problems without further representation by a lawyer. In these programs, such as legal-advice hotlines, advice-only clinics or pro se counseling programs, a client-lawyer relationship is established, but there is no expectation that the lawyer’s representation of the client will continue beyond the limited consultation. Such programs are normally operated under circumstances in which it is not feasible for a lawyer to systematically screen for conflicts of interest as is generally required before undertaking a representation. See, e.g., Rules 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10.

[2] A lawyer who provides short-term limited legal services pursuant to this Rule must secure the client’s informed consent to the limited scope of the representation. See Rule 1.2(c). If a short-term limited representation would not be reasonable under the circumstances, the lawyer may offer advice to the client but must also advise the client of the need for further assistance of counsel. Except as provided in this Rule, the Rules of Professional Conduct, including Rules 1.6 and 1.9(c), are applicable to the limited representation.

[3] Because a lawyer who is representing a client in the circumstances addressed by this Rule ordinarily is not able to check systematically for conflicts of interest, paragraph (a) requires compliance with Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a) only if the lawyer knows that the representation presents a conflict of interest for the lawyer, and with Rule 1.10 only if the lawyer knows that another lawyer in the lawyer’s firm is disqualified by Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a) in the matter.

[4] Because the limited nature of the services significantly reduces the risk of conflicts of interest with other matters being handled by the lawyer’s firm, paragraph (b) provides that Rule 1.10 is inapplicable to a representation governed by this Rule except as provided by paragraph (a)(2). Paragraph (a)(2) requires the participating lawyer to comply with Rule 1.10.
when the lawyer knows that the lawyer's firm is disqualified by Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a). By virtue of paragraph (b), however, a lawyer's participation in a short-term limited legal services program will not preclude the lawyer's firm from undertaking or continuing the representation of a client with interests adverse to a client being represented under the program's auspices. Nor will the personal disqualification of a lawyer participating in the program be imputed to other lawyers participating in the program.

[5] If, after commencing a short-term limited representation in accordance with this Rule, a lawyer undertakes to represent the client in the matter on an ongoing basis, Rules 1.7, 1.9(a) and 1.10 become applicable.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES
(Illinois Supreme Court Rules 11, 13, 137)

Rule 11. Manner of Serving Documents Other Than Process and Complaint on Parties Not in Default in the Trial and Reviewing Courts

* * *

(e) Limited Scope Appearance. After an attorney files a Notice of Limited Scope Appearance in accordance with Rule 13(c)(6), service of all documents shall be made on both the attorney and the party represented on a limited scope basis until: (1) the court enters an order allowing the attorney to withdraw under Rule 13(c) or (2) the attorney’s representation automatically terminates under Rule 13(c)(7)(ii).

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

Rule 13. Appearances – Time to Plead – Withdrawal

* * *

(c) Appearance and Withdrawal of Attorneys.

(6) Limited Scope Appearance. An attorney may make a limited scope appearance on behalf of a party in a civil proceeding pursuant to Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(c) when the attorney has entered into a written agreement with that party to provide limited scope representation. The attorney shall file a Notice of Limited Scope Appearance in the form attached to this rule, identifying each aspect of the proceeding to which the limited scope appearance pertains.

An attorney may file a Notice of Limited Scope Appearance more than once in a case. An attorney must file a new Notice of Limited Scope Appearance before any additional aspect of the proceeding in which the attorney intends to appear. A party shall not be required to pay more than one appearance fee in a case.

(7) Withdrawal Following Completion of Limited Scope Representation. Upon completing the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance filed pursuant to paragraph (6), the attorney shall withdraw by oral motion or written notice as provided in parts (i)-(ii) of this paragraph. A withdrawal for any reason other than completion of the representation shall be requested by motion under paragraphs (c)(2) and (c)(3).

(i) If the attorney completes the representation at or before a court hearing attended by the party the attorney represents, the attorney may make an oral motion for withdrawal without prior notice to the party the attorney represents or to other parties. The court must grant the motion unless the party objects on the ground that the attorney has not completed the representation. The order granting the withdrawal may require the attorney to give written notice of the order to parties who were neither present nor represented at the hearing. If the party objects that the attorney has not completed the representation, the court must hold an evidentiary hearing on the objection, either immediately or on a specified later date. After hearing the evidence, the court must grant the motion to withdraw unless the court expressly finds that the attorney has not completed the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance.

(ii) An attorney also may withdraw by filing a Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance in the form attached to this rule. The attorney must serve the Notice on the party the attorney represents and must also serve it on other counsel of record and other parties not represented by counsel, unless the court by order excuses service on other counsel and other parties. The attorney must also serve the Notice on the judge then presiding over the case. The attorney must file proof of service in compliance with this paragraph. Within 21 days after the service of the Notice, the party may file an Objection to Withdrawal of
Limited Scope Appearance in the form attached to this rule. The party must serve the Objection on the attorney and must also serve it on other counsel of record and other parties not represented by counsel unless the court by order excuses service on other counsel and other parties. If no timely Objection is filed, the attorney’s limited scope appearance automatically terminates, without entry of a court order when the 21-day period expires. If a timely Objection is filed, however, the attorney must notice a hearing on the Objection. If the ground for the Objection is that the attorney has not completed the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance, the court must hold an evidentiary hearing. After the requisite hearing, the court must enter an order allowing the attorney to withdraw unless the court expressly finds that the attorney has not completed the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance.


Committee Comments

(rev. June 14, 2013)

Rule 13 was added in 1982. It was patterned after Proposed Uniform Circuit Court Rule III, which was prepared by a special committee of the Illinois State Bar Association and approved by the ISBA Board of Governors on June 22, 1976. Under paragraph (c) of this rule, an attorney’s written appearance on behalf of a client before any court in this State binds the attorney to continue to represent that client in that cause until the court, after notice and motion, grants leave for the attorney to withdraw. (See Code of Professional Responsibility, Rules 2-110, 5-102 and 5-105 Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(c).) This is true whether a final judgment has been entered in the cause or the contract of employment has been carried out. See Rule 7-101(a)(2).

Committee Comments

(June 14, 2013)

Paragraph (c)(6) addresses the provision of limited scope representation to clients under Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(c). The paragraph is not intended to regulate or impede appearances made pursuant to other types of limited engagements by attorneys, who may appear and withdraw as otherwise provided by Rule 13.

An attorney making a limited scope appearance in a civil proceeding must first enter into a written agreement with the party disclosing the limited nature of the representation. The limited appearance is then effected by using the form Notice of Limited Scope Appearance appended to this Rule. Utilizing this standardized form promotes consistency in the filing of limited scope appearances, makes the notices easily recognizable to judges and court personnel, and helps ensure that the scope of the representation is identified with specificity.
RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

A party on whose behalf an attorney has filed a Notice of Limited Scope Appearance remains responsible, either personally or through an attorney who represents the party, for all matters not specifically identified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance.

Paragraph (c)(6) does not restrict (1) the number of limited scope appearances an attorney may make in a case, (2) the aspects of the case for which an attorney may file a limited scope appearance such as, for example, specified court proceedings, depositions, or settlement negotiations, or (3) the purposes for which an attorney may file a limited scope appearance. Notwithstanding the absence of numeric or subject matter restrictions on filing limited scope appearances, nothing in the Rule restricts the ability of a court to manage the cases before it, including taking appropriate action in response to client or lawyer abuse of the limited scope representation procedures.

Paragraph (c)(7) provides two alternative ways for an attorney to withdraw when the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance has been completed. The first method—an oral motion—can be used whenever the representation is completed at or before a hearing attended by the party the attorney represents. Prior notice of such a hearing is not required. The attorney should use this method whenever possible, because its use ensures that withdrawal occurs as soon as possible and that the court knows of the withdrawal.

The second method—filing a Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance—enables the attorney to withdraw easily in other situations, without having to make a court appearance, except when there is a genuine dispute about the attorney’s completion of the representation. The Notice must be served on the party represented and on other counsel of record and other parties not represented by counsel unless the court excuses service on other counsel of record and other parties not represented by counsel. The Notice must also be served on the judge then presiding over the case to ensure that the judge is made aware that the limited scope representation has been completed, subject to the client’s right to object. The attorney’s withdrawal is automatic, without entry of a court order, unless the client files a timely Objection to Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance.

If the attorney makes an oral motion to withdraw pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(i), with or without client objection, or if the client files a timely Objection to Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(ii), the court must allow the attorney to withdraw unless the court expressly finds that the attorney has not completed the representation specified in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance. An evidentiary hearing is required if the client objects to the attorney’s withdrawal based on the attorney’s failure to complete the representation. A nonevidentiary hearing is required if the client objects on a ground other than the attorney’s failure to complete the representation, although the primary function of such a hearing is to explain to the client that such an objection is not well-founded. A court’s refusal to permit withdrawal of a completed limited scope representation, or even its encouragement of the attorney to extend the representation, would disserve the interests of justice by discouraging attorneys from undertaking limited scope representations out of concern that agreements with clients for such representations would not be enforced.
RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

A limited scope appearance under the rule is unrelated to "special and limited" appearances formerly used to object to the lack of personal jurisdiction. The use of such appearances ended with the adoption of Public Act 91-145, which amended section 2-301 of the Code of Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 5/2-301) effective January 1, 2000.

Form for Limited Scope Appearance in Civil Action

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE _______ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
______________ COUNTY, ILLINOIS
(OR, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS)

Plaintiff/Petitioner

Defendant/Respondent

NOTICE OF LIMITED SCOPE APPEARANCE

1. The attorney, ____________________________ , and the Party, ____________________________ , have entered into a written agreement dated ____________________________ providing that the attorney will provide limited scope representation to the Party in the above-captioned matter in accordance with Paragraphs 3 and 4, below.

2. The Party is Plaintiff Petitioner Defendant Respondent in this matter. (Circle one)

3. The attorney appears pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13(c)(6). This appearance is limited in scope to the following matter(s) in which the attorney will represent the Party (check and complete all that apply):

☐ In the court proceeding (identify) on the following date: ____________________________
☐ And in any continuance of that proceeding
☐ At the trial on the following date: ____________________________
☐ "And in any continuance of that trial
☐ "And until judgment
☐ "At the following deposition(s):
☐ "If a family law matter, specify the scope and limits of representation:
☐ Other (specify the scope and limits of representation):

________________________________________

RULE 13 (RELEVANT PORTIONS)
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4. If this appearance does not extend to all matters to be considered at the proceeding(s) above, identify the discrete issues within each proceeding covered by this appearance:

5. The attorney may withdraw following completion of the limited scope representation specified in this appearance as follows:

   a. orally move to withdraw at a hearing attended by the Party, at which the Party may object to withdrawal if the Party contends that the limited scope representation specified in this appearance has not been completed; or

   b. file a Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Representation in the form attached to Supreme Court Rule 13. If the attorney files such a Notice, the attorney shall serve it upon the Party and upon all counsel of record and other parties not represented by counsel unless the court excuses service upon other counsel and other unrepresented parties, and upon the judge then presiding over this case. The method of service shall be as provided in Supreme Court Rule 11 unless the court orders otherwise. If the Party objects to the withdrawal, the Party may, within 21 days after the date of the attorney’s service of the Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance, file an Objection to Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance in the form attached to Supreme Court Rule 13. The attorney will provide a copy of the form of Objection to the Party with the attorney’s Notice, including instructions for filing and service of an Objection. If the Party timely serves an Objection, the attorney shall notice the matter for hearing to rule on the Objection.

6. Service of pleadings on the attorney and party named above shall be made in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 11(e).

7. By signing below, the Party being represented under this Limited Scope Appearance:

   a. agrees to the delivery of all court papers to the addresses specified below; and

   b. agrees to inform the court, all counsel of record, and all parties not represented by counsel of any changes to the Party’s address information listed below during the limited scope representation.

   Signature of Attorney

   Name of Attorney

   Attorney’s Address

   Attorney’s Telephone Number

   Attorney’s E-Mail Address

   Attorney Number

   Signature of Party

   Name of Party

   Party’s Address

   Party’s Telephone Number

   Party’s E-Mail Address

   Date
RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

Form for Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ________ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COUNTY, ILLINOIS
(OR, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS)

Plaintiff/Petitioner

v.

Defendant/Respondent

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LIMITED SCOPE APPEARANCE

I withdraw my Notice of Limited Scope Appearance for ________ [party], pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13(c)(7).

I have completed all services within the scope of the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance, and I have completed all acts ordered by the court within the scope of that appearance.

Service of documents upon me under Supreme Court Rule 11(e) will no longer be required upon the later of: (a) 21 days after service of this Notice or, (b) if ________ [party] files and serves an Objection to Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance within 21 days after service of this Notice, entry of a court order allowing my withdrawal. Service of documents on ________[party] continues to be required.

NOTICE TO ________[party]: You have the right to object to my withdrawal as your lawyer if you believe that I have not finished everything that I had agreed to do. To object, you must:

1. Fill in the blanks in the attached form of Objection to Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance, including the Certificate of Service and sign where indicated.

2. File the original Objection with the court by ________, ________, [date to be filled in by lawyer] which is 21 days after the date that I am filing and serving this Notice.

3. On the same day that you file the Objection with the court, send copies of it to me and to the other persons listed in the Certificate of Service attached to the Objection. Also, check the boxes in the Certificate of Service to show how you sent the copy to each person.
RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

If you file and serve an Objection within the 21-day period, I will arrange to have a hearing date set by the court. I will send you notice of the date. You must appear at the hearing and explain to the judge why you believe that I have not finished everything that I had agreed to do for you.

Signature of Attorney

Name of Attorney

Attorney’s Address

Attorney’s Telephone Number

Attorney’s E-Mail Address

Attorney Number

Date

Proof of Filing and Service

I certify that this Notice has been filed with the court on the __ day of __________, 20__, and on the same day I served this Notice on the following, including the Party that I represented, all counsel of record and parties not represented by counsel, and the judge now presiding over this case, by the method checked below for each.

[List Name and Address of Each] [Check Method of Service]  
The Honorable _______________ [ ] US Mail, Postage Prepaid [ ] Messenger  
______________ [ ] Personal Delivery [ ] Facsimile  
[ ] Email

[Client] ______________________ [ ] US Mail, Postage Prepaid [ ] Messenger  
______________ [ ] Personal Delivery [ ] Facsimile  
[ ] Email

[Repeat Same Information for Each Other Counsel of Record and Unrepresented Party]

Signature of Attorney
RELEVANT PORTIONS OF LIMITED SCOPE RULES

Form for Objection To Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance

******************************************************************************

[To Withdrawing Attorney: On the Copy of This Form Sent to the Client, List the Parties and Addresses in the Certificate of Service and Complete All Parts of the Form Except the Statement of Grounds, the Signature Block Information, the Date of Filing and Service of the Objection, the Client’s Method of Service, and the Client’s Signatures]

******************************************************************************

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE _______________ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

COUNTY, ILLINOIS

(OR, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS)

Plaintiff/Petitioner  )

v.  ) No.

Defendant/Respondent  )

OBJECTION TO WITHDRAWAL OF LIMITED SCOPE APPEARANCE

I, ________________, object to my attorney’s Notice of Withdrawal of Limited Scope Appearance filed on ______________.

My attorney has not finished everything he or she had agreed to do in the Notice of Limited Scope Appearance. I understand this is the only basis for me to present a valid objection to my attorney’s notice of withdrawal. The specific services that my attorney has not completed are:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

I understand that my objection will be set for a court hearing and I will be required to appear at that hearing and explain to a judge what services my attorney has not completed that he or she had agreed to do for me.

Signature of Party _____________________ Name of Party _____________________

RULE 13 (RELEVANT PORTIONS)
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Party’s Address

Party’s Telephone Number

Party’s E-Mail Address

Date

Proof of Filing and Service

I certify that this Objection has been filed with the court on the ___ day of __________, ____, and on the same day I served this Objection on the following by the method checked below for each.

[List Name and Address of Each] [Check Method of Service]
[Attorney Who Represented Client] [ ] US Mail, Postage Prepaid

[ ] Messenger

[ ] Personal Delivery [ ] Facsimile

[ ] Email

[Repeat Same Information for Each Other Counsel of Record and Unrepresented Party]

Signature of Party

Committee Comments

Rule 13 was added in 1982. It was patterned after Proposed Uniform Circuit Court Rule III, which was prepared by a special committee of the Illinois State Bar Association and approved by the ISBA Board of Governors on June 22, 1976. Under paragraph (c) of this rule, an attorney’s written appearance on behalf of a client before any court in this State binds the attorney to continue to represent that client in that cause until the court, after notice and motion, grants leave for the attorney to withdraw. (See Code of Professional Responsibility, Rules 2—110, 5--102 and 5--105.) This is true whether a final judgment has been entered in the cause or the contract of employment has been carried out. See Rule 7–101(a)(2).
Rule 137. Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Documents – Sanctions

(e) Attorney Assistance Not Requiring an Appearance or Signature. An attorney may assist a self-represented person in drafting or reviewing a pleading, motion, or other paper without making a general or limited scope appearance. Such assistance does not constitute either a general or limited scope appearance by the attorney. The self-represented person shall sign the pleading, motion, or other paper. An attorney providing drafting or reviewing assistance may rely on the self-represented person's representation of facts without further investigation by the attorney, unless the attorney knows that such representations are false.


Committee Comments
(June 14, 2013)

Under Illinois Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(c), an attorney may limit the scope of a representation if the limitation is reasonable under the circumstances and the client gives informed consent. Such a limited scope representation may include providing advice to a party regarding the drafting of a pleading, motion or other paper, or reviewing a pleading, motion or other paper drafted by a party, without filing a general or limited scope appearance. In such circumstances, an attorney is not required to sign or otherwise note the attorney's involvement and the certification requirements in Rule 137 are inapplicable. Moreover, even if an attorney is identified in connection with such a limited scope representation, the attorney will not be deemed to have made a general or limited scope appearance.

Consistent with the limited scope of services envisioned under this drafting and reviewing function, attorneys may rely on the representation of facts provided by the self-represented person. This rule applies, for example, to an attorney who advises a caller to a legal aid telephone hotline regarding the completion of a form pleading, motion or other paper or an attorney providing information at a pro bono clinic.

All obligations under Rule 137 with respect to signing pleadings and certifications apply fully in those limited scope representations where an attorney has filed a general or limited scope appearance. Drafting a pleading, motion or other paper, or reviewing a pleading, motion or paper drafted by a party does not establish any independent responsibility not already applicable under current law.
Rule 711. Representation by Supervised Senior Law Students or Graduates (effective
July 1, 2013)

(a) Eligibility. A student in a law school approved by the American Bar Association may
be certified by the dean of the school to be eligible to perform the services described in
paragraph (c) of this rule, if he/she satisfies the following requirements:

(1) He/She must have received credit for work representing at least three-fifths one-half of
the total hourly credits required for graduation from the law school.

(2) He/She must be a student in good academic standing, and be eligible under the school’s
criteria to undertake the activities authorized herein.

A graduate of a law school approved by the American Bar Association who (i) has not yet had an
opportunity to take the examinations provided for in Rule 704, (ii) has taken the examinations
provided for in Rule 704 but not yet received notification of the results of either examination, or
(iii) has taken and passed both examinations provided for in Rule 704 but has not yet been sworn
as a member of the Illinois bar may, if the dean of that law school has no objection, be
authorized by the Administrative Director of the Illinois Courts to perform the services described
in paragraph (c) of this rule.

For purposes of this rule, a law school graduate is defined as any individual not yet
licensed to practice law in any jurisdiction.

(b) Agencies Through Which Services Must Be Performed. The services authorized
by this rule may only be carried on in the course of the student’s or graduate’s work with one or
more of the following organizations or programs:

(1) a legal aid bureau, legal assistance program, organization, or clinic chartered by the State
of Illinois or approved by a law school approved by the American Bar Association;

(2) the office of the public defender; or

(3) a law office of the State or any of its subdivisions.

(c) Services Permitted. Under the supervision of a member of the bar of this State, and
with the written consent of the person on whose behalf he/she is acting, which shall be filed in
the case and brought to the attention of the judge or presiding officer, an eligible law student or
graduate may render the following services:

(1) He/She may counsel and advise clients, negotiate in the settlement of claims, represent clients in mediation and other nonlitigation matters, and engage in the
preparation and drafting of legal instruments.
(2) He/She may appear in the trial courts, courts of review and administrative tribunals of this State, including court-annexed arbitration and mediation, subject to the following qualifications:

(i) Written consent to representation of the person on whose behalf the law student or graduate is acting shall be filed in the case and brought to the attention of the judge or presiding officer.

(ii) Appearances, pleadings, motions, and other documents to be filed with the court may be prepared by the student or graduate and may be signed by him with the accompanying designation “Senior Law Student” or “Law Graduate” but must also be signed by the supervising member of the bar.

(ii) In criminal cases, in which the penalty may be imprisonment, in proceedings challenging sentences of imprisonment, and in civil or criminal contempt proceedings, the student or graduate may participate in pretrial, trial, and posttrial proceedings as an assistant of the supervising member of the bar, who shall be present and responsible for the conduct of the proceedings.

(iii) In all other civil and criminal cases in the trial courts or administrative tribunals, the student or graduate may conduct all pretrial, trial, and posttrial proceedings, and the supervising member of the bar need not be present.

(iv) In matters before courts of review, He/She the law student or graduate may prepare briefs, excerpts from the record, abstracts, and other documents filed in courts of review of the State, which may set forth the name of the student or graduate with the accompanying designation “Senior Law Student” or “Law Graduate” but must be filed in the name of the supervising member of the bar. Upon motion by the supervising member of the bar, the senior law student or law graduate may request authorization to argue the matter before the court of review. If the law student or law graduate is permitted to argue, the supervising member of the bar must be present and responsible for the conduct of the hearing.

(d) Compensation. A student or graduate rendering services authorized by this rule shall not request or accept any compensation from the person for whom he/she renders the services, but may receive compensation from an agency described in paragraph (b) above in accordance with an approved program.

(e) Certification and Authorization.

(1) Upon request of a student or the appropriate organization, the dean of the law school in which the student is in attendance may, if he/she finds that the student meets the requirements stated in paragraph (a) of this rule, file with the Administrative Director a certificate so stating. Upon the filing of the certificate and until it is withdrawn or terminated the student is eligible to render the services described in paragraph (c) of this rule. The Administrative Director shall authorize, upon review and approval of the completed
application of an eligible student as defined in paragraph (a) and the certification as described in paragraph (e), the issuance of the temporary license. No services that are permitted under paragraph (c) shall be performed prior to the issuance of a temporary license.

(2) Unless otherwise provided by the Administrative Director for good cause shown, or unless sooner withdrawn or terminated, the certificate shall remain in effect until the expiration of 24 months after it is filed, or until the announcement of the results of the first bar examination following the student’s graduation, whichever is earlier. The certificate of a student who passes that examination shall continue in effect until he/she is admitted to the bar.

(3) The certificate may be withdrawn by the dean at any time, without prior notice, hearing, or showing of cause, by the mailing of a notice to that effect to the Administrative Director and copies of the notice to the student and to the agencies to which the student had been assigned.

(4) The certificate may be terminated by this court at any time without prior notice, hearing, or showing of cause. Notice of the termination may be filed with the Administrative Director, who shall notify the student and the agencies to which the student had been assigned.

(f) Application by Law Graduate. A law school graduate who wishes to be authorized to perform services described in paragraph (c) of this rule shall apply directly to the Administrative Director, with a copy to the dean of the law school from which he/she graduated.


Committee Comments  
(June 18, 2013)

This rule was amended effective July 1, 2013, to clarify that students and law graduates may perform nonlitigation legal services under this rule. Nothing in this rule should be construed to require law students or law graduates to be certified under this rule for work, including but not limited to transactional, pretrial, and policy work, that properly may be performed by a law student or other nonlawyer under Rule 5.3 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct.
EXAMPLES OF COURT-BASED PRO BONO PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

Throughout the country, courts, the private bar, legal aid and pro bono organizations, and bar associations, among others, have partnered to develop innovative pro bono programs to assist unrepresented litigants. Below are brief descriptions of some of these programs in Illinois that may be discussed in our first panel. This list is not exhaustive and instead is intended to provide examples of the diverse court-based pro bono programs in Illinois.

Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee. Pro bono legal advice is offered through 30 minute appointments organized by the Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee, which includes the court system, the Madison County Bar Association, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, local attorneys and other community partners. The appointments are available to low-income individuals who do not have an attorney. These appointments are held at the Madison County Law Library in a private room the county built at the request of the Pro Bono Committee and the court system. Currently, the appointments are provided on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month with family law appointments in the morning and general civil law appointments in the afternoon. Appointments are scheduled through the Law Librarian and the Self-Help Center staff either in person, by phone, or through the internet. Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation (LOLLAF) screens the potential clients to determine income eligibility. Near Veteran’s Day, the committee offers two days of free appointments to Veterans. The Committee more recently started offering off-site presentations and clinics with other community partners. Housing and landlord/tenant legal information has been provided in two communities. The Committee annually provides free CLE training to potential volunteer attorneys, who agree to see clients at 1-2 appointment dates in the coming year. The court promotes the clinics and issues quarterly press releases naming and thanking lawyers who have volunteered during the quarter for any pro bono action. More information is available by contacting Judge Barb Crowder at 618.296.4580 or through blcrowder@co.madison.il.us and in the presentation materials.

Pro Se Day. In the Circuit Court of Will County, Judge Dinah Archambeault handles family law matters and schedules two “pro se days” per month during which volunteers provide settlement assistance to pro se litigants. Volunteers do not provide legal advice or assistance. When no attorneys are involved in a case, Judge Archambeault sets further dates on a pre-set pro se day. Judge Archambeault matches each case with experienced family law volunteers, who sign up to participate and help the litigants reach agreement. Ninety percent of the matters are settled on pro se day. Judge Archambeault holds 1-2 volunteer appreciation events each year. More information is available in your presentation materials or by contacting Judge Dinah Archambeault at (815) 727-8540.

Circuit Court of Cook County Domestic Violence Division’s Order of Protection Pro Bono Representation Program. In 2011, the Court established this program through which volunteer attorneys aid clients in obtaining both emergency and plenary orders of protection. Volunteer law firms sign up to cover half-day shifts, helping clients with advice that day and then representing clients through the plenary order of protection. A partner legal aid organization, the Domestic Violence Legal Clinic, assists with training and volunteer support. For more information contact Leslie Landis, Court Administrator, Domestic Violence Division, Circuit Court of Cook County, at (312) 325-9042 or leslie.landis@cookcountyil.gov.
Cook County Municipal Court Pro Bono Program. The Municipal Court Pro Bono Program ("Program") is a partnership between the Circuit Court of Cook County, The Chicago Bar Association, two legal aid organizations (CARPLS and the Chicago Legal Clinic) and several area law firms. The goal of the program is to provide much-needed representation to low-income people who are facing the prospect of a jury trial without a lawyer while allowing associates to gain litigation experience, including arbitrations, jury trials and all associated work. More information about the program is available at municourtpanel.illinoisprobono.org and in the presentation materials.

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois Trial Bar Pro Bono Program. The U.S. District Court for the Northern District Court established this pro bono program to improve the administration of justice and provide much-needed legal assistance to low-income litigants in federal court. Under the General Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District, "every member of the trial bar shall be available for appointment by the court to represent or assist in the representation of those who cannot afford to hire a member of the trial bar." U.S. Dist. Ct. N.D. Ill. Local R. 83.11(g). Through this program, members of the trial bar are appointed to provide pro bono representation to low-income litigants in cases including employment discrimination, prisoner civil rights cases and social security appeals. Case eligibility and the appointment process is governed by Local Rule 83.35. Information about the program and examples of the resources available to assist volunteer are available at on the Court’s website and in the presentation materials.

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois Settlement Assistance Program. In 2006, this program was instituted to provide pro se litigants with the benefit of an attorney at settlement conferences. In this voluntary program administered by Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, volunteer attorneys provide pro bono representation to low income individuals with certain meritorious claims in federal court settlement conferences. Assistance under the Program is limited to settlement and does extend to any other part of the litigation process. More information about the program is available in your presentation materials and at http://www.clccml.org/settlement.

7th Circuit Appeals Pro Bono Panel. The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit maintains a volunteer attorney panel for appointments in certain cases before the Seventh Circuit. The Court is continually seeking attorneys to join the panel who have experience or who have a sufficient support infrastructure from mentors or firm colleagues to handle these complex matters.

A majority of these cases are federal criminal appeals in which the previous attorney seeks to withdraw. Counsel to the Circuit Executive, Donald J. Wall, selects and appoints counsel in all direct criminal appeals where the defendant is financially unable to retain counsel. The appointments are made under the Criminal Justice Act. On occasion the Court also will appoint attorneys to represent prisoners in habeas corpus appeals. These appointments too are made under the Criminal Justice Act. The Act authorizes the payment of some compensation (plus expenses) to appointed counsel. At times the Court will provide free representation to litigants in civil matters, such as employment discrimination, immigration and prisoner civil rights cases. These appointments are not made under the Criminal Justice Act; therefore, appointed counsel
provide their services without compensation. The Seventh Circuit, however, will reimburse certain out-of-pocket expenses incurred by appointed counsel up to a maximum of $1,000.

The Volunteer Panel Attorney Questionnaire can be found on the court’s website at www.ca7.uscourts.gov (click on “CJA Information” then “Volunteer Panel Attorney Questionnaire”). Questions should be directed to Donald J. Wall at 312.435.5805 or don_wall@ca7.uscourts.gov.

**U.S. District Court, Central District of Illinois Pro Bono Program.** The Central District’s Pro Bono Program affords an opportunity for valuable civil jury trial experience in federal court on important constitutional and federal claims. Most of the indigent plaintiffs represented through this program are incarcerated and challenging the constitutionality of the conditions of their confinement through a civil rights claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pro bono counsel from all geographic areas are welcome. Travel is kept to a minimum: Pretrial hearings, evidentiary hearings, and even jury trials are held by video conference. Depositions may be conducted by video using the Court’s equipment when the Court is not in session. The Court has had parties and attorneys appearing by video from up to five different locations at once. In one case regarding a preliminary injunction hearing, attorneys appeared by video from the Dirksen Federal Building and the Urbana federal courthouse; their clients appeared by video from three prisons in central and southern Illinois; and, the Court appeared by video from Springfield, Illinois. Attorneys without videoconferencing equipment may generally appear by video from a federal courthouse near them or the State of Illinois building for court hearings and may have confidential video conferences with their clients using the Court’s video equipment. Additionally, the District has retained an expert in prisoner civil rights litigation, James P. Chapman, to provide free video and telephone consultation to pro bono attorneys appointed on a case in the Central District. More information is available on the Central District’s website, www.iled.uscourts.gov (pro bono tab), or by calling Susan Gleason at (217) 492-4705.
LAND OF LINCOLN LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION

A Proposal for a Pro Bono Coordinating Council

A study completed in 2005 found that the legal aid system in Illinois is so overburdened and underfunded that it is operating in a crisis mode, accepting only the most critical cases and turning away tens of thousands of people each year. Based on a study completed in 2003, poor people in Illinois face more than 1.3 million civil legal problems annually, such as domestic violence, divorce, child custody, evictions, mortgage foreclosure or financial and physical abuse of the elderly. In more than 80% of those cases, poor individuals and families faced the problem without legal assistance.

The demand for free or low-cost legal services in Madison County reflects the state-wide trend. Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance is without the resources to address many of the most pressing legal needs of county residents. Mandated mediation in contested custody cases and the growing need for guardian ad litem and child advocate expertise in contested custody and probate cases has increased the demand for pro bono legal expertise.

There are diverse pro bono providers throughout Madison County. Land of Lincoln in conjunction with the MCBA operates a pro bono program and recruits attorneys to accept various types of cases. The Simmons law firm provides pro bono assistance serving as GALs in family and probate cases. A number of private attorneys have provided pro bono mediation in family cases and volunteered to mediate cases in the new foreclosure mediation program. Many other attorneys provide pro bono legal assistance by way of court appointment or by simply providing free legal assistance when a need is brought to their attention. There is, however, no coordinated means to assess and prioritize the need for pro bono legal assistance or to coordinate and assess the willingness of attorneys to provide pro bono legal assistance.

As a means of providing a coordinated response to the growing demand for pro bono legal assistance and to more effectively deliver pro bono services to the poor within the community we propose the creation of a Pro Bono Coordinating Council. The goals, structure and duties of the Coordinating Council are outlined below.

Goals of the Pro Bono Coordinating Council:
- Raise awareness of the need for free or low-cost legal services.
- Identify and reduce barriers to providing free or low-cost legal services.
- Explore and develop innovative and efficient pro bono delivery methods.
- Promote pro bono legal services and recruit attorneys to participate in existing pro bono programs.
- More effectively recognize the pro bono contributions of attorneys.

Structure of the Coordinating Council:
- Representatives of Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation.
- Private attorneys who provide pro bono legal assistance.
- One or two judges from the circuit.
- Representatives from each of the local bar associations.
- Representatives from local agencies who routinely encounter unmet legal needs of the poor.
Duties of the Council:

1. Assess the need for pro bono legal services, including the needs of minority and isolated populations within the circuit.
2. Determine the nature and extent of existing free or low-cost legal services within the circuit.
3. Establish goals and priorities for pro bono legal services in the circuit.
4. Develop a plan to:
   a. raise awareness of the need for pro bono legal services,
   b. reduce barriers to providing pro bono legal services,
   c. promote and recruit attorneys to participate in pro bono programs
   d. recognize the pro bono contributions of attorneys.
   e. Investigate and develop new and effective models for meeting unmet legal need.
5. Develop and carry out action items toward implementing the plan.

The Public Interest Law Initiative (PILI) is willing to assist in developing this initiative and may have personnel available to provide administrative support to help with implementation, although at this time there is not specific funding available to support a Coordinating Council. I am uncertain if the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts would have to approve the creation of such a Council.

I appreciate your willingness to consider this proposal to develop a more coordinated response to the growing demand for pro bono legal assistance. Please feel free to contact me at 462-0029, ext. 24 if you have questions.

Joan Spiegel
Managing Attorney
Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc.
310 Easton, Ste. 330
Alton, IL 62002
For immediate release:

**Pro Bono Committee Trains Lawyers, Gives Advice**

The Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee trained 23 attorneys on March 1, 2012, to aid them in giving free legal advice at the Legal Advice Conference Center in the Law Library at the Madison County Courthouse. The Legal Advice Conference Center (LACC) first opened on October 27, 2011.

Volunteer attorneys have advised 63 low-income residents of Madison County since the Conference Center opened. According to Judge Barbara Crowder, Chair of the Committee, “we started the first Circuit-wide Pro Bono Committee in the State of Illinois in order to coordinate programs for those of limited means. We decided that being able to meet with an attorney and ask questions would be a great service for those who cannot afford to hire an attorney.”

Speakers at the seminar also donated their time and included Gail Donnelly Bader speaking about family law, Tanja Cook on landlord/tenant issues, Brad LaVite on Veterans’ issues, Judge Barbara Crowder concerning guardianships, Joan Spiegel on consumer issues and Betsy Mahoney on how to use the internet resources in the law library to assist pro se litigants. The seminar was jointly sponsored by the Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee and the Madison County Bar Association.

The Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono committee would also like to thank the following attorneys who have already donated at least one hour of Pro Bono service at the Legal Advice Clinic:


The Legal Advice Clinics take place on the second and fourth Tuesdays of every month in the Law Library at the Madison County Courthouse. Appointments must be made in advance to speak with a volunteer attorney about family or general civil law issues and are limited to individuals of limited means.

To make an appointment, to volunteer to give advice, or to obtain more information, contact Law Librarian Betsy Mahoney at bemahoney@co.madison.il.us or 618-296-5921.
The Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee, the Illinois State Bar Association, and
The Madison County Bar Association Present

Pro Bono Seminar: A Potpourri of Legal Updates

August 1, 2013
9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
6.25 MCLE hours applied for

County Board Room
Madison County Administration Building
157 N. Main Street
Edwardsville, IL 62025

Free of Charge in Exchange for Two hours Donated to Legal Advice Clinic

Program Coordinators:
Hon. Barbara Crowder, Third Judicial Circuit Judge & Joan Spiegel, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation

8:55 am  Introductions and Welcome
9:00 a.m. -9:30 a.m. Terminating Guardianships
E. Nicole Carrion, Edwardsville

9:30 a.m. -10:15 a.m. ABC’s of Social Security Disability
Linda Rothnagel, Prairie State Legal Services, Inc., McHenry

10:30 a.m. -11:00 a.m. Limited Scope Representation
Joan Spiegel, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Alton

11:00 a.m. -12:00 a.m. Small Claims Issues
Thea Rubin, Collinsville

Lunch on your own

1:15 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Uniformed Services Employment and Re-employment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA)
Rich Wuthrich, South West Area Chair for Illinois ESGR (Employee Support for Guard and Reserves Program)

2:00 p.m. -2:45 p.m. Veterans in Treatment Court and Pro Bono Needs
Matt Miller, VA Medical Center and Nicolette Watson, Madison County Veterans Assistance Commission

3:00 p.m. -4:00 p.m. Ins and Outs of Handling a Landlord/Tenant Case
John Roska, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Champaign

4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. Servicemembers Civil Relief Act
Captain Amy Morgan, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Alton (Air Force Reserves)

4:30 p.m.– 5:00 p.m. Family Law
Gail Donnelly Bader, Alton

To register, contact Betsy Mahoney at the Madison County Law Library at 618-296-5921 or email bemahoney@co.madison.il.us. You will need to provide your name, IL bar registration number, e-mail and telephone number. In addition, you will need to be prepared to sign up for a total of two one-hour appointments at the Legal Advice Clinic by the end of 2013. (If you have already donated two hours in 2013, you are welcome to attend this seminar and receive the free MCLE credit because you already deserve a gold star of appreciation). The coordinators thank the Illinois State Bar Association for assistance in the program and materials.
MADISON COUNTY PROVIDES THE FOLLOWING SERVICES FREE OF CHARGE TO THE PUBLIC

Legal Self-Help Center

The Legal Self-Help Center is located in the Madison County Law Library. It is staffed by a library clerk, who is available to answer general questions, to assist with research, and to guide visitors to available court forms. The Legal Self-Help Center has three computers with internet access and printers. While the Center's staff may provide information, they cannot give legal advice.

To contact the Legal Self-Help Center by phone, call 618-296-4472. You also may access the Legal Self-Help Center at the following e-mail address: jlistipak@co.madison.il.us.

To link to legal forms and information from any computer 24-hours-a-day, visit the Legal Self-Help Center online at the following Web site: www.madison.illinoislegalaid.org.

Law Library Days and Hours:
Monday – Friday, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Legal Self-Help Center Days and Hours:
Monday – Friday, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Closed daily, 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Legal Advice Center

The Legal Advice Center provides free 30-minute appointments to low-income, unrepresented individuals. Attorneys can discuss guardianship, family, housing, consumer, or other civil legal problems.

The Legal Advice Center is accessible by appointment only. Appointments are available on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month. One family appointment may be made, as well as one civil appointment. Follow-up appointments are not available.

You may schedule an appointment by visiting the Madison County Law Library at the Courthouse or by calling the Law Library at 618-296-4472.

Order of Protection Project

The Order of Protection Project is located in Room 205 of the Courthouse. The Project assists victims of violence, who are not represented by an attorney, with the necessary paperwork to seek an Order of Protection. The Project is staffed by advocates who can answer questions, can provide assistance in completing court forms, and can direct victims to other resources within the community.

To contact the Order of Protection Project by phone, call 618-296-5412.

Court Forms

The County has various forms available to assist with a variety of legal problems. To access the forms, visit the Madison County Circuit Court online at the following Web site:
www.madisoncountycircuitcourt.org.

Illinois Legal Aid Online (ILAO)

ILAO is an online resource that provides articles, gives answers to commonly asked questions, and provides forms specifically used by Illinois residents.

ILAO allows you to type in your legal question and ZIP code to receive legal information. ILAO can be accessed from the computers in the Legal Self-Help Center or from any computer by visiting Illinois Legal Aid Online at the following Web site:
www.illinoislegalaid.org.

Small Claims/Eviction

Legal Information

Individuals appearing at the small claims/eviction docket can register to speak with an attorney on the date listed on the summons. Attorneys may provide legal information about the case, the small claims process, the means to file an answer, or other legal questions related to the pending legal case. Answer dockets occur most Wednesdays at 2:00 p.m. in the Courthouse.
Residential Mortgage
Foreclosure
Mediation Project

Homeowners served with a foreclosure complaint in Madison County or in Bond County can access the Madison County Residential Mortgage Foreclosure Mediation Program by application. The application form is served on homeowners when they are served with the foreclosure summons.

Foreclosure mediation provides an opportunity for the homeowner and the plaintiff to meet with a neutral mediator and to work toward a mutual agreement to resolve the lawsuit.

You may be eligible for this FREE program if you meet the following requirements:

- You have been sued in Madison County or in Bond County for foreclosure of your home;
- The property is your primary residence;
- You are the borrower, and your loan is being foreclosed upon; AND
- You have the financial means to make a monthly mortgage payment.

To contact the Program Administrator by phone, call 618-296-4760.

What Is the Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee?

The Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee was formed as a joint project by the Court; the Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation; the Madison County Bar Association; lawyers from the community, including those from Simmons Browder Gianaris Angelides & Barnerd LLC and Heyl, Royster, Voelker & Allen; and representatives from local agencies, such as the Veterans’ Assistance Commission of Madison County. The purpose of the Third Judicial Circuit Pro Bono Committee is to coordinate and create programs which will help unrepresented litigants.
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THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT
SERVICES FOR UNREPRESENTED LITIGANTS IN MADISON COUNTY

For assistance, call
618-296-4472
Monday - Friday
8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
The Honorable Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride

1819 Fourth Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61201

May 7, 2013

RE: Pro Se Day

Dear Chief Justice Kilbride,

In follow up to our brief conversation about my pro se day, I am providing the following information as per your request:

Generally, I have what I refer to as "pro se" day twice a month in the morning. I post the dates in my courtroom each year.

Attorneys sign up as volunteers for various pro se days, and even if not signed up, often volunteer that day if they are available to help. The externs also help on pro se day, first shadowing a more experienced volunteer and then meeting with litigants on simple matters, to provide them hands on experience in the courtroom. Will County Legal Aid provides pro bono credit for the volunteers upon request. I generally average 8 volunteers per pro se day. As the volunteers are practicing attorneys, often about half of the volunteers that signed up cannot assist due to other matters. However, I always have other attorneys who have not signed up to volunteer stop by my courtroom to see if I need help, so I have enough assistance for the pro se litigants.

As cases come before me and I recognize that no attorneys are involved, I set further dates on a pre-set pro se day. I review all files in advance to ascertain what issues are before me. I then know which case should be assigned to each volunteer, matching the complexity of the issue with the experience and or expertise of the volunteer.

On pro se day, at the beginning of my call I announce it is pro se day. This reminds the attorneys that volunteers will be taken first and no contested hearings will be conducted for attorneys. The pro se litigants are advised that there are volunteers available, that they will be assigned a volunteer, but that the volunteer attorneys do not represent them, that they are not to ask for legal advice and that the volunteers are helping as a friend of the court. They are also advised that I will take care of cases with attorneys first, not out of disrespect to them but so that
the attorneys who volunteer will then be available to help them, and I ask for their patience. I try to determine if the pro se litigants need any forms to fill out, depending on their issues, and provide them so they can fill them out while waiting for a volunteer. I then call each case, asking that they not approach the bench but let me know if both parties are present, and if not, if the other party is expected. This allows me to know who is ready for a volunteer.

The volunteers approach after they finish other matters (either in my courtroom or other courtrooms) and I assign them a case. They meet with the litigants in a "mediator" type role, not to give legal advice but to help the parties reach an agreement, if possible, make sure they have all documents ready for hearing, if needed, and draft orders.

I have been conducting pro se day for the last several years. In my courtroom, uncontested matters are set at 9:00 am. and contested matters at 9:30 am. The vast majority of matters that are presented at 9:00 am. are resolved without the need for a second 9:30 am. hearing on another date, which eliminates multiple court appearances for the pro se litigants. This benefits not only the pro se litigants, but also benefits the attorneys as I only set pro se hearings on pro se day, with no attorney hearings, so they do not have to wait while pro se litigants argue on other days. The attorneys know in advance the pro se days so they can avoid the date if they so desire, or set matters with paying clients on those days prior to volunteering. If a matter is not resolved and a hearing date set, I advise the pro se litigants that the hearing will be continued if they decide to obtain counsel, again as no hearings with attorneys are conducted on pro se days. For the pro se litigants that need a hearing date for a contested matter, on the hearing date I again provide them a volunteer for one more opportunity to reach an agreement prior to hearing, so they have had 2 meetings with volunteers before hearing. When I set hearings for the pro se litigants, I also provide them with forms they will need for the hearing, such as an income expense affidavit or child support withholding order, to fill out and bring with them to their next court appearance.

Finally, I have either one or two pro se volunteer appreciation events each year, either lunches or most recently after hour "get togethers" to thank the volunteers. Attorneys repeatedly volunteer to help and I believe it is important that they know their efforts are appreciated. I have had no complaints from attorneys that the volunteers are taking clients away from them, as the pro se litigants for the most part cannot afford counsel.

If you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance to you, please let me know. I appreciate your interest in my pro se day.

Sincerely,

Judge Dina Lennon Archambault

The externs, as part of our program have training on mediation, drafting orders and pro se day instructions. As we discussed, I will send you information on our extern program, once plans are finalized.
Domestic violence court sees influx in pro bono help

July 29, 2011
By Pat Milhizer — pmilhizer@lbpc.com
Law Bulletin staff writer

For every 10 people who come to Cook County's domestic violence courthouse for a civil order of protection, nine of them walk up to the building's metal detectors without an attorney. Now they could have representation by the time they get to court.

Under a program launched in February, the circuit court partners with 10 law firms to provide pro bono attorneys to petitioners who seek independent orders of protection at 555 W. Harrison St.

Every weekday, petitioners come to domestic violence court seeking such orders, which are called "independent" because they're not linked to any criminal proceeding or civil action such as a divorce.

The petitioners tell a judge about physical abuse, verbal abuse and any form of harassing or threatening communication.

"It's a group of people that needs someone to advocate for them at a point in their life where they are the most scared and the most vulnerable," said Margrethe K. Kearney, an associate at Latham & Watkins LLP.

These aren't just one-way benefits for the petitioners. The lawyers also get better at their craft.

"It makes me more sensitive to the needs of all of my clients and remember that if they're individuals who are victims of domestic violence or people who work for a large company, they're looking to me to help and advise them," Kearney said. "It's taught me how to present my client's case to a judge in sometimes very less-than-ideal circumstances."

The process starts when a petitioner is screened by a courthouse help desk that's staffed by county employees. If the case is serious enough, the help desk refers petitioners to a pro bono lawyer who asks a judge to prevent the accused from having any contact with the petitioner.

Judges may then enter an emergency order of protection that's valid for 21 days. The accused — known as a respondent — is served with paperwork and allowed to come to court to protest a long-term order that can last up to two years.

After an order is granted, the program ensures that petitioners don't "fall through the cracks," said Chief Judge Timothy C. Evans. That's because the law firms ensure that petitioners know what to do if a violation occurs.

"At the end of the day, cases are being processed more efficiently and victims are receiving court-ordered protection. And that means greater progress is being made in curbing the cycle of violence," Evans said.

The program actually stems from volunteer representation that Latham & Watkins started in 2007.

Now the program has 10 law firms. Nine more firms expressed interest in joining this month.

The lawyers credit the program's success to the guidance of Circuit Judge Grace G. Dickler, who is the past presiding judge of the Domestic Violence Division, and Leslie Landis, the domestic violence court administrator who runs the program and oversees lawyer training. The pro bono desk is also staffed by students from DePaul University College of Law.
"It's a great example of the court reaching out to the private bar, identifying a problem and sitting down and coming up with a solution that really addresses a problem," said Benjamin C. Weinberg, who manages the pro bono program at SNR Denton. "I'd like to say that happens frequently, but the reality is it really takes leadership from people like Judge Dickler and Leslie."

The program also helps law firms expose junior associates to courtroom work.

"Your clients really need your help and it's a time in their lives when they're really in crisis," Weinberg said. "They've taken a brave first step which is just to come to the courthouse." And they're coming in waves.

Through May of this year, judges have granted 8,632 independent orders of protection. The caseload tends to spike in the summer months, so this year's total is on pace to potentially exceed last year's total of 21,238.

The figure has increased from 2009 and 2008, when the totals were 19,315 and 19,252, respectively.

As far as legal matters go, these cases move quickly.

"Sometimes the wheels of justice grind slowly," said Gregory A. McConnell, pro bono counsel at Winston & Strawn LLP.

"But when you're talking about a protective order, which is immediate, and then a prove-up hearing that follows shortly thereafter — as quickly as two or three weeks — really, within weeks where somebody can have a permanent legal solution to a dangerous situation for them, it's very gratifying for the lawyers to be part of that."

Along with the aforementioned law firms, the other seven firms involved in the project are Holland & Knight LLP; Jenner & Block LLP; Katten, Muchin, Rosenman LLP; Kirkland & Ellis LLP; Rinella and Rinella Ltd.; Schiller, DuCanto & Fleck LLP; and Ungaretti & Harris LLP.

When the law firm lawyers have questions about a case, mentoring is provided by the Domestic Violence Legal Clinic (DVLC), a nonprofit legal service at the courthouse.

"The DVLC is just so vital because once the court has a program in place, the court cannot be engaged in the individual legal work being provided by the volunteer lawyers," Landis said. "I can't advise a pro bono lawyer on an individual case. To have the DVLC partnership with the private bar's volunteer engagement is really important."

Law firms interested in joining the program may call Landis at (312) 325-9042.

"It is a clear illustration of a strong collaboration of public and private resources," Landis said. "It's been more successful than we had even anticipated. The law firms have been an amazing partner in not only the delivery of the services but the development of the project."
Municipal Court Pro Bono Pilot Program Overview

The Municipal Court Pro Bono Program Pilot Program ("Program") is a partnership between The Circuit Court of Cook County ("Court"), The Chicago Bar Association (CBA), CARPLS, the Chicago Legal Clinic (CLC) and area law firms ("Firms"). The goal of the program is to provide much-needed representation to pro se litigants in need of trial counsel. We hope the program will assist individual litigants, improve the administration of justice and provide opportunities for attorneys to gain trial and other litigation skills through pro bono service. The basic outline of the program:

- **Program Purpose.** The purpose of the Program is to provide pro bono representation to low-income litigants in Municipal Court, particularly in those cases where a jury demand has been filed.

- **Case Types.** The Program involves Cook County Municipal Court cases (claims involving $30,000 or less), and primarily cases in which a jury demand has been filed and one party is proceeding pro se. Case types will vary, but examples include: representing a defendant in a consumer debt claim, representing plaintiff in a claim for damages against the City for damaging plaintiff’s car while impounded, and representing a third-party defendant in a claim for damages arising out a multi-car accident. In more limited circumstances, the Program will involve cases where no jury demand has been filed, but CLC has determined that trial counsel is likely needed for an upcoming bench trial.

- **Referral Points.** Cases will be referred at various points in the litigation. Judges in trial courtrooms may refer cases that are ready for trial. Additionally, cases may be referred at the beginning of the litigation, which will involve longer periods of representation but provide pro bono attorneys with the opportunity to participate in mandatory arbitration.

- **Screening.** CARPLS currently runs the Municipal Court Advice Desk on the 6th floor of the Daley Center. Primarily through the Advice Desk, CARPLS will provide initial case screening for the Program. In cases where a jury demand has been filed and a litigant is pro se, CARPLS will screen initially for basic income eligibility, meritorious claims or defenses, and need for litigation counsel. Additional criteria are under consideration. CARPLS will refer appropriate cases to the CBA Liaison. For non-jury cases in need of trial counsel, CLC will work up the cases, and refer client to the Program for representation when it determines that trial counsel likely is needed.

- **Referral and Oversight.** The CBA Liaison will refer cases, on a rotating basis, to the designated contact person at each Firm. The CBA will also generally track case progress and outcomes.

- **Referrals.** When a Firm receives a referral, it should check for conflicts and conduct additional screening within 10 business days and notify the CBA and the potential client of its decision. If a Firm is unable or unwilling to take the case due to conflicts or capacity, the CBA Liaison will refer the case to the next Firm on the list, if appropriate.

- **Representation.** For cases referred at the initial stages of a case, pro bono attorneys will review existing pleadings, conduct necessary interviews (client, potential witnesses etc.) and develop case strategy. In some cases, attorneys may conduct written and/or oral discovery, and may engage in limited motion practice.
demand has been filed, attorneys will participate in mandatory arbitration (3 person panel; relaxed rules of evidence). If an arbitration award is rejected or if the case is referred to the Program after it has been assigned to a trial courtroom, attorneys will represent client leading into and at a jury trial. Attorneys may engage in settlement discussions at any point, as appropriate.

- **Training.** The initial training is tentatively scheduled for February 7, 2011, from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. at Jenner & Block. The training will cover the practical aspect of working in municipal court, as well as the referral procedures and other information about the Program.

Below is a more detailed explanation of the Program and how we expect the pilot phase to proceed.

**Program Objectives**

The purpose of the Program is to provide pro bono representation to litigants in Municipal Court who would otherwise proceed without counsel because due to income limitations. Pro bono attorneys will provide much-needed assistance to low-income individuals in litigation. Pro bono programs are strongest when they meet the needs of all stakeholders. The Municipal Court Pro Bono Program will further the administration of justice by increasing the efficiency of some cases and by evening the playing field when one side is represented by counsel, but the other side is unable to afford an attorney.

Volunteer attorneys will provide meaningful pro bono assistance to individuals facing the prospect of litigation without counsel and will help improve the administration of justice. At the same time, volunteer attorneys will gain valuable litigation and trial experience.

Throughout the program, but particularly during the pilot phase, the CBA/CBF will monitor the case referrals and progress to ensure that the program objectives are being met.

**Cases Referred to the Program**

The Program will focus primarily on cases where a jury demand has been filed for maximum impact – involving pro bono counsel in these cases will alleviate the burden on pro se litigant to conduct a jury trial without counsel. Additionally, pro bono attorneys in these cases will gain valuable litigation and potentially trial experience. Cases in which a jury demand has been filed are subject to mandatory arbitration; therefore attorneys involved in earlier stages of litigation will have the opportunity to conduct an arbitration in nearly every case.

In more limited circumstances, the Program will involve cases where no jury demand has been filed, but the Chicago Legal Clinic (CLC) has determined that trial counsel is likely needed. The ability to refer trial-ready cases to the program will provide much-needed leverage and back-up to the one CLC attorney that currently handles Municipal Court cases referred from the CARPLS advice desk. The CLC attorney can litigate cases knowing that trial counsel is available if a case does not settle. Pro bono attorneys in these cases will have the opportunity to conduct a bench trial.

In both jury and non-jury cases, the new involvement of pro bono attorneys will likely incentivize settlement in some cases. We will monitor the case progress and outcomes and
adjust the referral process as needed to appropriately balance the desire of pro bono attorneys to gain litigation experience with the program objectives.

Jury demands are filed in a variety of cases by one party or another. Here are some examples of cases that may be referred to the program:

- Pro se defendant asserting identity theft as a defense against a consumer debt claim
- Pro se plaintiff filed a lawsuit against the City of Chicago, alleging that plaintiff’s car was damaged while impounded by the City
- Uninsured pro se defendant, in case involving multiple car accident, defending against allegation of contributory negligence

At this stage, we are planning to accept referrals without restrictions on specific subject matter. As we gain a better sense of case volume, conflicts and the types of cases that are working well, we will prioritize case subject matter and adjust the referral criteria. Additionally, if individual firms have conflicts with particular parties that reoccur (such as the City of Chicago or certain banks), we will track those conflicts and adjust the referral list accordingly.

**Case Length**

Jury-demand cases will be referred at various points in the litigation, but primarily at two points: (1) at or near the initial intake; and (2) when the case has been assigned to trial courtroom. Cases in the Municipal Division are assigned discovery closure dates based on the amount of the claim at issue. Therefore, below we estimate the timelines for cases worth different amounts, and also provide a visual for an average case. As with all litigation, the length of litigation will vary depending on a variety of factors. As the Program begins, we will track the case length and disposition so that we can provide more accurate estimates.

**Referral at Initial Status Hearing**

Cases referred at this point will come from Judge Dunford in Room 1501. Referring cases at this stage provides the most benefit to the client, as he or she has representation at all stages of litigation. As discussed above, the pro bono attorney will have the opportunity to conduct an arbitration (which is mandatory) before a three-person panel. Finally, pro bono attorneys will gain experience developing case strategy and discovery. We recognize that the longer time until trial has drawbacks for participating Firms, but hope the longer time frame is balanced by the experience gained through participating in mandatory arbitration, conducting discovery and developing the case, as well as the needs of the client and the Court. The estimated timelines are as follow:

- Small claims ($10,000 and under)
  - No discovery
  - Mandatory arbitration: 2 months from referral
  - Trial: 5-8 months from referral

- Small claims (10K and under): same day (no discovery)
  - 10K-25K: approximately 11 weeks
  - Over 25K: approximately 16 weeks
• Claims between $10,000 and $25,000
  • Discovery closes: 3 months
  • Mandatory arbitration: 5 months
  • Trial: 8-13 months from referral

• Claims over $25,000
  • Discovery closed: 4 months
  • Mandatory arbitration: 7 months
  • Trial: 10-18 months from referral

• Rough timetable for example case referred at intake (assuming some discovery
  and no unusual delays)

---

**Case Referred at Initial Status: January 2010**

Screening, Initial Investigation, discovery, 90(c) Discovery Packets due 30 days prior to arbitration.

---

**Mandatory Arbitration: June 2010**

30 days after arbitration, judgment entered on arbitration award unless one party rejects the arbitration. If arbitration award rejected, the case will be assigned to trial courtroom.

---

**Trial: January 2011**

Once the case is assigned to a trial courtroom, it will be scheduled for status, then given a trial date, typically in about 3 to 6 months.

---

**Referral from Trial Court**

Cases referred at this point will come from judges who are assigned to trial courtrooms. At this stage, discovery will typically be closed, and the case will be set for trial within 1 to 6 months. Counsel may move to reopen discovery if necessary, and the court may grant the motion based on its discretion.

**Training and Supervision**

The CBA and the Court will provide training, including a training manual, specific to practicing in Cook County Municipal Court. Additionally, the initial training will provide a detailed explanation of the logistics and procedures for the Program, including the referral forms. Firms will provide all other general training and supervision necessary for attorneys to handle cases.
Pilot Phase of Program

As discussed, we view this Program as a pilot, and we will closely monitor the cases and procedures and make adjustments as needed. We will be seeking input and feedback from participating Firms, the Court and CARPLS in order to establish a strong pro bono program that meets the goals of everyone involved. We are enthusiastic about this Program, and believe it has great potential. Thank you for participating, and we look forward to working with you.

Contact Information

We will put together a list of all relevant contact information for people involved with the Program, but if you have questions about the Program in the meantime, please contact:

Kelly Tautges
Director of Pro Bono
The Chicago Bar Foundation
(312) 554-8356
ktautges@chicagobar.org

Megan McClung
CBA Liaison
(847) 730-3890
mhmcelung@gmail.com
Settlement Assistance Program for Pro Se Litigants

On November 6, 2006, by a General Order of the Court, Chief Judge James F. Holderman approved a court-wide program that allows pro se litigants to have the benefit of an attorney at settlement conferences. The Settlement Assistance Program builds on the successes of a pilot program developed by the Magistrate Judges of the Northern District of Illinois, with the help of Chicago law firm Mayer Brown.

In this voluntary program, attorneys from member law firms of the Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law provide free legal assistance to pro se parties regarding settlement of their cases, including attending and assisting parties in connection with settlement conferences conducted by District Judges or Magistrate Judges of the Court. The volunteer attorney, who is appointed by the judge presiding over the case, will assist in preparing for the settlement conference, participate in the settlement conference on behalf of the pro se litigant, and draft a settlement agreement and corresponding motion to dismiss, if appropriate. Assistance under the Program will be limited, however, only to the effort to settle the case and will not extend to any other part of the litigation process.

Training opportunities for volunteer attorneys are held periodically at the District Court. Counsel who both complete the training program and are subsequently appointed to represent a pro se litigant in regards to settlement will receive one training unit for purposes of admission to the District Court’s Trial Bar. See Local Rule 83.11. Participating parties and attorneys must complete a Limited Appointment of Settlement Assistance Program Counsel Form in order to obtain judicial approval of the appointment. Additionally, once appointed, participating attorneys must file a Limited Attorney Appearance Form as Settlement Assistance Program Counsel with the court. If a settlement is not reached after diligent efforts, Settlement Assistance Program counsel will be given leave to withdraw from the appointment at a hearing on a motion seeking to withdraw, upon notice to the client and opposing counsel.
Taking on a Settlement Conference:

Settlement Techniques &
U.S. District Court, N.D. Ill
Settlement Assistance Program
Training

Join us for this free CLE* seminar on settlement negotiation
& pro bono limited representation

February 21, 2013
2:30 – 5:00 p.m.
U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois
219 S. Dearborn, Courtroom 2525
Light Reception to Follow

Opening Remarks:
Hon. James F. Holderman, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, N.D. Illinois

Lessons From the Bench:
Hon. Sheila Finnegan, U.S. Magistrate Judge, U.S. District Court, N.D. Illinois
Hon. Young B. Kim, U.S. Magistrate Judge, U.S. District Court, N.D. Illinois

Strategies of Settlement Advocacy:
Laura McNally, Partner, Grippo & Elden, LLC

Taking – and Settling – an SAP Case:
J. Cunyon Gordon, Settlement Assistance Program Director, Chicago Lawyers
  Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Ayman Mourad, Civil Rights Fellow, Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under
  Law
Michael E. Norton, Associate, Jackson Lewis LLP

In addition to covering settlement negotiation generally, this seminar qualifies you to participate in the
court’s Settlement Assistance Program. Under N.D. Ill. Local Rule 83.11, SAP-trained attorneys
who handle one settlement conference earn one training credit for the Trial Bar.

*Illinois CLE credit pending: 1.75 hr general; .5 hr ethics.

Registration: This seminar is free, but space is limited. Please confirm your attendance
by contacting Debbie Groboski at dq@ag-ltd.com or (312) 692-2636.
Presented by the Seventh Circuit Bar Association Pro Bono & Public Service Committee
United States District Court
Northern District Of Illinois
Local Rules
LR83.11. Trial Bar

(a) Definitions. The following definitions shall apply to this rule:

(1) The term “testimonial proceedings” refers to proceedings that meet all of the following criteria:

(A) they are evidentiary proceedings in which all testimony is given under oath and a record is made of the testimony;

(B) the witness or witnesses are subject to cross-examination;

(C) a presiding officer is present;

(D) the parties to such proceedings are generally represented by attorneys; and

(E) where a proceeding was held before an administrative agency, the findings and determinations of the agency are based upon the proceeding and are reviewable for sufficiency of evidence by a court of record.

Procedures limited to taking the deposition of a witness do not constitute testimonial proceedings for the purposes of this rule.

(2) The term “qualifying trial” refers to an evidentiary proceeding that meets the following criteria:

(A) it lasts at least one day;

(B) it must be a trial or hearing involving substantial testimonial proceedings going to the merits; and

(C) it must be held in open court before one of the following: a judge or magistrate judge of a United States district court; a judge of a United States bankruptcy court; a judge of the United States Tax Court; a judge of a trial court of record of a state, the District of Columbia, or a territory of the United States; or any administrative law judge.

(3) The term “participation units” shall mean a qualifying trial in which the petitioner participated as the lead counsel or the assistant to the lead counsel.

(4) The term “observation unit” shall mean a qualifying trial the petitioner observed while
being supervised by a supervising attorney who consulted with the observer about the trial. At the time of the observation the supervising attorney must either have been a member of the trial bar of this Court or have had previous trial experience equivalent to at least 4 participation units.

(5) The term “simulation unit” shall mean a trial advocacy program in which the focus is experiential, as contrasted to lecture in which the petitioner satisfactorily participated either as a law school or a continuing legal education course.

(6) The term “training unit of the District Court” shall mean participation in a training seminar officially sanctioned by the Court.

(7) The term “qualifying unit of trial experience” shall include any of the following: participation units, observation units, simulation units, and training units. A petitioner shall be credited the following qualifying units of trial experience for the experience indicated:

(A) for each participation unit, 2 units where the trial lasted 7 days or less, 3 units where the trial lasted from 10 to 12 full days, and 4 units where the trial lasted 13 or more full days;

(B) for each observation unit, 1 unit;

(C) for each simulation unit, 2 units; and

(D) for each training unit of the District Court, 1 unit.

(8) The term “required trial experience” shall mean not less than 4 qualifying units of trial experience.

(9) The term “pro bono panel” shall refer to a panel of members of the trial bar selected pursuant to LR83.35(b) for the purpose of representing or assisting in the representation of parties unable to afford to hire a member of the trial bar.

(NOTE: See Regulations promulgated by the District Admissions Committee for additional material relating to admissions. The Regulations are located in the Appendix to the local Rules.)

(b) Qualifications. An applicant for admission to the trial bar of this Court must be a member in good standing of the general bar of this Court and provide evidence of having the required trial experience. Anyone wishing to apply for admission to the trial bar who is not a member of the bar of this Court may apply for admission to both bars simultaneously. An attorney representing the United States, a state or local government or an agency of any of those governments who is not a member of the general bar of this Court may be admitted to the trial bar for the sole purpose of representing such government or agency in the attorney’s official capacity provided that the attorney is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court in any state or the District of Columbia and provides evidence to the court of having the required trial experience.

(c) Petition Form. The Executive Committee will approve a form of petition to be used by anyone applying for admission to the trial bar. Copies of the approved form will be provided on request by the clerk.

(d) Screening the Petition. The clerk, under the supervision of the Executive Committee, will screen
each petition to assure that it is filed on the correct form, has been completed, and contains sufficient information to establish that the petitioner meets the qualifications required for the trial bar. Where these requirements are met, an indication to that effect will be placed on the petition and the petitioner will be notified that the petition is approved. Where the requirements are not met, the petition will be returned to the applicant with appropriate instructions.

(e) Admission Fee. Each petitioner shall pay an admission fee upon the filing of the petition, provided that in the event the petitioner is not admitted, the petitioner may request that the fee be refunded. The amount of the fee shall be established by the court.

The clerk shall deposit the fee in the District Court Fund.

(f) Duty to Supervise. Every member of the trial bar shall be available for appointment by the court to supervise attorneys who are in the process of obtaining observation units needed to qualify for membership in the trial bar. Such appointments shall be made in a manner so as to allocate the responsibility imposed by this rule equally among all members of the trial bar.

(g) Duty to Accept Appointments. Each member of the trial bar shall be available for appointment by the court to represent or assist in the representation of those who cannot afford to hire a member of the trial bar. Appointments under this rule shall be made in a manner such that no member of the trial bar shall be required to accept more than one appointment during any 12 month period.

(h) Withdrawal from Trial Bar. A member of the trial bar may, on motion for good cause shown, voluntarily withdraw from said bar. Such motion shall be filed with the clerk for presentation to the Executive Committee. Where the motion to withdraw is made by a member of the current pro bono panel the name of the attorney will be removed from the pro bono panel if the motion is granted.

(i) Reinstatement. Any attorney permitted to withdraw as a member of the trial bar pursuant to section (h) who wishes to be reinstated must file a petition for reinstatement with the clerk for presentation to the Executive Committee. Where the attorney was a member of a pro bono panel at the time the petition to withdraw was filed, the petition for reinstatement shall include a statement indicating the attorney’s present willingness and ability to accept an appointment under LR83.35 through LR83.49. If the committee grants the motion in such an instance, it shall direct that the attorney be included in the pro bono panel and remain there for one year or until the attorney is appointed, whichever comes first.
United States District Court

Northern District of Illinois

Local Rules

LR83.35. Pro Bono Program

(a) Definitions. The following definitions shall apply to the pro bono rules:

(1) The term “appointment of counsel” shall mean the appointment of a member of the trial bar to represent a party who lacks the resources to retain counsel by any other means. Such appointment shall only be in a civil action or appeal and shall not include any appointment made pursuant to the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, 18 U.S.C. §3006A.

(2) The term “judge” shall mean the judge to whom the action is assigned. It shall include a magistrate judge where the appointment is made in a civil case assigned to a magistrate for all purposes pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(c) or referred for evidentiary hearings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B).

(3) The term “panel” shall mean those members of the trial bar who have volunteered for appointment and those whose names were selected pursuant to section (b).

(4) The terms “pro bono rules” and “pro bono program” shall refer to LR83.35 through 83.49.

(b) Creating the Panel. From time to time, the clerk shall select names at random from the trial bar to create a panel. There shall be a panel for each division of the District. Except as otherwise provided by the pro bono rules, the clerk shall select members from the trial bar who have not been included on an earlier panel.

(c) Notification to Panel. Following the selection of a panel the clerk shall notify each member and obtain from each the following information:

(1) counsel’s prior civil trial experience, including a general indication of the number of trials and areas of trial experience;

(2) counsel’s ability to consult and advise in languages other than English;

(3) counsel’s preferences for appointment among the following types of matters:

(A) Social Security appeals;

(B) employment discrimination actions;

(C) civil rights actions filed by persons in custody; and
(D) other civil rights actions.

(4) whether counsel would be willing to accept an appointment to serve in one or both of the Court's divisions; and

(5) whether counsel would be willing to accept an appointment to serve in one or more of the other districts of the Seventh Circuit.

Such information as is supplied by counsel may be amended at any time by letter.

(d) Exemptions. A member of the trial bar

(1) whose principal place of business is outside of this District, or

(2) who is employed full-time as an attorney for an agency of the United States, a state, a county, or any sub-division thereof, or

(3) who is employed full-time as an attorney by a not-for-profit legal aid organization

shall, when selected for a panel, be removed from it and returned to the pool. However, such action shall not preclude counsel from being selected for a subsequent panel.

(e) Volunteers. A member of the trial bar may volunteer to be included in a panel. Whenever a volunteer is appointed, the clerk as part of the notification process will ask the volunteer to elect one of the following options:

(1) the volunteer’s name will be moved to the end of the list of names on the panel, or

(2) the volunteer’s name will be removed from the panel and either replaced after a specified time period or at the request of the volunteer.

The clerk will make a similar request of any volunteer whose name has been on a panel for 12 months and who has not been appointed during that time.

Committee Comment: Pursuant to LR83.11(g) each member of the trial bar has the responsibility to serve as an appointed attorney in pro se matters. The pro se rules provide for the reimbursement of expenses of counsel appointed under those rules. The admission fees collected when counsel join the trial bar form a major source of the funds used to pay the expenses.

The procedures for appointment involve selecting from a current panel. The panels are formed annually, one for each of the two divisions of the District. The names are selected in such a manner that no member of the trial bar is selected for a subsequent panel until all other members have been selected.

The only exemption from being included on a panel is the limited one granted to members of the groups specified in section (d).
United States District Court
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Local Rules

LR83.36. Appointment Procedures

(a) Application. Any application for the appointment of counsel by a party appearing pro se shall be on a form approved by the Executive Committee. The application shall include a form of affidavit stating the party’s efforts, if any, to obtain counsel by means other than appointment and indicating any prior pro bono appointments of counsel to represent the party in cases brought in this Court including both pending and previously terminated actions. A completed copy of the affidavit of financial status in the form required by LR3.3(a)(2) shall be attached to the application. The clerk shall provide the application forms and financial status affidavits on request together with a cover sheet informing the party of the following:

(1) the steps needed to complete and file the application;

(2) the party’s responsibility under LR83.40 to pay expenses to the extent reasonably feasible based on the party’s financial condition;

(3) the party’s responsibility under LR83.41 to pay part or all of counsel’s fees to the extent reasonably feasible based on the party’s financial condition;

(4) the provisions of 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(k) for the award of attorney’s fees to prevailing parties in Title VII employment discrimination actions; and

(5) the provisions for awarding statutory attorney’s fees from any award of retroactive disability benefits in Social Security appeals.

Failure of a party to make a written application for appointed counsel shall not preclude appointment.

(b) Re-application. A pro se party who was ineligible for appointed counsel at the outset of the litigation who later becomes eligible by reason of changed circumstances may apply for appointment of counsel within a reasonable time after the change in circumstances has occurred. The procedures set out in section (a) shall be followed in making such re-application.

(c) Factors Used in Determining Whether to Appoint. Upon receipt of an application for the appointment of counsel, the judge shall determine whether counsel is to be appointed to represent the pro se party pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d). That determination shall be made within a reasonable time after the application is filed. The following factors will be taken into account in making the determination:

(1) the potential merit of the claims as set forth in the pleadings;

(2) the nature and complexity of the action, both factual and legal, including the need for factual investigation;
(3) the presence of conflicting testimony calling for a lawyer’s presentation of evidence and cross-examination;

(4) the capability of the pro se party to present the case;

(5) the inability of the pro se party to retain counsel by other means;

(6) the degree to which the interests of justice will be served by appointment of counsel, including the benefit the court may derive from the assistance of appointed counsel; and

(7) any other factors deemed appropriate by the judge.

(d) Order of Appointment. Whenever the judge concludes that the appointment of counsel is warranted, the judge shall enter an order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d) directing the appointment of counsel to represent the pro se party. The judge may specify in the order of appointment an area of expertise or preference so that the clerk may select a prospective appointee who indicated such area, if one is available. The order shall be transmitted forthwith to the clerk. If service of the summons and complaint has not yet been made, an order directing service by the United States marshal or by other appropriate method of service shall accompany the appointment order.

The selection of a member of the panel for appointment pursuant to the appointment order will normally be made in accordance with section (e). However, the judge may determine that an appointment be made in any of the following manners:

(1) Where the pro se party has one or more other cases pending before this Court in which counsel has been appointed, the judge may determine it to be appropriate that counsel appointed in such other case or cases be appointed to represent the pro se party in the case before the judge.

(2) Where the judge finds that the nature of the case requires specific expertise and among the panel members available for appointment there are some with the required expertise, the judge may direct the clerk to select counsel from among those included in the group or may designate a specific member of the group.

(3) Where the judge finds that the nature of the case requires specific expertise and none of the panel members available for appointment has indicated that expertise, the judge may appoint counsel with the required expertise who is not on the panel.

In order to assist the judge in determining whether or not to make a direct appointment under (1) of this section, the clerk shall provide on request the case number, case title, judge to whom assigned, and name of counsel appointed of each case currently pending before the Court in which the pro se party has had counsel appointed.

(e) Selection of Attorney to be Appointed. Except where another method of appointment is ordered pursuant to section (d), the clerk, on receipt of the order of appointment shall select a name from the panel in the following manner:

(1) Where the order specifies a particular area of expertise or a preference, the clerk shall select the first available panel member indicating such expertise or preference. If no such person is found, the next available person listed on the panel shall be selected.
(2) Where the order does not specify any area of expertise or preference, the clerk shall select the first available person listed on the panel.

(f) Notice of Appointment. After counsel has been selected, the clerk shall forthwith send to counsel written notice of the appointment. A copy of the order of appointment and copies of the pleadings filed to date, relevant correspondence, and any other relevant documents shall accompany the notice. In addition to notifying counsel, the clerk shall also notify all of the parties to the action of the appointment and include with such notification the name, address, and telephone number of the appointee.

(g) Making Private Counsel Court-Appointed. Where a party is represented by counsel and because of the party's financial condition both the party and counsel wish to change the nature of the representation to court-appointed representation in order that counsel may be eligible for reimbursement of expenses from the District Court Fund pursuant to LR83.40, counsel may petition the court to be court-appointed counsel. Any such petition shall indicate that if the court grants the petition, any existing fee agreements between the party and counsel shall no longer be enforceable and any subsequent fee agreements between the party and counsel may only be made in accordance with the provisions of LR83.41. In ruling on the petition, the judge shall grant it only if the judge would have granted an application filed under this rule had the party not been represented by counsel. Where the party is represented by more than one counsel, any order of appointment under this section shall preclude prospective operation of fee agreements with all such counsel but shall appoint only those counsel wishing to be appointed.
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LR83.56.1. Accepting Appointments

A lawyer shall not seek to avoid or to resign from appointment by a tribunal to represent a person except for good cause.

Committee Comment. General. A lawyer ordinarily is not obliged to accept a client whose character or cause the lawyer regards as repugnant. The lawyer's freedom to select clients is, however, qualified. As LR83.11(g) reflects (though it is applicable only to members of the trial bar), all lawyers have a responsibility to assist in providing pro bono publico service. An individual lawyer fulfills this responsibility by accepting a fair share of unpopular matters or indigent or unpopular clients.

Appointed Counsel. LR83.38 provides guidance to the lawyer seeking relief from appointment.

An appointed lawyer has the same obligations to the client as retained counsel, including the obligations of loyalty and confidentiality, and is subject to the same limitations on the client-lawyer relationship, such as the obligation to refrain from assisting the client in violation of the rules.
Pro Bono Program Flourishes In Northern District of Illinois

"The measure of any society is not how the rich fare or are treated, but whether the cause of the poor can be heard and, when merited, vindicated in the same way as others more advantaged," Chief Judge Charles Kocoras of the Northern District of Illinois told a recent gathering of lawyers in Chicago.

He added, "Pro bono service is fulfilling and enriching in ways neither measurable nor limited. When success is realized, it brings memories which last a lifetime. And even when the best of efforts fall short of victory, it affords pride in the attempt."

His inspiring words were spoken during the district court's Fifth Annual Pro Bono and Public Interest Service Awards Ceremony. The ceremony gives special recognition to some of the up-to-300 lawyers who each year provide free legal help in a civil case in the district court. (The Latin phrase pro bono publico means "for the public good.")

"The pro bono program we have is a great program," said Senior Judge Marvin Aspen, who as chief judge initiated the annual awards ceremony.

"Everyone is a beneficiary," he said. "The public is better served because we can ensure effective representation to all indigents in civil cases. The court is better served, and the lawyers who participate tell me they receive a wonderful sense of satisfaction."

Other federal courts sponsor pro bono programs as well, but the Northern District of Illinois takes it a step farther—it is mandatory for many lawyers.

The large number of lawyers who are members of the district's general federal bar—licensed to practice law in that federal court—must meet certain experience and education requisites to join the district's trial bar. Such membership allows a lawyer to litigate in the federal court beyond filing motions and attending status calls.

It also requires a lawyer to be available to represent indigents when called to do so in a civil case.

"Because we have such a large bar, being called on is maybe a once- or twice-in-a-career thing," Aspen said. "It's been extremely well received by the trial bar."

Trial bar admission fees are used to reimburse lawyers for out-of-pocket expenses, such as paying for transcripts or hiring expert witnesses. But a pro bono lawyer's time spent on an assigned case is not compensated.

From four to eight recipients earn a plaque and ceremonial recognition each year. At this year's ceremony in May, American Bar Association President-Elect Robert Grey Jr. delivered the keynote speech.

"There are always more outstanding nominees than we could give awards to," said Sally Elson, the district court's senior staff attorney. "Without the mandatory trial bar, I do not believe any of this would work. We have developed a culture of pro bono work that encourages attorneys to treat these cases as any other. I think this is why we have such good results from the majority of our appointments."

In congratulating this year's winners, Kocoras referred to a 1761 letter in which John Adams described the essence of pro bono service.

"John Adams asks to what greater object, to what greater character, can we aspire as lawyers than to assist the helpless and friendless in a worthy cause," he said. "I say there is
To devote your skill and energy to the plight of another, without promise of a material reward for oneself, is what sets us apart as professionals. We can never forget that there is a more noble cause to be served than the mere pursuit of individual wealth for ourselves.
It has been some years since I have practiced law, so perhaps it is fair at the outset to question why I—a nontrial lawyer—should be advocating a renewed commitment to pro bono activities for today’s young litigators. After all, Mark Twain once said, “To do right is noble; to advise others to do right is also noble and much less trouble for yourself.” My response is that my long-held views on the importance of pro bono commitments, shaped both by my experiences as a trial lawyer and by observing the performances of pro bono lawyers from the bench, embolden me to address this subject, notwithstanding Twain’s admonishment.

The value of pro bono—literally, “for the public good”—service thankfully is repeated like a mantra in law schools and in seminars on professional responsibility. However, in today’s real-world law firm, it is sometimes not that easy to put into practice those idealistic self-promises enthusiastically made in an academic setting. A young lawyer must confront many disincentives to budget competing time demands and still be able to volunteer services to the indigent litigant.

A law firm culture once friendly to pro bono has changed, and today’s law firm is more a business than a profession in the traditional sense. Pro bono work by young associates, once encouraged by firms, is now more often grudgingly tolerated at best. High associate salaries mandate commensurately substantial billable hours. In fairness, some law firms are attempting to buck this trend by assigning a partner or an administrator to coordinate the firm’s pro bono activities or by giving partial credit for pro bono work in the firm’s billable hours requirement component.

But the young associate, struggling with the pressures of billable hours requirements, family responsibilities, and the social and recreational activities of a balanced lifestyle, must have a reason—idealistic or practical—for making the extra effort to find time for pro bono work. Here, I offer readers a few personal views on why it is more than worth the effort to make pro bono representation a regular component of your professional lives.

Better Trial Lawyer
First, pro bono work will help you become a better trial lawyer. You will have the opportunity to assume responsibilities that a young lawyer often does not, and this learning and experience in pro bono assignments will speed up the process of becoming an able trial lawyer. You will have a respite for a time from the young litigation associate’s somewhat predictable routine of research, drafting, depositions, and so on. You will have the opportunity to meet directly with clients. You will personally appear in court. You may actually try a case before a court or jury. You will be dealing hands-on with a matter of important legal significance and consequence for your client. These are wonderful opportunities that can accelerate your learning curve as a complete and accomplished litigator.

Second, you will help the poor and underprivileged who—but for your efforts—would be deprived of their day in court. There is a dire need for your services. Yours will be a more personal act of charity than any financial donation you may make. You will make a difference in the lives of others.

Third, you will assist the court. No case is more difficult or time consuming for a trial judge than one involving pro se representation. Your participation will enable the court to try an indigent party’s case fairly and efficiently. Because of your efforts, the court will be confident that a case that had the potential to add to the congestion of the court’s docket now will be disposed of professionally. Your contribution will exemplify the finest tradition of the trial lawyer as an officer of the court. Needless to say, the judge assigned to the case will appreciate your service, and your reputation with the court will be enhanced.

Fourth, pro bono representation helps strengthen our democracy. Learned Hand said it best: “It is the daily; it is the small; it is the cumulative injuries of little people that we are here to protect... If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice.” Our democracy is dis-
tinged by a justice system that, unlike any other, strives to serve both rich and poor equally. And your efforts will play an essential role in making this democracy work.

Fifth, and not least in importance, pro bono work is good for the soul. It will help you spiritually. I have spoken to many lawyers and judges about the most satisfying activities of their respective legal careers, and, quite frequently, it is a pro bono matter that is mentioned. You will have an unparalleled opportunity for the type of self-fulfillment espoused by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes when he wrote, “I have ... a desire to leave the world a little more human than if I had not lived; for a true humanity is, I believe, our nearest approach to Divinity.”

In some jurisdictions, judges spend much time and effort attempting to identify attorneys willing to represent indigents. Paradoxically, many young trial lawyers who may wish to volunteer often have difficulty locating opportunities to do so. This is not the case in the Northern District of Illinois, where the judges and lawyers have worked together to devise a program that provides every trial lawyer an opportunity to accept a pro bono assignment.

I was fortunate to contribute to our court’s pro bono program at its inception. In 1980, a freshman judge in the Northern District of Illinois, I was asked by Chief Judge James Benton Parsons to tackle a problem common to many courts throughout the country: the dearth of available and competent pro bono legal counsel for appointment in civil cases. What ensued was the creation of an unprecedented indigent civil litigant pro bono program. The lawyers’ acceptance of the program reflected an appreciation for the value of pro bono service as a moral and professional responsibility.

Our court’s idea was simple. Attorneys are required to meet certain heightened standards of practice to hold first chair positions in a trial before the district court. These standards, detailed in Local Rule (L.R.) 83.11, ensure that members of the trial bar have a specified minimum of experience in litigating in our court—through, for example, trials, qualified observations, or simulations. Our court added an additional requirement for trial bar admission: The attorneys meeting the heightened standards of practice also must be available to take an indigent civil case on a pro bono basis when called upon to do so. This pro bono program is detailed in L.R. 83.35 through L.R. 83.41.

Although L.R. 83.11(g) specifically directs that no member of the trial bar should be required to accept more than one such appointment during any 12-month period, the reality of the program is that attorneys are appointed quite seldom. After all, since the first trial bar admission in 1982, our trial bar has grown to more than 12,500 members, with an additional 500 joining every year (and about 50 withdrawing).

Each year nearly 1,000 pro se claims are filed in our court. As a result, we issue letters each fall to about 1,200 attorneys, advising them to be ready to handle an indigent case in the coming year. The cases are subsequently screened to weed out meritorious claims; eventually, attorneys from the trial bar are appointed to between 200 and 300 of the remaining cases. Members need not wait to be called for appointment and may volunteer as often as they wish, L.R. 83.35(e), and many do. Any inconvenience caused by the requirements of the pro bono program thus are mitigated by the fact that an individual attorney can expect to be appointed as counsel only once or twice throughout an entire legal career. For this small price, our court gains the ready representation of its most needy civil litigants.

The pool of attorneys that receives letters each fall (the panel) is selected by the court clerk according to requirements of L.R. 83.35. The names rotate so that no member of the trial bar can be selected for a subsequent panel until all members have been selected or deemed exempt. In addition to advising each panel member of the obligations, the clerk also obtains information, such as general level and area of trial experience and preference for type of matter. (Our most common pro se matters are Social Security appeals, employment discrimination actions, and civil rights actions by persons in custody.) The clerk uses this information to assist, where possible, in matching attorneys to appropriate cases. Exemptions are available in limited circumstances for members who, for example, have a principal place of business outside of the district or who are already employed as attorneys for not-for-profit legal aid organizations.

Pro Se Pro Bono
Pro se civil litigants request the appointment of counsel through a procedure outlined in L.R. 83.36. After receiving an application, the judge assesses whether counsel should be appointed, taking into account factors including potential merit of the claims, nature and complexity of the action, and inability of the pro se party to retain counsel by other means. If the judge orders the appointment of counsel, the application proceeds to the court clerk, who then selects a name from the panel while considering, where appropriate, the case’s particular area of law or the member’s area of expertise. The pro bono program sets forth the duties and responsibilities of appointed counsel, L.R. 83.37, and the limited grounds by which counsel can seek relief from appointment, L.R. 83.38.

Our court also provides support services for the appointed lawyer. We hold annual seminars; publish manuals about the most frequent subject matters of pro se representation; maintain a help Website; and offer experienced volunteer lawyers for consultation. In addition our pro bono program reimburses attorneys for some expenses that result from the pro bono appointment. Under L.R. 83.11(e), each petitioner for membership in the trial bar is required to pay a $50 admission fee, which is deposited in our district court fund. The fund reimburses attorneys for their expenses according to L.R. 83.40 and separate
regulations. The total of reimbursable attorney expenses is capped at $3,000 ($7,000 for multiple-party cases). In short, we attempt to eliminate as much stress and anxiety as possible for the "volunteer" appointee.

When the pro bono program was first instituted in our district, we hoped to create a pilot program that could be implemented on a national basis. After 20 years of success, we believe we have reached that goal. And I believe our pro bono program makes our court the envy of the federal judiciary. When I hear my judicial colleagues across the nation lament the difficulty of finding counsel to represent the poor in civil cases, I do not hesitate to mention the success of our program. I hope that other courts soon will adopt similar programs. However, a court-annexed program is not the sole route for pro bono service. In every jurisdiction the need today is great, and opportunities for the litigator to serve the needy abound.

This is not a boom time for lawyers in terms of public image and general prestige. Trial lawyers are often portrayed in banal and unflattering ways in movies and television. Disparaging lawyer jokes have replaced blonde and ethnic jokes as fodder for comedians and Internet humor. Most polls show us near the bottom rung of public esteem (although we may have been replaced by accountants and CEOs). But we need not be defensive about our profession. The efforts and commitment of trial lawyers in America—especially those who volunteer to represent the needy—remain what make the Constitution and the rule of law more than a legal abstraction.

We have chosen a career that offers both intellectual stimulation and financial reward. Holmes thought it a profession. Our profession also gives us many opportunities during our careers to work to make this a better society. I urge you to include a commitment to pro bono as a part of your professional lifestyle. Both you and society will be better for it.
EXAMPLES OF COURT-BASED PRO BONO PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

Throughout the country, courts, the private bar, legal aid and pro bono organizations, and bar associations, among others, have partnered to develop innovative pro bono programs to assist unrepresented litigants. Below are brief descriptions of some of these programs in Illinois that may be discussed in our second panel. This list is not exhaustive and instead is intended to provide examples of the diverse court-based pro bono programs in Illinois.

Illinois JusticeCorps. Illinois JusticeCorps is an innovative program through which students serve as guides to make courts across Illinois more welcoming and less intimidating for people without lawyers. Illinois JusticeCorps recruits, trains and provides the necessary support for college and law students to provide this procedural and navigational assistance. The Chicago Bar Foundation (CBF) first launched JusticeCorps as a pilot program in Chicago in 2009. JusticeCorps expanded in 2012 with the help of AmeriCorps funding from the Serve Illinois Commission, additional funding and significant in-kind support from the CBF and the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice. JusticeCorps members and volunteers currently are stationed at courthouses in Chicago, Markham and Bloomington, and come from local schools and universities including DePaul University, Loyola University, Governors State University, Roosevelt University, Illinois State University, Illinois Wesleyan University, John Marshall Law School, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. In 2013, the program continues to expand with funding from the Lawyers Trust Fund and leadership from the Court. More information is available on justicecorps.illinoisprobono.org and in the presentation materials.

McLean County Small Claims Mediation. The McLean County Small Claims Mediation program was established in October 2008 after approval from the Illinois Supreme Court. Civil cases seeking money damages less than $5,000 that involve self-represented litigants are eligible to participate. Currently, 18 active mediators volunteer their time to the Small Claims Mediation program. Working or retired, these mediators come from a variety of professional backgrounds, including law, medicine, insurance, ministry, social work, and community work. Each mediator completed 24 hours training, taught by a team of judges, attorneys, and previously trained mediators. Cases in which both the Plaintiff and Defendant are self-represented are scheduled on Friday mornings and mediators are present in the courtroom so that they may escort the parties to the Arbitration Center, where the mediations are conducted. The Arbitration Administrator coordinates the scheduling of the mediators. More information is available in the presentation materials or by contacting Judge Chief Judge Elizabeth A. Robb, 11th Circuit of Illinois at judge.robb@mcleancountyil.gov or (309) 888-5254.

Adult Guardian Ad Litem Program. This program provides much needed assistance to the court in cases involving low-income elderly or disabled individuals in the Probate Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County. GALs have two equally important missions. The first is to meet and talk with the respondent—the person alleged to be disabled. The second is to act as the eyes and the ears of the judge by investigating the respondent’s living conditions and to make a recommendation regarding the respondent’s best interests. CVLS is appointed by the Probate Court to serve as guardian ad litem (GAL) or counsel for wards, respondents and, in some cases, parties, in disabled adult guardianship cases. Once appointed, CVLS determines whether the case should be handled by a staff attorney or referred to a volunteer. CVLS recruits, trains and provides ongoing support to volunteers in this program. Basic information about the program and other CVLS programs is available from Chicago Volunteer Legal Services (www.cvls.org).
Lake County Child Guardianship Desk. A help desk staffed by Lake County Bar Association volunteer attorneys and paralegals at the courthouse in Waukegan provides brief advice to pro se litigant who are petitioning to become the guardian of a child. The desk was largely modeled after the successful desk run by CVLS and Cook County, and is a partnership between the Lake County Bar Association and the court. More information is included in your presentation materials.

Lake County Family Mediation Program. The Family Mediation Programs in Lake County provide divorcing parents the opportunity to submit custody, visitation, and removal disputes to mediation before proceeding to a contested hearing before the court. The Lake County Family Mediation Program is governed by local court rule 11.13, which not only sets out the requirements for paid mediators, but also requires mediators to take on two low-income cases annually and staff the pro se mediation room. Working with the Lake County Bar Association, Judge Ortiz established the volunteer mediation program whereby volunteer lawyer/mediators are available at the courthouse on regularly scheduled days to mediate visitation and economic disputes between pro se parties. The court oversees management and staffing of pro se mediations. Judge Ortiz also worked with the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, to secure funding to hire two mediators and establish a mediation program for never married persons appearing at the child support enforcement court call.

Expungement Help Desk. Cabrini Green Legal Aid (CGLA) operates an Expungement Help Desk at the Daley Center where volunteers meet daily with individuals seeking to clear their criminal records. The desk is staffed primarily by volunteer attorneys from a variety of backgrounds, including in-house counsel and transactional attorneys, as well as law students. Volunteers meet with clients, determine their eligibility for expungement, sealing, or clemency, and help them file the necessary paperwork. More information is available at http://www.cgla.net/expungement-help-desk.

Center for Conflict Resolution Small Claims Mediation Program. The Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) provides mediators for small claims cases at six courthouses in Cook County: Daley Center, Skokie, Rolling Meadows, Maywood, Bridgeview and Markham. Judges and court staff work closely with CCR to ensure broad access to mediation services in each of the courthouses. CCR mediators handle over 1,000 small claims cases each year, providing a free service for participants and a time and resource-saving alternative for the court system. The organization’s 120 volunteers participate in a 40-hour basic mediation skills training and a 3 month post-training mentorship program. In addition to the small claims mediation program, the Center for Conflict Resolution also mediates cases involving foreclosures, family and parenting, guardianship, criminal misdemeanors, juveniles, neighbors, and landlords and tenants, providing services to more than 6,000 clients each year. For more information visit www.ccrchicago.org.

Kane County Self-Help Desk. In response to the high volume of pro se defendant homeowners in foreclosure court, the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit and Prairie State Legal Services partnered to establish a foreclosure help desk to provide information to pro se defendants at the Kane County Courthouse. The Foreclosure Help Desk was established in February 2011 and operates Monday through Friday during the court’s foreclosure call. It is staffed entirely by volunteer attorneys, attorneys from Administer Justice, retired judges, paralegals, law students, and financial industry professionals. The volunteers do not provide specific legal advice, but assist pro se defendant
The Foreclosure Help Desk volunteers explain the foreclosure process, the foreclosure timeline, and where the pro se defendant can go to seek free legal help for the case. In addition, volunteers provide pro se defendants with information about the federal government's Making Homes Affordable loan modification program and other programs. Foreclosure Help Desk volunteers have helped over 2,500 pro se defendant homeowners in Kane County. For more information contact Marisa Wiesman, Volunteer Lawyer Project Director at 815-935-2750 or mwiesman@pslegal.org.
Illinois JusticeCorps:  
Leveraging Students to Improve Access to Justice

Illinois JusticeCorps is an innovative program through which students serve as guides to make courts across Illinois more welcoming and less intimidating for people without lawyers. Illinois JusticeCorps recruits, trains and provides the necessary support for college and law students to provide this procedural and navigational assistance.

Illinois JusticeCorps is an innovative approach to empower student volunteers, who are a largely untapped resource, to help people without lawyers navigate the courts.

- JusticeCorps recruits and trains volunteers to provide procedural guidance to unrepresented litigants in overburdened courts, legal self-help centers and legal advice desks throughout Illinois.
- Courts across Illinois have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of people without lawyers coming to court on their own. This growth in people without lawyers has grave implications for access to the courts, case management and public confidence in the judicial system.
- By providing procedural and navigational information and guidance, JusticeCorps complements the critical work of legal advice desks and self-help centers across Illinois by making the courts less intimidating and more welcoming for people without lawyers.
- The Chicago Bar Foundation (CBF) first launched JusticeCorps as a pilot program in Chicago in 2009. JusticeCorps expanded in 2012 with the help of AmeriCorps funding from the Serve Illinois Commission, additional funding and significant in-kind support from the CBF and the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice.

JusticeCorps volunteers strengthen existing initiatives to help people without lawyers resolve their legal issues in court by pulling in students with passion and energy to contribute.

- JusticeCorps volunteers do not perform or replace the work of courts, clerks or library staff, rather, they complement it—expanding and enhancing services so people can be served promptly and thoroughly.
- JusticeCorps volunteers provide assistance in a variety of ways in courts across Illinois. JusticeCorps members help to demystify the legal process for people without lawyers by helping them find their way around the courthouse and connecting them with assistance available there, helping them to find and use appropriate online resources, and helping them with referrals to legal aid and other services.
- Many JusticeCorps members and volunteers have diverse backgrounds with strong connections to client communities, and they often can provide legal information to people without lawyers in their own languages.

Illinois JusticeCorps recruits, trains and supervises diverse college, university and law students to serve in Illinois’ courts to help people without lawyers through the judicial process.

- JusticeCorps offers much needed assistance to the courts and legal aid community in the concrete form of excellent new talent, which, among other things, reduces the burden on court and clerk staff by listening to unrepresented litigants and providing them with basic court information.
- 28 students serve as minimum-time AmeriCorps members and make a 300-hour volunteer commitment during the academic year. The program also has two full-time AmeriCorps members who receive a modest living allowance during their 1700-hour commitment. In return, these JusticeCorps members receive training and a financial education award when they complete the program.
- JusticeCorps members and volunteers are stationed at courthouses in Chicago, Markham and Bloomington, and come from local schools and universities including DePaul University, Loyola University, Governors State University, Roosevelt University, Illinois State University, Illinois Wesleyan University, John Marshall Law School, and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

For more information about Illinois JusticeCorps and to get involved, please contact Danielle Hirsch, Executive Director of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice at (312)793 -2014 or dhirsch@illinoiscourts.gov
McLean County Small Claims Mediation Program

The McLean County Small Claims Mediation program was established in October 2008 after approval from the Illinois Supreme Court. Civil cases seeking money damages less than $5,000 that involve self-represented litigants are eligible to participate.

One of the primary goals of this program is to assist poor and low-income litigants with housing or consumer disputes to reach a solution quickly and with a high degree of satisfaction. In the event of an agreement, the defendant's appearance fee is waived and the dispute is resolved with only one appearance in court. To date, 69.6% of cases have been settled in full.

Currently, there are 18 active mediators who volunteer their time to the Small Claims Mediation program. Working or retired, these mediators come from a variety of professional backgrounds, including law, medicine, insurance, ministry, social work, and community work.

Each mediator completed 24 hours training, taught by a team of judges, attorneys, and previously trained mediators.

McLean County's Small Claims Mediation program continues to reduce the number of small claims bench trials, as well as provide a quick and convenient way for self-represented litigants to resolve their disputes. The benefits of this program reach both the court and the community.

Contact: Chief Judge Elizabeth A. Robb, 11th Circuit of Illinois
judge.robb@mcleancountyil.gov
(309) 888-5254
Rachel Bunner, Arbitration Administrator
Rachel.Bunner@mcleancountyil.gov
(309) 827-7584
McLean County Small Claims Mediation Program
Presiding Small Claims Judge: Michael Stroh, Courtroom 3D
Small Claims Mediation Administrator: Rachel Bunner

The Mediation Program:
- Is a process that helps people who have a disagreement reach a settlement.
- Will be assisted by a trained mediator who will help the parties talk through their dispute.
- Allows both sides to take an active role in reaching a resolution.
- Is free and voluntary.

You are eligible to participate in the Small Claims Mediation Program if:
- This is a civil dispute with money damages under $5,000.
- The parties in the lawsuit have not reached an agreement.
- Neither the plaintiff (person bringing the matter to court) nor the defendant (person who is summoned to appear) is represented by a lawyer.
- Both parties volunteer to participate in mediation.

At your first small claims court appearance the judge will explain the advantages of mediation and invite the parties to mediate their case. If both parties agree they will go with the mediator to the Alternative Dispute Center in the building next to the Law and Justice Center.

At the Mediation:
- The mediator will review the claim and explain the process.
- Each of the parties will clarify the issues that need to be resolved and explain what is important to him or her.
- All discussions will be kept strictly confidential.
- If an agreement is reached, it will be put in writing and signed by both parties.
- The agreement will be sent to the judge for approval.
- When the agreement is signed by the judge—it is a court order.
- If no agreement is reached the judge will set a date for a bench trial.

Advantages if an agreement is reached:
- The parties may be able to solve the problem in a way the judge could not.
- Both parties will only come to court one time.
- The defendant's appearance fee will be waived by the court.
ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT SMALL CLAIMS MEDIATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT SURVEY

In an effort to increase satisfaction with the Small Claims Mediation Program, please answer all of the questions below. All responses will be kept confidential and will be used only to evaluate our services. No identifying information will be released.

Name of Mediator: _______________________________ Date of Mediation: _______________________________

1. Are you: ___ the plaintiff? (the person who filed the case), or ___ the defendant?

Please answer the questions below as follows: 5..... Strongly agree 4..... Agree 3..... neither agree nor disagree 2..... Disagree 1..... Strongly Disagree

2. I understood what was happening during the mediation process ________.
3. The mediator allowed me to fully present my case ________.
4. The mediator helped me to think of different ways of resolving the dispute ________.
5. The mediator treated me with respect ________.
6. The mediator understood what was important to me ________.
7. Mediation helped the other party understand my point of view ________.
8. Mediation helped me understand the point of view of the other party ________.
9. The mediator treated me fairly ________.
10. The mediator did not pressure me to reach an agreement ________.
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the mediation ________.
12. The agreement is fair (answer only if an agreement was reached) ________.
13. The mediation was: Too long ________ About right ________ Too short ________.
   Why or why not ____________________________________________________________________________
15. Would you use this mediator again? 1. Definitely would not 3. Possibly 5. Definitely would _____
   Why or why not ____________________________________________________________________________

Please tell us more about yourself so we may better serve our clients. Answers will remain completely confidential.

Zip Code _______________ What languages do you usually speak at home: _______________________________

Ethnicity: ______________________________________ Age Range: ________________________________
   _____ American Indian/Alaskan Native _____ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 18-24 18-24 45-64
   _____ Asian 25-44 65+
   _____ Black/African-American _____ White, not Hispanic
   _____ Latino/Hispanic _____ Multiracial

Household Income (Number of People in Household): 
   _____ Less than $18,000 _____ $27,000 - $43,000 _____ More than $75,000
   _____ $18,000- $26,000 _____ $44,000 - $75,000

Please return this form to: Rachel Bunner, Arbitration Administrator, 200 W. Front St., Bloomington, IL 61701
(309) 827-7584 Rachel.Bunner@msleancountyil.gov
POST-MEDIATION ORDER

Upon completion of voluntary mediation, the parties report the following, and the Court being fully advised FINDS:

1. The parties were unable to reach any agreement. This cause is set for bench trial on __________, 20__, at _________ o’clock, __________, in Courtroom ______. All parties acknowledge receipt of notice of the next court date. All Defendants are required to file a written appearance and pay the required appearance fee no less than fourteen (14) days prior to the bench trial.

2. Defendant shall pay to Plaintiff the amount of $______ each ______, until the total amount of $__________ is paid in full. The first payment shall be made on the ___ day of ____________, 20___, and all further payments shall be made on the ___ day of each ____________ thereafter. Defendant agrees that a judgment may enter against him/her if the payment agreement is not followed. The judgment amount will be the amount listed above, less any monies paid, plus costs.

3. Defendant agrees to move out of the premises located at ____________, and shall pay to Plaintiff the amount of $______ each ______, until the total amount of $__________ is paid in full. The first payment shall be made on the ___ day of ____________, 20___, and all further payments shall be made on the ___ day of each ____________ thereafter. Defendant agrees that a judgment and order for possession may enter against him/her if Defendant fails to comply with any of the above terms. The judgment amount will be the amount listed above, less any monies paid, plus costs.

4. Subject to compliance with this order the case may be dismissed with prejudice and cannot be reinstated.

Other agreed terms:

______________________________

Date: ________________________

Approved by: ____________________________
Plaintiff

Defendant

ORDER

The Court, upon review of the parties’ agreement, approves and fully incorporates same as the court’s Order.

Date: ________________________

Enter: ____________________________
Judge
Lake County bar group creates help desk for pro se guardians

By Maria Kantzavelos
Law Bulletin staff writer

A help desk staffed by Lake County Bar Association volunteer attorneys and paralegals has been established at the courthouse in Waukegan to help clear up the confusion that can come with a pro se litigant's petition to become the guardian of a child and to help foster greater efficiency when those cases reach the courtroom, according to bar association leaders.

The Guardianship Help Desk, which is situated in a jury room adjacent to the 19th Judicial Circuit's probate courtroom in Waukegan, was unveiled in late January by the LCBA and its Wills, Trust, and Probate Committee, said Elizabeth M. Rochford, first vice president of the LCBA who focuses her practice in estate planning, probate law, and real estate law.

"When we recognized this need in Lake County, we saw people struggling through trying to navigate the legal system. These were people already overwhelmed by meeting the needs of a child," Rochford said.

That struggle typically translated into a glut of cases in the probate courtroom, Rochford said.

"From the court's perspective, these pro se petitioners were stepping up, time after time, and they weren't properly prepared," Rochford said. "The judge was having to stop and draft orders, assist with paperwork. It was slowing her court call.

"Obviously, these are people who are in need of this important service, but they didn't have anybody to help them through the process."

Rochford said organizers from Lake County studied Cook County's long-running Guardianship Assistance Desk — a joint project of Chicago Volunteer Legal Services, the Circuit Court of Cook County, and the Chicago Bar Foundation — as a model for their newly launched program.

"They were enormously cooperative with us. They have turned that program into an amazing model," said Rochford.

As of this morning, about 40 volunteers had signed on to the Lake County guardianship assistance program, and that number is growing. Initial interest came from attorneys who handle wills, trusts and probate matters.

"Now, it's expanding and we're getting interest from attorneys throughout the bar association," Rochford said. "People are so eager to participate. They find it really uniquely fulfilling."
The help desk, association leaders said, was created in cooperation with Circuit Judge Diane E. Winter, who presides in the probate courtroom in Waukegan.

In a news release announcing the program, Winter said that from her vantage point, after the Help Desk's first two sessions in operation, the program "noticeably improves the guardians' understanding of the process and comfort in court when they present their situations to me."

LCBA organizers also received the cooperation of the court clerk, whose staff instructs pro se litigants to report to the help desk before their case is presented to the judge. There, Rochford said, volunteers help litigants petitioning the court to become the guardian of a minor in filling out court-required documents.

The volunteers also assist in explaining the process, gathering necessary information, and in writing brief summaries of each file for the judge.

A variety of people may be involved in seeking guardianship of a child, such as a grandparent or other family member. And the situations stemming from the petition for guardianship are also varied, situations in which a parent may be deceased, unwilling or unable to care for the child.

"We sit down and sift through some of the complicating factors and circumstances, to get to the important things, and then we can share that information with the judge," Rochford said.

"Sometimes, these are complicated family situations," Rochford said. "By sitting down and interviewing these people in a non-threatening, non-formal setting, we can get more quickly to the important relevant facts, and we can capsulize them and send them in to the judge with our notes, which helps her to get to the heart of the matter more efficiently."

The Lake County Bar Foundation also has stepped up to help in the association's effort.

"The bar foundation identified ways to help us," Rochford said. "We were preparing our forms with carbon paper. As soon as they heard that, they had a fax machine, copier and scanner delivered."

The newly created Guardianship Help Desk operates each Friday, from 9 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. with about six volunteers — attorneys and non-attorneys — assisting people through both the legal and administrative aspects of the process.

"All the pro se [guardianship] cases come through our desk," Rochford said. "Before they walk into the courtroom, they're prepared with all their paperwork. So when they step up they're ready to go."

The Guardianship Help Desk is the second community outreach program located in the 19th Judicial Circuit to assist citizens. A Foreclosure Help Desk, established last fall, is situated in the courthouse in Park City, said Christopher T. Boadt, executive director of the LCBA.
Lake County attorneys interested in volunteering on the Guardianship Help Desk may call the bar association for more information at (847) 244-3143.

mkantzavelos@lbpc.com
Relevant provisions of Rule 11.13 FAMILY MEDIATION PROGRAM
of Part 11.00, FAMILY LAW, of the Uniform Rules of Practice,
Circuit Court of Illinois, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit

The Chief Judge is authorized to establish a list of qualified mediators in accordance with
the provisions and standards set forth in this rule. In the interests of efficient administration, and
to maintain the highest level of competence, the Chief Judge may, in his or her discretion, add or
remove members of the list at any time. The list shall be known as the Family Court Mediator
List.

A. Definitions

These Rules hereby adopted by reference the definitions contained in 710 ILCS 35/2 as if
fully set forth herein. In addition to those definitions, the following definition applies.

An “impediment to mediation” is any condition, including but not limited to domestic
violence or intimidation, substance abuse, child abuse, mental illness or a cognitive impairment,
that hinders the ability of a party to negotiate safely, competently, and in good faith. Pursuant to
these rules, the identification of impediments in a case is necessary to determine whether
mediation should be required, and to insure that only those parties having a present,
undiminished ability to negotiate are directed by the court to mediate under this rule.

B. Referral to Mediation; Time for Referral; Time for Disposition

Mediation shall be ordered by the court, except upon a showing of the existence of an
impediment to mediation or for other good cause shown, for all disputes involving child custody,
visitation, removal, or other non-economic issues relating to the child or children, either pre­
judgment or post-judgment. Mediation shall be limited to the issues specified by the court in the
referral order.

* * *

C. Subject Matter of Mediation

Mediation may also be ordered for issues other than those described in B.1., including
economic issues. For mediation of these other issues, the court shall take into account the
qualifications and professional background of the individual mediator appointed.

Economic issues may not be mediated unless specifically ordered by the court pursuant to
B.2., or agreed upon by the parties if they are mediating with an attorney-mediator.

D. Screening for Impediments

At the initial orientation session and from time to time as necessary during the
course of mediation, the mediator shall screen the parties for the presence of an
impediment to mediation as defined under Paragraph A.2.
If a mediator determines that an impairment exists that hinders the ability of the parties to negotiate safely, competently, or in good faith, mediation shall terminate and the case shall be returned to court for further proceedings, unless the parties agree to continue in mediation the mediator determines that the implementation of safeguards would remove the impediment(s) to safe and productive mediation.

If the parties to mediation are subject to an order of protection, mediation may nevertheless continue if both parties agree and the mediator determines that the sessions will be safe and productive. If the order of protection prohibits contact, the parties shall not meet in joint sessions.

E. Qualifications, Requirements and Selection of Dissolution Mediators

Any person who meets the following criteria is eligible to apply to serve as a mediator for the purposes of this rule:

a. The applicant must satisfactorily complete a 40-hour divorce mediation training program approved by the court. In addition, the applicant must have completed training specific to domestic violence, child abuse, substance abuse and mental illness, providing the applicant an understanding of the issues relating to these impairments, and of the parties' ability to negotiate effectively when impacted by one or more of these impairments.

b. The applicant must have a degree in law, or a graduate degree in a field that includes the study of psychiatry, psychology, social work, human development, family counseling, or other behavioral science substantially related to marriage and family interpersonal relationships, or a related field otherwise approved by a Presiding Judge of the Family Court.

c. The applicant must be a member in good standing in the professional organization of his or her respective disciplines.

d. The applicant must provide proof of professional liability insurance covering the mediation process, providing coverage satisfactory to the Presiding Judge of the Family Division.

e. The applicant must have a minimum of two years of work experience in his or her discipline or profession, or otherwise be supervised by a qualified mediator.

f. The applicant must maintain an office in Lake County.

2. All persons who meet the above requirements and are interested in acting as a court appointed mediator shall provide proof by way of affidavit, supported by documentation of the aforesaid requirements, to the Presiding Judge of the Family Court, or to the person otherwise designated to receive such material.

3. The Presiding Judge of the Family Court shall prepare a list of approved mediators. The list shall be submitted to the Chief Judge, who shall have the discretion to include
or remove persons from the list at any time, or to waive any of the above requirements, when
necessary to promote the highest standards of competency. An applicant denied inclusion on, or
removed from the list, may appeal the decision in writing within 10 days to the Chief Judge. The
Chief Judge shall decide the appeal after an opportunity for the applicant or member to be heard.
The decision of the Chief Judge shall be final. The list shall be reviewed in every even numbered
year.

4. An approved mediator shall attend ten hours of continuing education every two
years, on subjects related to child custody, visitation, domestic violence, substance abuse, mental
illness or the mediation process. The mediator shall be responsible to provide proof of attendance
by way of affidavit, of the specific course, seminar, or class attended to the Presiding Judge of
the Family Court at least thirty days prior to his or her two-year anniversary date of certification.

5. From time to time, mediators may be required to attend specific trainings offered
or sponsored by the Family Mediation Program, the Bar Association or other individuals or
organizations.

6. Each year, a mediator shall mediate two low-income cases, as identified by
the court, at a reduced fee. In addition, each mediator shall volunteer to staff a room to
which judges in the Family Division can refer parties who have discrete issues requiring
resolution. The room will be staffed by volunteers, as necessary. Mediators can sign up for
available days on a calendar that will be located at the reception desk for court
administration.

F. Referral Procedure

1. Upon the court’s order or the parties’ agreement to participate in mediation, the
case shall be assigned a mediator. This mediator may be chosen by agreement of the parties.
Absent such an agreement, the court shall assign a mediator from the list of qualified mediators,
and the selection of the mediator shall be in the sole discretion of the judge. A mediation order
shall be issued and signed by the court. A mediation status date will be set for no later than seven
weeks from the date the mediation order was issued.

2. The court may also designate in its order what percentage of the mediation
fee should be paid by each party, and/or whether the case should be considered a low-
income case.

3. Parties are obligated to participate in the mediation process when ordered by the
court. The parties’ attorneys shall encourage their clients to mediate in good faith, and the parties
shall participate in mediation in good faith.

4. After entry of a mediation order by the court, the absence of a party at a mediation
session or the lack of a party’s participation in the mediation process may result in sanctions,
including reasonable costs to the other party for mediation and attorney’s fees.

5. If the appointed mediator has any conflict of interest, another mediator shall be
appointed from the list. If the mediator appointed on a designated low-income case has
already met his or her annual requirement for mediating low-income cases, and so informs
the court, the court shall appoint another mediator. The Presiding Judge of the Family Division, or the person otherwise designated, shall keep a record of low-income cases assigned to each mediator to ensure a fair distribution of these cases.

6. By the status date, the mediator shall submit a Mediator Report to the court and the parties’ legal counsel. The required form and contents of the Mediator Report are specified in Paragraph L, below.

* * *

P. Statistics

The Court Administrator will be responsible for all statistical data. Data shall include the number of cases referred to mediation, the number of low-income cases referred, the number and duration of sessions per case and the final outcome of each case. These statistics shall be forwarded annually to the Chief Judge, and to the Presiding Judge of the Family Division. The Chief Judge shall report annually to the Supreme Court of Illinois on this mediation program, including a count of the number of cases assigned to Court-Ordered Mediation and the results achieved.

Q. Pilot Family Mediation Program – Never-Married Parents

The judge hearing child support enforcement matters may order never married parents involved in custody and/or visitation disputes to attend mediation with a court annexed mediator who meets the qualifications set forth in this rule. The mediator shall be available on site in the courthouse and shall provide mediation services consistent with this rule without charge to the parties.
Step-by-Step Checklist and Related Resources for Starting and Sustaining a Court-Based Pro Bono Program

Purpose of the Checklist and Related Resources

This version of the Checklist and the accompanying materials were developed for the Second Annual Conference of the Illinois Supreme Court’s Commission on Access to Justice. The information contained here reflects insight and experience from judges, legal aid organizations and others who have developed and implemented court-based pro bono programs. This document includes an overview of the process for setting up a successful pro bono program as well as helpful resources.

The checklist and the related resources will be available online in the coming weeks, and will include access to the program descriptions and sample documents included in the Conference materials. We will continue to build on the materials as more information becomes available, and we welcome you to send program descriptions or sample materials to add to the collection for use by your colleagues across the state. We encourage the use of the templates and sample documents to develop new programs. Please contact Kelly Tautges, Director of Pro Bono & Court Advocacy at The Chicago Bar Foundation at 312.554.8356 or ktautges@chicagobar.org. The Chicago Bar Foundation provides volunteer staff support to the Pro Bono Services Committee of the Illinois Supreme Court’s Commission on Access to Justice.
Step-by-Step Checklist for Starting and Sustaining a Pro Bono Program

This checklist provides a roadmap for developing a court-based pro bono program. Consider using this tool when you are evaluating a particular legal need inside the courthouse can be met through pro bono service.

1. □ Preliminary Evaluation
   - Define the need and goals for a potential program
   - Determine whether the need is likely to be successfully addressed through a pro bono program
   - Determine whether any legal aid organization is handling cases in the area and evaluate the potential for partnership
   - Identify existing models for similar pro bono programs
   - Determine program complexity and required staffing
   - Determine program costs
   - Decide whether to proceed with the program

2. □ Getting Started
   - Identify a model that will effectively and efficiently meet the program goals
   - Identify the staffing resources that will be necessary to run the program
   - Evaluate potential for malpractice insurance, through a partner legal aid organization or otherwise
   - Identify pilot phase, if needed

3. □ Implementing the Program
   - Establish criteria for case screening
   - Establish and draft program policies and procedures as needed
   - Establish plan for placing cases

4. □ Working with Volunteers
   - Evaluate potential for general or specific volunteer group
   - Draft volunteer opportunity description, if appropriate
   - Identify need for training and resources for providing same
   - Recognize your volunteers

5. □ Sustaining Your Program
   - Periodically communicate with relevant stakeholders
   - Periodically evaluate your program
Introduction, Background and Relevant Rules

Defining Pro Bono

**Basic Definition:** Free legal services from volunteer attorneys to low-income individuals and certain nonprofit organizations or training that supports the provision of legal aid or pro bono services to those clients.

Illinois Rules

The preamble to the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct, Section 6(a), states as follows:

> It is also the responsibility of those licensed as officers of the court to use their training, experience, and skills to provide services in the public interest for which compensation may not be available. It is the responsibility of those who manage law firms to create an environment that is hospitable to the rendering of a reasonable amount of uncompensated service by lawyers practicing in that firm. Service in the public interest may take many forms. These include but are not limited to pro bono representation of persons unable to pay for legal services and assistance in the organized bar's efforts at law reform. An individual lawyer's efforts in these areas is evidence of the lawyer's good character and fitness to practice law, and the efforts of the bar as a whole are essential to the bar's maintenance of professionalism. To help monitor and quantify the extent of these activities, and to encourage an increase in the delivery of legal services to persons of limited means, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756(f) requires disclosure with each lawyer's annual registration with the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the approximate amount of his or her pro bono legal service and the approximate amount of qualified monetary contributions.

**Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756(f)** defines pro bono in Illinois and requires all attorneys licensed in Illinois to report, in connection with the attorney's annual ARDC registration, pro bono legal services provided and qualified monetary contributions made during the preceding 12 months.

Supreme Court Rule 756(f) contains a broad definition that illustrates four distinct ways in which lawyers can use their unique training, experience and skills to help the public on a pro bono basis. Under the rule, qualifying "pro bono legal services" include (a) legal services to a person of limited means; (b) legal services to an organization designed to address the needs of persons of limited means; (c) legal services to certain charitable, religious, civic, or community organizations; and (d) pro bono training intended to benefit legal service organizations or lawyers who provide pro bono services. According to Rule 756(f), "persons of limited means" are not only those persons with household income below the federal poverty standard but also those persons frequently referred to as the "working poor." The Rule does not require lawyers to perform pro bono service, only that lawyers report their service under the Rule. The full text of the Rule as well as a summary of its requirements is included at www.iardc.org.
Other Rules and Statutory Provisions Relevant for Court-Based Pro Bono Programs

The Illinois Supreme Court also has implemented progressive rules that allow a variety of attorneys to engage in pro bono service in Illinois. Copies of the relevant rules and statutes are included in the Conference materials.

- House counsel admitted under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 716 are permitted to engage in pro bono service without any additional registration or affiliation requirement.

- Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756 allows retired and inactive attorneys, and attorneys registered in other states but not in Illinois, to perform pro bono service so long as certain procedural safeguards are followed, such as registering with the ARDC and working with a sponsoring entity.

- Under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756(i), retired and inactive Illinois attorneys and attorneys who are licensed in other states but not in Illinois are also allowed to engage in pro bono service if they do the following: (1) file a registration form with the ARDC; (2) work with an approved sponsoring entity (such as a legal aid organization or law clinic); (3) complete any training required by the sponsoring entity; and (4) annually register with the ARDC ongoing participation in a pro bono program. The forms needed to register under the Rule are available at www.iardc.org.

- Section 5-105.5 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure provides as follows:

  When a party is represented in a civil action by a civil legal services provider or attorney in a court-sponsored pro bono program, all fees and costs relating to filing, appearing, transcripts on appeal, and service of process shall be waived without the necessity of a motion for that purpose, and the case shall be given an index number or other appropriate filing number, provided that (i) a determination has been made by the civil legal services provider or attorney in a court-sponsored pro bono program that the party is an indigent person and (ii) an attorney's certification that that determination has been made is filed with the clerk of the court along with the complaint, the appearance, or any other paper that would otherwise require payment of a fee.

- 735 ILCS 5/5-105 (g) provides as follows: "A court, in its discretion, may appoint counsel to represent an indigent person, and that counsel shall perform his or her duties without fees, charges, or reward." Currently, there are no additional guidelines or rules about this appointment statute. In the coming year, the Access to Justice Commission is evaluating the potential for additional guidelines to encourage and support voluntary pro bono appointments.

- Rule 6.5 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct Allows a lawyer to undertake short-term, limited scope pro bono representation without performing a formal conflict check so long as the lawyer is unaware of any conflicts of interest and the other requirements of the rule are met. Rule 6.5 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct: Empowering Lawyers to Provide More Pro Bono, by Bob Glaves & Steve Pflaum, provides a helpful overview of the rule and how the rule can be utilized in court-based pro bono programs.
Illinois Supreme Court Rules 11, 13 and 137 allow lawyers to represent clients in litigation for only a portion of a case, allowing the potential for additional pro bono opportunities for attorneys who want to make a more limited time commitment. Pro bono programs offering limited scope opportunities may encourage additional volunteers to get involved.
Preliminary Evaluation

Utilizing volunteers to address the legal needs of low-income and other vulnerable people coming to court without lawyers may be an effective mechanism to improve the administration of justice. Some court-based pro bono programs may require only simple screening and matching mechanisms. Other programs may require legal aid or other partners to provide more robust case screening and volunteer training and support. The strongest programs consider the needs and viewpoints of other potential stakeholders (including local legal aid organizations, bar associations and pro bono attorneys) to design programs that are likely to last.

Most Important Inquiries:

- What need will be met through pro bono service?
- Are legal aid or other organizations operating in this space and, if so, are they potential partners in a program?
- How will cases be screened?
- Will volunteers be interested and able to manage the expected pro bono service? Will volunteers need training and support?
- Taking into account the program complexity, is there capacity to appropriately staff the program through resources in the court or potential partners?

☐ Define the Needs and Goals of a Potential Program. What need will be met with pro bono volunteers?

A simple description of the program, even just a sentence or two, will help clarify purpose of the program. Below are two examples, and there are many more ways to approach the project description.

Example 1. Pro se litigants need brief advice and assistance completing forms in divorce cases.

Example 2. Pro se litigants need representation in jury trials in municipal court.

☐ Determine whether the Need is Likely to be Successfully Addressed through a Pro Bono Program

The primary goal of any court-based pro bono program is to meet existing or emerging needs of low income and other vulnerable people coming to court without lawyers and to improve the administration of justice. Programs will require some level of case screening or eligibility standards, volunteer attorneys with subject-matter expertise or a topic that is amenable to training, and an approach that will interest pro bono volunteers.

The following questions help determine the level of need:

- How many pro se litigants need assistance?
- Are any legal aid organizations working in this area? If so, do they have capacity to handle additional cases? Are they turning away cases?
• Are private attorneys handling these claims for low-income clients (on contingency fee or because fees may be available)?

• With support from a legal aid organization or information from a self-help center, could these potential clients represent themselves? Depending on matter complexity and the type of resources available for pro se litigants, brief advice, settlement assistance or self-help may be the most effective forms of assistance, through a volunteer program or otherwise.

While pro bono volunteers can provide a great deal of assistance, they are not a panacea. As a threshold inquiry, determine whether volunteers are likely to be interested in the kinds of work needed and whether the matters are appropriate for pro bono placement. Two primary considerations:

• **Expertise Needed.** Are attorneys with expertise willing to handle the cases pro bono? Alternatively, can pro bono attorneys be trained to handle the matters in a reasonable amount of time? If experts are not likely pro bono candidates and the subject matter is so complex that pro bono attorneys cannot be trained in a reasonable amount of time, then the program may not be realistic.

• **Appeal to Pro Bono Volunteers.** Pro bono attorneys handle cases for a variety of reasons, which might include helping people in need, contributing a particular expertise, improving the system or developing skills. In addition, a variety of other factors may influence a volunteer's decision to get involved – the time required and the "feel good" factor are just a couple of examples. Court-based pro bono service may be especially appealing to attorneys who already practice in court, but other attorneys may be interested as well. In the early stages of planning, consider whether the proposed program will have some kind of appeal to pro bono attorneys or a particular group of attorneys. Some questions to ask here:
  - Are particular types of volunteers likely to be especially interested? Could subject-matter experts handle the cases?
  - Does the program offer an attractive training opportunity? What kinds of skills can attorneys gain through your program?
  - What time commitment is required?

☐ **Determine which Organizations are Active in the Relevant Area**

Legal aid organizations, bar associations and law schools can be instrumental in developing and implementing court-based pro bono programs. Reach out to your local organization(s) to determine whether they are active in the particular subject matter or have an interest in exploring a potential program. Legal aid organizations may provide screening, training or volunteer support. Similarly, bar associations or particular bar committees may be interested in partnering to develop and implement a program, and may be particularly helpful in identifying subject-matter experts and recruiting volunteers.

**Helpful Resources**

  On this website, you can search for pro bono programs by subject matter, geographical location and other characteristics.
• The Pro Bono Committee of the Illinois Supreme Court’s Commission on Access to Justice is happy to help investigate. Contact Kelly Tautges, Director of Pro Bono & Court Advocacy at the CBF and Volunteer Committee Staff, at 312-554-8356 or ktautges@chicagobar.org.

☐ Identify Existing Models for Similar Pro Bono Programs

Existing models can help you decide the best structure for your particular program. In addition, programs may be able to share training materials, standard forms, automated documents and lessons learned.

• The American Bar Association (ABA) hosts information on The State of Judicial Facilitation of Pro Bono. In addition, the ABA’s Resource Center for Access to Justice Initiatives has access to information about programs across the country.
• www.IllinoisProBono.org contains information about pro bono programs in Illinois
• The Conference materials provide examples of court-based pro bono programs from throughout Illinois, along with sample documents.

☐ Determine Program Complexity and Required Staffing

All pro bono programs require some level of screening, training or other support. The level required varies greatly depending on the case type, complexity and subject matter of the cases, as well as the types of volunteers that the program will utilize. In court-based pro bono programs, it is possible for the judge, court staff or other court resources to provide much of the needed infrastructure, especially when the program relies upon subject-matter experts to handle the cases, eliminating the need for volunteer training and support. In other programs, partners may be required to provide the appropriate levels of screening, training and ongoing support.

In terms of complexity, pro bono programs run the gamut. Understanding where the proposed program falls on the continuum is essential to evaluating the resources required to run the program. Consider several factors:

Screening. Some level of screening is required to ensure that cases are appropriate for pro bono representation. Many, but not all, pro bono programs have some income eligibility guidelines. In addition, for ongoing representation, screening may involve determining that a pro se litigant has a colorable claim or defense and that pro bono representation would be appropriate in a case in which the other party is represented by an attorney. Court clerks or other court staff also may help with this basic screening. In some programs, more advanced screening will be required to ensure that the case merits the investment of pro bono resources. In those programs, a legal aid organization may be an excellent partner.

Training. How much training is needed? If the volunteers are already subject-matter experts, then little will be required. On the other hand, if the volunteers do not have relevant substantive and/or practice experience, then partners will be needed to provide training and support. Potential partners to provide training include legal aid organizations, bar associations and law schools.
Support and Supervision. If the program will rely on subject-matter experts, then ongoing support and supervision by a program partner will not be necessary. If the program will rely on lawyers or law students unfamiliar with the subject matter or procedure, it is essential to identify a partner who can provide support and advice from the perspective of an advocate.

These factors should guide the evaluation of how much staff capacity will be needed for the program. A few programs may need basic judicial screening to refer cases to volunteers who already know the area and will require only limited oversight. Many programs will require training and ongoing support and, therefore, will require program partners.

If the issues raised here cannot be resolved, a pro bono program is not likely to be successful.

☐ Determine Program Costs

All programs will have some costs, but the amount of those costs will vary greatly. For legal aid organizations, partnering with the court is generally a great opportunity, but they may not have the capacity to provide all of the staff support necessary. However, new pro bono programs may provide the opportunity to apply for specific grants or other support. Similarly, bar associations or schools may be able to provide some staff resources to create the necessary infrastructure. Whatever the situation, it is important to consider the costs to the court and the program partners.

☐ Balancing All Information, Decide Whether to Proceed with Program

The biggest investment will likely be the time required to create and run the program. As far as the benefits, the most obvious are that litigants will receive much-needed legal assistance and the administration of justice will be more fair and efficient. There are, however, a number of other benefits from court-based pro bono programs, including that community partners may gain a deeper understanding of and investment in the administration of justice. Potential downsides of a program that does not work include frustrated volunteers and poorly represented litigants. Evaluating and anticipating the program needs will help ensure that the time and resources required to implement a new program will be a worthwhile investment.
Getting Started

☐ Identify a Model that Will Effectively and Efficiently Meet Your Goals

Pro bono programs may utilize a variety of models to deliver legal services. Brief advice, settlement assistance, appointment or referral programs are common possibilities. See the Examples of Court-Based Pro Bono Programs in Illinois, including the Conference Materials, for specific examples and supporting materials.

Panel Program. In a panel program, cases are either distributed to the list of potential volunteers or assigned by rotation. Volunteers either accept cases in which they are interested or accept the assignment based on the program rules. In some programs, court staff is able to manage the referral and distribution programs. In other programs, a partner legal aid organization may distribute cases to its pool of volunteers.

Legal Advice or Help Desk. Court-based help desks may utilize volunteers in a variety of ways. At general help desks or desks that deal with complex subjects, it may be challenging rely upon volunteers unless they have significant experience in the area. On the other hand, some desks address discreet areas of law that are amenable to basic training, such as collections or expungement. Bar associations or particular committees may be well-positioned to oversee volunteer recruitment and sign-up for some desks. Other desks rely upon court, library or self-help center staff to oversee volunteer sign-up and client registration. Whatever the staffing model, it is important to set clear expectations for clients and volunteers about whether they will be receiving/providing legal information or brief advice, and to be clear about the scope of the service. Depending the subject-matter, it may be necessary to have a supervisor present to answer questions and oversee the desk. Several help desks staffed by legal aid organizations have successfully incorporated volunteers and are able to provide training and supervision so that volunteers are able to increase the number of clients served at the desk. Note that Rule 6.5 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct eases conflicts issues for pro bono attorneys providing brief advice and can be an important planning and recruiting tool.

Settlement Assistance and Mediation Programs. Many courts rely upon volunteers for settlement assistance and mediation programs. These programs take a variety of forms and have been very successful in a variety of settings.

The Importance of Collaboration. In collaborative pro bono programs, multiple stakeholders work together to develop and run a program. Stakeholders may include multiple legal aid organizations, a court, social service providers, law firms or other interested parties.

☐ Identify the Staffing Resources that Will be Necessary to Run the Program

Every pro bono program needs a staff person who is responsible for managing the program. Particularly in court-managed programs, court staff, library staff or other existing staff within the courthouse may be in a good position to manage the program or certain aspects of it, such as client and volunteer registration. When different people or organizations are responsible for aspects of the programs, it is important to establish regular communication and to be clear
about roles and responsibilities. The functions that will need to be covered in most programs include the following:

- Volunteer recruitment, sign-up and communication
- Volunteer training and support, if not relying on subject-matter experts
- Case screening
- Case placement or coordination of client outreach and sign-up for brief-advice programs
- Volunteer recognition
- Overall monitoring and point of contact

☐ Identify the Potential for Malpractice Insurance, though a Partner Legal Aid Organization or Otherwise

The availability of malpractice coverage may be an important issue for some volunteers, particularly retired and inactive, in-house counsel and government attorneys who either do not have any malpractice coverage or whose employer’s malpractice insurance does not extend to pro bono work. Many legal aid organizations and some bar associations provide malpractice coverage to their volunteers, and may be able to cover volunteers in court-based programs in which they are partnering.

☐ Identify Pilot Phase, if needed

When starting a new program, and especially involves an innovative model or new collaboration, consider starting with a pilot phase. In the pilot phase, consider the following approaches:

- Work with a limited number of volunteer partners, who commit to developing the program, including by providing detailed feedback and acting as ambassadors for the program when it is ready to expand. These volunteers should understand that the program is a pilot and they will be working to evaluate and solve minor issues as the program gets off the ground.
- Establish criteria and systems to track and evaluate the program, including client and volunteer satisfaction. Implement changes based on the feedback before launching the program.
- Conduct regular meetings with relevant stakeholders, which may include the court, staff or other personnel involved in the program, partner organizations, and volunteers.
Implementing the Program

☐ Establish Criteria for Case Screening

Screening can be a particularly challenging aspect of court-based pro bono programs. A good program has responsibility not to waste staff or volunteers' time by referring cases that do not have merit or when the client will be unable or unwilling to work with pro bono counsel.

At minimum, the following should be considered:

- **Financial Eligibility.** All legal aid organizations have some financial eligibility guidelines for their intake process and many have strict requirements that they must follow as required by government funding or private grant agreements. Court programs may choose to follow similar guidelines or to relax those requirements to serve more court patrons. Most firms and many volunteers also have financial eligibility guidelines, though those vary widely and may be relaxed in many situations. Whatever the decision, it is important to be clear about the financial eligibility requirements for participation in a pro bono program, if any, and to be mindful of restrictions or limitations that apply for legal aid partners.

- **Colorable Claim or Defense.** Volunteers have limited resources and to the extent possible should not be required to invest significant amounts of time in cases where there is no possibility of prevailing on the merits. In programs that involve extended representation, most programs develop guidelines to address this issue in the referral guidelines. The issues are different in settlement assistance programs or advice desks, where volunteers often provide critical information and advice to participants who are not well positioned, providing an important service for the litigants and the court.

- **Willingness and Ability to Work with Pro Bono Attorneys.** Some unrepresented litigants may be unable or unwilling to work with pro bono counsel. In these situations, providing pro bono counsel for extended representation is not likely to be productive.

☐ Establish and Draft Program Policies and Procedures as Needed

Having clear program policies and procedures will increase efficiency and ensure that program partners and volunteers understand the rules, roles and responsibilities. Policies and procedures vary greatly depending on the nature of the pro bono program. For example, the Trial Bar Pro Bono Program established by the Federal Court for the Northern District of Illinois regulates the program through detailed local rules that establish the procedure creating the volunteer panel, standards for case referral and criteria for volunteers to decline appointments. Most programs do not require court rules and instead the policies and procedures are set forth in program documents. Whatever the form, the following are important considerations for any program:

- Roles and responsibilities of the volunteer and any partner organizations
- Case referral standards and eligibility guidelines
- The process for accepting or declining representation
• Responsibility for out-of-pocket costs
• What happens if a volunteer wants to withdraw from a case
• What happens if fees are available or awarded in the case
WORKING WITH VOLUNTEERS

Volunteers participate in pro bono activities for a variety of reasons, and may be particularly motivated to participate in pro bono programs in which the court is a partner.

Why Lawyers Volunteer for Pro Bono Service

Lawyers volunteer their time for many different reasons. Many lawyers perform pro bono service because it is the right thing to do and part of our professional responsibility as lawyers. However, pro bono programs might tap into some other motivations to increase the volunteer pool and understanding common concerns of volunteers may help appropriately tailor a program. For example, some volunteers may want to gain certain skills or experience (such as trial, negotiating, interviewing or drafting). If a program will allow attorneys to build certain skills, this may be a selling point for particular groups, firms or populations. In addition, a primary reason that volunteers may hesitate to sign-up for pro bono service is concern about how much time a case will require and balancing pro bono obligations with work for paying clients. Designing programs with more limited time commitments is one way to address this concern. Another solution is to involve a legal aid organization that can provide back-up support to their volunteers. Overall, understanding the potential volunteer and discussing any potential barriers to participation in advance will help design a program that is likely to work well for everyone.

Evaluate Potential for General or Specific Volunteer Group

Broadly speaking, consider whether a particular pool of volunteers may be interested in the proposed program. Some possibilities include: lawyers who are already experts in the subject matter; newer lawyers; retired attorneys; paralegals; law students and large firms. Some programs may be appropriate for a general audience, but some will have more success targeting a particular group and tailoring the program to the goals of that group. Set forth below are some basic considerations for some target volunteer pools:

Subject-Matter Experts. Involving lawyers who already have relevant experience or who regularly appear in a particular courtroom can be a great strategy, particularly for court-based programs. Some lawyers and law firms are looking for opportunities to use their particular expertise and will welcome the opportunity. In other circumstances, subject matter experts may not be as likely to get involved, and there may be conflicts that prevent them from doing so. If you are considering relying on subject matter experts, it is a good idea to research the potential issues. For some preliminary research, consider reaching out to bar association committees in the relevant areas, specialty bar associations or even just a few attorneys you know in the area. These conversations should give you a general idea of the interest level.

Newer lawyers. Newer lawyers are often especially eager to build skills. In addition, in a challenging job market, they may have more time to dedicate to pro bono. However, because they have less experience, they will likely require more training, support and supervision, as well as malpractice insurance. If program partners are able to provide that additional support, newer attorneys can be excellent volunteers.
Retired attorneys. Retired attorneys may have a lot of experience and wisdom to bring to a program. While programs targeting only retired attorneys are rare, this volunteer pool can be a great resource. Some court-based programs rely upon retired attorneys to serve as mediators or to staff legal advice desks. Illinois Supreme Court Rule 756 permits attorneys on retired and inactive status to perform pro bono work so long as they register with the ARDC and work with a sponsoring entity.

Paralegals. Paralegals may be excellent volunteers in court-based programs, particularly in self-help centers and to assist with other non-legal functions.

Law students. While law students are more limited in what they can do, most law schools are seeking meaningful opportunities for their students. In addition, students who are licensed under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711 may be eager to use that license in court-based settings. Law schools may excellent partners, and can often provide supervision through clinical programs or some level of coordination and support for their students. Most law schools have pro bono and/or public interest law staff, who may coordinate programs or provide a good connection to students, clinical faculty or other resources within the law school. The ABA Center on Pro Bono maintains a list of contacts at area law schools.

Large law firms. Every firm is different. Some goals that may be more prominent at large law firms include opportunities that provide litigation experience or build certain skills, such as negotiation. In addition, some firms have or would like to establish signature projects, so if your subject matter fits, they may be especially interested.

General audience. Some programs may work for all kinds of attorneys and there may be no need to target a particular audience.

☐ Draft Volunteer Opportunity Description, if appropriate

It is helpful for potential volunteers to have a written description of the opportunity and the expectations.

The most important information that volunteers need to know is (1) the specific activities they will engage in; (2) when they need to do the work and how long it will take; (3) the skills needed and whether training is offered to teach those skills; and (4) how to get involved.

☐ Identify Need for Training and Resources for Providing Same

A successful pro bono program may include both veteran attorneys, skilled in the areas in which they volunteer, and attorneys wanting to experience a new area of law. If volunteers are not experienced in the subject matter, then training and support will be needed. In these situations, it is necessary to involve a partner who can provide advice from the perspective of an advocate, such as a legal aid organization or law school clinic. However, judges and court personnel can participate in volunteer training programs and provide important perspective to attorneys who participate in the training programs.
Appreciate and Recognize Your Volunteers

Supporting and Retaining Your Volunteers

Retention is a challenging but exceptionally important part of working with volunteer attorneys. Volunteers who have a positive experience volunteering are likely to step up again to help people in need. Constantly cheerlead volunteers by publicly celebrating their service, building an *esprit de corps* amongst them, and giving them recognition with their employers and the community at large for their contributions.

Recognition ranges from thanking your volunteers when they appear in court, issuing press releases with the names of your volunteers or creating formal awards. At the outset, the court can take simple steps to appreciate volunteers and make it easier for pro bono attorneys to incorporate pro bono service into busy practices.

- **Thank Volunteers.** When volunteers appear in your courtroom, a simple thank you goes a long way. The volunteer feels good about performing a public service. Other attorneys in the room take note. This

- **Procedural Accommodations.** Call cases with pro bono attorneys first. When attorneys volunteer on pro se calls, allow them to schedule motions that day if possible. When appropriate, allow continuances for pro bono attorneys to get up to speed in a case. Allow for liberal discovery schedules. These procedural accommodations make it easier for pro bono attorneys to incorporate pro bono into busy practices.

- **After conclusion of the case, give feedback.** Particularly when the program involves more junior attorneys, after the case has concluded and all appeals periods have passed, consider providing feedback to the attorneys that will help them improve their skills. Your unique perspective can help them develop as professionals.

Volunteer Recognition

Much has been written about the importance of recognizing volunteers. Recognition and appreciation can take many forms. In addition to more formal awards (discussed more fully below), consider the following:

- **Nominate a volunteer to be a Face of Justice on Illinois Legal Aid Online.** ILAO creates an excellent video of featured volunteers, which is great recognition for the individual volunteer. In addition, many firms will post the video to their website or distribute it internally, which has the additional benefit of highlighting your program and encouraging pro bono in general. Visit www.IllinoisProBono.org for information and instructions.

- **Hold Volunteer Appreciation Events.** Many programs hold monthly, quarterly or annual events for volunteers. These range from informal lunches in the courthouse to formal luncheons where awards are presented.

- **Issue press releases listing the names of your volunteers.** The press release provides recognition in and of itself, and local publications may run stories about the program or particular volunteers.
Formal awards are another great way to recognize outstanding volunteer commitment and awards. Many courts issue their own awards for service. Volunteers also can be nominated for bar association or other awards. Some examples of established awards are included below.

Local Awards

**ISBA John C. McAndrews Award.** The ISBA established the John C. McAndrews Award to honor the extraordinary commitment of individuals, bar associations, or law firm/corporate legal departments to providing free legal services to the income eligible in Illinois or expanding the availability of legal services to the income eligible in Illinois. Nominations are typically accepted in early spring and the award is presented at the ISBA annual meeting in early summer. More information is available at [www.isba.org](http://www.isba.org).

**Northern District of Illinois and the Chicago Chapter of the Federal Bar Association Pro Bono Awards.** Since 1999, the Northern District of Illinois and the Chicago Chapter of the Federal Bar Association have presented pro bono awards to outstanding pro bono attorneys for their work on cases that are no longer pending in the District Court. Nominations are typically solicited in early spring and award recipients are recognized at an annual awards reception.

**Seventh Circuit Bar Association Pro Bono Awards.** Since 2010, the Seventh Circuit Bar Association has presented annual awards to celebrate the profession’s commitment to community service and honor outstanding pro bono and public service work by members of the bar. Awards are given out for work in the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, U.S. District Courts in Illinois and U.S. Bankruptcy Courts in Illinois. Nominations are accepted for individual attorneys, groups of attorneys, firms or other organizations. Nominations are typically solicited during the winter and are presented at the Seventh Circuit Bar Association’s Annual meeting in late spring.

**CBA/CBF Pro Bono and Public Service Awards.** Each year the CBF partners with The Chicago Bar Association to recognize exemplary attorneys in our legal community through the CBF/CBA Pro Bono and Public Service Awards. The Pro Bono and Public Service Awards celebrate outstanding members of the legal profession who have used their talents and resources to improve access to justice for the less fortunate in our community. These six awards are presented each year at the CBA/CBF Pro Bono and Public Service Awards Luncheon in July. Nominations are typically due in May. More information is available on the CBF’s website.

**Public Interest Law Initiative Awards.** Each year, PILI presents awards to acknowledge those whose work epitomizes the ideal of access to justice for all, including a Distinguished Service Award, a Pro Bono Initiative Award and two PILI Alumni Awards. Recipients are recognized at PILI’s annual luncheon, typically in late November or early December. More information is available at [www.pili-law.org](http://www.pili-law.org).
National Awards

Several organizations at the national level present pro bono awards. Some examples are included below.

**ABA Pro Bono Publico Awards.** Each year the Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service presents five awards to individual lawyers and institutions in the legal profession that have demonstrated outstanding commitment to volunteer legal services for the poor and disadvantaged. The awards are presented at the Pro Bono Publico Awards Assembly Luncheon during the ABA August Annual Meeting. More information is available on www.americanbar.org.

**National Legal Aid and Defender Association Awards.** NLADA sponsors 13 awards honoring the distinguished men and women whose outstanding service and achievements advance the cause of equal access to justice. More information about these awards is available at www.nlada.org.

**Other ABA Awards.** Many ABA sections and committees present pro bono awards to their members and relating to specific subject matter. If your volunteer is active in the ABA, you might consider one of these awards. A chart of the ABA awards is available at www.americanbar.org.
Sustaining the Program

☐ Periodically Communicate with Relevant Stakeholders

Regular communication will ensure that the program stays on track and continues to evolve. Some programs hold quarterly stakeholder meetings while others have more frequent communication. Whatever method you choose, it is important for program partners to stay connected.

☐ Periodically Evaluate the Program

Periodically evaluating the program will help ensure the program is meeting its original goals and will help identify any potential problems or issues.

Impact. The measures of success or impact will vary depending on the program. Collecting information allows the program to evaluate whether the program is a good investment allows a story to be told to potential funders and volunteers.

Volunteer Satisfaction. Period email surveys or evaluation forms can help identify whether adjustments can be made to improve the volunteer experience and ensure that volunteers will continue to participate in the program. An annual evaluation distributed through SurveyMonkey or another free online program allows you to collect anonymous feedback from volunteers.

Litigant Satisfaction. Collecting information from participants about their experiences can provide useful information. Simple forms handed out at the time of service can be effective and provide immediate feedback.
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Effective immediately, Article X of the Supreme Court Rules is created and Rule 10-100 is adopted as follows.

ARTICLE X

Rule 10-100. Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice

(a) Purpose.

The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice is established to promote, facilitate, and enhance equal access to justice with an emphasis on access to the Illinois civil courts and administrative agencies for all people, particularly the poor and vulnerable. The purpose is to make access to justice a high priority for everyone in the legal system and, to the maximum extent possible, the Commission is intended to complement and collaborate with other entities addressing access to justice issues.

(b) Membership and Terms.

(1) The Illinois Supreme Court shall appoint seven members to the Commission. In addition, the Illinois Bar Foundation, The Chicago Bar Foundation, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois, and the Illinois Equal Justice Foundation shall have the right to appoint one member each. The commission shall be composed of five members of the judiciary, five lawyers, and one member who is not a lawyer. The Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court shall appoint a person to serve as chair of the commission from among the members of the commission.

(i) The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice may, at its discretion, appoint separate specialized working groups and members to assist it in the carrying out of the purposes of the commission. Specialized groups may include, for example, Education, Court Rules/Procedures, Resources, Standardized Forms, and New Initiatives. These groups shall focus on particular issues within the working group’s area of concentration. Membership within these specialized groups may be composed of both members and nonmembers of the Illinois Access to Justice Commission.

(2) Appointed members shall be selected based on their dedication to the purposes and goals of the Commission. The potential appointee’s contributions to the bar and community and demonstrated commitment to providing legal services to the
underserved also shall be considered.

(3) Members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms of three years, except that in making initial appointments to the Commission, the Court may make appointments for one-year or two-year terms to ensure that the terms of the Commission’s members are staggered, so that no more than one third of the members’ terms expire in any given year.

(4) Members shall not be compensated for their contributions, but may be reimbursed for their necessary expenses.

(c) Duties.

In realizing the purpose of the Commission, the duties may include:

(1) encouraging means by which individuals can find proper legal representation in the judicial system;

(2) maintaining circuit court and community support and assistance so that the existing legal self-help centers in all Illinois counties can remain effective and accessible;

(3) collaborating with the circuit courts to develop standard guidelines and judicial education programs regarding interaction between self-represented litigants, judges, clerks, and other court personnel;

(4) creating standardized forms for simpler civil legal problems and basic procedural functions that, while not required for use by all litigants, would be required for courts to accept for filing throughout the state to ease the difficulty in self-representation;

(5) addressing language barriers in the courtroom;

(6) addressing the issue of accessibility to the courts, particularly in rural areas of Illinois;

(7) recognizing judges, attorneys, clerks, or other court personnel for their contributions of leadership and commitment to access to justice;

(8) recommending legislation, court rules, codes of conduct, policies, appropriations, and systematic changes that will open greater access to the courts, as needed;

(9) working with law schools in the development and furtherance of court-based programs that enhance equal access to justice;

(10) monitoring and sharing information on equal justice activities of similar entities in Illinois and in states outside of Illinois;

(11) expanding social work and social services in the court system for the purposes of addressing access to justice for individuals with special needs;

(12) supporting and guiding circuit court efforts to increase access through court-based information systems, Web sites, social media, and other technology platforms;

(13) researching and developing information by which the Commission’s purpose
can be made successful;

(14) promoting and supporting *pro bono* efforts in the state and fostering judicial and circuit court support for *pro bono* efforts throughout the state; and

(15) recommending to the Supreme Court other methods and means of improving the purposes and goals laid out in section (a) above.

(d) Administration.

(1) The Commission shall meet twice a year, at a minimum, and at other times at the request of the chair.

(2) A majority of its members in attendance at a meeting shall constitute a quorum. Meetings may be held at any place within the state and may also be held by means of telecommunication.

(3) The chair may appoint committees of members and assign them responsibilities consistent with the purposes and duties of the Commission.

(4) The Commission shall submit an annual report to the Court reporting on its activities and finances in the previous year and describing future goals for the upcoming year.

(5) Initially, staff will be volunteers. Any other support for the Commission will be provided through in-kind and financial support from a combination of private and public sources.

Adopted June 13, 2012, eff. immediately.
June 13, 2012

CHIEF JUSTICE KILBRIDE AND THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT ANNOUNCE NEW INITIATIVE TO EASE ACCESS TO COURTS

The Illinois Supreme Court announced Wednesday the formation of a commission to remove barriers and increase the ease of interacting with courts by those persons who can’t afford lawyers to represent their interests and needs.

It will be known as the Illinois Supreme Court Access to Justice Commission and is made up of 11 persons, seven of whom are appointed by the Supreme Court. The Illinois Bar Foundation, the Chicago Bar Foundation, the Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois and the Illinois Equal Justice Foundation appoint one member each. Those groups are all active in raising and distributing funds to legal aid organizations.

Jeffrey D. Colman, a partner at the Chicago firm of Jenner & Block and long a champion of delivering legal services to those who cannot afford them, has been named chair of the Commission by Chief Justice Thomas L. Kilbride. The Chief Justice presented the proposal to his colleagues on the Court for approval.

“The idea for the Commission was brought to me at the initiative of the Illinois Coalition for Equal Justice to build significant steps throughout the state to improve access to the justice system, particularly for the poor and the vulnerable residents of Illinois,” said Chief Justice Kilbride. “The Coalition for Equal Justice and several other groups have made important strides in ensuring equal access to the justice system, but the Supreme Court believes much more remains to be done.”

The Supreme Court charged the Commission on Access to Justice with promoting, facilitating and enhancing equal access to justice with an emphasis on access to the Illinois civil courts and administrative agencies for all people, particularly the poor and vulnerable.

“The purpose is to make access to justice a high priority for everyone in the legal system,” said Chief Justice Kilbride. “This includes judges, clerks, attorneys, other court personnel and even our law schools.”

The Commission is intended to complement and collaborate with those other entities in Illinois already addressing access to justice issues.
New Initiative to Ease Access to Courts
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“The idea behind the Commission and the reason we brought it to the attention of the Chief Justice is to propose innovative projects that will make the civil justice system more user-friendly and accessible for the growing number of people who are coming to the courts without lawyers,” said Joseph A. Dailing, executive director of the Coalition for Equal Justice.

Issues arising from family law – such as divorce, adoption, custody and visitation; consumer and debtor law; housing and issues between landlord and tenant; sticky issues surrounding wills and estates often bring into the legal orbit persons without the resources to hire attorneys and not equipped to face the sometimes daunting processes of the courthouse, Mr. Dailing explained.

Mr. Colman, the chairman, agreed. “The goal of the commission will be to propose measures to improve access to justice and to remove barriers, whether they be language or formalistic, so that people may access the courts in a meaningful way,” Mr. Colman said. “It is intended that the commission will build on the toil of a number of the groups that have been working to improve access to the Illinois courts. These efforts have been productive, but with the formal authority of the Illinois Supreme Court we expect a more coordinated, statewide approach in moving forward.”

To emphasize its importance, the rules creating the Commission and authorizing its membership, duties and administration are compiled in a new Article X of the Supreme Court Rules.

Included among the tasks that the Commission may undertake are:

--Creating standardized forms for simpler civil legal programs and basic procedural functions that courts would be required to accept to ease the difficulty of those representing themselves;

--Addressing the issue of accessibility to the courts in rural areas where travel may be long and public transportation lacking;

--Encouraging means by which individuals can find proper and affordable legal representation;

--Assuring that legal self-help centers where they now exist in Illinois counties remain effective and accessible;

--Expanding social work and social services in the court system for the purposes of addressing access to justice for individuals with special needs;

--Working with law schools in the development and furtherance of court-based programs that enhance equal access to justice.

Similar commissions have been established in 26 other states as well as Washington, D.C., said Mr. Dailing. Its creation in Illinois has been endorsed by the Illinois State Bar Association, the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois Judges Association.

The initial costs of the Commission are expected to be minimal.

MORE
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Mr. Dailing will volunteer his services as staff support, and the Chicago Bar Foundation also will lend a member of its staff on a part-time basis. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts will provide in-kind support for supplies, mailings and meeting space as well as other administrative support.

Commission members also serve as volunteers.

Partner with the Chicago firm of Jenner and Block, Mr. Colman has focused his 38 year career on complex civil and criminal litigation at the trial and appellate levels. He has been active in a number of programs designed to increase access to justice, has served as President of the Chicago Bar Foundation, and previously served the Illinois Supreme Court as Chairman of its Committee on Post-Conviction Review of Death Sentences and as a member of the Court's Committee on Pattern Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases.

Other members of the Commission are:

Illinois Appellate Court Justice Mary K. Rochford, First Judicial District, Chicago. Appellate Justice Rochford has been a judge since 1991, first serving as an associate judge in Cook County. She is a member of the Board of Managers for the Chicago Bar Association and a member of the Women's Bar Association of Illinois. Illinois Judges Association and the Illinois State Bar Association;

Chief Judge Michael J. Sullivan, 22nd Judicial Circuit, McHenry County Courthouse, Woodstock. Chief Judge Sullivan has been a judge since 1976, when he joined the 19th Judicial Circuit as an associate judge. He has served as chief judge in the 22nd Circuit since December 2006. He is a member of the Chicago, McHenry County, and Illinois State Bar Associations;

Circuit Judge Daniel J. Pierce, Cook County Circuit Court, Chicago. Judge Pierce serves as supervising judge of the Cook County Law Division. He served on the U.S. Senate Judicial Nominating Committee for the Northern District of Illinois from 1993-1996. Judge Pierce also served on the Supreme Court Committee on Character and Fitness for 12 years;

Circuit Judge Debra B. Walker, Cook County Circuit Court – Domestic Relations Division, Chicago. Judge Walker is a certified public accountant. She is vice-chair of the Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism and president-elect of the Illinois Bar Foundation. Judge Walker was awarded the 2012 Mary Heftel Hooton Award from the Women's Bar Association of Illinois;

Associate Judge Leonard Murray, Cook County Circuit Court, Chicago. He has served as a board member for the "Reach Out and Read" program and for the Omega Associates program for developing low-income housing. Judge Murray is also founder of the Ace Organization, which sends low-income children on trips to Africa. Judge Murray had also served as member of the Special Supreme Court Committee on Pro Bono Publico Legal Service;

Kelly Cheesman, Knox County Circuit Court Clerk, Galesburg. Ms. Cheesman has served in the Clerk's office since 1981 and was first elected as Knox County Circuit Court Clerk in 2000 and was last re-elected to that office in 2008;
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Michael A. Fiello, managing attorney, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc., Carbondale. Mr. Fiello manages a seven attorney office serving 23 counties in addition to representing clients in civil cases. He is the co-founder of the Welfare Rights Clinic in Champaign, board member of Food Works since 2009 and its secretary since 2011, as well as serving as board member of the Neighborhood Co-op Grocery Store from 2001 to 2008;

Timothy W. Kelly, founder and partner, Kelly Law Offices, concentrating on litigation, Bloomington. Mr. Kelly is a member of the Illinois State Bar Association, member of the board of managers for the American Trial Lawyers Association, member of the McLean County Inns of Court, and the McLean County and Chicago Bar Associations. He is a fellow with the Illinois Bar Foundation and a former staff attorney with Prairie State Legal Services. Mr. Kelly also served as McLean County assistant public defender.

Jennifer T. Nijman, partner, Nijman Franzetti LLP, with a concentration in environmental law and litigation, Chicago. Ms. Nijman, a former president of the Chicago Bar Association, was partner and chair of the environmental practice group at Winston & Strawn. She was given the CBA's Alta May Hulett Award for highest standards of professional ethics and excellence in 2001. She also received the Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois award for leadership in the Cause of Equal Access to Justice in 2005.

Michael A. Pope, partner, McDermott Will and Emery, Chicago. Mr. Pope heads the firm's international product liability practice group. For two years, he headed the Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois, the state's IOLTA funder. Mr. Pope later founded the Coordinated Advice and Referral Program for Legal Services (CARPLS), which provides telephone referral assistance to legal service providers in Cook County. Recently, he formed the Illinois Equal Justice Foundation and served as its first president.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT: Joseph Tybor, director of communications to the Illinois Supreme Court, at 312.793.2323)
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Volunteers

The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice is deeply indebted to the many people, listed below, who have graciously volunteered their time to serve on committees, advisory committees and task forces that further the Commission’s work.

Special thanks to our Executive Director, Danielle Elyce Hirsch; Michael J. Tardy and his colleagues at the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts; Bob Glaves and his colleagues at The Chicago Bar Foundation; Kristine Stassen, Julie Becker and Shannon George at Jenner & Block LLP; Adam Vaught in the Office of the Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court; and Ruth Ann Schmitt and her colleagues at the Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois for their incredible personal and organizational commitment to the work of the Commission.

1. ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT COMMISSION ON ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Chair: Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP

The Honorable Kelly Cheesman, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Knox County
Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
The Honorable Leonard Murray, Circuit Court of Cook County
The Honorable Daniel J. Pierce, First District Appellate Court
The Honorable Michael J. Sullivan, Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of McHenry County
Timothy W. Kelly, Kelly Law Offices, PC
Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP
The Honorable Mary K. Rochford, First District Appellate Court
Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery
The Honorable Debra B. Walker, Circuit Court of Cook County
Danielle Elyce Hirsch, Executive Director

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Angela M. Allen, Jenner & Block LLP
Jason M. Bradford, Jenner & Block LLP
Joseph A. Dailing, Illinois Coalition for Equal Justice
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
David Holtermann, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois
Gail H. Morse, Jenner & Block LLP
Anne P. Ray, Jenner & Block LLP
Carla J. Rozycki, Jenner & Block LLP
John R. Storino, Jenner & Block LLP
Kelly Tautges, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Ramon Villalpando, Jenner & Block LLP
Devin Mapes, Illinois Judges Foundation Commission on Access to Justice Extern
2. STANDING COMMITTEE ON STANDARDIZED FORMS

Co-Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Mary K. Rochford, First District Appellate Court
Co-Chair: Commissioner Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Liaison: Commissioner Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP

Lisa Colpoys, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Elena Shea Demos, Circuit Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County
Michelle Eggert, Vonachen, Lawless, Trager & Slevin
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
John Locallo, Amari & Locallo
Dina C. Nikitaides, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Dawn Marie Rubio, Administrative Office of Courts
The Honorable Stephen G. Sawyer, Chief Judge of the Second Judicial District and Circuit Court of Wabash County
Professor Ron Staudt, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law
The Honorable Cindy R. Svanda, Circuit Clerk of Circuit Court of Jefferson County
Mike Tardy, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

A. FORMS COMMITTEE ORDERS OF PROTECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: The Honorable Stephen G. Sawyer, Chief Judge of the Second Judicial District and Circuit Court of Wabash County

The Honorable Adrienne Albrecht, Circuit Court of Kankakee County
Margaret Duval, Domestic Violence Legal Clinic
The Honorable Kim Kellerman, Circuit Clerk of Circuit Court of Perry County
Loretta Line, Office of the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County
Amy Morgan, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Gail Thomas, Southern Illinois University School of Law

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Lisa Colpoys, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Laura Bishop, Jenner & Block LLP
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

B. FORMS COMMITTEE EXPUNGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: Elena Shea Demos, Circuit Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County

The Honorable Jennifer Bauknecht, Circuit Court of Livingston County
Halle Cox, Kane County Law Library and Self-Help Center
Chris Fisher, Office of the State Appellate Defender
C. FORMS COMMITTEE PROCEDURES SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: Cathy Schneider, CARPLS

Jack Carey, Attorney at Law
The Honorable Barbara Crowder, Third Judicial Circuit
The Honorable Maureen Josh, Clerk of the Circuit Court of DeKalb County
John G. Locallo, Amari & Locallo
The Honorable Steve Mathers (Retired), 9th Judicial Circuit
Marisa Wiesman, Prairie State Legal Services

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Dina C. Nikitaides, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

D. FORMS COMMITTEE NAME CHANGE SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Mary K. Rochford, First District Appellate Court

Adrian G. Barr, Prairie State Legal Services
The Honorable Cindy Braden, Clerk of Circuit Court of Moultrie County
Karl N. Fehr, Fehr Law Group, LLC
Martha M. Ferdinand, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
The Honorable Patrick E. McGann (Retired), Circuit Court of Cook County

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Caroline A. Lindsey, Jenner & Block LLP
Dina C. Nikitaides, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

E. FORMS COMMITTEE DIVORCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: Commissioner Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation

The Honorable Joseph J. Bruce, 17th Judicial Circuit
Susan Pulido-Craven, CARPLS
The Honorable Celia G. Gamrath, Circuit Court of Cook County
Jennifer A. Shaw, Law Office of Jennifer A. Shaw, PC
The Honorable Cindy Svanda, Circuit Clerk of the Circuit Court of Jefferson County

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Christopher Karacic, Jenner & Block LLP
Dina C. Nikitaides, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

F. FORMS COMMITTEE MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair: Justice Mathias W. Delort, First Appellate District

James Brady, LAF
The Honorable Lois Durbin, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Macon County
The Honorable Suzanne C. Mangiamele, 22nd Judicial Circuit
Lee Perres, Pierce & Associates, P.C.
Carini Segalini, Circuit Court of Cook County Mortgage Foreclosure Mediation Program
The Honorable Christy Solverson, First Judicial Circuit
Stacey Tutt, University of Illinois College of Law

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Monica Allen, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
Dina C. Nikitaides, Illinois Legal Aid Online
Cynthia Hocking, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

3. STANDING COMMITTEE ON LANGUAGE ACCESS

Co-Chair: The Honorable Grace G. Dickler, Circuit Court of Cook County
Co-Chair: The Honorable Laura Liu, Circuit Court of Cook County
Deputy Chair: The Honorable Diann K. Marsalek, Circuit Court of Cook County
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Debra B. Walker, Circuit Court of Cook County

The Honorable Ben L. Beyers, Illinois 3rd Judicial Circuit, Madison County
Elena Caloca-Norman, Circuit Court of Cook County Office of Interpreter Services
The Honorable Neal W. Cerne, Circuit Court of DuPage County
Jennifer Donohue, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
J. Christopher Johnsen, The Dailey Law Firm
Azam Nizamuddin, The Law Office of Azam Nizamuddin, PC
Heidi Ramos, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Jesus G. Salazar, The Law Office of Jesus G. Salazar, PC
The Honorable Esteban F. Sanchez, Circuit Court of Sangamon County
Denise Y. Staniec, The Law Office of Denise Y. Staniec, PC

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Danielle Kestnbaum, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law
Ramon Villalpando, Jenner & Block LLP
4. **STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRAINING AND GUIDANCE OF JUDGES AND OTHER COURTROOM PERSONNEL**

Co-Chair: Chief Judge and Commissioner Michael J. Sullivan  
Co-Chair: Clerk and Commissioner Kelly Cheeseman

The Honorable Cindy Braden, Clerk of Circuit Court of Moultrie County  
Sherry Chatz, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County  
The Honorable Dan L. Flannell, Chief Judge of the Sixth Judicial District  
The Honorable Maureen Josh, Clerk of the Circuit Court of DeKalb County  
The Honorable Marjorie C. Laws, Circuit Court of Cook County, Sixth Municipal District  
Mark Marquardt, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois  
The Honorable Ronald D. Spears, Fourth Judicial Circuit Court  
The Honorable James B. Stewart, Chief Judge of the Ninth Judicial Circuit Court  
The Honorable Ronda Yates, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Marion County

Volunteer Staff Assistance:  
Joseph A. Dailing, Illinois Coalition for Equal Justice  
David Holtermann, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois

5. **STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRO BONO SERVICES**

Co-Chair: Commissioner Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP  
Co-Chair: Commissioner Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery  
Liaison: Commissioner Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation  
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Daniel J. Pierce, First District Appellate Court

Margaret Benson, Chicago Volunteer Legal Services  
Anne Geraghty Helms, DLA Piper  
Maria J. Minor, Neil Gerber & Eisenberg LLP  
Christine M. Ory, The Law Offices of Christine M. Ory, PC  
Donna Otis, Otis Law Group, Ltd.  
Linda Rothnagel, Prairie State Legal Services  
Allen C. Schwartz, CARPLS  
Robert H. Shultz, State Farm

Volunteer Staff Assistance:  
Kelly Tautges, The Chicago Bar Foundation  
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation

**PRO BONO SERVICES CIVIL GIDEON SUBCOMMITTEE:**

Co-Chair: Commissioner Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP  
Co-Chair: Commissioner Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery  
Liaison: Commissioner Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation

Margaret Benson, Chicago Volunteer Legal Services  
Leslie Corbett, Illinois Equal Justice Foundation  
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
6. DEANS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Daniel J. Pierce, First District Appellate Court
Liaison: Commissioner Mike Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Debra B. Walker, Circuit Court of Cook County

Dean John Corkery, John Marshall Law School
Dean Cynthia L. Fountaine, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Dean Harold J. Krent, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law
Dean Gregory Mark, DePaul College of Law
Dean Daniel B. Rodriguez, Northwestern University Law School
Dean Jennifer L. Rosato, Northern Illinois University College of Law
Associate Dean Ralph Ruebner, John Marshall Law School
Dean Michael H. Schill, University of Chicago Law School
Dean Bruce P. Smith, University of Illinois College of Law
Dean David N. Yellen, Loyola University School of Law

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Jack L. Block, Attorney at Law
Kelly Tautges, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Anne P. Ray, Jenner & Block LLP

DEANS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEDIATION SUBCOMMITTEE:

Alan Boudreau, Northern Illinois University College of Law
Alyson Carrel, Northwestern University Law School
Teresa Frisbie, Loyola University School of Law
The Honorable Mort Denlow (Retired), JAMS
Katheryn M. Dutenhaver, DePaul College of Law
The Honorable Allen S. Goldberg (Retired)
Pam Kentra, Chicago-Kent College of Law
Rae Kyristsi, Center for Conflict Resolution
The Honorable Margaret J. Mullen, 19th Judicial Circuit
Cassandra Lively, Center for Conflict Resolution
Ayman Mourad, Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law
Anthony Niedwiecki, John Marshall Law School
Michael Ruiz, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Leonard Schrager, John Marshall Law School
Elizabeth Simon, Loyola University School of Law
Nina Tarr, University of Illinois College of Law
Susan Yates, Resolution Systems Institute
7. **GOVERNMENT LAWYERS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Chair: Commission Chair Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP  
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Daniel J. Pierce, First District Appellate Court  
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Mary K. Rochford, First District Appellate Court  
Liaison: Commissioner The Honorable Leonard Murray, Circuit Court of Cook County

Andrew G. Freiheit, House Republican Staff  
Jo Ellen Johnson, Senate Republican Caucus  
Daniel Kirk, Cook County State’s Attorney  
Eric Madiar, Office of the Illinois Senate President  
Marcia Meis, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts  
Stephen Patton, Corporation Counsel, City of Chicago, Department of Law  
John Schomberg, Counsel to the Governor  
Anne M. Spillane, Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
Juliana Stratton, Cook County Justice Advisory Council  
Michael J. Tardy, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts  
Heather Wier Vaught, Illinois House of Representatives

Volunteer Staff Assistance:  
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation  
John R. Storino, Jenner & Block LLP

A. **GOVERNMENT LAWYERS’ EXPUNGEMENT/SEALING SUBCOMMITTEE**

Todd L. Belcore, National Sargent Shriver Center on Poverty Law  
The Honorable Paul P. Biebel, Jr., Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County  
Suzanne L.Y. Bond, Illinois State Police  
Natalia M. Delgado, Illinois State Police  
The Honorable Timothy C. Evans, Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County  
Beth A. Johnson, Cabrini Green Legal Aid  
Marjie Nielsen, Chicago Legal Clinic  
Anne M. Spillane, Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
Brent Stratton, Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
Juliana Stratton, Cook County Justice Advisory Council

Volunteer Staff Assistance:  
John R. Storino, Jenner & Block LLP

B. **HB 3111 LEGAL AID FUNDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Chair: Commission Chair Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP

Dave Anderson, Illinois Bar Foundation
Leslie Corbett, Illinois Equal Justice Foundation
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
David Holtermann, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois
Mark Marquardt, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois
Dina Merrell, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Ruth Ann Schmitt, Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Angela M. Allen, Jenner & Block LLP
Adam Vaught, Office of the Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court

8. CORPORATE COUNSEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair: Darryl M. Bradford, Exelon

Jodi J. Caro, Integrys Energy
Christine Castellano, Ingredion
Kathleen M. Cronin, CME Group
Deborah Dorman-Rodriguez, HCSC
D. Cameron Findlay, Archer Daniels Midland
Maria C. Green, Illinois Tools Works
Brett J. Hart, United Continental
John L. Howard, W.W. Grainger
Peter Lieb, AON
T. Richard Riney, Ventas
Kim K.W. Rucker, Kraft
Thomas J. Sabatino, Jr., Walgreens
Gloria Santona, McDonald’s
David G. Susler, National Material L.P. and President of ACC Chicago
Kelly R. Welsh, Northern Trust
Roger Wilson, BCBSA

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Jason M. Bradford, Jenner & Block LLP

9. LISTENING CONFERENCES COMMITTEE

Co-Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Debra B. Walker, Circuit Court of Cook County
Co-Chair: Commissioner Timothy W. Kelly, Kelly Law Offices, PC

Ann Dirks-Linhorst, Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville
Teresa Do, John Marshall Law School
Nicole Meyer, Bradley University
Melody Mitchell, Northern Illinois University College of Law
Alicia Ruiz, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Carolyn Turner, University of Illinois College of Law
Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Julie Becker, Jenner & Block LLP
Meredith Ray, Attorney at Law
Kristine Stassen, Jenner & Block LLP
Kim Weaver, Illinois State Bar Association

10. ILLINOIS JUSTICECORPS COMMITTEE

Chair: The Honorable Elizabeth A. Robb, Chief Judge of the 11th Judicial Circuit
Chair: The Honorable James E. Snyder, Circuit Court of Cook County

Robert Bradley, Illinois State University (Retired)
The Honorable LaGuina Clay-Herron, Circuit Court of Cook County
Kristine M. Condon, Kankakee Community College
Matthew Hammoudeh, Illinois Department of Human Services
Jamie Hull, Cassidy Schade
The Honorable Patricia M. Logue, Circuit Court of Cook County
The Honorable Jorge L. Ortiz, Circuit Court of Lake County
Brian Nix, Harold Washington College, City Colleges of Chicago
Malou Roth, People First
Michael Ruiz, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Ann M. Spillane, Office of the Illinois Attorney General
The Honorable James B. Stewart, Chief Judge of the 9th Judicial Circuit
Matthew Streb, Northern Illinois University Department of Political Science
Stacey Tutt, University of Illinois College of Law
Stacey Walker, Allstate Insurance

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Kelly Tautges, The Chicago Bar Foundation

ILLINOIS JUSTICECORPS STUDENT VOLUNTEERS FOR 2012 – 2013:

Kelly Adams
Azar Alexander
Brittany Barclaee
Satkiran Bilkhu-Anand
Adriana Cross
Muriel Dorsey
Salma Ghalyoun
Kiersten Hellegers
Steven Henley
Magdalena Jachymiak
Ricardo Jimenez
James Kasun
Ayesha Khan
Jon Legg
Rowshan Louie
Colleen Lusk
Ernestina Martinez
Emily Miller
Lauren Miller
Cristian Nuno
Bethzabeth Ordaz
Annette Rauch
Chelsey Sandford
Samantha Scissom

Tiffany Showalter
Russell Smith
Luke Somogye
Clay Stambaugh
Monika Swiecienska
ILLINOIS JUSTICECORPS STUDENT VOLUNTEERS FOR 2013-2014:

Burke Bindbeutel          Dylan Reel
Cassie Monfiston          Shaza Sanaullah
Russell Smith            Kaitlin Sheber
Nichelle Howard          LaToya Sias
Kim Jackson              Rikara Skaggs
Dajana Kujaca            Timantha Tran
Eduard Lynn-Klimenko     Taylor Washington
Lauren Mifsud            Gernikin Wilson

11. FIRST ANNUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Commission Chair Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP
Commissioner Timothy W. Kelly, Kelly Law Offices, PC
Commissioner Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Dina Merrell, The Chicago Bar Foundation
Kristine Stassen, Jenner & Block LLP

12. APPELLATE PRO SE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Co-Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Daniel J. Pierce, First District Appellate Court
Co-Chair: Commissioner The Honorable Mary K. Rochford, First District Appellate Court

The Honorable Robert L. Carter, Third District Appellate Court
The Honorable Richard P. Goldenhersh, Fifth District Appellate Court
The Honorable Lisa Holder White, Fourth District Appellate Court
The Honorable Margaret Stanton McBride, First District Appellate Court
The Honorable Mary S. Schostok, Second District Appellate Court

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Bob Glaves, The Chicago Bar Foundation

13. MEDICAL/LEGAL PARTNERSHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair: Commissioner Michael A. Fiello, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Liaison: Commission Chair Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP
Liaison: Commissioner Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery

Stephanie Altman, Heath & Disability Advocates
Latasha Barnes, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Emily Benfer, Loyola University School of Law
Jeremy Bergstrom, National Sargent Shriver Center on Poverty Law
Addie Boone, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine
John Bouman, National Sargent Shriver Center on Poverty Law
John Elson, Northwestern University School of Law
Diane Goffinet, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Allyson Gold, Loyola University School of Law
Latonia Haney Keith, McDermott, Will & Emery
Jessica Harper, Prairie State Legal Services
Caroline Mandley, Center for Disability and Elder Law
Jamie Martinez, Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs
Patricia McGill, Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs
Megan Natalino, Prairie State Legal Services
Jay Redey, Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc.
Jill Roberts, Cabrini Green Legal Aid
Cynthia Sadkin, LAF
Kelly Scott Flood, American Bar Association
Woody Thorne, Southern Illinois Healthcare
Tom Wendt, Center for Disability and Elder Law
Margaret Stapleton, National Sargent Shriver Center on Poverty Law
Susan Zielke, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation
Amy Zimmerman, Heath & Disability Advocates

14. SUMMER RESEARCH ASSISTANCE

Jonathan A. Enfield, Jenner & Block LLP
Sarah L. Futernick, Jenner & Block LLP
Andrew S. Hammond, Jenner & Block LLP
John L. Mack, Jenner & Block LLP

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Jason M. Bradford, Jenner & Block LLP
Anne P. Ray, Jenner & Block LLP
Ramon Villalpando, Jenner & Block LLP

15. SECOND ANNUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Commission Chair Jeffrey D. Colman, Jenner & Block LLP
Commissioner Timothy W. Kelly, Kelly Law Offices, PC
Commissioner Jennifer T. Nijman, Nijman Franzetti LLP
Commissioner Michael A. Pope, McDermott, Will & Emery

Volunteer Staff Assistance:
Shannon George, Jenner & Block LLP
Kristine Stassen, Jenner & Block LLP
Kelly Tautges, The Chicago Bar Foundation