
STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE'S PLAN

1980 Report

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	
IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION	1-11
I. Physical Operations	1
II. Office Procedure - Service to Individual Students	2-7
A. Scope of Service and Statistics	2
B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction	2-7
III. Preventive Law Activities	8-9
IV. Liaison With Bar Association	10
V. Law Student Participation in the Program	11
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12-16
I. Evaluation	12
II. Recommendations	13-16
A. Office Space	13
B. Complaints/Client Satisfaction	13
C. S.O.R.F. Survey	13-14
D. Indigency	14-16
1. Application of the Requirement	15
2. Appeal Procedure to Board	15-16
Appendix	

INTRODUCTION

This report is twofold in scope and purpose. It is first an update of the 1978-1979 Annual Report and a summary of what has occurred during the time period from September 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980. It is also designed to be a cumulative report and evaluation of the two year pilot period of the Program. The outline form follows that of the 1978-1979 report. This will hopefully allow easy reference back to that report, and the reader is asked to assume its incorporation herein by this reference. No attempt will be made to go back over that which is contained in the first report except insofar as it may relate to changes that have occurred and progress that has been made in dealing with the suggestions and issues that were there raised.

The number of students being served by the office has increased considerably over the last year. On the average, roughly 300 students per month have utilized the counseling and representation services offered. The number of speaking engagements and related educational activities have also substantially expanded in the past year. The Program continues to maintain an excellent relationship with the local and state bar associations and is cautiously optimistic that a favorable decision regarding granting of 711 program status by the College of Law will be made in the Fall of 1980. Perhaps the most significant event that has occurred during the second year of the Program's operation has been the addition of a second attorney without whose presence much of what has been accomplished would still be relegated to the drawing board.

IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION

I. PHYSICAL OPERATIONS

During May of 1980, the Student Legal Service's office underwent substantial physical changes. A new conference room was built within the existing office area. This much needed addition serves to insure the confidentiality of all consultations that occur in the office. The new room is used primarily by the law students in conducting client interviews.

At the time the new room was added, the office also underwent a general facelift. New carpeting was laid throughout and the entire office was painted for the first time in several years. The completion of the total project has resulted in a welcome change and has done much to improve the professional ambiance of the office.

One of the primary goals of the Program since its inception has been the building of a quality legal library. The Program has continued over the past year to expand and strengthen its law book collection. (See Appendix). The office now possesses a quality library that, with regular updating and perhaps a few additional acquisitions, should meet the needs of the office for the foreseeable future.

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

A. Scope of Service and Statistics

The statistical data contained in this report includes both the monthly intake statistics and an "annual" statistic composite covering the period from September 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980. The number of client contacts with the office has steadily increased since the beginning of the Program. During the past 11 months, the office has had contact with 3,105 clients. Since October of 1978, the Student Legal Service has served 5,047 individual students. Excepting weekends, official University holidays and vacations, an average of 14 persons per day have used the service in its 22 months of operation. The statistical breakdown for the past 11 months is included in the Appendix and reflects client contact in the three major categories outlined in the 1978-1979 Annual Report:

- 1) general information and referral,
- 2) advice only,
- and 3) cases represented.

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction

During its second year of operation, the Student Legal Service's office has begun a follow-up evaluation questionnaire procedure in an attempt to measure client

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

satisfaction with services received. This survey covers the period from September 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980 and is divided into two categories: "advice only" (problems generally resolved through advice of the law students in direct consultation with the attorneys) and "clients" (cases in which one of the attorneys enters an appearance of record in a court proceeding). Questionnaires were sent to each client whose case was completed during that time period and to a randomly selected one out of ten "advice only" clients.

The questions presented can be divided into three cluster groups: a) program perceptions (Questions #1, 9-15, 17-19); b) case perceptions (Questions #2-4, 20) and; c) system perceptions (Questions #5-8, 16). The percentage response to each question is fully detailed in the Appendix.

a) Program Perceptions

Data assembled indicates a consistent overall high satisfaction with the Program among both advice only contacts (A.O.s) and clients. As expected, satisfaction appears

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

a) Program Perceptions (cont.)

to run somewhat higher among clients. Of particular significance would seem to be responses to Question #15 which indicate that a very high percentage of persons were satisfied with services received, to an extent that if confronted with another qualifying legal problem, they would return to Student Legal Service.

b) Case Perceptions

Satisfaction with case handling was very high among clients. The figures show a somewhat lesser degree of satisfaction among A.O.s although, on balance, still favorable. This variance between clients and A.O.s is attributable in part to the nature and seriousness of the legal problems of the respective groups. Advice only contacts perceive their problems as less serious in nature and the outcome or resolution as less favorable.

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

c) System Perceptions

Both groups appear to be somewhat skeptical regarding the efficacy of the American legal system. Clients indicated a greater concurrence with the proposition that there is a legal remedy for every wrong than did A.O.s. This would seem to be more a reflection of the nature and severity of the problems encountered than an unbiased assessment of the legal system.

The survey results show a generally high satisfaction with the Program and the quality of individual representation and counseling. The overall data does indicate somewhat greater satisfaction among clients than among A.O.s. Several reasons for this disparity in perceptions can be hypothesized. Firstly, the factual circumstances and avenues of resolution differ between A.O.s and clients. Oftentimes, A.O.s do not become cases for the very reason that the student involved has no legitimately maintainable legal posi-

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

tion or the problem is one not feasibly resolvable through the legal system. Secondly, it is a fairly common concern among A.O.s that they are seeing a law student rather than an attorney on their first appointment. This concern is, of course, resolved for those persons who become clients. Finally, many A.O.s that do not become cases are ultimately referred elsewhere for assistance in resolving their problems. This may to a certain extent be perceived by such persons as a failure by Student Legal Service to provide "all of the answers" to the student's problem - a not uncommon misconception of the capabilities and "clout" of the legal profession.

In an attempt to improve satisfaction among A.O.s with the services received, efforts will be made to further "professionalize" their contact with the office. The most feasible of several alternatives in this direction would seem to be increased utilization of written analysis. Reducing much of the advice to writing, including

II. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

citation to statutes and case law whenever possible, will hopefully give A.O.s a greater sense of satisfaction with the services received. Steps will be taken in this direction. There are other procedural changes that might serve this goal and these alternatives will be explored with a view towards maximizing the perceived quality of services offered.

III. PREVENTIVE LAW ACTIVITIES

One of the primary goals of the Student Legal Service's Plan is the implementation of a significant legal educational program aimed at informing students of their rights and obligations under the law. The efforts expended in this direction have been designed to assist students in the management of their personal affairs in such a manner as to minimize potential legal problems. To this end, the attorneys have given numerous talks, seminars and workshops for campus groups and organizations. They have also participated in such University functions as New Student Orientation and the Illini Union Noon Forum. (See Appendix).

The Student Legal Service has expanded the number and scope of publications available to students. The office continues to provide students with the many informational pamphlets published by both the Illinois and American Bar Associations. The "Student Legal Service Guide to Small Claims Court" has been published and is available in the office. A guide to the Student Legal Service's Program has also been published and is widely available on campus. A comprehensive legal handbook for students has recently been completed and is to be published within the next several weeks. This handbook will make available to students basic information in the areas of consumer affairs, domestic relations, housing matters and the criminal justice process.

III. PREVENTIVE LAW ACTIVITIES

Several articles have been published in the Daily Illini during the past year on matters of concern to students. Although some problems have occurred concerning space allocation in the DI, those difficulties will hopefully be resolved by Fall Semester and regular publication of articles resumed. (See Appendix).

Further ideas for extending and broadening the educational functions of the office are presently under consideration. It is contemplated that these will include both additional written material and an expanded schedule of speaking engagements.

IV. LIAISON WITH BAR ASSOCIATION

The relationship between the Student Legal Service's Program and the Champaign County Bar Association continues to be excellent. During the past two years, the office has made extensive referrals to members of the private bar through the Champaign County Bar Association Referral Service. The Board of Governors of the Champaign County Bar Association is provided with a written summary of the annual statistics and is kept informed of the progress of the Program, its operation, policies, and referral efforts. The local Bar continues to be very supportive of the Program.

Both of the students' attorneys are active members of the Champaign County Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. I continue to serve as a member of the Illinois State Bar Association's Standing Committee on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar and have recently been elected as a representative from the Sixth Judicial Circuit to the Illinois State Bar Association General Assembly. I have also been recently appointed chairperson of the Champaign County Bar Association Law Day Committee.

V. LAW STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM

Law students continue to play an integral part in the operation of the office. Students who perform 90 hours of work in the office during the course of the semester receive Law School credit for their work through the College of Law's clinical program.

Efforts are continuing to expand the Program to include participation by law students pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711. This rule allows third year law students to engage in actual litigation and representation under the supervision of a practicing attorney. As of this writing, it appears that a decision in this regard will be made by the Law School sometime during the early Fall of 1980. The Program is cautiously optimistic that 711 program status will be allowed commencing with the Spring Semester of 1981.

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. EVALUATION

The purpose of the Student Legal Service Program is to assist students in the identification and resolution of legal problems so they can make the most of their educational opportunities. This goal has been met. The office is providing high-quality legal representation to individual students and is offering a broad range of educational opportunities to the student body at large. The ever increasing utilization of the office and the educational services offered to the campus provide a clear indication of the success of the Program.

The broad support that the Program has received from the campus as a whole is also indicative of its success. As use of the Program and its services becomes more widespread, its need and value becomes even more apparent. During the past year, referrals from campus offices, departments, and organizations have steadily increased. As awareness of the Program has increased, so has its reputation for quality and competence. No greater compliment or testimonial to the Program's progress and the advancement of The Plan's goals could be made.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Office Space

The recently completed renovation of the present office has done much to alleviate the acute space problems that the office faced in its first year of operation. It still seems appropriate that a long-term goal of the Program should be the location of larger office space that will better meet the specialized needs of the Program. Expanded square footage, with a layout more conducive to the needs of a law office, remains a desirable goal.

B. Complaints/Client Satisfaction

As indicated elsewhere in this report, the client survey questionnaire is now in use. While this format of gauging the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by the office is subject to change and is not represented to be a completely accurate or scientific polling, it nonetheless serves as a useful tool in assessing the Program's strengths and weaknesses - the purpose for which it was designed.

C. S.O.R.F. Survey

It is submitted that some type of survey to determine students' overall understanding of the S.O.R.F.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

C. S.O.R.F. Survey (cont.)

project would be helpful in ascertaining whether or not students understand what the Student Legal Service's Program is, what its aims and scope encompass, and what its position is in relation to other facets of the S.O.R.F. project. This would seem to be a project most appropriately undertaken by Student Services, the S.O.R.F. Board or the Student Government Association.

D. Indigency

The operation of the indigency requirement and its effect on the service offered to individual clients remains an area of significant concern. This issue was raised in the 1978-79 Annual Report and the recommendations made in that report are repeated here.

The issue presents itself on two levels: the effect that the requirement itself has on individual representation and the resulting equities or inequities of its application, and the procedural aspects and method of the appeal procedure to the Advisory Board for those students with non-housing problems whose income exceeds the allowable level.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

D. Indigency (cont.)

1. Application of the Requirement

The issues that need to be addressed include the questions of whether the dollar figures used to make the indigency determination are realistic and whether application of the requirement as it now stands operates to effectuate the results contemplated by The Plan. Alternatives should be explored. These might include raising the dollar figure necessary for indigent status and creating new categories of eligibility for automatic representation, i.e., consumer matters. Consideration should also be given to including those persons whose sole source of income is a University assistantship in the category of those deemed automatically indigent.

2. Appeal Procedure to Board

Presently the Board operates on an ad hoc basis in considering petitions for waiver of the formal indigency requirement. Experience

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

D. Indigency (cont.)

2. Appeal Procedure to Board (cont.)

has shown a pattern to the types of cases and income levels of those clients accepted and those rejected. The possibility of the Board devising rules of thumb to be applied across the board should be considered and explored. Not only would this lessen the waiting period for resolution of a petition, it would also make the appeal process fairer, more consistent and more defensible.

APPENDIX

Book list

Client Contacts - Statistics

Survey Results

Minutes

Budget Summary

Speaking Engagements

Articles

Student Affairs Article on Student Legal Service

Informational Advertisements

Court Appearances

INVENTORY OF BOOKS IN THE OFFICE

July 31, 1980

Publisher: ALI-ABA COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Immigration Law & Practice

Trademarks & Copyrights

Publisher: BUILDING OFFICIALS & CODE ADMINISTRATORS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

BOCA Basic Property Maintenance Code (1978)

Publisher: CALLAGHAN

Goldstein Trial Technique, Volumes 1-3, 2nd Edition (Goldstein & Lane)

Callaghan's Illinois Civil Practice Forms, Volumes 1-8

Publisher: THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC.

Damages, 2nd Edition, Parts 1 & 2, 1952, McCormick & Fritz

Publisher: IICLE (Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education)

Code of Professional Responsibility Annotated
Creditor's Rights in Illinois
Equitable Remedies in Chancery
Immigration & Naturalization
Law for the Legal Secretary and Para-professional
Misdemeanors & Moving Traffic Violations
Tenant's Rights
Workmen's Compensation Practice
Illinois Civil Practice Before Trial
Illinois Civil Trial Practice
Illinois Civil Practice After Trial
Illinois Civil Trial Evidence
Illinois Family Law, Volumes 1-2
Illinois Basic Practice Guide
Illinois Criminal Practice, Volumes 1-2
Illinois Matrimonial Law System

Publisher: ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION - PANTAGRAPH PRINTING

Illinois Criminal Decisions Outline

Illinois Rules and Practice Handbook

Publisher: THE LAWYERS CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY

Complete Manual of Criminal Forms, 2nd Edition, Forms 1:1-28:7, Bailey & Rothblatt

Complete Manual of Criminal Forms, 2nd Edition, Forms 29:1-70:3, Bailey & Rothblatt

Successful Techniques for Criminal Trials

Trial Handbook for Illinois Lawyers, Hunter

Am-Jur Proof of Facts 2d, Volumes 1-22 and Quick Index

Publisher: MARTINDALE-HUBBELL

Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, Volumes I-VI, 1976

Publisher: SHEPARD'S INC.

Shepard's Illinois Citations, Case Edition, Parts 1-2, 1966

Shepard's Illinois Citations, Statute Edition, 1966

Shepard's Illinois Citations, Supplement 1966-1977

Shepard's Illinois Citations, Cases & Statutes, Cases March, 1980,

Statutes March, 1980, Cases & Statutes July, 1980

Publisher: WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Volumes 1-148, Smith-Hurd

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Constitution, Articles 1-end, Smith-Hurd

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Index, A-Z, Smith-Hurd

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Tables and Cumulative Supplement, Smith-Hurd

Illinois Legislative Service, Numbers 1 & 2, 1979, Laws (81-1 to 81-20 & 81-93)

Illinois Annotated Statutes, 1963-1978, Tables, Smith-Hurd

Illinois Annotated Statutes, 1978, Laws, Volumes 3-6 (80-1184 to 80-1520)

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Supplement, July 1979 and October 1978, Smith-Hurd

Publisher: WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY

Corbin on Contracts, 1951, Corbin
Simpson on Contracts, 1954, Hornbook
Illinois Decisions, Volumes 1-36 (continuing)
Illinois Digest, Volumes 1-37
Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions - Civil 2nd Edition
Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions - Criminal - Burdette Smith Company
Blacks Law Dictionary, Revised 4th Edition
West's Illinois Decisions, Paperback Supplements, (continuing)
Illinois Law & Practice, Volumes 1-40
Illinois Criminal Law & Procedures, 1980

1979 Illinois Vehicle Code books
Urbana City Code Book

ANNUAL STATISTICS

The following data was gathered from records existing between September 1, 1979 and July 31, 1980.

CASES OPENED 182

Accident	3	Criminal	22	Name Change	8
Adoption	1	Expungement	3	Personal Inj.	1
Bankruptcy	1	Family	42	Power of Atty.	9
Civil	11	Housing	33	Small Claims	11
Consumer	4	Immigration	1	Traffic	30
Contract	1	Insurance	1		

CASES CLOSED 160

Accident	2	Employment	2	Name Change	7
Civil	6	Expungement	3	Power of Atty.	9
Consumer	1	Family	40	Small Claims	6
Criminal	25	Housing	27	Traffic	32

CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF JULY 31, 1980 88

Accident	2	Criminal	3	Insurance	1
Adoption	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	2
Bankruptcy	1	Family	20	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	5	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	10
Consumer	5	Housing	27	Traffic	6
Contract	1	Immigration	1		

CONTACTS 3,105

Accident	67	Employment	46	Personal Inj.	10
Adoption	3	Expungement	6	Power of Atty.	23
Banking	11	Family	154	Real Estate	27
Bankruptcy	3	Fgn. Std. Affs.	12	Residency	6
Business	2	Housing	517	Small Claims	245
Civil	297	Immigration	17	Tax	73
Consumer	304	Incorporation	2	Traffic	231
Contract	40	Information	624	University	145
Copyright	12	Insurance	35	Wills	36
Corporation	4	Name Change	20	Workman's Comp.	1
Criminal	126	Patent	6		

ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED 1,323

Accident	55	Expungement	5	Real Estate	2
Adoption	3	Family	108	Residency	5
Banking	11	Housing	245	Small Claims	140
Bankruptcy	3	Immigration	8	Tax	10
Civil	182	Insurance	23	Traffic	172
Consumer	140	Name Change	16	University	12
Contract	36	Personal Inj.	9	Wills	2
Criminal	101	Power of Atty.	12	Workman's Comp.	1
Employment	22				

SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER 833

Civil	11	Housing	3	Power of Atty.	1
Consumer	6	Incorporation	1	Small Claims	94
Copyright	11	Information	617	Tax	60
Criminal	3	Insurance	4	Traffic	10
Employment	1	Patent	5	University	3
Family	3				

REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES 503

Consumer	127	Housing	239	University	125
Fgn. Std. Affs.	12				

REFERRED TO BARS 241

Accident	6	Expungement	1	Patent	1
Business	2	Family	26	Power of Atty.	5
Civil	52	Housing	8	Real Estate	21
Consumer	15	Immigration	6	Small Claims	3
Contract	3	Incorporation	1	Tax	1
Copyright	1	Information	3	Traffic	27
Corporation	2	Insurance	2	University	2
Criminal	9	Name Change	2	Wills	32
Employment	10				

PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS 78

Civil	17	Family	5	Small Claims	4
Consumer	7	Housing	13	Traffic	12
Criminal	9	Immigration	1	University	3
Employment	4	Insurance	3		

OTHER - (mostly non-student) 127

Accident	6	Family	12	Power of Atty.	5
Civil	35	Housing	9	Real Estate	3
Consumer	9	Immigration	2	Residency	1
Contract	1	Information	4	Small Claims	4
Corporation	2	Insurance	3	Tax	2
Criminal	4	Name Change	2	Traffic	10
Employment	9	Personal Inj.	1	Wills	3

% A.O. CONCLUDED

Accident	4.2	Expungement	.4	Real Estate	.2
Adoption	.2	Family	8.2	Residency	.4
Banking	.8	Housing	18.5	Small Claims	10.6
Bankruptcy	.2	Immigration	.6	Tax	.8
Civil	13.8	Insurance	1.7	Traffic	13.0
Consumer	10.6	Name Change	1.2	University	.9
Contract	2.7	Personal Inj.	.7	Wills	.2
Criminal	7.6	Power of Atty.	.9	Workman's Comp.	.1
Employment	1.7				

% CASES REPRESENTED

Accident	1.6	Criminal	12.1	Name Change	4.4
Adoption	.6	Expungement	1.7	Personal Inj.	.6
Bankruptcy	.6	Family	23.1	Power of Atty.	4.9
Civil	6.0	Housing	18.1	Small Claims	6.0
Consumer	2.2	Immigration	.6	Traffic	16.5
Contract	.6	Insurance	.5		

August 5, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF JULY 1, 1980</u>					89
Accident	2	Criminal	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	4	Name Change	2
Civil	5	Family	22	Personal Inj.	1
Consumer	5	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	9
Contract	1	Housing	27	Traffic	6
<u>CASES OPENED IN JULY, 1980</u>					11
Adoption	1	Housing	1	Small Claims	1
Criminal	1	Immigration	1	Traffic	1
Family	4	Power of Atty.	1		
<u>CASES CLOSED IN JULY, 1980</u>					12
Expungement	3	Housing	1	Traffic	1
Family	6	Power of Atty.	1		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF JULY 31, 1980</u>					88
Accident	2	Criminal	3	Insurance	1
Adoption	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	2
Bankruptcy	1	Family	20	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	5	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	10
Consumer	5	Housing	27	Traffic	6
Contract	1	Immigration	1		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, JULY, 1980</u>					239
Accident	6	Employment	4	Personal Inj.	1
Adoption	1	Family	17	Power of Atty.	3
Banking	2	Housing	29	Real Estate	2
Business	1	Immigration	4	Small Claims	10
Civil	28	Information	74	Traffic	12
Consumer	21	Insurance	2	University	10
Contract	3	Name Change	2	Wills	3
Criminal	4				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN JULY, 1980</u>					84
Accident	4	Criminal	4	Personal Inj.	1
Adoption	1	Family	10	Power of Atty.	1
Banking	2	Housing	15	Small Claims	5
Civil	14	Immigration	1	Traffic	11
Consumer	8	Insurance	2	University	3
Contract	2				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					81
Civil	1	Information	74	Small Claims	5
Housing	1				
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					32
Consumer	12	Housing	13	University	7
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					22
Accident	1	Employment	1	Power of Atty.	1
Business	1	Family	4	Real Estate	1
Civil	7	Immigration	2	Wills	2
Contract	1	Name Change	1		
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>					20
Accident	1	Family	3	Real Estate	1
Civil	6	Immigration	1	Traffic	1
Consumer	1	Name Change	1	Wills	1
Employment	3	Power of Atty.	1		

July 2, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF JUNE 1, 1980</u>					88
Accident	2	Expungement	4	Name Change	3
Bankruptcy	1	Family	20	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	4	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	9
Consumer	6	Housing	27	Traffic	8
Contract	1	Insurance	1		
<u>CASES OPENED IN JUNE, 1980</u>					11
Civil	1	Family	5	Name Change	1
Criminal	2	Housing	2		
<u>CASES CLOSED IN JUNE, 1980</u>					10
Consumer	1	Housing	2	Traffic	2
Family	3	Name Change	2		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF JUNE 30, 1980</u>					89
Accident	2	Criminal	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	4	Name Change	2
Civil	5	Family	22	Personal Inj.	1
Consumer	5	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	9
Contract	1	Housing	27	Traffic	6
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, JUNE, 1980</u>					216
Accident	3	Fgn. Std. Affs.	1	Real Estate	3
Civil	28	Housing	35	Residency	1
Consumer	18	Information	69	Small Claims	18
Copyright	1	Insurance	2	Traffic	11
Criminal	2	Name Change	3	University	2
Employment	2	Power of Atty.	4	Wills	4
Family	9				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN JUNE, 1980</u>					55
Accident	1	Employment	2	Name Change	1
Civil	14	Family	9	Residency	1
Consumer	8	Housing	6	Small Claims	7
Criminal	2	Insurance	2	Traffic	2
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					77
Civil	2	Information	63	Small Claims	11
Copyright	1				
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					34
Consumer	10	Housing	21	University	2
Fgn. Std. Affs.	1				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					26
Accident	1	Information	2	Real Estate	3
Civil	6	Name Change	1	Traffic	5
Housing	2	Power of Atty.	2	Wills	4
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>					1
Civil	1				
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>					23
Accident	1	Information	4	Power of Atty.	2
Civil	5	Name Change	1	Traffic	4
Housing	6				

June 4, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF MAY 1, 1980</u>				107	
Accident	2	Criminal	4	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	3
Civil	4	Family	26	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	16
Contract	1	Housing	32		
<u>CASES OPENED IN MAY, 1980</u>				17	
Consumer	3	Housing	3	Power of Atty.	2
Expungement	1	Name Change	1	Small Claims	1
Family	2	Personal Inj.	1	Traffic	3
<u>CASES CLOSED IN MAY, 1980</u>				36	
Criminal	4	Name Change	1	Small Claims	2
Family	8	Power of Atty.	2	Traffic	11
Housing	8				
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF MAY 31, 1980</u>				88	
Accident	2	Expungement	4	Name Change	3
Bankruptcy	1	Family	20	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	4	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	9
Consumer	6	Housing	27	Traffic	8
Contract	1	Insurance	1		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, MAY, 1980</u>				237	
Banking	1	Family	9	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	25	Fgn. Std. Affs.	2	Power of Atty.	4
Consumer	14	Housing	49	Residency	1
Contract	3	Immigration	2	Small Claims	26
Copyright	1	Information	46	Traffic	30
Corporation	3	Insurance	3	University	4
Criminal	10	Name Change	1	Wills	1
Expungement	1				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN MAY, 1980</u>				91	
Banking	1	Family	7	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	12	Housing	19	Power of Atty.	2
Consumer	6	Immigration	1	Residency	1
Contract	3	Insurance	1	Small Claims	10
Criminal	4	Name Change	1	Traffic	21
Expungement	1				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>				63	
Civil	2	Criminal	1	Small Claims	13
Copyright	1	Information	46		
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>				39	
Consumer	7	Housing	26	University	4
Fgn. Std. Affs.	2				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>				21	
Civil	6	Housing	1	Small Claims	1
Corporation	2	Insurance	1	Traffic	5
Criminal	2	Power of Atty.	1	Wills	1
Family	1				
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>				16	
Civil	2	Family	1	Insurance	1
Consumer	1	Housing	3	Small Claims	1
Criminal	3	Immigration	1	Traffic	3
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>				7	
Civil	3	Power of Atty.	1	Traffic	1
Corporation	1	Small Claims	1		

May 2, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF APRIL 1, 1980</u>				113	
Accident	2	Employment	1	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	4
Civil	5	Family	26	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	16
Criminal	6	Housing	34		
<u>CASES OPENED IN APRIL, 1980</u>				9	
Contract	1	Housing	1	Traffic	1
Family	5	Small Claims	1		
<u>CASES CLOSED IN APRIL, 1980</u>				15	
Civil	1	Family	5	Small Claims	1
Criminal	2	Housing	3	Traffic	1
Employment	1	Name Change	1		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF APRIL 30, 1980</u>				107	
Accident	2	Criminal	4	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	3
Civil	4	Family	26	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	16
Contract	1	Housing	32		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, APRIL, 1980</u>				323	
Accident	8	Employment	9	Power of Atty.	1
Banking	1	Expungement	2	Real Estate	6
Business	1	Family	14	Small Claims	33
Civil	30	Housing	41	Tax	16
Consumer	37	Information	70	Traffic	21
Contract	2	Patent	1	University	15
Copyright	3	Personal Inj.	1	Wills	2
Criminal	9				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN APRIL, 1980</u>				98	
Accident	8	Employment	3	Real Estate	1
Banking	1	Expungement	1	Small Claims	13
Civil	13	Family	5	Tax	2
Consumer	11	Housing	16	Traffic	13
Contract	2	Personal Inj.	1	University	3
Criminal	4	Power of Atty.	1		
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>				116	
Civil	2	Housing	1	Tax	14
Copyright	2	Information	70	Traffic	4
Employment	1	Patent	1	University	1
Family	1	Small Claims	19		
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>				49	
Consumer	21	Housing	19	University	9
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>				31	
Business	1	Criminal	2	Housing	2
Civil	8	Employment	2	Real Estate	4
Consumer	2	Expungement	1	Traffic	3
Copyright	1	Family	4	Will	1
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>				19	
Civil	3	Employment	1	Small Claims	1
Consumer	3	Family	3	Traffic	1
Criminal	2	Housing	3	University	2
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>				10	
Civil	4	Employment	2	Real Estate	1
Criminal	1	Family	1	Will	1

April 1, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF MARCH 1, 1980</u>				109	
Accident	1	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	4
Civil	5	Family	23	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	15
Criminal	6	Housing	34		
<u>CASES OPENED IN MARCH, 1980</u>				24	
Accident	1	Family	6	Name Change	2
Civil	1	Housing	7	Traffic	6
Criminal	1				
<u>CASES CLOSED IN MARCH, 1980</u>				20	
Civil	1	Family	3	Name Change	2
Criminal	1	Housing	7	Traffic	5
Employment	1				
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF MARCH 31, 1980</u>				113	
Accident	2	Employment	1	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	4
Civil	5	Family	26	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	16
Criminal	6	Housing	34		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, MARCH, 1980</u>				444	
Accident	11	Expungement	1	Power of Atty.	1
Banking	2	Family	22	Real Estate	3
Civil	50	Fgn. Std. Affs.	1	Small Claims	29
Consumer	57	Housing	60	Tax	29
Contract	8	Immigration	1	Traffic	36
Copyright	2	Information	96	University	8
Criminal	13	Name Change	4	Wills	5
Employment	4	Personal Inj.	1		
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN MARCH, 1980</u>				154	
Accident	7	Employment	1	Personal Inj.	1
Banking	2	Expungement	1	Power of Atty.	1
Civil	22	Family	11	Small Claims	12
Consumer	15	Housing	32	Tax	1
Contract	7	Immigration	1	Traffic	25
Criminal	11	Name Change	4		
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>				149	
Civil	1	Family	2	Tax	28
Copyright	2	Information	96	Traffic	2
Criminal	1	Small Claims	17		
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>				66	
Consumer	31	Housing	26	University	8
Fgn. Std. Affs.	1				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>				44	
Accident	2	Contract	1	Real Estate	3
Civil	12	Employment	2	Traffic	6
Consumer	7	Family	6	Wills	5
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SOME REFUNDS</u>				12	
Civil	6	Employment	1	Traffic	2
Consumer	2	Housing	1		
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>				19	
Accident	2	Criminal	1	Housing	1
Civil	9	Family	3	Traffic	1
Consumer	2				

March 4, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1980</u>					97
Accident	2	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	2	Name Change	4
Civil	6	Family	18	Small Claims	11
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	11
Criminal	4	Housing	31		
<u>CASES OPENED IN FEBRUARY, 1980</u>					23
Criminal	3	Family	8	Traffic	7
Expungement	1	Housing	4		
<u>CASES CLOSED IN FEBRUARY, 1980</u>					11
Accident	1	Family	3	Small Claims	1
Civil	1	Housing	1	Traffic	3
Criminal	1				
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF FEBRUARY 29, 1980</u>					109
Accident	1	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	3	Name Change	4
Civil	5	Family	23	Small Claims	10
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	15
Criminal	6	Housing	34		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, FEBRUARY, 1980</u>					372
Accident	9	Expungement	2	Personal Inj.	2
Banking	1	Family	15	Real Estate	4
Civil	31	Fgn. Std. Affs.	1	Residency	2
Consumer	33	Housing	73	Small Claims	24
Contract	5	Immigration	1	Tax	22
Copyright	2	Information	60	Traffic	24
Corporation	1	Insurance	10	University	24
Criminal	17	Name Change	1	Wills	4
Employment	4				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN FEBRUARY, 1980</u>					175
Accident	9	Expungement	2	Personal Inj.	2
Banking	1	Family	12	Residency	1
Civil	25	Housing	32	Small Claims	13
Consumer	22	Immigration	1	Tax	4
Contract	5	Insurance	7	Traffic	21
Criminal	14	Name Change	1	University	1
Employment	2				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					94
Civil	2	Small Claims	10	Traffic	2
Copyright	2	Tax	17	University	1
Information	60				
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					71
Consumer	10	Housing	39	University	21
Fgn. Std. Affs.	1				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					17
Civil	3	Family	2	Traffic	1
Consumer	1	Housing	1	University	1
Criminal	2	Real Estate	3	Wills	3
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>					15
Civil	1	Family	1	Residency	1
Corporation	1	Housing	1	Small Claims	1
Criminal	1	Insurance	3	Tax	1
Employment	2	Real Estate	1	Wills	1

February 4, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF JANUARY 1, 1980</u>					92
Accident	2	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	5
Civil	5	Family	17	Small Claims	7
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	13
Criminal	6	Housing	28		
<u>CASES OPENED IN JANUARY, 1980</u>					16
Accident	1	Expungement	1	Small Claims	4
Civil	2	Family	3	Traffic	1
Criminal	1	Housing	3		
<u>CASES CLOSED IN JANUARY, 1980</u>					11
Accident	1	Criminal	3	Name Change	1
Civil	1	Family	2	Traffic	3
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF JANUARY 31, 1980</u>					97
Accident	2	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	2	Name Change	4
Civil	6	Family	18	Small Claims	11
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	11
Criminal	4	Housing	31		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, JANUARY, 1980</u>					232
Accident	6	Housing	40	Residency	2
Adoption	2	Immigration	2	Small Claims	20
Civil	18	Information	39	Tax	1
Consumer	24	Insurance	3	Traffic	15
Contract	5	Name Change	3	University	21
Criminal	8	Patent	1	Wills	6
Employment	2	Power of Atty.	3	Workman's Comp.	1
Family	10				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN JANUARY, 1980</u>					105
Accident	6	Employment	2	Name Change	3
Adoption	2	Family	7	Residency	2
Civil	13	Housing	18	Small Claims	13
Consumer	13	Immigration	1	Traffic	12
Contract	3	Insurance	2	Workman's Comp.	1
Criminal	7				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					48
Civil	1	Information	39	Small Claims	4
Consumer	1	Power of Atty.	1	Traffic	2
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					50
Consumer	8	Housing	22	University	20
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					21
Civil	2	Insurance	1	Traffic	1
Consumer	2	Patent	1	University	1
Contract	1	Power of Atty.	1	Wills	6
Family	3	Small Claims	2		
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>					1
Criminal	1				
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>					7
Civil	2	Immigration	1	Small Claims	1
Contract	1	Power of Atty.	1	Tax	1

January 11, 1980

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF DECEMBER 1, 1979</u>				95	
Accident	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	3
Civil	6	Family	18	Power of Atty.	1
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	5
Criminal	12	Housing	27	Traffic	13
Employment	2	Insurance	1		
<u>CASES OPENED IN DECEMBER, 1979</u>				9	
Bankruptcy	1	Housing	1	Small Claims	2
Family	1	Name Change	2	Traffic	2
<u>CASES CLOSED IN DECEMBER, 1979</u>				12	
Civil	1	Family	2	Traffic	2
Criminal	6	Power of Atty.	1		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1979</u>				92	
Accident	2	Employment	2	Insurance	1
Bankruptcy	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	5
Civil	5	Family	17	Small Claims	7
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Traffic	13
Criminal	6	Housing	28		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, DECEMBER, 1979</u>				161	
Banking	1	Employment	4	Personal Inj.	1
Bankruptcy	1	Family	4	Small Claims	17
Civil	14	Housing	35	Tax	1
Consumer	16	Immigration	4	Traffic	13
Contract	4	Information	26	University	11
Criminal	6	Insurance	1		
		Name Change	2		
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN DECEMBER, 1979</u>				74	
Banking	1	Criminal	4	Name Change	2
Bankruptcy	1	Family	3	Personal Inj.	1
Civil	6	Housing	19	Small Claims	12
Consumer	10	Immigration	1	Tax	1
Contract	4	Insurance	1	Traffic	8
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>				30	
Information	26	Small Claims	4		
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>				27	
Consumer	2	Housing	14	University	11
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>				17	
Civil	5	Employment	2	Immigration	3
Consumer	2	Family	1	Traffic	2
Criminal	1	Housing	1		
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>				7	
Civil	1	Employment	2	Traffic	2
Criminal	1	Housing	1		
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-student)</u>				6	
Civil	2	Small Claims	1	Traffic	1
Consumer	2				

December 11, 1979

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF NOVEMBER 1, 1979</u>				86	
Accident	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	2
Civil	7	Family	19	Power of Atty.	1
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	5
Criminal	10	Housing	21	Traffic	11
Employment	2	Insurance	1		
<u>CASES OPENED IN NOVEMBER, 1979</u>				19	
Criminal	4	Housing	6	Power of Atty.	3
Family	1	Name Change	1	Traffic	4
<u>CASES CLOSED IN NOVEMBER, 1979</u>				10	
Civil	1	Family	2	Traffic	2
Criminal	2	Power of Atty.	3		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1979</u>				95	
Accident	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	3
Civil	6	Family	18	Power of Atty.	1
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	5
Criminal	12	Housing	27	Traffic	13
Employment	2	Insurance	1		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, NOVEMBER, 1979</u>				314	
Accident	10	Family	21	Name Change	3
Banking	1	Fgn. Std. Affs.	2	Power of Atty.	3
Civil	24	Housing	52	Small Claims	34
Consumer	33	Immigration	3	Tax	3
Contract	3	Incorporation	1	Traffic	27
Copyright	2	Information	42	University	20
Criminal	18	Insurance	3	Wills	5
Employment	4				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN NOVEMBER, 1979</u>				175	
Accident	9	Employment	3	Name Change	3
Banking	1	Family	16	Power of Atty.	3
Civil	17	Housing	34	Small Claims	29
Consumer	14	Immigration	2	Tax	2
Contract	3	Insurance	2	Traffic	20
Criminal	17				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>				50	
Consumer	2	Information	42	Small Claims	4
Copyright	2				
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>				49	
Consumer	15	Housing	13	University	19
Fgn. Std. Affs.	2				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>				17	
Civil	2	Family	1	Tax	1
Consumer	1	Immigration	1	Traffic	4
Employment	1	Incorporation	1	Wills	5
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SORF REFUNDS</u>				16	
Civil	3	Family	1	Small Claims	1
Consumer	1	Housing	5	Traffic	2
Criminal	1	Insurance	1	University	1
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-students)</u>				7	
Accident	1	Family	3	Traffic	1
Civil	2				

November 1, 1979

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1979</u>					65
Accident	1	Employment	2	Housing	20
Civil	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	1
Consumer	3	Family	17	Small Claims	4
Criminal	5	Garnishment	1	Traffic	8
<u>CASES OPENED IN OCTOBER, 1979</u>					32
Accident	1	Housing	4	Power of Atty.	2
Civil	5	Insurance	1	Small Claims	2
Criminal	7	Name Change	1	Traffic	3
Family	6				
<u>CASES CLOSED IN OCTOBER, 1979</u>					11
Criminal	2	Housing	3	Small Claims	1
Family	4	Power of Atty.	1		
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF OCTOBER 31, 1979</u>					86
Accident	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	2
Civil	7	Family	19	Power of Atty.	1
Consumer	3	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	5
Criminal	10	Housing	21	Traffic	11
Employment	2	Insurance	1		
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, OCTOBER, 1979</u>					307
Accident	11	Family	19	Pers. Inj.	2
Banking	2	Fgn. Std. Affs.	2	Power of Atty.	3
Civil	30	Housing	58	Real Estate	4
Consumer	29	Information	63	Small Claims	16
Contract	4	Insurance	4	Traffic	19
Copyright	1	Name Change	1	University	12
Criminal	18	Patent	1	Wills	4
Employment	4				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN OCTOBER, 1979</u>					162
Accident	9	Employment	2	Power of Atty.	3
Banking	2	Family	18	Small Claims	10
Civil	27	Housing	30	Traffic	16
Consumer	16	Insurance	2	University	2
Contract	4	Name Change	1	Wills	1
Criminal	17	Pers. Inj.	2		
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					72
Consumer	2	Information	62	Patent	1
Copyright	1	Insurance	1	Small Claims	5
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					49
Consumer	10	Housing	27	University	10
Fgn. Std. Affs.	2				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					13
Accident	1	Family	1	Real Estate	4
Civil	1	Housing	1	Wills	3
Employment	1	Information	1		
<u>PEOPLE WHO'VE RECEIVED SOME REFUNDS</u>					6
Civil	1	Insurance	1	Traffic	2
Criminal	1	Small Claims	1		
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-students)</u>					5
Accident	1	Consumer	1	Traffic	1
Civil	1	Employment	1		

October 1, 1979

<u>CASES PENDING AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1979</u>					66
Accident	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	1
Consumer	2	Family	18	Small Claims	5
Criminal	6	Garnishment	1	Traffic	8
Employment	2	Housing	21		
<u>CASES OPENED IN SEPTEMBER, 1979</u>					11
Civil	2	Family	1	Power of Attv.	1
Consumer	1	Housing	1	Traffic	2
Criminal	3				
<u>CASES CLOSED IN SEPTEMBER, 1979</u>					12
Criminal	4	Housing	2	Small Claims	1
Family	2	Power of Attv.	1	Traffic	2
<u>CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1979</u>					65
Accident	1	Employment	2	Housing	20
Civil	2	Expungement	1	Name Change	1
Consumer	3	Family	17	Small Claims	4
Criminal	5	Garnishment	1	Traffic	8
<u>CONTACTS WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS, SEPTEMBER, 1979</u>					260
Accident	3	For. Std. Affs.	3	Power of Attv.	1
Bankruptcy	2	Housing	45	Real Estate	5
Civil	19	Incorporation	1	Small Claims	18
Consumer	22	Information	39	Tax	1
Contract	3	Insurance	7	Traffic	23
Criminal	21	Patent	3	University	19
Employment	9	Personal Inj.	1	Wills	2
Family	14				
<u>ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED IN SEPTEMBER, 1979</u>					150
Accident	2	Employment	7	Real Estate	1
Bankruptcy	2	Family	10	Small Claims	16
Civil	19	Housing	24	Traffic	23
Consumer	17	Insurance	4	University	3
Contract	3	Power of Attv.	1	Wills	1
Criminal	17				
<u>SERVED BY OFFICE MANAGER</u>					53
Consumer	1	Information	39	Small Claims	2
Criminal	1	Insurance	3	Tax	1
Housing	1	Patent	3	University	1
Incorporation	1				
<u>REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES</u>					37
Consumer	1	Housing	19	University	14
For. Std. Affs.	3				
<u>REFERRED TO BARS</u>					12
Accident	1	Employment	1	Real Estate	3
Criminal	2	Family	3	Wills	2
<u>OTHER - (mostly non-students)</u>					8
Consumer	3	Employment	1	Housing	1
Criminal	1	Family	1	Personal Inj.	1

SLS SURVEY

CLIENTS ONLY

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE (Category response indicated by percentage)

* (77) 1. I was satisfied with the goal the staff and I agreed to pursue in my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
58.4	32.5	7.8	1.3	0

(78) 2. I consider the final resolution of my case to be fair:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
53.8	34.6	9.0	0	2.6

(79) 3. The outcome of my case resolved my legal concern:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
58.2	24.1	12.7	2.5	2.5

(79) 4. The final resolution of my case was what I desired:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
49.4	26.6	12.7	7.6	3.8

5. In my opinion, the U.S. legal judicial system as a whole is:

(80) a. Very fair, Fair, Unfair, Very unfair, No opinion

3.8	52.5	26.2	8.8	8.8
-----	------	------	-----	-----

(79) b. Very understandable, Understandable, Confusing, Very

3.8	45.6	35.4
-----	------	------

confusing, No opinion

8.9	6.3
-----	-----

(79) c. Very unbiased, Unbiased, Biased, Very biased, No opinion

2.5	29.1	38.0	12.7	17.7
-----	------	------	------	------

(79) d. Very responsive, Responsive, Unresponsive, Very unresponsive, No opinion

3.8	38.0	30.4	6.3	21.5
-----	------	------	-----	------

(78) e. Very helpful, Helpful, Unhelpful, Very unhelpful, No opinion

2.7	38.5	28.2	7.7	23.1
-----	------	------	-----	------

6. Lawyers and other legal professionals on the whole are:

(78) a. Very trustworthy, Trustworthy, Untrustworthy, Very untrustworthy, No opinion

11.5	61.5	9.0	1.3	16.7
------	------	-----	-----	------

(79) b. Very approachable, Approachable, Unfriendly, Very unfriendly, No opinion

12.7	68.4	6.3	0	12.7
------	------	-----	---	------

* Numbers in () equal the number of responses given

- (81) c. Very professional, Professional, Unprofessional, Very unprofessional, No opinion
 24.7 56.8 4.9
 1.2 12.3
- (79) d. Very industrious, Industrious, Lazy, Very lazy, No opinion
 21.5 48.1 8.9 0 21.5
- (77) e. Very responsible, Responsible, Irresponsible, Very irresponsible, No opinion
 18.2 54.5 7.8
 0 19.5
- (79) f. Very clear, Clear, Vague, Very vague, No opinion
 12.7 40.5 31.6 3.8 11.4
- (79) g. Very concerned, Concerned, Unconcerned, Very unconcerned, No opinion
 10.1 50.6 29.1 0
 10.1
- (80) h. Very dependable, Dependable, Undependable Very undependable, No opinion
 16.2 57.5 8.8 1.2
 16.2

(78) 7. I respect the U.S. legal judicial system:

Very much, Somewhat, Very little
 28.2 53.8 17.9

(79) 8. Since my recent experience with SLS, this respect has:

Increased, Remained the same, Decreased
 19.0 70.9 10.1

(80) 9. I felt I was treated with courtesy and respect by the SLS staff:

Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
 75.0 21.2 1.2 1.2 1.2

(80) 10. The staff members were approachable: I felt as though I could ask questions and discuss matters freely:

Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
 73.8 21.2 2.5 1.2 1.2

(80) 11. I felt the waiting period for my appointment with SLS was reasonable, given my understanding of their situation:

Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
 57.5 37.5 3.8 1.2 0

(80) 12. I felt the staff members assigned to my case were competent:

Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
 61.2 28.8 6.2 1.2 2.5

(80)13. I felt the staff afforded me adequate opportunity to participate in the handling of my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
41.2	40.0	13.8	5.0	0

(80)14. I felt SLS gave me the same quality service as a private law office would have:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
40.0	25.0	23.8	6.2	5.0

(80)15. I would use SLS again if I had a qualifying legal problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
67.5	27.5	2.5	0	2.5

16. Through my experience in the legal process, and because of the particular way SLS operated, I have:

(79) a. A better understanding of the legal process:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
8.9	46.8	26.6	15.2	2.5

(79) b. A better understanding of the role and function of attorneys:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
10.1	48.1	27.8	13.9	0

(79) c. Been motivated to take a greater interest in the law and current legal issues:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
11.4	24.1	27.8	35.4	2.5

(78) d. Learned that there is not necessarily a legal remedy for every problem situation:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
5.1	19.2	28.2	34.6	12.8

(80)17. I feel the SLS represents a valuable service to students:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
85.0	11.2	3.8	0	0

(79)18. I feel support of SLS to be a good allocation of a percentage of my SORF fee monies:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
83.5	13.9	1.3	1.3	0

(79) 19. I feel that without SLS I would have had greater difficulty in resolving my problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
65.8	20.3	6.3	6.3	1.3

20. In retrospect, the legal problem I had affected my:

(78) a. Academic performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
20.5	23.1	10.3	23.1	23.1

(75) b. Job performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
18.7	14.7	14.7	25.3	26.7

(77) c. Family life:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
28.6	16.9	10.4	23.4	20.8

(77) d. Social relationships:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
23.4	22.1	11.7	26.0	16.9

(78) e. General well-being:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
29.5	39.7	7.7	16.7	6.4

SLS SURVEY

A.O.'s ONLY

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE (Category response indicated by percentage)

* (69) 1. I was satisfied with the goal the staff and I agreed to pursue in my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
29.0	43.5	10.1	10.1	7.2

(63) 2. I consider the final resolution of my case to be fair:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
15.9	28.6	25.4	19.0	11.1

(65) 3. The outcome of my case resolved my legal concern:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
23.1	35.4	13.8	18.5	9.2

(64) 4. The final resolution of my case was what I desired:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
18.8	26.6	10.9	18.8	25.0

5. In my opinion, the U.S. legal judicial system as a whole is:

(70) a. Very fair, Fair, Unfair, Very unfair, No opinion

4.3	45.7	20.0	11.4	18.6
-----	------	------	------	------

(71) b. Very understandable, Understandable, Confusing, Very

4.2	47.9	25.4
-----	------	------

confusing, No opinion

8.5	14.1
-----	------

(71) c. Very unbiased, Unbiased, Biased, Very biased, No opinion

1.4	23.9	42.3	11.3	21.1
-----	------	------	------	------

(69) d. Very responsive, Responsive, Unresponsive, Very unrespon-

0	33.3	30.4	8.7
---	------	------	-----

sive, No opinion

27.5

(69) e. Very helpful, Helpful, Unhelpful, Very unhelpful, No opinion

0	46.4	20.3	7.2	26.1
---	------	------	-----	------

6. Lawyers and other legal professionals on the whole are:

(69) a. Very trustworthy, Trustworthy, Untrustworthy, Very untrust-

5.8	59.4	7.2	1.4
-----	------	-----	-----

worthy, No opinion

26.1

(71) b. Very approachable, Approachable, Unfriendly, Very unfriendly,

8.5	70.4	7.0	0
-----	------	-----	---

No opinion

14.1

* Numbers in () equal the number of responses given

(71) c.	Very professional,	Professional,	Unprofessional,	Very unprofessional,	No opinion
	14.1	66.2	4.2		
	0	15.5			
(68) d.	Very industrious,	Industrious,	Lazy,	Very lazy,	No opinion
	7.4	57.4	5.9	0	29.4
(70) e.	Very responsible,	Responsible,	Irresponsible,	Very irresponsible,	No opinion
	7.1	64.3	4.3		
	1.4	22.9			
(71) f.	Very clear,	Clear,	Vague,	Very vague,	No opinion
	4.2	43.7	29.6	2.8	19.7
(72) g.	Very concerned,	Concerned,	Unconcerned,	Very unconcerned,	No opinion
	2.8	43.1	15.3	1.4	
	27.8				
(69) h.	Very dependable,	Dependable,	Undependable	Very undependable,	No opinion
	4.3	60.9	4.3	0	
	30.4				

(70) 7. I respect the U.S. legal judicial system:

Very much,	Somewhat,	Very little
21.4	60.0	18.6

(70) 8. Since my recent experience with SLS, this respect has:

Increased,	Remained the same,	Decreased
10.0	80.0	10.0

(72) 9. I felt I was treated with courtesy and respect by the SLS staff:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
55.6	36.1	5.6	1.4	1.4

(72)10. The staff members were approachable: I felt as though I could ask questions and discuss matters freely:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
51.4	40.3	4.2	4.2	0

(72)11. I felt the waiting period for my appointment with SLS was reasonable, given my understanding of their situation:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
38.9	50.0	6.9	2.8	1.4

(70)12. I felt the staff members assigned to my case were competent:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
34.3	32.9	24.3	4.3	4.3

(63)13. I felt the staff afforded me adequate opportunity to participate in the handling of my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
20.6	52.4	22.2	4.8	0

(70)14. I felt SLS gave me the same quality service as a private law office would have:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
17.1	34.3	28.6	8.6	14.3

(71)15. I would use SLS again if I had a qualifying legal problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
45.1	39.4	11.3	0	4.2

16. Through my experience in the legal process, and because of the particular way SLS operated, I have:

(72) a. A better understanding of the legal process:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
5.6	47.2	26.4	18.1	1.4

(68) b. A better understanding of the role and function of attorneys:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
2.9	42.6	32.4	22.1	0

(71) c. Been motivated to take a greater interest in the law and current legal issues:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
4.2	28.2	23.9	39.4	4.2

(69) d. Learned that there is not necessarily a legal remedy for every problem situation:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
13.0	53.6	11.6	15.9	5.8

(72) 17. I feel the SLS represents a valuable service to students:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
68.1	20.8	6.9	4.2	0

(73) 18. I feel support of SLS to be a good allocation of a percentage of my SORF fee monies:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
60.3	24.7	4.1	6.8	4.1

(70) 19. I feel that without SLS I would have had greater difficulty in resolving my problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
21.4	48.6	8.6	8.6	12.9

20. In retrospect, the legal problem I had affected my:

(72) a. Academic performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
9.7	18.1	6.9	26.4	38.9

(70) b. Job performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
7.1	14.3	8.6	24.3	45.7

(73) c. Family life:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
11.0	20.5	8.2	21.9	38.4

(71) d. Social relationships:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
9.9	11.3	9.9	29.6	39.4

(72) e. General well-being:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
13.9	45.8	2.8	18.1	19.4

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD
Minutes of the meeting on April 23, 1980

Present at the meeting were: Mike Graham, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Joel Kron, Tim Madigan, Paul Monson, Ed Rawles, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Graham opened the meeting. He asked about the SORF proposal Witham was investigating. Discussion followed on the best way to go about separating SLS from SORF. Zimmerman mentioned that Stan Levy had vetoed a voluntary SORF fee, and she felt that there wasn't much hope in separating SLS from SORF. Several of the Board members felt that a separate check-off system during the refund period with \$1.00 for SLS and \$2.00 for SORF was feasible. This system would allow students who disagree with SORF's disbursement policies to use SLS. Witham mentioned that there are still people coming into the office who wish to donate \$3.00 to SLS because they obtained a SORF refund. Graham favored a totally separate fee for SLS with a separate refund period. Madigan disapproved of the separate refund period.

Graham asked Madigan if the Board of Trustees would be meeting during the summer, and if it would be possible to get the Board to review the renewal of the SLS Program and do something about the SORF problem at the same time. Madigan said the Board would meet during the summer and that it probably would be possible for them to review the SLS Program, but he thought that a separation from SORF should not be proposed at that time. He mentioned that any fee separation would have to pass through Stan Levy and the Administration before going to the Board of Trustees. Zimmerman recommended that someone get in touch with Stan Levy to discuss his feelings about a separate SLS fee. Rawles thought that it should be mentioned that the problems with SORF directly affect SLS and a separation would be advantageous for SLS. Rawles asked that the Board be notified of Stan Levy's reaction to the proposed separation of SLS from SORF. Witham suggested that a position be adopted by the Board regarding separation of an SLS fee from SORF. A motion was made by Graham that the Board be on record as supportive of a separate fee arrangement. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Witham asked if it would be possible to have monies allocated to the attorneys for attending legal conferences during the summer. Madigan recommended that funds be available for each of the attorneys to attend two IICLE meetings during the summer without calling a Board meeting for approval. The Board unanimously approved Madigan's recommendation.

Monson asked about the remodeling of the office. Witham remarked that it was in the works and that the remodeling should begin after the end of Spring semester.

Graham mentioned that 711 should be approved, if at all, by December. He felt that 711, SORF and any rewrites of the SLS Plan should be presented to the Board of Trustees sometime during the Fall semester.

Graham suggested that Witham notify the Board members if it was necessary to hold a meeting during the summer. The meeting was adjourned.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD
Minutes of the meeting on March 12, 1980

Present at the meeting were: Sarah Alley, Michael Graham, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Tim Madigan, Paul Monson, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Graham opened the meeting. Haasis opened a discussion by describing a student who had been in the office for help. The student would like to sue a fraternity and a problem ostensibly would arise if the fraternity brought in the president of the fraternity as an indispensable party to the suit (he had acted as the fraternity's agent). This would technically result in a student vs. student situation. Graham asked if that situation did happen, couldn't the president of the fraternity be considered an independent defendant. More discussion followed. As the client has a housing problem and the attorneys think that he has a viable claim, the wording in The Plan was checked. Since The Plan states, "Ordinarily, the Students' Attorney will not advise or represent a student bringing a cause of action against another student," the Board felt that it was indeed possible for the Students' Attorneys to represent their client and not have to withdraw if the president of the fraternity was brought in. Witham pointed out that the president, in any case, would not be responsible for paying any Judgment levied against the fraternity or Alumni Association. Someone asked what would happen if the president of the fraternity came to SLS for legal service. Witham stated that if he did come in for advice, SLS would have to tell him that we couldn't give him advice as that would create an adverse party situation. Madigan moved that the Board had no objections to the attorneys representing the student even if the president of the fraternity was named as a third party in the suit. The Board voted, and the resolution was unanimously approved.

Madigan asked about the plans for remodeling the office. Witham told the Board that the proper people had been notified, and we were waiting to hear from them.

Graham asked if the problems with the DI had been resolved yet. Witham told the Board no, but things should change within the next three weeks as the change of staff would be taking place by then, and he felt that we should just wait it out. If the problem continues after that time, Witham would notify the Board and they could handle it. The Board expressed their willingness to help solve the matter.

Madigan brought up the anti-SORF posters put up all over campus. It was suggested that if problems developed, it might be possible to separate SORF from SLS. Madigan thought that regardless of the publicity against SORF, SLS's \$25,000 for this Spring would still be available. Witham mentioned that students still come into the office wanting to donate \$3.00 to receive legal service. The students in general seem supportive of SLS. Graham asked Madigan if the Board of Trustees would be meeting during the summer and, if at that meeting, it would be possible to bring up SLS's status and to have it permanently approved. Madigan remarked that there were no meetings currently scheduled for the summer, but perhaps something could be done during the September meeting. Madigan thought that there could be administrative problems involved in setting up a separate fee for SLS. The Board discussed further the value of having SLS separate from SORF and everyone agreed that it would be a good idea. Graham suggested that the discussion be continued at the next meeting.

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, April 23 at noon. The meeting was adjourned.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting on February 20, 1980

Present at the meeting were: Sarah Alley, Michael Graham, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Ed Rawles, John Scouffas, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Graham opened the meeting. Two petitions were presented to the Board. Following discussion regarding the incomes of the individuals, votes were taken. It was unanimously agreed to approve Petitioner #2, and Petitioner #1 was given approval with one vote of nay.

Graham asked for other business to be considered by the Board. Witham mentioned that the handbook regarding the functions and procedures of the office was nearly finished. This handbook would be given to all Fall University registrants. Witham suggested that before the booklet is sent to the printer, it would be submitted to Madigan for review and comment.

Witham said that he had written a letter to Mr. Costello regarding the 711 status of the office. He stated that Costello is of the opinion that the Program is not a "law office of the state" for purposes of Rule 711. He suggested that the Board turn its attention to securing designation as an approved 711 program from the Law School. He also stated that under the Plan, the Board is obligated to pursue means to secure 711 status. Graham mentioned that he would like to discuss this more thoroughly later in the meeting.

Witham asked the Board to approve purchase of a set of books called Proof of Facts II. The approximate cost would be \$550.00. Witham and Haasis both felt that Proof of Facts would be a helpful addition to the office library. The books deal with consumer, criminal, housing and other matters which SLS deals with on a daily basis. Discussion followed on the merits of buying the books new. Rawles pointed out that many times used books could be obtained at a savings. It was pointed out that there were all kinds of problems with buying them used from a private party because of the University's purchasing policies. A vote was taken and it was unanimously approved that SLS could buy the books.

Witham mentioned that SLS has been having some problems with the Daily Illini in regard to getting articles printed on a regular basis due to in-house problems there. Witham said that a couple of educational articles have been backlogged due to the DI's problems and that perhaps SLS should begin paying for space in the DI. Several Board members expressed the opinion that perhaps the DI was not fulfilling its obligations to the students by not printing educational articles. Graham said that if the problem had not cleared itself up by the next Board meeting, the Board should write a letter-to-the-editor and if the DI wouldn't print it, perhaps the News-Gazette would.

Scouffas handed out the latest SLS expenditures sheet and explained that the University is sometimes several months behind in furnishing his staff with the necessary information and that is why the budget is not always up to date.

Graham reopened the discussion on obtaining 711 status for SLS through the Law School. He estimated that if anything could be done on the problem, that it wouldn't take place until September 1980 or later. This was due in part to the state of flux currently occurring due to the lack of several Law School administrators and the changing status of the staff. Graham felt that the more conservative members of the Law School did not particularly approve of the clinical program already in use and felt that presenting them with the 711 problem now would only make matters worse. It was suggested that perhaps the Board of Trustees could recommend approval of 711 status. More discussion followed. It was generally agreed that due to the lack of 711 approval to date and the fact that it may never be approved that the Plan should be rewritten in September.

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, March 12 at noon. The meeting was adjourned.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting on January 23, 1980

The following were present: Sarah Alley, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Joel Kron, Tim Madigan, Paul Monson, John Scouffas, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Witham opened the meeting. Haasis presented two petitions to the Board for approval. Both petitions were unanimously approved. Witham presented a petition for approval. After some discussion, the petition was approved.

A discussion was held as to the fairness of the indigency requirements as set forth by the Board of Trustees. Many Board members felt that the requirements penalized those on low incomes who were able to save money. Since this and other related problems have occurred frequently, Scouffas suggested that a meeting be set up in order to make suggestions for an updated version of the indigency requirements and The Plan. These suggestions could then be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

A brief discussion was held regarding changing the day and time of the Board meetings. It was suggested that everyone leave a schedule of times they were available at the SLS office. The secretary would then try to set up a meeting that was convenient for everyone.

Witham brought up the 711 question. He mentioned that he felt a letter should be sent to Mr. Costello and the Chancellor urging them to give official confirmation of the "state agency" status of the SLS Program. Several Board members thought the letter would be a good idea and Witham indicated he would proceed accordingly.

Scouffas started a discussion on the SLS budget. He mentioned that funds for Spring should be released by February 1. SLS could therefore proceed with plans to remodel the office.

Witham mentioned that the Small Claims booklets had been printed and copies were available in the office to interested parties. He also reported that the student surveys had been sent out prior to the Christmas break and there has been a fairly good response so far. However, Witham thought another month should elapse before a definitive report could be made. Witham mentioned that the release of the Spring allocation will allow the office to proceed with ongoing publication projects in the office and provide funds for additions to the office library. Madigan felt that any printing to be done should be first on the list.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 P.M. and no meeting was set at that time, until the availability of the Board members had been determined by a tally of the schedules submitted to SLS.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting on November 14, 1979

The following were present: Sarah Alley, Michael Graham, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Joel Kron, Dan Madden, Tim Madigan, Paul Monson, John Scouffas, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Graham asked Witham if his contract had been settled yet. Witham replied that as far as he knew yes, however, they were only able to give him an eight month contract due to the way the SORF money was allocated.

Graham mentioned that Costello, in his letter to the Board of Trustees regarding the SLS Annual Report, had mentioned the possibility of obtaining 711 status for the U of I Law students. Graham thought that perhaps the SLS Board would get some feedback from the Trustees sometime in January. If not, Graham suggested that the SLS Board bring the question of 711 up again in January.

Graham had previously asked to be furnished with a projected budget for SLS. After having discussed the above contract problems and funding for SLS, Graham realized that a projected budget at this time would not be feasible.

Graham asked if there was an estimate on the remodeling of the office. Witham gave a detailed breakdown and a total of \$3,281.00. Graham asked if there was any possibility that SLS would be moving to another office on campus. Witham and Scouffas thought that if the possibility existed, it would be a year or two in the future. A discussion followed on whether or not it would be feasible to pay for remodeling costs. It was generally agreed that as the budget stood now, there would be problems funding the remodeling of the office until Spring. It was agreed that final approval would of necessity be contingent on release of the SORF monies.

The petition submitted was the next order of business. Witham mentioned that according to The Plan, the Board should deny the petition as there seemed to be enough money for the person involved to hire private counsel. Witham, however, added that he feels that anyone with a Research or Teaching Assistantship should not be denied legal representation if that is their only source of income and urged the Board to consider recommending a revision of the guidelines. Madigan felt that the Board should abide by The Plan and therefore, the petition should be turned down. A vote was taken and the majority of the Board voted not to accept the petition. Discussion followed regarding modification of The Plan in regards to the indigency requirements. Graham thinks that the Board should not make any decision on contacting the Board of Trustees regarding The Plan at this point until the 711 matter has been settled. Madigan agreed. Scouffas mentioned that he didn't think it fair that a person should be penalized for being thrifty and frugal and Witham suggested that the Board may also be penalizing a person for being honest. Zimmerman also registered a complaint on the unfairness of the indigency requirement.

Graham asked if anyone on the Board had objections to not meeting during the month of December. He stated that if anyone had something major to bring up to the Board, a meeting could be arranged. Everyone agreed. The next meeting was set for Wednesday, January 23 at noon.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting on October 17, 1979

The following were present: Sarah Alley, Mike Graham, Gina Haasis, Rick Karpel, Dan Madden, Tim Madigan, Paul Monson, Edward Rawles, John Scouffas, Rick Witham.

Graham opened the meeting with a discussion of the budget that Scouffas handed out regarding the SLS August Summary of Expenses. Graham suggested that SLS provide the Board with an estimate of expenses coming up.

Witham brought up the two petitions submitted by persons seeking representation for a felony. Graham asked if the Public Defender would represent them, as he did not think that SLS should be routinely involved with felonies. Several others discussed the fact that they didn't think SLS should represent felons unless there is a unique problem involved or it affects the majority of students. Graham asked that a precedent be established as to policy matters involving felonies. Witham suggested that a motion be passed that if the petition to the Public Defender from the persons involved was turned down, that SLS would represent them without bringing further petitions to the Board. Madigan suggested that the petitions should be turned down. A vote was taken on both motions and the Board decided to turn down the petitioners.

Graham asked Karpel how and what had been done on the student survey mentioned at an earlier meeting. Karpel responded that at the time he requested to be allowed to conduct a student survey he had not realized that CUSA already had data available that would more or less answer what he was going to ask. Therefore, Karpel stated that he would no longer hold the committee responsible for research on the survey.

Graham asked Witham how the 711 research was going. Witham told him that the research was done and had been verbally transmitted to Madigan. Madigan explained that no conclusions had been reached at the University Counsel's office as yet, but that the matter would be further considered.

Graham asked Witham how things were progressing on the information booklets for the student. Witham mentioned that things were going well, but nothing had gone to print yet. As far as the new Small Claims booklet went, there were some problems involved as the Judge presiding over such matters has been changing the procedures regularly in order to find something that would speed up the processing of small claims.

Witham requested that Gina and he be allowed funds for attending three IICLE conferences between now and January 1, 1980. Graham suggested that the Board approve the funds. A vote was taken and the Board approved the funds.

Graham announced that an executive session of the Board would now meet and the SLS staff was excused. The next meeting of the Board was set for Wednesday, November 14 at noon.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting on September 12, 1979

The following were present: Sarah Alley, Michael Graham, Gina Haasis, Joe Kaminski, Rick Karpel, Dan Madden, Tim Madigan, Jan McCurley, Paul Monson, John Scouffas, Rick Witham, Sandy Zimmerman.

Scouffas mentioned that the budget the Board received at the previous meeting did not include the summer allotment of \$10,000 to SLS. This was done to protect the money for this year.

Discussion followed regarding the Petition that Witham had circulated. Several of the members had questions regarding it, which Witham was able to answer to their satisfaction. The Petition was unanimously approved.

Graham felt that discussion should follow regarding the annual report requested from SIS and the Advisory Board. He also wished to discuss the letter of resignation that Jim Kuehl sent (copies were made available to the Board members). Graham objected to the third paragraph in Kuehl's letter regarding the propriety of SLS agency which has interests adverse to those of students. Discussion followed throughout the meeting. Graham suggested that Witham contact the Bar Association to get their reaction to Kuehl's letter. Witham thought that things should be left as is. Graham suggested that the Board write a letter to Kuehl thanking him for serving on the Board. Madigan thinks that SLS should send something to the Board of Trustees dealing with Kuehl's inflammatory statement. He also thought that an objection to that statement be included in the annual report. After general discussion ensued, it was agreed that Witham would not be responsible for doing that and that Graham would take care of it.

Graham mentioned that the summary of the statistics included in the annual report should add up. He also objected to the section in the report by SLS on S.O.R.F. He and several others think that the wording was unclear and made SLS seem to be dependent on S.O.R.F. Witham agreed that a change in wording would be appropriate.

Graham asked that a list of the Board members addresses and phone numbers be sent to him and other members of the Board.

Monson asked if Witham had obtained an estimate on the wall to be built in the SLS office. Witham said that an estimate would be forthcoming in the following weeks.

Karpel wanted to know if the Board would support a survey from the students on what services they expect from SLS and whether or not they (the students) were aware of the limitations of SLS. Witham mentioned that an article explaining some of these things would be sent out soon. Discussion followed about what questions to ask and how far SIS was responsible for it. It was recommended that CUSA be responsible and that a subcommittee be set up to draft a questionnaire to be presented at the next Board meeting. The subcommittee consists of the following volunteers: Sarah Alley, Rick Karpel, Sandy Zimmerman.

Witham asked if he could possibly provide the Board with an estimate for carpeting the SLS office when he presents the estimate for building the wall. The Board agreed.

A discussion regarding 711 was brought up. Madigan feels that if SIS is really interested, then a reasonable case could be made for the proposition that SIS is a state agency.

The next Board meeting was set for Wednesday, October 17 at noon. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 P.M.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICES
Budget Summary

*Est. Forward Fiscal 78-79

	Attorney's Salary	Office Manager's Salary	Books	Supplies	Office Equipment	Advertising	Printing	Unappropriated	Total Expense	Total Balance
Funds Budgeted	\$5852.82*	\$4786.53*	\$1809.78*	\$825.97*	(236.68)*	\$196.06*	\$301.70*	\$9765.65*		\$23301.8*
July Expenses	-0-	613.76	3203.05	12.80	5.94	-0-	-0-	35.74	3871.29	
Aug. Expenses	3125.00	1503.98	207.36	202.91	186.92	-0-	-0-	138.76	5491.77	
Sept. Expenses										
Oct. Expenses										
Nov. Expenses										
Dec. Expenses										
Jan. Expenses										
Feb. Expenses										
Mar. Expenses										
April Expenses										
May Expenses										
June Expenses										
Total Expenses	3125.00	2117.74	3410.41	215.71	192.23	-0-	-0-	174.50	9363.06	
Balance	2727.82	2668.79	(1600.62)	610.26	(428.91)	196.06	301.70	9591.15		13938.77
Pending Expenses	1567.50	-0-	1176.50	50.10	434.01	-0-	-0-	165.00	1616.11	
Pending Balance	1165.32	2668.79	(2977.12)	552.16	(882.92)	196.06	301.70	9430.15		10322.66

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE
 Pending Summary of Expenses
 August 1979

<u>Budget Category/ Expense</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Category Subtotal</u>	<u>Monthly Total</u>
<u>Attorney's Salary</u>			
Richard Witham Sept. 1979	1562.50	1562.50	
<u>Office Manager's Salary</u>			
None	-0-	-0-	
<u>Books</u>			
West's Ill Digest	1369.50		
Ill Supreme Court Rules	7.00	1376.50	
<u>Supplies</u>			
Postage	51.50		
Paper	6.60	58.10	
<u>Office Equipment</u>			
Pocket Secretary and Microcassettes	248.31		
3 Drawer Legal File 40"	144.70		
Lanier Secretary Recorder	61.00	454.01	
<u>Advertising</u>			
None	-0-	-0-	
<u>Printing</u>			
None	-0-	-0-	
<u>Inappropriated</u>			
Reg. Fee LLCLC Conference	130.00		
Tuition Law for Legal Secretary	35.00	165.00	3616.11

Student Legal Service
 Monthly Summary Of Expenses
 AUGUST 1979

Budget Category/Expense	Amount	Monthly Subtotal	Monthly Total
<u>Attorney's Salary</u>			
Richard Witham July 1-31	1562.50		
Richard Witham August 1-31	1562.50	3125.00	
<u>Secretary's Salary</u>			
Regina Haasis	583.34		
Janice McCurley	920.64	1503.98	
<u>Books</u>			
Ill Trial 79 Supp	12.86		
Handling Consumer Credit Cases	39.50		
Manual of Criminal Forms	70.00		
Successful Tech. for Criminal Trials	45.00		
Champaign News Gazette	40.00	207.36	
<u>Supplies</u>			
Pencils	2.80		
Envelopes	3.46		
Ballpoint Pens	3.65		
Bond Paper	8.88		
Calendar	4.00		
6 File Boxes	14.04		
Telephone Service Charge	84.15		
Telephone Tolls	50.23		
IBM Copies	31.70	202.91	
<u>Office Equipment</u>			
File Cabinet	130.75		
Bookcase 36x9x42	56.17	186.92	
<u>Advertising</u>			
None	-0-	-0-	
<u>Printing</u>			
None	-0-	-0-	
<u>Unappropriated</u>			
Workmans Compensation	13.39		
Notary Publice Commission	13.44		
Notary Seal	8.93		
IBM Machine Repair	58.00		
Reg. Fee with Attorney Disciplinary Comm.	50.00	138.76	5491.77

MEETINGS ATTORNEYS SPOKE AT

October 11, 1979	Blaisdell Residence Hall
October 26, 1979	Women in Politics
October 28, 1979	Saunders Hall
December 3, 1979	Illini Union Board's - Noon Forum
January 18, 1980	International Student's Orientation
February 11, 1980	Busey-Evans Hall (Lounge)
February 11, 1980	Allen Hall
February 12, 1980	Hopkins Hall
February 12, 1980	Scott Hall
February 12, 1980	Tax Seminar
February 13, 1980	Pre-Law Club
February 14, 1980	Illinois Street Residence Hall
February 19, 1980	Garner Hall
February 21, 1980	Evans Hall (3rd Floor)
February 26, 1980	Evans Hall (4th Floor)
February 27, 1980	Lincoln Avenue Residence Hall
March 12, 1980	Oglesby Residence Hall (Students)
March 12, 1980	Oglesby Residence Hall (Staff)
March 18, 1980	Snyder Hall
May 27, 1980	Student Orientation at F.A.R.
June 4, 1980	International Student's Orientation

Tax Returns

The Student Legal Service Plan provides that the Service shall not engage in the preparation of tax returns, but may give students general advice on individual tax problems. The following information should be a helpful start.

It's important to decide first if you even need to file a tax return. While there are special rules that may apply under certain circumstances (which would not generally be applicable to most students), the determination of whether you need to file is generally based on the total amount of your income during the year and your filing status. You must file a Federal Tax Return, even if you have determined that you owe no tax, if you are:

1. Single (legally separated, divorced, or living apart from your spouse for the entire year with a dependent child), under 65, and your income for the year was at least \$3,300.
2. Eligible to be claimed as a dependent on your parent's income tax return, and had an earned income of \$1,000 or more.
3. Married and filing a joint return, and were living with your spouse at the end of 1979 with your income for the year at least \$5,400.
4. Married, filing separately or married, but not living with your spouse at the end of 1979, and your income for the year was at least \$1,000.
5. Self-employed and your net earnings from self-employment were at least \$400.

Even if you are not required to file a federal income tax return, it may well be in your best interests to do so if taxes were withheld from your pay during 1979. You must file the federal return to receive a refund of taxes paid. You are entitled to a refund even if you can be claimed as a dependent by your parents or spouse.

You may also wish to file a return if you are eligible for the Earned Income Credit. This refundable credit is available to certain persons with dependent children. To qualify, your income for the year must be less than \$10,000.

If you are required to file a federal tax return and were either a full or part-time resident of Illinois during 1979, you must additionally file a return with the State of Illinois if your income in 1979 was more than \$1,000 times the number of exemptions allowed for federal tax purposes. As in the case of federal returns, you may wish to file a state tax return even if you are not required to do so. If Illinois income tax has been withheld during the year and you seek a refund, you must file the state return.

The two most commonly used forms for individual federal income tax returns are Form 1040A and Form 1040. Most taxpayers may choose either form. Although there are many persons who for a variety of reasons are unable to use Form 1040A, it is the one most students would presumably file and the easier one to fill out.

Most of the basic state and federal forms required are available at the Student Legal Service office. Instructions for preparing your tax returns are also available.

Additional forms and information are available at the Internal Revenue Service office, 201 W. Springfield Avenue, Champaign. Specific questions may be answered directly by the IRS with their toll-free Taxpayer Information Line, 800-252-2921.

Richard T. Witham
Attorney at Law
Student Legal Service
268 Illini Union
3-9053

the daily illini

wednesday, march 5, 1980

Tenant Act

The Illinois Mobile Landlord and Tenant Act became law in the State of Illinois on January 1, 1980. It sets forth rules governing park owner's and tenant's rights and responsibilities regarding leases and maintenance of rental lots and units. The law applies to any mobile home park containing five or more mobile homes.

Under the Act both the tenant and the park owner have certain duties. The tenant is required generally to keep the lot and home in clean condition and free of debris, junk cars and abandoned appliances and furniture. He/she must exercise reasonable care for the property of the park owner and not disturb or interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of the premises by others. The mobile home park owner is under an affirmative duty to comply with all city, county, or state codes, statutes, or ordinances governing the operation of mobile home parks and with all the provisions of the lease. His/her failure to do so gives the tenant grounds for terminating the lease.

The Act requires that a park owner offer to each tenant a written lease for a term of not less than 12 months. The lease must contain the owner's agreement:

- to keep common areas of the park free of noxious weed growth
- to maintain all utilities and sewage lines and connections in good working order
- to give all tenants the name, address and home number of the park custodian.

In addition, the lease must list all services and facilities to be provided by the owner, disclose the name(s) and address(es) of the real owner(s) of the park and identify the specific lot area to be leased by the tenant. The lease must also include an option of automatic renewal. If either party does not wish the lease to automatically renew, they must notify the other in writing at least 30 days prior to the expiration of the lease.

The law specifically covers the issue of damage deposits. The amount of security deposit required by the owner cannot exceed an amount equal to one month's rent. The deposit must be returned in full within 15 days after termination of the lease or, if there are damages to be deducted from the deposit, the landlord must within 15 days of termination provide the tenant with an itemized statement listing damage and the estimated cost of repair. The tenant's failure to object to the listed damages within 15 days will be considered an agreement by the tenant that the charges are justified. Any objections should be made in writing. The owner's failure to provide such a statement within the 15 day period is considered an agreement that no charges will be made for damages.

The new law also provides grounds and procedures for evictions. A tenant can be evicted for failure to pay rent when due or for violation of a lease provision, including any reasonable and non-discriminatory rules or regulations of the park. The owner must give at least 5 days notice of intention to evict for non-payment of rent and 24 hours notice of intention to evict for violation of the lease. The tenant is allowed to terminate the lease under certain circumstances where the owner has failed to comply with the statute, but such action should normally not be taken until you have had a chance to discuss with legal counsel the advisability of terminating the lease.

Richard T. Witham, Attorney
Student Legal Service
268 Illini Union
3-9053

Security deposit interest case won by local tenants

by Maureen Cahill
staff writer

Landlords of 25 or more rental units are required to pay interest on security deposits regardless of whether the apartments are all in one building or in 25 separate buildings, according to a court decision handed down last week.

The decision, written by Circuit Court Associate Judge John R. DeLaMar, was the result of a suit by two former Champaign renters. The renters claimed that their landlord, James O'Malley, kept their security deposit from 1977 to 1979 without paying them any interest as required by the state Security Deposit Act.

The law, enacted in 1977, requires "a lessor of residential real property, containing 25 or more units," to pay 5 percent interest on all security deposits held for six months or more. If the landlord fails to do so, he or she is liable for an amount

Landlords and tenants in Urbana can collect from each other for the cost of repairing building code violations. Story on page 5.

equal to the security deposit, plus court and attorney fees.

O'Malley, however, contended that although he held four separate apartment buildings at 313 E. Green St., Champaign, no single building held 25 rental units. He claimed he should therefore be exempt from the law.

In finding in favor of the renters, DeLaMar stated the obvious intent of the act is "avoid the situation in which a tenant is compelled to forego the use of his or her money for a substantial period of time while being forced to make an interest loan of that capital to the landlord. The statute appears to be a legislative recognition of the inferior

bargaining position of the tenant...."

He added that the distinction O'Malley urged would be inconsistent with the intent of the statute. "The landlord who builds four buildings containing eight apartments each would seem as able, if not more able, to comply with the requirements of (the act) as one who owns a single building with 25 units.

"For example, under the facts of this case the defendant, assuming full occupancy, would hold approximately \$6,000 in deposits at any given time. It is difficult to believe that he is not using this sum to generate income in some manner."

O'Malley also contended that he should not be subject to the double damages penalty because he did not "willfully" refuse to refund the interest on the deposits because the law had never been interpreted so as to apply to him.

However, DeLaMar said the refusal itself was enough to qualify for the penalty; it did not have to be "wanton or negligent."

O'Malley said he hasn't made a decision yet whether he will appeal the circuit court ruling or not. He added that he didn't pay interest on any other security deposits he returned in the fall but that he hasn't heard any other complaints yet.

Rick Witham, who handled the case through Student Legal Service, said this case was the first in Champaign County to question the Security Deposit Act.

"The most important impact of the case is that the landlords in town are now or will become aware of the opinion and will follow the statute and pay interest on security deposits," Witham said.

He added that O'Malley is generally regarded as a pretty good landlord, but "he just believed the statute didn't apply to him."

O'Malley will have 30 days to appeal the decision.

the daily illini

saturday, march 8, 1980

C-U Tenant Union, Legal Service can solve problems that may arise

by Linda Bergstrom

The roof leaks, the promised carpet hasn't arrived and the place is a mess. Many students often find themselves in such situations when they rent an apartment. But help is available.

The Champaign-Urbana Tenant Union and the Student Legal Service help students realize their options and rights in dealing with various tenant and housing problems. Both organizations emphasize the fact that students do have rights.

"We want to make people aware of their rights and responsibilities under the law," said Richard Witham, attorney for the Legal Service. "Our purpose is to expand student's awareness so they can become informed consumers."

"I think it's important for tenants to understand that they are consumers," said Terry Cosgrove, employee of the Tenant Union. "In fact, they are the largest consumer group."

The Tenant Union has between 6,000 and 8,000 students come in their Illini Union office each year for councilation and advice. The Legal Service, also located in the Illini Union, sees approximately 600 people per year.

"We try to help them avoid problems before they start," Cosgrove said.

Cosgrove said their clientele is very seasonal. In the spring, they provide information about renting apartments and landlords, while in the fall they deal with retrieving student's damage deposits from the previous year.

Although some students will inevitably run into problems when dealing with landlords and contracts, the key is to be informed. There are precautions that can be taken before signing the dotted line.

"They (students) should be aware of

what they are entering into," Witham said. "It's not a joke. It's a legal document."

As simple as it may seem, the most important thing to do before signing a lease is to read it.

"People should check things out before they commit themselves to a legal document that is binding," Witham said. After signing the lease, the student is obligated to the terms of the agreement.

A careful analysis may turn up things that the tenants really don't want. "Be completely aware of what's in a lease before signing it and get all the unfair clauses out of a lease," Cosgrove said.

Watch out for oral agreements because in most cases, it's not legally binding, Witham said. Oral agreements don't have to be honored if a written document exists.

"Any agreements have to be contained within that lease," Witham said. "If they are going to honor it, they shouldn't be opposed to putting it in writing."

A tenant who is knowledgeable will often gain more respect with his landlord. "The landlord will take them more seriously if they know what they are doing," Cosgrove said.

Another precaution for renters should include talking to the most knowledgeable source available—the previous renters. "Talk to renters and neighbors," Cosgrove said. "Feel completely free to test things out and check the place out."

If problems do occur, and they often do, action should be taken. "If they haven't contacted the landlord, we advise them to contact the landlord," Cosgrove said. "I wouldn't blame a landlord who hasn't been talked to."

Students must keep a level head to be effective. "Reasonableness and common sense is first and foremost," Witham said.

Legal action is a last resort. "If you can

work problems out short of litigation, that's the best solution," Witham said.

The Legal Service represents about 60 cases in court each year. "Overall, we have been very successful in aiding people to enforce their rights under the law," he said.

The Tenant Union distributes a handbook to cover all various aspects of renting. The Legal Service also has pamphlets available to students.

Students are in a disadvantaged position as tenants because they don't know the apartment market that well. "There's such a shortage of housing and they have to find someplace to live," Cosgrove said. "It's a landlord's market."

Such an arrangement often makes students obvious victims for landlord and apartment problems. "Any community that has a population that, by nature, is transitory fosters a certain number of problems that don't exist in other established communities," Witham said.

Landlords know that most students leave town and some may use this to their advantage. "It's very difficult for people to come back and collect their damage deposits," Cosgrove said.

However, Witham said he thinks most landlords in Champaign and Urbana are basically honest. "The vast majority of landlords are running honest businesses," he said. "There are a handful of landlords in town who have a lot of problems."

But it is often the students, not the landlords, who are the basis of the problems. "You would have to say the same about students," Witham said. "There are a handful of students who aren't good tenants."

Cooperation between landlords and tenants when renting apartments is essential. But it never hurts to be careful, according to Witham. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."



STUDENT AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Volume 17, No. 1

October, 1979

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE: WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW

With the new academic year in full swing, many students can expect to encounter situations for which legal assistance may be required. The Student Legal Service, headquartered in 268 Illini Union, is here to help University of Illinois students resolve legal problems.

The Student Legal Service is funded by your \$3.00 student activity fee (SORF), which was one of the fees you paid when you registered. For this reason, the Student Legal Service is available only to registered University of Illinois students. The fee you paid was mandatory, although refunds were offered earlier in the semester. Those students who elected to collect the \$3.00 SORF refund are ineligible to receive any assistance whatsoever from the Student Legal Service. Legal advice and counseling are offered to all students who did not seek the SORF refund.

How to use the service

In order to make most efficient use of the Student Legal Service, keep these procedures in mind.

First, do not attempt to solicit legal advice over the telephone, as no business can be conducted with an unknown party. If you need assistance, go to the office in person and concerning your own situation. The Student Legal Service cannot advise you on a third party's problem. Both of these procedures involve professional legal ethics aimed toward the protection of your privacy.

Because of the formidable volume of clients, all advice is given by appointment only, and appointments cannot be made over the phone. At the time you come to the office to make an appointment, you will be asked to provide a brief description of your legal problem or question. Your first appointment for counseling or advice will usually be with a senior law student who will examine your written description prior to the meeting. He or she can then complete any necessary research and consult with one of the Students' Attorneys about the advice to be given to you. The law student counselors work under the close supervision of the Students' Attorneys. They have received special training in the particular areas of the law encountered most frequently in the

office. The Student Legal Service accepts full responsibility for all information given clients by its counselors.

If your problem is not resolved in the first conference, a second appointment will be arranged with your counselor or with a Students' Attorney for further assistance. The Student Legal Service provides courtroom representation on most legal matters encountered by students, including housing, family, consumer, traffic, auto accident or insurance problems, as well as some criminal matters. The Student Legal Service cannot represent one student against another, nor will it represent students in matters involving real estate, wills, business ventures or most personal bodily injury.

The Student Legal Service also offers law-related educational services to all University students through seminars, workshops and publications.

Who is eligible

Priority must be given to remedial matters for which a student would be financially unable to retain a private attorney. Students eligible for courtroom representation include those who are receiving any type of need-based financial aid through the University, or those whose financial resources place them within the "Modest But Adequate" budget established by the University. Naturally, this does not exclude a great number of students, and there is an appeal procedure available if you do not qualify. In addition, all students who have not received the SORF refund are eligible for courtroom representation in housing matters.

The Urbana-Champaign campus is fortunate to have the Student Legal Service at its disposal, so do use it, but use it intelligently. When a problem arises, attempt to exhaust all the remedies available to you before you decide to "sue 'em". Think about whether or not your problem is a matter for legal recourse. Often, other University or social service agencies are more appropriate for your needs. And think ahead—don't wait until the day before you are to appear in court to contact the Student Legal Service.

The wheels of the law turn slowly, but they are here to serve you, and so is the Student Legal Service.

the daily illini

tuesday, february 26, 1980
wednesday, february 13, 1980

friday, september 26, 1979

UIUC Official Notice

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE

—268 Illini Union— —333-9053—

HERE TO HELP UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS STUDENTS RESOLVE LEGAL PROBLEMS

WHO IS ELIGIBLE

The Student Legal Service is funded by your \$3.00 Student Organization Resource Fee (S.O.R.F.). Only students who do not receive a refund of the S.O.R.F. fee qualify for direct assistance from Student Legal Service.

Legal advice and counseling are offered to all students not seeking a S.O.R.F. refund. Courtroom representation is provided in matters for which a student would be financially unable to retain a private attorney. Students eligible for courtroom representation include those who are receiving any type of need-based financial aid through the University, or those whose financial resources place them within the "Modest But Adequate Budget" established by the University. In addition, all students who have not received a S.O.R.F. refund are eligible for courtroom representation in housing matters.

SERVICES PROVIDED

The Student Legal Service provides legal assistance and courtroom representation in most legal matters encountered by students, including housing, family, consumer, traffic, auto accident or insurance problems, and some criminal matters. Student Legal Service cannot represent students in matters involving real estate, wills, business ventures or most personal bodily injuries, nor can it represent one student against another.

The Students' Attorneys also offer law-related educational services to all University students through seminars, workshops and publications.

HOW TO USE THE SERVICE

If you need legal assistance, go to 268 Illini Union **in person** to set up an appointment. No advice can be given over the telephone.

Remember, Student Legal Service is here to serve you - Monday through Friday 9:00-noon, 1:00-5:00 P.M. in Room 268 of the Illini Union.

tuesday, february 12, 1980

the daily illini

friday, february 8, 1980

UIUC Official Notice

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE

ANNOUNCES:

**“PREPARATION OF YOUR
INCOME TAX RETURNS”**

A WORKSHOP/SEMINAR

Tuesday, February 12, 1980

8:00 pm

Room 209 Illini Union (North side)

The attorneys from SLS will take you step-by-step through the preparation of both Federal and Illinois returns. They will also be available to answer any particular questions you may have. All necessary filing forms and instructions will be available.

ALL U. of I. students welcome.

COURT APPEARANCES

September 1, 1979 - July 31, 1980

SEPTEMBER, 1979

12 (Witham)

OCTOBER, 1979

18 (Witham)

NOVEMBER, 1979

5 (Haasis, sworn in
November 5)

8 (Witham)

DECEMBER, 1979

9 (Haasis)

8 (Witham)

JANUARY, 1980

15 (Haasis)

15 (Witham)

FEBRUARY, 1980

14 (Haasis)

19 (Witham)

MARCH, 1980

28 (Haasis)

15 (Witham)

APRIL, 1980

11 (Haasis)

21 (Witham)

MAY, 1980

32 (Haasis)

17 (Witham)

JUNE, 1980

10 (Haasis)

16 (Witham)

JULY, 1980

8 (Haasis)

11 (Witham)

TOTAL

132 (Haasis) - 9 month period

160 (Witham) - 11 month period