

# The Domino Effect

## *Judicial Control of Legal Services*



A Report to the  
California Supreme Court  
on the Code of Judicial Ethics

### **Part Two: Exhibits**

*Trilogy on Legal Services*

Submitted by:





**Part Two** of the Trilogy on Legal Services focuses on policy statements and position papers published by national legal and judicial organizations opposing the practice of judges running legal services programs – especially when they involve attorneys who will be appearing before judicial officers of the court that is managing and directing the program. These policies and papers are premised on the need for legal services programs to have independence – not to be influenced by the judiciary to any greater extent than judges are allowed to influence privately-retained attorneys. Problems with court-run legal services programs – such as the PVP program in Los Angeles – include favoritism, conflicts of interest, a desire by attorneys to please bench officers, and the lack of judicial impartiality.

---

## Contents

<a href="#">Exhibit 1</a>	ABA’s Basic Principles for civil right to counsel – 2010 Website of National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel	1
<a href="#">Exhibit 2</a>	Resolution and Report to the House of Delegates – 2006 Website of the American Bar Association	6
<a href="#">Exhibit 3</a>	Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System – 2002 Website of the American Bar Association	8
<a href="#">Exhibit 4</a>	The Judicial Underpinnings of the ABA Ten Principles – 2011 Website of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association	11
<a href="#">Exhibit 5</a>	Guidelines for Involuntary Civil Commitment – 1986 Report of the National Center for State Courts	14
<a href="#">Exhibit 6</a>	Guidelines on Indigent Defense Services Delivery Systems – 2006 The State Bar of California	21
<a href="#">Exhibit 7</a>	Standards Relating to Counsel for Private Parties – 1980 Institute of Judicial Administration – American Bar Association	30
<a href="#">Exhibit 8</a>	Providing Educational Presentations at Specialty Bar Associations Formal Opinion 2018-012: Committee on Judicial Ethics Opinions	34