



1 N Charles St, Ste 200  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
(410) 625-9409  
fax (410) 625-9423  
www.publicjustice.org

John Nethercut  
Executive Director

Debra Gardner  
Legal Director

**ATTORNEYS**

Monisha Cherayil  
Sally Dworak-Fisher  
Sulma Guzman  
Matthew Hill  
Anthony May  
John Pollock  
Renuka Rege  
Russell R. Reno, Jr.  
Camilla Roberson  
David Rodwin  
Zafar S. Shah

**PARALEGALS**

Levern Blackmon  
Certified Paralegal

Jonathan Colarelli  
Ralikh Hayes  
Hannah Walsh

Brenda Midkiff  
Director of Administration

Jennifer Pelton, CFRE  
Development Director

Erin Brock  
Development Manager

Rebecca Reynolds  
Development Associate

Testimony of John Pollock  
Coordinator, National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel  
In Support of SB 501 and SB 502  
Senate Committee on Judiciary  
March 2, 2017

Chair Prozanski and Members of the Committee:

I am writing to express support for Oregon SB 501 and 502, which would require the appointment of counsel in public and private guardianship proceedings. I am a Staff Attorney with the Public Justice Center who serves as the Coordinator of the National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel. The NCCRC is comprised of nearly 300 participants in 38 different states who work to advance the right to counsel in civil cases implicating basic human needs. Guardianship proceedings undeniably implicate numerous basic human needs, including physical liberty and bodily integrity, and as such are deserving of procedural due process protection.

As noted in the testimony by Oregon Public Guardian Travis Wall, “In most states, appointment of counsel for respondents is mandatory or assured.” Indeed, at present, 41 states guarantee appointed counsel to respondents in guardianship cases, as indicated on our website’s interactive map displaying the status of the right to counsel in all 50 states (<http://www.civilrighttocounsel.org/map>). This approach is justified for a number of reasons. First, counsel can ensure that any objections of the respondent are fully heard by the court, particularly where such objections relate to the respondent’s family members and as such may be difficult for the respondent herself to air in open court. Second, even where the ward is incapable of effectively communicating with counsel, counsel can still act to protect the ward’s legal interests by: a) ensuring that the prospective guardian has no conflicts of interest; and b) as noted by the ACLU of Oregon, ensuring that the scope of the guardianship is no broader than necessary. Third, the Uniform Probate Code and the Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act both call for the appointment of counsel either upon request or in any case where the respondent is unrepresented.

While SB 501 and 502 provide several ways for the right to appointed counsel to be triggered besides a request by the respondent, our experience suggests that in order to effectuate the respondent’s ability to make such a request, the petition served on the respondent should specify that the respondent has the right to: a) object to the petition, and that such objection will trigger a mandatory hearing with appointment of counsel; and b) appointment of counsel upon request, regardless of whether the respondent objects to the petition.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on these important bills.

Sincerely,

John Pollock  
Coordinator, National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel