

Vol. 1

April 2026

No. 2

JOURNAL OF PARALEGAL EDUCATION AND PRACTICE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PARALEGAL EDUCATION

OUTCOMES OF NONLAWYER LEGAL PRACTITIONER MODELS: FOCUS ON ARIZONA

Toni Marsh

The access to justice crisis affects low- and middle-income Americans; nonlawyer licensing models in which states authorize limited legal practice by nonlawyers as a solution. Focusing on Arizona's Legal Paraprofessional program, the most expansive in the nation, the article analyzes 2024 survey data showing high client satisfaction, low costs, and minimal complaints. It concludes that well-regulated nonlawyer models can expand access, improve efficiency, and maintain quality, offering a scalable and effective approach to closing the justice gap.

Toni Marsh is a lawyer, the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs at George Washington University in Washington DC, and a Professor of Paralegal Studies and Constitutional Law. She founded the GW Paralegal Studies program and directed it for 20 years before moving on to her current position. She has extensively studied paralegal models in Tanzania, Ecuador, and the American Indian Tribal Nations and designed the standard paralegal curriculum for the nation of Tanzania.

INTRODUCTION

The United States is suffering from an access to justice crisis that affects nearly all Americans. To alleviate the crisis, states are turning to nonlawyer licensing models that allow nonlawyers to deliver defined legal services directly to the public in specified areas. States use rule changes, statutes, and waivers to avoid violating unauthorized practice of law mandates.

Arizona has the furthest-reaching model, allowing its nonlawyer professionals to practice in a wide range of areas and provide robust legal services, including litigating in court.

Despite initial misgivings and resistance from the legal community, the Arizona program has enjoyed tremendous success, with clients expressing near complete satisfaction with the service and fees, and an extremely low rate of complaints, all of which were dismissed.

This article examines the access to justice crisis, nonlawyer models, and delves into Arizona's experience, based on a 2024 survey conducted by the Arizona Supreme Court and disseminated to clients, attorneys, judicial officers, and Arizona Legal Paraprofessionals (LPs).

ACCESS TO JUSTICE CRISIS IN THE US AFFECTS MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS

Traditionally, studies have focused on the unmet legal needs of low-income Americans, who are indeed the most vulnerable. But the problem affects indigent and middle-income Americans, as well as Americans of all ages, races, and ethnicities; rural, suburban, and urban dwellers.¹ The crisis touches on all manner of civil actions including housing, domestic relations, violence, bankruptcy, business, and probate.²

Most Americans — 66% — experienced a legal problem in the four years covered by a comprehensive national study. Fewer than half of those problems — 49% — were completely resolved.³ The most frequently occurring legal problems were consumer disputes, personal injury and personal property damage, neighbor disputes, work and employment, and crime. The areas with the most serious consequences were domestic violence and abuse, family problems, land problems, work and employment, and problems with the police.⁴

There are really two access to justice crises: one for indigent Americans and one for middle-income Americans. While indigent Americans experience a great range of legal problems with higher stakes than middle-income Americans, they also have access to a greater range of resources.

Indigent Americans have a constitutional right to counsel in criminal actions, but no such right in civil actions. They have little or no money to pay legal fees, and they experience serious legal problems in high stakes areas such as housing, where an unaddressed legal issue can mean homelessness; family law, where an unaddressed issue can mean lost children or broken families; or debt collection, where an unrepresented litigant can end up crippling debts, fees, and penalties, and a permanently damaged credit rating.

Legal aid, pro bono, and low bono services are available, but they don't have the capacity to fully address the number and range of legal problems in the community.

Middle-income Americans — defined as those who are at or a certain percentage above the federal poverty level — have a wide range of legal problems, many of which are high stakes, but access to even fewer resources.⁵ They don't qualify for legal aid, pro bono, or low bono services and can ill afford the soaring legal fees that most lawyers command. Those who live in rural areas or underserved suburban and urban areas can't access lawyers at any price — the lawyers simply aren't there.⁶

THE IMPACT OF INADEQUATE ACCESS TO JUSTICE

UNREPRESENTED LITIGANTS

Of the 49% of legal problems that *are* resolved, 17% are reported to have been resolved unfairly or very unfairly. Americans spent anywhere from 29 days for traffic violations to 183 days for domestic violence cases to resolve their issues.⁷

The effects of unmet or poorly met legal needs on those who experience them are legion: negative emotions, negative impact on mental health, loss of money, negative impact on financial well-being, loss of time, debt, negative impact on physical health, harm to family relationships, limited ability to work, loss of job, medical bills, harm to relationships within community, physical injury, and violence.⁸

Outcomes are similarly dire for unrepresented litigants. In federal civil proceedings from 1998 - 2017, final judgments in cases where both parties are represented are about 50% for plaintiffs and 50% for defendants. Unrepresented plaintiffs lose 96% of the time, while unrepresented defendants prevail about 14% of the time.⁹

EFFECT OF UNREPRESENTED LITIGANTS ON THE COURTS

Unrepresented litigants slow court proceedings, resulting in longer waiting times for everyone. When an unrepresented litigant attempts to participate in court proceedings, they often get things wrong: they draft documents incorrectly, bring in irrelevant or inadmissible evidence, and argue extraneous issues. Court personnel spend time correcting errors and advising unrepresented litigants, while trying not to cross ethical lines. Every minute a court spends advising or correcting an unrepresented litigant is a minute of delay.

Judges have long advocated for increasing access to justice because of the problems they experience in their courts. As early as 2001, the Conference of Chief Justices recognized that “this promise of equal justice under law is not realized for individuals and families who have no meaningful access to the justice system” and called for “individual members in their respective states to establish partnerships with state and local bar organizations, legal service providers, and others to...[e]xpand the types of assistance available to self-represented litigants, including exploring the role of non-attorneys.”¹⁰

They repeated this call at least eight times.¹¹ Most recently, in July 2025 the Conference of Chief Justices passed Resolution 1-2025, in which they acknowledge that “the promise of equal access to justice is not realized for the vast majority of Americans” and “encourage their members to examine whether authorized justice practitioners could be beneficial to expand access to legal representation and to take appropriate steps to explore and discuss such possibilities.”¹²

STATES ARE ADDRESSING THE CRISIS THROUGH NONLAWYER LICENSING MODELS¹³

States have tried multiple solutions within current law: encouraging lawyers to provide more pro bono services¹⁴, expanding law school clinics¹⁵, increasing funding for legal aid¹⁶, debt forgiveness

for lawyers in public service in general and in underserved rural communities¹⁷ (which was paused for 2025, but is anticipated to resume in 2026¹⁸), encouraging rural regions to leverage technology, pursue innovative delivery models, and create “rural defense units” to ride circuit through rural areas to deliver legal services¹⁹.

All these proposals dig deeper into the lawyer well to pull more resources. But still the crisis persists. If there are not enough lawyers and legal aid services to meet the unmet needs, another approach is to authorize nonlawyers to provide prescribed legal services in defined areas of the law – to dig wider as well as deeper.

UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW (UPL) IS PROHIBITED

Allowing nonlawyers to provide legal services is tricky. The general rule is that only lawyers may practice law. Nonlawyers who practice law are subject to discipline ranging from permanent injunction to ancillary equitable remedies to afford complete relief, including monetary relief in the form of disgorgement, restitution, or reimbursement of those harmed by the conduct.²⁰

Defining what it means to practice law can be difficult. Many jurisdictions define it by listing the prohibited tasks. For example, preparing legal documents, preparing or expressing a legal opinion, or giving legal advice; appearing or acting as an attorney in any tribunal; preparing a claim, demand, or pleading; or providing advice or counsel as to how an activity might be done, or whether it was done, in accordance with applicable law.²¹ Others define it self-referentially, for example, by defining practicing law as “giving legal advice” without defining legal advice.²²

A good working definition of practicing law is to apply general knowledge to specific principles or facts, or to use independent judgment to alter the legal position of a lay person.

There are two kinds of proscriptions against unauthorized practice of law: one set addresses lawyers practicing law in a jurisdiction in which they are not licensed or after they have been disbarred.²³

The second category focuses on those who are not and never have been attorneys. NALA, a national paralegal professional association, forbids paralegals to “perform any of the duties that attorneys only may perform [or] take any actions that attorneys may not take.”²⁴ Canon 3 reiterates this dictate: “A paralegal must not: (a) engage in, encourage, or contribute to any act which could constitute the unauthorized practice of law,” and explains what constitutes the practice of law: “(b) establish attorney-client relationships, set fees, give legal opinions or advice, or represent a client before a court or agency unless so authorized by that court or agency.”²⁵

The National Federation of Paralegal Associations, another national paralegal professional association, mandates that a “paralegal shall not engage in the unauthorized practice of law,” and defines the practice of law as “giving legal advice, accepting cases, setting fees, planning strategy, making legal decisions, taking depositions, and appearing in court.”²⁶

In Washington D.C., D.C. Court Rule 49 mandates that unless they are a D.C. Bar member or have been otherwise permitted by its exceptions (which apply to out-of-state attorneys, federal

attorneys, administrative hearings, and in-house counsel), “[n]o person may practice law in the District of Columbia or hold out as authorized to do so.”²⁷ The rule defines practicing law as “provid[ing] legal services for or on behalf of another person within a client relationship of trust or reliance,”²⁸ such as preparing any legal document, expressing a legal opinion of giving legal advice, and appearing or acting as an attorney in any tribunal.”²⁹

These rules and others throughout the nation prohibit anyone but attorneys from providing the essential elements of legal practice: creating, signing, and filing legal documents; providing legal advice; and appearing in court on behalf of clients.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATING UPL RULES

The penalties for engaging in the unauthorized practice of law range from cease-and-desist orders to permanent injunctions and monetary fines or imprisonment.³⁰ A.B.A. professional ethics rules hold lawyers responsible for the actions of the lawyers and nonlawyers they employ and manage.³¹

NONLAWYER MODELS TO ADDRESS THE ACCESS TO JUSTICE CRISIS

To address the justice crisis, states have created models that allow nonlawyers to practice law in a limited manner and in specified areas of the law without violating UPL rules. Because the practice of law is governed by state rather than federal statutes, there is no uniformity among the models or the names. But two general models have emerged: the community justice worker and the legal practitioner.

The community justice worker (CJW) model allows nonlawyers to deliver legal services to the public by performing defined legal tasks in defined legal areas under the auspices of a legal aid program and the indirect supervision of a lawyer. There are lawyers on the staff and in the organization, but the CJWs work autonomously most of the time. The organization with which they are associated pays them a salary; clients do not pay them fees.

Under the legal practitioner model, nonlawyers provide defined legal services in certain areas of the law directly to the public without lawyer supervision. These professionals may work in law firms, or they may hang out a shingle and work independently. Their fees are typically lower than the average attorney fees in their area.

For practical purposes, this paper will refer to the former model as Community Justice Worker and the latter as Legal Practitioners and will use the official state term when referring to specific state programs.

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY JUSTICE WORKER PROGRAMS

Alaska pioneered the Community Justice Worker model with the nation’s first such program in 2019.³² As of 2025, nearly 500 CJW workers have either completed or are currently taking training courses from the Alaska Legal Services Corporation and over 190 are active in 47 different communities.³³ Alaska’s CJWs initially assisted clients in applying for Supplemental Nutrition

Assistance Program benefits; they now assist with debt collection defense, domestic violence, the Indian Child Welfare Act, and wills. Courses are planned for disaster response advocacy, eviction defense, probate and title clearing, and ethics and professionalism by the end of 2025.³⁴

Arizona instituted a CJW-style program called Certified Legal Advocate for domestic violence issues in 2021; it added a housing stability program in 2024 and in 2025 created programs for consumer issues, housing, debt relief, public benefits, and unemployment law.³⁵

Delaware adopted a CJW program for tenant housing issues in 2022; tenant advocates working with one of three Delaware legal aid groups can assist tenants in eviction proceedings, engage in settlement negotiations, file pleadings and other documents with the courts, and appear in the Justice of the Peace Court.³⁶

Hawaii established a CJW pilot program in 2023; Hawaii CJWs practice in paternity, child support, and visitation matters in Family Court.³⁷

In 2024, the South Carolina Supreme Court approved a CJW program for Housing Legal Advocates to be trained under a program developed by the South Carolina NAACP. The program is not yet in effect.³⁸

Utah implemented CJW programs to assist victims of domestic violence in 2021. Since then, Utah established programs to train CJWs to assist clients with medical debt in 2023, and housing stability in 2025.³⁹

SURVEY OF LEGAL PRACTITIONER STATE PROGRAMS

Colorado has adopted a model in which Licensed Legal Paraprofessionals (LLPs) may provide services relating to family law, including domestic violence. The first exams were administered in 2024; to date, over 100 LLPs have been licensed.⁴⁰ On October 30, 2025, the Colorado Supreme Court amended its LLP rules to allow LLPs to question witnesses in court,⁴¹ citing the “weaponization of the rules” by opposing attorneys who “bull[y LPs] into settlement [because they] know [LPs] cannot sufficiently or effectively support their clients in the event the case goes to trial.”⁴²

Minnesota adopted the Legal Paraprofessional pilot program in September 2020, implemented it in 2021 and it became permanent in September 2024.⁴³ Today, there are roughly thirty paraprofessionals who work under attorney supervision. The supervising attorney and paralegal are approved together as a team and are permitted to work in the practice areas of family law and housing. When making the program permanent in 2024, the Minnesota Supreme Court expanded the LP scope of duties, to permit LPs to provide legal advice in select legal matters and, in some cases, represent a client in court in select case types.⁴⁴

New Hampshire adopted a paraprofessional pilot program in family law, available exclusively to clients who earn up to 300% of the federal poverty level. The first phase took effect January 1, 2023, and allowed paralegals to prepare cases for qualifying clients in family and housing matters. The second phase permitted paraprofessionals to provide “paraprofessional representation” in family and district courts in three New Hampshire judicial districts.⁴⁵ In 2024, New Hampshire expanded the program statewide and extended the pilot project through 2029.⁴⁶

Oregon has developed a Licensed Paralegal program in family law and in landlord-tenant matters.⁴⁷ The Bar began accepting applications in July of 2023 and issued the first licenses in January of 2024. As of early 2024, ten licenses had been issued, all in family law.

Utah launched its Licensed Paralegal Practitioner program in January 2023. Utah Code allows LPPs to deliver legal services to the public in matters of family law, debt collection in small claims, and evictions. LPPs cannot appear in court except to stand or sit with their client to offer emotional support, answer factual questions, take notes, or assist the client in understanding the proceedings.⁴⁸ There are 44 LPPs in Utah.⁴⁹

Washington State has launched its Limited License Legal Technician program in family law in 2015. The Washington Supreme Court voted to sunset the program on June 4, 2020, allowing licensed LLLTs to continue to practice but not licensing any new LLLTs.⁵⁰ As of November 2025, there were 69 active, 11 inactive, and one pro bono LLLTs.⁵¹

MECHANISMS

Most states that have these programs have waived or amended the local rule on unauthorized practice of law to allow for CJWs and LPs. For example, the Alaska Supreme Court approved Alaska Bar Rule 43.5, which waives restrictions on the unauthorized practice of law for nonlawyers trained by, supervised by, and working full- or part-time under the auspices of the Alaska Legal Services Corporation.

Others have passed legislation that allows CJWs and LPs to practice in limited circumstances. For example, New Hampshire law states “Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, a paraprofessional may represent another person....”⁵²

REQUIREMENTS

Requirements vary, but for LPs most states require a combination of:

Core legal education, which may include a paralegal certificate or degree;

Subject matter education or training in the area of the law in which they wish to practice;

Core and subject matter testing;

Legal experience;

Ethics education and testing; and

Demonstration of character and fitness.⁵³

ARIZONA: A CASE STUDY

Arizona's LP program is the most extensive program in the nation.

The program launched in August 2020 through a unanimous vote by the Arizona Supreme Court to follow the recommendations of the 2019 Task Force on the Delivery of Legal Services to change the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration and the Arizona Judicial Council. The changes took effect on October 22, 2020, and the Administrative Office of the Courts began issuing licenses in September 2021.⁵⁴

Arizona established the nation's furthest-reaching LLP program in 2021. Arizona LLPs can assist clients in most domestic relations matters; civil matters before a municipal or justice court; criminal misdemeanor matters before a municipal or justice court where incarceration is not at issue; authorized services before any Arizona administrative agency; and juvenile dependency proceedings except contested adjudication.

As of November 2025, there were 101 active and four inactive LPs in Arizona. The LP program expanded its practice areas with the juvenile dependency law exam in 2024 and will continue to expand in 2025 with the potential addition of Qualified Domestic Relations Orders (QDRO) and probate practice areas. Arizona is the only jurisdiction that permits LPs to try cases, and then only in limited areas of law.

Pursuant to a Task Force recommendation to measure the "appropriateness, effectiveness, and sustainability" of the program, in 2024 the Administrative Office of the Courts surveyed clients, lawyers, judicial officers, and LPs.⁵⁵

At the program's inception, LPs were authorized to practice in the areas of:

Family law;

Limited jurisdiction civil;

Limited jurisdiction criminal where incarceration is not at issue; and

Administrative law.⁵⁶

Juvenile dependency was added in 2024, and there are plans to expand to include QDROs and probate this year. Legal Paraprofessionals can be licensed to practice in more than one area.⁵⁷

Arizona LPs are licensed to:

Prepare and sign legal documents;

Provide specific advice, opinions, or recommendations about possible legal rights, remedies, defenses, options, or strategies;

Draft and file documents, related to motions, discovery, interim and final orders, and modification of orders, and arrange for service of legal documents;

Appear before a court or tribunal;

Negotiate legal rights or responsibilities.⁵⁸

Arizona licenses LPs through education or experience.⁵⁹ Sixty-nine percent of LPs work within law firms; 22% own private practices; the remainder work at government agencies.⁶⁰

ARIZONA LPs IN THE COURTROOM

Of all the states that have a nonlawyer legal service provider model, only Arizona allows nonlawyers to litigate in court. Task Forces that consider the subject are reticent to broach the topic. Interestingly, while legal professionals fear the idea, the public is less fearful.

In Washington DC, for example, the District of Columbia Courts Civil Legal Regulatory Reform Task Force (DCCLRRTF) survey revealed that while 53.7% of community members said they would want an LP to provide legal representation in court, only 20.2% of professionals selected “representing a client in court” as a task that LPs should perform, and just 8.4% selected “conduct a trial including examining witnesses.”⁶¹

Even in Arizona, where 88% of judges and 55% of attorneys agreed or strongly agreed that LPs were aware of applicable court rules and 90% of judges and 59% of attorneys believed LPs displayed appropriate courtroom decorum, and where there has been not one single complaint related to LPs courtroom activities, some lawyers and judges who responded to the survey opined that LPs should never be allowed to represent clients in court.⁶²

As per the 2024 survey, twenty-seven percent of Arizona LPs were representing clients in court.

CLIENT SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AND FEES

When Arizona surveyed the public in 2020 as they were preparing to launch the LP program, 80.3% of respondents favored the idea.⁶³ After four years, public reaction to LPs was higher than anticipated:

One hundred percent of clients were satisfied or highly satisfied with the services they received;

Ninety-seven percent were satisfied or highly satisfied with their LPs’ communication skills;

One hundred percent were satisfied or highly satisfied with how their LP responded to their cases and their needs;

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest recommendation, clients responded with a score of 9.88 for how likely they would be to recommend a LP to a friend or family member. Ninety-one percent rated a 10.

A common assertion is that LPs charge nearly as much or as much as attorneys do, and therefore there's no reason to use an LP. While LP fees in Arizona are only slightly lower than attorney fees (\$239 per hour and \$266 per hour, respectively), 94% of LP clients were satisfied or very satisfied with the LP fee structure. Significantly, many expressed feeling that they got more for the money from the LP, as the LPs were more communicative, efficient, and effective.⁶⁴

COMPLAINTS OR DISCIPLINE

The State Bar of Arizona reported five allegations against Legal Paraprofessionals in 2024, all of which were dismissed.⁶⁵ No complaints were filed or discipline imposed against a legal paraprofessional by the State Bar in 2024.⁶⁶

CONCLUSION

Arizona's experience demonstrates that carefully designed nonlawyer licensing programs can meaningfully expand access to justice while maintaining high professional standards and strong consumer protection. The state's Legal Paraprofessional model — now the most comprehensive in the nation — shows that nonlawyer professionals can competently provide legal services, even in traditionally attorney-dominated arenas such as courtroom litigation.

The 2024 survey results are striking: clients overwhelmingly report satisfaction with the quality, responsiveness, and value of the services they received; judges and attorneys generally affirm LPs' professionalism and adherence to court rules; and there has been no substantiated misconduct or consumer harm.

This success is particularly significant against the backdrop of the nation's broader justice gap. Millions of Americans, across income levels and demographics, face serious legal problems without meaningful access to legal help. The consequences — inequitable outcomes, prolonged disputes, financial and emotional harm, and overloaded courts — underscore the need for innovative, scalable solutions. Nonlawyer practitioner models, whether community-based or fully licensed, offer one promising path forward. They supplement the legal workforce, reach underserved communities, and provide affordable services while relieving pressure on courts and legal aid organizations.

Arizona's program illustrates that expanding the legal services ecosystem does not erode quality or public trust; rather, it can enhance both when implemented with clear rules, rigorous training, and ongoing evaluation. As more states pilot and refine their own models, Arizona offers a compelling blueprint. If replicated thoughtfully, such programs can help close the justice gap — by ensuring that all people, regardless of income or geography, can access the legal help they need.

¹ Multiracial and Black Americans, younger Americans, and urbanites experiencing legal issues at slightly higher rates than their counterparts. Men have slightly more legal problems than women, but women experience domestic violence and abuse at a substantially higher rate than men.

² See UNIV. DENVER, INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGAL SYSTEM (IAALS) AND THE HAGUE INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION OF LAW (HiIL) (collectively “IAALS & HiIL”), JUSTICE NEEDS AND SATISFACTION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2021: LEGAL PROBLEMS IN DAILY LIFE, <https://iaals.du.edu/sites/default/files/documents/publications/justice-needs-and-satisfaction-us.pdf>.

³ *Id.* at 6.

⁴ *Id.* at 7.

⁵ See, e.g., DC AFFORDABLE LAW FIRM: *Eligibility*, <https://www.dcaffordablelaw.org/eligibility> (last visited Apr. 12, 2026).

⁶ *Mapping Legal Deserts*, THE PRACTICE (Harvard Ctr. on the Legal Pro., Aug.-Sept. 2025), <https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/legal-deserts/mapping-legal-deserts/>

⁷ IAALS & HiIL, *supra* note 2, at 45.

⁸ *Id.* at 69.

⁹ Mitchell Levy, *Empirical Patterns of Pro Se Litigation in Federal District Courts* 85 UNIV. OF CHICAGO L. REV. 1819, 1838 (2018), https://lawreview.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/Levy_CMT_Post-SA.pdf

¹⁰ Conf. of Chief Justices, *Resol. 23: Leadership to Promote Equal Justice* (Jan. 25, 2001),

<https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/leadership-promote-equal-justice>.

¹¹ Conf. of Chief Justices, *Resol. 23: Leadership to Promote Equal Justice* (Jan. 25, 2001),

<https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/leadership-promote-equal-justice>; *Resol. 2: In Support of Efforts to Increase Access to Justice* (July 30, 2008), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/support-efforts-increase-access-justice>; *Resol. 8: In Support of Access to Justice Commissions* (July 28, 2010), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/support-access-justice-commissions>; *Resol. 13: Reaffirming Commitment to Access to Justice Leadership and Expressing Appreciation for Access to Justice Progress and Collaboration* (July 31, 2013), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/reaffirming-commitment-access-justice-leadership-and-expressing-appreciation>; *Resol. 5: Reaffirming the Commitment to Meaningful Access to Justice for All* (2015), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/reaffirming-commitment-meaningful-access-justice-all>; *Resol. 3: Expanding Meaningful Access to Justice for All* (Jan. 31, 2018), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/expanding-meaningful-access-justice-all>; *Resol. 1: In Support of Promoting the Use of Limited Scope Representation in Civil Court Proceedings* (Aug. 2, 2023), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/support-promoting-use-limited-scope-representation-civil-court-proceedings-0>;

Conf. of Chief Justices, Conf. of State Ct. Adm’rs, *Resol. 1: In Support of Exploring Access to Justice Through Authorized Justice Practitioner Programs* (July 30, 2025), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/support-exploring-access-justice-through-authorized-justice-practitioner-programs>.

¹² Conf. of Chief Justices, Conf. of State Ct. Adm’rs, *Resolution 1-2025: In Support of Exploring Access to Justice Through Authorized Justice Practitioner Programs* (July 30, 2025), <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources-courts/support-exploring-access-justice-through-authorized-justice-practitioner-programs>.

¹³ The material in this section is adapted from the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS CIVIL LEGAL REFORM TASK FORCE REPORT, JULY 2025, Hon. Roy W. McLeese III and Hon. Alfred S. Irving, Jr., Co-Chairs, <https://www.dccourts.gov/sites/default/files/CLRRRTT-Final-Report-and-Appendices-7-31-2025.pdf> (hereinafter D.C. TASK FORCE REP.). The author of this article was an author of that report.

¹⁴ See e.g., *District of Columbia Courts 2024 Capital Pro Bono Honor Roll*, https://www.dccourts.gov/sites/default/files/Final_2024_Pro_Bono_Honor_Roll_by_Affiliation.pdf.

¹⁵ See e.g., Jeremy Conrad, *Citing Growing Need for Pro Bono Help, Judges Issue Call to Action to D.C. Attorneys* DC BAR MAG., June 15, 2022, <https://www.dccourts.gov/News-Events/News/Citing-Growing-Need-for-Pro-Bono-Help,-Judges-Issu>.

¹⁶ See e.g., LEGAL SERVICES CORP., OFF. OF DATA GOVERNANCE & ANALYSIS, RESEARCH BRIEF: THE ECONOMIC CASE FOR CIVIL LEGAL AID (2025), <https://lsc-live.app.box.com/s/0ldo54a34zc7s3dgp6ci2ra8r5qb611f>

¹⁷ Att’y Student Loan Repayment Program (ASLRP), 5 U.S.C. § 5379, as amended, and 5 C.F.R. pt. 537.

¹⁸ U.S. DEP’T OF JUST., ATT’Y STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM (updated Mar. 26, 2026), <https://www.justice.gov/oarm/attorney-student-loan-repayment-program>

¹⁹ U.S. Dep’t of Just., Fact Sheet: Access to Justice is Rural Access, <https://www.justice.gov/atj/fact-sheet-access-justice-rural-access>

²⁰ See e.g., D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49.

²¹ *Id.*

²² See e.g., D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49.

²³ See e.g., MODEL RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT 5.5(a)(AM. BAR ASS'N 2025) (hereinafter ABA MODEL RULES), (“A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.”); MD. ATT’YS RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT 19-305.5, (“An attorney who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction shall not...establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law; or...hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the attorney is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.”)

²⁴ NALA CODE OF ETHICS AND PRO. RESP., Canon 1.

²⁵ *Id.*, at Canon 3.

²⁶ NFPA CODE OF ETHICS AND PRO. RESP., Ethical Canon 1.8.

²⁷ D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49.

²⁸ D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49 (b)(2).

²⁹ D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49 (b)(2)(A – C).

³⁰ See, e.g., D.C. CT. APP. RULE 49(e); FLA. STAT. §453.23.

³¹ ABA MODEL RULES 5.3.

³² Alaska Legal Servs. Corp., Cmty. Just. Worker Program, <https://www.alsc-law.org/cjw/>.

³³ D.C. TASK FORCE REP., *supra* note 13.

³⁴ Alaska Bar Rule 43.5; see also Alaska Legal Serv. Corp., CJW Training Courses, <https://www.alsc-law.org/cjw/courses/>.

³⁵ ARIZ. CODE OF JUD. ADMIN § 7-211.

³⁶ DEL. SUP. CT. RULE 57.1.

³⁷ Haw. Sup. Ct., Order In re the Rural Paternity Advocate Pilot Project in the Third Circuit, May 15, 2023, <https://www.courts.state.hi.us/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/2023.5.15-Order-re-Rural-Paternity-Ad.-Pilot-Project.pdf>

³⁸ In re S.C. NAACP Hous. Advoc. Program, 897 S.E.2d 691 (S.C. 2024).

³⁹ Utah Sup. Ct., Order in re Application of Timpanogos Legal Center Certified Advocate Partners Program, Feb. 8, 2021, in Utah Sup. Ct. Off. of Leg. Servs. Innovation, Sandbox Authorization Packet, <https://utahinnovationoffice.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Auth-Packet-TLC-Certified-Advocates.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Colo. Jud. Branch, Colo. Sup. Ct. approves creation of legal paraprofessional license (Mar. 27, 2023), https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/media/press-release/colorado-supreme-court-approves-creation-legal-paraprofessional-license?utm_source=copilot.com.

⁴¹ See COLO. R. CIV. PRO. 207.1(g)(xiii) (Licensed Legal Paraprofessionals' Scope of Authority to Practice).

⁴² Michael Karlik, *Colo. Sup. Ct. addresses “weaponization” of paraprofessional program by loosening rules*, COLO. POL., Nov. 12, 2025, <https://www.coloradopolitics.com/2025/11/12/colorado-supreme-court-addresses-weaponization-of-paraprofessional-program-by-loosening-rules/>.

⁴³ Minn. Sup. Ct. ADM 19-8002, Ord. Amending Rules Governing Legal Paraprofessional Project (Oct. 6, 2022), <https://minnlawyer.com/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/2022/10/ORADM198002-100622.pdf>.

⁴⁴ See MINN. STATE BD. OF LAW EXAMINERS, SUPERVISED PRAC. RULES 12 (Authorized Prac. in Legal Paraprofessional Prog), <https://ble.mn.gov/supervised-practice/supervised-practice-rules/>.

⁴⁵ N.H. SUP. CT. RULES 35 (Appearances in Ct. by Licensed Paraprofessionals).

⁴⁶ N.H. REV. STAT. § 311:2-a (2023) (Legal Services by Paraprofessionals).

⁴⁷ Or. Sup. Ct, Rules for Licensing Paralegals in Oregon (Jan. 1, 2025),

<https://www.osbar.org/docs/rulesregs/RulesforLicensingParalegals.pdf>.

⁴⁸ UTAH SUP. CT. RULES OF PRAC. 4-802(c)(1) (Authorization to Practice Law: Licensed Paralegal Practitioners).

⁴⁹ Utah State Bar, Licensed Lawyer Search.

⁵⁰ Letter from Hon. Debra L. Stephens, C.J., Wash. State Sup. Ct. to Stephen R. Crossland, re vote to sunset the Ltd. License Technicians Program (June 5, 2020),

https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-source/licensing/lllt/1-2020-06-05-supreme-court-letter-to-steve-crossland-et-al.pdf?sfvrsn=8a0217f1_7

⁵¹ See Wash. State Bar Ass’n, Ltd. License Legal Technicians, <https://www.wsba.org/for-legal-professionals/join-the-legal-profession-in-wa/limited-license-legal-technicians>.

⁵² N.H. REV. STAT. § 311:2-a (2023) (Legal Services by Paraprofessionals).

⁵³ D.C. TASK FORCE REP., *supra* note 13.

⁵⁴ ARIZ. SUP. CT., ASSESSING ARIZ’S LEGAL PARAPROFESSIONALS: 2024 PROGRAM SURVEY, (hereinafter ARIZ. 2024 REP.) at 2,

https://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/0/26/Assessing%20Arizonas%20Legal%20Paraprofessionals_2024%20Survey%20-%20Complete_1.pdf.

⁵⁵ *See id.*

⁵⁶ ARIZ. CODE OF JUD. ADMIN. § 7-210.

⁵⁷ ARIZ. 2024 REP., *supra* note 54.

⁵⁸ ARIZ. CODE OF JUD. ADMIN. § 7-210 (F).

⁵⁹ ARIZ. CODE OF JUD. ADMIN. § 7-210 (E) (3)

⁶⁰ ARIZ. 2024 REP., *supra* note 54.

⁶¹ D.C. TASK FORCE REP., *supra* note 13.

⁶² ARIZ. 2024 REP., *supra* note 54

⁶³ ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, STATE OF ARIZONA PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY.

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ Two allegations referenced Ethics Rules 4.4 (Respect for Rights of Others) and 8.4(d) (Conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). The third referenced Supreme Court Rule 41(b)(7) (Avoid engaging in unprofessional conduct). The fourth reference Ethics Rule 1.6 (Confidentiality of Information) and the fifth referenced Ethics Rules 3.1 (Meritorious Claims and Contentions), 3.4 (Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel), and 8.4(c) (Misconduct).

⁶⁶ ARIZ. 2024 REP., *supra* note 54.

KEYWORDS: ACCESS TO JUSTICE, NONLAWYER PRACTICE, LEGAL PARAPROFESSIONALS, COURTROOM REPRESENTATION, REGULATORY REFORM, CLIENT SATISFACTION, LEGAL SERVICES DELIVERY, PARALEGAL PROFESSION, UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW