

DCACDL
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYERS

Vice President

Nina Masonson
202-518-5666
202-518-2923 (fax)

Secretary

June Perrone
202-333-1514 (tel & fax)

Treasurer

Andrew J.J. Delehanty
202-244-5551 (tel & fax)

2500 Que Street, N.W
No. 725
Washington, D.C., 20007

President

Richard K. Gilbert
202-898-0857
202-682-1245 (fax)
rkgesq@juno.com

Immediate Past President

Allen H. Orenberg

Board Of Directors

Cary Clennon
Pat Cresta-Savage
Donald Dworsky
Clark U. Fleckinger
Elizabeth Kent

July 22, 2002

Honorable Stephen H. Glickman
Associate Judge, District of Columbia
Court of Appeals
500 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20001

Ref: Request To Enlarge Time For Public Comments To Proposed Revisions To Plan For
Furnishing Representation To Indigents Under The District Of Columbia Criminal
Justice Act

Dear Judge Glickman,

I am writing you in my capacity as president of the District of Columbia Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (DCACDL) to urge you and the Court of Appeals to extend the time for comment on Court of Appeals's portion of the revision to the Plan for Furnishing Representation to Indigents Under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act (the CJA Plan) until the end of September, 2002. The Court published its initial draft in the July 8, 2002 edition of the Daily Washington Law Reporter and established August 15, 2002 as the date for submitting comments. While this time may be sufficient for interested individuals to comment, assuming they get the Daily Washington Law Reporter and are not on vacation, it is an unreasonably short period of time for an organization to respond, especially given the time of year.

As an organization composed of attorneys representing accused persons in the District of Columbia courts, to include the Court of Appeals, we are extremely interested in the revision of the Court's portion of the CJA Plan. We discussed the Court's proposed revision at some length, as an unplanned agenda item, at DCACDL's last board meeting. We identified several areas which deserve further consideration, to include the role of the trial attorney in the appeals

process and the desirability, composition, and manner of selecting a panel or panels of attorneys. In addition, there are aspects of the Superior Court portion of the CJA Plan which we believe may merit consideration by your Court. We have tasked one of our board members with an extensive appellate practice to coordinate the views of our individual members and prepare draft comments. However, all of this takes time. I would anticipate discussing and voting on our comments at our next board meeting in early September. (Like many organizations, we recognize the general futility of trying to accomplish projects requiring attendance and consensus over the summer, especially in August.)

We utilized this process to comment on the initial draft of the Superior Court portion of the Plan. We believe that Court found our comments helpful and I and our vice-president, Nina Masonson, were later selected by Chief Judge King to serve on the working committee, chaired by Judge Alprin, to refined the revisions. I believe that Chief Judge King and Judge Alprin would agree that meaningful input by the affected lawyers was invaluable in crafting the final version. I strongly hope that you and the Court of Appeals will agree, and will allow us additional time to prepare a meaningful response.

Respectfully

Richard K. Gilbert

cc: DCACDL Board