

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 07-05**

(Amends Administrative Order 07-01)

(Additions to Family Court Attorney Panel)

WHEREAS, Administrative Order No. 04-15 issued July 23, 2004 created the Panel Oversight Subcommittee of the Family Court Implementation Committee (“the Committee”) to consider applications to any Family Court Attorney Panel established pursuant to Administrative Order 03-11 and to recommend attorneys for inclusion on the Family Court Panel to the Presiding Judge of the Family Court and the Chief Judge; and

WHEREAS, the Committee submitted a final report on its procedures for evaluating applications and recommending names of attorneys to be added to the Family Court Panels as full or provisional members; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the parents and children of the District of Columbia involved in neglect and abuse and juvenile matters that attorneys be added to the Family Court Panels at this time and that a list of qualified and active attorney panels be reiterated;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY,

ORDERED, the attorneys whose names appear on the attached list, **Additions to Panels January 2007**, be and are hereby added to the Family Court Panel as full and provisional members respectively; and it is further,

ORDERED, at any time after one year, attorneys on the provisional panel may apply for full membership to the Family Court Panel pursuant to procedures to be issued by the Committee; and it is further,

ORDERED, as of the date of this order, the complete list of attorneys serving on CCAN and Juvenile panels is as set forth in the attached list, **Family Court Attorney Panels as of March, 2007**; and it is further,

ORDERED, this order is effective December 1, 2006, nunc pro tunc.

SO ORDERED.

**REPORT OF
THE FAMILY COURT PANELS OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE FAMILY COURT IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

I. INTRODUCTION

Chief Judge Rufus G. King, III, issued Administrative Order No. 03-11 establishing Attorney Panels to provide representation in certain Family Court proceedings. The panels were for appointment of attorneys in juvenile proceedings, as Guardians *ad litem* ("GAL's"), as special education advocates ("SEA's"), and as counsel to parties in neglect and termination of parental rights proceedings ("CCAN"). The first panels were selected by an Ad Hoc Committee established in Administrative Order 02-15 and were approved by the Chief Judge in 2003.

On July 23, 2004, the Chief Judge in Administrative Order 04-15 created the Panel Oversight Subcommittee of the Family Court Implementation Committee ("the Committee") to consider applications to any Family Court Attorney Panel established pursuant to Administrative Order 03-11 and recommend attorneys for inclusion on the Family Court Panels to the Presiding Judge of the Family Court and the Chief Judge. The Administrative Order also authorized the provisional appointment to panels of those attorneys whose qualifications do not warrant full membership on the panels with the anticipation that after a period of one (1) year they will be considered for full membership upon review of their work during the provisional period.

In deciding which applicants are best qualified for appointment to the Family Court Panels, the Committee may seek the views of other judicial officers, including present and past members of the Family Court, and must consider the recommendations of the Family Court Advisory Attorney Selection Committee, composed of attorneys from the Public Defender Service, Family Court Trial

Lawyer's Association and the Superior Court Trial Lawyer's Association.¹

On August 4, 2004, the Chief Judge set September 17 as the annual application deadline for attorneys interested in applying for any or all of the Family Court Panels.

II. THE APPLICATION PROCESS

Attorneys interested in serving on any or all of the panels were encouraged to apply by the filing deadline of September 17, 2006. Attorneys seeking conversion from provisional to full panel status were given until September 29, 2006 to submit their application.²

In addition to names, addresses and phone numbers, and the panels to which they were applying, applicants were asked to provide the following information:

1. languages other than English in which they are fluent;
2. whether they had previously applied for a Superior Court panel in any division, and if so, the panel for which they were selected;
3. the percentage of full-time employment they hoped to devote to the Family Court and to each panel for which they were applying;
4. their current caseload by number of cases;
5. when they first received appointments for juvenile, GAL, special education, and CCAN cases;
6. their educational background, including the place and date of their law school degree, the colleges they attended, and any honors they received or significant activities or work in which they were involved while in school;
7. their office locations or client meeting places; their system for receiving

¹ The Advisory Committee was also established in Administrative Order 04-15. The Advisory Committee has reviewed all applications and provided recommendations for each Panel since its establishment in November 2004.

² The Panel Oversight Subcommittee developed an application for provisional attorneys. The application required provisional attorneys to respond to a set of 14 questions designed to address the number and type of cases handled, resolution of cases: trial or stipulation, whether the attorney experienced any problems during the provisional year that resulted in removal from a case, a finding of contempt or sanction by the court, whether the attorney was referred for any reason to Bar Counsel, and whether the attorney participated in additional skills enhancing training. A letter was also sent to each provisional attorney explaining the application and review process.

messages from clients; their support staff, if any; their arrangements for coverage of cases when absent; and their modes of transportation for visiting children or clients;

8. whether they were a member in good standing of the District of Columbia Bar and all courts to which they have been admitted to practice;

9. their work history since law school and any other work experiences that might be of assistance in assessing their qualifications;

10. legal education programs they had attended within the previous five years; any course work or clinical training they completed concerning the law of evidence; and, their litigation experience;

11. their experience and expertise concerning residential placement; special education programs and procedures; adoption procedures, including adoption subsidies; legal guardianship and custody proceedings; the Interstate Compact for Placement of Children; Section 8 and other housing programs for low-income persons; drug treatment programs; teen mother programs; independent living programs; mental health programs and issues; and domestic violence programs;

12. the names of up to five D.C. Superior Court judicial officers who would have the most information about their qualifications to serve on the panel or panels to which they were applying;

13. the number of cases in which they served as counsel, for each panel; the number of such cases they tried to verdict; and a description of not more than five such cases;

14. with respect to the Special Education Advocates, the committee considered whether they were willing to be compensated exclusively from the D.C. Public Schools ("DCPS") for their services;

15. whether since admission to the D.C. Bar they had ever been convicted of a crime carrying a potential sentence of 180 days or more in prison; been sued by a client; been the subject of disciplinary proceedings; or, been cited for a breach of ethics or unprofessional conduct in the District of Columbia or elsewhere;

16. whether they had been removed from any Superior Court panel or Appellate case;

17. any further information they believed might be of assistance in assessing their qualifications.

Finally, applicants were required to submit a Certificate Concerning Discipline from the Office of Bar Counsel, provide proof of payment of DC Bar dues, and certify that they are familiar with the D.C. Superior Court Abuse and Neglect and Juvenile Practice Standards (hereafter referred to as the "Standards").

A total of 73 attorneys applied for one or more panels: 49 applied for the GAL Panel, 25 for the Juvenile Panel, 32 for the Special Education Advocate Panel and 54 for the CCAN Panel.

III. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS BY THE JUDICIAL OFFICERS

In October 2006, all associate judges, senior judges and magistrate judges assigned to the Family Court and all Court of Appeals judges³ were e-mailed an evaluation form listing all of the applicants and the panels to which they applied. The judicial officers were told that the Committee was seeking evaluations of each applicant for each panel to which he/she applied and were asked to evaluate all applicants with whom they were familiar. The evaluations were to be based on the judicial officer's personal knowledge of the applicant's competence and the quality of the applicant's work.

The evaluation form gave judicial officers the opportunity to grade applicants separately with respect to each panel to which they applied according to the following grading scale:

A -- strong recommendation in favor;

B -- recommendation in favor;

C -- recommendation in favor with reservations;

³ In a letter to Judge Anita Josey-Herring, Presiding Judge of Family Court, Judge Stephen Glickman, Chair of the Court of Appeals CJA and CCAN Committee, noted that the Court of Appeals routinely continues the appointments of CCAN trial counsel in appeals from Family Court. Accordingly, he requested that judges of that court be given an opportunity to evaluate lawyers being considered for or removed from Family Court panels.

- D -- mild recommendation against;
- E -- strong recommendation against.

The form also enabled judicial officers to provide a comment, of any length, concerning each applicant. Whenever possible, judicial officers were encouraged to provide comments in addition to letter evaluations. The judicial officers were assured that the Court and the Committee would keep their grades and evaluations confidential. Judicial officers were instructed to leave a blank if they did not have sufficient information to provide an evaluation. The Committee also received comments from other judges who were aware of an applicant and wished to communicate a recommendation or who were listed by the applicant as a reference and were thereafter contacted by a Committee member.

IV. PANEL SELECTION

Before meeting to discuss the qualifications of individual applicants, the Committee members received a copy of the applications of the candidates to thoroughly review and present to the Committee. Committee members were also provided reports concerning the applicants' grades and comments from the judicial evaluations, and the recommendations from the advisory panel were provided to Committee members.

The selection meeting occurred on October 30, 2006. The Committee member responsible for presenting a particular applicant summarized the applicant's background and experience, highlighted any special features of the application, and summarized the evaluations of the applicant by the judicial officers, including grades and comments, and the advisory committee recommendations. After discussion based upon all of the available information, a decision was made whether a particular applicant should or should not be placed on each of the panels to which he or she applied.

Some attorneys were excluded from a panel because their work is well known to judicial officers and the work was found to be deficient. Others, however, were excluded, particularly from the GAL Panel, because they lacked sufficient experience, because judicial officers had insufficient information about

the quality of their work, or because they had not previously demonstrated a commitment to the work of the panel to which they applied. In addition, the Committee reviewed the attorneys who were placed on the CCAN Panel as provisional members for 2006. The Committee reviewed 10 attorneys in this category. In order to conduct a careful review of the provisional attorneys performance and to ensure that the Committee was fully apprised of the attorney's work, each attorney was required to complete a 14-question application covering every aspect of their performance since their designation as CCAN provisional attorneys. The Committee reviewed the applications and the judicial evaluations to determine whether to recommend the attorney for full-panel status, extend provisional status for an additional year, or be removed from the panel. The Advisory Committee made no recommendations for provisional attorneys.

Provisional membership is not available for the Special Education Advocate, GAL or Juvenile Panels.

Considerations relevant to selection of attorneys for the panels are discussed below:

I. CCAN PANELS
Guardian Ad Litem

The Committee recommends eight (8) attorneys to serve as Guardian Ad Litem.

As the only attorney whose sole responsibility is to represent the child's best interest, the GAL plays a crucial role in abuse and neglect proceedings. Faced with difficult and very significant decisions affecting the safety and welfare of children, the Court relies considerably on the GAL. The GAL is expected to provide information based on first-hand observations and to make recommendations about suitable placements, needed services, and, of course, permanency decisions.

Recognizing the importance of the GAL to be informed concerning matters of critical importance to children, the Committee applied a strict standard before including attorneys on the GAL Panel. To be selected for the GAL Panel, an attorney had to have significant relevant experience; favorable evaluations from a substantial number of judicial officers, and **not** have significant unfavorable evaluations or reservations expressed about his or her competence to serve as GAL. The Committee also considered the evaluations from the Advisory Committee.

Before placing an attorney on the GAL list, the Committee required a consensus (although not a unanimous opinion) among judicial officers that the attorney had the qualifications and experience to be entrusted with this vitally important role. Accordingly, attorneys who had many favorable judicial evaluations, but also many unfavorable evaluations, were not included on the GAL Panel.

Despite outstanding legal and other training and expressed interest in working on behalf of children, some applicants were not included on the GAL Panel because of lack of experience in neglect and abuse cases and lack of familiarity with the many issues about which an able GAL must have knowledge, including residential placement; the Interstate Compact for Placement of Children; independent living programs; kinship care programs; and adoption subsidies, to name just a few. Some applicants, who may be qualified to serve as GAL's, were excluded from the panel because the court's judicial officers had insufficient experience with the applicant's work. Many unsuccessful GAL Panel applicants were placed on the CCAN Panel to

represent parents and other parties. Others would have been placed on the CCAN Panel if they had indicated an interest in being considered for the CCAN Panel.⁴

Recognizing that the Family Court may need additional GAL's, the Committee recommends that judicial officers continue to appoint GAL's from the CCAN Panel if necessary to meet the Family Court's needs and to encourage those attorneys to gain the experience necessary to apply successfully for the GAL Panel in the future.

Parents And Other Parties

The Committee recommends 16 attorneys to serve as counsel for parents and other parties.

The Committee chose some attorneys for this panel who did not have substantial CCAN experience and whose work was not known to as many of the judicial officers. The deciding factor was whether the applicant showed great potential based on any of a variety of criteria, such as favorable evaluations or comments from the few judicial officers with knowledge; an outstanding education and work history; prior service as teachers, social workers or counselors or as attorneys in neglect and abuse cases in other jurisdictions; substantial continuing legal education related to neglect and abuse; and the like. In addition, experienced practitioners who had a significant number of favorable evaluations, but also a significant number of unfavorable evaluations were selected to this panel if on average their evaluations and ratings were favorable.

Among the 16 attorneys added to this panel three (3) attorneys came from the 2006 provisional panel.

⁴ The Committee believes less experienced new attorneys or experienced attorneys new to the Superior Court can obtain valuable experience and demonstrate competence and interest in neglect and abuse work by working on the CCAN panel.

Special Education Advocates

The Committee recommends five (5) attorneys to serve as Special Education Advocates.

To qualify for this panel, the attorney had to demonstrate a substantial amount of experience in special education advocacy in the District of Columbia.

D. Review of the 2006 Provisional Panel

The Committee recommends provisional status for six (6) attorneys. The Committee also reviewed judicial comments, concerning each of the current members of the CCAN Panel under provisional status. The Committee recommends that three (3) members from the 2006 provisional panel become full members of the CCAN Panel, that five (5) others remain on the CCAN Provisional Panel so that the Court can obtain more information about their performance as counsel in cases⁵, and that two (2) attorneys be removed from the CCAN Panel because one relocated and is now serving as a full-time attorney in another jurisdiction⁶ and the other attorney's performance as a provisional panel member was rated by judicial officers as not meeting the D.C. Superior Court Abuse and Neglect Practice Standards.

II. THE JUVENILE PANEL

The Committee recommends four (4) attorneys for the Juvenile Panel.

In the case of the Juvenile Panel, the successful applicant had to have juvenile court or criminal law experience.

⁵ Each of the attorneys remaining as provisional handled three (3) or fewer cases since their designation as provisional CCAN attorneys. Because of the limited number of cases handled by each of the attorneys, most judicial officers were unfamiliar with their work and could not provide any comment concerning their performance. Therefore, the Committee did not believe it had sufficient information to recommend full panel status for these attorneys.

⁶ Before relocating the attorney moved to withdraw from cases citing his plan to relocate.

To a certain extent, the Committee limited the number of persons recommended for the Juvenile Panel because of the substantial number of juvenile cases assigned to the Public Defender Service.

In addition to recognized competence, a prerequisite for selection to the Juvenile Panel was demonstrated specialized experience.

Respectfully submitted:

FAMILY COURT PANEL COMMITTEE

Associate Judge Cheryl Long, co-chair
Magistrate Judge S. Pamela Gray, co-chair
Associate Judge Zoe Bush
Magistrate Judge Karen Aileen Howze
Magistrate Judge John McCabe
Magistrate Judge William W. Nooter
Associate Judge Odessa Vincent

Dated: November 16, 2006

Addition to Panels January 2007

GAL

Dennis Eshman
Elizabeth Felton
Nancy “Nan” Hooven
Courtney Ann French
Dorian Hamilton
Rodella Berry
Hilary Cairns
Christina Quinn

Other CCAN

Andrea Antonelli
Rodella Berry
Hilary Cairns*
Ronald Colbert*
Joy Van Blerkom Evans
Elizabeth N. Felton
Courtney Ann French
Dorian Hamilton
Rochanda Hiligh-Thomas
Nan Hooven
Aminata Ipyana
Cynthia Russell Jefferson*
Andrea Larry
Tracey Lloyd
Christina Quinn
Anika Simmons

CCAN Provisional

Mary Ellen Arnold+
Bryan Timothy Brookhard+
Alan S. Gregory+
John Hoppe+
Maude “Amy” Myers
Melissa Siegal
Michael Allan Smith

Julius Terrell+
Arnettia S. Wright
Vicki Ann Wright

Juvenile

Rodella Berry
Aminata Ipyana
Cynthia Nardone
Christina (Lugo) Raskin

Special Education

Rodella Berry
Christina R. Busso
Rochanda Hiligh-Thomas
Christopher West
Christina Quinn

* Denotes conversion from CCAN provisional status
+ Denotes extended CCAN provisional

Family Court Attorney Panels (Updated by CCAN Office 3/1/07)

(Attorneys who are inactive or who are missing CLE requirements have been omitted.)

(Any questions should be directed to Wilma Brier at BrierWA@dcsc.gov or 879-1301.)

GAL Panel

Anna Adamczyk
Iris Barnett
Alicia Barsoumian
Ranu Basu
Ashok Batra
Marion Baurley
Pierre Bergeron
Rodella Berry
Cathy Braxton
Sabine Browne
Steven Burns
Debra Burton
Hilary Cairns
Deborah Cason Daniel
Margaret Clark
John Connelly
Joel Curtis
Carolyn Daniels
Yvonne Davis-Smith
Jenny Epstein
Dennis Eshman
Rachel Evans
Charles Feezor, III
Elizabeth Felton
Cecilia Fiermonte
Matthew Fraidin
Courtney Ann French
Jerelyn Gladden
Harry Goldwater
Al Gonzalez
Kate Gould
Dorian Hamilton
Jennifer Hancock
Michelle Henry
Nancy "Nan" Hooven
Lawrence Huebner
Shirin Ikram

Rosalind Johnson
Joseph Jose
Kevin Kassees
Judith Katz
Jessica Kendall
Azhar Khan
Robert LaBelle
Richard Landis
Anne Lewandowski
Thomas Lydon
Adriane Marblestein-Deare
Laurie McManus
Thalia Meltz
Karen Mitchell
Janice Moore
Monica Myles
Michael O'Keefe
Lucy Osakwe
Christina Quinn
Carla Rappaport
Andrew Reese
Amrutha Rode
Pamela Roth
Joanne Schamest
Anne Schneiders
Sharon Singh
Betty Sinowitz
Lawrence Spillan
Virginia Stith
Leslie Susskind
Sharon Taylor-Smith
George Tilton
Kelly Venci
Milton Waddell
Stephen Watsky
Diane Weinroth

CCAN Panel

Anna Adamczyk

Sheila Albright

Glen Angelo
Andrea Antonelli
Michael Barry
Alicia Barsoumian
Ranu Basu
Ashok Batra
Marion Baurley
Pierre Bergeron
Rodella Berry
Larry Blackwood
Melanie Brady
Cathy Braxton
Lynne Brenner
Rhonda Brown
Sabine Browne
Steven Burns
Debra Burton
Marco Cabezas
Hilary Cairns*
Robert Cambridge
Deborah Cason Daniel
Ada Chan
Margaret Clark
Wesley Clarke
David Cohen
Ronald Colbert*
Phillip Collins
John Connelly
Ted Conwell
Moses Cook
Joel Curtis
Carolyn Daniels
Ardelia Davis
Yvonne Davis-Smith
Thomas Devlin
Martha Dickey
Ralph Dickinson
Victoria Dobbins
William Driscoll
Gwen D'Souza
Glen Duncan
Jason Dzubow
Jenny Epstein
Dennis Eshman
Richard Espovich
Joy Van Blerkom Evans
Rachel Evans
Donald Exner

Kevin Fahey
Charles Feezor, III
Elizabeth Felton
Semi Feuer
Matthew Fraidin
Lewis Franke
Courtney Ann French
Cheryl Mitchell Gaines
William Glasgow
Harry Goldwater
Al Gonzalez
Kate Gould
Hagos Haile
Dorian Hamilton
Jennifer Hancock
Peter Hapworth
Barbara Hargrove
David Hayes
Michelle Henry
Murphy Henry
Rochanda Hiligh-Thomas
Robert Hollander
Nancy "Nan" Hooven
Peter C. Ibe
Shirin Ikram
Aminata Ipayana
Elena Iuga
Chidinma Iwuji
Gary Jacobs
Cynthia Russell Jefferson*
Bashiru Jimoh
Rosalind W. Johnson
Joseph Jose
Lauren Kahn
Regina Kane
Nancy Karkowsky
Kevin Kassees
Judith Katz
Azhar Khan
Jack Kindsvatter
Patrick Knight
Desiree Knights-Taylor
Michelle Klass
Robert LaBelle
Francis Lacey
Richard Landis
Andrea Larry
Robert Lavine

Anne Lewandowski
David Lisansky
Tracey Lloyd
Relinda Louisy
Thomas Lydon
Adriane Marblestein-Deare
Laurie McManus
Thalia Meltz
Karen Mitchell
Janice Moore
William Morgan
Monica Myles
Madhavan Nair
Cynthia Nordone
Howard Nussbaum
Michael O'Keefe
Ethel Ollivierre
Lisa Orlow
Lucy Osakwe
Carol Oshinsky
Thomas O'Toole
Jon Pascale
Christina Quinn
Carla Rappaport
Andrew Reese
Jennifer Renton
Norman Robinson
Amrutha Rode
Pamela Roth
Gwenette Sales

Joanne Schamest
Steven Schiff
Seth Schraeger
Asif Shah
Lillian Shepherd
Anika Simmons
Sharon Singh
Betty Sinowitz
Lawrence Spillan
David Stein
Virginia Stith
Ethan Susskind
Leslie Susskind
Sharon Taylor-Smith
Carol Terry-Blume
Alvin Thomas
Ronald Thomas
George Tilton
Kelly Venci
Maria Vilches
Dominic Vorv
Lydia Wade
Beth Walker
Russell Washington
Stephen Watsky
Diane Weinroth
Louis Whitsett

CCAN Provisional

Timothy Bryan Bookhard+
Alan Scott Gregory+
John Hoppe+
Maude "Amy" Myers
Melissa Siegal

Michael Allan Smith
Julius Terrell+
Arnetta S. Wright
Vicki Ann Wright

Special Education Advocate Panel

Donovan Anderson
Iris Barnett
Fatmata Barrie
Marion Baurley

Rodella Berry
Pierre Bergeron
Jennifer Bingham
Steven Boretos

Cathy Braxton
Christina R. Busso
Deborah Cason Daniel
John Connelly
Gregory Cotter
Fatema Dariani
Yvonne Davis-Smith
Olkanma A. Ekekwe
Cecilia Fiermonte
Tracy Hellena Riller Givens
Harry Goldwater
Brian Gruber
Michelle Henry
Rochanda Hiligh-Thomas
Elizabeth Jester
Bonita Jones-Moon
Joseph Jose

Anne Lewandowski
Charles Gavin Maddox
Dolores L. Scott McKnight
Laurie McManus
Lucy Osakwe
Christina Quinn
Laura Rinaldi
Chesseley Alexander Robinson
Pamela Roth
John Straus
Marshall Taylor
Sharon Taylor-Smith
Ronald Thomas
Stephen Watsky
Christopher West
Dawn Wilson
Donna Wulkan

Juvenile Panel

Louis Barnett
Rodella Berry
Jennifer Bingham
Larry Blackwood
Lynne Brenner
Bryan Brown
Rhonda Brown
Robert Cambridge
David Carr
Anil Chopra
Moses Cook
Joel Davidson
Yvonne Davis-Smith
Thomas Devlin
William Driscoll
Harry Goldwater
Hagos Haile
Peter Hapworth
Geoffrey Harris
Kristin Henning
Robert Hollander
Peter Ibe
Shirin Ikram
Gary Jacobs
Joseph Jose
Ayanna Kambui
Kevin Kassees

Martin Killingham
John Kirby
Robert LaBelle
Francis Lacey
Robert Lavine
Stacey Lewis
Whitney Trevelyan Louchheim
Thomas Lydon
Adriane Marblestein-Deare
Lloyd McNair
William Caswell Morgan
Madhavan Nair
Cynthia Nordone
Howard Nussbaum
Charles O'Banion
Chiemeka Opaigbeogu
Lucy Osakwe
Christina (Lugo) Raskin
Marc L. Resnick
Gwenette Sales
Lisbeth Sapirstein
Steven Schiff
Seth Schrager
Asif Shah
Carol Terry Blume
Ronald Thomas
Lydia Wade
Charles Wall

Wanda Williams

- * Conversion from provisional to full status
- + Extended provisional status