

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

Amendment to Rule XX

TRAYLOR, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part with reasons.

I join in the views expressed by Justices Lemmon and Victory in this matter but write to additionally express my view that scope of law school clinic representation of indigents should remain as originally intended by the rule: that is that the law school clinics represent indigent persons and organizations that are made up of truly indigent persons. Furthermore, I join Justice Lemmon's assertion that this court should define indigency for individuals and for organizations using federal rules for providing legal services based upon the federal poverty level. The rule was designed to both help law students learn the practice of law and indigent persons attain representation. The rule has been perverted to serve ends never intended and thus these changes do not go far enough to address the real problem. Accordingly, I respectfully dissent.