

# SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

## Amendment to Rule XX

### **VICTORY, J., dissenting in part, and concurring in part with reasons.**

I dissent from the action taken by the court today as follows:

(1) By today's redefinition of *indigency* to include persons making twice the federal poverty guidelines, a family of eight making in excess of \$55,000 annually is deemed indigent. While this fiction may work to the advantage of those making larger incomes, it has no basis in law and may mean that some who meet federal indigency guidelines will go unrepresented.

(2) The intent of our rule is to allow students to represent local indigent community organizations on issues of local importance. Our rule should not allow representation of an indigent local organization when its national affiliate has the ability to provide counsel. In my view, in lifting the restriction that a local organization not be affiliated with a national organization, we should require proof that the national organization also meets our standards.

I concur as follows:

The deletion of the word *financial* before the word *information* in Section 5 was merely to make our rule conform to the federal regulations concerning representation of organizations, and does not mean that financial information need not be provided. In fact, it is difficult to imagine what information, other than financial information, would "show that the organization lacks, and has no private means of obtaining, funds to retain private counsel."