

REPORT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT FAMILY COURT PANEL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO CHIEF JUDGE LEE F. SATTERFIELD

December 2010

On January 15, 2010, Chief Judge Satterfield issued Administrative Order 10-01 through which the Court re-established the Family Court Panel, based on recommendations from the Family Court Panel Oversight Committee (“the Committee”). In addition, the Administrative Order provided for the consideration by the Committee of applications to the Family Court Panels of Attorneys (hereafter “Family Court Panels”) at any time between the periodic re-establishment of the Family Court Panels as the Committee deemed appropriate based upon the needs of the Family Court.

Pursuant to that directive, the Committee considered all applications filed after September 15, 2009 (the previous deadline) and on or before December 1, 2010, as well as applications from attorneys appointed to the Provisional CCAN panel in January 2010 for a one year term. Forty-six applications from new or returning applicants were received following the previous September 15, 2009 application deadline, and eleven Provisional CCAN attorneys re-applied for full CCAN panel status. Any application filed after December 1, 2010 will be considered by the Committee in due course, under the rolling admissions procedure.

The Application and Consideration Process

The Committee adhered to the same application format and consideration process as set forth in its January 2010 Final Report, issued in conjunction with Administrative Order 10-01: Re-Establishment of the Family Court Panels. Information about the application process and a copy of the application were posted on the D.C. Superior Court’s website throughout the application period.

The Committee considered the responses provided by the applicants to the questions set forth in the application form and input from Superior Court judicial officers on the qualifications and abilities of each applicant based upon that judicial officer’s own observations and experience. Many applicants were unknown to any judicial officer and received no comments; however, other applicants received numerous evaluations from a variety of judges. In addition, the Committee sought the input of the Family Court Advisory Selection Committee, established pursuant to Administrative Order 04-15.

Some applicants had not been admitted to the D.C. Bar either because they were awaiting results of the Bar exam or because they were waiting for their application for waiver to be decided. As set forth in the Administrative Order, if an applicant is not a member of the D.C. Bar, the applicant is not eligible for appointment to the Family Court Panels. Such applicants are invited to reapply at such time that they have been admitted to the D.C. Bar. In addition, several applicants notified the Committee that they were withdrawing their applications because they had accepted employment elsewhere.

The Committee met on March 4, 2010; October 18, 2010; and December 6, 2010 to review the applications. Usually there was consensus about whether an applicant should be accepted to the Provisional, CCAN, Guardian ad litem, Special Education, or Juvenile Panel.

Recommendations of the Family Court Panel Oversight Committee

The attached list represents the recommendations of the Family Court Panel Oversight Committee with respect to additions to the Family Court Panels.

With respect to the new or returning applicants, the Committee recommends that six of the twenty-three applicants for the GAL panel be deemed eligible for appointment as a guardian *ad litem*; nine of the twenty-two applicants for the CCAN panel be deemed eligible for other CCAN appointments and three be awarded Provisional CCAN status; ten of the twenty-four applicants for the Juvenile panel be deemed eligible for juvenile appointments; and six of the seventeen applicants for the Special Education panel be deemed eligible for special education attorney appointments.

With respect to the eleven Provisional panel applicants, the Committee recommends that nine be placed on the full CCAN panel, and that two remain as Provisional attorneys due to a lack of sufficient information about their performance given the limited number of cases in which they appeared.

It is the responsibility of Panel Attorneys to complete pre-service training prior to appointment. In addition, an attorney's membership on the Panel is conditioned upon his or her compliance with all Administrative Orders setting an annual cap for attorney compensation for appointed representation and providing representation in conformance with the applicable Attorney Practice Standards for Child Abuse and Neglect, adopted by administrative Order 03-07; for Representing Juveniles Charged with Delinquency or as Persons in Need of Supervision, adopted by Administrative Order 04-13; and/or for Special Education Panel Attorneys, adopted by Administrative Order 09-03.

The Committee recommends that the effective date of the additions to the Family Court Panel be the date of the issuance of the Administrative Order, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

On behalf of the District of Columbia Superior Court, the Committee thanks all attorneys who applied to the Family Court Panel.

Respectfully submitted:

Family Court Panel Oversight Committee

Judge Juliet J. McKenna, Chair
Judge Zoe Bush
Magistrate Judge Julie Breslow
Judge Carol Ann Dalton
Judge Linda K. Davis
Magistrate Judge Tara Fentress
Magistrate Judge John McCabe
Magistrate Judge William W. Nooter
Magistrate Judge Mary Grace Rook
Judge J. Michael Ryan

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FAMILY COURT PANEL OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE OF ATTORNEYS TO BE APPOINTED TO THE FAMILY COURT
PANELS**

Appendix 1

(Provisional CCAN Panel)

1. Marco Antonio Cabezas
2. Mark Anthony Cotton
3. Michelle Klass
4. Tiffani Sloan
5. James G. Turner

Appendix 2

(GAL Panel)

1. Stacey Boehm-Russell
2. Althea Izawa Fuhr
3. Jan A. Holland–Chatman
4. Lawrence Huebner
5. Phillip M. Skillman
6. Renee L. Stasio

Appendix 3

(CCAN Panel)

1. Lauren A. Balawejder-Schwartz
2. Maria Arnold Beaujuin
3. Karen A. Bower
4. Althea Izawa Fuhr
5. Jan A. Holland-Chatman
6. Errika M. Jefferson
7. Julia L. Jordaich
8. Cherie M. King
9. Karen M. Malovrh
10. Colleen J. Martin
11. Dawn H. Mascoll
12. Kathleen A. Muldoon
13. Derrick Page
14. Troy William Poole
15. Phillip M. Skillman
16. Renee L. Stasio
17. Richard J. Tappan
18. Jorge M. Vila

Appendix 4

(Special Education Attorney Panel)

1. Stacey Boehm-Russell
2. Pamela Laine Halpern
3. Jan A. Holland-Chatman
4. Lawrence Huebner
5. Rodney Michael Jones
6. Ebele Onweueme

Appendix 5

(Juvenile Panel)

1. Michael Paul Bruckheim
2. Elizabeth Michelle Tupper Butler
3. Timothy Curry
4. Eduardo Ferrer
5. Stanley Jamison Koelher
6. Loretta Okeke
7. Michael Pellegrin
8. Anna Bridget Scanlon
9. Phillip M. Skillman
10. Patricia A. Sulton