

Martin D Lynch
"Concerned Parents"
Chairman of the Legislative Committee – AZFR
1039 W 19th St, Tempe AZ, 85281
602-550-6304
MDL2222222222@gmail.com

IN THE SUPREME COURT

STATE OF ARIZONA

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC HEARING)	
per Rule 28(E) and)	Supreme Court Number
REQUEST TO COVER A PROCEEDING)	R-15-0006
per RULE 122(c))	
_____)	

To the Honorable Justices of the Arizona State Supreme Court,

On the Court Rules Forum, Petitioner has noted the nearly unanimous concurrence of prominent professionals who wish to dismiss these proceedings as without foundation as if there were no problems to correct. Regarding R-15-0006, several Attorney/PCs have opined, as it is their business to know about such pending proceedings since they make a very healthy living from providing PC services under Rule 74.

Nobody knows how many families and children have been harmed by PC abuse. Victims of PC abuse find themselves at a distinct disadvantage. Nobody has sent a letter or an email to every client who has utilized the services of PCs over the previous 24 or 36 months to notify them of these proceedings, at least not yet. Those few that do know must overcome hurdles to get registered and draft and submit input while they are trying to run a family and hold a job, which is most likely not related to Rule 74, as is otherwise the case for all of these Attorney/PCs. Under these lopsided circumstances Petitioner finds himself compelled to Request a Public Hearing on R-15-0006 per Rule 28(E).

Additionally, Petitioner wishes to concurrently submit a Request to Cover this Proceeding per Rule 122(c) with the intent of disseminating knowledge of the existence and substance of R-15-0006 in the public domain so that a full and fair hearing as reasonably can be achieved based upon a public discussion may take place in the service of the public interest and the welfare of the children of this community.

Since numerous news outlets have expressed interest in this topic, Petitioner can foresee a potential conflict with Rule 122(d)(1)(E) “adequacy of physical facilities of the court”. Since petitioner is not familiar with the size and facilities available in the “designated area” described in Rule 122(e), guidance from the court on this matter is requested. Petitioner presumes two or three camera crews could be directly accommodated before “pooling” per Rule 122(g) would be required but would gladly follow any instructions provided by the court and already intends to remind media personnel of Rule 122(k)(1) Prohibition of recording while the Judge is off the bench.

Until the day of the hearing we will not know how many camera crews show up but on the day of the hearing we will know the number and proceed appropriately. How can we say the PC process is performing properly if we don’t know which PCs are performing well as opposed to which PCs are performing poorly or causing harm to their clients and children? How can we know that Family Court judges are exercising appropriate oversight of PCs if there are judges that sustain zero objections to numerous PC recommendations?

Petitioner is grateful for this opportunity provided by this Supreme Court of the State of Arizona to work within the system to effect changes that might serve to protect vulnerable families in crisis and the children of those families.

Respectfully and Sincerely,

April 23, 2015

Martin Lynch - Petitioner