



**COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO FAMILY COURTS
AGENDA**

**Office of State Courts Administrator
Conference Call – 526-5398/866-630-9345**

June 4, 2010

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order/Approval of Minutes (Levine)

Minutes from March 5, 2010, Meeting

Attachment Page..... 3

Action: Committee approval of minutes

II. Status Updates

**A. Alliances with State / Local Bar Associations / Pro Bono Initiatives
(Stewart/DeFeo)**

1. Research update for “What can judges do to encourage and support pro bono representation?”

Verbal Update

2. Update of the *Pro bono* Subcommittee of the Delivery of Legal Services Committee

Verbal Update

B. Forms (Smith)

1. Update and Supreme Court Order regarding the following forms:
CAFC 101, 102, 111, 112, 140, 150, 170, 201, 211, 240, 250, & 270

Attachment Page 10

- a. Paternity Forms Corrections
- b. Motion to Modify Custody Corrections

C. Self-Help Centers (Schneider)

1. Verbal update

D. Litigant Education Program/Brochure (Bird/Brown)

1. Paternity Education Component

Action: Committee approval of component

E. Internet/Web Site (Bird)

1. Survey – Statistics and Comments (Norris)

Attachment Page 12

2. Website (Norris)

- F. Communications/Networking (Cruse)**
 - 1. Pro Se resources for Librarians
 - 2. Press release for first year statistics
 - 3. Publicity for Mid-Mo Access to Justice Project
 - 4. President's Page letter from Patricia Scaglia

- G. Court Staff /Clerk Education (Bird)**

- H. Judicial Education (Williamson)**

- III. Staff Report (Zacharias)**
 - Nothing to report

- IV. Old Business**

- A. Discussion with Supreme Court about the placement of the Litigant Awareness Program on the website (Levine)
- B. Forms: Standard Entry of Appearance, Affidavit for Publication, Petition for Appointment of Next Friend, Affidavit for Certified/Registered Mail (Forms Subcommittee)

- VI. New Business**

- A. Reorganization of Committee (Levine)
- B. Pro Bono Toolkit for Judges website
- C. "When Mommy and Daddy Get a Divorce" coloring book

- VII. Adjourn Meeting**

PLEASE MARK YOUR CALENDARS FOR THE NEXT CAFC MEETINGS:

**September 10, 2010
December 10, 2010**



**COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO FAMILY COURTS
MINUTES
March 5, 2010**

Members Present: Judge Dennis Smith, Lori Levine, Judge Leslie Schneider, Judge J.D. Williamson, Judge Miles Sweeney, Judge Bennett Burkemper, Lou DeFeo, Richard Holtmeyer, Mary Ann McClure, Karen Brown, Allen Stewart, Kathleen Bird, Richard Halliburton

Members Present
by Phone: Patricia Scaglia

OSCA Staff: Terri Norris, Kelly Cramer, Debbie Eiken

OSCA Staff Present
By Phone: Cathy Zacharias

Missouri Bar Staff: Robert Stoeckl

Members Absent: Judge Robin Vannoy, Judge Brent Powell, Deanna Scott, Beth Dessem, Fred Cruise, Marsha Holiman, Kelly Martinez

Guest: Cynthia Fox

I. Call to Order

The Committee on Access to Family Courts (CAFC) meeting was called to order by Lori Levine at 10:10 a.m. at the Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA), 121 Alameda Drive, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Karen Brown requested the sentence, “Karen Brown scheduled training for lawyers,” be removed from the minutes of the December 4, 2009, meeting. Kathleen Bird made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Judge Dennis Smith seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

II. Status Updates

A. Alliances with State/Local Bar Associations/Pro Bono Initiatives

Allan Stewart reported that Lucas Boling from the Missouri Bar Continuing Legal Education (CLE) programs agreed direction is needed from the committee in regards to funding training about Limited Scope Representation (LSR). The Missouri Bar is willing to work with the CAFC to present LSR training, but the issue is funding and marketing costs. The Bar can assist the CAFC in the funding. If the CAFC has no funds to sponsor the training, Bob Stoeckl will speak with the Bar leadership about what can be done. Allan asked if the committee has the funds or if

we need to seek funding from the Bar. If the Bar presents the training without funding assistance from CAFC, participants may have to pay. Allan stated telephone seminars cost approximately \$120.00 per participant. He is concerned about convincing lawyers to pay for a telephone seminar.

Lori asked Allan what the scope of the telephone seminars would be. Allan stated his focus is on creating a 2-hour program about LSR only. If a lawyer does have to pay for the training, it may need to be in conjunction with an annual meeting. Lou DeFeo suggested it might be possible to piggyback an existing CLE with a small piece about LSR. Another possibility is including LSR the Practicing Law Institute for free CLE for pro bono lawyers.

Allan introduced Cynthia Fox, an attorney from the St. Louis area who offers LSR. Cynthia presented information about how she uses LSR as a way to bridge a gap to provide access to the courts – sort of a legal services’ a la carte. LSR also helps parties take ownership of their problems and better understand the work to be done. She stated LSR is not being well received by judges. The parties need a lawyer to help complete the forms and they need to be substantiated with core documents. She stated she is willing to work with the committee if needed. Cynthia indicated the biggest problem with LSR is lack of acceptance from judges not the parties. She does LSR out of necessity, but it has gotten harder because she is seeing a greater number of people. A key component to being successful with LSR is to be organized.

Richard Halliburton asked Cynthia about her fees. Cynthia stated the fee is based on what is needed. She gives the litigant the option of visiting the resource center, which happens 99 percent of the time.

Judge Williamson stated he is unsure if a LSR component is on the schedule for this year’s judicial college. Judge Miles Sweeney stated there is a sequence to the schedule of topics presented at the judge’s college. He would recommend making LSR a part of ethics training. Two ethics hours are now required every year. Lori agreed we need to set up a program for ethics regarding LSR and seek approval from The Missouri Bar. Allan agreed it would be beneficial to have a LSR program be part of the ethics CLE, and there is already a rule; we just need to expand on it. Lori stated achieving this should be a goal of this subcommittee.

Robert Stoeckl stated the biggest obstacle to LSR may be lawyers who think they are not allowed to practice LSR. We need to educate them. Another problem noted before is we have “married” LSR with *pro se*. Lawyers equate LSR with *pro se* and the committee should work to distance it from *pro se*. The committee should also market LSR in a different way to help lawyers see LSR for what it is and the benefits to themselves.

Lori suggested Allan and Lou work with the subcommittee and Bob Stoeckl to develop the training for the two hour ethics seminar.

Kathleen Bird reported Judge Chamberlain started a *pro se* docket in Clay County with a list of three attorneys who agreed to provide LSR. Now, approximately 43 percent of the cases are LSR, up from zero percent with no representation when they started, and the list of attorneys is now three pages long. The fees vary and are determined by the lawyers.

Cynthia explained when staff in her office speaks to new clients, they explain the options available. Approximately 90 percent of her clients choose LSR. Kathleen stated the biggest fear for clients is being given an hourly rate and the amount quoted generally “shuts people down.” Karen asked Cynthia if she has received more business due to word of mouth. Cynthia stated she is not aware of that happening.

1. Characteristics of a Successful Pro Bono Program:

Lou requested committee members make suggestions for ways to increase pro bono representation and for ideas about how to design a program of education for judges to implement LSR and pro bono access to the courts. Suggestions included special dockets for pro bono cases, pro bono appreciation week/month for participating lawyers, CLE credit for pro bono lawyers, educating judges, surveying judges about pro bono issues, getting judges and lawyers together to educate them about LSR, designing a template that would fairly distribute the pro bono caseload to multiple lawyers and not just the same core group.

Mary Ann McClure suggested surveying judges to ask what they do to encourage the support of pro bono. Lou would like to see our committee survey judges and The Missouri Bar survey lawyers. Lori suggested two surveys be developed.

Judge Sweeney made a motion for the CAFC to survey judges in collaboration with the pro bono subcommittee, which will survey lawyers. Judge Williamson seconded the motion. The motion passed.

B. Forms

The committee discussed three different forms.

1. Motion to Modify – Property and Debt Statement Form

Judge Smith reviewed the final language changes included in the sections for “Property Owned by You” and “Debts Owed by You” that were approved at the previous meeting.

2. Paternity Forms

Judge Dennis Smith presented a packet of forms for use in paternity actions. They included the following:

- CAFC301 – Father’s Petition for Declaration of Paternity, Custody and/or Support
- CAFC 303 – Presumed Father’s Petition for Declaration of Non-Paternity
- CAFC 304 – Petition of Set Aside Judgment of Paternity and Support
- CAFC 305 – Guardians Ad Litem Petition for Declaration of Paternity, Child Custody and/or Support
- CAFC 307 – Paternity Judgment

The committee decided to change "Possible Father" to "Presumed Father" within the forms. There was some discussion regarding Guardian Ad Litem (GAL) and if the mother or father could be appointed as the GAL. Judge Smith believes the GAL has to be a lawyer. In the Father's Petition, CAFC 301, several questions regarding additional information about the children were consolidated. The same changes were made to the Mother's Petition, CAFC 302, and the Presumed Father's Petition, CAFC 303, and the Petition to Set Aside Judgment of Paternity, CAFC 304. After further discussion, the committee determined there was no authority for a GAL to petition for paternity and form CAFC 305 was removed from consideration.

Allan made a motion to approve the paternity forms (excluding CAFC 305) with revisions, Mary Ann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Motion to Modify Custody

Judge Smith reviewed changes to the Motion to Modify forms.

In paragraph four of CAFC111 - Answer to Motion to Modify Child Custody, the entire social security number was to be entered. This is a mistake. Only the last four digits of the social security number are to be entered on the form.

On forms CAFC101 - Motion to Modify Custody and CAFC201 - Petition for Custody, there are grammatical changes the committee agreed are necessary for consistency. Both of these forms are drafted so the person completing the form is answering information in the first person. For example, in paragraph one of CAFC 101, it states, "My current full name is." In paragraph three of the same form it gives the person answering the forms the options of, "I am the Mother," or "I am the Father." This language is consistent through the entire form until paragraphs 19 through 25. In these paragraphs the forms switch from a declarative mode to asking a question. For example, paragraph 19 as approved states, "What has changed since the last custody judgment that would justify a different custody arrangement? You may include information that was unknown to the trial court at the time of the previous judgment pursuant to Section 452.410, RSMo." The proposed language would state, "The following changes have occurred since the last custody judgment. These changes justify a different custody arrangement. (*Information that was unknown to the trial court at the time of the previous judgment may also be included pursuant to Section 452.410, RSMo.*)" The italics are in the original. Similar changes were also made to paragraphs 20 through 25 on the prior form so the language is now included in paragraphs 20 through 22.

Lastly, the committee discussed the six-month requirement for jurisdiction as the "home state," as well as requiring the dates the child resides in the state.

Judge Smith made a motion to approve the recommended grammatical changes to the modification forms, but not if approval is required by the Supreme Court. Lori seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The committee discussed whether it would be appropriate to have a test at the end of the forms. Karen asked if the forms are interactive such that, if a participant answers a question wrong are they notified in some manner that they need to make a correction? Judge Smith stated the forms do not alert the participant to mistakes made.

Kelly Cramer asked Judge Smith if the subcommittee will be revising the answer form. He stated he doesn't want to revise the answer form. Patricia Scaglia agreed. She stated some judges want just an answer, not waiver of service.

Other forms pending discussion by the committee include Affidavit for Publication, Petition for Appointment of Next Friend, and Affidavit for Certified/Registered Mail.

Kathleen noted she has had a couple of inquires regarding an application to file as a poor person. Terri stated this form is already on the Web site. There was some discussion about the form; it was agreed that the Application to File as a Poor Person (OSCA form) should be moved closer to the Representing Yourself forms.

C. Self-Help Centers

Judge Schneider reported the Mid-Missouri Access to Justice Project submitted a mid-year report to the Family Court Committee (FCC). She has requested an additional year of funding from the FCC through the Domestic Relations Resolution Fund. Judge Schneider feels the project needs another year to be fully functioning. She also stated the director has needed a lot of training and assistance.

Judge Burkemper stated an additional year of funding for the program was not hard to sell to the FCC and he believes the FCC will agree to provide the \$25,000 for a second year.

Richard Halliburton asked what the biggest problem is with the program. Judge Schneider stated lawyers do not want to take contested pro bono cases.

Lou made a motion to continue supporting a second year funding request for the Mid-Missouri Access to Justice Project. Judge Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Litigant Education

1. DVD/Brochure Update

Terri Norris reported the DVD and brochure have been mailed to all clerks. She stated the brochure has been posted on the internal judicial network for duplication by clerks. OSCA has not received any feedback or requests for additional copies. Kathleen Bird stated a link to the DVD will be placed on the Representing Yourself Home page. Mary Ann McClure stated she will be at the clerks' college and can answer questions about the DVD.

2. Education Components

Kathleen Bird reported she has been working with Karen Brown and Patricia Scaglia to draft three new education components for the Web site – Petition for Name Change, Motion for Family Access and Motion to Modify. They still are working on the paternity component. The committee reviewed the three documents and recommended a few minor changes.

Judge Smith made a motion to approve the three education components as revised. Judge Williamson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Lori would like to see more litigant awareness information about LSR on the Web site.

Judge Smith passed around a coloring book provided by The Bar Association of Metropolitan St. Louis titled, “When Mommy and Daddy Get a Divorce.” He suggested putting the book on the Web site. Lori suggested the litigant education subcommittee review the book and make a recommendation. The discussion of the book was tabled until the next meeting.

E. Internet/Web Site

Terri Norris and Kathleen Bird gave a verbal report. The DVD is now on the Web site. The new survey has been online since January 15, 2010. Terri will have survey statistics at the next meeting.

F. Communications/Networking

Patricia says she will draft a letter to Skip Walthers. She also is researching other options for networking. Patricia reported she would like to be further along than she is and that she needs to talk with Fred Cruse to get history about what has been done so she can correctly outline what the message is and where we have been. She is hoping to have everything done by April 1, 2010.

G. Court Staff/Clerk Education

Mary Ann McClure stated she will be at the circuit clerks conference that will be held in September 2010. She would like to get a time slot during the conference for an educational program. She also would like to do a road show.

Lori asked Mary Ann if she thinks the clerks are well educated about what the committee is doing. Mary Ann stated most of them really like what is being done, but there are several who do not. She agrees that the longer we have the program the better it gets.

H. Judicial Education (Williamson)

There was some discussion in conjunction with Cynthia Fox’s input regarding LSR. Judge Williamson was not sure if anything about LSR is on the schedule for judicial college. He would like to see the approval of ethics credits for LSR.

III. Staff reports

Kelly Cramer discussed the budget and reminded the committee about the need to eliminate some onsite meetings to cut expenses.

The committee discussed the upcoming meetings that can be held by phone conference. Lori stated the only issue is if the committee needs to discuss forms, then it's easier to have a face-to-face meeting. The June 4, 2010, meeting will be a conference call unless a discussion about forms is necessary.

IV. Old Business

A. Subcommittee New Assignments (Levine/Smith)

New assignments to the subcommittees were made by Lori and Judge Smith. The chair of the internet/web site subcommittee was changed from Terri Norris to Kathleen Bird.

The judicial education subcommittee should be working with the alliances subcommittee. The forms subcommittee is an active working committee. The communications subcommittee needs to work on the marketing message. Bob Stoeckl was asked to draft a press release about the first year statistics.

VI. Adjourn Meeting

Lori stated the top priority is to have a big push by the alliances subcommittee. The next meeting will be Friday, June 4, 2010. The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.



SUPREME COURT OF MISSOURI

en banc

April 2, 2010

Effective July 1, 2010

In re: Forms for use by self-represented parties in certain proceedings

ORDER

1. The materials attached hereto, having been prepared by this Court's Committee on Access to Family Courts and reviewed by the Court, are hereby adopted and approved effective July 1, 2010, but the forms may be used prior thereto.

2. Pursuant to Rule 88.09, effective July 1, 2010, the forms attached hereto shall be accepted by the courts of this state until disapproved or superceded by this Court. The forms attached hereto may be accepted by the courts of this state prior thereto. These forms supercede any similar forms previously approved by this Court. Every self-represented party who participates in a proceeding for dissolution of marriage, legal separation, parentage, or the modification of a judgment in any such proceeding shall use the forms attached if applicable.

3. It is further ordered that this order shall be published in the South Western Reporter and the Journal of The Missouri Bar. The materials attached need not be

published with the order if reference is made that the materials can be accessed at <http://www.courts.mo.gov> and clicking on the links to "Representing Yourself" and "Legal Forms."

Day - to - Day

WILLIAM RAY PRICE, JR.
Chief Justice

**Representing Yourself Web Site Survey Statistics
January 16 – April 28, 2010**

How many years of schooling have you completed?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Some High School	207	14.2	14.2	100.0
High School Graduate	311	21.3	21.3	49.5
GED	144	9.9	9.9	28.2
Some College	383	26.2	26.2	85.8
Occupational/Vocational Degree	86	5.9	5.9	58.8
Associates Degree	138	9.5	9.5	9.5
Bachelors Degree	116	7.9	7.9	17.4
Masters Degree	49	3.4	3.4	52.9
Professional School Degree	12	.8	.8	59.6
Doctorate Degree	14	1.0	1.0	18.4
Total	1460	100.0	100.0	

How much money do you make a year before taxes are taken out? Do not include your spouse or anyone else living in your house.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
\$0 - 10,999	437	30.1	30.1	30.2
\$11,000 - 19,999	254	17.5	17.5	47.7
\$20,000 - 29,999	254	17.5	17.5	65.2
\$30,000 - 39,999	193	13.3	13.3	78.5
\$40,000 - 49,999	107	7.4	7.4	85.9
\$50,000 or over	122	8.4	8.4	94.3
Unemployed	83	5.7	5.7	100.0
Total	1451	100.0	100.0	

How many children do you have?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	270	18.5	18.5	18.5
2	370	25.4	25.4	44.0
3	234	16.1	16.1	60.0
4	129	8.9	8.9	68.9
5	36	2.5	2.5	71.4
6	5	.3	.3	71.7
More than 6	11	.8	.8	72.5
None	401	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	1456	100.0	100.0	

How long have you been married?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 1 year	124	8.7	8.7	69.0
1 - 5 years	509	35.6	35.6	35.6
5 - 10 years	353	24.7	24.7	60.4
More than 10 years	322	22.5	22.5	91.6
No longer married	120	8.4	8.4	100.0
Total	1428	100.0	100.0	

Where do you most often use the Internet?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Home	931	64.2	64.2	72.8
Work	211	14.5	14.5	100.0
Public Library	163	11.2	11.2	85.5
Courthouse	2	.1	.1	.1
Friend or relative's house	123	8.5	8.5	8.6
Other (please specify below)	21	1.4	1.4	74.2
Total	1451	100.0	100.0	

“Other” selection for Where do you most often use the Internet?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
career center	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
cell phone	1	5.9	5.9	11.8
College	1	5.9	5.9	17.6
divorce	1	5.9	5.9	23.5
HOME	1	5.9	5.9	29.4
http://amaryl-fda.socialgo.com	1	5.9	5.9	35.3
I travel	1	5.9	5.9	41.2
library or fec	1	5.9	5.9	47.1
Mothers	1	5.9	5.9	52.9
never	1	5.9	5.9	58.8
public computer	1	5.9	5.9	64.7
school	3	17.6	17.6	82.4
School	3	17.6	17.6	100.0
Total	17	100.0	100.0	

Have you talked to a lawyer or free legal service about your case?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	485	33.7	33.7	100.0
No	954	66.3	66.3	66.3
Total	1439	100.0	100.0	

**Since you answered YES to question 7, why do you want to represent yourself?
(Select the one that best fits your situation.)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Too expensive	303	62.2	62.2	100.0
Lawyer had a conflict	6	1.2	1.2	19.3
Personal reasons	28	5.7	5.7	37.8
I did not like him or her	5	1.0	1.0	1.0
I think I can represent myself	83	17.0	17.0	18.1
None of the above	62	12.7	12.7	32.0
Total	487	100.0	100.0	

**Since you answered NO to question 7, why do you want to represent yourself?
(Select the one that best fits your situation.)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I want to hire a lawyer, but I cannot afford one	338	36.1	36.1	86.4
I can afford to hire a lawyer, but I do not want to hire one	60	6.4	6.4	6.4
I think I can represent myself	411	43.9	43.9	50.3
None of the above	127	13.6	13.6	100.0
Total	936	100.0	100.0	

Matter Type

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Divorce	1215	61.2	61.2	79.8
Custody Issues	194	9.8	9.8	18.5
Order of Protection (Domestic Violence)	19	1.0	1.0	91.1
Paternity	29	1.5	1.5	95.3
Child Support	174	8.8	8.8	8.8
Visitation	94	4.7	4.7	100.0
Name Change	105	5.3	5.3	90.1
Modification	70	3.5	3.5	84.8
Enforcement of Orders	30	1.5	1.5	81.3
Other (please specify below)	54	2.7	2.7	93.8
Total	1984	100.0	100.0	

It was easy to find what I was looking for on the Representing Yourself Web site.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	94	6.7	6.7	100.0
Disagree	104	7.4	7.4	47.3
No Opinion	210	14.9	14.9	62.2
Agree	561	39.9	39.9	39.9
Strongly Agree	395	28.1	28.1	93.3
Not Applicable	43	3.1	3.1	65.2
Total	1407	100.0	100.0	

The educational information was easy to understand.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	76	5.5	5.5	100.0
Disagree	40	2.9	2.9	48.0
No Opinion	216	15.5	15.5	63.5
Agree	627	45.1	45.1	45.1
Strongly Agree	382	27.5	27.5	94.5
Not Applicable	49	3.5	3.5	67.1
Total	1390	100.0	100.0	

Without the educational information I would not have been as prepared for court.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	69	5.0	5.0	100.0
Disagree	63	4.5	4.5	41.4
No Opinion	400	28.8	28.8	70.1
Agree	512	36.8	36.8	36.8
Strongly Agree	271	19.5	19.5	95.0
Not Applicable	75	5.4	5.4	75.5
Total	1390	100.0	100.0	

It was easy to know what forms I needed to use.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	86	6.2	6.2	100.0
Disagree	127	9.1	9.1	50.4
No Opinion	296	21.3	21.3	71.7
Agree	574	41.3	41.3	41.3
Strongly Agree	250	18.0	18.0	93.8
Not Applicable	58	4.2	4.2	75.8
Total	1391	100.0	100.0	

The forms were easy to use.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	73	5.3	5.3	100.0
Disagree	53	3.8	3.8	47.5
No Opinion	329	23.8	23.8	71.3
Agree	603	43.7	43.7	43.7
Strongly Agree	262	19.0	19.0	94.7
Not Applicable	61	4.4	4.4	75.7
Total	1381	100.0	100.0	

After looking at everything on this site, I feel more ready to represent myself in court.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	79	5.7	5.7	100.0
Disagree	38	2.8	2.8	45.1
No Opinion	307	22.3	22.3	67.3
Agree	583	42.3	42.3	42.3
Strongly Agree	312	22.6	22.6	94.3
Not Applicable	59	4.3	4.3	71.6
Total	1378	100.0	100.0	

Comments from Web Site Survey January, 16 – April 28, 2010

1. Did not find the forms. (Note from Terri: Family law matter selected was Name Change.)
2. I appreciate that the forms are available readily for processing a “no contest” dissolution of marriage (divorce). Beyond that the rest of the information was not necessary for me personally but I can see why it is beneficial to require individuals to review it to avoid problems whole-scale.
3. i can't answer you won't let me get beyond the point to look at the question or anything to see how to answer these questions.
4. Information could be made in easier layman terms.
5. i have printed divorce forms from your web site but sure what to do when i get them filled out
6. I still haven't found the correct form.
7. i hope this is all you need for a certificate that you are requestiog from me to get this devorice over with i just want my last name to be restored to schaffer and for me and my children to be able to able to go on with my life i am hoping this is all you need if not please help me get this information so i can be free from billy jo brown for good thank you very much in this matter if you need to contact me please feel free to contact me at 573-xxx-xxxx again thank you very much in this matter.
8. I want to file for divorce and represent myself because of the emotional and sexual abuse he inflicted upon my ten year old daughter and I cannot afford a private attorney
9. I just don't know what I need to do next. I thought once I filed the papers the courts would give me a court date. Also I turned in all the information for him to be served but that has yet to happen. I have tried to find the answers but I haven't yet on how to get a court date and him served. Please help I couldn't afford a laywer so I done this myself I saved up the filing fee and I don't have money now to even get advice or help if I could find someone willing to help me. Thank you, Lisa Knight ph.417-xxx-xxxx or email address ...
10. I need to file a review of claim exemption with the court. Case #05R5-AC00030. I gave already filed with Sheriff Jim Buckles I just need to file with your office pursuant Court Rule 76.075. My name is Danny J Conner, 1846 Old Exeter Rd. Cassville, Mo 65625. I do not have a computer at home and have to use the library as I answered above. Can you please notify me of what form I need to file with your office. Thank you and I have just a short time because I just received the letter from the Sheriff informing me of this March 9, 2010 and it said it needed to be done in 10 days.
11. divorce package didnt download
12. have not been able to find the Missouri Beneficiary Deed form.
13. the information and instructions were easy to understand.
14. i feel this is a great site specially for people who has no children and property, and if they agree to dissolve their marriage this is the way to go. GREAT SITE
15. I'M BEEN SEPARATED FROM MY WIFE 13 YEARRS, AND I DON'T KNOW WHERE IS SHE. SHE IS NOT CITISEN OF THE USA.
16. The forms are not in the proper format. The jackson county court in independence will not accept these forms. After searching other legal websites I found out what

forms i needed. If I commit a crime 2day I would have an attorney by friday but after 2years of trying to get legal aid to help me i decided it was cheaper to become a paralegal....

17. When I got my first divorce I filled a hand written petition and filed it. Then we appeared before the Judge and presented our sides and he made a ruling. Whatever happened to the simple way of doing things. These electronic forms have actually made everything more difficult.
18. This questionnaire popped up before I started my query for documents. Therefore, I can't answer questions 11-16.
19. Some of the instructions in the form are not clear. For example, the meaning of "waiver of service and entry of appearance" and where to get the form are not explained.
20. I just found out that the forms on this site are not accepted by the Clay County District 5 judge. I wish I would have known that prior to filing the forms.
21. There is nothing that shows what to do if someone is falsifying records to benefit their outcome. Especially, when neither one of us have lived before, lived since or plan to live in Missouri. Then the police report from another state goes from a simple argument to kidnapping, sexual assault and assault with a deadly weapon by their writing in your state. In most states isn't that perjury especially after you have sworn to it and the police sworn to their side.
22. You ask this before I filled out the forms
23. The court says I need to file again because she was not served. Do I have to do all the paper work again. I also need info on how to serve her in another state. She is in prison. Thank you very much.
24. THERE WILL BE NO DISPUTES IN THIS CASE AND I DO UNDERSTAND THE TERMS. HOPEFULLY IT WILL BE OVER AND WE CAN BOTH GET ON WITH OUR LIVES AND BE HAPPY. YOUR PROGRAM WAS VERY EASY TO WORK WITH.
25. I phoned the clerk of the court to ask what form I needed and was told I needed to find it myself. (64701 = Harrisonville, Mo)
26. I could not find anything on this site. Everything seemed to be a dead end. I only answered this survey because I wanted to tell you how frustrating it was for me to try and find what I was looking for.
27. am having a hard time downloading the dissolution of marriage documents
28. Very helpful in preparation. A valuable service provided from the State. Thank You.
29. I WOULD HAVE TALKED WITH AN ATTORNEY BUT KNEW I COULDN'T AFFORD ONE.
30. would be more helpful to see more forms for Family Court issues.
31. I am still in preparation for court and hoping that I will be able to self represent myself entirely. Thank you very much for this site. I've already told many people.
32. I have Adobe Reader 9 but it still won't let me save the documents even if they are not completed yet.
33. Great site! I couldn't have found one better! This is EXACTLY the information I was looking for to determine if/should I represent myself and how to go about doing it.
34. eviction form CV90 is the same as garnishment or something like that? There are tons of landlords and rental property, why is locating the eviction forms so difficult?
35. we both agree on all terms all is solved we just want the divorce and agree to split custody of the one child the others do not live with her or me