The Honorable Wilhelmina Rolark  
Chairperson, Judiciary Committee  
Council of the District of Columbia  
District Building, Room 125  
1350 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Councilmember Rolark,

We write to add support for efforts to retain adequate funding for the Superior Court’s Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Program. On behalf of Division 2 (Antitrust, Trade Regulation and Consumer Affairs) and of its Consumer Affairs Committee, we urge the Judiciary Committee of the Council of the District of Columbia to provide the full $260,000 for the requested ten positions.

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Program recognizes that alternatives to formal litigation may, in many instances, better serve the interests of all parties and provide for more efficient administration of justice. It offers citizens of the District a wider range of problem-solving mechanisms and helps create a better match between citizen disputes and the variety of services available for addressing those disputes.

---

1 Standard Disclaimer: The views expressed herein represent only those of Division 2 (Antitrust, Trade Regulation and Consumer Affairs) and of the Consumer Affairs Committee, of the D.C. Bar, and not those of the D.C. Bar or its Board of Governors.
Especially for low-income people, litigation expenses may often preclude a full vindication of important legal rights. Even for people of moderate income, the costs and delays of adversary litigation may quickly overwhelm the amount in controversy. The Multi-Door program, on the other hand, offers a more realistic and immediate avenue for pursuit of these lawful claims.

In short, the experiment with the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Program is well worth extending. It provides a valuable, cost-efficient resource to the community and substantially advances the interests of justice.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Susman
Chairperson, Division 2
Steering Committee

David A. Koplow
Chairperson, Consumer Affairs Committee