WASPLC – SPC: STATEWIDE

Tanya Goodman
July 26, 2025
Type of Paper: Policy

Policy Brief

Regulating Innovation to Death: How Washington's Legal Pilot Delays Justice and Blocks AI Access

Abstract

In December 2024, the Washington Supreme Court authorized a 10-year "legal innovation pilot" allowing select non-lawyer entities to offer legal services under bar-monitored oversight [1]. While framed as a bold experiment in expanding access to justice, the program creates more barriers than solutions. It reinforces professional monopolies, restricts AI-enabled tools from reaching pro se litigants, and centralizes control over legal innovation under WSBA authority.

Rather than opening the legal market, the pilot delays necessary reforms by another decade, shutting out grassroots tools and technologists already building affordable, effective alternatives. The result: a top-down, compliance-heavy structure that protects institutional turf while citizens—particularly low-income, disabled, rural, and self-represented litigants—are left behind.

Problem

Access to civil justice remains a crisis across Washington State. According to the 2022 Civil Legal Needs Study Update, over 70% of low-income households face at least one legal problem annually, but most receive no meaningful help. In family law, housing, consumer, and disability cases, AI-assisted tools and alternative models could provide rapid, affordable solutions—but they remain blocked by outdated professional rules.

In response to national calls for reform, the Washington Supreme Court authorized a time-limited pilot project (Order 25700-B-721) to test "entity-level regulation." However, instead of building on existing, successful models from other jurisdictions, Washington created an overly cautious, bar-controlled sandbox that delays access rather than expands it.

Other states have already taken bolder, faster action:
1. Arizona eliminated Rule 5.4 in 2020 and created the Alternative Business Structures (ABS) model, licensing entities—including tech companies and non-lawyer-owned firms—to provide legal services under independent regulatory oversight [2].
2. Utah's Office of Legal Services Innovation, launched in 2020, operates a real-time sandbox with over 30 authorized legal service providers offering AI tools, non-lawyer assistance, and hybrid delivery systems[7].
3. Colorado, California, and Illinois have studied or launched models focused on regulatory reform, often with public-facing data dashboards, community engagement, and shorter timelines[4],[5],[6].

Washington had these blueprints, and ignored them. Rather than adapting proven frameworks, it opted for a decade-long bar-led process that limits participation to pre-approved, lawyer-monitored entities, excludes grassroots or AI-driven tools, and delays real access to justice.

This approach reaffirms a clear institutional choice: to protect professional monopoly and delay structural change.

Solution

To restore public access to legal help, Washington must restructure or replace the current pilot framework. Key reforms include:
1. Cap the pilot at 12 months, with an independent public evaluation committee consisting of local expertise, not 10 years under closed WSBA control.
2. Legal Access Carveout for AI: Exempt public-interest AI tools from unauthorized practice rules when designed for pro se support.
3. Open Standards Framework: Allow innovators to develop tools transparently without requiring bar sponsorship or compliance officers.
4. Fund Community-Based Innovation:
    a. Create a public-interest legal tech fund to support nonprofits and small orgs

building direct-to-user tools, and teach the public how to engage for their legal concerns.

b.Create corporate incentivized programs that provide community resources and training.

5. Mandatory Public Transparency: Require all pilot outcomes, complaints, and effectiveness data to be published and independently analyzed.
6. Create an Independent AI & Legal Access Board: Convene technologists, access-to-justice experts, and end users, not just WSBA lawyers, to set standards for safe, scalable innovation.

Expected Outcomes

1. Increased access to legal tools for low-income, disabled, rural, and pro se communities.
2. Faster deployment of responsible AI solutions in protection orders, family law, housing, civil rights, and disability rights.
3. Diversified legal service models, ending the monopoly on help delivery.
4. Reduced pressure on overburdened courts by enabling early dispute resolution and guided self-help rooted in US and State constipation, laws.
5. Greater transparency and accountability in legal service delivery.

Conclusion

Washington's legal system must evolve yet the WSBA pilot slows that evolution under the guise of oversight and experimentation. While other states have created bold, transparent, and responsive legal innovation models, Washington chose a compliance-heavy framework that keeps power centralized and public access delayed.

This was not a lack of options. It was a deliberate decision to ignore available reforms and instead preserve the status quo under institutional control.

Real reform means giving people direct, safe tools to help themselves, not waiting 10 years for elite approval. The pilot, as written, protects institutions, not people. It must be amended, shortened, and opened to public-serving innovation now.

Sources

1. Washington Supreme Court. (2024). Order No. 25700-B-721: In the matter of the Legal Regulatory Reform Pilot Project. https://www.courts.wa.gov
2. Arizona Supreme Court. (2020). Administrative order establishing the Alternative Business Structures (ABS) program. https://www.azcourts.gov
3. California State Bar. (2022). Closing the Justice Gap Working Group final report. https://www.calbar.ca.gov
4. Colorado Supreme Court. (2023). Legal Regulatory Innovation Task Force: Final report. https://www.coloradosupremecourt.com
5. Illinois Supreme Court. (2022). Committee on Equality and Justice: Regulatory innovation initiatives. https://www.illinoiscourts.gov
6. Legal Services Corporation. (2022). The justice gap: The unmet civil legal needs of low-income Americans. https://www.lsc.gov/justicegap

7. Office of Legal Services Innovation. (2020). Utah Supreme Court Standing Order No. 15. https://utahinnovationoffice.org
8. Washington State Office of Civil Legal Aid. (2022). 2022 civil legal needs study update. https://ocla.wa.gov
9. American Bar Association. (2021). Report on regulatory innovation. https://www.americanbar.org