

**Rules Suggestion Under the Rules Enabling Act**

**Proposed Amendment to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**

**Mandatory Pro Se Assistance When Counsel Is Unavailable**

**Submitted to:** Secretary of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

**Relevant Advisory Committee:** Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

**Purpose:** To ensure ethical access to justice and prevent irreparable harm when Americans cannot secure counsel in time-sensitive civil matters.

**Executive Summary**

This submission proposes a targeted amendment to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure establishing a mandatory, court-administered Pro Se Assistance mechanism when a litigant demonstrates good-faith inability to secure counsel. The proposal is grounded in constitutional principles, ethical obligations of the judiciary, and practical realities of time-sensitive civil litigation involving health, safety, and life itself.

**Proposed Rule Text (Recommended: New Rule 83.1)**

Rule 83.1. Mandatory Pro Se Assistance Upon Verified Unavailability of Counsel

(a) **Trigger.** Upon a verified showing that a litigant has made reasonable, good-faith efforts to obtain counsel and that no attorney is willing to accept representation, the court shall order Pro Se Assistance under this Rule.

(b) **Scope of Assistance.** Pro Se Assistance shall include: (1) procedural guidance regarding pleadings, motions, and deadlines; (2) access to standardized forms and checklists; (3) a non-adversarial conference to clarify issues for adjudication; and (4) limited, neutral assistance to ensure filings comply with applicable rules.

(c) **Neutrality.** Assistance provided under this Rule shall be non-advocacy in nature and shall not include legal advice on the merits or strategic decision-making.

(d) **Administration.** Assistance may be provided by a court-employed Pro Se Assistance Officer or an equivalent program designated by the court.

(e) **No Right to Counsel Created.** Nothing in this Rule creates a right to appointed counsel.

(f) **Record.** The court shall make a brief record of assistance provided under this Rule.

**Ethical Imperative:** Fear, Decline, and the Duty to Hear

When an American is enduring fear of medical decline, fear of impending death, or fear for the life of a child, it is unethical for the justice system to

leave that person unheard. Courts exist to protect life, liberty, and redress abuse.

### **Constitutional Foundations:**

There are no footnotes in the Constitution of the United States requiring Americans to master procedural formalities before exercising their rights. Rights belong to the People, not only to those trained in legal semantics. We cannot refuse judicial guidance to sick and hurting people at even the possible expense of human lives for the sake of administrative issues.

### **Judicial Delay and Irreparable Harm**

Ongoing life or health decline is always subject to expiration. Judicial delay converts time into harm. Delay equals harm, and in urgent cases, delay may equal death.

### **The People as the Rightful Beneficiaries of Courtroom Power**

The courtroom derives its authority from the People. Lives must rise above font size and sentence structure when pleas invoke constitutional protection.

### **Declarant Perspective and Professional Basis**

As a lifelong learner and former public safety responder and instructor to medical professionals, I affirm that when children are reportedly suffering, refusal to hear urgent claims defies ethical integrity.

## **Plain-Language Analogy Illustrating Urgency and Ethical Duty**

True to my history of extensive experience as an instructor in emergency response, patient assessment, and triage, I communicate most effectively through analogy. In life-saving disciplines, analogies are not rhetorical devices; they are instructional tools. They translate urgency, risk, and ethical duty across different circumstances so that the listener understands what is at stake and why delay is unacceptable.

In emergency medicine and public safety, there is no margin for error when human life is involved. The same principle applies to justice.

Imagine a moment—past or possible—when emergency services were absolutely necessary: a child struck by a car, or a spouse with a closed airway who cannot breathe. An American dials 911. The caller is terrified. Some cry. Some explain everything they witnessed. Others recite medical histories. A few pray aloud. They speak differently, shaped by their experiences and education, but they share one common expectation: someone will answer, and help will come.

They wait anxiously until they hear sirens and see red lights. In that moment, Americans trust that handing their most vulnerable circumstance to a stranger was the right decision.

That same trust is placed in the federal judiciary when all other avenues have failed—when rights are ignored, when power is abused, or when harm is ongoing. Americans expect that the courtroom will answer when the stakes are life, health, safety, or the welfare of a person who cannot find a meaningful path alone.

As the system currently operates, I have lost confidence that this expectation is still understood. The Constitution that I have depended upon to guarantee a path to “right” is barricaded by today’s judicial system. This rule I am proposing is one step towards correcting this imbalance of justice we are experiencing.

What I am witnessing—while educated in emergency response and convinced that many Americans face real danger in the pursuit of institutional or financial priorities—is the equivalent of an unanswered emergency call. It is as if the call for help is received, but no sirens follow. No lights appear. Instead, those with a duty to act debate punctuation, formatting, and sentence structure while harm continues. In a courtroom, these patterns would demand remedy and the responders could face imprisonment.

In emergency response, delay equals harm. In justice, the same is true. When pleas for protection are met with procedural silence rather than meaningful assistance, the ethical integrity of the system itself is placed at risk.

**Conclusion and Notice**

Timely, Mandatory Pro Se Assistance is a narrow and necessary reform. A comprehensive evidentiary dossier addressing systemic failures is in final preparation and will be submitted promptly, as immediate protective action is required to safeguard Americans, even children, from further harm.

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Billie Glazier". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping flourish at the end of the name.

Billie Glazier  
Pro Se Litigant and Public Commenter  
Enterprise, Alabama  
billie@glazierresources.com  
02/02/2026