“ADOLAT”
MILLIY HUQUQIY AXBOROT MARKAZI
Guvohnoma № 636478
Litsenziya C-5669732

“HUQUQ va BURCH+” —
«ПРАВО и ДОЛГ+» —
"RIGHT and DUTY+"
Journal home page:
https://adolatmarkazi.uz/magazine/electron?id=393

2026-yil
10-son
oktabr
ISSN 3093-8546



From three days to thirty minutes: how standardized court forms can transform family law access to justice – lessons from Cook county for Uzbekistan and beyond

Guzal Abduakhatova,
LL.M. (2025), University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign College of Law LL.B. (2024), Tashkent State University of Law
Family Law Paralegal, Hurst, Kay, Allen & Stambler LLC, Chicago, Illinois
e-mail: guzalutkirjanovna@gmail.com

Аннотация. Rivojlangan va rivojlanayotgan mamlakatlarda oilaviy ishlar bo‘yicha sud jarayonlarida o‘z manfaatlarini advokatsiz himoya qilayotgan taraflar ulushi ortib bormoqda. Biroq aksariyat huquqiy yordam tizimlari hamon sudga murojaat qilish uchun hujjatni professional huquqshunos tuzishi shart degan farazga asoslanadi. Ushbu maqola mazkur farazni shubha ostiga oladi. Muallifning Illinoys shtati Cook okrugidagi Daley markazi qoshidagi “Advokatsiz fuqarolar uchun resurs markazi”da amaliyotchi sifatidagi hamda Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Yuridik klinikasidagi ko‘ngillilik faoliyatidagi bevosita tajribasiga tayangan holda, maqolada yaxshi ishlab chiqilgan standart sud blankalari o‘qitilgan, huquqshunos bo‘lmagan yordamchilar ko‘magida ariza tayyorlash vaqtini uch-yetti ish kunidan o‘ttiz-oltmish daqiqagacha qisqartirishi va bunda protsessual aniqlik saqlanib qolishi asoslab beriladi. O‘zbekistondagi oilaviy ishlar uchun sud blankalari tashabbusi aniq misol sifatida taqdim etilib, Cook okrugi modelini mavjud huquqiy yordam infratuzilmasi orqali boshqa huquqiy madaniyatga moslashtirish mumkinligi ko‘rsatiladi. Shuningdek, Buyuk Britaniya, Avstraliya, Kanada va Qirg‘iziston tajribasi qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi hamda “Madad” nodavlat notijorat tashkilotining 149 ta byurodan iborat tarmog‘iga tayanadigan bosqichma-bosqich joriy etish rejasi taklif etiladi. Maqolaning asosiy g‘oyasi: odil sudlovga erishishdagi asosiy to‘siq aholining huquqiy bilimi yetishmasligida emas, balki yaxshi ishlab chiqilgan protsessual vositalarning yo‘qligidadir.

Калит сўзлар. odil sudlovga erishish, advokatsiz taraflar, standart sud blankalari, oilaviy huquq, huquqiy yordam, O‘zbekiston, Cook okrugi, huquqshunos bo‘lmagan yordamchilar

Аннотация. В развитых и развивающихся странах растёт доля сторон, самостоятельно (без адвоката) представляющих свои интересы по семейным делам, однако большинство систем юридической помощи по-прежнему исходит из того, что для обращения в суд необходим документ, составленный профессиональным юристом. Настоящая статья ставит это предположение под сомнение. Опираясь на непосредственный опыт автора в качестве стажёра-юриста в Ресурсном центре для лиц без адвоката при Центре Дейли (округ Кук, штат

Guvohnoma № 636478 Litsenziya C-5669732 ISSN 3093-8546

Иллинойс) и волонтёрской работы в Юридической клинике Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, автор доказывает, что качественно разработанные стандартизированные судебные формы при содействии обученных помощников без юридического образования позволяют сократить подготовку заявления с трёх–семи рабочих дней до тридцати–шестидесяти минут без ущерба для процессуальной точности. В качестве конкретного примера представлена инициатива по внедрению судебных форм по семейным делам в Узбекистане, показывающая, как модель округа Кук может быть перенесена в иную правовую культуру с опорой на существующую инфраструктуру юридической помощи. Рассматривается сравнительный опыт Великобритании, Австралии, Канады и Кыргызстана и предлагается поэтапный план внедрения на базе сети из 149 бюро ННО «Madad». Центральный тезис статьи: главным препятствием в доступе к правосудию является не недостаток правовых знаний у населения, а отсутствие качественно разработанных процессуальных инструментов.

Ключевые слова. доступ к правосудию, стороны без представителя, стандартизированные судебные формы, семейное право, юридическая помощь, Узбекистан, округ Кук, помощники без юридического образования

Annotation. Self-represented litigants constitute a growing majority in family law proceedings across both the developed and developing world, yet most legal aid systems remain built around the assumption that professional legal drafting is necessary to access courts. This Article challenges that assumption. Drawing on the author's direct experience as a legal extern at the Resource Center for People Without Lawyers at the Daley Center, Cook County, Illinois, and as a volunteer at the TSUL Legal Clinic in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, this Article argues that well-designed standardized court forms–guided by trained non-lawyer assistants–can reduce petition preparation time from three to seven working days to thirty to sixty minutes, without sacrificing procedural accuracy. The Article presents a court forms initiative for Uzbekistan's family law proceedings as a concrete case study, demonstrating how the Cook County model can be transplanted into a distinct legal culture through existing legal aid infrastructure. It further examines comparative evidence from the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and Kyrgyzstan, and proposes a phased implementation plan leveraging the 149-bureau network of 'Madad' NGO. The central argument is this: the bottleneck in access to justice is not the absence of legal knowledge in the public–it is the absence of well-designed procedural tools.

Keywords. access to justice, self-represented litigants, standardized court forms, family law, legal aid, Uzbekistan, Cook County, non-lawyer assistance

Introduction. On a Tuesday morning in July 2025, a woman walked into the Resource Center for People Without Lawyers at the Daley Center in Chicago, Illinois. She carried an infant on her hip and a manila folder in her other hand. She did not have an attorney. She had a custody dispute, a soon-to-be ex-husband, and two older children whose lives were about to be

reorganized by a court. She had come alone – except for the baby, who slept through the entire process. By the end of that morning, with the infant still dozing, she had a completed, procedurally correct petition – filled out with the help of a trained volunteer who held no law degree.

That morning changed how I think about legal aid. I was a legal extern at the Chicago Bar Foundation, stationed at the Daley Center as part of the Social Justice Practicum. My role was to assist self-represented litigants in completing civil court forms in divorce, child custody, child support, and termination of parental rights cases. What I observed was both simple and radical: the form was doing the legal work. The volunteer – a college student with no legal training – was simply reading the questions aloud and helping the woman understand what each field asked for. The form's structure, its plain-language instructions, its embedded definitions, had eliminated the need for expert drafting knowledge. The result was indistinguishable from what a supervised law student would have produced in three to seven days.

I had seen the other side of this equation four years earlier. As a volunteer at the TSUL Legal Clinic in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, I helped self-represented litigants navigate family law proceedings in a system without standardized forms. Every case required a supervised student to draft an original petition – a process that took three to seven working days per client. Capacity was strictly limited by the number of available supervisors. Geographic reach was essentially confined to Tashkent. A woman in Fergana seeking child support was, for practical purposes, on her own.

The contrast between these two systems – one built around professional drafting, the other around procedural design – is the subject of this Article. My argument is that the Cook County Resource Center model is not a luxury of the American legal system. It is a transferable, scalable, and urgently needed intervention, applicable with deliberate adaptation to legal systems like Uzbekistan's, where access to justice remains limited not by the absence of legal institutions but by the absence of well-designed procedural tools.

This Article proceeds as follows. It first situates the self-representation crisis in global context, surveying the scale of unmet legal need in both the United States and Uzbekistan. It then examines the Cook County Resource Center model in detail, with particular attention to the role of non-lawyer volunteers and the design principles that make standardized forms effective. Next, it presents the Uzbekistan access to justice gap – its causes, its consequences, and the specific barriers that a court forms initiative would address. It then proposes a pilot court forms initiative for Uzbekistan's family law proceedings – a proof-of-concept framework drawing on my own research and on a bilingual proposal, with three draft form packages, formally submitted to the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, and 'Madad' NGO [1]. Finally, it surveys comparative evidence from the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and Kyrgyzstan, demonstrating that court form reform is a proven and replicable strategy across diverse legal systems. A brief conclusion argues that form design is not administrative detail – it is democratic infrastructure.

The Self-Representation Crisis in the United States. The scale of unmet legal need in the United States is staggering. A 2021 analysis found that ninety-two percent of low-income Americans involved in civil legal cases lacked professional legal help, despite being eligible for legal aid [2]. Millions

more fell into the “justice gap” – earning too much to qualify for legal aid, but too little to afford an attorney [3]. In family law proceedings, self-representation rates are particularly high: studies consistently show that more than half of all parties in divorce and custody cases appear without counsel [4, 5].

Self-represented litigants (SRLs) face documented disadvantages at every stage of civil proceedings. They file procedurally defective petitions at higher rates, miss deadlines, misunderstand evidentiary rules, and are disproportionately likely to have their claims dismissed on procedural rather than substantive grounds [6]. In family law cases – where the stakes are measured in child custody arrangements and child support obligations – these procedural failures have consequences that extend well beyond the courtroom.

The Self-Representation Crisis in Uzbekistan. The access to justice crisis in Uzbekistan operates at a different scale but with similar structural causes. The right to qualified legal assistance is enshrined in Article 29 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan [7]. In practice, however, attorney fees in family law matters often exceed monthly household income for a substantial portion of the population, making private representation inaccessible for most litigants navigating divorce, alimony, or child custody proceedings [8].

Uzbekistan's legal aid ecosystem is primarily composed of the TSUL Legal Clinic, regional legal aid centers, and the pro bono programs of the Uzbek Lawyers' Association. During my four years as a volunteer at the TSUL Legal Clinic, I saw firsthand how the drafting model – in which supervised students produce original petitions for each client – creates a structural bottleneck. The processing time per client ranged from three to seven working days. Capacity was constrained by the availability of supervising faculty. Geographic reach extended primarily to Tashkent, leaving citizens in regions like Fergana, Samarkand, and Surkhandarya with little or no practical access to legal assistance.

These barriers fall disproportionately on women. Uzbekistan's Family Code governs divorce, alimony, and child custody proceedings [9]. The majority of family law petitioners seeking child support or divorce are women. A procedurally defective petition – filed without legal assistance in a system with no standardized forms – can mean months of delay or outright dismissal, with consequences measured in a family's material welfare. The legal barrier is not substantive. It is procedural. And procedural barriers have procedural solutions.

The Cook County Model: The Resource Center for People Without Lawyers. The Resource Center for People Without Lawyers, located at the Daley Center in Chicago, is one of the most instructive access to justice interventions in the United States. Operated in partnership with the Circuit Court of Cook County's Domestic Relations Division, the Resource Center provides self-represented litigants with standardized court forms, guided completion assistance, and procedural information for civil family law matters – including divorce, child custody, child support, and orders of protection [10].

The Center's staffing model is its most significant design choice. Legal professionals are present and available for complex questions, but the majority of day-to-day assistance is provided by trained volunteers – many of whom hold no legal degree. During my summer 2025 externship, I worked alongside volunteers from undergraduate programs, social work organizations, and

community groups. None had attended law school. All were effective.

Form Design Does the Legal Work. The insight that emerged from my time at the Resource Center is straightforward but consequential: in a well-designed form system, the form carries the substantive legal knowledge. The volunteer carries the interpersonal skill. The two roles are separable, and recognizing that separability is the key to scaling legal aid without scaling the number of lawyers.

A standardized court form, properly designed, embeds the legal requirements of a petition into its structure. Each question maps to a legal element. Plain-language instructions explain what the court needs and why. Embedded definitions clarify legal terms. Conditional logic guides the user through the relevant sections based on their specific situation. The form, in other words, has already done the work that previously required a trained drafter.

“The form does the legal work. The assistant guides the process. These are not the same job – and confusing them is what has kept legal aid expensive and scarce”.

The result, which I observed across dozens of interactions during my externship, is a completion time of thirty to sixty minutes – compared to the three to seven working days required under a drafting model. The procedural accuracy of the completed forms was not distinguishable, in my observation, from petitions produced by supervised law students. Research on courthouse self-help centers documents this pattern more broadly: assisted self-represented litigants using structured court forms have been found to file procedurally defective petitions at rates below ten percent, compared to rates exceeding thirty percent among unassisted SRLs in comparable family law proceedings [2, 11].

Why Non-Lawyer Volunteers Suffice. The use of non-lawyer volunteers in a court forms context is not a compromise. It is a design feature. Legal aid scholarship has long documented the value of "unbundled" legal services – the practice of disaggregating legal tasks and delivering only those components that require professional expertise.

Court form completion, when the form is well-designed, does not require legal expertise. It requires patience, literacy support, familiarity with the form's structure, and the interpersonal skill to help a litigant – often frightened, often grieving — organize their situation into legible answers. These are skills that can be taught to any motivated volunteer in a structured training program [12].

This observation has profound implications for resource-limited legal aid systems. If the bottleneck in legal aid delivery is the scarcity of lawyers, a form-based system dissolves that bottleneck. According to Ministry of Justice figures published in January 2025, 6,175 advocates practise in Uzbekistan – a ratio of roughly one attorney per 6,154 residents, compared with roughly one per 3,900 in Kazakhstan and one per 672 in Türkiye [13, 14]. A form-based system, staffed by trained non-lawyer volunteers, is not merely preferable. It is the only model that can achieve meaningful access at national scale.

Structural Barriers to Court Access in Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan's civil court system is not, in formal terms, closed to self-represented litigants. Citizens have the right to file their own petitions. The barriers are not formal exclusions – they are procedural complexity, document requirements, and the absence of

any standardized form infrastructure [15].

A family law petition in Uzbekistan must satisfy the procedural requirements of the Civil Procedure Code and the substantive requirements of the Family Code. For a divorce petition with children, this means specifying the grounds for divorce, the proposed custody arrangement, the basis for that arrangement, the requested child support amount, the proposed visitation schedule, and a complete list of marital assets. For a citizen without legal training, assembling this information into a procedurally compliant document is not simply difficult – it is effectively impossible without assistance.

The consequences are severe and specific. Procedurally defective petitions are returned by the court – a process that restarts the clock and extends resolution timelines by weeks or months. In child support cases, delays translate directly into financial hardship for the custodial parent. In custody disputes, delay creates de facto arrangements that are difficult to disrupt even after a formal order is issued. The procedural barrier is not neutral. It favors the party better positioned to wait.

The TSUL Legal Clinic Bottleneck. The primary legal aid resource for self-represented family law litigants in Uzbekistan is the TSUL Legal Clinic, operated by the Tashkent State University of Law in partnership with USAID, UNDP, UNODC, the Eurasia Foundation, and Syracuse University [16]. The Clinic operates on a drafting model: supervised law students produce original petitions for clients who cannot afford private counsel. The quality of the work is high. The scale is not.

Having volunteered at the TSUL Legal Clinic for four academic years, I am in a position to describe its structural limitations with some specificity. Processing time per client ranged from three to seven working days, driven by the need for supervisory review at each draft stage. Monthly capacity was constrained to approximately fifty to eighty clients – a figure determined almost entirely by faculty availability rather than student capacity. Geographic reach was effectively limited to Tashkent, as the Clinic's in-person service model required physical presence at the university.

These are not failures of the Clinic. They are predictable consequences of a drafting model that requires expert oversight at every step. The TSUL Legal Clinic is doing exactly what it was designed to do. The question is whether what it was designed to do is the right design for the scale of need.

The Gender Dimension. Access to justice disparities in Uzbekistan's family law system are gendered in ways that deserve explicit attention. Women constitute the majority of self-represented petitioners in divorce and child support proceedings [8]. The procedural barriers that impede self-representation thus fall most heavily on the population least positioned to absorb them: women with children, navigating court systems without legal knowledge, without financial resources, and often under conditions of domestic stress or economic dependence. For a significant proportion of these women, the barriers are not merely procedural – they are structural. Many are homemakers with no independent income and no prior interaction with the legal system: women who have managed family life for years but have never held a bank account in their own name, never filed a document with a government office, and have no framework for understanding what a court petition requires or that they have the right to file one at all.

Guvohnoma № 636478 Litsenziya C-5669732 ISSN 3093-8546

The mahalla – Uzbekistan's community-level neighborhood institution – adds a further institutional dimension to this barrier. Under Article 40 of the Family Code, a court hearing a divorce petition may postpone the proceedings for up to six months to allow the spouses to reconcile and must notify the reconciliation commission of the citizens' assembly (mahalla) at the spouses' place of residence [9, 17, 18]. The commission has no power to decide the petition, but in practice mahalla reconciliation can function as a social pressure mechanism that deters women from proceeding with divorce or custody petitions, particularly where family separation carries stigma or where women are financially dependent on the family unit they are seeking to leave. A court form that explains, in plain Uzbek, that the litigant's petition will proceed regardless of the outcome of mahalla reconciliation is not merely a procedural document. It is an information intervention in a system where many women do not know what the law already gives them.

My experience at both the TSUL Legal Clinic and the Daley Center Resource Center confirmed this pattern. At the Daley Center, the majority of clients I assisted were women seeking divorce, child custody, or child support – many of whom, like the woman with the sleeping infant, had come entirely alone. At the TSUL Clinic, the women who reached us were often the most resourceful in their communities, not because they needed less help, but because they had overcome greater barriers simply to walk through our door. A well-designed court form available at a Madad NGO bureau in their own district – in their own language, in plain terms, completable in thirty minutes – is not a lesser version of access to justice. For these women, it is the first version they have ever had.

A Pilot Court Forms Initiative for Uzbekistan. In 2025–2026, I developed a pilot court forms initiative for Uzbekistan's family law proceedings, drawing on my comparative experience at the TSUL Legal Clinic and the Cook County Resource Center [1]. The pilot proposes three standalone bilingual court form packages – one for divorce with children, one for divorce without children, and one for de facto partnership dissolution – designed for use by self-represented litigants with the assistance of trained non-lawyer guides. The pilot framework is intentionally modest in its initial scope: rather than proposing immediate national deployment, it is designed to demonstrate proof of concept within a controlled setting before pursuing formal judicial adoption.

The design principles underlying the forms reflect lessons from the Cook County system. Each form is bilingual (Uzbek and Russian), consistent with Uzbekistan's dual-language legal environment. Instructions are embedded at the point of use – rather than consolidated in a separate document – so that each question is accompanied by the information needed to answer it. Legal terms are defined in plain language within the form itself. Conditional logic is expressed through structured branching questions rather than legal cross-references.

The structural objective of each form is identical to the Cook County model: the form must be completable by a person without legal training, with the assistance of a trained non-lawyer guide, in thirty to sixty minutes. Every design choice is evaluated against this standard. The pilot phase will measure completion time, filing acceptance rates, and user comprehension across a cohort of fifty to one hundred volunteer participants at the TSUL Legal Clinic,

Guvohnoma № 636478 Litsenziya C-5669732 ISSN 3093-8546

generating an evidence base sufficient to support a formal recommendation to the Ministry of Justice and the Supreme Court for national adoption.

The Madad NGO Infrastructure. The most significant strategic asset of this proposal is not the forms themselves. It is the deployment infrastructure that already exists. 'Madad' NGO, established in 2019 under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan, operates one hundred forty-nine free legal consultation bureaus embedded in State Services Centers (Davlat Xizmatlari Markazlari) across every district and city of Uzbekistan [19].

'Madad' NGO already provides free legal consultations and procedural document preparation, including family law matters. It maintains an active volunteer network, digital channels including the advice.uz portal, a Telegram channel (@advice_uz) with regular legal updates, and a twenty-four-hour chatbot (@Odil_chat_bot). Its geographic coverage is without parallel in the Uzbekistan legal aid landscape – with bureaus in Tashkent city (eleven), Tashkent province (seventeen), Fergana (seventeen), Samarkand (fourteen), and every other region of the country.

The significance of this infrastructure cannot be overstated. A court forms initiative in Uzbekistan does not require the construction of a new delivery network. It requires the integration of a new tool – the standardized form – into a network that already exists and is already doing the work. The analogy to Cook County is precise: the Resource Center did not create a new court. It placed a well-designed tool inside an existing courthouse [1].

The Three-Phase Implementation Plan. The initiative proposes a phased implementation designed to build judicial acceptance, validate the forms through user testing, and achieve national scale through the Madad NGO network.

Phase One (Months One through Six) consists of form design, legal mapping, and piloting. A working group comprising representatives of the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, TSUL faculty, and Madad NGO leadership would finalize the three form packages, conduct legal review for compliance with the Family Code and Civil Procedure Code, and pilot the forms with fifty to one hundred volunteer participants at the TSUL Legal Clinic. The pilot would measure completion time, error rate, and user comprehension. Madad NGO bureau staff and TSUL student assistants would be trained as form guides under the non-lawyer assistance model.

Phase Two (Months Seven through Twelve) deploys the validated forms across all one hundred forty-nine Madad NGO bureaus simultaneously. Each bureau would have at least one trained form guide – drawn from existing Madad staff or the volunteer network. Forms would be integrated into the advice.uz digital platform and the Telegram bot for digital access. A monitoring system would track time-to-assist, court acceptance rates, user satisfaction, and gender breakdown across all locations.

Phase Three (Year Two onward) pursues formal adoption by the Supreme Court or Ministry of Justice as official court documents, recognized for filing in all civil courts nationwide. A fully interactive digital guided form system, integrated into advice.uz, would build on the existing digital infrastructure developed by Madad NGO. Annual review cycles would update the forms to reflect legislative changes or user feedback [1].

Comparative Evidence: The United Kingdom's C100 Redesign. The United Kingdom provides the most directly applicable evidence for the effectiveness of guided court form redesign. HM Courts and Tribunals Service redesigned the C100 child arrangements form – used in all child custody proceedings – as a guided online process, incorporating plain-language instructions, embedded legal definitions, and conditional branching logic [20]. The redesigned form achieved a ninety-two percent user satisfaction rate and produced a measurable reduction in procedurally defective filings [21].

The UK experience demonstrates that the gains from form redesign are not marginal. A well-designed form does not merely reduce errors – it fundamentally changes the experience of interacting with the legal system. Litigants who complete a guided form report feeling heard, understood, and capable of participating meaningfully in their own legal proceedings. The form, when designed well, is not just a procedural tool. It is a dignity mechanism.

Canada: Bilingual Guided Pathways. Canada's experience with court form reform is directly relevant to Uzbekistan's bilingual context. Between fifty and eighty percent of parties in Canadian family court proceedings are self-represented – a rate comparable to what researchers observe in Uzbekistan's civil courts [22]. Canada developed online guided pathways for family law self-help, delivered in both English and French, that dramatically reduced complexity and improved filing accuracy. The bilingual architecture of the Canadian system – navigating a dual-language legal environment without sacrificing procedural precision – translates directly to Uzbekistan's Uzbek and Russian legal context.

Australia and Kyrgyzstan: Self-Help Kits and Regional Centers. The Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia provides self-help kits for family law matters, including forms, guides, and video instructions. Research found that self-represented litigants using self-help kits achieved significantly better outcomes and consumed less court time compared to unassisted SRLs [23, 24].

Kyrgyzstan – the most directly comparable regional case – established thirty-five state-funded legal aid centers nationwide under its 2016 Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid, developed with UNDP support [25]. The Kyrgyzstan model achieved meaningful rural access through a network of standardized intake centers – a model that directly anticipates the Uzbekistan proposal's use of Madad NGO's one hundred forty-nine bureaus. Where Kyrgyzstan had to build its network, Uzbekistan already has one.

The Pattern Across Systems. Taken together, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Kyrgyzstan evidence a consistent pattern: when courts invest in well-designed procedural tools, self-represented litigants succeed at higher rates, filing accuracy improves, court efficiency increases, and the experience of the legal system becomes more equitable. These outcomes do not depend on a particular legal tradition, a particular language environment, or a particular level of economic development. They depend on deliberate design.

Conclusion. Access to justice is a constitutional guarantee in Uzbekistan, an aspiration in the United States, and a measurable outcome in neither country [7, 26]. The gap between legal rights and legal reality is not primarily a resource problem – at least not in the way legal aid advocates have traditionally framed it. It is a design problem. The legal system was built for lawyers. When people without lawyers try to use it, they fail not because they

lack rights, but because they lack tools.

Standardized court forms are tools. They are not glamorous. They do not generate appellate decisions or advance legal theory. They get a mother's child support petition filed correctly. They get a divorce proceeding initiated without a three-week delay. They allow a person who has never entered a courthouse to navigate the legal system with the assistance of a college student who has never attended law school. These outcomes are not modest. They are the substance of what access to justice means in practice.

The Cook County Resource Center model demonstrates what is possible when courts commit to designing for the self-represented. The Uzbekistan initiative I have proposed – with its three bilingual form packages, its phased implementation plan, and its deployment through Madad NGO's one hundred forty-nine existing bureaus – demonstrates that this commitment is not a privilege of wealthy legal systems. It is available, today, in Uzbekistan, at a cost of approximately fifty-eight thousand to eighty-two thousand dollars for the first twelve months of full implementation.

The bottleneck in access to justice is not the absence of legal knowledge in the public. It is the absence of the right tools. Court form reform is not an administrative detail. It is democratic infrastructure — the means by which a constitutional guarantee is transformed from text into practice, and from practice into access.

REFERENCES:

1. Abduakhatova, G. (2026). Expanding Access to Justice in Uzbekistan: A Court Forms Initiative for Family Law Cases. Project proposal submitted to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Supreme Court of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Law and “Madad” NGO (unpublished).

2. The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2023). How to Make Civil Courts More Open, Effective, and Equitable. Available at: https://www.pewtrusts.org

3. Legal Services Corporation. (2022). The Justice Gap: The Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans. Washington, DC. Available at: https://lsc.gov/our-impact/publications/other-publications-and-reports/justice-gap-report

4. Judicial Commission of New South Wales. (2016). Litigants in Person: A Handbook for Judges and Magistrates. Sydney.

5. Sandefur, R. L. (2019). Access to What? Dædalus, 148(1), 49–55.

6. Engler, R. (2010). Connecting Self-Representation to Civil Gideon: What Existing Data Reveal About When Counsel Is Most Needed. Fordham Urban Law Journal, 37, 37 et seq.

7. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan (as adopted on April 30, 2023), Article 29. Available at: https://lex.uz/docs/-6445145

8. UNDP Uzbekistan. (2022). Monitoring Practice of Protecting Women’s Rights. Available at: https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan

9. Family Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan of April 30, 1998 (as amended). Available at: https://lex.uz

10. Circuit Court of Cook County, Domestic Relations Division. Resource Center for People Without Lawyers. Available at: https://www.cookcountycourt.org

11. Hough, B. R., et al. (2011). The New Normal in California Courts: Self-Represented Litigants. Journal of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, 12, 3 et seq.

12. Steinberg, J. K. (2015). Demand Side Reform in the Poor People’s Court. Connecticut Law Review, 47, 741 et seq.

13. Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Statistics on the number of advocates (January 2025), reported in: “Har 6154 o‘zbekistonlikka bitta advokat to‘g‘ri keladi”. UZ24, January 13, 2025. Available at: https://uz24.uz/uz/articles/advokat-25-1-13

14. World Justice Project. (2024). Rule of Law Index 2024: Uzbekistan Country Profile. Available at: https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/country/2024/Uzbekistan

15. Civil Procedural Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, approved by Law No. O‘RQ-460 of January 22, 2018 (as amended). Available at: https://lex.uz/docs/-3517337

16. Tashkent State University of Law. Legal Clinic. Available at: https://tsul.uz

17. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Citizens’ Self-Governance Bodies” No. 758-I of April 14, 1999 (as amended). Available at: https://lex.uz/docs/-86256

18. UN Women. (2023). Gender Profile: Uzbekistan. Available at: https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library

19. “Madad” NGO. Legal Consultation Bureaus (Huquqiy maslahat byurolari). Available at: https://advice.uz/uz/offices

20. HM Courts and Tribunals Service. C100: Apply for a Child Arrangements Order. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/form-c100-application-under-the-children-act-1989

21. UK Judiciary. (2023). Access to Justice for Litigants in Person. Available at: https://www.judiciary.uk

22. Macfarlane, J. (2013). The National Self-Represented Litigants Project: Identifying and Meeting the Needs of Self-Represented Litigants. Final Report. Available at: https://representingyourselfcanada.com

23. Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia. Self-Represented Litigant Resources. Available at: https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au

24. Judicial Commission of New South Wales; Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration. (2018). Impacts of Self-Represented Litigants.

25. UNDP Kyrgyzstan. (2024). National Programme for State-Guaranteed Legal Aid 2024–2028. Available at: https://www.undp.org/kyrgyzstan

26. Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011).