

WASHINGTON STATE
BAR ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING

August 13, 2026

Meeting Materials

Zoom and Teleconference



**Board of Governors Emergency Meeting
HELD VIRTUALLY
August 13, 2026, 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM**

WSBA Mission: To serve the public and the members of the Bar, to ensure the integrity of the legal profession, and to champion justice.

ALL ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA ARE POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

Meeting ID: 818 5651 2695 Passcode: 084682

<https://wsba.zoom.us/j/81856512695?pwd=8GwrUjE7JS39UerMgzanD8zfHCggqF.1>

To participate by phone, call +1 253-205-0468

5:00 PM – CALL TO ORDER

- ☐ TEMPORARY POLICY FOR COURTESY SEATING FOR THE FEBRUARY AND JULY 2027 BAR EXAMS FOR THOSE ACCEPTING WAIVER OF THE BAR EXAM REQUIREMENT 55
- ☐ CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COURT WITH RESPECT TO ADDITIONAL REMEDIES FOR THE JULY 2026 BAR EXAM.

6:00 PM – ADJOURN

Dear Board of Governors,

We are writing to you today, for your support in ensuring the outcome of this bar exam, is one that is equitable and fair to disabled accommodated examinees and general examinees alike.

Since the first day of the bar examination, examinees with disability accommodations' concerns have been dismissed, and treated as though the conditions did not impact our exam. Disappointingly, WSBA's communications regarding the difficulties faced on the day of the examination explicitly stated that accommodated examinees—and *only* accommodated examinees—were able to proceed with the bar exam. These communications were then disseminated by media and news articles that fell onto ears of those both in and outside the legal community.¹ These messages, shared by WSBA and others have minimized, dismissed, and at times misrepresented the experiences that were faced by accommodated examinees. What followed was a biased and prejudiced assumption that accommodated students were given the upper hand, while receiving a fair and just testing experience, but this is far from the truth.

The aftermath has included repeated situations where accommodated students have had to disclose or be outed as being disabled, as they were automatically associated with being accommodated. Unfortunately, this path has not been changed, after the recent Washington Supreme Court decision that leaves disabled, accommodated examinees as *the only* group of first time applicants that need a passing bar exam score to be licensed in Washington. This decision is not only discriminatory in theory, but also materially impacts our lives.

Discrimination:

Accommodated examinees are now the only first-time applicants who are required to earn a passing exam score from this administration. Every other first-time applicant is either being admitted without a passing score or has the option to take the September administration instead. The only remaining group required to pass this administration consists of applicants with disabilities who received testing accommodations.

Additionally, there are concerns regarding the disparate impact, where facially neutral policies and actions have consequences that disproportionately affect a protected group

¹ "WSBA's Chief Communications and Outreach Officer Sara Niegowski said in a statement that test takers with "approved accommodations were able to proceed with their exams as scheduled and were not impacted."
<https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation/washington-bar-exam-using-new-test-canceled-over-wifi-issues>

of people, and among such groups are people with disabilities. In such cases, intent is not looked at, but the outcome.²

Although the Court's order may seem facially neutral, it disproportionately impacts disabled examinees with accommodations, as the only group made to continue the exam. By prohibiting us from being able to take the September make-up exam, or opting to be waived in, disabled examinees are put at a disadvantage. September exam takers were given an additional month of preparation, additional studying materials provided by the NCBE, and have been exposed to the testing material that has been shared and discussed online (discussed further, below).

Additionally, the Court's justification for the enactment of the order misses the reality that accommodated examinees faced during their examinations. The interruptions during the testing were of high magnitude, and resulted in rendering some accommodations null. We feel this is inconsistent with the Court's mission of upholding justice, and know that there are far more equitable alternatives that would help lessen the discriminatory outcome—which would be to extend the *same* opportunities non-accommodated examinees received, to the accommodated examinees (including waiver, September make-up, etc).

Forced disclosure, and privacy concerns:

The order also continues the forced disclosure of disability status that has occurred throughout this process. Communications from the WSBA, NCBE, and other entities repeatedly stated that examinees with accommodations were able to continue testing, uninterrupted, while the remainder of the exam was cancelled. As a result, many accommodated examinees have effectively been forced to disclose their disability status when employers, colleagues, or others who ask whether they took the bar or whether they need to delay their employment start date. The Court's order extends that problem by creating a separate path only for accommodated examinees, who must now wait until October for results while most other first-time applicants will already know they have been admitted.

² As one is already aware, there is a three prong test that is used to determine disparate impact: This three-part test consists of the following:

First, the plaintiff must identify the protected class, the facially neutral policy or practice in question, and how the protected class is disproportionately harmed by this policy or practice.

Second, the court must review the defendant's justification of the policy or practice and its connection to the institution's mission or goals.

Lastly, the plaintiff must identify less discriminatory alternatives, and the court may evaluate them against the policy or practice at issue.

Numerous examinees have had no choice but to reveal their disability status, under questions from others regarding the bar exam. This disclosure is further compelled, as examinees know, value, and respect the Professional Rules of Responsibility, and the issues that would follow if one lied to their employer, to maintain a semblance of privacy over their disability status, by disclosing that they were able to take the examination. People should be able to decide if (and/or when) they share that they have a disability and if they need/receive accommodations. This has taken the choice, autonomy, and privacy away from many. This is especially difficult as many are entering the workforce with new jobs and employers - meaning these are the first impressions they are having with us. Additionally, this disclosure surpasses what would usually occur in a workplace between HR and the employee, as it has been made so public, and these seemingly neutral questions carry the association with the answer.

Testing interruptions:

It is also important to stress that accommodated examinees did not experience a normal or uninterrupted testing experience. We faced technical issues, improperly implemented accommodations, unexpected schedule changes, repeated disruptions, and the uncertainty of continuing an exam while watching it be cancelled for everyone around us.

Accommodated rooms, both at the offsite hotel and in rooms at the convention center, experience technical difficulties. In multiple rooms there were technical issues so wide and extreme, that there were multiple people at one examinees table trying to fix an issue, while the exam was still in progress. Many people passed back and forth in and out of the room, talking, rushing, etc, to resolve the technical issues. This not only impacted the examinee who was facing the technical difficulties, but also the test takers around them. Most of these rooms were designed to be low-distraction rooms, but the consistent disruption made this null. Additionally, the distractions also meant that examinees lost the purpose of the accommodations of extra time, as their attention was constantly being pulled away from the exam.

Additional distractions were also present - which included the disruption of hundreds of general body examinees that were in the halls, talking, crying, and flowing out of the examination room. This was not only distracting as the noise itself, but also took an emotional toll, as accommodated examinees were not privy to the conversations that were occurring regarding the state of the bar exam. Instead, many learned about what was going on during the lunch break, in pieces from those around us, instilling uncertainty about the state of our exam, and the stability and reliability of the technology.

These feelings only increased as the examination furthered, and later included the weight of the feelings from some of the general body examinees who were resentful of the fact that accommodated examinees “got to continue,” while also paired with the internal frustration from accommodated examinees, about why we were being told to continue, while knowing the exam was cancelled for everyone else. Going into the examination after the first day carried anxiety not just associated with typical exam jitters, but anxiety about everything surrounding the exam, and the uncertainty of it all. It became more difficult to continue with the exam to the same extent as we had been, unsure that the work we submitted would count for anything as it was so separated from everyone else. With both the lack of communication and inconsistent communication, many believed we were being forced to continue with an exam that would end up being voided. These feelings offered big impacts on the ability to sleep, study, and focus on the exam.

These conditions would impact most examinees, but the impact that it has on disabled examinees is increased for many due to some of our disabilities/conditions that magnify the effects.

Comments made by Proctors

As accommodated test takers continue to share their respective experiences, more concerning issues have surfaced. One of the more alarming examples we have come across was from one test taker who shared that a proctor mistakenly believed the individual was also a proctor, and joked that there were students there that did not look like they had a disability, so they must be making it up—and that the technical issues that were being faced should not be a concern because they had extra time anyways. This sentiment is concerning, but also, disappointingly, consistent with other sentiment that have been shared. Even amidst all of the technological difficulties and interruptions that were experienced, disabled examinees are thought to have been at an unfair advantage due to a thoroughly documented disability. It all raises concern of other potential bias that accommodated test examinees may have encountered during the two test dates, and solidifies the issue of unfair treatment.

Concerns about implementation of accommodations and accessibility:

The accommodations themselves were not sufficient either. For example, the requirement of the use of a #2 pencil when previous administrations of the exam allowed a black or blue pen, created an inaccessible way to take notes, as the paper provided—whose color was not disclosed before hand—was a dark muted lavender, creating no contrast, leaving examinees unable to see their writing. When requested, the admin communicated they had no other paper to offer the examinees. Additionally, examinees that had 1.75x time, were not permitted breaks like the examinees with 2.0x

time, which impacted their ability to focus, allowed their medications to wear off, and more. In some instances, safeguards were not properly maintained leading to accommodation violations as severe as the gender of the proctor that could be left alone with an examinee in a room.

Fairness and integrity:

While accommodate examinees are still required to pass the bar exam administered in July for licensure, general examinees are given the option to take the make-up test in September. General examinees who elect for this option (an option not awarded to accommodated examinees), will have had an additional month to study, as well as access to NCBE study resources that were not available to accommodated examinees before the July exam. If the September exam is substantially the same as the July exam, there are serious concerns regarding exam integrity given that portions of the exam have already circulated online. If it is different, there are legitimate questions about whether the two administrations will be of comparable difficulty and whether scoring will be equitable, particularly because graders will already know that only accommodated examinees completed the July administration.

The concerns about the integrity of the exam is not to pass blame on those who have had it circulated online, or have innocently discussed the exam, mistakenly believing that everyone had already taken it, but rather to expose the realities that exist when a standardized exam is largely given. Regardless of the intentions of those who shared online, the current issue lies in how this reality is resolved. Disabled examinees are not being given the same conditions, circumstances, (and possibly the substantive content of the exam), which cuts to the very core of the purpose behind a standardized exam. Instead, there is a sentiment that is shared by many, that accommodated examinees are being punished for the fact that they were granted accommodations.

Financial impact:

As a final note, we wanted to touch on the financial/economic impact faced by accommodated examinees. Because there is no opportunity for a waiver into the bar, like the general examinees, accommodated test takers have a higher likelihood of facing increased costs/financial disruptions than non-accommodated examinees. Disabled, accommodated examinees are given no guaranteed admittance because of the denial of a waiver, whereas general examinees are given the option. This means the entirety of the accommodated, disabled examinees are the only examinees that face a guaranteed possibility that they will not be licensed due to the nature of an exam. Not only were costs incurred when traveling to Yakima, including gas, flights, hotel accommodations, taking leave from work, student loans expenses, etc., but there is a chance that additional costs would need to be incurred to sit for the exam in February.

The majority of jobs are dependent on passing the bar. In a normal year, this would be fair, as accommodated and non-accommodated students alike face the same chances of passing. The issue becomes when the only group of first time applicants that is facing this issue, are disabled, accommodated examinees. This incurring of fees, and lack of equal opportunities for the same pathways granted to the general applicants, means that it is the jobs lined up for disabled accommodated examinees are the ones that are forcibly at stake, the financial concerns are involuntarily in the hands of disabled accommodated examinees, and the ones that will face these impacts are accommodated examinees.

These effects also can ripple. Examinees that opt for a waiver are seen preferential to employers because it means a guaranteed admittance. They are able to get a head start at work, and will have more opportunities with the certainty that comes with the waiver. Additionally, because we were not able to take the September bar, if one fails the bar in July, we will have to wait until February to take it. For many, their visa, health insurance, rent, and cost of living is dependent on a bar passage and their job opportunity. By denying us the opportunities that others have, these outcomes disproportionately impact disabled examinees.

Remedy and Conclusion:

Disabled, accommodated examinees are not looking for special treatment. We are looking to be treated the same as our colleagues who did not receive accommodations. We are looking to be given the same options: waiver, makeup examination (or accepting the July score), or an option to push to February. The extension of these opportunities means that disabled examinees will be given the same autonomy and choice to decide what option is best for them, just like the general examinees.

Accommodated examinees have faced struggles, similar as well as distinct to general examinees. The circumstances that have arose, are of no fault of any examinee, and thus no examinee should be punished for such. We believe there is still room to make changes that are equitable, and are thus urging an amendment to the Court's order. It is not fair, nor is it in the interest of justice to the examinees, and to the legal profession, to hold disabled examinees to different standards than our peers.

We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Signatures:

Lyd Haindfield

Brynna Yentz

Anonymous Examinee 1
Nohely Diaz
Anonymous Examinee 2
Anonymous Examinee 3
Adam Johnson

Subject: [External]Accommodations July 2026 BAR Experience
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 at 1:40:29 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Simrin Brar
To: Board Feedback
Priority: High

You don't often get email from sbrar98@uw.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon,

In anticipation of the board meeting at 2pm I would like to raise some alarming issues and complications I faced:

- Day 1 consisted of a late start due to internet and tech issues. We continued to have these same issues at the beginning of and throughout session 2 on Day 1.
- We had a 25 min lunch break on Day 1, to which none of us had time to go and buy a lunch if needed.
- Not only did Day 2 also have these same tech issues, but in my specific exam hall, there was a bar-taker who had an emotional outburst due to these tech issues and started yelling and screaming at one of the invigilators which caused disruption, time loss, and emotional distress for everyone- me especially as I was the one who had to speak up and tell him to please calm down as my exam had commenced at that point.

These issues severely impacted my performance, and I believe we too should be availed the same option- diploma privilege. It is extremely disheartening to be singled out and punished for persevering and choosing to return on day 2 despite these many disappointing issues and disturbances. It almost feels like all of us accoms students should have simply not shown up for day 2 and boycotted so that we could have had the same options availed to us as the rest of the students.

I'm sure many others have also raised the issues of exam integrity and how questions/answers were shared to the rest of the students who were unable to write in Yakima. The grading scale will be completely distorted and unrepresentative of our hard work and commitment to the Law. I'm sure this is not the precedent the State of Washington wants to set for our future attorneys and law students.

I deeply and sincerely encourage the Supreme Court to consider these issues, amongst many, that the accommodations students faced. After spending ample time, money, and mental capacity for this exam, a lot of us are losing hope in the system and this is definitely a profoundly discouraging start to what should be the beginning of our legal career in the lovely state of Washington.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Simrin Brar
LL.M. | LL.B. | BBA (Hons.)

Subject: [External]Alternative Licensure Pathway Following the July 2026 Bar Exam Technology Failure
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 at 12:16:03 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Noel Mamplata
To: Board Feedback, admissions

Some people who received this message don't often get email from noelmamplata@microsoft.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Noel Mamplata
Bellevue, Washington
August 10, 2026

Washington Supreme Court
Temple of Justice
415 12th Avenue SW
Olympia, WA 98504

Washington State Bar Association
Board of Governors
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98101

Re: Request for a One-Time Inclusive Alternative Licensure Pathway Following the July 2026 Bar Exam Technology Failure

Dear Chief Justice, Justices of the Court, and Members of the WSBA Board of Governors:

I respectfully write to request that the Washington Supreme Court and the Washington State Bar Association establish a one-time, inclusive alternative licensure pathway for qualified law graduates who were not included in the Court's August 6, 2026 emergency bar-exam waiver relief, but who can demonstrate competence through substantial professional experience, documented legal work, supervised practice, portfolio evidence, and character and fitness review.

The Court's August 6, 2026 order responded to the cancellation of the July 2026 NextGen bar exam due to technology failure. The Court's public statement explains that any resolution must balance fairness to various categories of applicants with professional standards and public protection. The order allows first-time applicants who were unable to take the exam due to the technology failure, and who had not previously failed to achieve a passing score on a bar exam in any U.S. jurisdiction, to choose either a later Washington NextGen bar exam or waiver of the bar exam requirement and admission by court order. Applicants who previously failed one or more bar exams are ineligible for admission by court order, and applicants who completed the July 2026 exam despite interruptions are not eligible for the admission-by-order option or the special September exam.

I recognize the difficulty of the Court's task and appreciate the need to act quickly in

response to an unprecedented exam-administration failure. I also recognize that the WSBA has acknowledged the magnitude of the disruption, the significant preparation undertaken by applicants, the absence of a perfect solution, and the dual need to help aspiring lawyers avoid delay while preserving integrity and public confidence in the admissions process.

At the same time, the current relief is underinclusive. It creates a waiver for one category of affected applicants while excluding others who may also have suffered harm through no fault of their own, including multiple test takers, candidates who completed the exam under interrupted conditions, and candidates whose disabilities or accommodated testing circumstances affected how they experienced the July 2026 administration. Public meeting materials before the WSBA Board of Governors include concerns from applicants asking for equal treatment of all July 2026 applicants and raising concerns about applicants with accommodations.

This moment should not be treated only as an emergency testing problem. It is also an opportunity to modernize Washington's licensing system in a way that protects the public, preserves professional standards, and recognizes that legal competence can be demonstrated through more than a single high-stakes exam.

I am a 1999 graduate of the University of Miami School of Law, an ABA-accredited institution. I am also a first-generation Filipino American who grew up in a socioeconomically disadvantaged household and was the first in my family to navigate both higher education and the legal profession. Since 2001, I have worked for Microsoft and its affiliated organizations in complex legal, contracts, compliance, procurement, governance, and public-sector business roles.

My path was not linear. Like many first-generation professionals from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, I made career decisions shaped by financial reality, family responsibility, and opportunity. I did not enter the traditional law-firm pipeline after law school. Instead, I built a decades-long career applying legal education, legal reasoning, contract interpretation, negotiation, compliance judgment, procurement analysis, risk assessment, and executive counseling in sophisticated corporate and public-sector environments.

That experience is directly relevant to the competencies Washington seeks to measure. Over more than two decades, I have worked on matters requiring careful analysis of contract obligations, procurement rules, regulatory requirements, confidentiality, privacy, security, accessibility, supplier governance, risk allocation, and public-sector accountability. These are not merely administrative tasks. They require legal analysis, negotiations, sound judgment, ethical awareness, written advocacy, client counseling, and the ability to translate complex rules into practical guidance.

The August 6 order recognizes an important principle: Washington can, under appropriate circumstances, protect the public and preserve professional standards while permitting admission without completion of the traditional bar examination. The question now is whether that principle will remain limited to a narrow emergency category, or whether Washington will build a broader, fairer, one-time alternative pathway for qualified applicants who can demonstrate competence through reliable means other than a bar score.

I respectfully urge the Court and WSBA to adopt a one-time alternative pathway for applicants excluded from the August 6 waiver, including experienced law graduates, multiple test takers, accommodated test takers, and others whose competence can be demonstrated through a structured review process.

Core request: Create a one-time, inclusive alternative pathway that allows qualified law graduates excluded from the August 6 waiver to prove competence through legal education, professional experience, portfolio evidence, supervised practice, attestations, ethics review, and character and fitness review.

Such a pathway could require:

1. **Proof of legal education and eligibility.** Applicants should demonstrate graduation from an ABA-accredited law school or other qualifying legal education pathway recognized by Washington admission rules.
2. **Character and fitness review.** No applicant should be admitted without satisfying Washington's character and fitness standards.
3. **Portfolio evidence of competence.** Applicants should be permitted to submit legal memoranda, persuasive writing, contract analyses, negotiation summaries, compliance assessments, client counseling communications, ethics essays, or other legal work product demonstrating readiness.
4. **Supervised-practice or attestation requirement.** Applicants with substantial legal, corporate, compliance, procurement, regulatory, or public-sector experience should be able to provide supervisor attestations, attorney attestations, or supervised-practice certifications verifying professional competence.
5. **Inclusion of multiple and accommodated test takers.** A prior unsuccessful bar attempt should not automatically disqualify an applicant from showing current competence. Nor should applicants with disability-related testing needs be disadvantaged by a remedy that does not fully account for the realities of accommodated testing.
6. **Optional refresher or Washington-law component.** To preserve public protection, the Court could require a Washington-law component, ethics component, or focused refresher requirement before admission.

This approach would not lower standards. It would make standards more directly connected to the work lawyers actually perform. A portfolio-and-attestation pathway can test legal reasoning, ethics, writing, research, counseling, judgment, negotiation, and professional maturity in a way that a single exam may not fully capture.

From: O.Shane Balloun <o.shane@ballounlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2026 1:00 PM

To: fadewale@spokanecity.org; sunitha@amlawseattle.com; Kari Petrasek <kari@petraseklaw.com>; ahearne@foster.com; chrisbhangbog@gmail.com; jordan@palacelaw.com; lparvinpricebog@gmail.com; allisonwidneyBOG@gmail.com; mmrbog4d@gmail.com; emily.arneson@outlook.com; matthew@dresdenlaw.com; avilleneuve@trxtraining.com; kristinalarrybog@gmail.com; kevinfaybog@yahoo.com; Nam.wsba@gmail.com; questions <questions@wsba.org>

Subject: Bar Exam Failure this week

Dear President Adewale, Governors of the WSBA, and Executive Director Nevitt:

As many other members of the Washington State Bar Association have become aware, I learned that the NCBE failed in its administration of the Washington State Bar Exam this week. The technical failures were so profound that the examinees at the Tuesday session could not complete any portion—let alone the entirety—of that day's exam.

As a former grader of the Washington State Bar Exam, I am appalled at this occurrence. It represents a devastating situation for examinees who dutifully prepared for, traveled, and sat for the exam, and who—due to no fault of their own—will not be able to demonstrate their knowledge for minimum competency for the practice of law so as to be admitted to practice this year.

Absent a renewed administration of the exam in very short order (which would still cost all examinees more money in travel costs, etc.), there is no form of complete relief available to the examinees for the loss in time, effort, and expectation damages they have suffered.

While I have no doubt that the WSBA will call NCBE to account for its systemic failure this week, I call upon the Washington State Bar Association and the Supreme Court of Washington to make exception for these examinees who stood for the Bar Exam this week and to allow them to be admitted as members of the Bar, subject to their individual character and fitness determinations, under a diploma privilege—particularly if any of them graduated from law schools in Washington State.

Respectfully,

O. Shane Balloun (WSBA # 45053)

Bellingham, Washington

Balloun Law Professional Corporation
355 Harris Avenue, Suite 201
Bellingham, Washington 98225

(360) 318-7778 | (360) 989-8879 mobile

(360) 318-7798 & (360) 483-5960 vfax

Subject: [External]Concerns about statistical methods used in diploma privilege decision making
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2026 at 11:08:13 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Jennifer Gary
To: Board Feedback, admissions, supreme@courts.wa.gov

You don't often get email from jennifer_gary@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chief Justice, Justices and WSBA Board of Governors,

Thank you for the time you spent considering remedies for the failed administration of the Yakima bar exam in July. I know that my son, who had accommodations and completed the test, appreciated how much time was spent on the WSBA Zoom meeting on Friday. He felt that the Board listened to the applicants' concerns, and, in such a complicated, emotional, high stakes situation, that is so important.

Concerns about statistical methods used in diploma privilege decision making

Before Friday's meeting, I forwarded the Court and the Board of Governors the email I wrote to the state law school deans expressing concerns. One topic I did not address was the use of statistical methods to determine what is a fair and logical way to treat July 2026 bar applicants. This topic is particularly relevant to the denial of diploma privilege to applicants who have failed a past bar exam.

I did not raise the topic because my coursework in statistics is limited and took place years ago. I feel I have enough knowledge to raise questions but not provide answers. These are extremely important questions to raise. Perhaps a statistician or psychometrician could be consulted to ensure that the remedies for the July 2026 bar exam failure are not just fair and logical, but also are statistically sound.

Questions about predictive validity and confidence intervals

- **Predictive validity**
 - Predictive validity is how well a test score or measurement (x, or in this case, UBE score) predicts a future outcome or behavior (y, or in this case, NextGen score).
- *Questions:*
- *As the NextGen test was developed, were test trials conducted to establish a correlation between scores on the UBE (x) and scores on the NextGen test (y)?*
- *If so, what was the correlation?*
- *Was the correlation strong enough to support denying diploma privilege to applicants who have previously failed a bar exam?*

- I have not found information on correlation of scores from the two tests. In fact, most sources stress the differences between the two tests, both in content areas and skills assessed.
- *Questions:*
- *If there is no correlation data, is it fair, logical or statistically sound to single out one group of test takers for denial of the waiver? What is the evidence or data to support such different treatment?*
- **Confidence interval**
 - A confidence interval on a scaled score provides the range of scores where a person's true score most likely falls. A 95% confidence interval means that if a person took the same test 100 times, the score would fall within the interval 95 times. A 90% confidence interval would be smaller and would mean that a person's true score would be within the interval 90% of test administrations
 - Applicants who missed passing a previous bar exam by only 1-2 points are currently denied diploma privilege whereas new test takers with no test score history are currently granted the privilege, with the presumption or prediction that they will pass.
 - We are making predictions that individual first time applicants pass the exam with no relevant data to support that prediction.
 - On the other hand we are predicting that individual students who previously failed the bar exam are likely to fail despite the fact that they came close to passing. It is possible that their score fell in the 90% or 95% confidence interval range.
- *Question:*
- *Is it fair, logical, **and** statistically sound to grant diploma privilege to an applicant for whom there is no data about bar exam performance, yet deny diploma privilege to an applicant whose score was within the 90% or 95% confidence interval range?*

Additional information is needed to make fair, logical and statistically sound decisions

The bar exam is a standardized test, developed and scored using complex psychometric principles to ensure fairness and consistency. If specific groups are singled out for different treatment when determining test results, the decision makers should be able to provide a strong, psychometrically sound defense for the different treatment. I do not feel a rationale has been provided for treating groups of July 2026 test takers differently. I hope someone with more knowledge of statistics and

psychometrics can look into these questions. If the decision stands that applicants who failed a previous bar exam will be denied diploma privilege, I expect the decision to be based on statistical methodology that can be fully and clearly explained to the stakeholders in this situation.

Thank you all for reading these concerns. I apologize if, due to my limited statistics background, I have used terminology incorrectly or not explained ideas clearly.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Gary

Subject: [External]Impact of July Approved Testing Accommodations

Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 at 4:49:17 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Marina Robles

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from mrobles2@seattleu.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors:

I respectfully submit this statement to bring attention to the specific circumstances experienced by candidates with approved testing accommodations during the July 2026 Washington NextGen Bar Examination.

I was a first time bar examination taker and a graduate of Seattle University School of Law. I sat for the July 2026 Washington NextGen Bar Examination with approved testing accommodations, including additional time and a reduced distraction testing environment.

Although I was able to complete the examination, the conditions under which I took the exam were materially affected by technical failures and did not reflect the testing environment provided by my approved accommodations.

On July 28, 2026, during the first examination section, there were significant internet and technical problems at the testing location. The examination did not begin as scheduled because of connectivity issues, resulting in approximately a 40-minute delay while we remained seated waiting for IT assistance.

After the examination began, technical problems continued affecting examinees in the room. IT personnel and proctors repeatedly moved throughout the testing area to address computer and internet issues. In my specific situation, the person seated directly next to me experienced technical difficulties, and IT personnel and proctors stood immediately beside my seat and spoke while attempting to resolve the issue. Although the conversations were quiet, the movement, presence of individuals next to me, and ongoing troubleshooting created distractions that directly interfered with my ability to concentrate.

This was particularly significant because my approved accommodation included a reduced-distraction testing environment. The purpose of that accommodation was to provide conditions that would allow me to focus and complete the examination under appropriate circumstances.

After completing the first examination section, we were required to remain seated because of additional technical issues related to submitting examination answers. As a result, my scheduled break between sections was substantially reduced. The scheduled break was

approximately one hour and twenty minutes; however, because approximately 30 minutes of that time was consumed by technical delays and waiting for IT resolution, I had only approximately 25 minutes of actual break time before beginning the next examination section.

I was then required to complete another four-and-one-half-hour examination section. In practical terms, I completed approximately nine hours of examination time with only approximately 25 minutes of actual break time between sections.

The reduced break time significantly affected my ability to rest, eat, and mentally prepare before beginning the second section. Nevertheless, I continued the examination because I had no alternative under the circumstances.

On July 29, 2026, during the final examination section, there was also an additional internet-related delay affecting some examinees.

I respectfully ask the Board to recognize that accommodated candidates who completed the examination were not necessarily testing under normal or equitable conditions. The fact that an accommodated candidate was able to finish the examination does not mean that the candidate received the testing conditions that had been approved.

I respectfully request that the Board consider whether additional action is appropriate for candidates with approved accommodations who were materially affected by the technical failures, internet issues, disruptions in the testing environment, and reduced break time during the July 2026 Washington NextGen Bar Examination.

Thank you for your consideration of these circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Marina Bethel Robles Valera

Seattle University School of Law Graduate

July 2026 Washington NextGen Bar Examination Applicant

Subject: [External]Impact Statement Regarding July 2026 Yakima Bar Exam Disruption

Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 at 5:53:37 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Renata Akalin

To: Board Feedback

Priority: High

You don't often get email from renata.akalin@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the WSBA Board of Governors,

I am writing to share my experience as a Washington bar applicant affected by the July 2026 Yakima examination disruption and to clarify how the current categorization of “repeat taker” does not reflect my educational or professional background.

Although I previously sat for the California bar exam, that attempt occurred before I began any U.S. legal education. I had not yet started my LL.M. at the University of Washington School of Law, and at that time I was not ABA-educated nor trained in U.S. law. I took California as a financial safeguard: a way to avoid taking on educational loans until I confirmed that pursuing licensure in Washington was viable. It was not a reflection of prior U.S. legal training, because I had none.

I have lived and worked in Washington’s legal field for nine years, serving in roles that require deep familiarity with Washington practice, legal processes, and professional standards. Many of my classmates who received the Court’s remedy of diploma privilege have lived in Washington for less than a year and do not have the same level of experience or understanding of the legal profession here as I do. By contrast, the July 2026 Washington bar exam was the first bar examination I took after completing my U.S. legal education, and the Yakima testing collapse prevented me from completing it.

Being placed into the September retake cohort has been deeply discouraging, particularly because the classification of “repeat taker” does not accurately reflect my educational timeline or my long-standing commitment to Washington’s legal community. I am, in every meaningful sense, a first-time Washington examinee who was directly harmed by the Yakima disruption.

I am sharing this information so that the Board has an accurate understanding of how the current categories affect applicants like me. I respectfully ask that my circumstances be considered as WSBA continues its discussions with the Court regarding the July administration and the scope of the remedy.

Thank you for your attention and for your service to the Washington legal community.

Respectfully,
Renata Akalin

Subject: [External]Fwd: Motion to reconsider
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 at 3:19:34 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: morphy andraws
To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from andrawslaw@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)
kari@petraseklaw.com ahearne@foster.com chrisbhangbog@gmail.com jordan@palacelaw.com lparkinpricebog@gmail.com allisonwidneyBOG@gmail.com
----- Forwarded message -----
From: **morphy andraws** <andrawslaw@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Aug 7, 2026, 4:10 PM
Subject: Motion to reconsider
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@courts.wa.gov>, admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Washington Supreme Court and the Governors of the Washington State Bar Association,

I am humbly requesting the Court to reconsider the scope of the relief granted after the failed July 2026 Washington NextGen Bar Examination.

I appreciate that the Court acted quickly in response to an event that left hundreds of applicants without the examination they had spent months preparing to take.

The Court recognized that what happened in Yakima was not a normal testing problem and that requiring every applicant to wait for another administration would not adequately address what had occurred.

I respectfully ask the Court to consider whether the relief that was granted has prevented injustice.

The September examination does not put affected applicants back in the position they were in on July 28. It cannot.

By the time September arrives, applicants will have spent additional weeks studying, delaying employment, rearranging work and family obligations, spending money they did not expect to spend, and living with uncertainty about when, or whether, they will be able to begin practicing law. Some have jobs that depend on licensure. Some have had to extend housing or change travel plans. Some have had to continue bar preparation at a time when they expected to be working.

Others have had to explain to employers, family members, and creditors that the examination they were prepared to take did not happen. The details vary from person to person, but the disruption itself does not.

I reside in Florida -for now- and the cheapest flight ticket I just found is almost \$450 to Seattle. Hotel reservations are super expensive, especially after Yakima travel, which was a very long trip for me and I am sure for many people.

The September examination is not simply July postponed by several weeks. The people taking it will be doing so under conditions that are materially different from the ones they prepared for. They will have been forced into a longer study period, additional financial pressure, continued uncertainty, and the stress of returning to a testing process that already failed them once. Those things affect performance.

A retaker going into July had prepared for the July examination just like everyone else in the room. Many had spent months correcting weaknesses from an earlier attempt, changing study methods, completing hundreds of additional practice questions, working with tutors, and putting themselves in a stronger position than before.

My experience in my prior exam, that a very few weeks before the February 2025 exam, my cousin which she was one of my supporters in my baptism ceremony was died and in the same week were she was buried her oldest son died because heart attack of the sadness of losing his mother, all these incidents happened in Jordan my original country, I wasn't there to be next of my family and I was preparing for the bar exam February 2025, I did not made it.

My MPRE score is 88 and expires in December. I did everything I could to prepare for the July 2026 NextGen exam. I finished Barbri's course 100%; I did 2000 MCQs, 30 PTs, and 30 IQs. I was fully prepared, and I got the point that one of my PT grades in Barbri was 100%.

Many things happened when I was preparing for the July 2026 exam; I was diagnosed with shingles right before the exam course began. I held my super painful condition and kept going. Three weeks before my exam, my wife rushed to the ER for lungs issues which we know before and I had to stay with her in the ER for 12 hours, I studied there, I kept going of what I started with, all these preparations and dedication are gone, not because of my fault; it's just because a technical issue prevented us from proceeding with the exam.

I have been engaged in the legal field in the US since I moved to the United States as my second country and am proud to be American. I finished the mediation and arbitration course, as I became a certified court certified mediator and Arbitrator from the Supreme court of Florida, I was speaker of NALA annual conference in Kentucky where I spoke about e-contracts and ADR methods, I gave CLE certified webinars to the paralegals and also I was appointed from the Richard court moot international arbitration competition to be Arbitrator the world law schools in Miami in JAMS offices since 2019 until 2026, recently I have appointed be Florida General Attorney to be an Arbitrator in Lemon Arbitration Law panel, but I have completed the sign up because of what happened in Yakima, currently I am working in legal aid service of Collier county in Florida as I worked before in law office in Miami, my goal to help the low income people for a good representation in mediation and immigration that is why I was planing to work in any legal aid in Washington if I passed the bar to help poor people, all these achievements did not count as a minimal competent to practice law? On the other hand, the diploma privilege gave the chance to people who have no experience, sometimes are not residents in the US, to be admitted to the bar, because they were lucky that they did not sit the bar exam before.

The Court's response already recognized that reality for many applicants. Diploma privilege was granted because the usual answer of "take the next examination" was not enough under these circumstances.

The concern raised here is that the same problem remains for the applicants who are still being required to test. For them, the ordinary remedy is still being used even though the Court has already recognized that this was not an ordinary situation. Public protection also weighs in favor of reconsideration.

Washington State has already used diploma privilege in recent history. In 2020, the Court allowed a group of applicants, including retakers, to become licensed without completing the traditional bar examination because the COVID-19 pandemic had disrupted the ordinary admissions process. Six years later, there is no evidence that those lawyers have created a meaningful increase in discipline, malpractice, or risk to clients compared with lawyers admitted through the traditional process.

The WSBA's own research on preparedness also did not show that diploma privilege lawyers entered practice unable to perform the work expected of new attorneys.

That experience gives the Court information it did not have in 2020. It is no longer being asked to guess what diploma privilege might look like in practice.

The concern behind any licensing decision is whether the public will be protected. The experience since 2020 shows that diploma privilege did not cause the kind of widespread professional problems that opponents feared. Lawyers admitted that way have practiced, represented clients, worked in government, joined firms and organizations, and become part of the profession.

We respectfully urge the WSBA Board and the Supreme Court Justices to review yesterday's decision and immediately rectify the severe inequity and injustice of excluding repeat test-takers from the emergency diploma privilege.

There is absolutely no empirical or historical basis for this exclusion. Data from Washington State's 2020 emergency diploma privilege demonstrates that the repeat takers who were granted admission have generated zero disciplinary complaints, proving they pose no greater risk to the public and possess no less competency than first-time takers.

By withholding diploma privilege from retakers now, the WSBA and the NCBE are sending a loud, clear, and deeply troubling message: you believe that repeat test-takers are inherently inadequate. You are operating under a preexisting prejudice that past attempts define permanent competence—completely ignoring that these candidates are testing under brand-new degrees, on a brand-new NextGen format they have never failed.

This arbitrary exclusion brings us to a critical question of institutional integrity. If this Board and the NCBE already harbor a systemic distrust toward retakers, how can you possibly conduct a fair, unbiased exam for this pool of applicants in September? If your starting premise is that repeat takers are lesser-than, the September makeup exam is not an objective measure of minimal competence. It is a punitive, biased hurdle designed to logistically wear down the very applicants who already have to fight the hardest to be in this profession. We demand an equitable resolution to preserve justice and prevent injustice that grants the same emergency diploma privilege to all registered July 2026 Yakima applicants equally, regardless of their testing history.

Retakers did not arrive in Yakima expecting special treatment. They arrived expecting to take the bar examination. They accepted the possibility that they might pass or fail based on their own performance. What they did not accept, and could not have planned for, was the possibility that the examination itself would fail before they were given a fair chance to complete it.

There is a meaningful difference between failing a bar examination and being denied the chance to take one. One is the result of an applicant's performance. The other is the result of a system failure. The applicants still being required to sit in September are being asked to bear the consequences of the second as though it were simply another version of the first.

The Court has already recognized that the July failure was serious enough to justify relief outside the ordinary admissions process. We ask the Court to reconsider whether requiring the remaining affected applicants to take the September examination actually fixes what happened to them.

For many, it does not. It gives them another examination, but it does not give them back July. It does not return the lost time, the money spent, the jobs delayed, the additional weeks of preparation, or the conditions under which they were ready to test, the Bar Assoc and the NCBE did not provide. Equitable damages remedies to the retaker, but they need to be collaborate with us to make the thing going back to normal with less extra damages to us, could be administering the exam in Pearson Examination Centers across the nation where we did the MPRE exam, since the MPRE exam is a requirement to be licensed to practice law in the US, so prioritize this solution would one of the acceptable remedies to us rather to spend extra money for faults was not our specially that the bar keep saying tentatively on September, and/ or reconsider the decision that you Honor justices has been decided to include the retakers in the Diploma Privilege.

For those reasons, we ask the Court to reconsider the scope of its August 2026 order and extend diploma privilege, or comparable relief, to applicants who were required to return for another administration after the failure of the July 2026 examination.

Respectfully submitted,
The Retake Examinees of the July 2026 Bar Examination
Morphy Andraws, ABA-LLM

Subject: [External]Comment/question Re: NextGen Portability
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 at 2:14:32 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Mingyue Zhou
To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from mzhou1@seattleu.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I am an applicant to July WA bar. I want to ask one question: if we accept diploma privilege and then choose to take the February bar again, will the score be accepted in other 40 jurisdictions like traditional UBE scores?

Best,

Mingyue Zhou (she/her/hers)

[How do I pronounce that?](#)

J.D. Candidate 2026

Global Accelerated JD Program

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Phone: (206) 513-4661 | [LinkedIn](#) | mzhou1@seattleu.edu

// AT THE HEART OF LAW

Subject: [External]Public Comment Regarding Accommodated Applicants and the Supreme Court's August 6 Order
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 at 9:50:04 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Rebecca Gil
To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from rgil@seattleu.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors,

I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment before your upcoming meeting; specifically, I would like to address the Washington Supreme Court's August 6 order addressing the unprecedented failure of the July 2026 Washington Bar Examination.

First, I want to acknowledge what I believe many of us recognize: there was no perfect solution to an unprecedented situation. I understand that the Board has been placed in an extraordinarily difficult position, and I recognize that the Court ultimately made the decision regarding the remedy.

Nevertheless, I respectfully ask that the Board consider one group of applicants whose circumstances I fear have been overlooked: those of us who tested with approved disability accommodations.

Like every applicant granted accommodations, I was required to submit extensive medical documentation to the WSBA demonstrating that accommodations were necessary to provide me an equal opportunity to demonstrate my competence. Accommodations are not a benefit or an advantage. They exist solely to level the playing field.

Unfortunately, I believe the current remedy has had the opposite effect.

Washington has long championed equity, accessibility, and the inclusion of marginalized communities. Yet, in this instance, one of those very communities has been excluded from an equitable remedy.

The distinction drawn by the Court is not based upon who experienced technological failures or who endured a fundamentally compromised testing environment. Instead, it turns almost entirely upon whether an exam file can be scored.

For accommodated applicants, that distinction carries consequences that I do not believe were fully contemplated.

While many understandably focus on the cancellation experienced by the standard administration, those of us testing with accommodations also experienced repeated Wi-Fi disruptions, prolonged delays, uncertainty, and extraordinary distractions throughout the

day. We waited for long periods without information while chaos unfolded outside our testing rooms. After arriving at 6:30 that morning, I was released around 2:00 p.m. for what amounted to a twenty-minute lunch, only to learn through rumors and hallway conversations that the standard administration had not yet been administered. No one communicated to accommodated applicants whether our examinations would continue with certainty, whether they would ultimately be scored, or what we should expect before we were sent back into the testing rooms to continue under the same technological failures and surrounding confusion.

For applicants whose disabilities include anxiety, ADHD, PTSD, and other conditions recognized through the accommodations process, these circumstances had consequences extending far beyond ordinary inconvenience. Accommodations exist precisely because these conditions can substantially affect one's ability to perform under testing conditions. The events of July 28 fundamentally altered those conditions.

There is another consequence that I have not yet seen discussed.

Because accommodated applicants remain ineligible for the waiver solely by virtue of having completed enough of the examination to generate a score, many of us are now placed in the position of either disclosing our disability accommodations to employers in order to explain why we cannot elect the same remedy as our peers or allowing employers to assume we voluntarily chose to wait for a future examination. I do not believe applicants should be placed in the position of effectively disclosing deeply personal medical information because of how the remedy was structured.

Throughout my legal career, I have advocated for employees, many of whom have disabilities and have been forced to publicly disclose deeply personal information in hopes of obtaining an equitable remedy. Until now, I had always been on the other side of that conversation. I never imagined that I would find myself publicly disclosing my own disabilities to advocate for myself and for a group of individuals similarly situated.

Before law school, I served in the United States Navy. I then spent nearly eight years as a paralegal before earning my Rule 9 license and graduating from law school. Military service, deployments, and ten years as a single mother and sole provider taught me resilience in the face of extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

Yet despite those experiences, I humbly admit that the uncertainty, confusion, and complete loss of confidence in the testing process that followed the WSBA's technological failures compounded that pressure in ways I have never before experienced.

I do not believe those experiences should be minimized simply because an examination file exists that can be scored.

To be clear, I am not advocating that accommodated applicants receive both admission by

court order and an examination score. Nor am I suggesting that applicants with disabilities deserve special treatment.

Rather, I respectfully submit that every affected applicant should have been afforded the same meaningful choice: preserve the examination score if they wish to do so, or decline that score and accept admission by court order. The question should not be whether a score can be generated. The question should be whether applicants who endured a fundamentally compromised testing experience should have the autonomy to decide whether they wish to rely upon that score.

I recognize that the Board did not issue the Court's order. However, I respectfully ask that, in your continuing discussions and any future recommendations to the Court, you consider whether the current remedy unintentionally leaves accommodated applicants behind.

Finally, I want to be clear that I am genuinely happy for my peers who have been given the opportunity to begin the careers they have worked so hard to earn. Washington is gaining an extraordinary class of new attorneys, and I sincerely celebrate that outcome. My hope is simply that the same principles of equity and fairness that guided relief for the majority of applicants can also be extended to those whose disabilities required accommodations in the first place.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Respectfully,

Rebecca Gil (she/her)

JD

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Phone: (425) 577-9989 | law.seattleu.edu

Subject: [External]Fw: Request for Equal Consideration of All Qualified Bar Applicants
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 at 12:32:06 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: leye bajo
To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from kol4lee@yahoo.co.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

 *God is always good; God is always right and God is never late.*

----- Forwarded message -----

From: leye bajo <kol4lee@yahoo.co.uk>
To: "supreme@courts.wa.gov" <supreme@courts.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, 30 July 2026 at 19:56:28 GMT-7
Subject: Request for Equal Consideration of All Qualified Bar Applicants

Dear Chief Justice and Honorable Justices:

I am one of the many applicants who were supposed to write the July 28 and 28, 2026 Bar Exam in Yakima. I write with respect and appreciation for the tremendous responsibility the Court faces in responding to the unprecedented circumstances surrounding the Washington Bar Examination. I recognize that the Court's primary concern is protecting the public while ensuring fairness to applicants whose path to licensure has been disrupted through no fault of their own.

I read in the news that the Deans of Law from Law Schools in Washington state are advocating that their law students be granted diploma privilege or any form of emergency licensure relief.

If the Court decides to grant diploma privilege or any other form of emergency licensure relief, I respectfully urge the Court to extend that relief to all applicants who were eligible to sit for the examination, including foreign-trained attorneys who qualified under Washington's admission rules, rather than limiting relief solely to graduates of ABA-accredited law schools.

Foreign-trained attorneys who have met Washington's eligibility requirements have already demonstrated that their legal education and credentials satisfy the standards necessary to take the Washington Bar

Examination. Many have also practiced law successfully for years in other jurisdictions before relocating to Washington.

Like graduates of ABA-accredited law schools, these applicants devoted substantial time, financial resources, and personal sacrifice to preparing for the bar examination. They paid the same application fees, invested months of intensive study, arranged time away from work and family responsibilities, and endured the same uncertainty, stress, and emotional strain caused by the recent disruption of the examination process. The impact of these extraordinary events has not been limited by where an applicant earned a law degree.

Indeed, experienced foreign-trained attorneys may have an even stronger claim for equitable consideration because they have already demonstrated their competence through years of legal practice while also completing the additional steps required to become eligible for admission in Washington. Excluding them solely because their legal education occurred outside an ABA-accredited institution would create a distinction that bears little relationship to the hardships the Court seeks to remedy.

The purpose of emergency relief is to address the extraordinary burden imposed by circumstances beyond the applicants' control. That burden has been shared equally by every qualified applicant who prepared for this examination. An equitable solution should therefore recognize all applicants who were lawfully eligible to sit for the exam, regardless of whether their legal education was obtained at an ABA-accredited institution or through another pathway recognized by Washington's admission rules.

The legal profession is strengthened by attorneys with diverse educational and professional backgrounds. Washington has long recognized that qualified foreign-trained lawyers can contribute meaningfully to the practice of law within the state. Any emergency remedy should reflect that inclusive principle.

I respectfully ask the Court to ensure that any relief granted in response to these extraordinary circumstances is administered fairly and without unnecessary distinctions among applicants who have all satisfied Washington's eligibility requirements and who have borne the same financial, emotional, and professional burdens.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and for your continued service to the people of Washington.

Yours faithfully,

Kolade O. Olubajo

Subject: [External]Request for Information Regarding Reimbursement for July Bar Exam Cancellation

Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 at 6:22:02 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Chelsey Bryson

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from cajbryson@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Board of Governors,

I am a Washington Bar applicant who was affected by the cancellation of the July Washington Bar Exam. While I am traveling back to Washington for the make-up exam in a few weeks, I am concerned that there has been no discussion of compensation beyond refunding the application and examination fees.

In addition to the significant time and money I spent preparing for the exam—I work full-time and had to take substantial time off—I traveled to Seattle from Hawaii for the July exam. I then had to rent a car due to the limited public transportation options to Yakima and pay for lodging and other travel expenses. I am now incurring the cost of a second flight, rental car, and accommodations for the make-up exam, many of which are considerably more expensive because they are being booked at the last minute.

In total, I have spent more than \$3,000 in direct expenses related to taking this exam, not including the value of my leave from work or the considerable time I have spent studying and preparing.

Given that the cancellation resulted from a foreseeable technical failure associated with the administration of a new examination and limited local bandwidth, and given the substantial mental, emotional, and financial planning required of applicants, I would like to know what mechanism is available to applicants to request reimbursement for the additional costs incurred as a result of the cancellation.

Specifically, I would appreciate information about how the Board is considering reimbursement for reasonable travel, lodging, transportation, and other documented expenses resulting from the cancellation, and how applicants can submit a claim.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would appreciate any information you can provide regarding the process and whether additional compensation will be available to affected applicants.

Best,
Chelsey Bryson
Washington Bar Applicant

--

Chelsey Alexandra Bryson (she/her)
cajbryson@gmail.com

Subject: [External]Request for Recommendation to Reconsider Diploma Privilege Eligibility
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 at 10:01:34 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: samiulla malang
To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from samiullam786@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the WSBA Board of Governors,

I respectfully request that the Board reconsider the current diploma privilege eligibility criteria.

I devoted the last **four months** to continuous preparation for the Washington NextGen Bar Exam. I traveled, invested substantial time and money, and was fully prepared to become licensed in Washington. The July 2026 exam was canceled through no fault of my own.

I was also affected by the **California February 2025 Bar Exam technology failure**, which was likewise beyond my control. I respectfully ask why I should be excluded from diploma privilege solely because I previously experienced another technology-related bar exam failure.

The current policy appears to benefit applicants with less preparation while excluding applicants like me who invested months of dedicated study and experienced multiple examination disruptions caused by administrative and technological failures.

I respectfully request that the Board recommend extending equal consideration to all applicants affected by the July 2026 cancellation, regardless of prior U.S. bar exam attempts, in the interest of fairness, equity, and equal treatment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Samiullah Malang

Subject: [External]Fw: Request for Reconsideration of Order No. 25700-B-753
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 at 5:02:30 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Jocema Bittencourt
To: Board Feedback
Attachments: Bar Exam Complaint - how to proceed.eml, Petition for Reconsideration - Jocema Bittencourt.pdf

You don't often get email from jocemab@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am forwarding the *Petition for Reconsideration* that I submitted to the Supreme Court yesterday.

I appreciate that the Board will have another emergency meeting soon to discuss advocating to the Court that **Order No. 25700-B-753** be extended to students with accommodations and repeat takers.

I would like to participate in the meeting. Would that be possible?

Best,
Jocema Bittencourt
UW LLM Graduate

From: Jocema Bittencourt <jocemab@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 9, 2026 1:39 PM
To: supreme@courts.wa.gov <supreme@courts.wa.gov>
Cc: lawdean@uw.edu <lawdean@uw.edu>; Terry J Price <tprice@uw.edu>; Carrie Sanford <sanfordc@uw.edu>; Mariola Lisewska <mlisew@uw.edu>
Subject: Request for Reconsideration of Order No. 25700-B-753

Honorable Debra L. Stephens
Chief Justice, Washington State Supreme Court
Temple of Justice
PO Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

**Re: Request for Reconsideration of Order No. 25700-B-753 —
Accommodated July 2026 Examinee**

Dear Chief Justice Stephens and Honorable Justices of the Washington Supreme Court:

I am writing as a July 2026 applicant who completed the three-day accommodated administration of the NextGen Uniform Bar Examination in Yakima. I respectfully ask the Court to reconsider the treatment of applicants who completed the examination under paragraph 3 of Order No. 25700-B-753. I understand the difficult balance the Court is attempting to strike. I hope my firsthand experience helps illustrate why "completed the examination" does not necessarily mean that an applicant received a fair or reliable opportunity to demonstrate competence.

I experienced software problems on both the second and third days. On the morning of Day 2, I used the highlighting feature to mark several questions for later review. When I returned to them, some of the highlighting had moved, skipped words, or otherwise no longer corresponded to the text I had selected.

Because of that experience, I began Day 3 by carefully analyzing one of the performance tasks before writing it. I used different highlighting colors to organize different arguments and prepared a detailed answer plan using headings and other text formatting. I reserved the final hour of my examination to write that response. When I returned to the task, **all of my highlighting had disappeared, and the formatting of the outline I had prepared was distorted.**

I immediately reported the problem and asked for approximately 15–20 additional minutes so that I could reconstruct the work that had disappeared. I was told that additional time could not be provided. The only alternative offered was another laptop, which would not have restored the highlighting or outline I had already written, nor the time I had already lost.

I still had 11 minutes of break time remaining, so I used those minutes to

leave the testing room and formally report what had happened to the administrators. I was told that a technical ticket had been opened. When I asked for a ticket or reference number, I was told there was none. When I asked how I could follow up, I was instructed to contact Washington State Bar Association Admissions. I specifically asked that the report reflect how significantly the incident had affected me, and I was assured that it did.

I then returned to the examination and tried to finish the performance task, but I ran out of time before I could complete it. I contacted Admissions by telephone near 5:00 p.m. and left a voicemail that Thursday reporting what happened and asking how to proceed to file a formal complaint. Then, on Monday, August 3, I tried calling multiple times again and left a voicemail after the 20th attempt. Later that day, I sent an email with the same request. I received no response.

At the end of a timed licensing examination, 15-20 minutes can matter enormously. **There is now no way to determine what effect those lost minutes will have on my score.** Perhaps I would have received the same score regardless. Perhaps the additional time would have made the difference between passing and failing. That uncertainty is precisely the problem: a technological failure outside my control may now become inseparable from the score that determines whether I may practice law.

The Court's Order acknowledges that technological failures may have detrimentally affected applicants who completed the examination. I respectfully submit that the distinction between an examination that could not be administered at all and an examination that was completed under materially compromised conditions should therefore not be absolute. The inability to begin an examination is one form of harm. Losing work and critical testing time during the examination is another.

The resulting difference in remedies is substantial. A first-time applicant who was unable to sit may elect waiver of the examination requirement and admission by court order, and may later take a bar examination if a portable

score is desired. By contrast, because I completed the accommodated administration, I have no comparable election. My July examination will be scored despite the documented interruption, and if that compromised score falls below the passing threshold, my only route to admission is to take the examination again.

For that reason, I respectfully ask the Court, at minimum, to permit applicants who completed the accommodated examination but experienced documented technological or administrative disruptions to make a **binding election before scores are released**: either have the July examination scored or elect the same examination waiver available to similarly situated first-time applicants who could not test. Making the election before results are known would prevent outcome-based decision-making while recognizing that completion alone does not establish that an examination was fairly administered.

I am also concerned about the practical effect of the categories created by the Order. For accommodated examinees like me, the accommodated administration continued when the general administration could not. We completed the examination because we were instructed and mandated to continue; that completion now categorically excludes us from the principal relief afforded to other first-time applicants. I do not suggest that this result was intended to discriminate against applicants with disabilities. But when the operation of the remedy leaves accommodated examinees outside the relief precisely because their administration continued, the resulting disparity deserves careful reconsideration.

I have a similar concern regarding the categorical exclusion of repeat applicants. A prior unsuccessful examination did not contribute to the July technology failure or make its consequences less serious. I recognize that the Court may have reasons grounded in professional standards or public protection for drawing that distinction. But without an explanation connecting prior examination history to the harm caused by this administration, the distinction is difficult for affected applicants to

understand and risks creating the appearance that two identifiable groups —accommodated examinees and repeat applicants—are being required to bear consequences from an institutional failure that other affected applicants are not.

I respectfully ask the Court to reconsider Order No. 25700-B-753 and extend the examination-waiver option to all otherwise eligible July 2026 applicants affected by the failed administration. At a minimum, I ask the Court to provide that election to applicants who, like me, completed the accommodated examination but can document technological disruptions capable of affecting their performance.

Thank you for considering my firsthand account and for the Court's continued attention to this extraordinary situation. I am available to provide any additional information concerning the incident, my communications with examination administrators, or the technical ticket I was told was created.

Respectfully,

Jocema Bittencourt da Cruz

July 2026 Washington Bar Examination Applicant

Applicant No. 33980 | NCBE No. 10888008

jocemab@hotmail.com | (206) 446-4976

cc: Tamara Lawson, UW Toni Rembe Dean and Professor of Law
Terry J. Price, UW Associate Dean for Student Affairs/Associate
Teaching Professor
Carrie Sanford, UW Director of Academic Success/Associate
Teaching Professor
Mariola Lisewska, UW Assistant Director of Academic Success

Subject: [External]Request for WSBA Advocacy – Equal Relief for All Applicants Affected by the July 2026 Bar Exam Cancellation;

Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 at 6:51:35 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Riana Simbolon

To: Board Feedback, admissions

You don't often get email from rianasimbolon@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear President Adewale, Executive Director Nevitt, Members of the Board of Governors, and WSBA Admissions Staff,

I write as one of the retaker applicants who traveled to the Yakima Convention & Event Center for the July 2026 NextGen UBE and was unable to sit due to the technology failure. I respectfully request that the WSBA Board of Governors and leadership strongly advocate to the Washington Supreme Court for equal treatment of all affected applicants, including those of us who previously sat for a bar exam, and that the Board publicly address the inequality created by Order 25700-B-753.

I appreciate that the Board held a special meeting on August 7 and committed to an independent investigation of the failure as well as reimbursement for some costs incurred by examinees. Those steps are welcome and necessary. **They do not, however, remedy the core problem created by the Court's order: the creation of two tiers of victims of the same institutional failure.**

Every applicant who appeared in Yakima suffered the identical exogenous harm. We all prepared for months, incurred travel, lodging, and meal expenses, and arrived ready to be tested. The technology failure was not caused by any applicant's prior exam history. Yet the order grants first-time applicants the option of a full waiver of the exam requirement and admission by court order, while limiting retakers solely to a fee transfer or refund for a later administration. That distinction treats people who were identically situated with respect to the cancellation as unequally situated for purposes of relief.

This approach is inconsistent with the Court's own 2020 precedent. In Order 25700-B-630, the Court expressly made diploma privilege available to both first-time applicants and those repeating the examination. The 2020 disruption was systemic; the Court responded by treating all registered applicants equally. The 2026 disruption was also systemic and institutional. The departure from the 2020 approach therefore requires a stronger justification than has been offered. Using prior exam performance as the sorting mechanism converts a shared injury into differential treatment based on a status unrelated to the harm.

A transfer or refund does not restore the position we would have occupied. It does not compensate for months of preparation timed to a specific administration, the out-of-pocket costs of traveling to Yakima, the emotional and psychological impact of the cancellation, or the compromised conditions under which a September examination would now be taken. For retakers, the knowledge that the Court has

classified us as ineligible for the more complete relief available to others compounds the injury and further undermines morale and fairness.

I urge the Board to:

1. Formally request that the Supreme Court reconsider or amend Order 25700-B-753 to extend the waiver option (or equivalent equitable relief) to all applicants who registered for and were unable to sit for the July 2026 administration in Yakima due to the technology failure, regardless of prior exam history;
2. Publicly acknowledge that the current distinction creates an unjustified inequality among people harmed by the same institutional failure; and
3. Continue and expand efforts to provide meaningful financial relief for documented out-of-pocket costs incurred by all affected applicants.

The WSBA's mission includes ensuring the integrity of the profession and championing justice. Advocating for equal treatment of all applicants injured by this failure is consistent with that mission. Treating retakers as a lesser class of victim is not.

I recognize the Board's and the Court's difficult position and the need to balance public protection with fairness to applicants. I ask only that the same principle of equal treatment applied in 2020 be applied here. I am prepared to provide additional information or documentation if helpful.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I look forward to the Board's continued engagement on behalf of all affected applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

Riana Simbolon Hicks

WSBA Applicant ID Number: 33751
July 2026 Washington State Bar Exam Candidate

Subject: [External]Request to Extend Diploma Privilege to All Affected Examinees

Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 at 4:12:29 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Roger Williams

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from rogerwilliamsokok@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Washington State Bar Association,

I am writing to respectfully urge the WSBA to advocate for diploma privilege for all applicants affected by the disrupted July 2026 Washington bar examination.

The current situation places applicants with testing accommodations in a particularly difficult position. Many of these applicants completed the examination and have returned to work, where employers and colleagues are congratulating them on “passing the bar” and “becoming an attorney.” Yet uncertainty about their eligibility for licensure remains above their heads. When asked about their status, these applicants must either allow others to believe something that may not yet be true, correct them without explaining why their situation differs from other examinees, or disclose that they received disability-related testing accommodations. Applicants should not have to choose between risking a misleading statement and revealing private disability information simply because of how the disrupted examination was administered.

I also urge the WSBA to extend relief to retakers who previously attempted the legacy bar examination but have not yet had a complete opportunity to take the NextGen examination. The NextGen exam uses a fundamentally different format and testing methodology. A prior attempt on a different examination should not disqualify an applicant from relief arising from the failed July NextGen administration.

All affected applicants invested substantial time, money, and professional opportunity preparing for an examination that Washington could not administer as intended through no fault of the applicants. Extending diploma privilege to all affected examinees would provide the clearest and most equitable resolution.

Thank you for your consideration and your continued efforts to address these circumstances.

Respectfully,

Roger Williams

Subject: FW: [External]Respectful Ask to Call an Emergency BOG Meeting
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 at 11:22:26 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Aziza Ozgoren on behalf of Terra Nevitt
To: Aziza Ozgoren

From: Kate Sargeant <ksargeant@seattleu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 at 4:26 PM
To: Adewale, Francis <fadewale@spokanecity.org>
Cc: Terra Nevitt <terran@wsba.org>
Subject: [External]Respectful Ask to Call an Emergency BOG Meeting

You don't often get email from ksargeant@seattleu.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear President Adewale,

My name is Kate Sargeant. I am one of the impacted examinees from the July bar examination and one of the individuals who spoke at the Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors' special meeting last week.

This email serves two purposes. First, I want to sincerely thank you for everything you have done in response to the technology catastrophe that occurred at the bar examination two weeks ago.

Second, I am writing to respectfully ask that you consider utilizing your authority under Section 7, Subsection C, and Section 3, Subsection A of the Washington State Bar Association Bylaws to call an emergency meeting of the Board of Governors for the purpose of discussing whether the Board should submit a recommendation to the Washington Supreme Court asking it to reconsider the exclusion of retakers and accommodated examinees from its August 6 order permitting first-time examinees to waive into the Washington State Bar.

It is my understanding that, during the first summer of COVID in 2020, the Board of Governors intervened in a similar manner on behalf of registered examinees after the Court initially declined to provide a waiver from the examination requirement. I believe the Board of Governors can and should use its institutional voice to urge Court directly to stop the ongoing injustice happening to retakers and accommodated individuals. .

I fully acknowledge that I may have overlooked a provision of the Bylaws or another rule

that would prevent the use of this power. If that is the case, I apologize for my misunderstanding.

If it is possible, I ask that you use that power quickly as the deadline for decisions continues to approach, and, as far as I am aware, the location of that examination remains unconfirmed. Every passing day further limits individuals who must travel for the exam the ability to make informed decisions about travel, lodging, employment, preparation, finances, and whether participating in the make-up examination is realistically possible at all.

If this situation did not already rise to the level of an extraordinary matter warranting emergency consideration by the Board of Governors, I believe it certainly does now, given the disparities the order has created and furthered.

I do not make this request lightly as I recognize that calling an emergency meeting is itself an extraordinary request. But the affected examinees are rapidly running out of time, and the Board of Governors may be one of the few bodies that the Court may listen to. I would be remised in my role as an advocate if I did not at least attempt to request this on behalf of, yes myself but also, my fellow examinees who have been treated unjustly for an event that they had no control over.

Thank you again for your time.

Sincerely,

Kate Sargeant

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Phone: (405) 531-8768 ksargeant@seattleu.edu

Subject: [External]Urging WSBA Direct Admission for All of July 2026 Examinees without Exclusion

Date: Sunday, August 9, 2026 at 2:36:26 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Safjola (Vavla) Istrefi

To: admission@wsba.org, Board Feedback, Bar Leaders

You don't often get email from sv432@georgetown.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Board of Governors,

I do not expect a reply. I simply want to express my disappointment because this situation has gone too far. Instead of resolving it quickly and allowing us to celebrate alongside everyone else, you have punished us. You have punished me. What am I being punished for? For failing the bar exam before? How can the highest court in the state make such a biased decision? How is this fair? How could the Washington Supreme Court divide us into two groups—those who passed and those who failed?

The Washington Supreme Court has made history for all the wrong reasons by punishing its own future colleagues. Some of us may one day sit in those same seats. In this story, the Washington Supreme Court and the WSBA are the ones who have treated us unfairly. Our only fault is that we are retakers—that we previously failed the exam. But you do not know our stories. You do not know my story. You do not know how hard I have worked to get here or how much I love this profession. Yes, I am a retaker, and I am not ashamed that I did not pass before. That experience made me stronger and better prepared. This could have been the last time I ever needed to take this exam, but you took that opportunity away from me.

I am a foreign-trained attorney from Albania. Before coming to the United States to continue my education, I spent four years providing pro bono legal services through a nonprofit organization supported by USAID and through an organization serving survivors of domestic violence. I then attended Georgetown University Law Center, where I completed a two-year LL.M. in General Studies. I took the same classes as J.D. students and fulfilled every requirement established by the ABA and the NCBE for LL.M. students. I assure you that I am more than qualified to take this exam. After graduating, I worked for a nonprofit organization in Georgetown, Washington, D.C. I have also worked as a government contractor and as a legal analyst and clerk for more than ten years across several federal agencies, including the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Department of the Interior, and now the Department of Defense.

Do you think I am incompetent? Do you truly believe that I do not deserve to be included in the diploma privilege remedy? What about my job? Do you think my employment depends on this license any less than the employment of those who were included? Why am I being excluded? What have I done to deserve this? Please tell me what I am supposed to do now? I worked full-time, studied full-time, and raised my child as a full-time mother. Someone else might call me a SUPERWOMAN. Instead, you are making me feel like a failure. You are telling me that I do not deserve to be treated equally.

What kind of remedy is this? The SEPTEMBER EXAMINATION should have been offered to ALL of us or NONE of us. How do you think I will feel walking back into that convention

center? We need counseling after what happened, not another exam. How can you expect us to perform under these circumstances? I still have flashbacks from the July 28, 2026 NextGen Bar Examination. I stood in that room with 647 other candidates and sat at the same table as a recent Georgetown University Law Center graduate. How ironic is that? The Washington Supreme Court gave her an opportunity because she had just graduated, while denying me that same opportunity simply because I had taken the exam before.

And you, as a Board, are standing by while this unfair decision remains in place.

Please tell me: How am I supposed to return in September? When I look beside me, I will not see the same woman who sat next to me because she was given an opportunity that I was denied. Were we not seated at the same table and taking the same exam? Are you telling me that she is worth more than I am? How do you know that she would have passed while I would have failed AGAIN? What basis did the Supreme Court have for making that assumption? I do not say this to be petty, but I believe that I have more legal experience than she does. Is this equal treatment?

I am asking the Board to demand that the Washington Supreme Court correct this terrible injustice. Even if this decision appears to have a rational basis on its face, a closer examination of our constitutional protections may support a much higher level of scrutiny. You must ensure that the September examination does not go forward under these circumstances.

Suppose the Washington Supreme Court ignores our plea. Then what? What happens next? There are far too many unanswered questions. Please tell us what the next steps will be. How do you expect this examination to proceed? How can you be certain that it will work this time? Do you not think that requiring only us to return in September creates another form of unfairness? Do you not think the graders may view us differently? Can you assure us that the process will be impartial? Who can assure me that, this time, you will do the right thing? You are already in breach, and the only adequate remedy is immediate admission. What can you do, as a Board, to correct this?

I am pleading with you to do the right thing.

Please tell me: Is this justice? How will you make this right? Simply saying, "I'm sorry," does not cure a breach of contract. An apology alone does not repair the harm that has already been done, just as an apology in court would not erase the harm suffered by a victim or the victim's family. As a Board, you cannot make this right simply by asking us to return in September. My employer does not need an apology. An apology will not relieve my pain and suffering, restore the opportunity I lost, or protect my future employment.

V/r,
Safjola Istrefi
sv432@georgetown.edu
(862) 213-8730

Subject: [External]Waive exam requirement for all July 2026 applicants

Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 at 11:05:13 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Rosalyn Estrada-Leban

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from rosalyn@estradaledban.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good evening,

My name is Rosalyn Leban, and I'm a member of the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA).

I took and passed the Washington State bar examination in July 2024 after graduating from Yale Law School with my Juris Doctor degree in May 2024. I am also a member of QLaw (the LGBTQ+ Bar Association of Washington), the Chelan-Douglas Bar Association, the Wenatchee chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and the Pacific Northwest hub of the National Immigration Project, among other professional organizations. I am a Staff Attorney in the Wenatchee office of the Northwest Immigrant Rights Project. **I write in my personal capacity to urge WSBA to waive the examination requirement for all July 2026 applicants for the bar examination**, including those who received accommodations and those who were attempting the examination again after a previous failure.

I appreciate that WSBA and the Washington Supreme Court (WASC) will allow waiver of the examination requirement by applicants who have never failed a bar examination. This is an important first step towards remedying the harm WSBA caused in its failed administration of the NextGen Uniform Bar Examination. I was also relieved to see that WSBA will reimburse some of the collateral costs of the July 2026 bar examination in Yakima. However, the current WSBA and WASC are insufficient: an equitable solution must make disabled applicants and repeat applicants eligible for admission by waiver.

My office provides *pro bono* services for low-income immigrants living in Adams, Chelan, Douglas, Ferry, Grant, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens counties. Through my work, I have witnessed the impacts of the attorney shortage on rural communities, including many unmet civil legal needs. We struggle to recruit and retain attorneys. We desperately need more lawyers to serve our communities' needs. We can't afford to lose out on qualified attorneys who might have achieved a passing score but for the adverse conditions of the July 2026 and September 2026 examinations.

As a disabled attorney, I'm horrified by the way WSBA is treating disabled applicants. Disabled applicants are entitled to the right to privacy regarding their disability. WSBA and WASC are effectively forcing applicants to disclose their status as a person with a disability by requiring disabled applicants, but not other applicants, to wait for July 2026 results. Anyone who has a passing score from the July 2026 examination will be publicly outed as a person with a disability. The applicants who took the July 2026 bar examination with accommodations also suffered adverse conditions affecting the test in general and the specific accommodations applicants needed. It is unfair to hold these applicants to the standards of testing under ideal conditions. **The only solution that respects the rights of disabled applicants is to waive examination for**

applicants who received accommodations when they took the July 2026 bar exam.

Repeat applicants should also be included in the waiver. These examinees suffered the same adverse conditions as first-time examinees. It is unfair to force them to take an additional bar exam on five weeks' notice, and even more unfair to force them to wait until February to take the exam again. Especially for applicants who must take the September 2026 exam instead of waiting until February 2027, which likely constitutes a large number of the applicant population since many people's employment is contingent on bar passage, the short notice will likely result in a decreased chance of passing the test for which they have spent months or years preparing. The unreimbursed costs of retaking the exam, including costly test preparation courses, are an unreasonable burden on repeat test-takers. **It is appropriate and necessary to waive examination for repeat examinees in addition to first-time test-takers.**

I hope that WSBA and WASC will make the correct decision to waive examination for applicants who received accommodations and applicants retaking the bar examination.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Rosalyn D. Leban, WSBA No. 62632
pronoun: she / pronombre: ella

Subject: [External]We need help, We need Justice
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 at 3:07:41 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: morphy andraws
To: Board Feedback, Tom Ahearne, CHRIBHANGBOG@gmail.com, emily.arneson@outlook.com, FRANCIASADEWALEBOG@gmail.comkari, KARI@petraselaw.com, SUNITHA@amllawseattle.com, Questions, Bar Leaders, Jordan Couch, Parvin Price, allisonwidneyBOG, mmmrbog4d, Matthew Dresden, avilleneuve, kristinalarrybog@gmail.com, nam.wsba@gmail.com
Attachments: WASC auto-response .pdf

You don't often get email from andrawslaw@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear BOG WSBA,

First, please see the attachment.

Some examinees started receiving the attachment upon submitting their motions to reconsider from the Supreme Court of Washington.

This is an absolutely discriminatory conclusion of the Supreme Court of how it's dealt with this case, it's just like it's needed to find some class of people to carry the fault of what happened in Yakima, the supreme court is killing us every day of what it's ordered to prevent the retakers from the exam waiver, this very painful for us and the pain is severe, how do you expect from us to study clear and perform normal in the September exam?

This response from the Supreme Court is an outrageous discriminatory statement without any legal or objective reasoning; this is very inequitable and too far from justice and fairness, it says in the response that " the Court recognized its resolution was neither perfect nor individually tailored to each applicants' circumstances."

We, as Yakima survivors, retakers, and people with accommodations, are being punished daily by the Supreme Court with its order; we are not sleeping, we are not eating well, and we live in this nightmare every day.

The Supreme Court is standing on the wrong side of history in this case, and we will never forget.

We need your support with the Supreme Court to modify its decision and ensure everyone who sat the exam in Yakima receives the same rights and equality by giving all examinees who sat for July 2026 the same opportunity without discrimination for the bar exam waiver option for the retakers and the people with accomodation.

Please stand with us; this discrimination is very painful. I am sending this email at 4 am after battling myself to sleep before my work, battling myself to resume studying, but I couldn't. It's horrible to feel discriminated against.

They want us to keep going forward, as they responded.
It's just like, suck it up and move on as if nothing happened.

How do you expect us to perform fairly in the September exam? During this stress?

Do you accept this for yourself or for your loved ones to go through what we are going through?
That is not fair; that is inequitable; that is not equal.

Please, we need feedback from GOG on whether they sent letters or a motion to reconsider to the Supreme Court, and we need to have a meeting with you on Zoom to hear what you are suggesting to us, and we need you to hear us more.

Please help us

Best,

Morphy Andraws

Subject: [External]Written Comment from an Anonymous Examinee

Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 at 11:33:31 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Anonymous Examinee

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from examineeanonymous@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors:

Because this is a public comment, I am writing anonymously regarding the July 2026 Washington Bar Examination and, in particular, the treatment of applicants who tested with accommodations.

I previously wrote to the Washington Supreme Court on two occasions, urging consideration of an equitable licensing remedy in light of the unprecedented circumstances surrounding the July examination. Since then, the Court has declined to extend diploma privilege to accommodated applicants. I respectfully submit that the circumstances experienced by accommodated examinees warrant continued consideration by the Board and the Court as the consequences of the July examination are addressed.

The fact that accommodated examinees were able to continue testing does not mean that they completed the examination under the conditions that had been approved or reasonably anticipated. Many accommodated applicants experienced substantial disruptions, uncertainty, technological problems, and, in some cases, failures to implement the accommodations that had been approved specifically to provide equal access to the examination.

Like many accommodated applicants, I completed the lengthy accommodations process months before the examination. That process required extensive documentation, including a comprehensive psychological evaluation and full disclosure of deeply personal medical and trauma history. After its review, the Washington State Bar Association approved several accommodations, including that I be supervised by a female proctor in a private testing environment.

During my third testing session on July 30, 2026, my assigned female proctor temporarily left for a break, and a male proctor entered my private testing room to supervise. I initially tried to continue working. During that time, I became hyperaware of his presence and was unable to think clearly. I ultimately informed him that I was supposed to have a female proctor. He apologized, indicated he would obtain another proctor, asked whether he could remain briefly, and then left the room shortly thereafter.

Although the error was corrected promptly, my approved accommodation was not fully implemented during that period. As a result, I remained dysregulated for approximately ten to fifteen minutes afterward and experienced difficulty concentrating for the remainder of that testing session, which comprised roughly half of my allotted time. I have documented this incident with the Washington State Bar Association, and I am awaiting a response.

But my experience was not unique. Other accommodated examinees have similarly reported failures in the implementation of approved accommodations, as well as software malfunctions, testing delays, shortened breaks, repeated interruptions in reduced-distraction testing rooms, and uncertainty resulting from the widespread technological failures affecting the examination. Many of us also learned during the examination that the vast majority of applicants had been unable to continue testing, requiring us to complete a high-stakes licensing examination amid significant uncertainty regarding the examination's administration and ultimate validity. The particular circumstances varied, but accommodations did not insulate applicants from the extraordinary conditions surrounding this administration.

The distinction between applicants who were unable to continue testing and accommodated applicants who were able to continue also creates difficult questions about the July examination's ability to provide a fair and comparable basis for licensure.

If July and September examinees are ultimately considered together, September examinees will have had substantially more time to prepare than applicants who completed the examination in July. If the July administration is instead evaluated separately, questions remain regarding the fairness and comparability of the scoring process, particularly because the July pool consists exclusively of accommodated applicants. For example, graders would be aware that any exams from the July administration were completed by applicants with accommodations.

There is also a significant privacy concern. The public statements identifying accommodated examinees as the only applicants who completed the July examination have created concerns regarding privacy and the involuntary disclosure of accommodation status. Many accommodated applicants sought accommodations only after extensive documentation of disabilities or serious health conditions. Publicly distinguishing that group may have professional consequences beyond the examination itself. Several accommodated applicants, including myself, have already felt compelled to disclose their accommodation status to future employers in order to explain why they were able to complete the examination when most applicants could not. Continuing to draw distinctions between accommodated applicants and other July 2026 applicants would only serve to exacerbate this harm.

I recognize that the WSBA and the Court have faced an extraordinary situation and that applicants who were unable to complete the examination experienced an

especially serious and involuntary disruption. Nothing in this comment is intended to diminish that experience. Those applicants invested months preparing for the examination, traveled, incurred significant expenses, and were prevented from completing the licensing examination through circumstances beyond their control. Their experience was profoundly unfair.

At the same time, the fact that an applicant remained in the testing room does not necessarily mean that the applicant experienced the examination under fair or equivalent conditions. Accommodated applicants sought accommodations precisely because they require particular conditions to obtain equal access to the examination. When those conditions are not implemented, the resulting harm should not be dismissed simply because the applicant was technically able to continue testing.

I therefore respectfully ask the Board of Governors to consider whether the existing distinction between applicants who were unable to test and accommodated applicants who completed the July examination adequately accounts for the circumstances actually experienced by accommodated examinees. And I respectfully urge the WSBA to help advocate for these applicants to the Court.

The remedy should adequately address the plight of accommodated applicants, who currently bear the consequences of having attempted to complete an examination under unprecedented and inequitable conditions.

The Court has granted accommodated applicants who fail because of these circumstances a retake in February without having to pay associated WSBA and NCBE fees, but that remedy does not account for potential consequential damages, such as costs associated with delayed licensure (which includes potential long-term employment consequences), travel, lodging, and absences from other life obligations such as work. If an accommodated applicant failed the exam because of the July 2026 disruptions, it would be an injustice to ask them to shoulder these costs and burdens.

The concern is not that accommodated applicants necessarily experienced greater hardship than other applicants. Rather, it is that the July examination affected different groups of applicants in disruptive ways, and an equitable response should account for that rather than treating completion of the examination as dispositive of whether an applicant was fairly tested.

Accommodated applicants sought and received testing accommodations only after completing an extensive application process and providing documentation demonstrating that accommodations were necessary to afford them equal access to the examination. Because diploma privilege has not been extended to accommodated applicants, those applicants currently remain subject to the results of an examination administered under these unprecedented circumstances.

If an accommodated applicant ultimately fails the July examination because of disruptions, failures to implement approved accommodations, or other extraordinary conditions affecting the administration, that applicant could become one of the only July 2026 applicants in Washington denied licensure because they attempted to complete an examination under circumstances that were inequitable. Accommodated applicants would also become the only July 2026 applicants required to obtain licensure through an examination administered under these unprecedented circumstances. Respectfully, I do not believe such an outcome would be consistent with the principles of equity and fairness.

I hope that the experiences of accommodated applicants will be fully considered as the WSBA evaluates what happened, communicates with the Court, and considers what lessons should be drawn for future administrations. I respectfully urge the WSBA to request that the Court reconsider its order denying diploma privilege to accommodated applicants because an amendment of the order is necessary to avoid injustice.

Thank you for your service and for your careful consideration of the experiences of July 2026 examinees. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Respectfully,
An Anonymous Accommodated Examinee

Subject: [External]Written Comment — Request for Reconsideration of July 2026 Bar Examination Relief
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 at 7:57:11 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Alex Leshko
To: Board Feedback
CC: admissions, Questions

Some people who received this message don't often get email from aleshko@seattleu.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Washington State Bar Association Board,

Thank you for holding this special Board meeting on August 7, 2026, I appreciate the Board taking the time to listen to applicants who were present in Yakima on July 28.

My name is Alex Leshko, and I was one of the applicants sitting in the Yakima examination room when the July 2026 Bar Examination failed. I respectfully ask the Board to support reconsideration Order No. 25700-B-753 by the Washington Supreme Court of the scope of the current relief and to consider diploma privilege or another equitable remedy for all applicants affected by the July 28 examination failure.

I came to Yakima after months of preparation and significant personal sacrifice. I had already taken the bar examination once in February 2026. At that time, I was working full-time while studying and carrying the emotional burden of the ongoing war in Ukraine, where my brother and other family members continue to live. I did not pass my first attempt, but I made a conscious decision not to give up. I studied my weaknesses, changed my preparation methods, continued improving, and prepared myself to try again.

For my second attempt, I made an even greater commitment. On May 4, 2026, I resigned from my employment so I could dedicate myself fully to preparing for the July examination. I relied on the scheduled July date and planned to return to work afterward. I continued making student loan payments and spent significant amounts on bar preparation, travel to Yakima, accommodations, and living expenses. I also stopped pursuing other employment opportunities because I expected to complete the examination and move forward with my legal career.

Then I was sitting in the same examination room as everyone else when the examination failed.

I had completed the eligibility requirements and Character and Fitness process. I traveled to Yakima and was prepared to accept the possibility that I might pass or fail based on my own performance. What I was not prepared for was losing the opportunity to complete the examination because of circumstances completely outside my control.

The current relief has been personally discouraging because I was in the same room, experienced the same disruption, and lost the same opportunity as every other

applicant affected by the failure. Although I was a retaker of the February examination, the July examination was my first attempt at the NextGen UBE. The July examination was a new examination for everyone. I was not a “NextGen retaker.”

The consequences have also been significant. I am struggling financially, continuing to make student loan payments, and stuck in the hiring process because my admission timeline is uncertain. I had planned to return to work in August and begin my legal career. Instead, I am being asked to prepare again after months of preparation that culminated on July 28.

I also want to explain why this experience has been particularly personal for me.

I grew up in Ukraine in a family whose Evangelical Christian community experienced religious discrimination during the Soviet era. My parents told me stories about members of our family and religious community who attended school alongside other children but, despite their grades and abilities, were denied opportunities to pursue higher education because of their faith. After the Soviet Union collapsed, my parents worked hard to give my siblings and me the educational opportunities that previous generations of our family had been denied.

I personally remember experiencing bias because of my religion during my own education. I remember receiving a lower grade from a teacher whom I believed treated me differently because of my faith. Those experiences stayed with me.

Because of that history, education has always meant much more to me than obtaining a credential. When I came to the United States, I believed that I could finally be judged by my work, preparation, and ability. Seattle University School of Law became a place where I felt welcomed and encouraged to pursue my dream of becoming a lawyer. Completing my LL.M. was not simply another degree. It represented years of perseverance and the fulfillment of a dream that my family had carried for generations.

That is also why being a retaker has been emotionally difficult. I have sometimes struggled with the feeling that my first attempt could define me, even though I refused to give up and worked hard to improve. I do not want my previous result to become a permanent measure of my ability. I wanted the July examination to give me the opportunity to demonstrate what I had learned and how much I had improved.

The September examination does not simply return me to where I was on July 28. On July 28, I was prepared, focused, and ready. Since the cancellation, I have experienced significant emotional distress and financial uncertainty, and I am seeking support from a mental health professional. Additional calendar weeks should not automatically be considered additional effective study time. Many affected applicants are now trying to prepare while dealing with stress, lack of sleep, financial obligations, employment uncertainty, and family responsibilities that were disrupted by the cancellation.

We were in the same room. We faced the same examination. We experienced the same failure.

The Washington Supreme Court has previously recognized, during the extraordinary

circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, that extraordinary circumstances can justify an extraordinary admissions remedy, including admission without the traditional bar examination for certain applicants, including retakers. The Court now has several years of experience with lawyers admitted through that process. I respectfully believe that experience should be considered when evaluating an equitable remedy for the extraordinary circumstances of July 2026.

I respectfully ask the WSBA Board to communicate to the Washington Supreme Court that the current relief should be reconsidered and that diploma privilege, or another comparable equitable remedy, should be extended to all applicants affected by the July 28 examination failure, including retakers.

We did not choose these circumstances. We chose to prepare. We chose not to give up. We traveled to Yakima, entered the examination room, and were ready to be judged on our own performance.

Thank you for listening to us and for considering the very real personal, professional, and financial consequences of what happened.

Respectfully,

Alex Leshko

LL.M., American Legal Studies Program, 2025

Seattle University School of Law

Bachelor of Laws, 2010

Master of Laws (Jurist), 2011

International University of Economics and Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

TO: WSBA Board of Governors
CC: Terra Nevitt, Executive Director
FROM: Bobby Henry, Associate Director for Regulatory Services
DATE: August 12, 2026
RE: Bar Exam Courtesy Seating Policy

ACTION: Approve a temporary policy to allow persons who are admitted to practice law in Washington by exam waiver or who have accepted the option for admission by exam waiver to sit for the bar exam in Washington at their own expense in order to earn a portable NextGen UBE score.

Issue

Many applicants for the July 2026 bar exam in Yakima who were unable to take the exam are eligible for and have elected to accept a bar exam waiver for admission to practice law in Washington. As a result, those applicants lost their opportunity to earn a portable NextGen UBE score for admission in another jurisdiction. Adopting a policy to allow for “courtesy seating” at the bar exam in Washington provides a convenient option for affected individuals to sit for the NextGen UBE without having to travel outside the state.

Background

Historically, only applicants for admission or members who are required to pass the bar exam for reinstatement to active status have been permitted to sit for the bar exam in Washington. This protects the content of the exam and ensures WSBA staff do not exceed their workload capacity by processing applications for individuals with no intention to be admitted in Washington. Some jurisdictions, primarily on the east coast where many jurisdictions are in close proximity, allow applicants for admission from a different jurisdiction to take the bar exam in their jurisdiction as a convenience for those applicants. This is known as courtesy seating.

In Washington, the Admission and Practice Rules (APR) and the WSBA Admissions Policies are silent on the concept of courtesy seating for the bar exam. The admissions application procedures and administration of the exam are delegated to the WSBA by court rule. APR 4(a) provides: “Examinations for admission to practice law shall be conducted by and under the direction of the Bar.” APR 3(i) assigns the form and manner of an application and application time limits to the Bar and the setting of application fees to the Board of Governors. The Washington Supreme Court, in Order No. 25700-B-753, indicated that applicants who accept the bar exam waiver are eligible to sit for a later bar exam at their own expense, subject to generally applicable rules for doing so.¹

Given the apparent intention of the Court to allow for an option to take a later bar exam in Washington at the applicant’s expense and the delegated authority under the APR for administering exams and setting admissions policies, the Board of Governors should develop a courtesy seating policy for the bar exam to assist eligible individuals who lost the opportunity to earn a portable UBE score. Adopting a policy at this time will provide

¹ Washington Supreme Court Order No. 25700-B-753, August 6, 2026, at p. 2 provides: “Applicants who choose the option of bar exam waiver and admission by court order are not eligible to sit for the September 2026 bar exam. However, this does not affect their eligibility to sit for a later bar exam to obtain an exam score at their own expense, subject to generally applicable rules for doing so.”

additional information and certainty to applicants as they prepare to notify the WSBA of their future plans, which, under the terms of the Court’s order, is required to be submitted by Noon on August 14.

Proposed Policy

The WSBA Regulatory Services Department proposes the following temporary courtesy seating policy:

Applicants who qualify for and accept the bar exam waiver, or who are admitted by bar exam waiver, pursuant to Washington Supreme Court Order No. 25700-B-753 are eligible to apply for courtesy seating at either or both the February 2027 and July 2027 administrations of the NextGen Bar Exam in Washington state at their own expense. Applicants who achieve a minimum passing score on the February 2027 exam are not eligible for another courtesy-seating in July 2027. Per the Court’s Order No. 25700-B-753, applicants accepting the bar exam waiver are not eligible to sit for the September 2026 bar exam.

Applicants must submit to the WSBA their courtesy-seating application beginning on October 12, 2026, and by December 5, 2026, for the February 2027 NextGen Bar Exam and beginning February 1, 2027, and by May 5, 2027, for the July 2027 NextGen Bar Exam in Washington. These applicants will be required to pay the WSBA bar exam application fee based on their applicant type at the time of submitting their courtesy-seating application, the exam fee, and the NCBE technology fee. Applicants will not be subject to character and fitness review or an NCBE investigation for courtesy seating. Applicants must comply with all other applicable application and exam policies and deadlines. Failure to pass a future bar exam does not affect an individual’s license to practice law or eligibility for admission by bar exam waiver.

The proposed policy is consistent with the Court’s order, has the latest possible deadline consistent with the WSBA Admissions Policies, and requires the same application fees as all other applicants for the bar exam which is also consistent with the Admissions Policies.

Information for Equity Analysis

Deadline is the latest possible (because C&F/background investigation not needed)

Same application fees as other bar exam applicants/test-takers

Allows applicants to take exam in WA without travel expense to another jurisdiction

WSBA RISK ANALYSIS: This section is to be completed by the Office of General Counsel, with input from the proposing entity or individual.

WSBA FISCAL ANALYSIS: This section is to be completed by the Finance Department, with input from the proposing entity or individual.

The fiscal impact to WSBA resulting from the proposed policy applies to both revenue and expense areas. The policy requires applicants to apply at their own expense, which will result in revenue for the Admissions cost center based on the existing fee structure set by the Board of Governors and subject to approval by the Supreme Court. In terms of expenses, the impact includes additional direct expenses associated with administering the exam, such as facilities rental, exam grading, proctors, and possible accommodations, as well as the cost of staff time used to support the application process, administer exam, draft policy language, incorporate the changes into

relevant records and systems, and communicate the policy to stakeholders. The staff time that would be allocated to this work is included in the overall duties of existing WSBA staff and does not require additional staff or allocation of resources from other internal sources. Application fee revenue is intended to offset costs associated with administering the exam.

WSBA EQUITY ANALYSIS: *This section is to be completed by the Equity and Justice Team, with input from the proposing entity or individual.*

August 13, 2026

The Honorable Chief Justice Debra L. Stephens
Washington State Supreme Court
415 12th Avenue SW
Olympia, WA 98504

Via Electronic Mail

**Re: Request to Reconsider Order No. 25700-B-753 (3), Excluding Accommodated Bar
Examinees from Admission by Order**

Dear Chief Justice Stephens, Associate Chief Justice Johnson, and Associate Justices of the Washington Supreme Court:

We write on behalf of the Center for Civil Rights and Critical Justice (Center) at Seattle University School of Law¹ regarding the Court's recent order concerning administration of the July 2026 bar examination in Washington. We wish to applaud the Court for addressing the immensely challenging circumstances presented by the unsuccessful administration of the bar exam in July. In recognizing the need to offer admission by order, this Court has ensured that hundreds of future members of the Washington Bar will be ready and able to pursue their profession and work toward greater justice in our state.

However, the Center has significant concerns about the harm created by the order. On its face, this Court's denial of relief to all applicants who were able to complete the exam may appear fair—but this category is comprised entirely of accommodated examinees and their exclusion from eligibility for admission by order fails to account for the significant accessibility barriers on the days of the exam.² The order is fundamentally inconsistent with this Court's robust anti-discrimination jurisprudence that, when appropriate, examines impact rather than intent.

To document the severity of the accessibility barriers experienced by those who completed the exam, the Center circulated a survey soliciting responses from first-time accommodated bar examinees who completed the July 2026 exam. We are alarmed by their reports of the chaotic conditions under which the exam was administered, and the degree to which those conditions undermine the integrity of the results. The overwhelming majority of accommodated

¹ The views expressed in this letter do not represent the official views of Seattle University. Nor does the Center for Civil Rights and Critical Justice represent any individual or class of bar examinees.

² Sarah Merken, *Tech Problems, Cancellation Mar New US Bar Exam for Some Test Takers*, Reuters (July 29, 2026), <https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/tech-problems-cancellation-mar-new-us-bar-exam-some-test-takers-2026-07-29/> (quoting WSBA chief communications officer, Sara Niegowski as saying "All applicants testing with approved accommodations were able to proceed with their exams as scheduled and were not impacted.").

examinees who responded to our survey experienced a testing environment that was so compromised as to deny them an accessible exam.

We respectfully request that the Court reconsider the portion of its August 6, 2026, order denying relief to those who completed the exam³ by amending paragraph 3 to permit this group to elect admission by order, as set forth at the conclusion of this letter.

Accommodated Examinees Experienced Significant Disruptions that Interfered with Access

According to the 2025 Law School Survey of Student Engagement, 1 in 5 law students report disabilities, the majority of which are linked to anxiety and ADHD.⁴ Accounts provided to the Center through the survey describe a testing environment that would severely exacerbate those and other conditions, including: (1) repeated and disruptive technological failures (with both connectivity and the exam software itself), (2) reduced time; and (3) significant distractions and disruptions from other examinees, proctors, and IT staff.

We received survey responses from 57 first-time accommodated bar examinees. Of those who responded, 95% (54 total) reported experiencing disruptions during their exam, with more than half of respondents who experienced disruptions reporting more than five instances. Respondents reported various types of disruptions including: Wi-Fi connectivity (87%), proctor disruption (55%), disruptions by other examinees (55%), and submission problems (55%). Nearly half (44%) reported various other types of disruptions, including: delays impacting break times and overall time for exam completion, software/platform malfunctions resulting in loss of work, derogatory comments by proctors, and failure to honor gender-specific accommodations. While some tech support was available, 52% report it was not adequate.

Several test takers report that because of the disruptions, many of their approved accommodations, such as extended time to complete the exam, more regular breaks, and reduced distractions, were rendered meaningless.

“I took my medication when I normally would but we didn’t end up starting until quite a bit later than scheduled... by the time we did my medication was already wearing off and I had to decide between an uncertain dosage or operating a lower capacity. We were only able to start once the main room evacuated. While they were out of their room it was EXTREMELY loud and we could hear shouting and lots of talking. When we came back from lunch they told us that we would have to continue the exam offline and that they didn’t know whether our responses would save or not. The environment was SO distracting and I had wax

³ Supreme Court of Washington, *In the Matter of the Administration of the July 2026 National Conference of Bar Examiners’ NextGen Uniform Bar Examination in Washington State*, Order No. 25700-B-753 at 3, ¶ 3 (Aug. 6, 2026).

⁴ Karen Sloan, Reuters, *One in Five US Law Students Reports Disabilities, Most Linked to Mental Health* (Nov. 5, 2025), <https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/one-five-us-law-students-reports-disabilities-most-linked-mental-health-2025-11-05/> (“Among the 20% of survey respondents with a disability, 57% reported having anxiety; 55% said they have attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; and 41% reported having depression.”).

earplugs AND muffs on. We had 15 people coming in and out of our room throughout and the seriousness of the testing environment was completely absent."

"The disruptions affected more than my schedule, they undermined the effectiveness of the accommodations that had been approved for me. Those accommodations exist to provide an equitable opportunity to demonstrate competence under standard testing conditions. Instead, the uncertainty, repeated interruptions, prolonged delays, and constantly changing environment exacerbated the very symptoms those accommodations were intended to address."

"I am still feeling a fundamental lack of control regarding the exam and my ability to pass under conditions that did not meet the requirements of my approved accommodations. Feeling a lack of control independently triggers my PTSD under normal circumstances. Combining this situation with such a high stakes test, I feel almost as horrible as I did when I was having daily flashbacks."

"The examination experience for those with accommodations was not the experience that was promised by the NCBE and the WSBA. Many accommodated test takers were placed in separate rooms due to learning disabilities or otherwise particular susceptibility to distractions. Yet, the exam administered was filled with constant distractions, noises, and disruptions. In addition, the lack of certainty as to whether the exam would continue caused great anxiety for examinees and were additional distractions."

"I did not receive the full break time provided under my approved accommodations. Significant delays and technical issues substantially extended the testing day, but my lunch break was not extended to account for those delays. When examinees asked whether lunch could be lengthened given how late the testing day had become, a proctor responded, we don't want to be here until 10:00 p.m. As a result, I was required to continue an already extended day without receiving the full break time contemplated by my approved accommodations."

These reports necessarily raise concerns that the decision to exclude accommodated bar examinees from the option for admission by order will result in a discriminatory outcome for this group: they were not provided an accessible environment to best ensure that their exam results will reflect their readiness to practice law.⁵

The ADA Requires a Level Playing Field for Examinees with Disabilities

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires that professional licensing exams, including state bar exams, be administered in a manner that is accessible to individuals with

⁵ See 28 C.F.R. § 36.309(b)(1)(i).

disabilities, including by offering alternative accessible arrangements where necessary.⁶ To ensure accessibility, examiners must administer the exam to individuals with disabilities in a manner that “best ensures” that “the examination results accurately reflect the individual’s aptitude or achievement level ... rather than reflecting the individual’s impaired [] skills,”⁷ assurance of which can be accomplished through modifications or accommodations to the exam or testing environment.⁸

These ADA requirements are designed to permit people with disabilities to access the bar exam on an equal basis with bar examinees who do not have disabilities. The “best ensure” standard required under the federal regulations is essential to establishing a level playing field under circumstances like the bar exam, “a one-time event wherein the accommodations either ensure equality or do not.”⁹ Courts have recognized when examinees with disabilities are required to take a professional exam without the necessary accommodations “[their] ability to work through [their] disabilities rather than [their] knowledge of the subject matter of the test will be the aptitude tested.”¹⁰

Many accommodated bar examinees sought and were approved for accommodations that grant extended testing time, extended break time, elimination of distractions, and measures to decrease stress and anxiety. However, when connectivity issues arose, disruptions ensued, and additional accommodations were not offered to address the unforeseen circumstances, the accessibility of the exam environment was severely compromised. Based on our survey, most test-takers who qualified for accommodations did not adequately receive them, resulting in an effective denial of the accommodations WSBA had already approved.

The Court’s Order Denying Accommodated Examinees the Ability to Elect Admission by Order Risks Replicating Persistent Stigma Around Disability Accommodations

In addition to the failure to account for the actual testing circumstances that undermined equal access to the bar exam, the denial of relief to accommodated examinees risks replicating “the persistent stigma surrounding disability accommodations and the profession’s ongoing anxiety about perceived ‘special treatment.’”¹¹ Many accommodated bar examinees have lamented

⁶ 42 U.S.C. §12189; see *Bartlett v. New York State Bd. of L. Examiners*, 970 F. Supp. 1094, 1128–29 (S.D.N.Y. 1997), *aff’d in part, vacated in part on other grounds*, 156 F.3d 321 (2d Cir. 1998), *cert. granted, judgment vacated*, 527 U.S. 1031, 119 S. Ct. 2388, 144 L. Ed. 2d 790 (1999), and *aff’d in part, vacated in part*, 226 F.3d 69 (2d Cir. 2000) (“Although Title III generally applies only to private entities, the examination provision has unanimously been held to apply to public entities, and specifically to state bar examinations.” (collecting cases)).

⁷ 28 C.F.R. § 36.309(b)(1)(i).

⁸ See 28 C.F.R. § 36.309(b).

⁹ *Jones v. Nat’l Conference of Bar Examiners*, 801 F. Supp. 2d 270, 284 (D. Vt. 2011); *Bartlett*, 970 F. Supp. at 1121 (examinee is “not entitled to an accommodation which will ensure that she actually *passes* the bar examination. Rather, the accommodation is given so that she might be able to compete on a level playing field with other applicants taking the bar examination.”).

¹⁰ *Jones*, 801 F. Supp. 2d at 286.

¹¹ Antonia A.B. Miceli, *Accommodating Justice: The Fragmented Path to Legal Licensure for Students with Disabilities*, 57 Univ. Mem. L. Rev. at *17 (forthcoming 2026), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6438298> (citing Nicole Buonocore Porter, *Special Treatment Stigma After the ADA Amendments Act*, 43 Pepp. L. Rev. 233, 254 (2016)).

that this Court's decision has essentially "outed" them—putting them in the untenable position of having to disclose their disability to friends, employers, and colleagues by admitting that they do not qualify for admission by order. The circumstances amount to a de facto violation of the confidentiality they were promised when they sought accommodations for the bar exam.¹²

"I had to continue testing while processing the short and long-term ramifications of being publicly outed like that for no reason. It was a gut punch to feel exposed [] and to know that my test would be graded by people who knew I had accommodations; that my job applications and interviews would be with employers who would know I had accommodations; that friends/family I had not disclosed my health issues to would now know I was accommodated; that many people believe accommodations are unfair advantages rather than equitable measures; and that my colleagues who did not have accommodations now knew I had them."

"I have been and will be really harmed by the WSBA broadcasting my disability status which has been exacerbated 10 fold by the WA Supreme Court's order that provides no "cover" for me or other accommodated students."

"I was forced to disclose to my employer about my accommodations. Before this I had a panic attack because the disclosure was really hard for me. I am a first generation woman of color and imposter syndrome is already very heavy. I never thought I would ever have to disclose this to anyone about my accommodations. Instead now I worry I might be discriminated by my disability. I thought this was all supposed to be confidential."

"I value my privacy as an accommodated examinee because I have experienced discrimination for it before and prefer to keep it to myself to avoid the bias it seems to create against me. This situation essentially forces disclosure. Bias is inevitable, and I am concerned employers will now inevitably be aware of my disability. I worry that knowledge of my accommodations will impact their perception of me and the legitimacy not only of my score on the exam, but also my grades in school."

The denial of admission by order to the accommodated examinees also fails to account for the significant barriers that exist in obtaining accommodations to begin with. WSBA's process for

(developing the concept of "special treatment stigma" and explaining how fears of unfair advantage shape accommodation decision-making)).

¹² The WSBA website assures bar applicants that their requests for accommodations will not be made public. Washington State Bar Association, *Testing Accommodations*, Online Admissions (2026), <https://admissions.wsba.org/testing-accom> ("Confidentiality of Testing Accommodation Requests: In accordance with APR 1(d), all testing accommodations requests and supporting documentation are confidential. This information is used to evaluate and determine appropriate modifications to standard testing procedures.").

granting accommodations is extensive and requires significant and reliable documentation.¹³ Each of the accommodated examinees satisfied these requirements and rightfully expected to have the benefits of their approved accommodations throughout the test. As explained by Professor Antonia Miceli, a leading disability scholar who writes about accommodations and professional licensure, obtaining accommodations “is a system of serial re-adjudication that treats stable impairments as perpetually suspect, compounding cost, delay, and attrition at precisely the moments when stakes are highest.”¹⁴

The denial of relief to this group also risks undermining diversity of the Washington bar and compromising quality representation for clients with disabilities. Discussing the fragmented systems of legal licensure—even under the NextGen UBE, which delegates accommodation decisions to each jurisdiction¹⁵—Professor Miceli notes that these barriers to obtaining accommodations “[p]erpetuate[] underrepresentation of lawyers with disabilities, creating representation gaps for clients with disabilities and depriving the profession of valuable talent and perspectives.”¹⁶ The same can be said of the risk created by this Court’s order denying relief to the accommodated examinees.

This Court’s Commitment to Examining the Actual Impact of Laws Should Inform Its Reconsideration of Its Order Excluding Accommodated Applicants from Admission by Order

The Court’s categorical exclusion of those who completed the exam avoids the precise analysis this Court conducts in both litigation and rulemaking postures, when appropriate: an inquiry into actual impact.¹⁷ This Court’s commitment to looking at the actual impact of how laws operate should inform its approach to reconsidering the relief available to the accommodated examinees—as a separate and distinct matter from the Court’s laudable intent to address an admittedly complex and terrible set of circumstances with care. As the survey demonstrates, nearly all respondents to the survey experienced a testing environment that was so compromised as to rise to the level of a denial of an accessible exam. The only logical conclusion is that the Court’s order will result in discriminatory outcomes.

¹³ See Washington State Bar Assoc., *Admissions Policies of the Washington State Bar Association* 8 (May 2026), <https://admissions.wsba.org/getpdfform.action?id=2080> (describing process for requesting disability accommodations for bar exams, including submitting request at least 80 days before the exam and providing supporting documentation, after which the WSBA reserves the right to have the documentation reviewed by a specialist); see also Washington State Bar Association, *Testing Accommodations*, Online Admissions (2026), <https://admissions.wsba.org/testing-accom> (linking to optional detailed forms to certify accommodations history and proof of disability and need for accommodations from a qualified professional).

¹⁴ Miceli, *supra* n. 11, at *17.

¹⁵ *Id.* at *32.

¹⁶ *Id.* at *5; see also *id.* at 41 (discussing underrepresentation of members of ABA with self-reported disability and noting that when representation lags behind prevalence, “the costs are immediate: fewer culturally competent advocates for high-incidence problems, diminished trust with affected client communities, and lost organizational performance gains that inclusive teams reliably deliver.”).

¹⁷ *State v. Bagby*, 200 Wn.2d 777, 792-93 (2023) (“We are concerned with the impact of racial bias—not a person’s intent.”); see generally GR 37; *State v. Sum*, 199 Wn.2d 627 (2022); *State v. Gregory*, 192 Wn.2d 1 (2018).

The Center requests that this Court reconsider the portion of its August 6 order that excludes accommodated bar examinees who completed the exam from opting for admission by order. This result could be accomplished by amending paragraph 3 of the order as follows:¹⁸

3. All first-time applicants who completed the July 2026 administration of the NextGen UBE in Yakima, Washington, are also ~~ineligible~~ for waiver of the bar exam requirement and admission by court order. Applicants shall inform the WSBA in writing by email to admissions@wsba.org by Noon on August , 2026, whether they are accepting an exam waiver or instead accepting the Exam results for these applicants that were submitted upon completion of the exam and for which the scoring process is underway. ~~They~~ Those who choose to accept their exam results will receive a NextGen UBE score, and are also not eligible to sit for the special September 2026 exam administration. Any of these applicants who do not achieve the minimum passing score on their exam will be eligible to sit for the February 2027 administration of the NextGen UBE in Washington without paying the WSBA application fee or NCBE exam fee. Applicants who apply for the February 2027 exam must comply with all other bar exam application deadlines and requirements.

This Court has led the nation with respect to equity, justice, and inclusion. Reconsideration of the Court's order to recognize the discriminatory impact of excluding accommodated examinees from opting for admission by order will address the harm experienced by this group. And granting the relief above will help the newest members of our profession take pride in this Court's willingness to right past wrongs.¹⁹

Sincerely,



Professor Melissa Lee, Director
Professor Jessica Levin, Director
Professor Pilar Margarita Hernández Escontrías, Research Director
CENTER FOR CIVIL RIGHTS AND CRITICAL JUSTICE

¹⁸ While this proposed amendment is the most important to accomplish the stated goals, there may be other necessary edits to the order to ensure consistency, which are not included here.

¹⁹ E.g., Letter from the Wash. State Supreme Court to the Members of the Judiciary and the Legal Cmty (June 4, 2020) (addressing racial injustice); Order, *State v. Towesnutte*, No. 13083-3, at *4 (July 10, 2020) (“We cannot forget our own history, and we cannot change it. We can, however, forge a new path forward, committing to justice as we do so.”); *Garfield Cnty. Transportation Auth. v. State*, 196 Wn.2d 378, 390 n.1, 473 P.3d 1205 (2020) (overruling as incorrect and harmful the decision in *Price v. Evergreen Cemetery Co. of Seattle*, 57 Wn.2d 352, 357 P.2d 702 (1960)).

Subject: [External]A Final Plea to the Board

Date: Thursday, August 13, 2026 at 11:38:11 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Beyza Pinar

To: Board Feedback

You don't often get email from beyza1pinarr@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Governors,

At this point, we do not want to keep repeating the legal arguments or explaining what relief may be available. You understand those issues better than we do, and we genuinely feel that many of you are standing with us.

What we need now is for someone to fight for us.

We hope this chain can become a place where we stand together as a community. We will not forget the support we receive during this time. When we become licensed attorneys, we will carry that support forward—to the Bar, to future examinees, and to others who find themselves in a position like ours. We will remember who stood beside us when we needed it most.

But today, we are the ones who need help.

Many of us cannot study. We are anxious, exhausted, and unable to focus. We spend hours and days in front of our computers waiting helplessly for any decision, any update, or even a single sentence from WSBA that might tell us what will happen to our futures. We did not deserve to be left in this position. We worked incredibly hard. We were prepared. We were determined to succeed, and we believed in ourselves.

There is also something that may sound obvious, but I think it has been lost in this discussion: **there are no “retakers” of the NextGen exam. We have never taken this exam. We have never failed this exam.**

We were supposed to sit for a completely new examination—one specifically designed to be more humane, more practical, and more reflective of the actual practice of law. We were prevented from completing that examination through no fault of our own. Yet because we previously took the UBE and fell short by a few points—in my case, only three points—we are now excluded from the relief given to others who experienced the exact same failed administration.

It is difficult for us to see that as anything other than punishment. We are being treated differently not because of anything that happened at the July NextGen examination, but because of an entirely different examination we took in the past.

Please stand with us today. Please do not allow this experience to make us lose faith in the profession we have worked so hard to join, in the jurisdiction we hoped to serve, or in the fairness of the Washington courts and WSBA.

We know that once we are licensed, the Bar will be there for us throughout our careers. But we need you most **right now, before we have that license.**

Today, we feel lost. We feel defeated. And more than ever, we need someone within this profession to tell us that we have not been forgotten.

We are asking you to be that voice.

Thank you for hearing us, for standing with us, and for everything you can do.

Sincerely,
Beyza Pinar

Dear President Adewale,

My name is Deniz Tufek. I am reaching out to you in particular because, as someone who came to the United States from another country, faced many of the same challenges, and succeeded in overcoming them, I believe you may understand how serious the consequences of this decision are for immigrant applicants.

I am from Türkiye, and my wife and I both sat for the affected Yakima examination. We were fully prepared for the July exam, yet we are now excluded from the waiver because we are retakers.

Currently, many immigrant examinees affected by the Yakima exam are struggling to protect their jobs and employment opportunities. Some had job offers contingent on becoming licensed, and those offers are now being withdrawn. Others are facing difficulty keeping their current jobs or taking additional time off because they had already taken significant time away from work to prepare for and attend the examination.

For many people, losing a job or a job opportunity means financial loss. For immigrant applicants, however, the consequences are much more serious. Many immigrants who remain in the United States after law school have immigration status or visas tied directly to employment. As a result, losing a job, losing an offer, or being unable to secure employment directly affects not only their financial stability, but also their visa status and ability to remain in the United States.

We were affected by the same failed examination administration as first-time examinees, yet they are able to move forward while retakers are left bearing the consequences.

I respectfully ask you to support us and stand with us in seeking equal relief. We are not asking for special treatment. We are asking for the same remedy to be extended to all applicants affected by the Yakima examination failure.

Your support and advocacy would mean a great deal to many of us.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Deniz Tufek

Subject: [External]Request to Consider My Letter Regarding the July 2026 NextGen Bar Exam
Date: Thursday, August 13, 2026 at 11:53:24 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: samiulla malang
To: Board Feedback, Aziza Ozgoren
CC: Bar Leaders, sunitha, hunter@wsbalaw.org, Terra Nevitt, alec@wsbalaw.org, Parvin Price, Kevin Fay, kristinalarrybog@gmail.com, Matthew Dresden, allisonwidneyBOG, emily.arneson@outlook.com, mmmrbog4d, avilleneuve
Attachments: 03_California_Bar_Supporting_Documents.pdf.pdf, WSBA_Email_Communications.pdf.pdf

You don't often get email from samiullam786@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the WSBA Board of Governors,

I hope you are doing well.

I am writing to respectfully share the same letter and supporting materials that I previously submitted to the Washington Supreme Court regarding the July 2026 NextGen Bar Exam.

I am a foreign-trained attorney, a U.S. permanent resident, and a first-time applicant to the Washington State Bar. I respectfully ask the Board to consider my individual circumstances while discussing any additional recommendations or remedies related to the July 2026 examination.

My situation is unique because I participated in the February 2025 California Bar Examination during the well-documented technology failures. Although I received an unsuccessful result, I did not participate in the March 2025 make-up examination, did not accept provisional licensure, and did not take any subsequent California Bar Examination.

I was initially informed that I would be eligible for the waiver because I had never sat for a U.S. Bar Exam. However, after additional verification, I was later informed that I was not eligible.

I respectfully request that the Board review my letter and supporting documents before making any final recommendations regarding diploma privilege or other remedies for affected applicants.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service.

Respectfully,

Samiullah Malang



The State Bar of California

Dear Applicant ,

Day 3 of the exam has concluded. For those of you testing in person, Day 2 meant a significant delay in getting started; for most it involved delays in logging back into the exam after the lunch break. In addition to these systemic challenges, we are aware of other issues experienced by test takers, including continued challenges with proctors, connectivity lapses, time lost, and submission problems. We are still assessing results from Day 3 and will report on that following the conclusion of all testing.

As we stated after Day 1, these conditions are unacceptable, and we make no excuses for them. We are actively meeting with our psychometrician and other stakeholders to solidify the full range of remediation steps.

Initial retake opportunity March 18-19

Note that the retake originally planned for March 3-4 has been rescheduled due to a prohibited online disclosure of an essay question. (Please see more about this prohibited disclosure below.) Day 1 content will be changed as a result of this disclosure. This change requires reconfiguration of the exam driver, which takes time to execute.

In the immediate term, Meazure will be offering this retake opportunity on March 18-19 to test takers meeting the following criteria:

1. Were unable to launch the bar exam in the Meazure Learning platform at all.
2. Have fewer than four successfully submitted written responses (essays and/or the Performance Test). Why this parameter? For statistical reasons, imputation of scores can be applied to applicants with at least four written submissions. Imputation, regression analysis, and pro rata scoring adjustments have been used with the California bar exam in the past—most recently in July 2021. [You can learn more about that score imputation here.](#)

If you meet criteria 1. or 2. above, you will be affirmatively contacted to schedule your retake exam.

If you do not meet these criteria

Because of the evolving nature of what we are learning, the fact that there are a number of accommodated applicants who will continue to test through Saturday, and the need to better understand systemwide versus applicant-specific failures, we will be taking a few more days to finalize any other remediation plans. As mentioned, the State Bar has used psychometric remedies like score imputation, pro rata adjustments, and regression modeling in prior exams. We understand that any delay on our part will be a cause for even more frustration, but we do not want to rush towards a solution that may not in fact work.

Statement re: prohibited dissemination of exam questions

The State Bar is aware that certain individuals are attempting to prevent the administration of a retake of the February 2025 bar exam by posting exam questions online. [This conduct is strictly prohibited.](#) The State Bar will engage digital forensic

experts to identify individuals who have posted exam content and has already taken steps to preserve postings to support this forensic investigation. Individuals who are found to have engaged in any conduct that violates exam security or compromises exam integrity are subject to strict sanctions, including revocation of a previously granted positive moral character determination or denial of a pending moral character application. In short, individuals who are found to have engaged in this type of prohibited and unethical behavior will find it difficult if not impossible to secure licensure with the State Bar of California.

Seeking your input

In the immediate term, those of you who have completed an exam should expect to receive a survey from us. This will not be a typical post-exam survey; instead, the results will be used to inform the remediation discussions we are currently engaged in.

Lastly, some of you may notice that we are changing the registration date for the July bar exam. Please don't be alarmed; we will finalize the application launch date once July exam administration plans are confirmed in the coming weeks.

Thank you for your perseverance,

Office of Admissions
State Bar of California



Supreme Court of California

THE STATE'S HIGHEST COURT

[Supreme Court](#) / [news and events](#) /

NEWS RELEASE

California Supreme Court Issues Statement on February Bar Exam

By Merrill Balassone
March 04, 2025

The California Supreme Court on Tuesday issued the following statement about the administration of the February 2025 California Bar Examination:

The court is deeply concerned by the troubling reports of technical failures, delays, and other irregularities in last week's administration of the February 2025 California Bar Examination. The court regrets this situation and apologizes for the disappointment, stress, and frustration experienced by some applicants. At present, the complete scope and causes of the problems are still being determined. Last week, the court asked the State Bar, in conjunction with the vendor responsible for administering the exam, to provide an expedited, detailed report regarding the problems encountered by applicants. This information is crucial in informing how the court will provide appropriate remedies for affected applicants who deserved and expected better. In the interim, the court directs the State Bar to plan on administering the July 2025 California Bar Examination in the traditional in-person format."

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

admissions <admissions@wsba.org>
To: samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>
Cc: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Wed, Aug 12, 2026 at 2:58 AM

Dear applicant:

We have received confirmation from State Bar of California that you did sit for the February 2025 CA bar exam and were unsuccessful. Based on the information,

A waiver of the exam requirement is not available to retakers who failed a prior bar exam. You may sit for the make-up exam, scheduled for September 1–2, 2026, at the Tacoma Convention Center in Tacoma, WA, or transfer your application to the February 2027 administration — both without paying again. Email admissions@wsba.org with your decision by 12:00 p.m. PDT (noon) on August 14, 2026.

Best regards,



Ramana Pendyala | Admissions Manager, Regulatory Services Department

Washington State Bar Association | 206.733.5943 | ramanap@wsba.org

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600 | Seattle, WA 98101-2539 | www.wsba.org

The WSBA is committed to full access and participation by persons with disabilities. If you have questions about accessibility or require accommodation please contact admissions@wsba.org

The information contained in this email, and any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. **If you received this email in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any device.**

NOTICE: Pursuant to **WSBA Artificial Intelligence (AI) External Use Policy**, any AI use by external parties for WSBA work requires advance or written notification.

[Quoted text hidden]



samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 11, 2026 at 11:34 PM

To: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Dear WSBA Admissions Team,

I am writing to respectfully follow up on my previous email. I am currently awaiting your response and would greatly appreciate any update or clarification you can provide.

As the August 14 deadline is approaching, your guidance would be very helpful in allowing me to make my decision and proceed accordingly.

Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Samiullah Malang

[Quoted text hidden]

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 11, 2026 at 1:03 AM

To: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Dear WSBA Admissions Team,

Thank you again for your assistance regarding my eligibility for the waiver.

I previously explained my California Bar examination history, and I greatly appreciate your response stating: "Then you would be eligible for the waiver, as you never sat for a U.S. Bar exam."

I intend to elect the waiver based on your guidance. However, because the August 14, 2026 deadline is approaching, I respectfully request clarification before making my final decision.

I contacted the State Bar of California again today to make sure my examination history is accurate. They informed me that their records show that I participated in the February 2025 California Bar Examination. Following the technology failures during that examination, I did not participate in the March 2–3, 2025 make-up examination. California also confirmed that although I applied for the February 2026 and July 2026 California Bar Examinations, I did not appear for or take either examination.

I have requested official documentation from the State Bar of California confirming this examination history and will provide it to WSBA immediately upon receipt.

My primary concern is the timing of the verification process. If I elect the waiver before the August 14 deadline but the California documentation is not received before that deadline, may I submit it afterward while WSBA completes its verification?

More importantly, if I elect the waiver based on your prior guidance and WSBA later determines that I am not eligible after reviewing the California records, will I still be permitted to take the September 1–2, 2026 make-up examination?

I respectfully request confirmation of:

1. Whether I may elect the waiver while the California documentation is pending;
2. Whether I may submit the documentation after August 14 if California does not provide it before the deadline; and
3. If WSBA ultimately determines that I am not eligible for the waiver, whether I will still be permitted to take the September 1–2 make-up examination.

I want to ensure that I do not unintentionally lose both the waiver opportunity and my opportunity to take the September examination while WSBA verifies my eligibility.

Because the election deadline is August 14 at noon PDT, I would greatly appreciate your guidance as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance and consideration.

Respectfully,

Samiullah Malang

[Quoted text hidden]

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

admissions <admissions@wsba.org>
To: samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>
Cc: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Sat, Aug 8, 2026 at 4:51 AM

Hello,

You can notify us of your decision by replying to this email specifying which option you choose. Your eligibility will be verified prior to final approval.

Thank you,



Admissions Team | Regulatory Services Department

Washington State Bar Association | 206.727.8209 | admissions@wsba.org

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600 | Seattle, WA 98101-2539 | www.wsba.org

The information contained in this email, and any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. **If you received this email in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any device.**

The WSBA is committed to full access and participation by persons with disabilities. If you have questions

about accessibility or require accommodation please contact admissions@wsba.org

NOTICE: Pursuant to **WSBA Artificial Intelligence (AI) External Use Policy**, any AI use by external parties for WSBA work requires advance or written notification.

[Quoted text hidden]



samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Sat, Aug 8, 2026 at 3:45 AM

To: samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>, admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Then you would be eligible for the waiver, as you never sat for a U.S Bar exam.

[Quoted text hidden]



samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 8, 2026 at 2:15 AM

To: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

I respectfully confirm that, following the technology failures during the February 2025 California Bar Examination, I did not participate in the March 2025 make-up examination or any subsequent California Bar Examination.

[Quoted text hidden]



samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Sat, Aug 8, 2026 at 12:34 AM

To: samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>, admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Hi Samiulla,

To confirm, you never sat for the California bar, nor completed the make up exam?

[Quoted text hidden]

Response to Supreme Court Order Bar Exam July 2026

samiulla malang <samiullam786@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 7, 2026 at 5:55 AM

To: admissions <admissions@wsba.org>

Although I took the California Bar Exam in February 2025 and was affected by the system failure during that administration, I was unsuccessful. My application to the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) is my first application to the WSBA. Therefore, I believe I should still be considered eligible for any diploma privilege or other remedial relief that the Washington Supreme Court may decide to extend to first-time WSBA applicants.

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments



image001.png
11K



image001.png
11K