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O'Bryan's Forms has been since 1932 the only authority on forms and practice in the State of Washington. The publisher claims that a complete revision was found necessary in order to bring the work up to date, add necessary material omitted in the earlier work, and to coordinate the text with the Revised Code of Washington.

The format of the work remains unchanged. The cumbersome two volume work is printed on legal size paper and bound at the top. The various divisions of the publication are separated by plastic-coated tabs. A welcome change over prior editions appears in the form of the repetition of the complete index in the second volume.

The major change occurs in the elimination of textual citations to Remington's Compiled Statutes, substituting coordination to our new Revised Code of Washington. Most of the forms also follow the Rules of Court which in many instances have superseded the statutes. The new section devoted to Workmen's Compensation practice consists of sixteen pages, including five forms of pleading. The new set of forms for discovery procedure and taking depositions makes minor changes in three forms and adds nine new samples. It is also noted that a few new forms appear in the probate section.

The principle value of O'Bryan's Forms is that it is the only publication of Washington forms. This distinction makes it an essential part of the library of the young practitioner, who has not had the opportunity to acquire a form file of his own. Even the established attorney will frequently consult this tome before preparing an unfamiliar pleading. Certainly the legal stenographer will consider this publication an asset. The format lends itself readily to copying and thus becomes an office time-saver.

The value of the textual material immediately preceding most of the forms is to be questioned. Certainly the careful practitioner will consult the statutes, decisions, and rules of court before utilizing a printed form. In many instances the textual material has not been revised but merely citations to RCW have been substituted for earlier compilations of the Washington statutes.

The bare statistics of the changes made in the 1954 edition raises the important question of whether or not the additional expenditure is justified if one already owns the earlier set. The budget conscious neophyte practitioner would do well if he investigated the possibilities of acquiring an old set for a price approaching the trade-in allowance. One suspects that a reduction in physical size of the publication by photographing the forms, reducing their size, and including them all in one volume would have resulted in a less expensive enterprise without sacrificing convenience resulting from the exact duplication of the pleadings. In addition, one further suspects that two years spent in revision could easily have produced more extensive changes in the earlier work than are apparent in the published revised volumes.
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