

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 9-10, 2008
Washington, DC
Minutes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance.....	1
Introductory Remarks.....	3
Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting.....	4
Report of the Administrative Office.....	4
Report of the Federal Judicial Center.....	4
Report of the Time-Computation Subcommittee...	5
Reports of the Advisory Committees:	
Appellate Rules.....	13
Bankruptcy Rules.....	17
Civil Rules.....	21
Criminal Rules.....	40
Evidence Rules.....	50
Report of the Sealing Subcommittee.....	52
Report on Standing Orders.....	53
Next Committee Meeting.....	53

ATTENDANCE

The mid-year meeting of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure was held in Washington, DC, on Monday and Tuesday, June 9 and 10, 2008. All the members were present:

Judge Lee H. Rosenthal, Chair
David J. Beck, Esquire
Douglas R. Cox, Esquire
Chief Justice Ronald N. George
Judge Harris L Hartz
Judge Marilyn L. Huff
John G. Kester, Esquire
William J. Maledon, Esquire
Professor Daniel J. Meltzer
Judge Reena Raggi
Judge James A. Teilborg
Judge Diane P. Wood

Deputy Attorney General Mark R. Filip attended part of the meeting as the representative of the Department of Justice. In addition, the Department was represented throughout the meeting by Ronald J. Tenpas, Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division.

Also participating in the meeting were committee consultants Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr. and Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.

Providing support to the committee were:

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette	The committee's reporter
Peter G. McCabe	The committee's secretary
John K. Rabiej	Chief, Rules Committee Support Office
James N. Ishida	Senior attorney, Administrative Office
Jeffrey N. Barr	Senior attorney, Administrative Office
Joe Cecil	Research Division, Federal Judicial Center
Tim Reagan	Research Division, Federal Judicial Center
Andrea Kuperman	Judge Rosenthal's rules law clerk

Representing the advisory committees were:

- Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules —
 - Judge Carl E. Stewart, Chair
 - Professor Catherine T. Struve, Reporter
- Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules —
 - Judge Laura Taylor Swain, Chair
 - Professor Jeffrey W. Morris, Reporter
 - Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Assistant Reporter
- Advisory Committee on Civil Rules —
 - Judge Mark R. Kravitz, Chair
 - Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
- Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules —
 - Judge Richard C. Tallman, Chair
 - Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter
- Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules —
 - Judge Robert L. Hinkle, Chair
 - Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Rosenthal reported that Professor Morris was completing his service as reporter to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, noting that he would be honored formally at the January 2009 committee meeting. She pointed out that Professor Morris had made extraordinary contributions to the rules process during the hectic periods preceding and following enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005. The far-reaching legislation, she noted, had required him to devote an enormous amount of time and effort to researching, analyzing, and drafting a great many new rules and forms. She said that Professor Morris truly had accomplished the work of several people, and the committee would greatly miss him.

Judge Rosenthal presented a resolution signed by the Chief Justice to Judge Kravitz recognizing his service as a member of the committee from 2001 to 2007. She noted that he had been at the center of several important projects during that time, had coordinated development of the time-computation amendments now before the committee for final approval, and had served as the committee's liaison to the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules. And she was delighted that Chief Justice Roberts had appointed him as the new chair of the civil rules committee.

Judge Kravitz, in turn, presented Judge Rosenthal with a resolution from the Chief Justice recognizing her service as chair of the civil advisory committee from 2003 to 2007. During her tenure, she had shepherded many landmark rules changes dealing with such important matters as class actions, electronic discovery, and restyling of the civil rules.

Judge Rosenthal asked the committee to recognize the many contributions of the late Judge Sam Pointer, who had served as chair of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules from 1990 to 1993. Among other things, he had coordinated the major package of amendments to the civil rules needed to implement the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990. She noted that Judge Pointer had also led the committee's initial efforts to restyle the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. He consistently had set high standards in everything he did and had been a very influential leader of the federal judiciary.

Judge Rosenthal noted that Chief Judge Anthony Scirica, former chair of the standing committee, had just been elevated by the Chief Justice to the position of chair of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference. She said that the appointment would serve the rules process and the entire federal judiciary very well.

Judge Rosenthal reported that the March 2008 session of the Judicial Conference had been uneventful for the rules process, as no rules matters had been placed on the discussion calendar. She noted that she and Professor Coquillette had had very productive meetings with both Chief Justice Roberts and Administrative Office Director

James Duff. Both are very appreciative of the work of the rules committees. The Chief Justice, she said, was supportive of the effort to restyle the evidence rules and was keenly aware of the need for the rules committees to address problems regarding cost and delay in civil cases, victims' rights in criminal cases, and privacy and security concerns in court records.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the minutes of the last meeting, held on January 14-15, 2008.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Mr. Rabiej reported briefly on two pieces of legislation affecting the rules process, both of which have been opposed consistently by the Judicial Conference. First, legislation had been introduced in the last several congresses, at the behest of the bail bond industry, to limit the authority of a judge to revoke a bond for any condition other than failure of the defendant to appear in court as directed. The legislation had not moved in the past, but had now passed the House of Representatives and been introduced in the Senate.

Second, protective-order legislation had been reintroduced by Senator Kohl. It would require a judge, before issuing a protective order under FED. R. CIV. P. 26(c), to make findings of fact that the discovery sought: (1) is not relevant to protect public health or safety; or (2) if relevant, the public interest in disclosing potential health or safety hazards is outweighed by a substantial interest in keeping the information confidential, and the protective order is narrowly drawn to protect only the privacy interest asserted. Mr. Rabiej noted that the Senate Judiciary Committee had reported out the bill, but it had not been taken up by the full Senate. It has also been introduced in the House.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. Cecil presented a detailed written report on the various activities of the Federal Judicial Center (Agenda Item 4). He also reported on the Center's extensive research on local summary judgment practices in the district courts as part of the committee's discussion of the proposed revision of FED. R. CIV. P. 56 (summary judgment).

REPORT OF THE TIME-COMPUTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Amendments for Final Approval by the Judicial Conference

Judge Rosenthal and Judge Huff, chair of the time-computation subcommittee, explained that the committee was being asked to approve:

- (1) a uniform method for computing time throughout the federal rules and statutes, as prescribed in the proposed revisions to FED. R. APP. P. 26(a), FED. R. BANK. P. 9006(a), FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), and FED. R. CRIM. P. 45(a);
- (2) conforming amendments to the time provisions set forth in 95 individual rules identified by the respective advisory committees; and
- (3) a proposed legislative package to amend 29 key statutes that prescribe time periods.

Judge Rosenthal explained that the time-computation project had proven to be more complicated than anticipated, and the subcommittee and advisory committees had worked very well together in resolving a number of difficult problems. In the end, she said, the package that the committees had produced is very practical and elegant.

Judge Huff stated that the purpose of the amendments is to simplify and make uniform throughout all rules and statutes the method of calculating deadlines and other time periods. She noted that the public comments had been generally positive and had helped the committees to refine the final product. She noted that the subcommittee and the advisory committees had identified the 29 most relevant and significant statutory deadlines that should be adjusted to conform to the proposed new rules. She pointed out, too, that local rules of court will also have to be amended to conform to the new national rules. The rules committees will work with the courts to accomplish this objective.

Professor Struve reported that there had not been a great deal of public reaction to the published amendments. The comments, she said, had been mixed but mostly positive and very useful. She noted that a few changes had been made following the comment period. For example, the definition of the term “state” had been deleted from proposed FED. R. APP. P. 26(a) and FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a) because it would be added elsewhere.

She reported that the principal issues discussed by the subcommittee following the public comment period concerned the interaction between the backward time-counting provision in the proposed rules and the definition of a “legal holiday,” which includes all official state holidays. For example, in counting backwards to ascertain a filing deadline, the proposed rule specifies that when the last day falls on a weekend or holiday, one must continue to count backwards to the day before that weekend or holiday. The problem, as the public comments pointed out, is that the definition of a “legal holiday” may cause a trap for the unwary because some state holidays are obscure and not generally observed either by courts or law firms. A filer unaware of an obscure state holiday, for example, might file a paper on the holiday itself only to learn at that

time that the filing is untimely.

Professor Struve explained that the subcommittee had considered potential fixes for the problem. One would be to provide that a state holiday is a “legal holiday” for forward-counting purposes, but not for backward-counting purposes. She said, though, that the subcommittee had rejected the fix because a majority of members believed that it would make the rule too complex. On the other hand, the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules has complained that the rule will cause serious problems in bankruptcy practice and that state holidays must be excluded from the backwards-counting provision – either across-the-board for all the rules, or at least in the bankruptcy rules.

Professor Struve emphasized that the advisory committees were recommending changes in the specific deadlines contained in many individual rules to make the net result of time-computation changes essentially neutral as to the actual amount of time allotted for parties to take particular actions.

Professor Struve noted, for example, that the 10-day appeal deadline in FED. R. BANKR. P. 8002 would be revised to 14 days. In addition, she said, the civil and appellate advisory committees had worked together to address post-judgment tolling motions filed under FED. R. CIV. P. 50, 52, or 59. They decided to lengthen the deadline for filing such motions from 10 days to 28 days.

CIVIL RULES TIME COMPUTATION

Judge Kravitz stated that, as published, the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had recommended extending the deadline to file a post-judgment motion under FED. R. CIV. P. 50 (judgment as a matter of law), 52 (amended or additional findings), or 59 (new trial) from 10 days to 30 days. But the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules pointed out that extending the deadline to 30 days could cause problems because FED. R. APP. P. 4 (appeal as of right – when taken) imposes the same 30-day deadline to file an appeal in a civil case not involving the federal government. Accordingly, as the deadline to file a notice of appeal looms, an appellant may not know until the last minute whether a post-judgment tolling motion will be filed.

As a result, he said, the civil rules advisory committee considered scaling back the proposed deadline for filing a post-trial motion from 30 days to 21 days or 28 days. The committee concluded that 21 days was simply not a sufficient increase from 10 days, and that a substantial increase is in fact needed to help the bar. Therefore, the committee decided upon 28 days, even though that might seem like an odd time period. Yet it would give the appellant at least two days before a notice of appeal must be filed to learn whether any other party has filed a post-judgment motion tolling the time to file a notice of appeal. The appellate rules committee found this change acceptable.

Judge Kravitz reported that the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had found only one statute that needs to be amended to conform with the proposed rule changes.

CRIMINAL RULES TIME COMPUTATION

Judge Tallman reported that the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules was recommending several changes in individual rules to extend deadlines from 10 days to 14, a change that is essentially merits-neutral. He noted that Congress had deliberately established very tight deadlines in some statutes, some as short as 72 hours, and he suggested that it might be difficult to persuade Congress to change these statutes.

APPELLATE RULES TIME COMPUTATION

Professor Struve stated that some public comments had suggested eliminating or revising the “three-day rule,” which gives a party additional time to file a paper after service. She said that the advisory committee thinks the suggestion is well worth considering and had placed it on its agenda. But it had decided not to recommend elimination as part of the current time-computation package.

BANKRUPTCY RULES TIME COMPUTATION

Judge Swain stated that the proposed amendments to the bankruptcy rules include a recommendation to extend from 10 days to 14 days the deadline in FED. R. BANKR. P. 8002 (time for filing notice of appeal) to file an appeal from a bankruptcy judgment. She noted that the proposal had been controversial because it would change a century-old tradition of a 10-day appeal period in bankruptcy. She noted that the advisory committee had made special efforts to reach out to the bar on the issue.

Judge Swain pointed out that the proposed rules pose special challenges for the bankruptcy system in dealing with backward-counting deadlines because the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure rely heavily on a notice and hearing process and use a good deal of backwards counting. Moreover, because of the national nature of bankruptcy practice, it is not expected that bankruptcy practitioners would be aware of all state legal holidays.

The advisory committee, she said, was strongly of the view that state holidays should not be included in backwards counting. She recognized the importance of having uniformity among all the rules, and urged that state holidays be excluded from backwards counting in all the rules. If this approach is not possible, an exception to uniformity should be made in this particular instance for the bankruptcy rules.

Professor Morris explained that the Bankruptcy Code specifies more than 80 statutory deadlines. Another 230 time limits are set forth in the Federal Rules of

Bankruptcy Procedure, including 18 that require counting backwards. Accordingly, he said, backward-counting deadlines are dramatically more common in bankruptcy than in the other rules. State holidays, he explained, pose no problem in counting forward because they give parties an extra day. But in counting backwards, a filing party is given less time to file a document if a deadline falls on any state holiday. Judges, he said, can usually deal with inadvertent mistakes made in backwards counting. But when a deadline is statutory, a court is less likely to be generous.

He suggested adopting the approach set forth in Judge Swain's memorandum of June 4, 2008, to the standing committee recommending that FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006(a)(6)(C) be added to define a state holiday as a "legal holiday" only in counting forward. The advisory committee would also state in the committee note to the rule that this limiting provision would apply only in the bankruptcy rules.

A member emphasized the importance of uniformity among all the rules and stated that he was concerned about having different standards in the different sets of rules. Nonetheless, he said, the bankruptcy advisory committee had made persuasive points. He wondered whether there might be another solution, such as to make distinctions among different types of state holidays. Some, he said, are important, with government offices, courts, and law firms closed throughout the state. Others, however, are hardly known at all. He suggested that the rule might be revised to provide that only those state holidays that are listed in local court rules be included in the definition of "legal holidays."

Another member agreed that the rule would clearly create a trap for the unwary. He argued that the proposal to exclude state holidays from backward counting is not too complicated, and it should be implemented across the board in all the rules, not just in the bankruptcy rules. Several other participants concurred.

A member argued, though, that the proposed rule is clear, and states do in fact announce all their official holidays. The main problem appears to be that state officials cannot act on days when their offices are closed. If they file a paper on the following day, it will be untimely under the rule. As a practical matter, they will have to file a day early.

A member noted that the committee simply cannot achieve national uniformity in this area and suggested that state holidays be dealt with by local rules. Another responded, though, that reliance on local rules would not address the concerns of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules that many bankruptcy lawyers have a national practice and represent far-flung creditors. Lawyers and creditors are largely unaware of state holidays and state issues. Judge Swain added that many creditors in bankruptcy cases do not have counsel. Their involvement is often limited to filing a proof of claim.

It would be unreasonable to expect them to be aware of local court rules referring to state holidays.

Several participants recommended extending the bankruptcy committee's proposed exclusion of state holidays in backwards counting to all the rules. Judge Huff and Professor Struve pointed out that the agenda book contained the text of an alternate rule that would accomplish that objective by including state holidays only in counting forwards. They said that it would be an excellent starting point for revising the rule.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to FED. R. APP. P. 26(a), FED. R. BANK. P. 9006(a), FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), and FED. R. CRIM. P. 45(a) for approval by the Judicial Conference, using the alternate rule language set forth in the agenda book, together with a committee note incorporating language from the bankruptcy committee's memorandum of June 4, 2008, except for its last sentence, and some improved language by Professor Cooper regarding the inaccessibility of the clerk's office. Judge Rosenthal added that the text would be subject to final review by the style subcommittee and recirculation to the standing committee.

Following approval of the uniform time-computation rule, Judge Rosenthal turned the discussion to the specific time adjustments in individual rules proposed by the advisory committees to account for the changes in the time-computation method.

One member argued that the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 50 (motion for judgment as a matter of law), 52 (motion for amended or additional findings), and 59 (motion for a new trial) go well beyond conforming the three rules to the new time-computation methodology. Rather, they would substantially expand the time for filing post-judgment motions and add cost and delay to civil litigation. She suggested that trial judges may not support extending the time because they want to resolve their cases promptly and have post-trial motions made without delay. In addition, if a lawyer does not have enough time to fully prepare a polished post-trial motion, the matter can be fixed later, and the parties will still enjoy their full appellate rights. Extending the time to file motions from 10 days to 28 days will slow down the whole litigation process.

Judge Kravitz pointed out, though, that trial judges often bend the rules to give lawyers more time to file post-trial motions, especially after a long trial when the lawyers are exhausted and a transcript is not yet available. Judges, for example, may hold up the entry of judgment. Or they may let lawyers file a skeletal post-judgment motion to meet the deadline and then have them supplement it later. The problem, he said, is that 10 or 14 days is simply not enough time in many cases for a lawyer to prepare an adequate motion. Under the rules, moreover, the court cannot extend the deadline, even though some judges routinely do so by procedural maneuvers. In addition, there is case law holding that issues not raised in the original filing cannot be raised later. All in all, Judge

Kravitz concluded, it is unreasonable to require lawyers to file quick post-trial motions, especially in large cases. Extending the deadline to 28 days may result in some delays, but on balance, the advisory committee believes that it is the right thing to do.

A member asked whether trial judges could impose a deadline shorter than the 28 days specified in the proposed rule. Professor Cooper responded that the matter had not been considered by the advisory committee. But it had considered amending FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b) (extending time) to allow judges to extend the time for filing post-trial motions. It was concerned, though, about the interplay between the civil and appellate rules and the jurisdictional nature of the deadline for filing a notice of appeal. Therefore, it declined to take any steps that might be applied ineptly in practice and lead to a loss of rights.

Judge Kravitz explained that scholars are concerned that permitting a judge to extend the time to file post-motion judgments would not fully protect the parties, given the jurisdictional and statutory nature of the time to appeal. A party might still lose its right to appeal if it fails to meet the jurisdictional deadline, even though the trial judge has extended the time to file a post-judgment motion.

A member suggested that 10 or 14 days to file a post-trial motion should be sufficient for lawyers in most cases. He asked how often the short deadline actually presents problems for lawyers. If not frequent, the procedural devices that trial judges now use to give lawyers more time may be sufficient to address the problems.

Judge Kravitz responded that the advisory committee had concluded that it was common for lawyers to need additional time, especially in circuits where the case law holds that claims are waived if not raised in the original motion. He said that he had presided over a number of cases in which the parties needed a transcript to file a motion. He pointed out that there had been no negative public comments on extending the deadline from 10 days to 28 days, either from judges or the bar. Professor Struve added that the E.D.N.Y. Committee on Civil Litigation had been critical of the time-computation project in general, but had come out strongly in favor of this particular extension.

A member added that lawyers are uncomfortable with the devices that trial judges now use, such as deferring entry of judgment or allowing a bare-bones post-judgment motion. The 10-day deadline, he said, is notoriously inadequate because many issues require careful briefing, even after a relatively short trial. Moreover, there may be a change in counsel after the trial, making the current deadline virtually impossible to meet. The proposed extension to 28 days, he said, is badly needed and will not cause unreasonable delays.

The lawyer members of the committee all agreed that the current 10-day deadline is much too short. They said that it is not safe for lawyers to rely on procedural maneuvering, such as delaying the entry of judgment. Lawyers, moreover, are bound by what they write in the original filing, and they may need a transcript to prepare a proper motion. One added that it is not uncommon for appellate counsel to be brought in after the trial and have to be brought up to speed by exhausted trial counsel.

A member pointed out that notices of appeal are normally filed only after disposition of a post-judgment motion, usually a Rule 59 motion for a new trial. Under the proposed extension, more parties may file prophylactic notices of appeal before any post-judgment motions are filed. This practice may impose some administrative burdens on the court of appeals, but Professor Struve suggested that it would likely arise only in multi-party cases. Judge Kravitz added that even 28 days may not be sufficient for lawyers to prepare post-judgment motions in some cases. Therefore, the proposed change may not altogether end the procedural devices that are now being used.

A member suggested that the committee consider the fundamental purpose of post-trial motions. As originally conceived, they were designed to allow a trial judge to promptly fix errors in the trial record. But they have evolved into full-blown motions to reconsider a whole host of issues raised at pretrial, by motion, and at trial and to relitigate all the decisions made by the trial judge in the case. In all, post-trial motions lead to a misuse of judicial time.

Judge Rosenthal stated that the advisory committees, and district judges generally, are troubled by the procedural subterfuges now used to circumvent the current rule. They are not worried about waiting a few more days if the result is better-prepared motions.

A motion was made to adopt all the proposed rule changes in the time-computation package.

Judge Tallman pointed out that FED. R. CRIM. P. 5.1 (preliminary hearing) and 18 U.S.C. § 3060(b) both specify that a preliminary hearing must be held within 10 days of the defendant's first appearance if the defendant is in custody. He explained that the proposed amendment to Rule 5.1 would extend the deadline to 14 days, but the statute will also have to be amended to keep the two consistent. If Congress does not extend the statutory deadline to 14 days, it would make no sense to amend the rule.

A member asked whether the committee should approve the rule contingent upon Congress amending the statute. Judge Rosenthal reported that representatives of the rules committees had already discussed a timetable with congressional staff to synchronize the effective date of the new rules with the needed statutory changes. She said that staff had been very sympathetic to the objective, and it did not appear that there would be

significant obstacles to accomplishing this objective. There is certainly no guarantee of success, but the committees are hopeful. Professor Coquillette added that the problem of synchronization could also be addressed by delaying the effective date of all the rules, or selected rules, to coincide with the statutory changes.

A member noted that under the Rules Enabling Act, rule changes supersede inconsistent statutes (except for changes to the bankruptcy rules). So even if Congress were not to act, the revised rules would override the inconsistent statutes. Judge Rosenthal responded that the committee, as a matter of comity with the legislative branch, tries to avoid reliance on the supersession clause of the Act. It also seeks to avoid the confusion that results when a rule and a statute are in conflict. The member agreed, but noted that if Congress simply does not act in time, as opposed to refuses to act, the extended deadlines in the new rules would govern in the interim until Congress acts.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved all the proposed time-computation amendments for approval by the Judicial Conference.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the advisory committees' recommendations that the Judicial Conference seek legislation to adjust the time periods in 29 statutes affecting court proceedings to conform them to the proposed changes in the time-computation rules.

Judge Rosenthal asked the committee to concur in her view that the changes made in the time-computation amendments following publication were not so extensive as to require republication of the proposals.

The committee without objection by voice vote agreed that there was no need to republish any of the proposed time-computation amendments.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Stewart and Professor Struve presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Stewart's memorandum and attachments of May 13, 2008 (Agenda Item 7).

*Amendments for Final Approval by the Judicial Conference***TIME-COMPUTATION RULES**

FED. R. APP. P. 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28.1, 30, 31, 39, and 41

As noted above on pages 9 and 12, the committee approved for submission to the Judicial Conference the proposed time-computation amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(4)(B)(ii)

Professor Struve reported that the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(4)(B)(ii) (effect of a motion on a notice of appeal) would resolve an inadvertent ambiguity that resulted from the 1998 restyling of the Appellate Rules. The current rule might be read to require an appellant to amend a prior notice of appeal if the district court amends the judgment after the notice of appeal is filed, even if the amendment is in the appellant's favor. She reported that the public comments on the proposed amendment had raised some additional issues, which had been placed on the future agenda of the advisory committee.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendment for approval by the Judicial Conference.

FED. R. APP. P. 12.1

Judge Stewart explained that the proposed new Rule 12.1 (remand after an indicative ruling by the district court) was designed to accompany new FED. R. CIV. P. 62.1 (indicative ruling on a motion for relief that is barred by a pending appeal). It had been coordinated closely with the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules.

Judge Stewart reported that the Department of Justice had expressed concern about potential abuse of the indicative ruling procedure in criminal cases. As a result, the advisory committee modified the committee note after publication by editing the note's discussion of the scope of the rule's application in criminal cases. Professor Struve added that the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules might wish to consider a change in the criminal rules to authorize indicative rulings explicitly. Accordingly, the appellate

advisory committee had included language in the committee note to anticipate that possible development.

A member questioned the language that had been added to the second paragraph of the committee note stating that the advisory committee anticipates that use of indicative rulings “will be limited to” three categories of criminal matters – newly discovered evidence motions under FED. R. CRIM. P. 33(b)(1), reduced sentence motions under FED. R. CRIM. P. 35(b), and motions under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c). He worried that the language might be too restrictive and recommended that it be revised to state that “the Committee anticipates that Rule 12.1 will be used primarily, if not exclusively, for [those matters].”

Professor Struve explained that the advisory committee had been reluctant to limit the rule to the three situations suggested by the Department of Justice because there may be other situations when indicative rulings are appropriate. A member added that the procedure could be useful in handling § 2255 motions, as appellate courts have said that a district court should rarely hear a § 2255 motion when an appeal is pending. He noted that a three-judge panel of his court recently had permitted use of the indicative ruling procedure in a § 2255 case. But Mr. Tenpas responded that the Department was particularly concerned about systematic use, and abuse, of the procedure by pro se inmates in § 2255 cases.

A member pointed out that the principal safeguard against abuse is that the court of appeals has discretion to deny any request for an indicative ruling and may refuse to remand a matter to the trial court. The discretion vested in the court of appeals safeguards against excessive use of the procedure.

Judge Stewart and Professor Struve agreed that the recommended substitute language for the committee note, “the Committee anticipates that Rule 12.1 will be used primarily, if not exclusively, for . . . ,” would be acceptable. A motion was made to approve the proposed new rule, with the revised note language.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed new Rule 12.1 for approval by the Judicial Conference.

FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1)

Judge Stewart explained that the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1) (certificate of appealability) would conform the rule to changes being proposed by the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules in Rule 11 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases and § 2255 Proceedings. The amendment would delete from Rule 22 the requirement that the district judge who rendered the judgment either issue a certificate of appealability or state why a certificate should not issue, because the matter is more appropriately

handled in Rule 11. Professor Struve added that approval of the amendment would be contingent on approving the tandem amendments proposed by the criminal rules committee.

A member questioned the language of the proposed amendment stating that “(t)he district clerk must send the certificate and the statement . . . to the court of appeals,” suggesting that the district clerk should be required to send the certificate only when it has been issued by a district judge. The certificate may be also issued by the court of appeals or a circuit justice, but a district clerk should bear no noticing obligation in those situations. The limitation on the clerk’s obligation may be implicit in the rule, but it would be preferable to substitute language such as, “If the district court issues the certificate, the district clerk must send”

Professor Struve explained that the principal concern of the advisory committee had been to make sure that the certificate is included in the case file. She noted, though, that under CM/ECF, the courts’ comprehensive electronic records system, there should be few problems with filing and transmitting documents. Nevertheless, the district clerk should have no obligation to handle a certificate issued by a circuit judge.

Judge Rosenthal suggested that the committee defer further consideration of the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1) until after the committee considers the parallel rule amendments proposed by the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules.

Later in the meeting, the committee approved the parallel rule amendments proposed by the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules. At that time, it approved without objection by voice vote the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1) for approval by the Judicial Conference. (See page 46.)

FED. R. APP. P. 26(c)

Judge Stewart explained that the proposed amendments to FED. R. APP. P. 26(c) (additional time allowed after mail and certain other service) would clarify the method of computing the additional three days that a party is given to respond after service. The amendment would make the language of the rule parallel to that of FED. R. CIV. P. 6(d). He also pointed out that the advisory committee had received a comment from Chief Judge Frank Easterbrook recommending that the “three-day rule” be eliminated entirely, and the committee would place the matter on its agenda for a full discussion.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendment for approval by the Judicial Conference.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. APP. P. 1(b)

Professor Struve explained that proposed new FED. R. APP. P. 1 (definition) would define the term “state” throughout the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure to include the District of Columbia and any U.S. commonwealth or territory. The definition, she explained, is consistent with a proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 81(d).

FED. R. APP. P. 29(a)

The proposed amendments to FED. R. APP. P. 29(a) (when an amicus curiae brief is permitted) would eliminate the current language referring to a state, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia because new FED. R. APP. P. 1(b) would make it unnecessary.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for publication.

FORM 4

Professor Struve reported that Form 4 (affidavit accompanying a motion for permission to appeal in forma pauperis) had already been updated informally to conform to the new privacy rules that took effect on December 1, 2007, and had been posted by the Administrative Office on the Judiciary’s web-site. The proposed revisions to the form would delete the full names of minor children and the home address and full social security number of the applicant. She explained that the advisory committee had also concluded that the term “minor” could be ambiguous because the definition varies from state to state, and pro se petitioners who normally fill out Form 4 should not be placed in the position of worrying about who is a “minor.” Instead, the committee decided to substitute the language “under 18.”

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments in the official form for publication.

Informational Item

Judge Stewart reported that the advisory committee was continuing to monitor case law developments following *Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. ____ (2007), regarding the jurisdictional and statutory dimensions of the time limits to appeal.

Judge Swain and Professors Morris and Gibson presented the report of the advisory committee, as set out in Judge Swain's memorandum and attachments of May 14, 2008 (Agenda Item 10).

Amendments for Final Approval by the Judicial Conference

TIME-COMPUTATION RULES

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1007, 1011, 1019, 1020, 2002, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2007.2, 2008, 2015, 2015.1, 2015.2, 2015.3, 2016, 3001, 3015, 3017, 3019, 3020, 4001, 4002, 4004, 6003, 6004, 6006, 6007, 7004, 7012, 8001, 8002, 8003, 8006, 8009, 8015, 8017, 9006, 9027, and 9033

As noted above on pages 9 and 12, the committee approved for submission to the Judicial Conference the proposed time-computation amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1017.1

Judge Swain noted that proposed new FED. R. BANKR. P. 1017.1 (individual debtor's exemption from the pre-petition credit counseling requirement) would have revised the process for granting an extension of time for the debtor to complete the credit-counseling required by the 2005 amendments to the Bankruptcy Code. It had been published for public comment in August 2007, but the comments had shown that a rule is unnecessary because very few cases arise in which there is a request for an extension. Therefore, the advisory committee decided to withdraw it from further consideration.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 4008

Judge Swain noted that the proposed amendment to Rule 4008 (discharge and reaffirmation hearing) would require that a new official form cover sheet be filed with a reaffirmation agreement. (See OFFICIAL FORM 27 below.)

FED. R. BANKR. P. 7052, 7058, and 9021

Judge Swain explained that the new rule and the proposed rule amendments deal with clarifying the requirement that a judgment be set forth in a separate document. New FED. R. BANKR. P. 7058 (entry of judgment) would make FED. R. CIV. P. 58 (entering judgment) applicable in adversary proceedings. FED. R. BANKR. P. 7052 (findings by the court) and 9021 (entry of judgment) are conforming amendments to accompany new Rule 7058.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the rules for approval by the Judicial Conference.

OFFICIAL FORMS 1, 8, and 27

Professor Morris reported that the amendments to Exhibit D of OFFICIAL FORM 1 (individual debtor's statement of compliance with the credit counseling requirement) and OFFICIAL FORM 8 (individual Chapter 7 debtor's statement of intention) would become effective on December 1, 2008. New OFFICIAL FORM 27 (reaffirmation agreement cover sheet) would take effect on December 1, 2009, to coordinate it with the proposed revision to Rule 4008 that would require the form to be filed with a reaffirmation agreement. The form will give the court basic information about what is contained in the agreement. He noted that the advisory committee had received comments on the form and had made minor changes after publication.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the forms for final approval by the Judicial Conference.

TECHNICAL CHANGES

FED. R. BANKR. P. 2016, 7052, 9006(f), 9015, and 9023

Professor Morris reported that the advisory committee recommended that the proposed amendments to the five rules be approved and sent to the Judicial Conference for final approval without publication because they involve only technical changes, such as correcting cross-references or implementing provisions in the other sets of rules.

He said that the proposed amendment to FED. R. BANKR. P. 2016 (compensation for services rendered and reimbursement of expenses) merely corrects a cross-reference to a subsection of the Bankruptcy Code changed by the 2005 omnibus bankruptcy legislation.

The amendment to FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006(f) (additional time allowed after service by mail or certain other means) would correct a cross-reference to subparagraphs in FED. R. CIV. P. 5 (service), which had been renumbered as part of the civil rules restyling project.

The other three amendments would implement the proposed new 14-day deadline to file a notice of appeal from a bankruptcy judgment. Professor Morris explained that the proposed 28-day time to file a post-judgment motion in civil cases would not work in bankruptcy cases because the deadline to file a notice of appeal, currently 10 days, will be 14 days once the time-computation amendments take effect.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the rules for approval by the Judicial Conference.

OFFICIAL FORMS 9F, 10, and 23

Professor Morris reported that the proposed amendments to the forms were technical in nature and did not merit publication. He explained that the advisory committee inadvertently had retained a requirement in OFFICIAL FORM 9F (initial notice in a Chapter 11 corporation or partnership case) that debtors provide their telephone numbers. That item of personal information has been removed from the other forms.

The change in OFFICIAL FORM 10 (proof of claim) would remind persons filing claims based on health-care debts that they should limit the disclosure of personal information. Two changes in the definition section of the forms would tie the words “creditor” and “claims” more closely to the definitions set forth the Bankruptcy Code.

The proposed amendment to OFFICIAL FORM 23 (debtor’s certification of completing the required post-petition financial-management course) would add a reference to § 1141(d)(5)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the forms for final approval by the Judicial Conference.

Amendments for Publication

Professor Morris explained that the proposed amendments and new rule would implement new Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, added by the 2005 legislation.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1004.2

Under proposed new FED. R. BANKR. P. 1004.2 (Petition in Chapter 15 cases), an entity must state on the face of the petition the country of the debtor’s main interests.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1014 and 1015

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1014 (dismissal and change of venue) and 1015 (consolidation or joint administration of cases) both deal with multiple cases involving the same debtor. A question had been raised as to whether these rules are applicable in Chapter 15 cases. The advisory committee would resolve the ambiguity by making the two rules specifically applicable.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1018

The amendments to FED. R. BANKR. P. 1018 (contested involuntary and chapter 15 petitions, etc.) would clarify the scope of Rule 1018 to the extent it governs

proceedings contesting an involuntary petition or Chapter 15 petition for recognition. There is some confusion now as to the applicable procedures in injunctive actions. The amendments clarify that the rule applies to contests over the involuntary petition itself, and not to matters that arise in or are merely related to a Chapter 15 case or an involuntary petition. Such other matters are governed by other provisions of the Rules, as explained in the proposed committee note.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 5009

FED. R. BANKR. P. 5009 (case closing) would require a foreign representative to file and notice a final report in a Chapter 15 case describing the nature and results of the representative's activities in the United States court. In the absence of timely objection, a presumption will arise that the case has been fully administered and may be closed. Another amendment would require the clerk to send a notice to individual debtors in Chapter 7 and Chapter 13 cases that their case will be closed without a discharge if they have not timely filed the required statement that they have completed a financial-management course.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 5012

New FED. R. BANKR. P. 5012 (agreements concerning coordination of proceedings in Chapter 15 cases) would establish a motion procedure in Chapter 15 cases for obtaining approval of an agreement or "protocol" under § 1527(4) of the Code for the coordination of Chapter 15 proceedings with foreign proceedings.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 9001

The amendment to FED. R. BANKR. P. 9001 (general definitions) would incorporate into the rule the definitions set forth in § 1502 of the Code, added by the 2005 bankruptcy legislation.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the rules for publication.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Kravitz and Professor Cooper presented the report of the advisory committee, as set out in Judge Kravitz's memorandum and attachments of May 9, 2008 (Agenda Item 6).

Amendments for Final Approval by the Judicial Conference

TIME-COMPUTATION RULES

FED. R. CIV. P. 6, 12, 14, 15, 23, 27, 32, 38, 50, 52,
53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 65, 68, 71.1, 72, and 81
SUPPLEMENTAL RULES B, C, and G
FORMS 3, 4, and 60

As noted above on pages 9 and 12, the committee approved for submission to the Judicial Conference the proposed time-computation amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Supplemental Rules, and the illustrative Civil Forms.

FED. R. CIV. P. 8(c)

Judge Kravitz reported that the advisory committee had published a proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 8(c) (affirmative defenses) that would remove a "discharge in bankruptcy" from the list of defenses that a party must affirmatively state in responding to a pleading. The Bankruptcy Code makes the exception unnecessary as a matter of law because a discharge voids a judgment to the extent that it determines the debtor's personal liability on the discharged debt. He said, though, that the Department of Justice had voiced opposition to the change. As a result, the advisory committee decided to postpone seeking final approval of the change in order to discuss the matter further with the Department.

FED. R. CIV. P. 13(f)

Judge Kravitz reported that FED. R. CIV. P. 13(f) (omitted counterclaim) would be deleted from the rules as largely redundant and misleading. Instead, an amendment to a counterclaim would be governed exclusively by FED. R. CIV. P. 15 (amended and supplemental pleadings).

FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)

The amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 15 (amended and supplemental pleadings) would revise the time when a party's right to amend its pleading once as a matter of course ends.

FED. R. CIV. P. 48(c)

Judge Kravitz said that new FED. R. CIV. P. 48(c) (polling the jury) is based on FED. R. CRIM. P. 31(d), but has minor revisions in wording to reflect that the parties in a civil case may stipulate to a non-unanimous verdict.

A member noted that the proposed amendment referred to "a lack of unanimity or assent" on the part of the jury and asked whether "unanimity" and "assent" are different requirements. Professor Cooper responded that they are, in fact, different concepts. If the parties in a civil case stipulate to accepting a less-than-unanimous verdict, only the "assent" of the jury is required, not "unanimity." Professor Cooper added that Professor Kimble had suggested restyling the language to read: "a lack of unanimity or a lack of assent."

FED. R. CIV. P. 62.1

Judge Kravitz reported that proposed new FED. R. CIV. P. 62.1 (indicative ruling on a motion for relief that is barred by a pending appeal) was the most important rule in the package being forwarded to the Judicial Conference for approval. He noted that the language had been refined following the public comment period to emphasize that the remand from the court of appeals to the district court is for the limited purpose of deciding a motion.

A member suggested that the rule's language was awkward in referring to "relief that the court lacks authority to grant because of an appeal that has been docketed and is pending." He suggested rephrasing the rule to read: "because an appeal has been docketed and is pending." Professor Cooper responded that there are several situations in which docketing of an appeal does not oust the district court's jurisdiction. The advisory committee, moreover, had tried to avoid getting into the morass over whether docketing an appeal is jurisdictional.

FED. R. CIV. P. 81(d)

Judge Kravitz pointed out that the proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 81(d) (law applicable) would define a "state" for purposes of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where appropriate, as the District of Columbia and any U.S. commonwealth or territory.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for approval by the Judicial Conference.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. CIV. P. 56

Judge Kravitz reported that the advisory committee had made additional refinements in the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 56 (summary judgment) as a result of the comments made by standing committee members at the January 2008 meeting. In addition, the committee note had been shortened significantly.

Judge Kravitz explained that the project to revise FED. R. CIV. P. 56 had been challenging and, understandably, it had taken a great deal of time to complete. He extended special thanks to Judge Michael Baylson for his excellent leadership and insight in chairing the subcommittee that had developed the summary judgment proposal. He also thanked Professor Cooper, Andrea Kuperman, Joe Cecil, James Ishida, and Jeffrey Barr for their significant research efforts in support of the project.

Judge Kravitz explained that actual summary judgment practice has grown apart from the current text of Rule 56. The deficiencies of the current national rule have left space that has been filled by experimentation at the local level. Accordingly, he said, in fashioning a new national rule, the advisory committee had enjoyed the unique opportunity of drawing upon the best practices contained in local court rules.

Judge Kravitz reported that the bar is largely supportive of moving towards a more uniform national summary judgment practice under Rule 56. He noted that the advisory committee had conducted two mini-conferences on the proposed amendments with lawyers, law professors, and judges, and he had spoken personally to several bar groups. At the same time, however, he said that there may be resistance to the proposed rule from courts that do not presently use the three-step process embodied in the new rule.

He explained that the proposed rule would provide a uniform framework for handling summary judgment motions throughout the federal courts, but it would also give judges flexibility to prescribe different procedures in individual cases. The procedure that the new rule lays out will work well in most cases, he said, but trial judges will be free to depart from it when warranted in a particular case.

Judge Kravitz emphasized that there is nothing radical about the three-step, point-counterpoint procedure prescribed in the proposed rule. Clearly, a party should be required to give citations to the record to support its assertion that an issue is disputed or not. That, he said, is precisely what the amendments are designed to accomplish.

Judge Kravitz emphasized that the advisory committee had adhered to two basic principles in drafting the rule. First, it decided not to change the substantive standards governing summary judgment motions. Second, it decided that the revised rule must be neutral – not favoring either plaintiffs or defendants. He pointed out that the last time the advisory committee had proposed making changes to Rule 56, in the early 1990s, it had attempted to make substantive changes, and the effort had failed.

Judge Kravitz reported that the advisory committee had also worked with the Federal Judicial Center to verify empirically that the proposed rule would not run afoul of either of the two fundamental principles.

Mr. Cecil explained that 20 districts now require the point-counterpoint procedure in their local rules. The Center had compared summary judgment practice in those districts with practice in two other categories of districts: (1) the 34 districts that require movants to specify all the undisputed facts in a structured manner, but do not require any particular form of response from opponents; and (2) the remaining districts that have no local rule requiring either party to specify undisputed facts.

The Center's research, he said, had uncovered little meaningful difference among the three categories of districts, except in two respects. First, in districts having a point-counterpoint process, judges take somewhat longer to decide summary judgment motions. Those districts, however, generally have lengthier disposition times. Therefore, the longer times cannot be ascribed to the point-counterpoint procedure. Second, in districts that do require a structured procedure, motions for summary judgment are more likely to be decided. But there appears to be no difference as to the outcome of the motions – whether they are granted or denied. Mr. Cecil cautioned, however, that the current court data concerning termination by summary judgment may not be sufficiently reliable.

Judge Kravitz proceeded to highlight those provisions of the proposed rule that either have prompted comment from bench and bar or have been changed by the advisory committee since the January 2008 standing committee meeting.

RULE 56(a)

Judge Kravitz pointed out that proposed Rule 56(a) specifies that a court “should” grant summary judgment if there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. He said that the advisory committee had heard a great deal about whether the appropriate verb should be “should,” “must,” or “shall.” He noted that the rule had used the term “shall” until it was changed to “should” as part of the 2007 general restyling of the civil rules.

He said that the advisory committee, after lengthy consideration, had decided that it would be best to retain the language of the rule currently in effect, *i.e.*, “should.” Professor Cooper added that there continues to be some nostalgic support for returning to “shall,” but that usage would violate fundamental rules of good style. Therefore, he said, the choice lies between “should” and “must.” Earlier drafts of the committee note, he said, had undertaken to elaborate on the contours of “should,” but the advisory committee decided that it would be improper to risk changing the meaning of a rule through a note. Thus, the 2007 committee note to the restyled Rule 56 remains the final word on the subject.

Professor Cooper added that the verb “should” is clearly appropriate when a motion for summary judgment addresses only part of a case. Under certain circumstances, he explained, it is wise as a practical matter for a judge to let the whole case proceed to trial, rather than grant partial summary judgment. He suggested that one possible approach might be to use “must” with regard to granting summary judgment on a whole case, but “should” for granting a partial summary judgment. That formulation, however, appears unnecessarily complicated.

Judge Kravitz noted a Seventh Circuit case suggesting that summary judgment must be granted when warranted on qualified immunity grounds, although the decision appears to have more to do with qualified immunity than summary judgment. He explained that the advisory committee tries to avoid providing legal advice in the committee notes. The committee, moreover, did not want to mention qualified immunity in the note as an example of a particular substantive area in which summary judgment may come to be indeed mandatory when the proper showing is made, for fear that it might miss other substantive areas.

Judge Kravitz noted that, at the January 2008 standing committee meeting, a member had pointed out a discrepancy between proposed Rule 56(a), which specifies that summary judgment “should” be granted in whole or in part, and Rule 56(g), specifying that partial summary judgment “may” be granted. He reported that the discrepancy had been fixed and the two provisions now work well together.

A member expressed concern that using the word “should” in Rule 56(a) would signal to the bar that the committee is retrenching from the substantive standard that had prevailed before the restyling of the civil rules, thereby making summary judgment less readily available. For decades, he said, Rule 56 had specified that a judge “shall” grant summary judgment if a party is entitled to it. In the restyling effort, though, the verb “shall” was changed to “should” as part of the policy of eliminating the use of “shall” throughout the rules. At the time, the committee specified that no substantive change had been intended.

He recommended that the committee signal to the bar once again that no substantive change had been intended by the change to “should.” Accordingly, a judge

should have no discretion to deny summary judgment when a party is entitled to it as a matter of law.

Another member suggested that the relevant sentence in proposed Rule 56(a) is incoherent because it specifies that a court “should” grant summary judgment if a party is “entitled” to it. If a party is “entitled” to summary judgment, by definition the grant of summary judgment is mandatory. Other members endorsed this view.

A member argued that the appropriate verb to use in the rule is “must.” In his state, for example, the state court trial judges are concerned that the intermediate appellate courts frequently reverse their grants of summary judgment. The consequence is that they are chilled from granting summary judgment, believing that it is safer to just let a case proceed to trial. Another member noted that some trial judges in his federal circuit grant summary judgment even when there is clearly a credibility dispute between the parties because they believe that they know how a case will turn out in the end.

Judge Kravitz explained that the advisory committee believes that the substance of the proposed rule is identical to the way it was before December 1, 2007, when “should” replaced “shall.” There was no intention to make any substantive change. He pointed out that the committee note, for example, states that discretion should seldom be exercised. That point, he said, would continue to be emphasized in the materials that are published. A judge would exercise discretion to deny summary judgment only in a rare case.

He added that under prevailing summary judgment standards, a trial judge who decides a summary judgment motion must resolve all reasonable inferences in favor of the non-moving party. That, he said, leaves a good deal of latitude to the judge, even before deciding whether the moving party is “entitled” to summary judgment as a matter of law. He suggested that even if the rule were to specify that summary judgment “must” be granted if the moving party is “entitled” to it, the trial judge would have some flexibility in determining whether the moving party is “entitled.”

A member complained that a number of trial judges avoid granting summary judgment, no matter how strong the moving party’s entitlement to it. But there is no empirical evidence on the point because the cases go to trial, and there is no way to appeal the denial of summary judgment. To avoid the stark choice between “should” and “must,” he suggested that the language might be revised to specify that “summary judgment is required if . . .,” or “summary judgment is necessary if”

Judge Kravitz responded that the advisory committee had indeed considered an alternative formulation along these lines, but had abandoned the effort because it would change the substantive standard for granting summary judgment. He added that while the civil defense bar is nervous about the 2007 change from “shall” to “should,” the

plaintiffs' bar is concerned about other aspects of the proposed rule and would be strongly opposed to changing "should" to "must."

A member suggested that the committee publish the rule for comment as currently drafted and solicit comments from the bar. She also observed that the proposed rule would explicitly authorize a court to grant partial summary judgment, and it would not make sense to specify that a judge "must" grant partial summary judgment.

Judge Kravitz pointed out that it was clear from the discussion that several committee members believe that a substantive change had been made inadvertently during the course of the restyling process. But he pointed out that the term "shall" had been interpreted in the pertinent Rule 56 case law as not requiring a judge to grant summary judgment in every case even though a party may be "entitled" to it.

He also noted that the committee would have to republish the rule for further public comment if it were to: (1) publish the proposal using "should"; (2) receive many negative public comments on the choice; and (3) then decide to revert to "must." He suggested that it might make more sense – although he did not specifically advocate the idea – to publish the rule using "should" and "must" as alternatives and specifically invite comment on the two.

A member observed that the bar had been informed that the change from "shall" to "should" during the restyling process was merely a style change. Therefore, the change from "should" back to "shall" would also be a mere style change.

Judge Kravitz noted that a change from "should" to "must" would clearly be more than a style change. He explained that the style subcommittee had made clear that "shall" is an inherently ambiguous word that should be changed wherever it appears. Therefore, in drafting the proposed revisions to Rule 56, the advisory committee had carefully researched how courts had interpreted the word "shall" in Rule 56. It concluded that "shall" had largely been read to mean "should" within the context of Rule 56.

Professor Kimble added that "shall" is so ambiguous that it can mean just about anything. It has been interpreted to mean "must," "should," and "may" in different circumstances. A cardinal principle of sound drafting, he said, is that ambiguous terms must be avoided. He said that "shall" should indeed normally mean "must," but in actual usage it often does not.

A member stated that she had always assumed that "shall" meant "must" and had been surprised to learn about the inherent ambiguity of "shall." She said that if the committee wants to solicit public comment on the choice between "should" and "must," it should make clear in the publication exactly what the committee intends for the rule to

mean as a matter of substance, describe the underlying issues, and ask for specific advice on those issues.

Judge Kravitz stated that the advisory committee will certainly highlight the issue for public comment. He reiterated that there are sound reasons for giving a trial judge discretion regarding partial summary judgment. One common problem, he noted, is that parties often move for summary judgment on the whole action, but may only be entitled to it on one count. In some cases, granting partial summary judgment may be warranted, but it may make more sense for the judge to go ahead and try the whole case.

A participant observed that these issues are critically important because few civil cases now go to trial. Summary judgment today lies at the very heart of civil litigation and is key as to how counsel perceive and evaluate a case. He recommended publishing the proposed rule using the alternative formulations of “should” and “must” and inviting specific comments on the alternatives. Judge Kravitz noted, by way of example, that the recent electronic discovery amendments had also been published with alternative formulations.

A member stated that, on initial reading, the change from “shall” to “should” did not appear to be substantive. But, on further reflection, the matter is not so clear. He pointed out that the 2007 change from “shall” to “should” is perceived by some as a substantive change, even though the committee is convinced that it is not. For that reason the proposal should be published with “should” and “must” in the alternative to solicit thoughtful comments. Several other members concurred.

A member suggested that some judges may refuse to grant summary judgment, even when warranted, because they are overworked. They can simply deny summary judgment with a one-line order and proceed to trial. But under the committee’s proposal, the trial judge “should” give reasons for denying summary judgment. The requirement to give reasons may impact the willingness of some judges to grant summary judgment. Judge Kravitz added that the Federal Judicial Center’s research shows that a disturbing number of summary judgment motions are still undecided when cases go to trial.

Judge Kravitz observed that it would be complicated to draft a provision specifying that a trial judge “must” grant complete summary judgment, but “should” grant partial summary judgment. It may be that some other formulation could avoid the drafting problems, but he suggested that it would be better just to tackle the issue head on and use either “should” or “must.” He also noted that the choice of words could affect appellate review of summary judgment determinations because the word “must” conjures up the prospect of mandamus.

A member stated that if the committee were to change the verb to “must,” it would clearly be a substantive change. Judge Kravitz responded that the committee

would have to conclude that “shall” had meant “must” all along, that it would not be a substantive change, and that the committee had made a mistake in the restyling process.

A member argued, however, that most lawyers and judges believed that “shall,” formerly used in Rule 56, had meant “must.” Therefore, the 2007 restyling change to “should” was substantive. Judge Kravitz responded, though, that research had revealed cases where courts of appeals had held that district courts had discretion not to grant summary judgment, even though the operative language of the rule was “shall.”

A motion was made to publish the Rule 56(a) amendments for comment in a form that sets out and highlights “should” and “must” as alternatives and also solicits comment on the concept of treating complete summary judgment differently from partial judgment in this regard.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 56(a) for publication, subject to further refinement in language.

RULE 56(b) and (c)(1)-(2)

A member observed that the term “response” appears in several places in proposed Rule 56(b) and (c), but it is confusing because Rule 56(c) intends it to include only a factual statement, and not the response in full. He recommended that the language be modified to make it clear that a “response” does not include a brief.

A member noted that proposed Rule 56(c)(2)(A) specifies that a party must file a motion, response, and reply. Then Rule 56(c)(2)(B) refers to a response that includes a statement of facts. He suggested that the language state that the party must file a response and a separate statement of facts, rather than have the statement included in the response.

A participant noted that proposed Rule 56(b)(2) states that “a party opposing the motion must file a response within 21 days after the motion is served or a responsive pleading is due, whichever is later.” But the filing of the summary judgment motion means that an answer is not due. Thus, there will never be a responsive pleading “21 days after . . . a responsive pleading is due.”

Professor Cooper explained that the impetus for the provision had come from the Department of Justice. The Department pointed out that a plaintiff may serve a summary judgment motion together with the complaint. This is common, for example, in collection actions. The Department has 60 days to answer a complaint. Under the proposed rule, however, it would have to respond to a plaintiff’s summary judgment motion before its deadline for filing an answer to the complaint. For that reason, the

advisory committee added the language “or a responsive pleading is due, whichever is later.” What the committee meant to say was something like: “or if the party opposing summary judgment has a longer time to file an answer to the complaint.” Mr. Tenpas concurred, noting that the Department did not want to be required to respond to a motion for summary judgment before even being required to answer the complaint. He suggested that perhaps the provision could be fixed by saying, “or a responsive pleading is due from that party.”

A participant pointed out that the problem is that the provision was intended to cover summary judgment motions filed by plaintiffs, but as written it covers all parties. Several participants suggested improvements in language, including breaking out the provision into parts to specify how it will operate in each situation. Judge Rosenthal recommended that Professor Cooper and Judge Kravitz consider the suggestions and return to the committee with substitute language.

Judge Kravitz explained that Rule 56(c) spells out the primary feature of the revised rule – its three-step, point-counterpoint procedure. He reported that the advisory committee had made a number of improvements since the last standing committee meeting, and he thanked Professor Steven Gensler, a member of the advisory committee, for devising a more logical, clearer format for the rule.

Judge Kravitz pointed out that one of the criticisms of the three-step process comes from lawyers who have had to defend complex cases where a moving party may list 500 or so facts in a summary judgment motion. It is just too difficult, he said, for the opposing party to go through them all and respond to each. Most local rules, moreover, do not give a party the right to admit a fact solely for purposes of the summary judgment motion. Accordingly, the proposed rule specifies that a party need not admit or deny every allegation of an undisputed fact, but may admit a fact solely for purposes of the motion. This, he said, was an important improvement.

He also noted that the words “without argument” had been deleted from proposed Rule 56(c)(5) because they were confusing and unnecessary. The committee note, moreover, explains that argument belongs in a party’s brief, not in its response or reply to a statement of fact.

A member reported that, in his experience, the procedure contemplated in proposed Rule 56(c) is essentially standard practice in many districts already. He pointed out, though, that the proposed language of Rule 56(c)(2)(B) was confusing in part because it specifies that a party opposing a motion “must file a response that includes a statement.” The “response” and the “statement” accepting or disputing specified facts are two separate things. Another member agreed and pointed out that the confusion results in part because the rule requires a moving party to file three documents and the opposing party to file two.

Another explained that a party opposing a motion must actually file four things: (1) a statement opposing the motion for summary judgment; (2) a “counterpoint” response, *i.e.*, a response to each of the undisputed facts enumerated by the moving party; (3) a statement pointing out any other facts that the opposing party contends are disputed; and (4) a brief. It is not intended, though, that the opposing party actually file four separate documents. But it would be useful for the rule to flag for opposing parties that the second and third items are separate concepts.

Another member agreed that the current formulation needs to be refined and suggested devising a new term that would denominate the whole package that the moving party must file and the whole package that the responding party must file. Lawyers should be given clear directions as to exactly what they are expected to provide.

A motion was made to approve proposed Rule 56(b) and 56(c)(1-2) for publication, subject to Judge Kravitz, Professor Cooper, and the Rule 56 Subcommittee making further improvements in the language consistent with the committee’s discussion.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 56(b) and (c)(1-2) for publication, subject to further refinement in language.

RULE 56 (c)(3)-(6)

A member noted that proposed Rule 56(c)(3) specifies that “a party may accept or dispute a fact” for purposes of the motion only. It makes perfect sense for a party to accept a fact for purposes of the motion only, but for what purpose would a party ever dispute a fact for purposes of the motion only? Judge Kravitz responded that the advisory committee had focused only on “accepting” a fact for purposes of the motion, and had not considered “disputing” a fact for purposes of the motion.

A member noted that, under proposed Rule 56(c)(4), the court may consider other materials in the record to grant summary judgment “if it gives notice under Rule 56(f).” He suggested that the reference to Rule 56(f) is unnecessary because that rule itself covers the notice that the court must give.

In addition, he noted that proposed Rule 56(c)(6) states that an affidavit or declaration must “set out facts that would be admissible in evidence.” The affidavit itself, though, would be admissible in evidence only if the affiant were testifying at trial. The language may cause some confusion because an affidavit submitted in support of or in opposition to summary judgment need not itself be admissible in evidence, but the facts do have to be admissible. Courts often receive affidavits that set out hearsay, but hearsay evidence is not enough to defeat summary judgment.

A participant noted that “facts” are not admissible in evidence and suggested that it would be better to say “facts that can be proven by admissible evidence.” Another pointed out, though, that the language had been taken directly from the current Rule 56(e)(1), even though the terminology is not accurate. No court will be misled, and it does not appear to present a serious problem in practice that needs to be fixed. Another member recommended that no change be made because it might appear to signal a substantive change.

A member suggested that proposed Rule 56(c)(5), specifying that “a response or reply . . . may state without argument,” should be revised to refer explicitly to a party’s brief, where “argument” should be made. Another member suggested, though, that the rule should not go into detail as to how parties should combine their papers. It is an area where trial judges will want flexibility to prescribe procedures.

A motion was made to approve the rest of proposed Rule 56(c) for publication, with appropriate revisions in language to incorporate the suggestions made at the meeting.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 56(c)(3)-(6) for publication, subject to further refinement in language.

RULE 56(e)

Judge Kravitz explained that proposed Rule 56(e) enumerates the actions that a trial judge may take if the party opposing a summary judgment motion does not properly respond to the motion. He pointed out that if a party does not cite support to show that a particular fact is disputed, the court may deem the fact undisputed for purposes of the motion. But that by itself does not automatically entitle the moving party to summary judgment.

He noted that the advisory committee had decided not to spell out in detail what a judge should do with defective motions. There is a good deal of case law on the subject, and judges have experience in dealing with them. A member added that the committee note should explain that giving the opposing party notice and a further opportunity to respond will often be all that a court needs to do.

RULE 56(f)

A member asked whether the language of proposed Rule 56(f)(2), allowing a judge to “grant or deny the motion on grounds not raised by the motion or response,” refers only to legal grounds not raised, or also to other facts not raised. Judge Kravitz responded that the language is intended to be broad and cover both.

RULE 56(g)

Judge Kravitz reported that proposed Rule 56(g) had been revised substantially since the last standing committee meeting. It would give a court substantial discretion when it does not grant all the relief requested by a motion for summary judgment.

A member pointed out that the committee note sets out several reasons why a trial court might not want to grant partial summary judgment. He suggested that the note would be more balanced if it also stated the reasons why a court should grant partial summary judgment, as set forth in Judge Kravitz's memorandum accompanying the proposed rule.

A member pointed out that the committee note refers to the trial of facts and issues at "little cost," and suggested that the words be deleted because there are always substantial costs to a trial.

Judge Kravitz observed that if the committee were to decide that there should be a revised section addressing partial summary judgment – in response to the suggestions that judges should have discretion to deny a worthy partial summary judgment motion but not a worthy summary judgment on the whole case – proposed Rule 56(g) would need to be folded into that section.

A participant suggested that the language of proposed Rule 56(g) that "any material fact – including an item of damages or other relief – that is not genuinely in dispute" is confusing. An item of damages is not a material fact. He suggested that the provision would be clearer if it referred to "any material fact, item of damages, or other relief." Judge Kravitz pointed out that the advisory committee had merely retained the language of the current rule, though it might be improved.

A member noted that proposed Rule 56(c)(3) permits a party to accept a fact for purposes of the motion only. But then proposed Rule 56(g) allows a court to treat the fact as established in the case. Would the party have to be given notice if the court is considering treating the fact as established in the case?

Judge Kravitz responded that this should not happen because the party has accepted the fact for purposes of the motion only. The judge should not be able to use the party's limited admission for any other purpose. The member speculated, though, that a party might try to prevent a trial judge from finding a fact established in the case under Rule 56(g) precisely by using the stratagem of admitting the fact for purposes of the motion only. Another member agreed, suggesting that the rule seemed to present a paradox. Judge Kravitz noted, though, that judges rarely enter a Rule 56(g) order anyway.

A member stated that it might be advisable to delete proposed Rule 56(g). Under the current proposal, if a party admits a fact for purposes of the motion only, some further procedure should be required before the judge may enter an order under Rule 56(g) finding the fact established in the case. Judge Kravitz noted that the proposed Rule 56(g) material is in the current rule, and he suggested that it remain in the rule for publication and that public comment might be solicited on whether it is still needed.

RULE 56(h)

Judge Kravitz reported that defense counsel had urged that the rule specify that sanctions be imposed when a summary judgment motion is made or opposed in bad faith. But, he said, the advisory committee had decided to avoid the inevitably controversial issue of sanctions.

A motion was made to approve for publication the remainder of proposed Rule 56, with drafting improvements to incorporate the suggestions made at the meeting.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the remainder of FED. R. CIV. P. 56 for publication, subject to further refinement in language.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26

Judge Kravitz reported that both plaintiffs' and defendants' lawyers have voiced strong support for the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(2) (disclosure of expert testimony) and FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(4)(A) (trial preparation protection for experts' draft reports, disclosures, and communications with attorneys). He pointed out that lawyers commonly opt out of the current rule by stipulation. The proposed amendments, he said, do not go as far as some may want in shielding all expert materials from discovery. For example, they do not place an expert's work papers totally out of bounds for discovery.

Under the current regime, he explained, lawyers engage in all kinds of devices to make sure that little or no preparatory material involving experts is created that could be discovered. Among other things, lawyers may hire two experts – one to analyze and one to testify. They may also direct experts to take no notes, prepare no drafts, or work through staff whenever possible.

Judge Kravitz noted that lawyers expend a great deal of time and expense in examining experts about their communications with lawyers and the extent to which lawyers may have contributed to their reports. But the outcome of cases rarely turns on these matters. Although some benefit may accrue to the truth-seeking function by having

more information available about lawyer-expert communications, the benefits are far outweighed by the high costs of the current system.

He emphasized that it is very important for the proposed amendments to Rule 26 to be clearly written. If the rule is vague, it will not succeed in reducing the high costs of the current rule because lawyers will not feel secure about the extent of the rule's protections. It would lead to unnecessary litigation over the meaning of the text, and lawyers will continue to engage in the kinds of artificial behavior regarding their experts that the advisory committee is trying to avoid.

RULE 26(a)(2)

Judge Kravitz explained that the proposed amendments to Rule 26(a)(2)(C) would require lawyers to provide a summary of a non-retained expert's testimony. The advisory committee, he said, had deliberately used the word "summary," rather than "report," to make it clear that a detailed description is not needed. The committee, he said, was concerned about placing additional burdens on attorneys.

A member asked whether the provision is intended to cover a lay witness described by FED. R. EVID. 701. Judge Kravitz responded that a witness under Rule 701 – one who is not an expert witness – is not covered by the amendments, and a lawyer would not be required to provide a summary of the testimony of a non-expert witness.

The member added that some witnesses do not testify as experts, but nonetheless have specialized knowledge. Judge Kravitz pointed out that proposed Rule 26(a)(2)(C) does in fact cover witnesses who are both fact-witnesses and expert-witnesses, and a summary must be provided of their expert testimony.

RULE 26(b)(4)(A)

Judge Kravitz said that under current Rule 26 anything told to or shown to an expert is discoverable. But under proposed Rule 26(b)(4)(A), work-product protection would be extended both to an expert's draft reports and to the communications between a party's attorney and the expert, with three exceptions: (1) compensation for the expert's study or testimony; (2) facts or data supplied by the attorney that the expert considered in forming the opinions to be expressed; and (3) assumptions supplied by the attorney that the expert relied upon in forming the opinions to be expressed. Under current Rule 26(b)(3), work-product protection is limited to "documents and tangible things." But the work-product protection proposed in the amendment would be broader, in the sense that it would cover all lawyer-expert communications not within any of the three exceptions, even if not "documents or tangible things."

A member stated that the proposed changes are excellent. He noted that lawyers now opt out of the current rule by stipulation or play games to avoid discovery of experts' draft reports and communications. He asked whether an attorney who deposes an expert and has a copy of the expert's report may ask the expert whether the attorney who has retained him or her had helped write the report or had made any changes in it. Judge Kravitz said that the question could not be asked under the proposed rule because inquiries about lawyer-expert communications would be out of bounds for discovery. The proposal, he said, is fair because it applies to drafts and communications on both sides.

A member suggested that the key question for the jury to decide is whether it can rely on an expert's opinion because it is based on the expert's own personal expertise. Therefore, the opposition should be permitted to pursue inquiries that could establish that the expert's opinion is not really an independent assessment reflecting the expert's own expertise, but the views of the attorney hiring the expert. Judge Kravitz pointed out, though, that the expert's report itself is not in evidence. The opposition can probe fully into the basis for the expert's opinions, but it just cannot ask whether the lawyer wrote the report. Who wrote the report is not important to the jury, and the jury does not even see the report. The key purpose of the report is really to apprise the opposition of the nature of the expert's testimony.

A member stated that he always enters into stipulations opting out of the current expert-witness provisions of Rule 26 because the current rule leads to a great deal of needless game-playing, discovery, and cross-examination. He explained that he always provides an outline for an expert to use at trial in order to help organize the testimony for the witness. The testimony, though, is that of the expert, not the lawyer. Requiring the outline to be turned over creates largely irrelevant disputes over authorship and distracts from the substance of the expert's testimony. The proposed rule, he concluded, is a major improvement over current practice and is consistent with what good lawyers on all sides are doing right now. And it does not favor one side or the other.

Professor Coquillette agreed and reported that he has often served as an expert witness in attorney-misconduct cases. Under the Massachusetts state rule, which is similar to the advisory committee's proposal, state trial judges do not allow inquiry into who wrote an expert's report. The cases go to trial, and the experts are cross-examined at the trial, but there are no long cross-examinations or interrogations. The jury bases its decision in the final analysis on what the expert says on substance. The state rule, he said, does not take away anything important from the truth-finding process.

On the other hand, in professional malpractice cases in the federal court in Massachusetts, it is routine for an expert to be deposed for an entire day. In the end, though, almost all the cases are settled without trial.

A member asked what the advisory committee had meant by using different language in the last two bulleted exceptions. One would allow discovery of facts and data that an expert “considered,” while the other allows inquiry into assumptions that the expert “relied upon.” Professor Cooper explained that it is legitimate for the opposition to ask whether an expert considered a particular fact provided by an attorney. But a more restrictive test is appropriate regarding “assumptions” provided by the attorney.

A participant argued that proposed Rule 26(a)(2)(B) explicitly requires an expert report to be “prepared and signed by the witness.” Thus, the opposition should be able to ask whether the witness actually prepared the report and whether any part of it had been written by a lawyer. Judge Kravitz responded that the advisory committee had considered removing the word “prepared” from the rule and simply require that a report be signed by the witness. The committee note states clearly that a lawyer may provide assistance in writing the report, but the report should reflect the testimony to be given by the witness. The signature of the expert witness on the report means that he or she embraces it and offers it as his or her own testimony.

At trial, the opposing party may ask whether the expert agrees with the substance and language of the report, but it does not matter who actually drafted it. The current rule uses the word “prepared” and anticipates that a lawyer will provide assistance in drafting the report. But discovery should not be allowed into who wrote which parts of the report or who suggested which words to use. That is what has led to all the excessive costs and artificial gamesmanship that the proposed amendments are designed to eliminate.

A member stated that the proposed amendments are a great idea that will save the enormous time and expense now wasted on discovery into draft reports and lawyer-expert communications. He said that the litigation process should not be cluttered up with the extraneous and expensive issues of who “prepared” expert reports and opinions.

A member noted that under FED. R. EVID. 705 (disclosure of facts or data underlying expert opinion) and other provisions, experts routinely rely on other people, such as lab technicians. Much expert testimony is really the assimilation of much background information, rather than the work of one person. Perhaps a better word could be used than “prepared,” but it should be understood that an expert’s report will often involve collaboration. An expert could not function properly without speaking with others. If the expert signs the report, and by so doing stands by its substance, it really does not matter who supplied the actual words.

Another member observed that the rule deals with discovery, not trial. But the net effect of it will be to keep some evidence away from a jury, on the theory that it involves work product worthy of protection. Generally, expert witnesses have no direct knowledge of the facts of a case. They bring their own specialized knowledge to the

case, based on their professional expertise, not the lawyer's. A report is required in order for the expert to testify. It is different from a lawyer's communications with an expert. The opposition should be able to inquire into the circumstances of the production of a report that the court requires to be filed.

A member pointed out that most cases settle, and the proposed amendments will clearly reduce the costs of litigation by not allowing discovery of draft reports or inquiry into whether lawyers contributed to preparation. She noted that the three bulleted exceptions in Rule 26(b)(4)(A) draw a distinction between facts or data "considered" and assumptions "relied upon" that will likely lead to litigation over whether something was considered versus relied upon. She suggested that the distinction be eliminated and that in all cases the reference should be to matters "considered, reviewed, or relied upon."

A participant also questioned the validity of the distinction between "facts and data" and "assumptions," suggesting that the third bulleted exception be eliminated and the rule refer only to "facts and data."

The lawyer members of the committee were asked about the contents of the stipulations they use in opting out of the current rule. One responded that the stipulations he negotiates specify that neither party may ask for the drafts of experts, and no discovery will be allowed of lawyer-expert communications leading up to the expert's report. He added that his stipulations, though, allow the other party to ask whether the expert actually drafted the entire report.

Another member, however, said that his stipulations prohibit any inquiry into authorship. He emphasized that if questions of that nature were allowed, it would make more sense just to let the draft reports themselves be discovered because they will establish more reliably whether the expert wrote the whole report. The opposing party, he said, should only be allowed to ask whether the expert's opinion is his or her own, how the expert reached that opinion, and what supports the opinion. All the questions concerning the role of counsel in preparing the report, although not technically irrelevant, are largely pointless. There is no end to the inquiries, and they lead to endless, needless expense. Therefore, in the absence of a stipulation, lawyers and experts are forced to engage in artificialities, put nothing in writing, and avoid communications. As a result, it takes the expert much longer to draft a report, adding another large expense.

Judge Kravitz reiterated that it was important to keep in mind that the central purpose of the report is to provide the other side with notice of what the expert is going to testify about at the trial. It is not to find out who wrote each word.

A member emphasized that the real debate is over how much can be asked of the witness in cross-examination. There is a trade-off between what the other side may find out during cross-examination and the sheer cost of the exercise. Judge Rosenthal added

that the minimal benefits of the information that would be lost under the proposed amendments are simply not worth the expense of the current system.

A member stated that, under the current rule, if he cannot reach a stipulation with the other side to bar discovery of drafts and lawyer-expert communications, he will fight to obtain all the drafts. Unless an attorney knows what the other party can or cannot do, as set forth in a rule or stipulation, he or she will want all reports and communications. It would be best for the committee to cut off this kind of discovery entirely. The proposed amendments, he said, reflect the best of current practice. Without them, though, he will continue to negotiate stipulations.

A member stated that in testing an expert, the opposing party will probe for any inconsistencies between the expert's testimony and what is set forth in the report. The expert may explain an inconsistency by admitting that the particular point in the report had been written by the lawyer. The opposing party should not have to wait to learn about the inconsistency for the first time when the expert is on the witness stand. Inquiry into the inconsistency should be allowed during the discovery process.

In addition, a witness may be impeached by inquiry into the methodology used. It is important to know whether an attorney channeled the methodology for the expert. In other parts of the law, for example, it is common to have statements prepared by lawyers and signed by others, such as affidavits. Law-enforcement agents, for example, do not always write their affidavits in support of search warrants. Moreover, cross-examination is allowed in criminal cases. Issues of inconsistency may arise between a criminal defendant's testimony and a suppression report written by the lawyer. There should not be a different rule for civil and criminal cases.

A member asked why, in proposed Rule 26(b)(4)(A)(iii), the protections and restrictions apply only to a witness who is "required to provide a report." A treating physician, for example, who is not required to file a report under rule 26(a)(2)(B), should be entitled to the same work-product protection. Professor Cooper explained that if the treating physician is not retained by counsel, the work-product protection is really not needed. The relationship with the lawyer for a retained expert is not the same. Therefore, the protection applies only to retained witnesses.

Judge Kravitz suggested the example of an expert witness who is a state trooper, not retained by counsel. There is no need for the lawyer's communications with the trooper to receive work-product protection because there is no special relationship between the two. Troopers and family physicians testify essentially as fact witnesses, although they give some expert advice. The professional witness, on the other hand, is part of the litigation team.

A motion was made to approve the proposed amendments to Rule 26 for publication and to solicit specific public comment on the issues identified during the committee's discussions. Judge Kravitz added that the proposed amendments were still subject to style and format improvements.

The committee, with one member opposed, by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to Rule 26 for publication.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Tallman and Professor Beale presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Tallman's memorandum and attachments of May 12, 2008 (Agenda Item 9).

Amendments for Final Approval by the Judicial Conference

TIME-COMPUTATION RULES

FED. R. CRIM. P. 5.1, 7, 12.1, 12.3, 29, 33, 34, 35, 41, 45, 47, 58, and 59
and
HABEAS CORPUS RULE 8

As noted above on pages 9 and 12, the committee approved for submission to the Judicial Conference the proposed time-computation amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Rules Governing §2254 Cases and § 2255 Proceedings.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 7, 32, and 32.2

CRIMINAL FORFEITURE

Judge Tallman reported that the proposed amendments to FED. R. CRIM. P. 7 (indictment and information), FED. R. CRIM. P. 32 (sentencing), and FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.2 (forfeiture), dealing with criminal forfeiture, had been initiated at the request of the Department of Justice. They were drafted by an ad hoc subcommittee that had enjoyed significant input from lawyers who specialize in forfeiture matters, both from the Department and the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. The amendments essentially incorporate current practice as it has developed since the forfeiture rules were revised in 2000.

Judge Tallman explained that in some districts the government currently includes criminal forfeiture as a separate count in the indictment and specifies the property to be

forfeited. The proposed rule would specify that the government's notice of forfeiture should not be designated as a count of the indictment. The indictment would only have to provide general notice that forfeiture is being sought, without identifying the specific property to be forfeited. Forfeiture, instead, would be handled through the separate ancillary proceeding set forth in FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.2.

Professor Beale pointed out that the proposal was not controversial and represents a consensus between the Department of Justice and private forfeiture experts. She walked the committee through the details of the amendments and pointed out that they elaborate on existing practice and eliminate some uncertainties regarding the 2000 forfeiture amendments.

A member pointed to language in the committee note cautioning against general orders of forfeiture (where the property to be forfeited cannot be readily identified), except in "unusual circumstances," and asked what those circumstances might be. Judge Tallman suggested that a general order might be appropriate when the government demonstrates that funds derived from narcotics have been used to buy other property. The defendant, in essence, tries to hide assets and the government seeks to forfeit an equivalent amount of property.

Professor Beale pointed out that other examples are found in the cases cited in the note. She noted that the 2000 amendments allowed a forfeiture order to be amended after property has been recovered. Thus, some flexibility in forfeiting property is already accepted in the rules and in case law, although the outer boundary of forfeiture law is still somewhat ambiguous.

Judge Tallman added that the concept of forfeiture is driven by the "relation-back" doctrine, under which the sovereign acquires title to the property obtained by wrongdoing at the time of the wrong. The rule follows the money and perfects the sovereign's interest in an equivalent value of property. A participant recommended using the term "tracing" in the rule, and Judge Tallman suggested that the committee note might add the words "to identify and trace those assets."

A member pointed to an inconsistency in the proposed rule that needed to be corrected. Under proposed Rule 32.2(b)(6)(A) publication by the government is mandatory. But Rule 32.2(b)(6)(C) specifies that publication is unnecessary if any exception in Supplemental Rule G(4)(a)(i) applies.

Professor Beale suggested changing the heading of Rule 32.2(b)(6)(C) to make it clear that there are exceptions to (A)'s mandatory publication requirement. She noted that the style consultant had advised against adding a cross-reference to subparagraph (C) in

Rule 32.2(b)(6)(A). A member suggested turning the proposed last sentence of (C) into a separate subparagraph (D), but Professor Kimble suggested that it would be better to pull the proposed last sentence of (C) back into (A). Professor Beale recommended that the committee approve the rule subject to further drafting improvements.

A participant noted that proposed Rule 32.2(b)(4)(C) specifies that “a party may file an appeal regarding that property under FED. R. APP. P. 4(b)” and asked whether it applies to an appeal by a third party. Professor Beale responded that the advisory committee had intended the language to refer only to the defendant or the government, not to third parties. It was suggested, therefore, that the rule might be amended to read: “the defendant or the government may file an appeal.” A member noted that third parties are not atypical in forfeiture proceedings, and they need to be considered. The defendant takes an appeal from the judgment of conviction, but that obviously does not apply to a third party. So some guidance would be appropriate. Professor Struve added that third parties are not specifically mentioned in FED. R. APP. P. 4.

A member noted that the provision deals only with an appeal of the sentence and judgment. Forfeiture, on the other hand, is an ancillary proceeding governed by Supplemental Rule G. Therefore, no separate provision is needed in the criminal rules. A member added that proposed Rule 32.2(b)(4)(A) states that an order “remains preliminary as to third parties until the ancillary proceeding is concluded.”

A member emphasized the need to have the rule make clear when third parties are included and when they are not. He moved to replace the term “a party” with “the defendant or the government” throughout Rule 32.2(b)(6)(A) and (B). Another member suggested that consideration be given to making a global change, such as by adding a new definition in FED. R. CRIM. P. 1 that would define the term “party” for the entire Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Judge Rosenthal agreed that the suggestion may have merit, but it would take considerable time to accomplish. She suggested, therefore, that the committee ask Judge Tallman, Professor Beale, the style subcommittee, and the forfeiture experts to refine the language of the amendments in light of the committee’s discussion. Judge Tallman added that the advisory committee would favor changing the terminology in Rule 32(b)(6)(2)(C) from “a party” to “the defendant or the government.”

Judge Rosenthal recommended that the committee approve the proposed forfeiture rules, subject to the advisory committee, working with others, further refining the exact language of the amendments.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed forfeiture amendments for approval by the Judicial Conference, subject to revisions by the advisory committee along the lines discussed at the meeting.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 41

Judge Tallman stated that the amendments to FED. R. CRIM. P. 41 (search and seizure) had been drafted to address challenges that courts are facing due to advances in technology. They would establish a two-step procedure for seizing electronically stored information. He noted that a huge volume of data is stored on computers and other electronic devices that law-enforcement agents often must search extensively after probable cause has been established.

Judge Tallman reported that the advisory committee had seen a demonstration of the latest technology at its April 2007 meeting. He noted, for example, that technology now on the market can prevent anyone from making a duplicate image of electronically stored information. Thus, agents in some cases must seize entire computers because they cannot duplicate the contents for off-site review. The Department of Justice, he said, reports that this process requires substantial additional time to execute warrants properly.

To address problems of this sort, the proposed rule sets out a two-step process. First, the data-storage device may be seized. Second, the device may be searched and the contents reviewed. The court may designate a magistrate judge or special master to oversee the search. Maximum discretion is given to judges to provide appropriate relief to aggrieved parties.

Professor Beale stated that the law on particularity under the Fourth Amendment is inconsistent and still evolving. The proposed rule, she said, is not intended to govern the developing case law on the specificity required for a warrant, but merely sets up a procedure. The warrant would authorize both seizure of the device and later review of the contents. The owner of the device may come into the court and seek return of the device or other appropriate relief.

A member stated that the rule makes a great deal of sense, but asked whether the advisory committee had considered how likely it is that a Fourth Amendment challenge will be brought to the proposed procedure. Professor Beale responded that the challenge would not be to the rule per se, but to particular orders or warrants issued under it. In other words, there will be the usual challenges to the breadth of the warrants, but the rule will not be invalidated.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for approval by the Judicial Conference.

HABEAS CORPUS RULES 11 and 12

Judge Tallman explained that the Rules Governing §§ 2254 Cases and 2255 Proceedings conform to the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act. The statute aims to narrow the focus of issues that might justify issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. When the district court denies a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, it enters a judgment. Under the statute, a certificate of appealability must then be entered before an appeal may be taken by the petitioner, but it is unclear how and by whom it is issued. The Act, in fact, allows it to be issued by a district judge, the court of appeals, or a circuit justice.

Judge Tallman explained that the great majority of petitioners are pro se inmates, and the rules create a potential trap for them. District judges normally will first enter a judgment denying a habeas corpus petition and then later issue a certificate of appealability. But in waiting for the certificate to issue (and often seeking reconsideration of the denial of the certificate), inmates may fail to file a timely appeal. They are generally unaware that motions for a certificate of appealability do not toll the time for filing an appeal.

Judge Tallman said that the advisory committee had attempted to draft new Rule 11 in a way that spells out as clearly as possible, both in § 2254 cases and § 2255 proceedings what inmates have to do. The judges on the committee, he said, believe that district judges should normally issue or deny the certificate at the end of the case, when the facts and issues are still fresh in the judge's mind.

Professor Beale reported that the public comments had expressed some differences of opinion on this issue. Some had suggested that it would be better to bifurcate the two court decisions and allow a district judge to decide on the certificate later than ordering entry of the judgment. But, she said, the advisory committee had concluded that it is important for the court to make the two decisions together, both to promote trial court efficiency and to avoid misleading prison inmates. The committee, however, did revise the proposal after publication to give a trial judge the option of ordering briefing on the issues before deciding on the certificate of appealability. The court may also delay its ruling, if necessary, and include the two actions in a joint ruling. Judge Tallman added that the advisory committee had tried to make it clear in the last sentence of proposed Rule 11(a) that a motion for reconsideration of the denial of a certificate of appealability does not extend the time to appeal.

A member agreed that the revisions to Rule 11 will provide better information to pro se litigants, but questioned the companion amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b). The appellate rule, he suggested, assumes that the district court's decision on issuing the certificate of appealability will be made after the notice of appeal has been filed and sent to the court of appeals. But under the proposed revisions to Rule 11, the certificate of appealability will usually be issued before a notice of appeal is filed.

Judge Tallman responded that it was not necessarily true that the certificate will issue before the notice of appeal is filed. Under the governing statute, an appeal cannot be filed without a certificate of appealability. Thus, if the court of appeals receives a notice of appeal without a certificate of appealability, it must consider asking the district court to decide on issuing a certificate or granting one itself. Several participants suggested possible improvements in the language of the proposed amendment. One noted that if a habeas petitioner files a notice of appeal without a certificate of appealability, his circuit deems the notice of appeal to be a motion for a certificate of appealability.

A member pointed out that proposed Rule 11 specifies that the district court “must” issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order. She suggested that the verb be changed to “should” in order to give district judges discretion in appropriate circumstances. Judge Tallman reported that the advisory committee had deliberately chosen the word “must,” believing that a district judge could delay issuing the joint order and certificate to allow time for briefing, if necessary. He said that the advisory committee would be amenable to changing the language if the standing committee preferred to give trial judges greater discretion.

Current Rule 11 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases would be renumbered as Rule 12.

A motion was made to approve proposed Rule 11, retaining the verb “must.”

The committee, with one objection, by voice vote approved the proposed amendments to the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases and § 2255 Proceedings for approval by the Judicial Conference.

A motion was made to approve the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1), with a change in language to read, “If the district court issues a certificate, the district clerk must send the certificate”

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendment to FED. R. APP. P. 22(b)(1) for approval by the Judicial Conference.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. CRIM. P. 6

Judge Tallman reported that the proposed amendment to FED. R. CRIM. P. 6 (grand jury) had been brought to the advisory committee's attention by magistrate judges, who noted that in some districts no judge is present in the city where the grand jury sits. Therefore, a magistrate judge may have to travel hundreds of miles just to receive the return of an indictment. The proposed amendment would authorize a magistrate judge to take the return by video teleconference.

A participant questioned the language of the amendment that specifies that a judge may take the return "by video teleconference in the court where the grand jury sits." He suggested that the proper phrasing might be "from the court . . ." Alternatively, the sentence might end after the word "teleconference." Professor Beale responded that the advisory committee wanted to have the return by the grand jury made in a courtroom in order to maintain the solemnity of the proceedings.

A member pointed out that the committee note states that the indictment may be transmitted to the judge in advance for the judge's review. She said that it is surprising that the matter is addressed in the note, rather than the rule itself, because it is essential that the indictment be sent to the judge in advance by reliable telegraphic means.

Judge Tallman agreed that the judge should have a copy of the indictment in hand. The judge would conduct the proceedings remotely by videoconference, and a deputy clerk would be physically present in the courtroom with the grand jury to receive and file the indictment.

A member pointed out that he had served as an assistant U.S. attorney in three different districts, and the practice of receiving grand jury returns varied in each. Nevertheless, there is always at least a deputy clerk present to receive and file the indictment. Judge Tallman emphasized that the thrust of the proposed rule is merely to authorize a judge's participation by video teleconference, not to regularize grand jury practices.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for publication.

Judge Rosenthal stated that there may be some advantage to deferring publication of the proposed amendment to Rule 6 because it may be an unnecessary burden to couple it for publication with the potentially controversial proposed amendments to Rule 15. She suggested that it might be better to publish the amendments to Rule 15 in August 2008, review the public reaction to them, and then publish the amendment to Rule 6 at a later date. She emphasized that no decision had been made on the matter, but asked the committee's approval to delay publication if she deems it appropriate.

The committee without objection by voice vote agreed that the chair of the committee may decide on the timing of publication of the proposed amendment.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 15

Judge Tallman stated that the proposed amendments to FED. R. CRIM. P. 15 (depositions) would authorize, in very limited circumstances, the taking of depositions outside the United States and outside the presence of the criminal defendant, when the presence of a witness for trial cannot be obtained. The procedure, for example, would be permissible when the presence of the witness in the United States cannot be secured because the witness is beyond the district court's subpoena power and the foreign nation in which the witness is located will not permit the Marshals Service to bring the defendant to the deposition.

Judge Tallman noted a recent decision of the Fourth Circuit upholding the taking of depositions in Saudi Arabia in an al-Qaeda case. The Saudi Arabian government would not permit the witnesses to come to the United States. So the district court authorized a video conference where the defendant was in Virginia and the witnesses in Saudi Arabia. The witnesses could see the defendant, and the defendant could see the witnesses. The procedures contained in the proposed amendments, he said, mirror what the Fourth Circuit approved in that case.

Judge Tallman pointed out that the advisory committee was particularly sensitive in this area because the Supreme Court had reviewed earlier proposed amendments in 2002 and had declined to transmit a proposed amendment to FED. R. CRIM. P. 26 to Congress. At that time, Justice Scalia questioned the constitutionality of this kind of procedure, but said it might be permissible if there were case-specific findings that it is necessary to further an important public policy. Judge Tallman explained that the advisory committee had tried to meet Justice Scalia's concerns. Thus, proposed Rule 15(c)(3) lists in detail all the factors that the court must find in order for a deposition to be taken without the defendant's physical presence.

Professor Beale added that the proposed rule would require a court to determine, on a case-by-case basis, what technology is available and whether the technology permits reasonable participation by the defendant. The rule, she said, clearly establishes a preference for the witness to be brought to the United States and covers only those situations where the witness cannot come.

A member stated that certain nations would regard this procedure as a serious abuse of extraterritorial judicial authority by the United States and a violation of their sovereignty. Therefore, it might be helpful to state in the committee note that the

committee takes no position on whether the procedure might be legal in particular foreign nations.

A participant pointed out that the proposal was, in effect, a rule of evidence and suggested tying it to the language of FED. R. EVID. 807(b) (residual exception to the hearsay rule) and its comparative requirement. Under the proposed amendments to FED. R. CRIM. P. 15, for example, the government might have many similar witnesses available in the United States, but their presence is not a listed factor that the court must consider. FED. R. EVID. 807(b), he said, would provide a better, tougher standard. He also questioned the reference in proposed Rule 15(c)(3)(A) to “substantial proof of a material fact.” Professor Beale responded that the phrase had been taken from the case law.

A member suggested that the standard in the rule need not be as narrow as FED. R. EVID. 807(b) because the testimony of the witness may not be hearsay evidence. In any event, though, she expressed doubts that the evidence produced by a deposition conducted under the proposed rule would be admissible.

Professor Beale agreed that the proposed rule does not address whether the information obtained from the witness will actually be admissible in evidence. But, she said, several circuits now have allowed district judges to craft specific arrangements in individual cases. The rule, she explained, had been drafted carefully to meet the constitutional standards and provide some structure that would make it possible in appropriate circumstances to have the evidence admitted. Of course, there is little point in conducting the deposition if it produces evidence that cannot be admitted.

A member pointed out that there are many procedural issues that the proposed rule does not address, such as the location of the prosecutor and defense lawyer during the deposition and the transmission of exhibits. She noted that the rule only addresses the initial approval and justification for conducting the deposition at all. Judge Tallman agreed that the advisory committee had intended to leave the logistical arrangements to the individual courts. Mr. Tenpas added that it is wise for the rule to avoid the technology issues because the technology is changing rapidly. It is appropriate that the rule simply focuses on when a court may allow a deposition to be taken. The Department of Justice, he said, supports the committee’s best efforts on the matter and hopes that the Supreme Court will accept the rule.

A member suggested adding another circumstance to the list of case-specific findings that support taking a deposition – the physical inability of a criminal defendant to travel to another country. Mr. Tenpas responded that that circumstance may fall within proposed Rule 15(c)(3)(D)(ii), “secure transportation . . . cannot be assured,” or proposed Rule 15(c)(3)(D)(iii), “no reasonable conditions will assure an appearance.”

A member asked whether the committee planned to ask specifically for public comments on the constitutional issues, especially since the Supreme Court had rejected a similar proposal in the past. Judge Rosenthal responded that the committee would solicit comments on the constitutionality of the proposed procedure, and it must be up front in the publication regarding the history of the earlier amendments submitted to the Supreme Court.

A member pointed out that in some cases the criminal defendant may request a deposition. In that event, the defendant's confrontation-clause rights are not implicated by the deposition. She suggested that the proposed rule would be useful in that situation.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for publication.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.1

Judge Tallman stated that the proposed amendment to FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.1(a)(6) (revoking or modifying probation or supervised release) had been brought to the committee's attention by magistrate judges. The current rule, he said, provides that a person accused of a violation of the conditions of probation or supervised release bears the burden of establishing that he or she will not flee or pose a danger, but it does not specify the standard of proof that must be met.

The Bail Reform Act specifies that a "clear and convincing evidence" standard applies at a defendant's initial appearance. Case law establishes that the same standard should be used in determining whether to revoke an order of probation or supervised release. The proposed amendment would explicitly state that the "clear and convincing evidence" standard of proof would apply in revocation proceedings.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for publication.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Hinkle and Professor Capra presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Hinkle's memorandum and attachments of May 12, 2008 (Agenda Item 8).

Amendments for Publication

RESTYLING THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

FED. R. EVID. 101-415

Judge Hinkle reported that the advisory committee was restyling the Federal Rules of Evidence in the same way that the appellate, criminal, and civil rules had been restyled to make them easier to read and more consistent, but without making any substantive changes. He pointed out that the committee was requesting approval at this meeting to publish the first third of the rules, FED. R. EVID. 101-415, but not to publish them immediately. The second third of the rules would be presented for approval at the January 2009 meeting, and the final third at the June 2009 meeting. All the restyled evidence rules would then be published as a single package in August 2009.

Judge Hinkle pointed out that additional changes may be needed in the first third of the rules because the advisory committee will have to go back later in the project to revisit all the rules for consistency. He also pointed to some global issues, such as whether the restyled rules should use the term “criminal defendant” or “defendant in a criminal case.” Other issues that the advisory committee had been dealing with, he noted, have been set forth in footnotes to the proposed rules. He emphasized that the proposed restyling changes had been very thoroughly vetted at the advisory committee level.

A member noted that the proposed revision of FED. R. EVID. 201(d) (judicial notice) refers to the “nature” of a noticed fact, rather than the “tenor” of the fact, as in the current rule. Professor Capra responded that the advisory committee had examined the case law and could find no discussion of what “tenor” means. As a result, it decided to use “nature,” rather than “tenor,” because it is easier to understand and does not represent a substantive change.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for delayed publication.

FED. R. EVID. 804(b)(3)

Judge Hinkle reported that FED. R. EVID. 804(b)(3) is the hearsay exception for a statement against interest by an unavailable witness. The proposed amendment, he said, would extend the corroborating circumstances requirement to all declarations against penal interest offered in criminal cases. He emphasized that the Department of Justice does not oppose the change.

He noted that the current rule requires corroborating circumstances if the defendant offers a statement, but not if the government does. The anomaly results from the fact that Congress, in drafting the rule, believed that the government could never use

the provision because case law under the Confrontation Clause would preclude it from submitting evidence under the rule.

The government, however, in fact can use the rule. Therefore, the provision does not impose parallel requirements on the government and the defendant. Nevertheless, some courts have held that the government must show corroborating circumstances, even though the current rule does not contain that requirement.

Judge Hinkle said that there was never any real rationale for the different treatment in the rule. It was just an historical accident because the drafters had assumed that the government could never use the provision.

He stated that the advisory committee had decided not to make any change in the rule regarding civil cases. The amendment, thus, would address only criminal cases. In addition, there are some other current misunderstandings about the rule that the committee decided not to address as part of the current proposal.

Professor Capra stated that the proposed amendments to Rule 804(b)(3) had not yet gone through style review. He pointed out that all the hearsay rules would be restyled together, which will require a great deal of work. Nevertheless, the advisory committee wanted to publish the substantive amendments to Rule 804(b)(3) now, with the understanding that the rule will be restyled in due course as part of the restyling process.

The committee without objection by voice vote approved the proposed amendments for publication.

Informational Item

Judge Hinkle reported that the most important matter currently affecting the evidence rules is the pending effort to get Congress to enact new FED. R. EVID. 502 (limitations on waiver of attorney-client privilege and work-product protection). The rule, he noted, had been approved unanimously by the Senate, but was still pending before the House Judiciary Committee.

Judge Hinkle noted that the advisory committee was continuing to monitor case law developments in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004). In that case, the Court held that admitting "testimonial" hearsay violates an accused's right to confrontation unless the accused has had an opportunity to cross-examine the declarant. He said that it is at least possible, in light of *Crawford* and the developing case law, that some hearsay exceptions may be subject to an

unconstitutional application in some circumstances. Case law developments to date suggest that rule amendments may not be necessary.

REPORT OF THE SEALING SUBCOMMITTEE

Judge Hartz, chair of the sealing subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee had decided to confine its inquiry to cases that have been totally sealed by a judge. The Federal Judicial Center, he noted, had been searching the courts' electronic databases to identify all cases filed in 2006 that have been sealed. It divided the civil cases into five categories: (1) False Claims Act cases; (2) cases related to grand jury proceedings; (3) cases involving juveniles; (4) cases involving seizures of property; and (5) all other cases. Criminal cases are being treated separately. In addition, the Center had contacted the clerks of the courts to obtain additional information about the cases. Its initial research to date had identified 74 sealed civil cases, 238 sealed criminal cases, and 3,631 cases sealed by magistrate judges. The Center reported that some of the sealed cases were later resolved by public opinions, including some published opinions.

Judge Hartz reported that the subcommittee planned to hold an additional meeting before the next meeting of the standing committee.

REPORT ON STANDING ORDERS

Judge Rosenthal reported that the committee, with the invaluable assistance of Professor Capra, was continuing its work on reviewing the use of standing orders in the courts. She said that a survey had just been distributed to chief district judges and chief bankruptcy judges, and a good deal of helpful information had been received. Professor Capra, she added, was working on proposed guidelines to assist courts in determining which subjects should be set forth in local rules of court and which may appropriately be relegated to standing orders. In addition, the courts will be urged to post all standing orders on their court web-sites.

NEXT MEETING

The committee agreed to hold the next meeting in early to mid-January 2009, with the exact date to be set after the members have had a chance to consult their calendars. By e-mail, the committee later decided to hold the meeting on Monday and Tuesday, January 12-13, in San Antonio, Texas.

Judge Kravitz reported that the civil rules committee was planning to hold three hearings on the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 26 and 56 – one on the east coast, one on the west coast, and one in the middle of the country. Judge Rosenthal recommended scheduling the hearings to coincide with upcoming committee meetings. Thus, one hearing will be held on November 17, 2008, in conjunction with the fall meeting of the civil rules committee in Washington, and another will be held in San Antonio on January 14, 2009, the day after the next meeting of the standing committee. The third will be held on February 2, 2009, in San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter G. McCabe,
Secretary