

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 14-15, 1999
Newton, Massachusetts

Minutes

The mid-year meeting of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure was held at the Boston College Law School in Newton, Massachusetts on Monday and Tuesday, June 14-15, 1999. The following members were present:

Judge Anthony J. Scirica, Chair
Judge Frank W. Bullock, Jr.
Charles J. Cooper, Esquire
Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.
Judge Phyllis A. Kravitch
Gene W. Lafitte, Esquire
Patrick F. McCartan, Esquire
Judge James A. Parker
Sol Schreiber, Esquire
Judge A. Wallace Tashima
Chief Justice E. Norman Veasey
Judge William R. Wilson, Jr.

Judge Morey L. Sear was unable to attend. The Department of Justice was represented at the meeting by Deputy Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr. and Associate Attorney General Raymond C. Fisher, both of whom attended the Monday portion of the meeting. Neal K. Katyal, Advisor to the Deputy Attorney General, also participated on behalf of the Department. Judge Robert E. Keeton, former chairman of the committee, and Francis H. Fox, former member of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, also attended the meeting.

Providing support to the committee were: Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, reporter to the committee; Peter G. McCabe, secretary to the committee; John K. Rabiej, chief of the Rules Committee Support Office of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; Mark D. Shapiro, deputy chief of that office; and Nancy G. Miller, the Administrative Office's judicial fellow.

Representing the advisory committees were:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules —
Judge Will L. Garwood, Chair
Patrick J. Schiltz, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules —
Judge Adrian G. Duplantier, Chair
Professor Alan N. Resnick, Reporter

Advisory Committee on Civil Rules —
Judge Paul V. Niemeyer, Chair
Judge David F. Levi
Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
Professor Richard A. Marcus, Special Reporter
Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules —
Judge W. Eugene Davis, Chair
Professor David A. Schlueter, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules —
Judge Fern M. Smith, Chair
Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

Also participating in the meeting were: Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr. and Bryan A. Garner, consultants to the committee; Professor Mary P. Squiers, Director of the Local Rules Project; Patricia S. Channon, senior attorney from the Bankruptcy Judges Division of the Administrative Office; and Joe S. Cecil and Carol L. Krafka of the Research Division of the Federal Judicial Center.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Scirica reported that he and Judge Davis had appeared before the Judicial Conference in March 1999 to present the committee's proposed amendments to the criminal rules. He stated that most of the rules had been approved as part of the Conference's consent calendar. But the comprehensive new Rule 32.2, governing criminal forfeiture, had been placed on the Conference's discussion calendar. He added that the members of the Conference had been presented with a letter opposing the rule from the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and a written response from Judge Davis.

Judge Scirica said that he described for the Conference the lengthy and meticulous process that the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules followed in drafting the new rule, in soliciting comments and input, and in making appropriate revisions in light of the comments received from the public and the Standing Committee. He noted that several members of the Conference stated expressly that they had been very impressed by the careful nature of the work of the committees.

Judge Scirica reported that Judge Davis addressed the Conference on the merits of the proposed criminal forfeiture rule and was asked several penetrating questions. Some members, he said, expressed concern over the rule's explicit reference to the practice in some circuits of allowing courts to issue money judgments in lieu of the forfeiture of specific property connected to an offense. In the end, however, the Conference approved the new rule without change.

Judge Scirica also reported that the Federal Judicial Center was in the process of

conducting a study for the Standing Committee to document the procedures used by individual district and circuit courts to obtain financial information from parties for purposes of judge recusal. He noted that Judge Bullock had agreed to serve as the committee's liaison to the Center in connection with the study.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The committee voted without objection to approve the minutes of the last meeting, held on January 7-8, 1999.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Legislative Report

Mr. Rabiej reported that 20 bills had been introduced in the 106th Congress that would have an impact on the federal rules or the rulemaking process. He proceeded to describe four of the most significant bills.

He said that H.R. 771 would undo the 1993 amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 30(b) and require, in essence, that depositions be taken down by a stenographer. He noted that the 1993 amendments had been designed expressly to save litigation costs by providing the parties with discretion to select the recording means that best suited their individual needs.

He reported that H.R. 755, the "Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act," which had just passed the House of Representatives, would, among other things, federalize all "Y2K" class actions. He said that Judge Stapleton, chairman of the Judicial Conference's Federal-State Jurisdiction Committee, had written to the Congress expressing opposition to the class action provision of the bill on federalism grounds. He added, though, that Judge Stapleton had included in his letter a caveat that the judiciary's opposition to the Y2K legislation should not be construed as opposition to the extension of minimal diversity to every mass tort.

Mr. Rabiej reported that S. 353, the "Class Action Fairness Act of 1999," contained a provision that would undo the 1993 amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 11, thereby making the imposition of sanctions mandatory for violations of the rule. He noted that several witnesses had testified against a return to the wasteful satellite litigation generated by the pre-1993 rule. He added that the Judicial Conference would continue to oppose repeal of the 1993 amendments, which focus on deterrence, rather than compensation, and provide courts with appropriate discretion to impose sanctions on a case-by-case basis.

Finally, Mr. Rabiej reported that comprehensive bankruptcy legislation had just passed the House of Representatives. H.R. 833, the "Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999," he noted, contained several objectionable rules-related provisions. The Director of the Administrative Office had written to the Congress seeking deletion or modification of these provisions. But, he noted, except for adding a provision dealing with rules in bankruptcy appeals, the House passed the legislation without correcting the objectionable rules-related provisions.

Administrative Actions

Mr. Rabiej reported that the volume of staff work needed to support the rules committees had increased enormously in the last few years. This, he said, was due in large measure to: (1) increased legislative activity; and (2) the initiation of special projects and studies on such topics as mass torts, class actions, attorney conduct, discovery, and technology. He noted that the increased workload of preparing, printing, and distributing materials and of staffing committee and subcommittee meetings had placed considerable stress on the staff. He added, though, that technological improvements had provided some relief and that agenda books could now be sent to the members by electronic mail.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. Cecil presented a brief update on the Federal Judicial Center's recent publications, educational programs, and research projects. (Agenda Item 4) He referred in particular to the ongoing project to survey the means used by courts to identify financial information about parties in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest for judges.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Garwood presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in his memorandum and attachments of May 13, 1999. (Agenda Item 5)

He reported that the advisory committee had no action items to present for approval or publication. Nevertheless, the committee was continuing to consider and approve necessary amendments to the appellate rules, and it would seek authority to publish a package of proposed changes at the January 2000 meeting of the Standing Committee.

Judge Garwood pointed out that the advisory committee had considered the proposed draft amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b) that would authorize service by electronic means. He noted that the committee had some reservations regarding certain specific provisions of the proposal, but it endorsed the approach taken by the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules. The advisory committee, moreover, believed that it was essential to provide the pilot electronic case files courts with legal authority to permit service by electronic means.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Judge Duplantier and Professor Resnick presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Duplantier's memorandum and attachments of May 7, 1999. (Agenda Item 7)

Judge Duplantier reported that the advisory committee had decided not to proceed with the "litigation package" of proposed amendments that it had published for comment in August 1998. But, he said, parts of the package had been returned to the advisory committee's litigation subcommittee for further study, including proposals addressing the use of affidavits at trial and the scheduling of witnesses for hearings.

Judge Duplantier stated that the advisory committee was seeking final approval from the Standing Committee for amendments to five rules and authority to publish amendments to six rules. The advisory committee would also propose amendments to two other rules regarding electronic service, if the Standing Committee decided to publish the proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b).

Action Items

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1017

Professor Resnick stated that the proposed amendment to Rule 1017(e) would permit the court to grant a request by the United States trustee for an extension of time to file a motion to dismiss a chapter 7 case under 11 U.S.C. § 707(b), even if the court actually rules on the request for an extension after the 60-day time limit specified in the rule for filing the request has expired. He added that the rule, as presently written, has been interpreted to require the court to issue its ruling before the end of the 60-day period.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002

Professor Resnick explained that the proposed amendment to Rule 2002(a)(6) was designed by the advisory committee as a cost-cutting measure and would take account of inflation. The current rule requires the clerk of court to send a notice of hearing to all creditors on any application for compensation or reimbursement of expenses that exceeds \$500. The proposed amendment would raise the threshold amount — which has not been adjusted since 1987 — to \$1,000. The clerk, however, would still have to send notices of applications of \$1,000 or less, but only to the trustee, United States trustee, and creditors' committee.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 4003

Professor Resnick noted that the proposed amendment to Rule 4003(b) was similar to that proposed in Rule 1017. It would permit the court to grant a timely-filed request for an extension of time to object to a list of claimed exemptions, whether or not the court actually rules on the request for an extension within the 30-day period specified in the rule.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 4004

Professor Resnick stated that Rule 4004(c)(1) requires the court to issue a discharge by a certain time unless one or more specified events have occurred. The proposed amendment would add an additional exception to the rule. It would provide that a discharge not be granted if a motion is pending for an extension of time to file a motion to dismiss the case for substantial abuse under 11 U.S.C. § 707(b).

FED. R. BANKR. P. 5003

Professor Resnick reported that new subdivision 5003(e) was designed to facilitate the routing of notices to federal and state governmental units. He noted that debtors, especially consumer debtors, frequently provide incomplete or incorrect addresses for governmental creditors. As a result, the appropriate governmental unit may receive a notice too late for it to act in a bankruptcy proceeding.

Professor Resnick stated that the advisory committee had been working with the Department of Justice to devise a reasonable way to improve and expedite the processing of notices to government creditors. As a result, the proposed new Rule 5003(e) would require each clerk's office to maintain, and annually update, a register of federal and state governmental agencies. The clerk would not be required to include in the register more than one mailing address for each agency.

He noted that the amendment would specify that the mailing address set forth in the register is conclusively presumed to be a correct address. The debtor's failure to use that address, however, would not invalidate a notice if the agency in fact received it. In essence, then, using the address in the register would provide a "safe harbor" for debtors and would encourage use of the register.

Professor Resnick noted that a representative of state governments had urged the advisory committee to go further and require debtors use the register address. The committee, however, rejected that approach because it would be too harsh for consumer debtors. He pointed out, in addition, that the comprehensive bankruptcy legislation that had recently passed the House of Representatives contained a stronger notice requirement. It would require debtors to use the register address and require the clerks of court to update the registry quarterly, rather than annually. Judge Duplantier stated that if the legislation were to become law, the Judicial Conference would be advised promptly that the pending rule amendment would be mooted.

The committee approved the amendments to Rules 1017, 2002, 4003, 4004, and 5003 without objection.

Rules for Publication

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1007

Professor Resnick said that Rule 1007 instructs debtors as to what they must include in the list of creditors and schedules. The proposed new subdivision 1007(e) would add a requirement that if the debtor knows that a person on the list or schedules is an infant or incompetent person, the debtor must also include on the list or schedules the name, address, and legal relationship of any person on whom service should be made. The amendment would enable the person or organization that mails the notices in the case to send them to the appropriate guardian or other representative of an infant or incompetent person.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002

Professor Resnick stated that Rule 7001 currently requires a party to file an adversary proceeding in order to obtain an injunction. Effective December 1, 1999, however, the rule will be amended to specify that an adversary proceeding need not be filed if an injunction is provided for in a plan (i.e., an injunction enjoining conduct other than that enjoined by operation of the Bankruptcy Code itself). He explained that it is relatively common practice today for chapter 11 plans to include injunction provisions.

Professor Resnick reported that the Department of Justice originally had opposed the amendment to Rule 7001, expressing concern that affected parties would not normally become aware of an injunction in a plan unless they are served with process as part of an adversary proceeding. He noted that some government agencies had also complained that injunctions — some of which might be against the public interest — could be buried in lengthy, complex plans. He added, though, that the Department later withdrew its objection to the Rule 7001 amendment on the understanding that the advisory committee would work with it to devise appropriate solutions to the notice problem.

Professor Resnick explained that the proposed new Rule 2002(c)(3) — and companion amendments to Rules 3016, 3017, and 3020 — were designed to ensure that parties who are entitled to notice of a hearing on confirmation of a plan are provided with clear notice of any injunction included in a plan enjoining conduct not otherwise enjoined by operation of the Bankruptcy Code. The notice, for example, would have to be set forth in conspicuous language, such as bold, italic, or highlighted text.

Professor Resnick pointed out that the proposed amendments to Rule 2002(g) deal with a different problem. He explained that the clerk's office typically receives information on the addresses of creditors from three sources: (1) lists provided by the debtor; (2) proofs of claim; and (3) separate requests from creditors designating an address. He said that the proposed amendments would establish priorities or rankings to determine which address governs.

He said that the proposed new paragraph 2002(g)(3) was part of the package dealing with notice to infants and incompetent persons. (See Rule 1007 above.) It would provide that if the debtor lists the name of a guardian or legal representative in the notice, all notices would have to be mailed to that guardian or representative.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 3016

Professor Resnick pointed out that the proposed new subdivision 3016(c) was a companion to the amendment to Rule 2002(c)(3) above — designed to assure that entities whose conduct would be enjoined under a plan are given adequate notice of the proposed injunction. The amendment would require that the plan and the disclosure statement describe all acts to be enjoined in specific and conspicuous language and identify all entities that would be subject to the injunction. Thus, Rules 2002(c)(3) and 3016 together would require specific and conspicuous language regarding the injunction to be included in the notice, the plan, and the disclosure statement.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 3017

Professor Resnick stated that the proposed new subdivision 3017(f) is also part of the injunction package. He noted that some chapter 11 plans contain injunctions against entities that are not parties in the case. The proposed amendment would require the court to consider providing appropriate notice to non-parties who are to be enjoined under a plan.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 3020

Professor Resnick pointed out that the proposed amendments to Rule 3020(c) are also part of the injunction package. They would require that the order of confirmation describe in reasonable detail all acts to be enjoined, be specific in its terms regarding the injunction, and identify all entities subject to the injunction. He added that notice of entry of the order of confirmation would have to be provided to all entities subject to an injunction provided for in a plan.

Professor Resnick stated that the Department of Justice was pleased with the package of amendments dealing with injunctions, and it had worked closely with the advisory committee in preparing them.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 9020

Professor Resnick reported that the advisory committee would delete the current, complex provision on contempt in Rule 9020 and replace it with a single sentence that would simply state that Rule 9014 applies to a motion for an order of contempt. Rule 9020, thus, would provide that a party seeking a contempt order proceed by way of a contested matter, rather than an adversary proceeding.

Professor Resnick explained that the current rule had been drafted soon after the bankruptcy courts had been restructured under the 1984 bankruptcy reform legislation. The 1984 legislation, in effect, deleted the explicit statutory contempt power granted to bankruptcy judges by legislation in 1978. He noted that, as a result of the 1984 legislation, it was unclear whether bankruptcy judges retained contempt power. Accordingly, the advisory committee drafted a rule, which took effect in 1987, specifying that a bankruptcy judge may issue an order of contempt, but the order may only take effect after 10 days. During the 10-day period, the party named in the contempt order may seek de novo review by a district judge.

Professor Resnick explained that a number of court of appeals decisions have been issued since Rule 9020 took effect in 1987, holding that bankruptcy judges do in fact have contempt power — either under 11 U.S.C. § 105 or as a matter of inherent judicial power. Thus, it was the opinion of the advisory committee that Rule 9020 is too restrictive and is no longer needed. He added that the committee note makes it clear that the advisory committee does not take a position on whether bankruptcy judges have contempt power or not. Issues relating to the contempt power of bankruptcy judges are substantive. The rule simply provides the appropriate procedure, i.e., through the filing of a contested matter under Rule 9014.

The committee approved the amendments to Rules 1007, 2002, 3016, 3017, 3020, and 9020 for publication without objection.

Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Resnick

Judges Scirica and Duplantier reported that Professor Resnick had just announced his intention to relinquish the post of reporter to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules after 12 years of distinguished service. He asserted that it would be difficult to imagine anyone doing a better job than Professor Resnick and added that his personal experience in working with him had been immensely gratifying.

The committee unanimously approved the following resolution honoring Professor Resnick:

Whereas, Alan N. Resnick, Benjamin Weintraub Distinguished Professor of Bankruptcy Law at Hofstra University, has served as Reporter to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules for more than eleven years, beginning in late 1987, the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure wishes to recognize Professor Resnick for extraordinary service of the highest quality, marked in particular by

- the complete revision of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure to accommodate the creation by Congress of a national system of United States trustees to supervise the administration of bankruptcy estates and with statutory authority to raise and be heard on any issue in a case:

- the complete revision of the Official Bankruptcy Forms in conjunction with the revision of the rules;
- the drafting and rapid distribution to the courts following further amendments to the Bankruptcy Code of suggested interim rules for local adoption to provide procedural guidance during the period required to prescribe permanent national rules implementing the statutory changes;
- the drafting of rules to facilitate the use of technology in the giving of notice to parties in bankruptcy cases and initiating the drafting of rules to permit electronic filing of documents in all types of proceedings in federal courts;
- the providing of wise counsel on bankruptcy matters to the committee's working groups on mass torts and on attorney conduct; and
- the concise and lucid presentation to the committee of proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure approved by the advisory committee.

And whereas Professor Resnick has requested that he be permitted to relinquish the post of Reporter, a request that the committee has reluctantly granted,

Be it RESOLVED that the committee hereby expresses its gratitude to Professor Resnick for his exemplary drafting of rules and related explanatory materials, for his patient answers to questions from committee members, and for his unfailing collegiality.

Professor Resnick expressed his appreciation for the resolution and the kind words of the chairman. He added that it had been his distinct honor to have served under four remarkable chairs — Judges Lloyd D. George, Edward Leavy, Paul Mannes, and Adrian G. Duplantier — and was grateful to the advisory committee for the intellectual stimulation and respect that they had provided to him over the past 12 years.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Niemeyer presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in his memorandum and attachments of May 11, 1999. (Agenda Item 6)

Action Items

Judge Niemeyer reported that the advisory committee was seeking approval of three separate packages of amendments to the civil rules, dealing respectively with: (1) service on federal officers and employees sued in their individual capacity; (2) admiralty rules; and (3) discovery rules.

1. Service Package

FED. R. CIV. P. 4 AND 12

Judge Niemeyer reported that the proposed amendments to Rules 4 and 12 had been initiated at the suggestion of the Department of Justice and adopted by the advisory committee without opposition. He added that the thrust of the amendments was to entitle federal officers and employees who are sued in their individual capacity to the same rights that they would have if sued in an official capacity.

Professor Cooper explained that federal officers and employees are sued in their individual capacity for actions that have some connection to their functions as officers or employees of the United States. He noted that it is common for the United States, through the Department of Justice, to assume the burden of defending them and to move to have the government substituted as the defendant. He said that there was some uncertainty in the case law whether the United States must be served with process, as well as the individual defendant, when an officer or employee is sued for acts in connection with employment.

The amendments to Rule 4 would require service on the United States when a federal employee is sued in an individual capacity for acts occurring in connection with the performance of duties on behalf of the United States. Rule 12 would be amended to provide the same 60-day answer period in an individual-capacity action that the United States enjoys when an officer is sued in an official capacity.

Professor Cooper said that little public comment had been generated by the proposed amendments. The comments received were favorable to the amendments, and several suggested certain drafting improvements. As a result, the advisory committee made improvements in language after publication. For example, as revised, the amendments now use the term “officer or employee” consistently. Language was also added to make sure that no one reads the rule to mean that when the same individual is sued both in an individual capacity and an official capacity, both the individual and the United States must be served twice — once under subparagraph (a) and once under subparagraph (b).

The committee approved the amendments to Rules 4 and 12 without objection.

2. Admiralty Package

Judge Niemeyer reported that the proposed changes in the admiralty rules had been developed over a long period of time with the assistance of a special subcommittee chaired by Mark O. Kasanin, Esquire. He noted that the subcommittee had coordinated its work very closely with the Department of Justice and the Rules Committee of the Maritime Law Association.

Professor Cooper reported that the proposed changes in the Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims were designed to meet two goals. First, they reflected the increasing importance of civil forfeiture proceedings, which generally use admiralty procedure. The amendments adjust the admiralty rules, for the first time, to make certain necessary procedural distinctions between traditional maritime proceedings and civil forfeiture proceedings. Second, the changes would take account of the 1993 reorganization of FED. R. CIV. P. 4. In addition, the rules have been reorganized and restyled for purposes of clarity.

Professor Cooper stated that it was not necessary to describe the proposed amendments in substantial detail because the advisory committee had presented them to the Standing Committee in January 1998, when it sought authority to publish them for public comment. He noted that there had been little comment or testimony on the proposals and that minor drafting changes had been made by the advisory committee in light of the public comments.

SUPPLEMENTAL ADMIRALTY RULE B

Professor Cooper reported that the advisory committee had made a post-publication adjustment in the language of Rule B(1)(d) — and a companion amendment to Rule (C)(3)(b) — to substitute the passive voice for the active. As published, the amendment had provided that the clerk of court must deliver a summons or other process to the marshal for service if the property in question is a vessel or tangible property aboard a vessel. One of the public comments asserted that delivery of the papers to the clerk for forwarding to the person making service would occasion delay in cases when time is usually of the essence. It was pointed out, for example, that it was the practice in the Eastern District of New York for the clerk to deliver the process to the attorney for the plaintiff, who in turn arranges delivery to the person who will make service. Accordingly, the advisory committee changed the rule to provide broadly that process “must be delivered” to the person making service, without designating who is to effect the delivery. Professor Cooper added that the Maritime Law Association and the Department of Justice agreed with the change, which was made at three places in the amended rules.

Professor Cooper pointed out that FED. R. CIV. P. 4 had been reorganized in 1993. As part of the reorganization, former Rule 4(e) — which is incorporated in the current Admiralty Rule B(1) — has been replaced by Rule 4(n)(2), which permits use of state law to seize a defendant’s assets only if personal jurisdiction over the defendant cannot be obtained in the district where the action is brought. The advisory committee, however, decided not to incorporate Rule 4(n)(2) in the revised Admiralty Rule B because maritime attachment and

garnishment are available whenever the defendant is not found within the district, including some circumstances in which personal jurisdiction can also be asserted.

Professor Cooper noted that Rule (B)(1)(e) expressly incorporates FED. R. CIV. P. 64 to make sure that elimination of the reference to state quasi-in-rem jurisdiction in former Rule 4(e) is not read as defeating the continued use of state security devices. Thus, subparagraph (e) reminds attorneys that it is consistent with the admiralty rules to invoke FED. R. CIV. P. 64, which allows the use of security provisions in the manner provided by state law. Professor Cooper said that a concluding sentence would be added to the committee note to Rule E(8) providing that: "if a state law allows a special, limited, or restrictive appearance as an incident to the remedy adopted from state law, the state practice applies through Rule 64 'in the manner provided by' state law."

SUPPLEMENTAL ADMIRALTY RULE C

Professor Cooper explained that the amendments to Rule C were designed in large measure to take into account meaningful distinctions between traditional admiralty and maritime proceedings and civil forfeiture proceedings. In paragraph (2)(c), for example, the complaint in an admiralty or maritime proceeding must state that the property is located within the district or will be within the district while the action is pending. On the other hand, paragraph (2)(d) reflects the variety of civil forfeiture statutes that now allow a court to exercise authority over property outside the district.

Professor Cooper noted that subdivision (6) explicitly provides for different procedures for forfeiture proceedings and admiralty seizure proceedings. In a maritime proceeding, for example, fewer people are entitled to appear and only 10 days are provided to file a verified statement of right or interest. In civil forfeiture proceedings, a person who asserts an interest or right against the property has 20 days to file a statement.

SUPPLEMENTAL ADMIRALTY RULE E

Professor Cooper stated that Rule E(3) provides that maritime attachment and garnishment may be served only within the district. But in forfeiture cases, in rem process may be served outside the district if so authorized by statute. He noted that subdivision E(10) is new and makes clear the authority of the court to preserve and prevent removal of attached or arrested property that remains in the possession of the owner or other person under Rule E(4)(b).

FED. R. CIV. P. 14

Professor Cooper pointed out that the only changes in Rule 14 were to replace the term "the claimant" with "a person who asserts a right under Supplemental Rule C(6)(b)(i)."

The committee approved the amendments to Supplemental Admiralty Rules B, C, and E and FED. R. CIV. P. 14 without objection.

3. Discovery Package

Judge Niemeyer reported that the advisory committee had studied discovery in a comprehensive manner over the past three years. The focus of its efforts was not to curb discovery “abuse” per se, but rather to examine broadly the whole architecture of discovery and to ask whether it can be made more efficient and less expensive — while still preserving the fundamental principle of providing full disclosure of relevant information to the litigants. Yet, he added, full disclosure — especially in the age of information technology — may not require the production of each and every document, regardless of the cost of producing it and the likelihood of its actual use in a case. What needs to be produced, he said, is “all the information that matters.”

Judge Niemeyer pointed out that the package of proposed amendments to the civil rules was modest and well balanced. It was designed to make discovery cost less and work better. He said that the advisory committee and its discovery subcommittee would continue to study whether additional changes in the rules should be proposed in the future. He noted, for example, that he believed personally that the committee could explore a number of possibilities for establishing a very inexpensive, streamlined process that would result in prompt resolution of uncomplicated cases.

Judge Niemeyer stated that the impetus for considering changes in the discovery rules had come from several sources. He noted, for example, that the American College of Trial Lawyers and other bar groups had urged that the scope of discovery be narrowed. But, he said, the biggest impetus for change had come from the impact of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 on the district courts. The Act urged each court to experiment locally with various procedural devices in an effort to reduce litigation costs and delay. The 1993 amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, enacted in part to facilitate the local experiments sanctioned by the Act, allowed courts to “opt out” of certain provisions of the national rules — most notably the provisions on mandatory disclosure. He added that the combined effect of the Act and the 1993 rules amendments was a “balkanization” of federal pretrial procedure and the proliferation of local rules and procedures.

Judge Niemeyer reported that the advisory committee was firmly committed to returning to a uniform set of national procedural rules. He noted that the bar had been nearly unanimous in urging the committee to limit “opt outs” and local variations. He added, however, that opposition to the rules amendments would likely come from district judges, who are used to their own, carefully developed — and often very effective — local procedures.

Judge Niemeyer described the lengthy and careful process that the advisory committee had followed in developing the proposed amendments to the discovery rules. He noted that the committee had asked the RAND Corporation to take a fresh look at the enormous data base that

it had developed under the Civil Justice Reform Act and to examine particularly the cost of discovery, the satisfaction of attorneys with discovery, and the extent to which discovery is actually used in federal civil cases. In addition, at the committee's request, the Federal Judicial Center polled a scientific cross-section of lawyers and received more than 1,200 responses regarding discovery practice and opinions.

He reported that the advisory committee had received numerous papers from academics on discovery topics. It had conducted two conferences involving judges, lawyers, and law professors, and several of the papers presented at its Boston conference were published in the Boston College Law Review. In addition, the committee sought out and heard the views of practitioners from practically every sector of the legal profession, federal and state judges, law professors, and former rules committee chairs and reporters. He added that he had never witnessed any legislative action or committee action that had involved as much participation, research, input, and support.

Judge Niemeyer reported that the research and input, among other things, had revealed that —

- Discovery accounts for about half of all litigation costs.
- Discovery is actually used in a relatively small percentage of federal civil cases. In 40% of the cases, for example, there is no discovery at all, and in another 25% of the cases, there is only minimal discovery.
- Discovery, however, is used extensively in an important minority of cases. It may cause serious problems in those cases and account for as much as 90% of the litigation costs.
- Both plaintiffs' lawyers and defense lawyers agree by very large margins that discovery costs in general are too high (although they tend to emphasize different factors as the principal reasons for the high costs).
- The bar overwhelmingly supports national uniformity in the rules.
- The bar also overwhelmingly supports early judicial involvement in discovery, early discovery cut-off dates, and firm trial dates.

Judge Niemeyer stated that the advisory committee had conducted its efforts through a discovery subcommittee chaired by Judge Levi, with the assistance of Professor Marcus as special reporter. He reported that the advisory committee had asked the subcommittee to consider all reasonable proposals for improvement in the discovery process. The subcommittee, he said, had developed and presented the advisory committee with more than 40 possible recommendations for change. The advisory committee, over the course of several meetings, then debated each of the

recommendations. It decided to proceed only with those proposals that commanded the support of a strong majority of the committee members. No measure was approved by a close vote.

Judge Niemeyer stated that the advisory committee then published the package of proposed amendments, conducted three public hearings, heard from more than 70 witnesses, and received more than 300 written comments. The committee concluded that the comments, while very informative and helpful, generally addressed the same policy issues and concerns that had been considered thoroughly before publication. Accordingly, the changes made by the committee following publication consisted of language and organizational improvements, rather than substantive changes. The committee, however, amended proposed Rule 30(f)(1) in light of the public comments to delete the requirement that the deponent consent to extending a deposition beyond one day.

Judge Niemeyer reported that three issues in the package had caused the greatest debate during the public comment period and the committee's deliberations: (1) mandatory initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1); (2) the scope of discovery under Rule 26(b)(1); and (3) cost bearing under Rule 26(b)(2).

1. Mandatory Initial Disclosures. Judge Niemeyer pointed out that the 1993 rule amendments, which had introduced mandatory initial disclosures, were very controversial. They had generated three dissents on the Supreme Court and came close to being rejected by the Congress. He noted that lawyers had complained strenuously that the revised Rule 26(a)(1) invades the attorney-client relationship by requiring the production of hostile documents and turning over to opposing parties documents that have not been asked for.

Nevertheless, he said, mandatory disclosure has worked well in the districts that have adopted it, and it has been used substantially even in many of the districts that have officially opted out of the national disclosure rule. The empirical data show general satisfaction with disclosure, but they are not conclusive on whether it reduces costs.

Judge Niemeyer explained that the advisory committee was committed to the principle of a single, uniform national rule, without local "opt outs." It therefore had three options: (a) to reject mandatory disclosure altogether; (b) to extend the existing mandatory disclosure regime to all districts; or (c) to mandate disclosure, but in a modified, less controversial form. He stated that the advisory committee decided upon the third course — requiring parties to disclose only that information that the disclosing party may use to support its own claims or defenses.

Judge Niemeyer pointed out that most of the criticisms that the advisory committee had received about disclosure were that it would not work in certain kinds of cases. In response, the rule was amended to exclude certain categories of cases from the disclosure requirement. It also allows the attorneys to opt out of disclosure in individual cases. And the rule provides district judges with considerable discretion to dispense with disclosure in individual cases.

2. Scope of Discovery. Judge Niemeyer noted that the committee's proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(1) would not narrow the scope of discovery. Rather, it would divide discovery into two distinct phases: (1) attorney-managed discovery, generally conducted without court involvement and embracing matters relevant to the claim or defense of any party; and (2) court-managed discovery, embracing — with court approval — any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action.

He said that opponents of the change had argued that the proposed amendment would cause substantial litigation regarding the scope of discovery. He agreed that some litigation would in fact occur initially, but the law would soon become clear.

3. Cost bearing. Judge Niemeyer stated that much of the opposition to the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(2) had been expressed in terms that it would favor rich litigants at the expense of poor ones. He explained that the present rules give a judge implicit authority to allow a party to obtain discovery that may be burdensome or duplicative, on the condition that the requesting party pay for it. The amended rule, he said, would make that authority explicit, and it would tell judges clearly that they have the tools they need to manage and regulate discovery.

FED. R. CIV. P. 5

Judge Niemeyer explained that the advisory committee had originally proposed — when it sought authority from the Standing Committee to publish the proposed discovery amendments — that Rule 5(d) be amended to provide that discovery and disclosure materials “need not” be filed with the court until they are used in a proceeding. The Standing Committee, however, voted to change “need not” to “must not.” Judge Niemeyer said that the rule had attracted very little public comment, and the advisory committee on reflection agreed with the Standing Committee that “must not” is preferable language to “need not.”

One of the members argued that discovery material not filed with the court should nevertheless be considered part of the court record. He recommended adding a sentence to that effect in the committee note in order to protect the press and the public. He explained, for example, that these materials, having the status of court records, would be privileged. Therefore, one who published them would be protected in the event of a defamation action. Another member agreed and added that if the materials were court records, they would also be available for public examination. He said that it was important to clarify the status of unfiled discovery materials, and the status should be specified in the rule itself, rather than the committee note.

Judge Niemeyer responded that the advisory committee had not studied this issue. Rather, its principal purpose in amending Rule 5 was to alleviate the storage burdens and costs imposed on clerks' offices. Judge Levi added that the advisory committee also considered the amendment necessary to bring the national rule on filing into conformity with most of the present local rules and practices on the subject.

Professor Marcus pointed out that he had conducted considerable research on whether unfiled materials are “court records” and had concluded that it is a very complicated matter that cannot be addressed properly by simply adding a sentence to the committee note. Several other participants agreed with his analysis.

Professor Hazard recommended that the advisory committee undertake a study of whether discovery and disclosure materials are, or should be, part of the court record. **Mr. Lafitte moved to have the advisory committee study the issue and report back at the January 2000 meeting of the Standing Committee. The committee approved the motion by consensus without a formal vote.**

The committee approved the amendment to Rule 5 without objection.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)

Judge Levi said that the Rules Enabling Act contemplates a set of national, uniform procedural rules to accompany national substantive law. He noted that the Judicial Conference, in its 1997 final report to Congress on the Civil Justice Reform Act, had asked the rules committees specifically to consider whether the advantages of national uniformity outweigh the advantages of allowing courts to develop their own local alternative procedures in such areas as initial disclosure and the development of discovery plans.

Judge Levi reported that well over half the district courts have some form of disclosure in place. Research conducted for the committee by the Federal Judicial Center, moreover, disclosed that some sort of disclosure had occurred in three-fifths of the federal cases surveyed. The Center study also showed that most of the 1,200 attorneys interviewed who had used disclosure liked it and said that it helps to reduce disputes, enhance settlements, and expedite cases. Judge Levi said that the Center study had confirmed that cases where disclosure occurs are concluded more quickly than cases without disclosure, and the RAND study came close to saying that attorney hours are reduced when there is disclosure. He added that the Federal Judicial Center had also found that a majority of the lawyers believe that the lack of procedural uniformity among districts causes problems for attorneys.

Judge Levi reported that the discovery subcommittee had been working on discovery for three years, had conducted several conferences with the bar, and had consulted with six major bar organizations. It had heard from both plaintiffs’ attorneys and defense attorneys that national procedural uniformity was very important to them. Members of the bar, he said, report that it is difficult to keep up with changes in local rules, and the practical effect of the local rules is to create a preference for local counsel. Judge Levi added that although many of the rules are posted on the Internet, they are not easy to find. Electronic postings, moreover, do not include standing orders and local interpretations of the local rules.

Judge Levi emphasized that national uniformity was a major matter. He noted that it had

been a common theme voiced by the lawyers at the subcommittee's Boston College conference. In fact, he said, it was a fundamental premise of the federal rules and the Rules Enabling Act. Discovery and disclosure, he emphasized, are an important part of the pretrial process and should not be handled by different sets of rules determined by geography. Discovery and disclosure can affect notice pleading, motions to dismiss, and motions for summary judgment, and they may in certain instances affect the outcome of cases.

Judge Levi said that the subcommittee, in seeking national uniformity, had three options before it. The first was to retain the present disclosure requirements of Rule 26(a)(1), but to eliminate the authority of courts to opt out of the requirements. The second option was to eliminate disclosure entirely from the national rule, effectively preventing any court from using it. He noted that this approach would be very controversial because many courts now require disclosure and have achieved substantial benefits from it. The third choice — which the subcommittee adopted — was to retain disclosure as a national requirement, but to remove the “heartburn” from it by removing the present requirement that attorneys disclose information harmful to their clients without a formal discovery request.

Under the subcommittee's proposal, which the advisory committee eventually approved, parties would only have to disclose matters that support their own claims. Complex, or “high end,” cases will be effectively removed from the rule by action of counsel, and eight categories of “low end” cases are explicitly exempted from the rule. The lawyers, moreover, may mutually opt out of the present disclosure requirements, and the court has discretion to dispense with disclosure in any case.

Judge Levi said that the proposal was moderate and based on fundamental fairness. He noted that it was similar to FED. R. CRIM. P. 16 in criminal cases, under which the government turns over documents that it intends to use at trial. Moreover, he said, it was similar to FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(3), which deals with documents and witnesses that parties intend to use at trial. He added that the bar, with some notable exceptions, supports the proposal. He noted that the Litigation Section of the American Bar Association, which had been adamantly opposed to Rule 26(a)(1) in 1993, supported the present proposal. In addition, endorsements had been received from the American College of Trial Lawyers and the Federal Magistrate Judges Association.

Judge Levi reported that many letters had been received from judges during the public comment period opposing any national rule that would impose mandatory disclosure in their districts or prescribe a form of disclosure different from that currently provided in their own local rules. The judges in the Eastern District of Virginia, in particular, expressed concern that the amendments would slow down the “rocket docket” used in that court. In response, the advisory committee added a sentence to Rule 26(f) after publication authorizing a court by local rule to shorten the prescribed period between the Rule 26(f) attorney conference and the court's Rule 16(b) scheduling conference or order.

Judge Levi noted that 10 different federal judges had worked in the advisory committee on

the discovery package over the past three years, and all 10 agree that the proposed Rule 26(a)(1) would both achieve national uniformity and benefit civil litigation. He emphasized that the rule provides judges with considerable discretion, but within the context of an overall national rule.

Mr. Schreiber argued against weakening the present mandatory disclosure requirements. He said that hostile information is the key to all discovery and that parties should be required to disclose pertinent information hostile to their clients' interests. He added that the language of the proposed amendment — requiring disclosure of matters “that the disclosing party may use to support its claims” — was meaningless. He said that a party could simply argue at the initial stages of the case that it simply has not yet made up its mind as to whether it will use any particular material in the case.

Mr. Schreiber moved to substitute the word “will” for the word “may.” Thus, the amendment would require a party to disclose matters that it “will use to support its claims.” Judge Tashima recommended an amendment to the motion to substitute the words “supports its claims or defenses.” Judge Tashima said that the term “supports its claims or defenses” will lead to less gamesmanship among attorneys than “may use to support its claims or defenses” Mr. Schreiber accepted the amendment to his motion.

Judge Levi responded that the advisory committee had considered both formulations at considerable length. He noted that the agenda binder included a memorandum in which Professors Cooper and Marcus — who had different personal preferences regarding the appropriate terminology — describe the respective advantages and disadvantages of “may use to support” vis a vis “supporting.” At Judge Levi's request, each of them presented his respective views orally to the committee.

Judge Levi stated that the advisory committee ultimately concluded that “may use to support” would be easier for lawyers to apply. It also has the advantage of generally tracking the language of Rule 26(a)(3), dealing with pretrial disclosures. In any event, he said, the court has authority to impose appropriate sanctions to prevent gamesmanship on the part of attorneys

The members discussed the merits of the two alternatives, how they compared to similar language in other parts of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (including Rule 11), and how lawyers and judges might apply them in practical situations.

The committee rejected Mr. Schreiber's motion by a vote of 8 to 3

Judge Tashima moved to amend Rule 26(a)(1) to allow a court by local rule either: (1) to opt out completely from its mandatory disclosure requirement; or (2) to narrow the categories of disclosure materials.

Some of the members expressed opposition to the motion on the grounds that it would

undercut the goal of national uniformity. One member added that if the local bar does not need or want disclosure, the parties will mutually stipulate out of it.

The committee rejected Judge Tashima's motion by a vote of 11 to 1.

Judge Tashima moved to delete from the fifth paragraph of the committee note the sentence reading, "Clients can be bewildered by the conflicting obligations they face when sued in different districts." Professor Cooper agreed that the sentence was not essential. The committee decided without objection to eliminate the sentence.

Judge Wilson moved to repeal the 1993 amendments entirely and return to the pre-1993 procedures. He said that the single most important procedural requirement is to encourage judges to resolve disputes decisively and quickly. He added that if a judge is readily accessible to decide disputes, the disputes will arise less frequently and cases will be resolved promptly. He said that judges should also establish early cut-off dates for discovery and set early and firm trial dates.

Judge Levi responded that the 1993 rules authorized mandatory disclosure, and its repeal would deprive courts of the benefits derived from disclosure, as demonstrated by attorney surveys and other empirical data. He said that the present Rule 26(a)(1) proposal was very modest and was necessary to provide the district courts with continuing authority to require disclosure.

Associate Attorney General Fisher stated that the Department of Justice very much favors a uniform set of national procedural rules, although different parts of the Department may have different views as to specific parts of the proposed rules amendments. He said that the central concept of judge-managed discovery will work if the judges actually make it work by being readily accessible to resolve discovery problems.

Mr. Fisher added that Department attorneys, based on their experience, had identified several other categories of cases that should be exempted from the initial disclosure requirements of Rule 26(a)(1). As examples, he listed forfeiture cases, mandamus cases, FOIA cases, constitutional challenges to statutes, *Bivens* cases, and social security cases. He noted that the advisory committee was not inclined to expand the list at this point, but had promised to consider these suggestions promptly. One of the members responded that the list of exemptions was too long already and that it is generally not sound policy to encourage different procedural rules for different categories of cases. Mr. Fisher responded that the Department supported Rule 26(a)(1), as amended.

The committee rejected Judge Wilson's motion by a vote of 8 to 4.

The committee then approved the proposed amendments to Rule 26(a) by a vote of 11 to 1.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(1)

Judge Levi stated that the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(1) will not change the scope of discovery. He said that it will not keep litigants from obtaining appropriate discovery in any case. Parties will still be entitled — on request and without court approval — to a very broad range of information, *i.e.*, “any matter . . . relevant to the claim or defense of any party.” The change occasioned by the amendment is to assign a portion of the discovery to the courts to manage, as judges for cause may make available “any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in an action.”

Judge Levi said that the language of the amended rule is clearer than that of the present rule, which provides insufficient guidelines for limiting overbroad discovery. The district judges and magistrate judges who had reviewed the amendment believe that it will work well. In fact, he said, not a single judge had written or testified against the amendment. He noted that the proposal was supported by the American College of Trial Lawyers, the Litigation Section of the American Bar Association, and the Federal Magistrate Judges Association.

Judge Levi pointed out that the Department of Justice under the Carter Administration had urged the advisory committee to narrow the scope of discovery by removing the “subject matter” criterion. He read from a letter from Attorney General Griffin Bell to Judge Roszel Thomsen, chairman of the Standing Committee, in which the Attorney General reported that he “was particularly pleased with the . . . proposed change in Rule 26 which would narrow the scope of discovery to the ‘issues raised.’ It has been my experience as a judge, practicing lawyer and now as Attorney General that the scope of discovery is far too broad and that excessive discovery has significantly contributed to the delays, complexity, and high cost of civil litigation in the federal courts.”

Judge Levi said, however, that the Department of Justice had submitted a memorandum to the committee opposing the proposed amendment, stating that it would have a deleterious effect on the Department’s litigation and on civil cases generally.

Mr. Fisher pointed out that the Department of Justice sues on behalf of the public interest, and its career litigators have sincere objections to the proposed amendment, as do the American Trial Lawyers Association and civil rights and environmental organizations. In short, he said, Department lawyers are satisfied with the existing standards and believe that they work very well. The burden, presently, is placed on the defendant to come forward to limit discovery when it is seen as inappropriate or excessive. For the most part, judges do not intervene in the discovery process, and, as a consequence, a broad range of discovery is routinely provided today. The Department believes, however, that the amended rule will shift the burden to plaintiffs and require them to seek judicial intervention to obtain information that they now receive regularly. He added that government attorneys fear that most judges simply will not have the time or inclination to become involved in discovery matters. They fear, moreover, that judges, individually and collectively, will construe the revised language of Rule 26(b)(1) narrowly and deny discovery on

the merits. The net result, thus, will be a narrowing of the scope of discovery.

Mr. Fisher said that the amendment will cause particular problems in civil rights and environmental cases, and the public interests of the United States will not be served. He noted that defendants in these cases often resist producing essential records and information. He said that the Department lawyers, and plaintiffs' lawyers generally, believe that they will face even greater resistance under the amended rule.

Mr. Fisher concluded that the problems that the advisory committee attempted to address through the proposed amendment are important and difficult ones. He expressed the Department's appreciation for the committee's careful and thoughtful work. But, he added, the amendment simply was not needed. He suggested that the principal argument advanced in support of the change is that judges do not take appropriate steps under the current rule to limit the excessive discovery that occurs in some cases. But, he said, the current rule clearly gives judges sufficient authority to take an active role and limit inappropriate discovery requests.

He noted that the Department of Justice believed that there would be a good deal of costly litigation over the meaning of the amendment, at least for a while. There may well be inconsistent interpretations of the new rule, and, as a result, the scope of discovery will effectively be narrowed for some plaintiffs. In short, he said, the proposed amendment attempts to deal with a small group of troublesome cases, but will result in serious negative consequences. He suggested that, rather than recreating the whole landscape of Rule 26(b), the advisory committee should consider removing those troublesome cases from the general operation of the rule and regulating them with special rules.

Judge Niemeyer thanked Mr. Fisher and said that his points were very well taken. But, he said, the advisory committee had considered the same points at great length both before and during the public comment period. He noted that some members of the advisory committee agreed generally with Mr. Fisher's arguments, but a strong majority of the committee supported the proposed amendment. He noted that the advisory committee included in its report to the Standing Committee an April 14, 1999 "dissenting opinion" prepared by Professor Thomas D. Rowe, Jr., a member of the advisory committee.

Judge Levi added that the current law makes almost everything relevant to the claims or defenses in civil rights and environmental cases. The amendment, he said, would not limit the broad array of information that plaintiffs presently receive through discovery. They will, for example, still be entitled under the amended rule to information about the treatment of other employees, a pattern of discrimination, or a continuing violation, as well as information extending beyond the statute of limitations. These types of information are all considered relevant to the claims and defenses under current law.

Judge Levi noted that the advisory committee disagreed that the proposed amendment would lead to costly motion practice. He emphasized that discovery disputes are usually decided

on an expedited basis. In many courts they are resolved without the filing of written motions, and often by telephone. He added that discovery works well in most cases and will continue to work well under the proposed amendment. But there is a group of cases where it is very contentious and very expensive. He said that the courts need to take an active role in managing these cases, and the amended rule gives judges clear authority and direction to manage them.

Judge Niemeyer said that the discovery rules are designed generally for lawyers and litigants who do not abuse the process. They assume compliance and good faith for the most part. The existing rules, as well as the proposed amendments, expect judges to supervise discovery in those cases where there are problems. Thus, if a defendant “stonewalls” on discovery production in a case, plaintiffs’ counsel or the Department of Justice, will have to litigate on the scope of discovery in any event — either under the present rule or the amended rule.

One of the members strongly opposed the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(1), calling it — along with the proposed cost-bearing amendment to Rule 26(b)(2) — the most radical change in the civil rules in 60 years. He said that every employment law group and civil rights organization was opposed to the change, because it would limit discovery and strongly tilt the playing field against them. Another member, however, responded that he could not think of a single piece of information obtainable under the current rule that would not be discovered under the new rule. Other members added that they supported the amendment because it would cause lawyers to focus their discovery efforts more effectively and require them to be more specific and responsible in what they request.

Mr. Schreiber questioned why the advisory committee had used the term “for good cause shown,” instead of “on motion” or “for reasonable cause.” He moved to delete “for good cause shown” and substitute the words “on motion.” Thus, judges would have complete discretion to order broader discovery, without being bound to the “good cause” standard.

Judge Levi replied that the committee note states specifically that the good-cause standard is meant to be flexible. One of the members added that the rule had to prescribe a standard beyond that of mere discretion. Another member reminded the committee that “good cause” had been the standard required for the production of discovery documents before 1970.

Mr. Schreiber later withdrew his motion.

The committee approved the amendment to Rule 26(b)(1) by a vote of 10 to 2.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(2)

Judge Niemeyer noted that the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(2), governing cost bearing, had been published as an amendment to Rule 34. The advisory committee relocated it in Rule 26 after publication, but without any change in content. He said that its placement in Rule

26 would emphasize that it applies to all categories of discovery. He added that the proposed amendment would not change the law as it exists, but would make an existing judicial tool explicit. It would give district judges and magistrate judges clear authority to require a party seeking information not otherwise discoverable under Rule 26(b)(2)(i), (ii), or (iii) to pay part or all of the reasonable expenses incurred in its production.

Mr. Fisher stated that the Department of Justice was concerned that the proposed amendment might be applied by the courts to require requesting parties to pay for “court-managed” discovery, vis a vis “attorney-managed” discovery. He recommended inclusion of a clear statement that discovery of “any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action” would be provided without charge to the requesting party, in the same manner as discovery of “any matter . . . relevant to the claim or defense of any party.” In other words, the cost-bearing provision explicitly would be applicable to both.

Judge Niemeyer responded that the proposed amendment did in fact apply equally to both and said that he would be pleased to work on improving the language. Mr. Fisher suggested including in the committee note to Rule 26(b)(1) language from page 74 of the agenda book declaring that the scope-expansion and cost-bearing provisions are not intended to operate in tandem and that ordinarily a request to expand the scope of discovery will not justify a cost-bearing order. Judge Niemeyer agreed to draft appropriate language to that effect, and his language was later incorporated in the revised committee note.

Judge Scirica stated that several public comments had suggested that the amendment would have the effect of distinguishing between plaintiffs who have resources and those who do not. Judge Niemeyer replied that the amendment would not change the current results. Plaintiffs will continue to receive, without charge, every document that relates to their claim or defense or that relates to the subject matter of the action. Cost-bearing will only be applied to discovery requests that are burdensome, duplicative, or unreasonable. Judge Levi added that a judge, in considering cost bearing, is required explicitly to take account of the parties’ resources under Rule 26(b)(2). Accordingly, parties with limited resources may actually be treated better than well-healed parties under the amended rule. Moreover, a party who can afford to pay for marginal discovery, and is willing to pay for it, may not in fact receive it because the judge has discretion to deny the request entirely.

One of the members said that the amendment would cause havoc, especially in employment discrimination cases. He predicted that defendants would bring a motion for cost-bearing in every case in an effort to save money for their clients. One of the members responded that the prediction assumed that judges would act foolishly. He said that routinely-made motions will be routinely denied.

Judge Levi added that the cost-bearing amendment, by definition, deals only with material that is marginal to the case and is burdensome, duplicative, or unreasonable. Some members questioned why that type of material should be produced at all. Others responded that the amendment provides judges with a useful management tool and would permit a judge to determine how much a lawyer wants particular material and whether the lawyer is willing to pay

for it. Others suggested that the amendment would allow judges to order discovery on condition that the requesting party pay only part of the cost of producing it. They said that it was not clear whether judges may apportion costs under the current rule.

One member asked why local rule authority had been removed from the provision of Rule 26(b)(2) dealing with the number of depositions and interrogatories and the length of depositions, but retained with regard to the number of requests for admissions. Professor Cooper responded that there were several local rules on the subject, and the advisory committee was reluctant to eliminate local rule authority to limit requests for admission without further study of local practices.

Another member pointed out that the committee note to Rule 26 referred to standing orders, as well as local rules, in some places, but not in others. He suggested that the note be reviewed in this respect for consistency of terminology.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(2) by a vote of 11 to 1.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(d) and (f)

Judge Niemeyer reported that the proposed amendments to Rule 26(f) would require the parties to confer at least 21 days, rather than 14 days, before the court's Rule 16 scheduling conference or scheduling order. He noted that the advisory committee had made a change in the amendments after publication to accommodate the expedited pretrial procedures used in the Eastern District of Virginia. The change would allow a court by local rule to require that the conference be held less than 21 days before the scheduling conference or order.

Judge Niemeyer pointed out that the amendments would no longer require the attorneys to meet face-to-face, but would allow a court by local rule or order to require that the attorneys attend the conference in person. Several members questioned the wisdom of allowing courts to issue local rules on this subject, especially since the authority of courts to opt out of national requirements was being eliminated in other parts of Rule 26. One added that the requirement for face-to-face meetings should be made in individual cases, rather than by local rule.

Judges Niemeyer and Levi agreed that local rules should be discouraged generally, but they noted that the advisory committee believed that differences in geography and local culture made it appropriate to allow courts to have local variations in this specific instance. They added that several commentators had informed the committee that face-to-face meetings between the attorneys, as required by the 1993 amendments to Rule 26(f), had been instrumental in expediting cases and reducing costs.

One of the members stated that a court should not be allowed by local rule to require out-of-town counsel to appear in person. Professor Cooper replied that the committee note addressed

the issue and provided that, “a local rule might wisely mandate face-to-face meetings only when the parties or lawyers are in sufficient proximity to one another.”

Judge Kravitch moved to eliminate from the proposed amendments the authority of a court to require face-to-face meetings of counsel by local rule and replace it with language that would authorize a court to require that meetings be held face-to-face, but only by a judge’s case-specific order. Her motion was approved by a vote of 8 to 2.

The committee approved the amendments to Rules 26(d) and (f) by a vote of 12 to 0.

FED. R. CIV. P. 30

Judge Niemeyer reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 30(d)(2) would establish a presumptive limit on depositions of one day of seven hours. But a longer period could be authorized by court order or stipulation of the parties. The amendment, he said, was designed to respond to an area cited by commentators — particularly plaintiffs’ lawyers — as one of recurring abuse and excess cost. He noted that research by the Federal Judicial Center had demonstrated that depositions are often the single most expensive item of discovery.

Judge Niemeyer stated that the rule provides a norm to guide the bench and bar in measuring depositions. He said that the advisory committee had heard many comments at the public hearings that the new rule would be effective. He added that the most common response from lawyers was that they have little trouble in reaching accommodations with opposing counsel on making arrangements for depositions. The amendment, he said, tells lawyers what the norm is for a deposition, and they will plan their depositions accordingly. One member added that he had been strongly opposed to the amendment when it had been published, but the consistent testimony from lawyers at the hearings had convinced him that the rule would work well in practice.

Judge Tashima moved to exclude expert witnesses from the operation of the rule. He noted that many expert witness depositions simply cannot be completed within seven hours. He added that the Department of Justice supported his position in this regard, but the Department would go further and also exclude Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses and named parties.

One of the members spoke against the proposed amendment in general, saying that it simply was not necessary. He said that it is easier to demonstrate to a judge that abuse has occurred in a deposition than to convince the judge that additional time is needed for a deposition. Judge Niemeyer replied that many members of the advisory committee had been of the same view, but were convinced by the hearings that the amendment to the rule would be beneficial.

Professor Marcus said that the advisory committee had included additional language in the committee note to guide lawyers and judges as to when it would be desirable to extend the time for the deposition. Mr. Katyal added that the Department of Justice appreciated the additional language in the committee note, but still believed that there was no need to apply the presumptive

time limit to depositions of expert witnesses. He said that government attorneys feared that relying on the consent of a party or the court's management to waive the 7-hour limit would not be sufficient.

The committee rejected Judge Tashima's motion by a vote of 7 to 3.

One member said that it was essential that the deponent be required to read pertinent documents in advance in order to avoid wasting time and generating requests for extensions of time. He noted that language to that effect had been included in the committee note, but he would prefer to have a clear requirement included in the rule. He also suggested that the note provide additional direction to the bar regarding time limits for depositions in multiple-party cases. Judge Niemeyer responded that the discovery subcommittee would continue to study these matters, but it is simply not possible to address all potential problems in the rule or the note.

Judge Niemeyer reported that the advisory committee had amended Rule 30(f)(1), without publication, to eliminate the need to file a deposition with the court. The change merely conforms the rule to the published amendment to Rule 5(d), which provides that depositions not be filed with the court.

The committee approved the proposed amendments to Rule 30 by a vote of 10 to 1.

FED. R. CIV. P. 34

Judge Niemeyer reported that the advisory committee had added to Rule 34 a cross-reference to Rule 26(b)(2)(i), (ii), and (iii). He noted that, as published, the cost-bearing provision had been included as part of Rule 34(b), but the committee relocated it to Rule 26(b)(2) after publication. Because cost-bearing concerns often arise in connection with discovery under Rule 34, a reference was needed in Rule 34 to call attention to the availability of cost-bearing in connection with motions to compel Rule 34 discovery and Rule 26(c) protective orders in connection with document discovery.

Some members of the committee questioned the need for the cross-reference in Rule 34. Other members pointed out, however, that although the reference is not essential, it serves as a helpful flag to lawyers.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 34 without objection.

FED. R. CIV. P. 37

Judge Niemeyer reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 37(c)(1) closes a gap in the current rule and provides that the sanction of exclusion, forbidding the use of materials not properly disclosed, applies to a failure to supplement a formal discovery response.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 37 without objection.

The committee approved the package of amendments to the discovery rules by a vote of 10 to 0.

Rules for Publication

Electronic Service

FED. R. CIV. P. 5, 6, and 77 and FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006 and 9022

Judge Niemeyer reported that the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had been asked to take the lead in drafting uniform amendments to the federal rules to authorize service by electronic means. The advisory committee, he said, had worked closely with the Standing Committee's Technology Subcommittee (which includes representatives from each of the advisory committees), and it had generally followed the advice of that subcommittee. He noted that the proposed amendments before the Standing Committee had been circulated to the other advisory committees for comment. Although many of the suggestions from the other committees had been incorporated in the draft, the advisory committees were not in complete agreement on all parts of the draft.

Professor Cooper pointed out that all the participants agreed that the time for electronic service had arrived, but they also agreed that it was premature to consider making its use mandatory — either by national rule or by local rule. Accordingly, the proposed amendments authorize electronic service with the consent of the party being served. He added that they authorize electronic service only for documents under Rules 5(a) and 77(d), and not for the service of initiating documents and process in a case, such as under FED. R. CIV. P. 4

Professor Cooper said that, as amended, Rule 5(b) specifies that service is complete upon “transmission.” He noted that the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had requested specific comment from the other advisory committees on this point. In response, the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules asked what should happen if service is transmitted electronically, but the electronic system notifies the sender that the message has not in fact been delivered. As a result, language was added to the committee note specifying that: “As with other modes of service, . . . actual notice that the transmission was not received defeats the presumption of receipt that arises from the provision that service is complete upon transmission.”

Professor Cooper pointed out that new subparagraph 5(b)(2)(D) provides that, if authorized by local rule, a party may make service through the court's transmission facilities. He explained that this provision contemplates eventual enhancements in the courts' electronic systems to allow a party to file a paper with the court and have it served simultaneously on all the required parties. Professor Cooper also pointed out that this is the only reference to local rule authority in the proposed amendments. In addition, a minor amendment would be made to FED. R. CIV. P. 77(d) to conform to the changes proposed in Rule 5(b).

Judge Niemeyer reported that electronic service raises the question of whether the party being served should be allowed additional time to respond, in the same way that FED. R. CIV. P. 6(e) currently provides an additional three days to respond when a party is served by mail. He said that differing views had been expressed on this subject. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had prepared a draft rule plus three alternatives for presentation to the Standing Committee. The draft rule would allow an extra three days for all service other than personal service. Alternative 1 would make no change in Rule 6(e), therefore providing no additional time when service is made electronically. Alternative 2 would eliminate Rule 6(e) and the three-day provision entirely. Alternative 3 would amend Rule 6(e) to allow an additional three days if service is made by mail “or by a means permitted only with the consent of the party served.” Professor Resnick said that this formulation, which covers electronic service, could conveniently be incorporated by the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

Judge Niemeyer reported that 6 members of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had voted against allowing additional time for service by electronic means — or for any other types of proposed consensual service, such as commercial carrier. Professor Cooper added that the reasoning for this approach is that the rule specifically requires consent, and people will only consent to a type of service in which they have confidence. Accordingly, there is no need to provide them with additional time. He added that the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules had expressed concern that if additional time were given, it would deter people from using electronic service.

Judge Niemeyer said that 4 members of the advisory committee had voted to allow three days additional time. He noted that those who favored allowing additional time urged that consent will be more likely to be given if it brings with it the reward of additional time. He added that the committee would describe the alternatives and solicit comment from the public on the advisability of applying the three-day rule to electronic service.

Judge Scirica emphasized the importance of publishing a uniform set of amendments if feasible. Professor Cooper agreed, but pointed out some practical differences between civil and appellate practice. Judge Garwood added that the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure — unlike the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure — presently authorize service by commercial carrier, and that no consent is required from the party being served by commercial carrier. He noted that FED. R. APP. P. 25 and 26 give the party being served an extra three days unless the paper in question is delivered on the date of service specified in the paper.

Judge Garwood said that the time periods should generally be the same in all the federal rules. He would, however, distinguish the issue of the authority to use commercial carriers from the issue of whether an additional three days is provided for a response.

Professor Resnick said that the bankruptcy rules did not have to be amended to authorize electronic service in adversary proceedings because FED. R. CIV. P. 5 is applicable to those proceedings. He added that the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules believed that an additional three days should be allowed for electronic service, and for all other types of service

except personal delivery. Therefore, it had prepared companion amendments to FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006, to extend the three-day "mail rule" to all service under FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b)(2)(C) and (D), and to FED. R. BANKR. P. 9022, to conform to the proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 77(d). He urged that the proposed amendments to the bankruptcy rules be published together with the proposed amendments to the civil rules.

The committee voted without objection to authorize publication of the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b) and 77(d) and to FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006 and 9022. As part of the package, an alternate amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 6(e) would also be published for comment.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Davis presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in his memorandum and attachments of May 12, 1999. (Agenda Item 8)

He reported that the advisory committee had no action items to present. He noted that the committee was deeply involved in the project to restyle the body of criminal rules. The Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee had prepared a draft of the entire criminal rules, and the advisory committee was close to completing its revision of the first 22 rules.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Smith presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in her memorandum and attachments of May 1, 1999. (Agenda Item 9)

Judge Smith reported that the advisory committee was seeking approval of amendments to seven rules. She noted that she had provided the Standing Committee with a detailed explanation of the proposed amendments at the January 1999 meeting. The advisory committee, she said, had conducted two hearings on the amendments and had received 173 written comments from the public.

FED. R. EVID. 103

Judge Smith said that the proposed amendment to Rule 103 would resolve a dispute in the case law over whether it is necessary for a party to renew an objection or an offer proof at trial after the court has made an advance ruling on the admissibility of the proffered evidence. She noted that the amendment had been considered by the Standing Committee on several occasions and that improvements in its language had been made. She added that the current proposal had received very favorable support during the public comment period.

Judge Smith pointed out that the proposed amendment, as published, had contained an additional sentence codifying and extending to all cases the principles of *Luce v. United States*, 469 U.S. 38 (1984). In that case, the Supreme Court held that a criminal defendant must testify at trial in order to preserve the right to appeal an advance ruling admitting impeachment evidence. The public comments on the addition, she said, had been negative, and several commentators had expressed concern over the potential and unpredictable consequences of applying *Luce* to civil cases.

Judge Smith said that the advisory committee had decided to eliminate the additional sentence in light of the public comments. But, she added, some members were concerned that elimination of the sentence might be interpreted as an implicit attempt to overrule *Luce*. Ultimately, the advisory committee decided to eliminate the sentence but to include explicit language in the committee note stating that nothing in the amendment is intended to affect the rule set forth in *Luce*.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 103 without objection.

FED. R. EVID. 404

Judge Smith reported that Rule 404(a)(1) would be amended to provide that when an accused attacks the character of an alleged victim, the accused's character also becomes subject to attack for the "same trait." She pointed out that the amendment, as published, had been broader in scope, allowing the accused to be attacked by evidence of a "pertinent trait of character." She added that the advisory committee had narrowed the amendment in light of negative public comments and comments from some members of the Standing Committee.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 404 without objection.

FED. R. EVID. 701

Mr. Holder reported that the litigating divisions of the Department of Justice, the United States attorneys, and other components of the Department had thoroughly reviewed the proposed amendment to FED. R. EVID. 701 and had concluded that it would have a serious and deleterious impact on the Department's civil and criminal litigation. He said that he was grateful that the advisory committee had carefully considered his letter of January 5, 1999, to Judge Smith and had made changes in the amended rule and the accompanying committee note to accommodate the Department's concerns. But, he said, the revised amendments regrettably did not alleviate the core concerns of the Department's lawyers.

Mr. Holder explained that no bright line is presently drawn in Rule 701 between lay testimony and expert testimony. Witnesses are often put on the stand by counsel to testify as to facts, but their testimony inevitably includes opinions based on their occupation or personal experience.

He noted, for example, that the Department of Justice puts witnesses on the stand who testify as to drug transactions, food adulteration, or environmental cleanups. Many of these witnesses would not be considered “experts,” in the common or legal use of the term, but their testimony is often based on specialized knowledge. The testimony cannot meaningfully be presented to the court or jury without the witnesses giving their opinions, which are based on specialized knowledge arising from their occupation or life experience.

Mr. Holder said that forcing these people to be considered “experts” under Rule 702 would lead to a number of unfortunate results. Under FED. R. CRIM. P. 16, for example, they would have to file a written summary of their testimony. In civil cases, FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(2) may require them to file expert reports. Also by brightening the line between lay and expert testimony, the amendment, he said, would subject the evidentiary rulings of trial judges to greater appellate review. This result would run counter to the thrust of the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* 509 U.S. 579 (1993), and *Kumho Tire Co. V. Carmichael*, 119 S. Ct. 1167 (1999), which confirmed the discretion of trial courts to weigh the reliability of testimony.

Finally, Mr. Holder said that the net effect of the amendment to Rule 701 would be to require the Department under FED. R. CRIM. P. 16 to disclose in advance of trial the identity of fact witnesses whom it intends to call if part of their testimony entails giving their opinion as to matters they have observed. Such disclosure might in a few cases pose a danger to the life or safety of prospective witnesses.

In conclusion, Mr. Holder urged the committee to reject the rule entirely. Alternatively, he recommended that it be deferred for further consideration by the civil and criminal advisory committees.

Judge Smith said that the Department, basically, objects to brightening the line between Rule 701 lay testimony and Rule 702 expert testimony. But, she said, although the line cannot be brightened completely, it can be clarified. There will always be some doubt, and judges will continue to have to exercise judicial discretion. She added that in light of the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Daubert* and *Kumho*, it was necessary to provide judges and lawyers with some guidelines in this area.

Judge Smith said that there was a widespread belief among the bar that the lack of guidelines has led to increasing attempts by attorneys to evade the reliability requirements of Rule 702 by proffering experts in the guise of law witnesses under Rule 701. She added that the proposed amendment to Rule 701 was not intended in any way to change the status of lay opinion or opinion that is based on people’s everyday life experiences. Rather, the advisory committee wanted to clarify for the bench and bar how the judicial gatekeeping function should operate. She explained that, as helpful as the *Kumho* decision had been, there still needed to be guidelines set forth in the rules to aid the bench and bar.

Judge Smith pointed out that Mr. Holder’s letter of June 9 to the Standing Committee, in

discussing FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(1), had expressed "grave substantive concerns, shared by the Department, about the Advisory Committee's proposal to modify the most essential element of the federal civil system — the complementary hallmarks of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: notice pleading and full discovery of relevant information." She said that full disclosure of information requires that a party give notice to the other party of any specialized knowledge on the part of a witness it intends to call. Only in this way can the court's gatekeeping function be handled properly, with appropriate input from both sides. She said that the basic needs of fairness outweigh the inconvenience of having to disclose more witnesses in some kinds of cases.

Judge Smith reported that the advisory committee had made changes in Rule 701 to ameliorate the concerns of the Department of Justice. She said that the words "within the scope of Rule 702" had been added to the rule after publication to show that witnesses need not be qualified as experts unless they are clearly found to be expert witnesses under Rule 702. She said that the committee had also added several examples to the committee note of the types of lay opinion witnesses who do not need to be qualified as experts. Professor Capra explained that the committee had incorporated the examples from the pertinent case law to help clarify the application of Rules 701 and 702 in light of the concerns of the Department and to assist attorneys in determining in advance how to avoid potential violations of FED. R. CRIM. P. 16.

Mr. Katyal said that the Department's principal concern with the amendment was not that its lawyers would be unable to introduce necessary testimony in court, but that testimony currently admitted under Rule 701 would now be classified as Rule 702 expert testimony. This would require compliance with FED. R. CRIM. P. 16, including pretrial disclosure of the names of witnesses. He noted that the Attorney General has had a long-standing policy on this matter and had written to the chief justice in the past firmly opposing proposed amendments to Rule 16 that would have required pretrial disclosure of government witnesses.

Mr. Katyal said that the United States attorneys and the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice believe strongly that the proposed amendment will threaten the safety of government witnesses and add to litigation costs. He added that *Kumho* did not require the proposed amendment, and that the bright line fashioned by the proposed amendment would actually undercut *Kumho*.

Several judges responded that, based on their experience, the potential problems pointed out by the Department of Justice were overstated. One judge, for example, said that the Department's views must always be taken very seriously, but the danger to witnesses cited by the Department was simply not realistic. He suggested that the proposed amendment was both modest and reasonable and added that the Department's concern over the safety of witnesses could be handled in appropriate cases by issuance of a protective order. Professor Capra noted that FED. R. CRIM. P. 16 does not require the government to disclose the identity of a witness. It only requires disclosure of statements.

Judge Scirica said that if the proposed rule were adopted, a United States attorney would in an appropriate case petition the court *ex parte* to protect any witness against whom there was a

potential threat. Mr. Katyal responded that the Department had in fact discussed this suggested course of action with the United States attorneys, but they countered that the amended rule might not authorize that type of action. And, in any event, the district court might deny their request. Judge Smith added that the witnesses covered by the rule were, usually, law enforcement witnesses, rather than potentially endangered lay witnesses.

Judge Scirica asked Judges Davis and Niemeyer to comment on Mr. Holder's alternate recommendation that the proposed amendment to Rule 701 be deferred to obtain the views of the criminal and civil advisory committees. Judge Davis responded that the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules would have no problem with the proposed amendment. He noted that his committee had consistently called for greater pretrial disclosure under FED. R. CRIM. P. 16 than the Department of Justice has been willing to provide. Judge Niemeyer commented that the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules had not considered the proposed amendment, but that he personally believed that it would be helpful in clarifying the distinction between lay witnesses and expert witnesses.

Mr. Katyal suggested that the committee note be amended to specify that the rule is not intended to require the disclosure of the identify of witnesses if the United States attorney personally avers to the court that the safety of a witness is at stake, or there are facts that tend to reveal that the safety of a witness may be at stake. Professor Capra responded that the additional language would be inappropriate because Rule 702 is an evidence rule, not a disclosure or discovery rule.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 701 by a vote of 9 to 1.

FED. R. EVID. 702

Judge Smith reported that the advisory committee had made minor changes in the rule following publication: (1) to delete the word "reliable" from Subpart 1 of the proposed amendment; (2) to amend the committee note in several places to add references to the Supreme Court's decision in *Kumho*, which was rendered after publication; (3) to revise the note to emphasize that the amendment does not limit the right to a jury trial or encourage additional challenges to the testimony of expert witnesses; and (4) to add language to the note to clarify that no single factor is necessarily dispositive of the reliability inquiry mandated by Rule 702.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 702 by a vote of 9 to 0.

FED. R. EVID. 703

Judge Smith reported that the advisory committee had made a few minor, stylistic changes following publication.

The committee approved the proposed amendment to Rule 703 by a vote of 10 to 0.

FED. R. EVID. 803 AND 902

Professor Capra pointed out that the proposed amendments to Rules 803(6) and 902(11) and (12) were part of a single package, allowing certain records of regularly conducted activity to be admitted without the need for calling a foundation witness. He pointed out that two new subdivisions would be added to Rule 902 to provide procedures for the self-authentication of foreign and domestic business records. Professor Capra said that the advisory committee had made minor stylistic changes following publication and had added a phrase to specify that the manner of authentication should comply with any Act of Congress or federal rule.

The committee approved the proposed amendments to Rules 803 and 902 without objection.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY CONDUCT RULES SUBCOMMITTEE

Judge Scirica reported that Professor Coquillette and the subcommittee had accomplished a great deal since the last committee meeting. He noted that the subcommittee had held a meeting in Washington in May 1999 that included members of other Judicial Conference committees and a number of people interested and knowledgeable in attorney conduct matters. He said that recent federal legislation had made government attorneys subject to state ethical regulations, and that Chief Justice Veasey and Professor Hazard had been active in working with the Department of Justice in trying to fashion an acceptable rule to govern the subject matter of Rule 4.2 of the A.B.A. Code of Conduct, *i.e.*, contact by government attorneys with represented parties.

Chief Justice Veasey reported that additional progress had been made in the negotiations on this matter among the chief justices, the Department of Justice, and the American Bar Association. He added that two competing bills were pending in the Senate. One, sponsored by Senator Hatch, would preempt state bars from regulating federal prosecutors. The other, sponsored by Senator Leahy, would single out for Judicial Conference action the issue of government attorneys contacting represented parties. He reported that the Conference of Chief Justices had written to Senators Hatch and Leahy informing them that work was proceeding on trying to reach a compromise. He added that Professor Hazard had been very active and very helpful in the negotiations.

Professor Coquillette said that the subcommittee was planning to hold one additional meeting, in Philadelphia in September.

He reported that there are literally hundreds of local federal court rules purporting to govern attorney conduct. Some of them, he said, just adopt the conduct rules of the state in which the federal court sits. Other local rules adopt the A.B.A. Code, and some adopt the A.B.A. canons. Many courts, moreover, appear to ignore their own rules in practice.

Professor Coquillette said that there appeared to be a consensus that attorney conduct obligations should, as a general rule, be governed by the laws of the states. If there are to be any special rules for federal attorneys, they should be limited to a very small core when clear federal interests are at stake. He noted that Professor Cooper was working on a draft “dynamic conformity” rule that would make state conduct rules applicable in the federal courts, but leave open a narrow door for such matters as Rule 4.2 conduct. He said that the draft would be circulated for comment to the subcommittee and the advisory committee reporters. He added that there was a possibility that a proposed resolution of the matter might be brought before the Standing Committee at the January 2000 meeting.

LOCAL RULES PROJECT

Professor Squiers explained in brief the manner in which she had conducted the original local rules project. She explained that in her original study she had gathered the rules of every court and had placed them in five categories: (1) those that were appropriate local rules; (2) those that were so effective that they should be publicized as model rules for the other courts to consider; (3) those that should be incorporated into the national rules; (4) those that were duplicative of the federal rules; and (5) those that were inconsistent with federal law or the national rules. She added that the courts were provided with the results of this work and asked to take appropriate action. Compliance, she said, was voluntary.

Professor Squiers pointed out that the federal rules had been amended in 1995 to require that local rules be renumbered, and most courts had redrafted their rules to meet that requirement. In addition, she said, the Civil Justice Reform Act had led to the adoption of many new local rules, and that some additional local rules changes had been made to take account of the expiration of the Act.

Professor Squiers reported that she planned to follow the same general approach in the new study of local rules, and she invited the members to provide input and guidance. She pointed, for example, to suggestions that she had received that the judicial councils of the circuits should be involved early in the project since they have the authority to oversee and abrogate local rules.

Some of the members pointed out that some of the judicial councils appeared to be very active in reviewing and acting on local rules, while other councils appeared to be largely inactive in this area. Judge Scirica said that it might be useful for the committee eventually to suggest a model process for the judicial councils to follow in reviewing local rules.

REPORT OF THE STYLE SUBCOMMITTEE

Judge Parker reported that the style subcommittee’s efforts had been directed to assisting

the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules in restyling the body of criminal rules. He noted that the style subcommittee had completed a preliminary draft of all the criminal rules, and that the advisory committee would take action on FED. R. CRIM. P. 1-22 at its June 1999 meeting.

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

Judge Scirica reported that the next committee meeting had been scheduled for January 6 and 7, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter G. McCabe,
Secretary