

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 25, 2019 | Washington, DC

The Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee or Committee) met in Washington, DC, on June 25, 2019. The following members participated in the meeting:

Judge David G. Campbell, Chair
Judge Jesse M. Furman
Daniel C. Girard, Esq.
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr., Esq.
Judge Susan P. Graber
Judge Frank Mays Hull
Judge William Kayatta, Jr.

Peter D. Keisler, Esq.
Professor William K. Kelley
Judge Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge Amy St. Eve
Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Esq.*
Judge Srikanth Srinivasan

*Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division, and Andrew D. Goldsmith, National Coordinator of Criminal Discovery Initiatives, represented the Department of Justice (DOJ) on behalf of the Honorable Jeffrey A. Rosen, Deputy Attorney General.

The following attended on behalf of the Advisory Committees:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules –
Judge Michael A. Chagares, Chair
Professor Edward Hartnett, Reporter

Advisory Committee on Civil Rules –
Judge John D. Bates, Chair
Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
Professor Richard L. Marcus,
Associate Reporter

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules –
Judge Dennis R. Dow, Chair
Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter
Professor Laura Bartell,
Associate Reporter

Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules –
Judge Debra Ann Livingston, Chair
Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules –
Judge Donald W. Molloy, Chair
Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter
Professor Nancy J. King,
Associate Reporter

Others providing support to the Committee included: Professor Catherine T. Struve, the Standing Committee's Reporter; Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, Professor Bryan A. Garner, and Professor Joseph Kimble, consultants to the Standing Committee; Rebecca A. Womeldorf, the Standing Committee's Secretary; Bridget Healy, Scott Myers, and Julie Wilson, Rules Committee Staff Counsel; Ahmad Al Dajani, Law Clerk to the Standing Committee; and Judge John S. Cooke, Director, and Dr. Tim Reagan, Senior Research Associate, of the Federal Judicial Center (FJC).

OPENING BUSINESS

Judge Campbell called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to Washington, DC. This meeting is the last for two members, Judge Susan Graber and Judge Amy St. Eve. Judge Campbell thanked Judge Graber for her contributions as a member of the Committee and for her service as liaison to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules. Judge Campbell thanked Judge St. Eve for her contributions as a member of the Committee and her leadership on the Task Force on Protecting Cooperators and wished her luck on her new assignment as a member of the Budget Committee. Judge Campbell also noted this would be the last Standing Committee meeting for Judge Donald Molloy, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules, and thanked him for his many years of service to the rules process. Judge Campbell also recognized Scott Myers for twenty years of federal government service, which has included time as a member of the United States Marine Corps, a law clerk, and counsel to the Rules Committees.

Rebecca Womeldorf reviewed the status of proposed rules amendments proceeding through each stage of the Rules Enabling Act process and referred members to the detailed tracking chart in the agenda book for further details. Judge Campbell noted that the rules adopted by the Supreme Court on April 25, 2019 will go into effect on December 1, 2019 provided Congress takes no contrary action.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion by a member, seconded by another, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved the minutes of the January 3, 2019 meeting.**

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Chagares and Professor Hartnett presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules.

Action Items

Final Approval of Proposed Amendments to Rule 35 (En Banc Determination) and Rule 40 (Petition for Panel Rehearing). Judge Chagares asked the Committee to recommend final approval of proposed amendments to Rules 35 and 40 which will set length limits applicable to a response filed to a petition for en banc review or for panel rehearing. The proposed amendments were published for public comment in August 2018. The one written comment received was supportive and Judge Chagares reported receiving informal favorable comments from colleagues. No revisions were made after publication.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 35 and Rule 40 for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Publication of Proposed Amendments to Rule 3 (Appeal as of Right—How Taken) and Conforming Amendments to Rule 6 and Forms 1 and 2. Judge Chagares asked the Committee for approval to publish for public comment proposed amendments to Rule 3(c) regarding contents of the notice of appeal, along with conforming amendments to Rule 6 and Forms 1 and 2. Judge

Chagares noted by way of background the recent Supreme Court decision in *Garza v. Idaho*, 139 S. Ct. 738 (2019), in which the Court stated that the filing of a notice of appeal should be a simple, non-substantive act.

Judge Chagares explained that this proposal originated in a 2017 suggestion that pointed to a problem in the caselaw concerning the scope of notices of appeal. Some cases, the suggestion noted, apply an *expressio unius* approach to interpreting the notice of appeal. Under that approach, for example, if the notice of appeal designates a particular interlocutory order in addition to the final judgment, such courts might limit the scope of the appeal to the designated order rather than treating the notice as bringing up for review all interlocutory orders that merged into the judgment. Extensive research revealed confusion on the issue both across and within circuits. Professor Hartnett noted another problematic aspect of the caselaw: numerous decisions treat notices of appeal that designate an order that disposed of all remaining claims in a case as limited to the claims disposed of in the designated order. Judge Chagares noted that the Advisory Committee’s goal in proposing amendments to Rule 3(c) is to ensure that the filing of a notice of appeal is a simple, non-substantive act that creates no traps for the unwary.

Professor Hartnett reviewed the rationale behind the Advisory Committee’s proposed amendments. Professor Hartnett noted that one source of the problem was Rule 3(c)(1)(B)’s current requirement that a notice of appeal “designate the judgment, order, or part thereof being appealed.” Some have read this provision to require designation of any order that the appellant wishes to challenge on appeal, rather than simply designation of the judgment or order that serves as the basis of the court’s appellate jurisdiction and from which time limits are calculated.

The Advisory Committee proposed four interrelated changes to Rule 3(c)(1)(B) to address the structure of the rule and to provide greater clarity. First, to highlight the distinction between the ordinary case in which an appeal is taken from the final judgment and the less-common case in which an appeal is taken from some other order, the terms “judgment” and “order” are separated by a dash. Second, to clarify that the kind of order that is to be designated in the latter situation is one that can serve as the basis of the court’s appellate jurisdiction, the word “appealable” is added before the word “order.” Third, to clarify that the judgment or order to be designated is the one serving as the basis of the court’s appellate jurisdiction, the phrase “from which the appeal is taken” replaces the phrase “being appealed.” Finally, the phrase “part thereof” is deleted because the Advisory Committee viewed this phrase as contributing to the problem. The result requires the appellant to designate the judgment – or the appealable order – from which the appeal is taken. To underscore the distinction between an appeal from a judgment and an appeal from an appealable order, Professor Hartnett noted, the proposed conforming amendments to Form 1 would create a Form 1A (Notice of Appeal to a Court of Appeals From a Judgment of a District Court) and a Form 1B (Notice of Appeal to a Court of Appeals From an Appealable Order of a District Court).

Other proposed changes address the merger rule. A new paragraph (4) was added to underscore the merger rule, which provides that when a notice of appeal identifies a judgment or order, this includes all orders that merge into the designated judgment or order for purposes of appeal. The Advisory Committee also added to the Committee Note a paragraph discussing the

merger principle. In addition, the Advisory Committee added a fifth paragraph to the rule addressing two kinds of scenarios where an appellant's designation of an order should be read to encompass the final judgment in a civil case. In one scenario, some pieces of the case are resolved earlier, and others only later; a notice of appeal designating the order that resolves all remaining claims as to all parties should be read as a designation of the final judgment. In the other scenario, a notice of appeal designates the order disposing of a post-judgment motion of a kind that re-started the time to appeal the final judgment; that notice should be read to encompass a designation of the final judgment. In both scenarios, the proposed rule operates whether or not the court has entered judgment on a separate document.

A new sixth paragraph was added providing that “[a]n appellant may designate only part of a judgment or appealable order by expressly stating that the notice of appeal is so limited. Without such an express statement, specific designations do not limit the scope of the notice of appeal.” The final sentence was added to expressly reject the *expressio unius* approach. The Advisory Committee settled on this approach to avoid the inadvertent loss of appellate rights while empowering litigants to define the scope of their appeal.

Finally, the Advisory Committee recommended conforming changes to Rule 6 to change the reference to “Form 1” to “Forms 1A and 1B,” and conforming changes to Form 2 to reflect the deletion of “part thereof” from Rule 3(c)(1)(B). The Advisory Committee consulted with reporters to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules regarding the amendments to Rule 6.

A member asked why the Advisory Committee referenced but did not define the merger rule in the rule text. Professor Hartnett explained that the Advisory Committee did not want to limit the merger principle's continuing development by codifying it in the rule. The rule's reference to the merger rule will prompt an inexperienced litigant to review the Committee Note for more information. Judge Campbell observed that an attempt to define the merger rule in the Rule text could change current law by overriding existing nuances. Two judge members expressed concern that the Rule needs to be understandable to pro se litigants and unsophisticated lawyers. One of these members asked why the Rule text could not state in simple terms the outlines of the merger principle – e.g., “an appeal from a final judgment brings up for review any order that can be appealed at that time”? Professor Hartnett responded that the Advisory Committee was concerned that such a formulation in the Rule text might alter current law; he stated that the Advisory Committee wanted to alert litigants to the merger rule in the rule itself and provide additional guidance for litigants in the Committee Note. An attorney member suggested that the proposed draft offered the most elegant solution – using Rule text that serves as a placeholder for the merger doctrine. A judge member expressed agreement with this view.

That judge member next asked why the Advisory Committee proposed to retain, in new subdivision (c)(6), the appellant's ability to designate only part of a judgment or order. Professor Hartnett suggested that a designation of just part of a judgment might serve the interest of repose by assuring other parties that the scope of the appeal was limited. Professor Cooper offered as an example an instance in which the plaintiff's claims against both of two defendants have been dismissed but the plaintiff has no wish to challenge the dismissal as to one of the defendants; a

limited notice of appeal, in such a case, would reassure the defendant whom the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue.

A judge asked about the potential for over-inclusion in notices of appeal as a result of the proposed amendments, and whether there is a benefit to requiring that parties be specific about what they are appealing. Professor Hartnett responded that the notice is not the place to limit the issues on appeal. A notice is just a simple document transferring jurisdiction from the district court to the appellate court. The scope of the appeal can be clarified in the ensuing briefing.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rules 3 and 6 and Forms 1 and 2.**

Professor Struve congratulated the Advisory Committee and Professor Hartnett for a clever solution to a very tough problem. Professor Hartnett thanked Professor Cooper for his assistance.

Publication of Proposed Amendments to Rule 42(b) (Voluntary Dismissal). Judge Chagares stated that the Advisory Committee sought publication of proposed amendments to Rule 42(b). Rule 42(b) currently provides that the clerk “may” dismiss an appeal if the parties file a signed dismissal agreement. Prior to the 1998 non-substantive restyling of the Appellate Rules, Rule 42(b) used the word “shall” instead of “may” dismiss. Following the 1998 restyling, some courts have concluded that discretion exists to decline to dismiss. Attorneys cannot advise their clients with confidence that an action will be dismissed upon agreement by the parties. To clarify the distinction between situations where dismissal is mandated by stipulation of the parties and other situations, the proposed amendment would subdivide Rule 42(b), add appropriate subheadings, and change the word “may” to “must” in new Rule 42(b)(1) for stipulated dismissals.

Judge Chagares explained that the phrase “no mandate or other process may issue without a court order” in current Rule 42(b) has caused confusion as well. Some circuit clerks have taken to issuing orders in lieu of mandates when appeals are dismissed in order to make clear that jurisdiction over the case is being returned to the district court. These issues are avoided – and the purpose of that language served – by deleting the phrase and instead stating directly, in new subsection (b)(3): “A court order is required for any relief beyond the mere dismissal of an appeal—including approving a settlement, vacating an action of the district court or an administrative agency, or remanding the case to either of them.”

A member suggested that language from the proposed Committee Note be moved to the rule itself, creating a new subdivision stating that the Rule does not affect any law that requires court approval of a settlement. Four other members expressed agreement with the idea of putting such a caveat into the Rule text. A motion was made and seconded to amend the proposal to include such a caveat; the motion passed. The Committee discussed how to draft the caveat; it started by considering language that had been used in a prior draft, as follows: “If court approval of a settlement is required by law or sought by the parties, the court may approve the settlement or remand to consider whether to approve it.” Following a break and extensive discussion of

possible language, including suggestions from the style consultants, Judge Chagares proposed instead to add a new subdivision (c) which would modify both preceding paragraphs of Rule 42 and state as follows: “(c) Court Approval. This Rule 42 does not alter the legal requirements governing court approval of a settlement, payment, or other consideration.” The Committee Note was revised to add a cite to “F.R.Civ.P. 23(e) (requiring district court approval)” and to explain that the “amendment replaces old terminology and clarifies that any order beyond mere dismissal—including approving a settlement, vacating, or remanding—requires a court order.” By consensus, this new subdivision (c) was incorporated into the proposed amendments to Rule 42, upon which the Committee proceeded to vote.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rule 42.**

Information Items

Possible Additional Amendments to Rules 35 (En Banc Determination) and 40 (Petition for Panel Rehearing). Judge Chagares advised that the Advisory Committee continued to study whether amendments were warranted to clarify and codify practices under Rules 35 and 40.

Rule 4 (Appeal as of Right – When Taken). Judge Chagares explained that the Advisory Committee has been considering whether to amend Rule 4(a)(5)(C) (which deals with extensions of time to appeal) in light of the Court’s decision in *Hamer v. Neighborhood Housing Services of Chicago*, 138 S. Ct. 13 (2017). In *Hamer*, the Court distinguished time limits imposed by rule from those imposed by statute, characterizing time limits set only by rules as non-jurisdictional procedural limits. Professor Hartnett noted that the Advisory Committee tabled its consideration of the issue pending the Court’s decision in *Nutraceutical Corp. v. Lambert*, 139 S. Ct. 710 (2019). In *Nutraceutical*, the Court held that a mandatory claim-processing rule was not subject to equitable tolling. After reviewing this holding, the Advisory Committee decided not to take action on a possible amendment to Rule 4(a)(5)(C).

Potential Amendment to Rule 36. The Advisory Committee considered an amendment to Rule 36 that would provide a uniform practice for handling votes cast by judges who depart the bench before an opinion is filed with the clerk’s office. Consideration was tabled pending the Court’s decision in *Yovino v. Rizo*, 139 S. Ct. 706 (2019), addressing whether a federal court may count the vote of a judge who dies before the decision is issued. The Court answered this question in the negative, explaining that “federal judges are appointed for life, not for eternity.” Since the Court has resolved the question, the Advisory Committee removed this item from its docket.

Suggestion Regarding the Railroad Retirement Act and Civil Rule 5.2. Judge Chagares noted that the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board’s General Counsel submitted a suggestion that cases brought under the Railroad Retirement Act should be among the cases excluded (under Civil Rule 5.2) from certain types of electronic access. Petitions for review of the Railroad Retirement Board’s final decisions go directly to the courts of appeals, not the district courts; thus, any change would need to be to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Judge Chagares has appointed a subcommittee to consider the suggestion and to investigate whether any other

benefit regimes would warrant similar treatment. The subcommittee is consulting with the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Judge Dow and Professors Gibson and Bartell presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules.

Action Items

Judge Dow first addressed proposed amendments to three rules published for comment last August: Rule 2002 (Notices), Rule 2004 (Examination), and Rule 8012 (Corporate Disclosure Statement).

Final Approval of Proposed Amendments to Rule 2002 (Notices). Judge Dow explained that Rule 2002 generally deals with requirements for providing notice in bankruptcy cases, and that the proposed changes affect three subparts of the Rule. The first change involves Rule 2002(f)(7), which currently directs notices to be given of the “entry of an order confirming a chapter 9, 11, or 12 plan.” Although it is unclear why the rule does not currently require notice of the entry of a Chapter 13 confirmation order, the Advisory Committee concluded that notice of a confirmation order is appropriate under all bankruptcy chapters. The one comment addressing this change argued that the amendment was not needed because at least one court already serves orders confirming Chapter 13 plans. Because that comment addressed a local practice only, however, the Advisory Committee recommended final approval of the amendment as proposed.

The Committee had no questions and Judge Campbell suggested that the Committee vote separately on the proposed amendments to each of the three relevant subparts of Rule 2002. Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 2002(f)(7) for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

The second change pertains to Rule 2002(h) which authorizes the court to direct that certain notices to creditors in chapter 7 cases be sent only to creditors that timely file a proof of claim. The proposed amendment would allow the court to exercise similar discretion in chapter 12 and 13 cases and would also conform time periods in the subdivision to the respective deadlines for filing proofs of claim set out in recently amended Rule 3002(c).

One of the comments on Rule 2002(h), while generally supportive, raised two issues. The first issue concerned whether the clerk’s noticing responsibilities in a chapter 13 case should extend 30 days beyond the proof-of-claim deadline to give the debtor or trustee time to file a claim on behalf of a creditor. The Advisory Committee rejected this suggestion because the rule does not currently address such a situation in a chapter 7 case and the purpose of the proposed amendment is simply to extend the rule to chapter 12 and 13 cases. In addition, because the rule is permissive, a court already has authority to continue to provide notices until after the expiration of a debtor or trustee’s derivative authority to file a proof of claim on behalf of a creditor.

The second issue raised was whether notice of the proposed use, sale, or lease of property of the estate and the hearing on approval of a compromise or settlement should be given to all

creditors otherwise entitled to service of the noticed motion, even if they have not timely filed a proof of claim. No justification was provided for this suggestion and the Advisory Committee saw no reason to amend the rule in this respect. It recommended that Rule 2002(h) be approved as published.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 2002(h) for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

The final amendment to Rule 2002 concerned subdivision (k) which addresses providing notices under specified parts of Rule 2002 to the U.S. trustee. The change adds a reference to subdivision (a)(9) of the rule, corresponding to the relocation of the deadline for objecting to confirmation of a chapter 13 plan from subdivision (b) to subdivision (a)(9). The change ensures that the U.S. trustee will continue to receive notice of this deadline.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 2002(k) for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Judge Dow next addressed the proposed amendments to Rule 2004. He explained that the rule provides for the examination of debtors and other entities regarding a broad range of issues relevant to a bankruptcy case, and that it includes provisions to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents. The Advisory Committee received a suggestion that the rule be amended to impose a proportionality limitation on the scope of the production of documents and electronically stored information.

The Advisory Committee considered this issue over three meetings. By a close vote, the Committee ultimately decided not to add proportionality language because the rule already allows the court to limit the scope of a document request, and because the change might prompt additional litigation. The Advisory Committee did, however, decide to propose amendments to Rule 2004(c) to refer specifically to electronically stored information and to harmonize its subpoena provisions with the current provisions of Civil Rule 45, which is made applicable in bankruptcy cases by Bankruptcy Rule 9016.

After considering the comments, the Advisory Committee unanimously approved the amendments to Rule 2004(c) as published. Two of the three comments submitted supported the proposal as published. Although a third comment urged inclusion of proportionality language, the Advisory Committee declined to revisit that issue as it had been carefully considered and rejected by the Advisory Committee prior to publication.

Judge Campbell recalled discussion at the Advisory Committee meeting of the fact that debtor examinations in bankruptcy are intended to be broad in scope and of a concern that adding proportionality language might signal an intent to limit those examinations. Judge Dow agreed.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 2004 for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Final Approval of Proposed Amendments to Rule 8012 (Corporate Disclosure Statement). Current Rule 8012 requires a nongovernmental corporate party to a bankruptcy appeal in the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel to file a statement identifying any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10 percent or more of the party's stock (or file a statement that there is no such corporation). It is based on Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1. Amendments to Rule 26.1 were promulgated by the Supreme Court on April 25, 2019 and are scheduled to go into effect December 1, 2019 absent contrary action by Congress.

The Advisory Committee's proposed amendments to Rule 8012 track the relevant amendments to Appellate Rule 26.1. An amendment to 8012(a) adds a disclosure requirement for nongovernmental corporate intervenors, and a new subsection (b) requires disclosure of debtors' names and requires disclosures about nongovernmental corporate debtors. Publication of the proposed amendments to Rule 8012 elicited three supportive comments and no suggestions for revision.

Judge Dow noted that, during the consideration of the proposed amendments, one member of the Advisory Committee suggested a need for additional amendments that would extend the Rules' disclosure requirements to a broader range of entities. Judge Dow said such an undertaking would require coordination with the other advisory committees and should not delay the current round of amendments, which are designed to conform Rule 8012 to Appellate Rule 26.1.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 8012 for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Judge Dow then addressed several proposed amendments that the Advisory Committee considered to be technical in nature and appropriate for the Standing Committee's final approval without publication.

Proposed Amendments to Rule 2005 (Apprehension and Removal of Debtor to Compel Attendance for Examination). Rule 2005(c), which addresses conditions to ensure attendance and appearance, refers to provisions of the federal criminal code (previously codified at 18 U.S.C. § 3146) that were repealed more than 30 years ago. The Advisory Committee considered the matter and recommended a technical amendment updating the statutory citation in the rule to 18 U.S.C. § 3142, the part of the criminal code that now addresses conditions to ensure attendance or appearance. Judge Dow explained, however, that after the Standing Committee's agenda book was published there was discussion among the reporters about whether such a change would be appropriate without publication.

Professor Struve explained her concerns with a technical amendment. Current Section 3142 contains a number of features that were not present in the old Section 3146. For example, it refers to statutory authorization for the collection of DNA samples. Presumably it is implausible to think that a debtor apprehended under Rule 2005 would be subjected to DNA collection as a condition of release. But, she suggested, such differences between the former and

present statutory provisions provided reason to send the proposed amendment through the ordinary process of notice and comment.

Professor Capra raised the issue of whether statutory citations should be included in the Rules at all given that statutes change. Perhaps it would be better for the Rule to direct the court to consider “the applicable requirement in the criminal code” in considering conditions to compel attendance or appearance. Professor Kimble suggested that a general reference would not help readers. If a particular statute is relevant it should be cited and updated as needed.

A member suggested that there was little risk that inapposite provisions of § 3142 would be applied under Rule 2005(c), and Professor Bartell stated that bankruptcy debtors are not arrestees, so there is not a realistic danger that they would be subjected to DNA collection.

Judge Campbell observed that the Committee must decide whether citation to an updated statutory cross reference was appropriate, or whether the prior statutory language should be inserted into the rule. In addition, even if only a statutory cross reference was appropriate, the Committee also needed to decide the separate issue of whether approval would be appropriate without public comment.

Professor Garner suggested that “applicable” or “relevant” be inserted prior to the Rule’s reference to the “provisions and policies of” the statutory provision.

After further discussion Judge Campbell observed that it seemed clear that the Committee did not support amending the rule as a technical matter without publication, and Judge Dow amended the request on behalf of the Advisory Committee to seek the Standing Committee’s approval to publish the amendment for public comment, with a slight revision. Instead of a simple change to replace the existing statutory citation with the new statutory citation, the proposed amendment to Rule 2005(c) would state that in determining the conditions that would reasonably ensure attendance the court would be “governed by the **relevant** provisions and policies of title 18 U.S.C. § 3142.” In addition, a new sentence was added to the Committee Note: “Because 18 U.S.C. § 3142 contains provisions bearing on topics not included in former 18 U.S.C. § 3146(a) and (b), the rule is also amended to limit the reference to the ‘relevant’ provisions and policies of § 3142.”

The Committee approved the proposed amendments to Rule 2005(c) for publication in August 2019.

Judge Dow next discussed proposed technical conforming amendments to Rules 8013 (Motions; Intervention), 8015 (Form and Length of Briefs; Form of Appendices and Other Papers), and 8021 (Costs). The amendments would revise these Rules to accord with the recent amendment to Rule 8011(d) that eliminated the requirement of proof of service when filing and service are completed using a court’s electronic-filing system and would revise Rule 8015 to accord with the pending amendment to Rule 8012.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the technical amendments to Rules 8013, 8015, and 8021 for approval by the Judicial Conference without prior publication.**

The final recommended technical change concerned Official Form 122A-1, the first part of a two-part form used to calculate the debtor's disposable income and to determine whether it is appropriate for the debtor to file under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. An instruction at the end of Official Form 122A-1 tells the filer not to complete the second part of the form (Official Form 122A-2) if the box at line 14a is checked. Line 14a, in turn, should be checked if the debtor's current monthly income, multiplied by 12, is less than or equal to the applicable median family income. The Advisory Committee received a suggestion that the instruction at the bottom of the form is often overlooked, and that it should also be included at the end of line 14a. The Advisory Committee agreed that the suggested amendment would make it more likely that the forms would be completed correctly.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the technical amendment to Official Form 122A-1 for approval by the Judicial Conference without prior publication.**

Professor Gibson next reported on three proposed amendments recommended for publication.

Rule 3007 (Objections to Claims). The proposed amendment addresses the narrow issue of how credit unions should be served with objections to their claims. Rule 3007 was amended in 2017 to clarify that objections to claims are generally not required to be served in the manner of a summons and complaint, as provided by Rule 7004, but instead may be served on most claimants by mailing them to the person designated on the proof of claim. Rule 3007 contains two exceptions to this general procedure, one of which is that "if the objection is to the claim of an insured depository institution [service must be] in the manner provided by Rule 7004(h)." Rule 3007(a)(2)(A)(ii). The purpose of this exception is to comply with a legislative mandate (enacted as part of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1994 and set forth in Rule 7004(h)) providing that an "insured depository institution (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act)" is entitled to a heightened level of service in adversary proceedings and contested matters.

The Advisory Committee concluded that the exception set out in Rule 3007(a)(2)(A)(ii) is too broad because it does not qualify the term "insured depository institution" by the definition set forth in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as is the case in Rule 7004(h) itself. Rule 7004(h) was added by the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1994 which required special service requirements for insured depository institutions as defined under the FDIA. Because the more expansive Bankruptcy Code definition of "insured depository institution" set forth in 11 U.S.C. § 101(35) specifically includes credit unions, such entities also seem to be entitled to heightened service under Rule 3007(a)(2)(A)(ii). The proposed amendment to Rule 3007(a)(2)(A)(ii) would limit its applicability to an insured depository institution as defined by section 3 of the FDIA (consistent with the legislative intent of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1994, as set forth in Rule 7004(h)), thereby clarifying that an objection to a claim filed by a credit union may be served, like most claim objections, on the person designated on the proof of claim.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rule 3007.**

Rule 7007.1 governs disclosure statements in the bankruptcy court. Like the amendment to Rule 8012 discussed earlier, the proposed amendment to Rule 7007.1 would conform the rule to the pending amendments to Appellate Rule 26.1.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rule 7007.1.**

The proposed amendment to Rule 9036 would implement a suggestion from the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management that high-volume-paper-notice recipients (initially defined as recipients of more than 100 court-generated paper notices in a calendar month) be required to sign up for electronic service, subject to exceptions required by statute.

The rule is also reorganized to separate methods of electronic noticing and service available to courts from those available to parties. Both courts and parties may serve or provide notice to registered users of the court's electronic-filing system by filing documents with that system. Both courts and parties also may serve and provide notice to any entity by electronic means consented to in writing by the recipient. However, only courts may serve or give notice to an entity at an electronic address registered with the Bankruptcy Noticing Center as part of the Electronic Bankruptcy Noticing program.

Finally, the title of Rule 9036 is changed to "Notice and Service by Electronic Transmission" to better reflect its applicability to both electronic noticing and service. The rule does not preclude noticing and service by other means authorized by the court or rules.

Proposed amendments to Rule 2002(g) and Official Form 410 were previously published in 2017. These proposed amendments (like the proposed amendments to Rule 9036) are designed to increase electronic noticing and service. The proposed amendments to Rule 2002 and Form 410 would create an 'opt-in' system at an email address indicated on the proof of claim. The Advisory Committee has not yet submitted those proposed amendments for final approval, however, because the comments recommended a delayed effective date of December 1, 2021 to provide time to make needed implementation changes to the courts' case management and electronic filing system. Because that is the same date the proposed changes to Rule 9036 would be on track to go into effect if published this summer, the recommended changes to Rules 2002(g) and 9036 and Official Form 410 could go into effect at the same time.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rule 9036.**

Information Items

Professor Bartell reported on two information items, beginning with the ongoing project to restyle the bankruptcy rules. The style consultants provided an initial draft of Part I to the reporters in mid-May, and the reporters have given the consultants comments on that draft. Professor Bartell reported that she and Professor Gibson have been delighted at what the style consultants have done. She thinks the bench and bar will welcome the improvements to the Rules. She praised the style consultants for their work. When the consultants respond to the reporters' comments and produce another draft, the Restyling Subcommittee will consider it. The consultants will also be producing an initial draft of Part II soon, which will be handled in the same way.

The second information item concerns part of a larger project within the judiciary to address the problem of unclaimed funds in the bankruptcy system. The Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System created an "Unclaimed Funds Task Force" to address this issue. Among other things, the Unclaimed Funds Task Force proposed adoption of a Director's Bankruptcy Form (along with proposed instructions and a proposed order) for applications for withdrawal of unclaimed funds in closed bankruptcy cases. The Advisory Committee concluded that standard documentation would be appropriate, made minor modifications to the draft submitted by the task force, and recommended that the Director of the Administrative Office adopt the form effective December 1, 2019. The form, instructions, and proposed orders are available on the pending bankruptcy forms page of uscourts.gov and will be relocated to the list of Official and Director's Bankruptcy Forms on December 1, 2019.

Judge Campbell praised the restyling effort and observed that the Advisory Committee is on track to consider the first batch of restyled rules at its fall 2019 meeting. Judge Campbell noted that the time is ripe to send a letter to the appropriate congressional leaders making sure they know the restyling effort is underway.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Bates provided the report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, with support from Professors Cooper and Marcus. Judge Bates noted the Advisory Committee had two action items, one for final approval and the second for publication, and several information items.

Action Items

Rule 30(b)(6). The Advisory Committee recommended final approval of an amendment to Rule 30(b)(6), the rule that deals with depositions of an organization. This issue drew intense interest from the bar. After the proposed amendment was published for comment in August 2018, two public hearings were held. The first hearing in Phoenix drew twenty-five witnesses. Fifty-five witnesses testified at the second hearing in Washington, DC. Some 1780 written comments were submitted, although that number overstates the substance of the comments as many of those comments repeated points made in previous comments.

After considering the public comments, the Advisory Committee approved a modified version of the proposed amendment that was published for comment. Compared with the current rule, the central change made by the revised proposal is to require the party taking the deposition and the organization to confer in advance of the deposition about the matters for examination. Many commenters observed that conferring in advance of the deposition reflects best practice; this modest proposed rule change did not cause great concern from commenters and was uniformly supported by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee made several changes to the proposed amendment as compared with the version that went out for comment. It deleted the proposed requirement that the parties confer about the identity of the witnesses that the organization would designate, and it also deleted the requirement that the parties confer about the “number and description of” the matters for examination. Because the conferring-in-advance requirement would be superfluous in connection with a deposition by written questions, the Advisory Committee added to the Committee Note the observation that the duty to confer about the matters for examination does not apply to depositions by written questions under Rule 31(a)(4).

Other proposed changes to Rule 30(b)(6) were the subject of active discussion and debate, although the Advisory Committee ultimately decided not to recommend them. One change considered by the Advisory Committee would have required the organization to identify the designated witness or witnesses at some specified time in advance of the deposition. Another change would have added a 30-day notice requirement for 30(b)(6) depositions. It was agreed that these changes would have likely required re-publication. After a great deal of discussion, the Advisory Committee determined, in a split but clear vote, not to pursue these amendments.

Professor Marcus agreed with the summary of the process of considering changes to Rule 30(b)(6) as related by Judge Bates and noted that the Standing Committee had also engaged in a vigorous discussion of the issues at previous meetings. Judge Bates noted that the Advisory Committee voted to approve the Committee Note language line-by-line, and virtually word-by-word. The ultimate proposal reflects the hard work of a subcommittee chaired by Judge Joan Ericksen.

A member voiced support for changes to a rule both sides of the bar agree is problematic but wondered whether much is accomplished by imposing a requirement to confer without specifying what must be discussed; this member suggested that the proposed amendment had “no meat on the bone.” The Committee Note could provide additional guidance, but the current version does not do so. The member noted the difficulty in changing the rule given the differing views on what should be a required disclosure prior to a deposition. A judge member echoed the concern that the modest amendment does not add that much given that Rules 26 and 37 provide a process to handle any objection to a 30(b)(6) notice.

Judge Bates agreed that the amendment is modest and will not lead to a wholesale change in 30(b)(6) deposition practice. The amendment does put existing best practice in the rule itself, which may lead to improvements in some cases. The Advisory Committee ended up with this limited recommendation because it found agreement within the bar on this narrow issue, while in general other suggestions were met with intense disagreement from one side or the other.

A judge member stated that he understood the disagreement and the reasons for it but wondered why the Committee should endorse such a limited change given the presumption that something notable has changed. Judge Campbell responded that often rules are written for the weakest lawyers and gave his view that the modest change would improve practice in some cases. In his experience, the most frequent complaint from one side is that the witness is not adequately prepared while the most frequent complaint by the other is that the notice is not precise enough on what the matters are for examination. These complaints usually come to him from the lawyers who do not talk to each other in advance of the deposition. He has often thought if you could get people to talk in advance of the deposition both sides would have greater understanding going into the deposition and a better-prepared witness. It is a marginal change but one that will help. Judge Bates stated that this was the sentiment of the Advisory Committee.

Responding to the suggestion that Rules 26 and 37 already provide a process to handle disputes over Rule 30(b)(6) depositions, Professor Marcus noted that those rules address the handling of disputes that have already become combative; the proposed amendment to Rule 30(b)(6), by contrast, would require the parties to confer *before* conflict has a chance to arise. A member noted that he viewed the amendment as a warning of sorts not to engage in gamesmanship. If this does not work, this rule will come back to the Committee. Judge Bates noted that this rule comes back to the Advisory Committee every few years. The Federal Magistrate Judges Association, Professor Marcus noted, supported the proposed amendment while also suggesting that further changes might be warranted depending on how this change works in practice.

Professor Beale complimented the Advisory Committee on the consideration of a huge amount of input received from the public. She stated that Professor Marcus's presentation of that input could serve as a model for how to handle a large volume of comments. Judge Bates and Professor Coquillette echoed similar praise for the work of the Advisory Committee and Professor Marcus. Professor Coquillette emphasized that it is not just the result that matters, it is the public perception of the process. The Reporters and the Committee, he observed, had done much to build confidence in that process among members of the bar. Another member emphasized that with this particular rule, most changes proposed by one party were changes thought to alter the negotiating balance vis-à-vis the opposing party. The Advisory Committee's careful and impressive effort had been to improve the Rule without seeming to favor one side or the other.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 30(b)(6) for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Rule 7.1. Judge Bates introduced the second action item from the Advisory Committee, a proposal to publish for comment amendments to Rule 7.1, the rule concerning disclosure statements. The first proposed amendment conforms Rule 7.1 to pending amendments to Appellate Rule 26.1 and Bankruptcy Rule 8012(a) so that a disclosure statement is required of a nongovernmental corporation that seeks to intervene. The proposed amendment also deletes the direction to file two copies of the disclosure statement, as that requirement has been rendered superfluous by electronic court dockets.

A second proposed amendment would add a new subsection 7.1(a)(2) requiring parties to disclose the name and citizenship of those whose citizenship is attributable to the party for purposes of determining diversity jurisdiction. A prominent example of the need for this amendment arises in cases where a party is a limited liability company (LLC). Many judges now require the parties to provide detailed information about LLC citizenship. This practice serves to ensure that diversity jurisdiction actually exists, a significant matter, and it protects against the risk that a federal court's substantial investment in a case will be lost by a belated discovery – perhaps even on appeal – that there is no diversity.

Judge Bates observed that a member of the Standing Committee had raised a question about the applicability of 7.1(b)(2), which requires a supplemental filing whenever information changes after the filing of a disclosure statement. Given that diversity is determined at the time of filing, a supplemental filing is irrelevant for diversity purposes. Accordingly, Judge Bates suggested a slight modification of the proposed language to 7.1(a)(2) to state: “at the time of filing.” This would remove the obligation to make a supplemental filing when it is not relevant to the diversity determination.

A judge member spoke in favor of the proposal, as modified by the friendly amendment just described. He suggested a conforming change to the Committee Note (at page 232, line 273 of the agenda book).

Judge Campbell pointed to the language “unless the court orders otherwise” in proposed new subdivision (a)(2) as a safety valve for situations in which a party has a privacy concern connected to disclosure. In such an instance, the party could seek court protection from public disclosure of the information but would still need to provide the information bearing on the existence (or not) of diversity jurisdiction.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved for publication in August 2019 the proposed amendments to Rule 7.1.**

Information Items

Consideration of Proposals to Develop MDL Rules. Judge Bates reviewed the continuing examination of proposals to formulate rules for multidistrict litigation (MDL) proceedings, the work on which has been done by the MDL Subcommittee, chaired by Judge Robert Dow. Judge Bates described efforts by the subcommittee to obtain information on this complex set of issues. He noted that the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) has been very helpful and engaged. Judge Bates observed that the consideration of possible MDL rules has generated a great deal of discussion among lawyers and judges, and the MDL process will likely be improved as a result, even if rules are not ultimately proposed.

Judge Bates described the focus of ongoing work, primarily on four subjects: (1) the use of Plaintiff Fact Sheets (PFSS) – and perhaps Defendant Fact Sheets (DFSS) – to organize MDL personal injury litigation, particularly in MDLs with a thousand or more cases, and to “jump start” discovery; (2) the feasibility of providing an additional avenue for interlocutory appellate review of district court orders in MDLs; (3) addressing the court's role in relation to global

settlement of multiple claims in MDLs; and (4) third-party litigation funding (TPLF), which is not unique to the MDL setting.

TPLF. Judge Bates noted that the general topic of TPLF has received a great deal of attention. TPLF is not unique to MDL proceedings, and indeed might be less prevalent in MDLs than other settings. Many courts require disclosure of TPLF information. TPLF is a rapidly evolving area. The TPLF topic remains on the subcommittee's agenda; it is not clear whether the subcommittee will recommend a rules response to this issue.

Judicial Involvement in MDL Settlements. The subcommittee continues to study judicial involvement in review of MDL settlements. Both the plaintiffs' and the defense bar would like to avoid rules that would require more judicial involvement in settlements. Current practice varies a lot by judge; transferee judges are split on it, with some being very active in settlements and others not. The issues are different than in a class action because every individual MDL plaintiff has an attorney.

PFSs/DFSs. Judge Bates stated that most of the subcommittee's attention has focused on PFSs and interlocutory appellate review. PFSs are used in some 80% of the big MDLs, although there is some definitional issue about what counts as a PFS. DFSs are also often used in large MDLs. A more recent proposal concerns something called an initial census of claims, which is similar to a PFS but more streamlined, and would be used early in the litigation to capture exposure and injury, not expert testimony or causation. This proposal has some support from both sides of the bar, which may mean there is no reason to have a rule. One problem with a PFS is the length of time to get those negotiated – sometimes as long as eight months – as well as the time necessary to produce responsive information. Something simpler that could be routinely used might be advantageous. The subcommittee continues to look for ideas that could get support from transferee judges as well as the plaintiffs' and defense bars.

Interlocutory Review. Judge Bates described the subcommittee's ongoing examination of issues concerning interlocutory review in MDL proceedings, a subject on which plaintiff and defense counsel have very different perspectives. One area of dispute is the utility of review under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Different studies have reached different conclusions. The Advisory Committee received one study on the subject compiled by the defense bar. At a recent event in Boston, the plaintiffs' bar presented additional and contrary data in an oral presentation. The Advisory Committee asked the plaintiffs' bar to put their empirical data in writing. The defense bar felt it had not responded fully to the plaintiffs' presentation. The subcommittee is awaiting further information from both sides of the bar.

Professor Marcus noted that the process of considering rulemaking has generated good discussion about best practices that may ultimately be more beneficial than new rules.

A member asked whether the subcommittee had analyzed the grant rate for § 1292(b) applications by circuit. This member has asked an associate to look at this question but the research is not completed yet. The question, this member suggested, is whether the district court should continue to serve as a gatekeeper for these interlocutory appeals. This member noted that Rule 23(f) works well in the class action context and wondered about comparing the grant rate for Rule

23(f) petitions. Judge Bates responded that the bar is providing that data, and sometimes conflicting data. One might also investigate whether the defense bar sometimes opts not to seek review under § 1292(b). Professor Marcus indicated that the data are currently contested.

A judge member asked why the proposal under discussion would expand the availability of interlocutory review only for mass tort MDLs and not other complex litigation. Professor Marcus characterized the current issue as responding to the “squeaky wheel” and pointed to proposed legislation that addresses claims in the MDL setting. Professor Marcus noted that in rulemaking applicable to one type of case, you will always have to define what the rule does not apply to, which can be difficult. An attorney member suggested that expanded interlocutory review should apply to all MDLs, not merely a subset of them. Judge Bates observed that the more one increases the number of MDLs eligible for expanded interlocutory review, the harder it would become to provide expedited treatment for those appeals.

Judge Campbell noted that requiring PFSs in cases over a certain threshold, for example, MDLs over a thousand cases, will raise the issue that MDLs grow over time; by the time a given MDL hits the threshold, it might be late to require a PFS. Professor Marcus noted that because MDL centralization may often occur before a given threshold number of cases is reached, it is difficult to draft an applicable rule. Who monitors this, and how do you write that in a rule? Judge Bates stated this is an example of why transferee judges say they need flexibility.

Another judge member noted that there are two different things going on with regard to PFS proposals. The first is use of the PFS to jump start discovery. The second is use of the PFS to screen out meritless cases. These are two different objectives, which may require different solutions.

Social Security Disability Review. The Social Security Disability Review Subcommittee continues to work toward a determination whether new Civil Rules can improve the handling of actions to review disability decisions under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). This proposal originated from the Administrative Conference of the United States. Professor Cooper has worked on this effort along with the chair of the subcommittee, Judge Sara Lioi.

The Social Security Administration (SSA) is very enthusiastic about the idea of national rules, even the pared-down discussion draft that the subcommittee has discussed with SSA and other groups most recently. The DOJ is not as enthusiastic but is not voicing an objection. The plaintiffs’ bar is coalescing in opposition to national rules, which it views as unnecessary. The subcommittee met on June 20, 2019 with claimants’ representatives, the SSA, the DOJ, magistrate judges, and others who are familiar with present practices. The purpose of the meeting was to focus on getting input from the claimants’ bar. It was a good meeting with positive input that will lead to changes in the working draft.

Professor Cooper stated the subcommittee hopes to make a recommendation at the Advisory Committee’s October meeting on whether to proceed further with a rulemaking proposal on this topic. Such rulemaking, he noted, would be in tension with the important principle of trans-substantivity in the rules. Even so, Professor Cooper cautioned that the subcommittee should not lightly turn away from a proposal that could improve the lives of those

who deal with these cases. Social Security cases, he observed, constitute a large share (8%) of the federal civil docket. Another issue is how to draft a rule that would supersede undesirable local rules while permitting the retention of valuable ones.

Professor Coquillette emphasized the need to exercise caution when departing from the principle of trans-substantivity in rulemaking. As soon as one permits the insertion into the national Rules of substance-specific provisions, one increases the risk of lobbying by special interests. If there is a need for rules on Social Security review cases, one solution might be to create a separate set of rules for that purpose.

Other Information Items. Judge Bates briefly summarized the following additional information items:

(1) Questions have arisen about the meaning of the provisions in Civil Rule 4(c)(3) for service of process by a United States marshal in cases brought by a plaintiff *in forma pauperis*. These questions are being explored with the U.S. Marshals Service.

(2) The Civil and Appellate Rules Committees have formed a joint subcommittee to consider whether to amend the rules – perhaps only the Civil Rules – to address the effect (on the final judgment rule) of consolidating initially separate actions. *Hall v. Hall*, 138 S. Ct. 1118 (2018), established a clear rule that actions initially filed as separate actions retain their separate identities for purposes of final judgment appeals, no matter how completely the actions have been consolidated in the trial court. Complete disposition of all claims among all parties to what began as a single case establishes finality for purposes of appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. The subcommittee has begun its deliberations with a conference call to discuss initial steps. The opinion in *Hall v. Hall* concluded by suggesting that if “our holding in this case were to give rise to practical problems for district courts and litigants, the appropriate Federal Rules Advisory Committees would certainly remain free to take the matter up and recommend revisions accordingly.”

(3) Rule 73(b)(1) was reviewed after the Advisory Committee received reports that the CM/ECF system automatically sends to the district judge assigned to a case individual consents to trial before a magistrate judge. That feature of the system disrupts the operation of the rule that “[a] district judge or magistrate judge may be informed of a party’s response to the clerk’s notice only if all parties have consented to the referral.” No other ground to revisit Rule 73(b)(1) has been suggested. It would be better to correct the workings of the CM/ECF system than to amend the rule. Initial advice was that it is not possible to defeat the automatic notice feature, but there may be a work-around that would obviate the need for a rule. The Advisory Committee has suspended consideration of possible rule amendments while a system fix is explored.

(4) The Advisory Committee continues to consider the privacy of disability filings under the Railroad Retirement Act. The Appellate Rules Committee is taking the lead because review of those cases goes to the courts of appeals in the first instance.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Livingston and Professor Capra delivered the report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules. Judge Livingston explained that the Advisory Committee had one action item – the proposed amendment to Rule 404(b) for final approval – and three information items related to Rules 106, 615, and 702.

Proposed Amendment to Rule 404(b) (Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts). The Advisory Committee sought final approval of proposed amendments to Rule 404(b). Professor Capra explained that the Advisory Committee had been monitoring significant developments in the case law on Rule 404(b), governing admissibility of other crimes, wrongs, or acts. He stated that the Advisory Committee determined that it would not propose substantive amendments to Rule 404(b) to accord with the developing case law because such amendments would make the rule rigid and more difficult to apply without achieving substantial improvement.

The Advisory Committee determined, however, that it would be useful to amend Rule 404(b) in some respects, especially with regard to the notice requirement in criminal cases. As to that requirement, the Committee determined that the notice should articulate the purpose for which the evidence will be offered and the reasoning supporting the purpose. Professor Capra noted issues that the Committee had observed with the operation of the current Rule. In some cases a party offers evidence for a laundry list of purposes, and the jury receives a corresponding laundry list of limiting instructions. Some courts rule on admissibility without analyzing the non-propensity purpose for which the evidence is offered. And some notices lack adequate specificity.

Professor Capra stated that the proposal to amend Rule 404(b) was published for comment in August 2018. Given how often 404(b) is invoked in criminal cases, Professor Capra expected robust comments, but only a few comments were filed, and they were generally favorable. In response to public comments and discussion before the Standing Committee, the Advisory Committee made two changes to the proposed Rule text as issued for public comment. Most importantly, the Committee changed the term “non-propensity” purpose to “permitted” purpose. Secondly, the Committee changed the notice provision to clarify that the “fair opportunity” requirement applies to notice given at trial after a finding of good cause.

A Committee member suggested replacing the verb “articulate” in the proposed amendment because, he suggested, the term usually refers to a spoken word rather than written material. He noted that the term is not used elsewhere in the Federal Rules. Professor Capra pointed out that the proposed amendment was an effort to get beyond merely stating a purpose. The terms “specify” or “state” were suggested as substitutions for “articulate.” Judge Campbell stated that the use of the term “articulate” suggests both identifying the purpose and explaining the reasoning. Professor Capra noted that the word “articulate” is what the Advisory Committee agreed to, and it suggests more rigor. A DOJ representative noted that the language in the proposed amendment was the subject of painstaking negotiation, and that she preferred to retain

the negotiated language to avoid unintended consequences. The Committee determined to retain the term “articulate.”

A judge member noted that the Committee Note still used the term “non-propensity” purpose even though that term had been removed from the text of the rule. Professor Capra explained that the use of the term was intentional and resulted from significant discussion at the Advisory Committee’s meeting. Judge Campbell added that part of the reason for retaining the language in the Committee Note was to provide guidance to judges in applying the rule. Judge Livingston explained that the term propensity is embedded in caselaw and the Committee Note’s use of that term would provide a good signal to readers to focus their caselaw research on that term.

Another judge member asked about the use of the term “relevant” in the Committee Note’s statement that “[t]he prosecution must ... articulate a non-propensity purpose ... and the basis for concluding that the evidence is relevant in light of this purpose.” Judge Livingston explained that this passage reflected a complex underlying discussion, and that the Committee was attempting to avoid undue specificity in the Committee Note.

Upon motion by a member, seconded by another, and on a voice vote: **The Committee decided to recommend the amendments to Rule 404(b) for approval by the Judicial Conference.**

Professor Capra thanked the DOJ for all its work on the rule. A DOJ representative noted the sensitivity of Rule 404(b) and thanked Professor Capra, Judge Livingston, and prior chair Judge Sessions for more than five years’ work on the rule.

Information Items

Professor Capra summarized the Advisory Committee’s ongoing consideration of possible amendments to Rule 106, sometimes known as the rule of completeness. The Advisory Committee is considering two kinds of potential amendments – one that would provide that a completing statement is admissible over a hearsay objection, and another that would provide that the rule covers oral as well as written or recorded statements. In an illustrative scenario, the defendant makes the statement “this is my gun, but I sold it two months ago,” and the prosecution offers the first portion of the statement and objects to the admission of the latter portion on hearsay grounds. Some courts admit a completing oral statement into evidence over a hearsay objection, but other courts do not admit the completing statement. The Advisory Committee reached consensus on the desirability of acting to resolve the conflict but is carefully considering how such an amendment should be written and what limitations should govern when such a completing statement should be admitted over a hearsay objection. The Advisory Committee has received information about how completing oral statements are handled in other jurisdictions, including California and New Hampshire.

The next information item concerns Rule 615, the sequestration rule. The Advisory Committee is considering whether to propose an amendment addressing the scope of a Rule 615 order. The Rule text contemplates the exclusion of witnesses from the courtroom; one question is

whether a Rule 615 order can also bar access to trial testimony by witnesses when they are outside the courtroom. Most courts have answered this question in the affirmative, but others apply a more literal reading of the rule. The Advisory Committee is considering an amendment that would specifically allow courts discretion to extend a Rule 615 order beyond the courtroom. The rule would not be mandatory. One potentially challenging issue is how to treat trial counsel's preparation of excluded witnesses.

Professor Capra next reported on the Advisory Committee's ongoing work with regard to Rule 702. In September 2016 the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology issued a report which contained a host of recommendations for federal scientific agencies, the DOJ, and the judiciary, relating to forensic sciences and improving the way forensic feature-comparison evidence is employed in trials. This prompted the Advisory Committee's consideration of possible changes to Rule 702. Judge Livingston appointed a Rule 702 Subcommittee to study what the Advisory Committee might do to address concerns relating to forensic evidence. In fall 2017 the Advisory Committee held a symposium on forensics and *Daubert* at Boston College School of Law.

Following discussion by the Advisory Committee, the main issue the subcommittee is considering concerns how to help courts to deal with overstatements by expert witnesses, including forensic expert witnesses. Professor Capra noted that the DOJ is currently reviewing its practices related to forensic evidence testimony, and some have suggested waiting to see the results of the DOJ's efforts. Judge Livingston stated that one threshold issue is whether the problems should be addressed by rule, or perhaps by judicial education. Judge Livingston thanked the DOJ and Professor Capra for putting together a presentation for the Second Circuit on forensic evidence that is available on video. Professor Capra noted that there will be a miniconference in the fall at Vanderbilt Law School to continue discussion of these issues and *Daubert*.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Molloy presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules, which consisted of four information items.

Judge Molloy first reported on the Advisory Committee's decision not to move forward with suggestions that it amend Rule 43 to permit the court to sentence or take a guilty plea by videoconference. The Advisory Committee has considered suggestions to amend Rule 43 several times in recent years. The first suggestion came from a judge who assists in districts other than his own and who sought to conduct proceedings by videoconference as a matter of efficiency and convenience. The Advisory Committee concluded that an amendment to Rule 43 was not warranted to address that circumstance.

The second suggestion to amend Rule 43 came from the Seventh Circuit's opinion in *United States v. Bethea*, 888 F.3d 864, 868 (7th Cir. 2018), which included the specific statement that "it would be sensible" to amend Rule 43(a)'s requirement that the defendant must be physically present for the plea and sentence. In *Bethea*, the defendant's many health problems made it extremely difficult for him to come to the courtroom, and given his susceptibility to

broken bones, doing so might have been dangerous for him. After *Bethea* was permitted to appear by videoconference for his plea and sentencing as requested by his counsel, *Bethea* appealed and argued that the physical-presence requirement in Rule 43 was not waivable. The Seventh Circuit in *Bethea* concluded that even under the exceptional facts presented “the plain language of Rule 43 requires all parties to be present for a defendant’s plea” and “a defendant cannot consent to a plea via videoconference.” *Id.* at 867. Advisory Committee members emphasized that physical presence is extraordinarily important at plea and sentencing proceedings, but they also recognized that *Bethea* was a very compelling case. On the other hand, members wondered if the case might be a one-off, since practical accommodations at the request of the defendant – with the agreement of the government and the court – have been made in such rare situations, obviating the need for an amendment.

A subcommittee that was formed to consider the issue and chaired by Judge Denise Page Hood recommended against amending the rule to permit use of videoconferencing for plea and sentencing proceedings. The subcommittee acknowledged that there are, and will continue to be, cases in which health problems make it difficult or impossible for a defendant to appear in court to enter a plea or be sentenced, and that Rule 43 does not presently allow the use of videoconferencing in such cases (though that is less clear for sentencing than for plea proceedings). Nonetheless, it recommended against amending the rule for three reasons. First, and most important, the subcommittee reaffirmed the importance of direct face-to-face contact between the judge and a defendant who is entering a plea or being sentenced. Second, there are options – other than amending the rules – to allow a case to move forward despite serious health concerns. These options include, for example, reducing the criminal charge to a misdemeanor (where videoconferencing is permissible under Rule 43), transferring the case to another district to avoid the need for a gravely ill defendant to travel, and entering a plea agreement containing both a specific sentence under Rule 11(c)(1)(C) and an appeal waiver. Finally, the subcommittee was concerned that there would inevitably be constant pressure from judges to expand any exception to the requirement of physical presence at plea or sentencing. The Advisory Committee unanimously agreed with the subcommittee’s recommendation not to amend Rule 43.

Shortly after that determination, the Advisory Committee received a request for reconsideration of that determination. Judges who serve in border states asked for the ability to use videoconferencing for pleas and sentencing. These judges explained that their courts were dealing with thousands of cases brought under 8 U.S.C. § 1326 against defendants charged with illegal reentry. Their districts cover vast distances and, under existing rules, either the judge must travel, or the U.S. Marshals Service must transport defendants. While sympathetic to the issue, the Advisory Committee determined that it would be undesirable to open the door to videoconferencing for these critical procedures. There is a slippery slope and once exceptions are made to the physical presence requirement, exceptions could swallow the rule in the name of efficiency.

Professor King noted that several years ago when the rules were reviewed with an idea of updating them to account for technological advancements, including enhanced audio/visual capabilities, some rules were amended but Rule 43’s physical-presence requirement was left unchanged.

Judge Molloy next addressed the Advisory Committee's consideration of a suggestion received from a magistrate judge to amend Rule 40 to clarify the procedures for arrest for violations of conditions of release set in another district. The issue arises from the interaction of Rule 40 with 18 U.S.C. § 3148(b) and Rule 5(c)(3). Section 3148(b) governs the procedure for revocation of pretrial release, and as generally understood it provides that the revocation proceedings will ordinarily be heard by the judicial officer who ordered the release. After discussing the ambiguities in Rule 40 and in 18 U.S.C. § 3148(b), the Advisory Committee decided Rule 40 could benefit from clarification but agreed with an observation by Judge Campbell that many rules could benefit from clarification, but the Rules Committees must be selective. Given the relative infrequency with which this scenario arises, and the fact that the courts have generally handled the cases that do arise without significant problems, the Advisory Committee decided to take no action at this time. Judge Bruce McGiverin greatly assisted the Advisory Committee in understanding the issues by sharing his own experience and by consulting widely among the community of magistrate judges.

Judge Molloy next introduced the Advisory Committee's consideration of Rule 16, an issue he noted ties in with the Evidence Rules Advisory Committee's report about expert testimony as well as Civil Rule 26's requirements for expert discovery. Judge Molloy noted that he has served on the Advisory Committee for eleven years and for most of that time Rule 16 has been on the agenda. Judge Kethledge chairs the Rule 16 Subcommittee that has been asked to review suggestions to amend Rule 16 so that it more closely follows Civil Rule 26's provisions for disclosures regarding expert witnesses. Back in the early 1990s, there was a suggestion that discovery rules on experts in criminal cases be made parallel to rules governing civil cases. The Criminal Rules did not change, although changes to Civil Rule 26 went forward.

To address the questions before the subcommittee, Judge Kethledge convened a miniconference to discuss possible amendments to Rule 16. There was a very strong group of participants, from various parts of the country, including six or seven defense practitioners, and five or six representatives from the DOJ. Most had significant personal experience with these issues and had worked with experts.

Judge Kethledge organized discussion at the miniconference into two parts. First, participants were asked to identify any concerns or problems they saw with the current rule. Second, they were asked to provide suggestions to improve the rule.

The defense side identified two problems with the rule. First, Rule 16 has no timing requirement. Practitioners reported they sometimes received summaries of expert testimony a week or the night before trial, which significantly impaired their ability to prepare for trial. Second, they said that they do not receive disclosures with sufficiently detailed information to allow them to prepare to cross examine the witness. In contrast, the DOJ representatives stated that they were unaware of problems with the rule and expressed opposition to making criminal discovery more akin to Rule 26.

When discussion turned to possible solutions on the issues of timing and completeness of expert discovery, participants made significant progress in identifying some common ground. The DOJ representatives said that framing the problems in terms of timing and sufficiency of the

notice was very helpful. It was useful to know that the practitioners were not seeking changes regarding forensic evidence, overstatement by expert witnesses, or information about the expert's credentials. The lack of precise framing explained, at least to some degree, why the DOJ personnel who focused on these other issues were not aware of problems with disclosure relating to expert witnesses. The subcommittee came away from the miniconference with concrete suggestions for language that would address timing and completeness of expert discovery.

Judge Molloy stated that the subcommittee plans to present a proposal to amend Rule 16 at the Advisory Committee's September meeting.

A DOJ representative noted that the Department views this less as a need for a rule change and more as a need to train lawyers so that prosecutors and defense counsel alike understand what the rules are. Prosecutors need to understand what the concerns are and the Department needs to conduct training to ensure this understanding. The DOJ has worked with Federal Public Defender Donna Elm to highlight the problematic issues; a training course presented by the DOJ's National Advocacy Center will be shown to all prosecutors. Even if a rule change were to go forward, it would take years. Collaboration on training means that the Department can begin to address problems now.

Judge Molloy provided a brief update on progress in implementing the recommendations of the Task Force on Protecting Cooperators. Task Force member Judge St. Eve reported on the status of efforts by the Bureau of Prisons to implement certain recommendations. One recommendation is to adopt provisions for disciplining inmates who pressure other inmates to "show their papers."

Judge Campbell thanked the advisory committee chairs and reporters for all the work that goes into the consideration of every suggestion. He noted that even a five-minute report on a given issue may be the result of long and painstaking effort.

OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Proposal to Revise Electronic Filing Deadline. Judge Chagares explained his suggestion that the Advisory Committees study whether the rules should be amended to move the current midnight electronic-filing deadline to earlier in the day, such as when the clerk's office closes in the respective court's time zone. The Supreme Court of Delaware has adopted such a practice. Judge Campbell delegated to Judge Chagares the task of forming a subcommittee to study the issue and provide an initial report at the January meeting.

Legislative Report. Julie Wilson delivered the legislative report. She noted that the 116th Congress convened on January 3, 2019, and she described several bills that have been introduced or reintroduced that are of interest to the rules process or the courts generally. There has been no legislative activity to move these bills forward. Ms. Wilson reviewed several pieces of legislation of general interest to the courts. Scott Myers provided an overview of H.R. 3304, a bipartisan bill introduced the week before the Committee meeting that would extend for an additional four years the existing exemption from the means test for chapter seven filers who are certain National Guard reservists. The bill is expected to pass; absent passage, an amendment to the

Bankruptcy Rules would be required. The Rules Committee Staff will continue to monitor any legislation introduced that would directly or effectively amend the federal rules.

Judiciary Strategic Planning. Judge Campbell discussed the Judiciary’s strategic planning process and the Committee’s involvement in that process. He solicited comments on the Committee’s identified strategic initiatives and the extent to which those initiatives have achieved their desired outcomes. Judge Campbell also invited input on the proposed approach for the update of the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* that is to take place in 2020. Judge Campbell will correspond with the Judiciary’s planning coordinator regarding these matters.

Procedure for Handling Public Input Outside the Established Public Comment Period. Judge Campbell summarized prior discussions by the Committee concerning how public submissions received outside the formal public comment period should be handled, including submissions addressed directly to the Standing Committee. Professor Struve explained the revised draft principles concerning public input during the Rules Enabling Act process and welcomed additional comments on the draft. These procedures are proposed to be posted on the website for the Judiciary. *See Revised Draft Principles Concerning Public Input During the Rules Enabling Act Process* (agenda book, p. 495).

Upon motion by a member, seconded by another, and on a voice vote: **The Committee approved the principles concerning public input.**

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Before adjourning the meeting, Judge Campbell thanked the Committee’s members and other attendees for their preparation and contributions to the discussion. The Committee will next meet in Phoenix, Arizona on January 28, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca A. Womeldorf
Secretary, Standing Committee