PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate, Bankruptcy, and Civil Procedure

Request for Comments on Amendments to:

Appellate Rules	6 and 39;
Bankruptcy Rules	3002.1 and 8006; Official Forms 410, 410C13-M1, 410C13-M1R, 410C13-N, 410C13-NR, 410C13-M2, and 410C13-M2R; and
Civil Rules	16, 26, and new Rule 16.1

Written Comments Due By
February 16, 2024

Prepared by the
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure
Judicial Conference of the United States
August 2023

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Bench, Bar, and Public

FROM: Honorable John D. Bates, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

DATE: August 15, 2023

RE: Request for Comments on Proposed Amendments to Federal Rules and Forms

---

The Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee) has approved for publication for public comment the following proposed amendments to existing rules and forms, as well as one new rule:

- Appellate Rules 6 and 39;
- Bankruptcy Rules 3002.1 and 8006;
- Bankruptcy Official Forms 410, 410C13-M1, 410C13-M1R, 410C13-N, 410C13-NR, 410C13-M2, and 410C13-M2R; and
- Civil Rules 16, 26, and new Rule 16.1.

The proposals, supporting materials, and instructions on submitting written comments are posted on the Judiciary's website at:

https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/proposed-amendments-published-public-comment

Opportunity to Submit Written Comments

Comments concerning the proposals must be submitted electronically no later than **February 16, 2024**. Please note that comments are part of the official record and publicly available.

Opportunity to Appear at Public Hearings

On the following dates, the advisory committees will conduct public hearings on the proposals either virtually or in person:

- Appellate Rules on October 18, 2023, and January 24, 2024;
- Bankruptcy Rules on January 12, 2024, and January 19, 2024; and
- Civil Rules on October 16, 2023, January 16, 2024, and February 6, 2024.

If you wish to appear and present testimony regarding a proposed rule or form, you must notify the office of Rules Committee Staff **at least 30 days before the scheduled hearing** by emailing RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov. Hearings are subject to cancellation due to lack of requests to testify.

At this time, the Standing Committee has only approved the proposals for publication and comment. After the public comment period closes, all comments will be carefully considered by the relevant advisory committee as part of its consideration of whether to proceed with a proposal.

Under the Rules Enabling Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2072-2077, if any of the published proposals are later approved, with or without revision, by the relevant advisory committee, the next steps are approval by the Standing Committee and the Judicial Conference, and then adoption by the Supreme Court. If adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress by May 1, 2025, absent congressional action, the proposals would take effect on December 1, 2025.

If you have questions about the rulemaking process or pending rules amendments, please contact the Rules Committee Staff at 202-502-1820 or visit https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Excerpt from the May 11, 2023 Report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules (revised July 14, 2023)

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hon. John D. Bates, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Judge Jay Bybee, Chair
Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

DATE: May 11, 2023*

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules met on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, in West Palm Beach, Florida. * * *

* * * * *

* Revised to incorporate changes that were made by the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee) at its June 6, 2023 meeting.

It also seeks publication of two proposed amendments, one to Rule 39, dealing with costs on appeal, and one to Rule 6, dealing with appeals in bankruptcy cases. (Part III of this report.)

* * * * *

III. Action Items for Approval for Publication

A. Costs on Appeal (21-AP-D)

Rule 39 governs costs on appeal. Some costs are taxable in the court of appeals, while others are taxable in the district court. In *City of San Antonio v. Hotels.com*, 141 S. Ct. 1628 (2021), the Supreme Court held that Rule 39 does not permit a district court to alter a court of appeals' allocation of costs, even those costs that are taxed by the district court. The Court also observed that "the current Rules and the relevant statutes could specify more clearly the procedure that such a party should follow to bring their arguments to the court of appeals." *Id*. at 1638.

The Advisory Committee seeks publication of proposed amendments to Rule 39. The proposal is designed to accomplish several things:

First, it clarifies the distinction between (1) the court of appeals deciding which parties must bear the costs and, if appropriate, in what percentages and (2) the court of appeals, the district court (or the clerk of either) calculating and taxing the dollar amount of costs upon the proper party or parties. It uses the term "allocated" for the former and the term "taxed" for the latter. Rule 39(a) established default rules for the allocation of costs; these default rules can be displaced by party agreement or court order.

Second, it codifies the holding in *Hotels.com*, providing that the allocation of costs by the court of appeals applies to both the costs taxable in the court of appeals and the costs taxable in the district court.

Third, it responds to the need identified in *Hotels.com* for a clearer procedure that a party should follow if it wants to ask the court of appeals to reconsider the allocation of costs. It does this by providing for a motion for reconsideration of the allocation. To prevent delay, it provides that the mandate must not be delayed while awaiting determination of such a motion for reconsideration while making clear that the court of appeals retains jurisdiction to decide the motion.

Fourth, it makes Rule 39's structure more parallel. The current Rule lists the costs taxable in the district court but not the costs taxable in the court of appeals. The proposed amendment lists the costs taxable in the court of appeals.

The proposal does not, however, deal with one significant issue. Most costs on appeal are modest. The Advisory Committee learned that some parties do not even

bother to file bills of costs because the price of lawyer time to do so exceeds the value of the costs themselves. But one cost on appeal—indeed, the cost involved in *Hotels.com*—can be quite significant: the premium paid for a supersedeas bond. Because of the bond premium, the bill of costs in *Hotels.com* was for more than $2.3 million.

The Advisory Committee was unable to come up with a good way to make sure that the judgment winner in the district court is aware of the cost of the supersedeas bond early enough to ask the court of appeals to reallocate the costs. Allowing a party to move for reallocation in the court of appeals after the bill of costs is filed in the district court would mean that both courts are dealing with the same costs issue at the same time. Creating a long period to seek reallocation in the court of appeals would mean that the case would be less fresh in the judges' minds and begin to look like a wholly separate appeal. Requiring disclosure in the bill of costs filed in the court of appeals would be odd because those costs are not sought in the court of appeals. Plus, a party might forego the relatively minor costs taxable in the court of appeals and care only about costs taxable in the district court. It would be possible to have the court of appeals tax the costs itself, but that would be a major departure from the principle, endorsed by the Supreme Court in *Hotels.com*, that the court closest to the cost should tax it.

For this reason, the Appellate Rules Committee believes that the easiest and most obvious time for disclosure is when the bond is before the district court for approval. It has requested the Civil Rules Committee to consider amending Civil Rule 62 to require that disclosure.

Even without such an amendment to Civil Rule 62, however, the Appellate Rules Committee believes that the following proposed amendment to Appellate Rule 39 is worthwhile and therefore asks the Standing Committee to publish it for public comment. The proposal has been revised since the Advisory Committee's March 2023 meeting in accordance with the suggestions of the style consultants.

Rule 39. Costs

(a) ~~Against Whom Assessed~~Allocating Costs Among the Parties. The following rules apply to allocating costs among the parties unless the law provides, the parties agree, or the court orders otherwise:

(1) if an appeal is dismissed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellant;

(2) if a judgment is affirmed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellant;

(3) if a judgment is reversed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellee;

(4) if a judgment is affirmed in part, reversed in part, modified, or vacated, each party bears its own costs ~~costs are taxed only as the court orders~~.

(b) Reconsideration. Once the allocation of costs is established by the entry of judgment, a party may seek reconsideration of that allocation by filing a motion in the court of appeals within 14 days after the entry of judgment. But issuance of the mandate under Rule 41 must not be delayed awaiting a determination of the motion. The court of appeals retains jurisdiction to decide the motion after the mandate issues.

(c) Costs Governed by Allocation Determination. The allocation of costs applies both to costs taxable in the court of appeals under (e) and to costs taxable in district court under (f).

~~(b)~~(d) Costs For and Against the United States. Costs for or against the United States, its agency, or officer will be ~~assessed~~ allocated under ~~Rule 39~~(a) only if authorized by law.

(e) Costs on Appeal Taxable in the Court of Appeals.

(1) **Costs Taxable.** The following costs on appeal are taxable in the court of appeals for the benefit of the party entitled to costs:

(A) the production of necessary copies of a brief or appendix, or copies of records authorized by Rule 30(f);

(B) the docketing fee; and

(C) a filing fee paid in the court of appeals.

~~(c)~~(2) **Costs of Copies.** Each court of appeals must, by local rule, set~~fix~~ the maximum rate for taxing the cost of producing necessary copies of a brief or appendix, or copies of records authorized by Rule 30(f). The rate must not exceed that generally charged for such work in the area where the

clerk's office is located and should encourage economical methods of copying.

~~(d)~~(3) **Bill of Costs; Objections; Insertion in Mandate.**

~~(1)~~(A) A party who wants costs taxed in the court of appeals must—within 14 days after ~~entry of~~ judgment is entered—file with the circuit clerk and serve an itemized and verified bill of those costs.

~~(2)~~(B) Objections must be filed within 14 days after ~~service of~~ the bill of costs is served, unless the court extends the time.

~~(3)~~(C) The clerk must prepare and certify an itemized statement of costs for insertion in the mandate, but issuance of the mandate must not be delayed for taxing costs. If the mandate issues before costs are finally determined, the district clerk must—upon the circuit clerk's request—add the statement of costs, or any amendment of it, to the mandate.

~~(e)~~(f) **Costs on Appeal Taxable in the District Court.** The following costs on appeal are taxable in the district court for the benefit of the party entitled to costs ~~under this rule~~:

(1) the preparation and transmission of the record;

(2) the reporter's transcript, if needed to determine the appeal;

(3) premiums paid for a bond or other security to preserve rights pending appeal; and

(4) the fee for filing the notice of appeal.

Committee Note

In *City of San Antonio v. Hotels.com*, 141 S. Ct. 1628 (2021), the Supreme Court held that Rule 39 does not permit a district court to alter a court of appeals' allocation of the costs listed in subdivision (e) of that Rule. The Court also observed that "the current Rules and the relevant statutes could specify more clearly the procedure that such a party should follow to bring their arguments to the court of appeals." *Id.* at 1638. The amendment does so. Stylistic changes are also made.

Subdivision (a). Both the heading and the body of the Rule are amended to clarify that allocation of the costs among the parties is done by the court of appeals. The court may allow the default rules specified in subdivision (a) to operate based on the judgment, or it may allocate them differently based on the equities of the situation. Subdivision (a) is not concerned with calculating the amounts owed; it is

concerned with who bears those costs, and in what proportion. The amendment also specifies a default for mixed judgments: each party bears its own costs.

Subdivision (b). The amendment specifies a procedure for a party to ask the court of appeals to reconsider the allocation of costs established pursuant to subdivision (a). A party may do so by motion in the court of appeals within 14 days after the entry of judgment. The mandate is not stayed pending resolution of this motion, but the court of appeals retains jurisdiction to decide the motion after the mandate issues.

Subdivision (c). Codifying the decision in *Hotels.com*, the amendment also makes clear that the allocation of costs by the court of appeals governs the taxation of costs both in the court of appeals and in the district court.

Subdivision (d). The amendment uses the word "allocated" to match subdivision (a).

Subdivision (e). The amendment specifies which costs are taxable in the court of appeals and clarifies that the procedure in that subdivision governs the taxation of costs taxable in the court of appeals. The docketing fee, currently $500, is established by the Judicial Conference of the United States pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1913. The reference to filing fees paid in the court of appeals is not a reference to the $5 fee paid to the district court required by 28 U.S.C. § 1917 for filing a notice of appeal from the district court to the court of appeals. Instead, the reference is to filing fees paid in the court of appeals, such as the fee to file a notice of appeal from a bankruptcy appellate panel.

Subdivision (f). The provisions governing costs taxable in the district court are lettered (f) rather than (e). The filing fee referred to in this subdivision is the $5 fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1917 for filing a notice of appeal from the district court to the court of appeals.

B. Appeals in Bankruptcy Cases

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules has asked the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules to consider amendments to Appellate Rule 6 dealing with appeals in bankruptcy cases. Two different concerns led to this request.

Resetting time to appeal. The first concern involves resetting the time to appeal in cases where a district court is exercising original jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(4)(A) resets the time to appeal if various post-judgment motions are timely made in the district court. To be timely in an ordinary civil case, the motion must be made within 28 days of the judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b), 52(b), 59. But in a bankruptcy case, the equivalent

motions must be made within 14 days of the judgment. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7052, 9015(c), 9023.

So what happens if a district court itself—rather than a bankruptcy court—decides a bankruptcy proceeding in the first instance and a post-judgment motion is made on the 20th day after judgment? Does the motion have resetting effect or not?

The Court of Appeals for the First Circuit has said no. *In re Lac-Mégantic Train Derailment Litigation*, 999 F.3d 72, 84 (1st Cir. 2021). The Bankruptcy Rules and their time limits apply to a bankruptcy case heard in the district court.

This result, while sensible, is not obvious from the text of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. That's because Rule 6 provides:

> **(a) Appeal From a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a District Court Exercising Original Jurisdiction in a Bankruptcy Case.** An appeal to a court of appeals from a final judgment, order, or decree of a district court exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1334 is taken as any other civil appeal under these rules.

And Rule 4(a)(4)(A) gives resetting effect to motions that are filed "within the time allowed" by "the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure"—which is 28 days, not 14 days .

The Bankruptcy Rules Committee considered amending Bankruptcy Rules 7052, 9015(c), and 9023 to provide 28 days for the motions if the proceeding is heard by the district court, but that would undermine the goal of expedition and disrupt the uniformity of bankruptcy rules. It considered asking the Appellate Rules Committee to consider amending Appellate Rule 4(a)(4)(A) to acknowledge the different timing rules, but that would complicate an already quite complicated rule with material that doesn't apply to non-bankruptcy cases. It settled on asking the Appellate Rules Committee to consider amending Appellate Rule 6(a)—the rule that deals with bankruptcy appeals where the district court exercised original jurisdiction—to acknowledge the different timing rules.

The Appellate Rules Committee agreed.* It proposes to add a sentence to Appellate Rule 6(a): "But the reference in Rule 4(a)(4)(A) to the time allowed for motions under certain Federal Rules of Civil Procedure must be read as a reference to the time allowed for the equivalent motions under the applicable Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure, which may be shorter than the time allowed under the Civil Rules." The Committee Note provides a table of the equivalent motions and the time allowed under the current version of the applicable Bankruptcy Rule.

* At the meeting, the Committee agreed in principle and asked the subcommittee to refine the language and provide a Committee Note for its consideration by email. The subcommittee did so, and the full Advisory Committee without dissent approved the proposal below.

Direct appeals. The second concern involves direct appeals in bankruptcy cases. Appeals in bankruptcy are governed by 28 U.S.C. § 158. The default rule for appeals from an order of the bankruptcy court is that such appeals go either to the district court for the district where the bankruptcy court is located or (in the circuits that have established a bankruptcy appellate panel (BAP)) to the BAP for that circuit. Under § 158, the losing party then has a further appeal as of right to the court of appeals from a final judgment of the district court or BAP.

The bankruptcy appeal process thus creates a redundancy whenever an appeal is taken to the court of appeals under § 158(d)(1), and the two-tiered procedure can be quite time-consuming. That can be problematic in the bankruptcy context, where quick resolution of the parties' disputes is sometimes critical.

In response to these concerns, as part of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (BAPCPA), Congress amended § 158(d) to provide that, in certain circumstances, appeals may be taken directly from orders of the bankruptcy court to the courts of appeals, bypassing the intervening appeal to the district court or BAP. To do so, Congress added § 158(d)(2), which provides:

> (A) The appropriate court of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals described in the first sentence of subsection (a) if the bankruptcy court, the district court, or the bankruptcy appellate panel involved, acting on its own motion or on the request of a party to the judgment, order, or decree described in such first sentence, or all the appellants and appellees (if any) acting jointly, certify that—
>
> > (i) the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law as to which there is no controlling decision of the court of appeals for the circuit or of the Supreme Court of the United States, or involves a matter of public importance;
> >
> > (ii) the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law requiring resolution of conflicting decisions; or
> >
> > (iii) an immediate appeal from the judgment, order, or decree may materially advance the progress of the case or proceeding in which the appeal is taken;
>
> and if the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal of the judgment, order, or decree.
>
> (B) If the bankruptcy court, the district court, or the bankruptcy appellate panel—

> (i) on its own motion or on the request of a party, determines that a circumstance specified in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) exists; or
>
> (ii) receives a request made by a majority of the appellants and a majority of appellees (if any) to make the certification described in subparagraph (A);
>
> then the bankruptcy court, the district court, or the bankruptcy appellate panel shall make the certification described in subparagraph (A).
>
> (C) The parties may supplement the certification with a short statement of the basis for the certification.
>
> (D) An appeal under this paragraph does not stay any proceeding of the bankruptcy court, the district court, or the bankruptcy appellate panel from which the appeal is taken, unless the respective bankruptcy court, district court, or bankruptcy appellate panel, or the court of appeals in which the appeal is pending, issues a stay of such proceeding pending the appeal.
>
> (E) Any request under subparagraph (B) for certification shall be made not later than 60 days after the entry of the judgment, order, or decree.

28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

Under this statute, any order of the bankruptcy court—final or interlocutory—can be certified for direct appeal to the court of appeals if it meets the remaining statutory requirements. Those requirements are similar to, but looser than, the standards for certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), which permits courts of appeals to hear appeals of interlocutory orders of the district courts in certain circumstances. Moreover, the certification can be made by the bankruptcy court, district court, BAP, or the parties. Under the Bankruptcy Rules, even if a bankruptcy court order has been certified for direct appeal to the court of appeals, the appellant must still file a notice of appeal to the district court or BAP in order to render the certification effective. As with § 1292(b), the court of appeals must also authorize the direct appeal.

Under this structure, a court of appeals' decision to authorize a direct appeal does not determine whether an appeal will go forward, but instead in what court the appeal will be heard. The party asking that the appeal from the bankruptcy court be heard directly in the court of appeals might be an appellee rather than an appellant. Accordingly, the Bankruptcy Rules Committee seeks a clarifying amendment to Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g) providing that any party to the appeal may file a request that the court of appeals authorize a direct appeal:

(g) Request After Certification for a Court of Appeals To Authorize a Direct Appeal.

Within 30 days after the certification has become effective under (a), any party to the appeal may ask the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal by filing a petition with the circuit clerk in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 6(c).

Current Appellate Rule 6(c), which governs direct appeals, largely relies on Rule 5, which governs appeals by permission. But the proposed amendment to the Bankruptcy Rules revealed that Appellate Rule 5 is not a good fit for direct appeals in bankruptcy cases. That's because Rule 5 was designed for the situation in which the court of appeals is deciding whether to allow an appeal at all. But in the direct appeal context, that's not the question. Instead, in the direct appeal context, there is an appeal; the question is which court is going to hear that appeal.[1]

More generally, experience with direct appeals shows considerable confusion in applying the Appellate Rules. This is primarily due to the manner in which Rule 6(c) cross-references Rule 5 and to its failure to take into account that an appeal of the bankruptcy court order in question is already proceeding in the district court or BAP, which results in uncertainty about precisely what steps are necessary to perfect an appeal after the court of appeals authorizes a direct appeal.

For these reasons, the Appellate Rules Committee proposes to overhaul Rule 6(c) and make it largely self-contained. Parties will not need to refer to Rule 5 unless expressly referred to a specific provision of Rule 5 by Rule 6(c) itself. Rule 6(c) makes Rule 5 inapplicable except to the extent provided for in other parts of Rule 6(c).

The proposed amendments also spell out in more detail how parties should handle initial procedural steps in the court of appeals once authorization for a direct appeal is granted, taking into account that an appeal from the same order will already be pending in the district court or BAP. The proposed Rule 6(c)(2) permits any party to the appeal to ask the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal. It also adds provisions governing contents of the petition, answer or cross-petition, oral argument, form of papers, number of copies, and length limits. It also makes clear that no notice of appeal to the court of appeals needs to be filed, and provides for calculating time, notification of the order authorizing a direct appeal, and payment of fees. It adds a provision governing stays pending appeal, makes clear that steps already taken in

[1] A caveat: 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) allows appeals from a bankruptcy court to a district court (or BAP) of otherwise unappealable interlocutory orders with leave of court. Authorization of a direct appeal under § 158(d)(2) subsumes leave to appeal. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004(e). ("If leave to appeal an interlocutory order or decree is required under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3), an authorization of a direct appeal by the court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2) satisfies the requirement.").

pursuing the appeal need not be repeated, and provides for making the record available to the circuit clerk. It requires all parties, not just the appellant or applicant for direct appeal, to file a representation statement. Additional changes in language are made to better match the relevant statutes.

None of these are intended to make major changes to existing procedures but to clarify those procedures. The proposal has been revised since the Advisory Committee's March 2023 meeting in accordance with the suggestions of the style consultants.

Rule 6. Appeal in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding

(a) Appeal From a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a District Court Exercising Original Jurisdiction in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding. An appeal to a court of appeals from a final judgment, order, or decree of a district court exercising original jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. §1334 is taken as any other civil appeal under these rules. But the reference in Rule 4(a)(4)(A) to the time allowed for motions under certain Federal Rules of Civil Procedure must be read as a reference to the time allowed for the equivalent motions under the applicable Federal Rule* of Bankruptcy Procedure, which may be shorter than the time allowed under the Civil Rules.

(b) Appeal From a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a District Court or Bankruptcy Appellate Panel Exercising Appellate Jurisdiction in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding.

(1) **Applicability of Other Rules.** These rules apply to an appeal to a court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. §158(d)(1) from a final judgment, order, or decree of a district court or bankruptcy appellate panel exercising appellate jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. §158(a) or (b), but with these qualifications:

(A) Rules 4(a)(4), 4(b), 9, 10, 11, 12(c), 13–20, 22–23, and 24(b) do not apply;

(B) the reference in Rule 3(c) to "Forms 1A and 1B in the Appendix of Forms" must be read as a reference to Form 5;

(C) when the appeal is from a bankruptcy appellate panel, "district court," as used in any applicable rule, means "bankruptcy appellate panel"; and

* "Rule" was changed to "Rules" by the Standing Committee at its June 6, 2023 meeting.

(D) in Rule 12.1, "district court" includes a bankruptcy court or bankruptcy appellate panel.

(2) **Additional Rules.** In addition to the rules made applicable by ~~Rule~~ ~~6~~(b)(1), the following rules apply:

(A) **Motion for Rehearing.**

(i) If a timely motion for rehearing under Bankruptcy Rule 8022 is filed, the time to appeal for all parties runs from the entry of the order disposing of the motion. A notice of appeal filed after the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel announces or enters a judgment, order, or decree—but before disposition of the motion for rehearing—becomes effective when the order disposing of the motion for rehearing is entered.

(ii) If a party intends to challenge the order disposing of the motion—or the alteration or amendment of a judgment, order, or decree upon the motion—then the party, in ~~compliance~~ accordance with Rules 3(c) and 6(b)(1)(B), must file a notice of appeal or amended notice of appeal. The notice or amended notice must be filed within the time prescribed by Rule 4—excluding Rules 4(a)(4) and 4(b)—measured from the entry of the order disposing of the motion.

(iii) No additional fee is required to file an amended notice.

(B) **The record on appeal.**

(i) Within 14 days after filing the notice of appeal, the appellant must file with the clerk possessing the record assembled in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 8009—and serve on the appellee—a statement of the issues to be presented on appeal and a designation of the record to be certified and made available to the circuit clerk.

(ii) An appellee who believes that other parts of the record are necessary must, within 14 days after being served with the appellant's designation, file with the clerk and serve on the appellant a designation of additional parts to be included.

(iii) The record on appeal consists of:

- the redesignated record as provided above;

- the proceedings in the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel; and

- a certified copy of the docket entries prepared by the clerk under Rule 3(d).

(C) **Making the Record Available.**

(i) When the record is complete, the district clerk or bankruptcy-appellate-panel clerk must number the documents constituting the record and promptly make it available to the circuit clerk. If the clerk makes the record available in paper form, the clerk will not send documents of unusual bulk or weight, physical exhibits other than documents, or other parts of the record designated for omission by local rule of the court of appeals, unless directed to do so by a party or the circuit clerk. If unusually bulky or heavy exhibits are to be made available in paper form, a party must arrange with the clerks in advance for their transportation and receipt.

(ii) All parties must do whatever else is necessary to enable the clerk to assemble the record and make it available. When the record is made available in paper form, the court of appeals may provide by rule or order that a certified copy of the docket entries be made available in place of the redesignated record. But at any time during the appeal's pendency, any party may request ~~at any time during the pendency of the appeal~~ that the redesignated record be made available.

(D) **Filing the Record.** When the district clerk or bankruptcy-appellate-panel clerk has made the record available, the circuit clerk must note that fact on the docket. The date as noted ~~on the docket~~ serves as the filing date of the record. The circuit clerk must immediately notify all parties of that ~~the filing~~ date.

(c) Direct Appeal ~~Review~~ from a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a Bankruptcy Court by ~~Permission~~ Authorization Under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

(1) **Applicability of Other Rules.** These rules apply to a direct appeal from a judgment, order, or decree of a bankruptcy court by ~~permission~~ authorization under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2), but with these qualifications:

(A) Rules 3–4, 5~~(a)(3)~~ (except as provided in this subdivision (c)), 6(a), 6(b), 8(a), 8(c), 9–12, 13–20, 22–23, and 24(b) do not apply; and

(B) as used in any applicable rule, "district court" or "district clerk" includes—to the extent appropriate—a bankruptcy court or bankruptcy appellate panel or its clerk~~; and~~

~~(C) the reference to "Rules 11 and 12(c)" in Rule 5(d)(3) must be read as a reference to Rules 6(c)(2)(B) and (C)~~.

(2) **Additional Rules.** In addition to the rules made applicable by (c)(1), the following rules apply:

(A) **Petition to Authorize a Direct Appeal.** Within 30 days after a certification of a bankruptcy court's order for direct appeal to the court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2) becomes effective under Bankruptcy Rule 8006(a), any party to the appeal may ask the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal by filing a petition with the circuit clerk under Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g).

(B) **Contents of the Petition**. The petition must include the material required by Rule 5(b)(1) and an attached copy of:

(i) the certification; and

(ii) the notice of appeal of the bankruptcy court's judgment, order, or decree filed under Bankruptcy Rule 8003 or 8004.

(C) **Answer or Cross-Petition; Oral Argument.** Rule 5(b)(2) governs an answer or cross-petition. Rule 5(b)(3) governs oral argument.

(D) **Form of Papers; Number of Copies; Length Limits.** Rule 5(c) governs the required form, number of copies to be filed, and length limits applicable to the petition and any answer or cross-petition.

(E) **Notice of Appeal; Calculating Time**. A notice of appeal to the court of appeals need not be filed. The date when the order authorizing the direct appeal is entered serves as the date of the notice of appeal for calculating time under these rules.

(F) **Notification of the Order Authorizing Direct Appeal; Fees; Docketing the Appeal.**

(i) When the court of appeals enters the order authorizing the direct appeal, the circuit clerk must notify the bankruptcy clerk and the district court clerk or bankruptcy-appellate-panel clerk of the entry.

(ii) Within 14 days after the order authorizing the direct appeal is entered, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk any unpaid required fee, including:

- the fee required for the appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel; and
- the difference between the fee for an appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel and the fee required for an appeal to the court of appeals.

(iii) The bankruptcy clerk must notify the circuit clerk once the appellant has paid all required fees. Upon receiving the notice, the circuit clerk must enter the direct appeal on the docket.

(G) **Stay Pending Appeal**. Bankruptcy Rule 8007 applies to any stay pending appeal.

~~(A)~~(H) **The Record on Appeal**. Bankruptcy Rule 8009 governs the record on appeal. If a party has already filed a document or completed a step required to assemble the record for the appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel, the party need not repeat that filing or step.

~~(B)~~(I) **Making the Record Available.** Bankruptcy Rule 8010 governs completing the record and making it available. When the court of appeals enters the order authorizing the direct appeal, the bankruptcy clerk must make the record available to the circuit clerk.

~~(C) **Stays Pending Appeal.** Bankruptcy Rule 8007 applies to stays pending appeal.~~

~~(D)~~(J) **Duties of the Circuit Clerk**. When the bankruptcy clerk has made the record available, the circuit clerk must note that fact on the docket. The date as noted ~~on the docket~~ serves as the filing date of the record. The circuit clerk must immediately notify all parties of that ~~the filing~~ date.

~~(E)~~(K) **Filing a Representation Statement**. Unless the court of appeals designates another time, within 14 days after ~~entry of~~ the order ~~granting permission to appeal~~ authorizing the direct appeal is entered, the attorney for each party to the appeal ~~the attorney who sought permission~~ must file a statement with the circuit clerk naming the parties that the attorney represents on appeal.

Committee Note

Subdivision (a). Minor stylistic and clarifying changes are made to subdivision (a). In addition, subdivision (a) is amended to clarify that, when a district court is exercising original jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1334, the time in which to file post-judgment motions that can reset the time to appeal under Rule 4(a)(4)(A) is controlled by the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, rather than the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Bankruptcy Rules partially incorporate the relevant Civil Rules but in some instances shorten the deadlines for motions set out in the Civil Rules. *See* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9015(c) (any renewed motion for judgment under Civil Rule 50(b) must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7052 (any motion to amend or make additional findings under Civil Rule 52(b) must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9023 (any motion to alter or amend the judgment or for a new trial under Civil Rule 59 must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment).

Motions for attorney's fees in bankruptcy cases or proceedings are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 7054(b)(2)(A), which incorporates without change the 14-day deadline set in Civil Rule 54(d)(2)(B). Under Appellate Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(iii), such a motion resets the time to appeal only if the district court so orders pursuant to Civil Rule 58(e), which is made applicable to bankruptcy cases and proceedings by Bankruptcy Rule 7058.

Motions for relief under Civil Rule 60 in bankruptcy cases or proceedings are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 9024. Appellate Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(vi) provides that a motion for relief under Civil Rule 60 resets the time to appeal only if the motion is made within the time allowed for filing a motion under Civil Rule 59. In a bankruptcy case or proceeding, motions under Civil Rule 59 are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 9023, which, as noted above, requires such motions to be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment.

Civil Rule	Bankruptcy Rule	Time Under Bankruptcy Rule
50(b)	9015(c)	14 days
52(b)	7052	14 days
59	9023	14 days
54(d)(2)(B)	7054(b)(2)(A)	14 days

60	9024	14 days

Of course, the Bankruptcy Rules may be amended in the future. If that happens, the time allowed for the equivalent motions under the applicable Bankruptcy Rule may change.

Subdivision (b). Minor stylistic and clarifying changes are made to the header of subdivision (b) and to subdivision (b)(1). Subdivision (b)(1)(C) is amended to correct the omission of the word "bankruptcy" from the phrase "bankruptcy appellate panel." Stylistic changes are made to subdivision (b)(2)(D).*

Subdivision (c). Subdivision (c) was added to Rule 6 in 2014 to set out procedures governing discretionary direct appeals from orders, judgments, or decrees of the bankruptcy court to the court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

Typically, an appeal from an order, judgment, or decree of a bankruptcy court may be taken either to the district court for the relevant district or, in circuits that have established bankruptcy appellate panels, to the bankruptcy appellate panel for that circuit. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a). Final orders of the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel resolving appeals under § 158(a) are then appealable as of right to the court of appeals under § 158(d)(1).

That two-step appeals process can be redundant and time-consuming and could in some circumstances potentially jeopardize the value of a bankruptcy estate by impeding quick resolution of disputes over disposition of estate assets. In the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2) to provide that, in certain circumstances, appeals may be taken directly from orders of the bankruptcy court to the courts of appeals, bypassing the intervening appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel.

Specifically, § 158(d)(2) grants the court of appeals jurisdiction of appeals from any order, judgment, or decree of the bankruptcy court if (a) the bankruptcy court, the district court, the bankruptcy appellate panel, or all parties to the appeal certify that (1) "the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law as to which there is no controlling decision of the court of appeals for the circuit or of the Supreme Court of the United States, or involves a matter of public importance"; (2) "the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law requiring resolution of conflicting decisions"; or (3) "an immediate appeal from the judgment, order, or decree may materially advance the progress of the case or proceeding in which the appeal is taken" *and* (b) "the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal of the judgment, order, or decree." 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

* The Standing Committee removed the "(D)" from the citation for the subsection reference at its June 6, 2023 meeting.

Bankruptcy Rule 8006 governs the procedures for certification of a bankruptcy court order for direct appeal to the court of appeals. Among other things, Rule 8006 provides that, to become effective, the certification must be filed in the appropriate court, the appellant must file a notice of appeal of the bankruptcy court order to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel, and the notice of appeal must become effective. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8006(a). Once the certification becomes effective under Rule 8006(a), a petition seeking authorization of the direct appeal must be filed with the court of appeals within 30 days. *Id.* 8006(g).

Rule 6(c) governs the procedures applicable to a petition for authorization of a direct appeal and, if the court of appeals grants the petition, the initial procedural steps required to prosecute the direct appeal in the court of appeals.

As promulgated in 2014, Rule 6(c) incorporated by reference most of Rule 5, which governs petitions for permission to appeal to the court of appeals from otherwise non-appealable district court orders. It has become evident over time, however, that Rule 5 is not a perfect fit for direct appeals of bankruptcy court orders to the courts of appeals. The primary difference is that Rule 5 governs discretionary appeals from district court orders that are otherwise non-appealable, and an order granting a petition for permission to appeal under Rule 5 thus initiates an appeal that otherwise would not occur. By contrast, an order granting a petition to authorize a direct appeal under Rule 6(c) means that an appeal that has already been filed and is pending in the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel will instead be heard in the court of appeals. As a result, it is not always clear precisely how to apply the provisions of Rule 5 to a Rule 6(c) direct appeal.

The new amendments to Rule 6(c) are intended to address that problem by making Rule 6(c) self-contained. Thus, Rule 6(c)(1) is amended to provide that Rule 5 is not applicable to Rule 6(c) direct appeals except as specified in Rule 6(c) itself. Rule 6(c)(2) is also amended to include the substance of applicable provisions of Rule 5, modified to apply more clearly to Rule 6(c) direct appeals. In addition, stylistic and clarifying amendments are made to conform to other provisions of the Appellate Rules and Bankruptcy Rules and to ensure that all the procedures governing direct appeals of bankruptcy court orders are as clear as possible to both courts and practitioners.

Subdivision (c)—Title. The title of subdivision (c) is amended to change "Direct Review" to "Direct Appeal" and "Permission" to "Authorization," to be consistent with the language of 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2). In addition, the language "from a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a Bankruptcy Court" is added for clarity and to be consistent with other subdivisions of Rule 6.

Subdivision (c)(1). The language of the first sentence is amended to be consistent with the title of subdivision (c). In addition, the list of rules in subdivision (c)(1)(A) that are inapplicable to direct appeals is modified to include Rule 5, except as provided in subdivision (c) itself. Subdivision (c)(1)(C), which modified certain

language in Rule 5 in the context of direct appeals, is therefore deleted. As set out in more detail below, the provisions of Rule 5 that are applicable to direct appeals have been added, with appropriate modifications to take account of the direct appeal context, as new provisions in subdivision (c)(2).

Subdivision (c)(2). The language "to the rules made applicable by (c)(1)" is added to the first sentence for consistency with other subdivisions of Rule 6.

Subdivision (c)(2)(A). Subdivision (c)(2)(A) is a new provision that sets out the basic procedure and timeline for filing a petition to authorize a direct appeal in the court of appeals. It is intended to be substantively identical to Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g), with minor stylistic changes made in light of the context of the Appellate Rules.

Subdivision (c)(2)(B). Subdivision (c)(2)(B) is a new provision that specifies the contents of a petition to authorize a direct appeal. It provides that, in addition to the material required by Rule 5, the petition must include an attached copy of the certification under § 158(d)(2) and a copy of the notice of appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel.

Subdivision (c)(2)(C). Subdivision (c)(2)(C) is a new provision. For clarity, it specifies that answers or cross-petitions are governed by Rule 5(b)(2) and oral argument is governed by Rule 5(b)(3).

Subdivision (c)(2)(D). Subdivision (c)(2)(D) is a new provision. For clarity, it specifies that the required form, number of copies to be filed, and length limits applicable to the petition and any answer or cross-petition are governed by Rule 5(c).

Subdivision (c)(2)(E). Subdivision (c)(2)(E) is a new provision that incorporates the substance of Rule 5(d)(2), modified to take into account that the appellant will already have filed a notice of appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel. It makes clear that a second notice of appeal to the court of appeals need not be filed, and that the date of entry of the order authorizing the direct appeal serves as the date of the notice of appeal for the purpose of calculating time under the Appellate Rules.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F). Subdivision (c)(2)(F) is a new provision. It largely incorporates the substance of Rules 5(d)(1)(A) and 5(d)(3), with some modifications.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(i) now requires that when the court of appeals enters an order authorizing a direct appeal, the circuit clerk must notify the bankruptcy clerk and the clerk of the district court or the clerk of the bankruptcy appellate panel of the order.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(ii) requires that, within 14 days of entry of the order authorizing the direct appeal, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk any

required filing or docketing fees that have not yet been paid. Thus, if the appellant has not yet paid the required fee for the initial appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel, the appellant must do so. In addition, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk the difference between the fee for the appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel and the fee for an appeal to the court of appeals, so that the appellant has paid the full fee required for an appeal to the court of appeals.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(iii) then requires the bankruptcy clerk to notify the circuit clerk that all fees have been paid, which triggers the circuit clerk's duty to docket the direct appeal.

Subdivision (c)(2)(G). Subdivision (c)(2)(G) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(C). It is substantively unchanged, continuing to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8007 governs stays pending appeal, but reflects minor stylistic revisions.

Subdivision (c)(2)(H). Subdivision (c)(2)(H) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(A). It continues to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8009 governs the record on appeal, but adds a sentence clarifying that steps taken to assemble the record under Bankruptcy Rule 8009 before the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal need not be repeated after the direct appeal is authorized.

Subdivision (c)(2)(I). Subdivision (c)(2)(I) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(B). It continues to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8010 governs provision of the record to the court of appeals. It adds a sentence clarifying that when the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal, the bankruptcy clerk must make the record available to the court of appeals.

Subdivision (c)(2)(J). Subdivision (c)(2)(J) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(D). It is unchanged other than a stylistic change and being renumbered.

Subdivision (c)(2)(K). Subdivision (c)(2)(K) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(E). Because any party may file a petition to authorize a direct appeal, it is modified to provide that the attorney for each party—rather than only the attorney for the party filing the petition—must file a representation statement. In addition, the phrase "granting permission to appeal" is changed to "authorizing the direct appeal" to conform to the language used throughout the rest of subdivision (c), and a stylistic change is made.

* * * * *

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 6. Appeal in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding

(a) Appeal From a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a District Court Exercising Original Jurisdiction in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding. An appeal to a court of appeals from a final judgment, order, or decree of a district court exercising original jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1334 is taken as any other civil appeal under these rules. But the reference in Rule 4(a)(4)(A) to the time allowed for motions under certain Federal Rules of Civil Procedure must be read as a reference to the time allowed for the equivalent motions under the applicable Federal

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, which may be shorter than the time allowed under the Civil Rules.

(b) Appeal From a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a District Court or Bankruptcy Appellate Panel Exercising Appellate Jurisdiction in a Bankruptcy Case or Proceeding.

(1) **Applicability of Other Rules.** These rules apply to an appeal to a court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(1) from a final judgment, order, or decree of a district court or bankruptcy appellate panel exercising appellate jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a) or (b), but with these qualifications:

* * * * *

(C) when the appeal is from a bankruptcy appellate panel, ‘‘district court,’’ as

used in any applicable rule, means ''bankruptcy appellate panel''; and

* * * * *

(2) **Additional Rules.** In addition to the rules made applicable by Rule 6(b)(1), the following rules apply:

(A) **Motion for Rehearing.**

* * * * *

(ii) If a party intends to challenge the order disposing of the motion—or the alteration or amendment of a judgment, order, or decree upon the motion—then the party, in ~~compliance~~ accordance with Rules 3(c) and 6(b)(1)(B), must file a notice of appeal or amended notice of appeal.

The notice or amended notice must be filed within the time prescribed by Rule 4—excluding Rules 4(a)(4) and 4(b)—measured from the entry of the order disposing of the motion.

* * * * *

(C) **Making the Record Available.**

* * * * *

(ii) All parties must do whatever else is necessary to enable the clerk to assemble the record and make it available. When the record is made available in paper form, the court of appeals may provide by rule or order that a certified copy

of the docket entries be made available in place of the redesignated record. But at any time during the appeal's pendency, any party may request ~~at any time during the pendency of the appeal~~ that the redesignated record be made available.

(D) **Filing the Record.** When the district clerk or bankruptcy-appellate-panel clerk has made the record available, the circuit clerk must note that fact on the docket. The date as noted ~~on the docket~~ serves as the filing date of the record. The circuit clerk must immediately notify all parties of that ~~the filing~~ date.

(c) Direct Appeal ~~Review~~ from a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a Bankruptcy Court by ~~Permission~~ Authorization Under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

(1) **Applicability of Other Rules.** These rules apply to a direct appeal from a judgment, order, or decree of a bankruptcy court by ~~permission~~ authorization under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2), but with these qualifications:

(A) Rules 3–4, 5~~(a)(3)~~ (except as provided in this subdivision (c)), 6(a), 6(b), 8(a), 8(c), 9–12, 13–20, 22–23, and 24(b) do not apply; and

(B) as used in any applicable rule, ''district court'' or ''district clerk'' includes—to the extent appropriate—a bankruptcy court or bankruptcy appellate panel or its clerk~~; and~~

~~(C) the reference to ''Rules 11 and 12(c)'' in Rule 5(d)(3) must be read as a reference to Rules 6(c)(2)(B) and (C).~~

(2) **Additional Rules.** In addition to the rules made applicable by (c)(1), the following rules apply:

(A) **Petition to Authorize a Direct Appeal.** Within 30 days after a certification of a bankruptcy court's order for direct appeal to the court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2) becomes effective under Bankruptcy Rule 8006(a), any party to the appeal may ask the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal by filing a petition with the circuit clerk under Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g).

(B) **Contents of the Petition.** The petition must include the material required by Rule 5(b)(1) and an attached copy of:

(i) the certification; and

(ii) the notice of appeal of the bankruptcy court's judgment, order, or decree filed under Bankruptcy Rule 8003 or 8004.

(C) **Answer or Cross-Petition; Oral Argument.** Rule 5(b)(2) governs an answer or cross-petition. Rule 5(b)(3) governs oral argument.

(D) **Form of Papers; Number of Copies; Length Limits.** Rule 5(c) governs the required form, number of copies to be filed, and length limits

applicable to the petition and any answer or cross-petition.

(E) **Notice of Appeal; Calculating Time.** A notice of appeal to the court of appeals need not be filed. The date when the order authorizing the direct appeal is entered serves as the date of the notice of appeal for calculating time under these rules.

(F) **Notification of the Order Authorizing Direct Appeal; Fees; Docketing the Appeal.**

(i) When the court of appeals enters the order authorizing the direct appeal, the circuit clerk must notify the bankruptcy clerk and the district court clerk or

bankruptcy-appellate-panel clerk of the entry.

(ii) Within 14 days after the order authorizing the direct appeal is entered, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk any unpaid required fee, including:

- the fee required for the appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel; and
- the difference between the fee for an appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel and the fee required

for an appeal to the court of appeals.

(iii) The bankruptcy clerk must notify the circuit clerk once the appellant has paid all required fees. Upon receiving the notice, the circuit clerk must enter the direct appeal on the docket.

(G) **Stay Pending Appeal.** Bankruptcy Rule 8007 applies to any stay pending appeal.

~~(A)~~(H) **The Record on Appeal.** Bankruptcy Rule 8009 governs the record on appeal. If a party has already filed a document or completed a step required to assemble the record for the appeal to the district court or

bankruptcy appellate panel, the party need not repeat that filing or step.

~~(B)~~(I) **Making the Record Available.** Bankruptcy Rule 8010 governs completing the record and making it available. When the court of appeals enters the order authorizing the direct appeal, the bankruptcy clerk must make the record available to the circuit clerk.

~~(C)~~ ~~**Stays Pending Appeal.** Bankruptcy Rule 8007 applies to stays pending appeal.~~

~~(D)~~(J) **Duties of the Circuit Clerk.** When the bankruptcy clerk has made the record available, the circuit clerk must note that fact on the docket. The date as noted ~~on the docket~~ serves as

the filing date of the record. The circuit clerk must immediately notify all parties of that ~~the filing~~ date.

~~(E)~~(K) **Filing a Representation Statement.** Unless the court of appeals designates another time, within 14 days after ~~entry of~~ the order ~~granting permission to appeal~~ authorizing the direct appeal is entered, the attorney for each party to the appeal ~~the attorney who sought permission~~ must file a statement with the circuit clerk naming the parties that the attorney represents on appeal.

Committee Note

Subdivision (a). Minor stylistic and clarifying changes are made to subdivision (a). In addition, subdivision (a) is amended to clarify that, when a district court is exercising original jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1334, the time in which to file post-judgment motions that can reset the time to appeal under Rule 4(a)(4)(A) is controlled by the Federal Rules of

Bankruptcy Procedure, rather than the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Bankruptcy Rules partially incorporate the relevant Civil Rules but in some instances shorten the deadlines for motions set out in the Civil Rules. *See* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9015(c) (any renewed motion for judgment under Civil Rule 50(b) must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7052 (any motion to amend or make additional findings under Civil Rule 52(b) must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9023 (any motion to alter or amend the judgment or for a new trial under Civil Rule 59 must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment).

Motions for attorney's fees in bankruptcy cases or proceedings are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 7054(b)(2)(A), which incorporates without change the 14-day deadline set in Civil Rule 54(d)(2)(B). Under Appellate Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(iii), such a motion resets the time to appeal only if the district court so orders pursuant to Civil Rule 58(e), which is made applicable to bankruptcy cases and proceedings by Bankruptcy Rule 7058.

Motions for relief under Civil Rule 60 in bankruptcy cases or proceedings are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 9024. Appellate Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(vi) provides that a motion for relief under Civil Rule 60 resets the time to appeal only if the motion is made within the time allowed for filing a motion under Civil Rule 59. In a bankruptcy case or proceeding, motions under Civil Rule 59 are governed by Bankruptcy Rule 9023, which, as noted above, requires such motions to be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment.

Civil Rule	Bankruptcy Rule	Time Under Bankruptcy Rule
50(b)	9015(c)	14 days
52(b)	7052	14 days
59	9023	14 days
54(d)(2)(B)	7054(b)(2)(A)	14 days
60	9024	14 days

Of course, the Bankruptcy Rules may be amended in the future. If that happens, the time allowed for the equivalent motions under the applicable Bankruptcy Rule may change.

Subdivision (b). Minor stylistic and clarifying changes are made to the header of subdivision (b) and to subdivision (b)(1). Subdivision (b)(1)(C) is amended to correct the omission of the word "bankruptcy" from the phrase "bankruptcy appellate panel." Stylistic changes are made to subdivision (b)(2).

Subdivision (c). Subdivision (c) was added to Rule 6 in 2014 to set out procedures governing discretionary direct appeals from orders, judgments, or decrees of the bankruptcy court to the court of appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

Typically, an appeal from an order, judgment, or decree of a bankruptcy court may be taken either to the district court for the relevant district or, in circuits that have established bankruptcy appellate panels, to the bankruptcy appellate panel for that circuit. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a). Final orders of the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel resolving appeals under § 158(a) are then appealable as of right to the court of appeals under § 158(d)(1).

That two-step appeals process can be redundant and time-consuming and could in some circumstances potentially jeopardize the value of a bankruptcy estate by impeding quick resolution of disputes over disposition of estate assets. In the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2) to provide that, in certain circumstances, appeals may be taken directly from orders of the bankruptcy court to the courts of appeals, bypassing the intervening appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel.

Specifically, § 158(d)(2) grants the court of appeals jurisdiction of appeals from any order, judgment, or decree of the bankruptcy court if (a) the bankruptcy court, the district court, the bankruptcy appellate panel, or all parties to the appeal certify that (1) "the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law as to which there is no controlling decision of the court of appeals for the circuit or of the Supreme Court of the United States, or involves a matter of public importance"; (2) "the judgment, order, or decree involves a question of law requiring resolution of conflicting decisions"; or (3) "an immediate appeal from the judgment, order, or decree may materially advance the progress of the case or proceeding in which the appeal is taken" *and* (b) "the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal of the judgment, order, or decree." 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

Bankruptcy Rule 8006 governs the procedures for certification of a bankruptcy court order for direct appeal to the court of appeals. Among other things, Rule 8006 provides that, to become effective, the certification must be filed in the appropriate court, the appellant must file a notice of appeal of the bankruptcy court order to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel, and the notice of appeal must become effective. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8006(a). Once the certification becomes effective under Rule 8006(a), a

petition seeking authorization of the direct appeal must be filed with the court of appeals within 30 days. *Id.* 8006(g).

Rule 6(c) governs the procedures applicable to a petition for authorization of a direct appeal and, if the court of appeals grants the petition, the initial procedural steps required to prosecute the direct appeal in the court of appeals.

As promulgated in 2014, Rule 6(c) incorporated by reference most of Rule 5, which governs petitions for permission to appeal to the court of appeals from otherwise non-appealable district court orders. It has become evident over time, however, that Rule 5 is not a perfect fit for direct appeals of bankruptcy court orders to the courts of appeals. The primary difference is that Rule 5 governs discretionary appeals from district court orders that are otherwise non-appealable, and an order granting a petition for permission to appeal under Rule 5 thus initiates an appeal that otherwise would not occur. By contrast, an order granting a petition to authorize a direct appeal under Rule 6(c) means that an appeal that has already been filed and is pending in the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel will instead be heard in the court of appeals. As a result, it is not always clear precisely how to apply the provisions of Rule 5 to a Rule 6(c) direct appeal.

The new amendments to Rule 6(c) are intended to address that problem by making Rule 6(c) self-contained. Thus, Rule 6(c)(1) is amended to provide that Rule 5 is not applicable to Rule 6(c) direct appeals except as specified in Rule 6(c) itself. Rule 6(c)(2) is also amended to include the substance of applicable provisions of Rule 5, modified to apply more clearly to Rule 6(c) direct appeals. In addition, stylistic and clarifying amendments are made to conform to other provisions of the Appellate Rules and Bankruptcy

Rules and to ensure that all the procedures governing direct appeals of bankruptcy court orders are as clear as possible to both courts and practitioners.

Subdivision (c)—Title. The title of subdivision (c) is amended to change "Direct Review" to "Direct Appeal" and "Permission" to "Authorization," to be consistent with the language of 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2). In addition, the language "from a Judgment, Order, or Decree of a Bankruptcy Court" is added for clarity and to be consistent with other subdivisions of Rule 6.

Subdivision (c)(1). The language of the first sentence is amended to be consistent with the title of subdivision (c). In addition, the list of rules in subdivision (c)(1)(A) that are inapplicable to direct appeals is modified to include Rule 5, except as provided in subdivision (c) itself. Subdivision (c)(1)(C), which modified certain language in Rule 5 in the context of direct appeals, is therefore deleted. As set out in more detail below, the provisions of Rule 5 that are applicable to direct appeals have been added, with appropriate modifications to take account of the direct appeal context, as new provisions in subdivision (c)(2).

Subdivision (c)(2). The language "to the rules made applicable by (c)(1)" is added to the first sentence for consistency with other subdivisions of Rule 6.

Subdivision (c)(2)(A). Subdivision (c)(2)(A) is a new provision that sets out the basic procedure and timeline for filing a petition to authorize a direct appeal in the court of appeals. It is intended to be substantively identical to Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g), with minor stylistic changes made in light of the context of the Appellate Rules.

Subdivision (c)(2)(B). Subdivision (c)(2)(B) is a new provision that specifies the contents of a petition to

authorize a direct appeal. It provides that, in addition to the material required by Rule 5, the petition must include an attached copy of the certification under § 158(d)(2) and a copy of the notice of appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel.

Subdivision (c)(2)(C). Subdivision (c)(2)(C) is a new provision. For clarity, it specifies that answers or cross-petitions are governed by Rule 5(b)(2) and oral argument is governed by Rule 5(b)(3).

Subdivision (c)(2)(D). Subdivision (c)(2)(D) is a new provision. For clarity, it specifies that the required form, number of copies to be filed, and length limits applicable to the petition and any answer or cross-petition are governed by Rule 5(c).

Subdivision (c)(2)(E). Subdivision (c)(2)(E) is a new provision that incorporates the substance of Rule 5(d)(2), modified to take into account that the appellant will already have filed a notice of appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel. It makes clear that a second notice of appeal to the court of appeals need not be filed, and that the date of entry of the order authorizing the direct appeal serves as the date of the notice of appeal for the purpose of calculating time under the Appellate Rules.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F). Subdivision (c)(2)(F) is a new provision. It largely incorporates the substance of Rules 5(d)(1)(A) and 5(d)(3), with some modifications.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(i) now requires that when the court of appeals enters an order authorizing a direct appeal, the circuit clerk must notify the bankruptcy clerk and the clerk of the district court or the clerk of the bankruptcy appellate panel of the order.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(ii) requires that, within 14 days of entry of the order authorizing the direct appeal, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk any required filing or docketing fees that have not yet been paid. Thus, if the appellant has not yet paid the required fee for the initial appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel, the appellant must do so. In addition, the appellant must pay the bankruptcy clerk the difference between the fee for the appeal to the district court or bankruptcy appellate panel and the fee for an appeal to the court of appeals, so that the appellant has paid the full fee required for an appeal to the court of appeals.

Subdivision (c)(2)(F)(iii) then requires the bankruptcy clerk to notify the circuit clerk that all fees have been paid, which triggers the circuit clerk's duty to docket the direct appeal.

Subdivision (c)(2)(G). Subdivision (c)(2)(G) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(C). It is substantively unchanged, continuing to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8007 governs stays pending appeal, but reflects minor stylistic revisions.

Subdivision (c)(2)(H). Subdivision (c)(2)(H) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(A). It continues to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8009 governs the record on appeal, but adds a sentence clarifying that steps taken to assemble the record under Bankruptcy Rule 8009 before the court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal need not be repeated after the direct appeal is authorized.

Subdivision (c)(2)(I). Subdivision (c)(2)(I) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(B). It continues to provide that Bankruptcy Rule 8010 governs provision of the record to the court of appeals. It adds a sentence clarifying that when the

court of appeals authorizes the direct appeal, the bankruptcy clerk must make the record available to the court of appeals.

Subdivision (c)(2)(J). Subdivision (c)(2)(J) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(D). It is unchanged other than a stylistic change and being renumbered.

Subdivision (c)(2)(K). Subdivision (c)(2)(K) was formerly subdivision (c)(2)(E). Because any party may file a petition to authorize a direct appeal, it is modified to provide that the attorney for each party—rather than only the attorney for the party filing the petition—must file a representation statement. In addition, the phrase "granting permission to appeal" is changed to "authorizing the direct appeal" to conform to the language used throughout the rest of subdivision (c), and a stylistic change is made.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 39. Costs

(a) ~~Against Whom Assessed~~ Allocating Costs Among the Parties. The following rules apply to allocating costs among the parties unless the law provides, the parties agree, or the court orders otherwise:

(1) if an appeal is dismissed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellant~~, unless the parties agree otherwise~~;

(2) if a judgment is affirmed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellant;

(3) if a judgment is reversed, costs are ~~taxed~~ allocated against the appellee;

(4) if a judgment is affirmed in part, reversed in part, modified, or vacated, each party bears

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

its own costs ~~costs are taxed only as the court orders~~.

(b) Reconsideration. Once the allocation of costs is established by the entry of judgment, a party may seek reconsideration of that allocation by filing a motion in the court of appeals within 14 days after the entry of judgment. But issuance of the mandate under Rule 41 must not be delayed awaiting a determination of the motion. The court of appeals retains jurisdiction to decide the motion after the mandate issues.

(c) Costs Governed by Allocation Determination. The allocation of costs applies both to costs taxable in the court of appeals under (e) and to costs taxable in district court under (f).

~~(b)~~**(d) Costs For and Against the United States.** Costs for or against the United States, its agency, or officer

will be ~~assessed~~ allocated under ~~Rule 39~~(a) only if authorized by law.

(e) Costs on Appeal Taxable in the Court of Appeals.

(1) **Costs Taxable.** The following costs on appeal are taxable in the court of appeals for the benefit of the party entitled to costs:

(A) the production of necessary copies of a brief or appendix, or copies of records authorized by Rule 30(f);

(B) the docketing fee; and

(C) a filing fee paid in the court of appeals.

~~**(c)**~~ (2) **Costs of Copies.** Each court of appeals must, by local rule, set ~~fix~~ the maximum rate for taxing the cost of producing necessary copies of a brief or appendix, or copies of records authorized by Rule 30(f). The rate must not exceed that generally charged for such work

in the area where the clerk's office is located and should encourage economical methods of copying.

~~(d)~~ (3) **Bill of Costs: Objections; Insertion in Mandate.**

~~(1)~~ (A) A party who wants costs taxed in the court of appeals must—within 14 days after ~~entry of~~ judgment is entered—file with the circuit clerk and serve an itemized and verified bill of those costs.

~~(2)~~ (B) Objections must be filed within 14 days after ~~service of~~ the bill of costs is served, unless the court extends the time.

~~(3)~~ (C) The clerk must prepare and certify an itemized statement of costs for insertion in the mandate, but issuance

of the mandate must not be delayed for taxing costs. If the mandate issues before costs are finally determined, the district clerk must—upon the circuit clerk's request—add the statement of costs, or any amendment of it, to the mandate.

~~(e)~~(f) **Costs on Appeal Taxable in the District Court.** The following costs on appeal are taxable in the district court for the benefit of the party entitled to costs ~~under this rule~~:

* * * * *

Committee Note

In *City of San Antonio v. Hotels.com*, 141 S. Ct. 1628 (2021), the Supreme Court held that Rule 39 does not permit a district court to alter a court of appeals' allocation of the costs listed in subdivision (e) of that Rule. The Court also observed that "the current Rules and the relevant statutes could specify more clearly the procedure that such a party should follow to bring their arguments to the court of appeals…." *Id*. at 1638. The amendment does so. Stylistic changes are also made.

Subdivision (a). Both the heading and the body of the Rule are amended to clarify that allocation of the costs among the parties is done by the court of appeals. The court may allow the default rules specified in subdivision (a) to operate based on the judgment, or it may allocate them differently based on the equities of the situation. Subdivision (a) is not concerned with calculating the amounts owed; it is concerned with who bears those costs, and in what proportion. The amendment also specifies a default for mixed judgments: each party bears its own costs.

Subdivision (b). The amendment specifies a procedure for a party to ask the court of appeals to reconsider the allocation of costs established pursuant to subdivision (a). A party may do so by motion in the court of appeals within 14 days after the entry of judgment. The mandate is not stayed pending resolution of this motion, but the court of appeals retains jurisdiction to decide the motion after the mandate issues.

Subdivision (c). Codifying the decision in *Hotels.com*, the amendment also makes clear that the allocation of costs by the court of appeals governs the taxation of costs both in the court of appeals and in the district court.

Subdivision (d). The amendment uses the word "allocated" to match subdivision (a).

Subdivision (e). The amendment specifies which costs are taxable in the court of appeals and clarifies that the procedure in that subdivision governs the taxation of costs taxable in the court of appeals. The docketing fee, currently $500, is established by the Judicial Conference of the United States pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1913. The reference to filing fees paid in the court of appeals is not a reference to the $5

fee paid to the district court required by 28 U.S.C. § 1917 for filing a notice of appeal from the district court to the court of appeals. Instead, the reference is to filing fees paid in the court of appeals, such as the fee to file a notice of appeal from a bankruptcy appellate panel.

Subdivision (f). The provisions governing costs taxable in the district court are lettered (f) rather than (e). The filing fee referred to in this subdivision is the $5 fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1917 for filing a notice of appeal from the district court to the court of appeals.

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable John D. Bates, Chair
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Honorable Rebecca B. Connelly, Chair
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

DATE: December 5, 2022

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules met in Washington, D.C., on September 15, 2022. One Committee member participated remotely by means of Microsoft Teams; the rest of the Committee met in person. * * *

At the meeting, the Advisory Committee voted to seek publication for comment of an amendment to Official Form 410. Part II of this report presents that action item.

* * * * *

II. Action Item

Item for Publication

The Advisory Committee recommends that an amendment to Official Form 410 (Proof of Claim) be published for public comment in August 2023. The form as proposed for amendment appears in the appendix to this report.

The proposed amendment would eliminate on the proof-of-claim form the language that restricts use of a uniform claim identifier ("UCI") to electronic payments in chapter 13. It would allow the UCI to be used in cases filed under all chapters of the Bankruptcy Code and for all payments whether or not electronic. Use of the UCI is entirely voluntary on the part of the creditor. The amended language allows a creditor to list a UCI on the proof-of-claim form in any case if it chooses to do so.

Part 1, Box 3, of Official Form 410 currently provides space for a "Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one)." Dana C. McWay, chair of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts' Unclaimed Funds Expert Panel, recommended that the quoted language be modified so that it is no longer limited to chapter 13. She explained that "[c]ase trustees make payments to creditors in chapter 7 asset cases, chapter 12 cases, chapter 13 cases, and when acting also as a disbursing agent, in Subchapter V chapter 11 cases. Allowing any creditor to provide this identifier can assist trustees in all case types to issue electronic payments in lieu of paper checks." Suggestion 22-BK-C at 1.

The Advisory Committee agreed with the suggestion, but on the recommendation of the Forms Subcommittee, it voted to expand the amendment even further. Rather than simply removing the words "in chapter 13," the Advisory Committee concluded that the entire phrase "for electronic payments in chapter 13" should be removed, finding no reason that the UCI could not be used for paper checks as well as electronic payments. Indeed, the Advisory Committee was informed that the UCI is currently being used for payments by check.

* * * * *

Excerpt from the May 17, 2023 Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules (revised July 13, 2023)

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable John D. Bates, Chair
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Honorable Rebecca B. Connelly, Chair
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

DATE: May 17, 2023*

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules met in West Palm Beach, Florida, on March 30, 2023. Two Committee members were unable to attend; the rest of the Committee met in person. * * *

* * * * *

* Revised to incorporate changes that were made during the June 6, 2023, meeting of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Advisory Committee also voted to seek republication for comment of amendments to Bankruptcy Rule 3002.1 (Notice Relating to Claims Secured by a Security Interest in the Debtor's Principal Residence in a Chapter 13 Case) and related forms. Previously, at the fall 2022 meeting, the Advisory Committee voted to seek publication for comment of proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rule 8006(g) (Request for Leave to Take a Direct Appeal to a Court of Appeals After Certification).

Part II of this report presents those action items and is organized as follows:

* * * * *

B. Items for Publication
- Rule 3002.1;
- Rule 8006(g); and
- Official Forms 410C13-M1, 410C13-M1R, 410C13-N, 410C13-NR, 410C13-M2, and 410C13-M2R.

* * * * *

B. Items for Publication

The Advisory Committee recommends that the following rule and form amendments be published for public comment in August 2023. The rules and forms in this group appear in Bankruptcy Appendix B.

Action Item 6. Rule 3002.1 (Notice Relating to Claims Secured by a Security Interest in the Debtor's Principal Residence in a Chapter 13 Case). In response to suggestions submitted by the National Association of Chapter Thirteen Trustees and the American Bankruptcy Institute's Commission on Consumer Bankruptcy, the Advisory Committee proposed amendments to Rule 3002.1 that were published for comment in 2021. The amendments were intended to encourage a greater degree of compliance with the rule's provisions and to provide a more straightforward and familiar procedure for determining the status of a mortgage claim at the end of a chapter 13 case. The amended rule as published provided for a new midcase assessment of the mortgage claim's status in order to give the debtor an opportunity to cure any postpetition defaults that might have occurred. Provisions were added to prescribe the effective date of late payment-change notices and to provide more detailed provisions about notice of payment changes for home equity lines of credit ("HELOC"). The assessment of the status of the mortgage at the end of a chapter 13 case was changed from a notice to a motion procedure that would result in a binding order.

Twenty-seven comments were submitted on the proposed amendments. They included a letter from a group of 68 chapter 13 trustees who questioned whether there was a need for the amendments. They were particularly concerned about the midcase review because they said that it would impose an unnecessary burden on them and that the needed information about home mortgages is already available. They and other trustees also contended that the new requirements for the end-of-case motion would not work well in a case in which the debtor made mortgage

payments directly to the servicer because the trustee would lack records about the postpetition payments. The comments from some debtors' attorneys, on the other hand, welcomed the requirement of a midcase review. They pointed out that mortgage servicers' records are often inconsistent with trustees' and debtors' records and that an earlier opportunity to reconcile them would be beneficial. The National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, while stating that it did not oppose the amendments, raised questions about the authority to promulgate several provisions. It also questioned whether the benefits of a midcase assessment and the revised end-of-case procedures were sufficient to outweigh the added burden on courts and parties imposed by the provisions.

At the fall 2022 meeting and by email afterwards, the Advisory Committee approved republication changes to the proposed Rule 3002.1 amendments in response to the comments. Among the changes were the following:

- The provision for giving only annual notices of HELOC payment changes was made optional. The provision is intended to be for the benefit of the claim holder, so if such a claim holder prefers to provide notices more frequently, there would be no reason not to allow it to do so.

- Significant changes were made to subdivision (f), which as published required a midcase review of the status of the mortgage claim. As revised, it would be optional, not mandatory; could be initiated by either the trustee or the debtor, not just the trustee; could be sought at any time during the case, not just between 18 and 24 months after the petition was filed; and would be initiated by a motion, not a notice. The claim holder would have to respond to the motion only if it disagreed with the facts set forth in the motion, rather than in all cases.

- Rather than starting with a motion by the trustee, as the published rule did, the end-of-case procedure would, like the current rule, start with a notice by the trustee indicating whether and in what amounts he or she had cured any prepetition arrearage and made any payments to the claim holder that came due postpetition. Rather than being triggered by the debtor's final cure payment, the notice would have to be filed "within 45 days after the debtor completes all payments due to the trustee" under the plan. As under the current rule, the claim holder would be required to file a response to the notice.

- If thereafter the trustee or debtor wanted the court to determine whether the debtor had cured all defaults and paid all required postpetition amounts, either one could file a motion for a court determination.

- * * *[*]

[*] During the June 6, 2023 Standing Committee meeting, the Chair of the Advisory Committee withdrew a proposed amendment to current Rule 3002.1(i)(2) (which would become proposed Rule 3002.1(h)(2)) that would have specified that the relief awarded if a claim holder failed to provide information as required by Rule 3002.1 could include "in appropriate circumstances, noncompensatory sanctions." This proposed

The Advisory Committee approved a few additional substantive and stylistic changes at the spring meeting.

Because the changes to the originally published amendments are substantial and further public input would be beneficial, the Advisory Committee asks to have the proposed amendments to Rule 3002.1 republished.

Action Item 7. Rule 8006(g) (Request for Leave to Take a Direct Appeal to a Court of Appeals After Certification). Rule 8006(g) currently requires that, within 30 days after the date the certification becomes effective, "a request for permission to take a direct appeal to the court of appeals must be filed with the circuit clerk in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 6(c)." The rule is written in the passive voice and does not specify who is supposed to file that request for permission to take a direct appeal.

Bankruptcy Judge A. Benjamin Goldgar suggested that the rule be rewritten to clarify the existing meaning, which he (and the Advisory Committee) believes is that any party to the judgment, order, or decree can file the request for permission to take a direct appeal, not just the appellant who initiated the appeal.

At the spring 2022 meeting of the Advisory Committee, the Subcommittee on Privacy, Public Access, and Appeals recommended an amendment to Rule 8006(g) for publication. The reporter to the Standing Committee was concerned that the revised Rule 8006(g) might not work properly with Fed. R. App. P. 6(c)—which also addresses direct appeals from a bankruptcy court to a court of appeals—and asked the reporters for the Bankruptcy Rules Committee and the Appellate Rules Committee to work with their respective committees to ensure that the rules worked in a coordinated fashion.

An amendment to Rule 8006(g) that was the product of that collaboration was approved by the Advisory Committee at its fall 2022 meeting. Because the Appellate Rules Committee at its fall meeting created a subcommittee to consider related amendments to Fed. R. App. P. 6(c) and to report back at its spring meeting, the Advisory Committee decided to wait to seek approval from the Standing Committee for publication of Rule 8006(g) until publication was also sought for amendments to the appellate rule. The Appellate Rules Committee has now completed its work and is presenting amendments to Fed. R. App. P. 6 at this meeting for publication.

Action Item 8. Official Forms 410C13-M1, 410C13-M1R, 410C13-N, 410C13-NR, 410C13-M2, and 410C13-M2R. In 2021 the Standing Committee published five forms drafted to implement proposed amendments to Rule 3002.1 (Official Forms 410C13-1N, 410C13-1R, 410C13-10C, 410C13-10NC, 410C13-10R). The Advisory Committee deferred considering the comments submitted on the forms until after it approved changes to the rule in response to comments.

At the spring 2023 meeting, the Advisory Committee approved for publication 6 new forms to implement the revised amendments to Rule 3002.1. The new forms no longer include a

change was withdrawn to allow for further consideration by the Advisory Committee and possible resubmission later.

mandatory midcase-trustee notice of the status of the mortgage. Instead, either the trustee or the debtor may choose to file a motion to determine the status of the mortgage claim at any point during the case prior to the trustee's Final Notice of Payments Made. Official Form 410C13-M1 was drafted for that purpose. No distinction is made between cases in which the trustee makes postpetition mortgage payments and those in which the debtor does so. The moving party—either the trustee or debtor—must only provide the information that she has knowledge of. Official Form 410C13-M1R is the form for the claim holder's response to that motion.

After the debtor completes all payments due to the trustee under a chapter 13 plan, the trustee must file a notice of payments made on the mortgage. Official Form 410C13-N was drafted for that purpose. The claim holder then must file a response, using Official Form 410C13-NR.

If either the trustee or debtor wants a final determination of the mortgage's status at the end of the case, he can file a Motion to Determine Final Cure and Payment, using Official Form 410C13-M2. The claim holder, if it disputes any facts in the motion, must then file a response, using Official Form 410C13-M2R.

* * * * *

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 3002.1. ~~Notice Relating to~~ Chapter 13 ~~Claims~~ Claim Secured by a Security Interest in the Debtor's Principal Residence ~~in a Chapter 13 Case~~[2]

(a) In General. This rule applies in a Chapter 13 case to a claim that is secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence and for which the plan provides for the trustee or debtor to make contractual ~~installment~~ payments. Unless the court orders otherwise, the ~~notice~~ requirements of this rule cease when an order terminating or annulling the automatic stay related to that residence becomes effective.

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

[2] The changes indicated are to the restyled version of Rule 3002.1, not yet in effect.

(b) Notice of a Payment Change; Home-Equity Line of Credit; Effect of an Untimely Notice; Objection.

(1) ***Notice by the Claim Holder—In General.*** The claim holder must file a notice of any change in the payment amount, ~~of an installment payment~~ including ~~any change~~ one resulting from an interest-rate or escrow-account adjustment. ~~At least 21 days before the new payment is due, the~~ The notice must be ~~filed and~~ served on:

- the debtor;
- the debtor's attorney; and
- the trustee.

Except as provided in (b)(2), it must be filed and served at least 21 days before the new payment is due. ~~If the claim arises from a home-equityline of credit, the court may~~

~~modify this requirement.~~

(2) ***Notice of a Change in a Home-Equity Line of Credit.***

(A) *Deadline for the Initial Filing; Later Annual Filing.* If the claim arises from a home-equity line of credit, the notice of a payment change must be filed and served either as provided in (b)(1) or within one year after the bankruptcy-petition filing, and then at least annually.

(B) *Content of the Annual Notice.* The annual notice must:

(i) state the payment amount due for the month when the notice is filed; and

(ii) include a reconciliation amount to account for any

overpayment or underpayment during the prior year.

(C) *Amount of the Next Payment.* The first payment due at least 21 days after the annual notice is filed and served must be increased or decreased by the reconciliation amount.

(D) *Effective Date.* The new payment amount stated in the annual notice (disregarding the reconciliation amount) is effective on the first payment due date after the payment under (C) has been made and remains effective until a new notice becomes effective.

(E) *Payment Changes Greater Than $10.* If the claim holder chooses to give

annual notices under (b)(2) and the monthly payment increases or decreases by more than $10 in any month, the holder must file and serve (in addition to the annual notice) a notice under (b)(1) for that month.

(3) ***Effect of an Untimely Notice.*** If the claim holder does not timely file and serve the notice required by (b)(1) or (b)(2), the effective date of the new payment amount is as follows:

(A) when the notice concerns a payment increase, on the first payment due date that is at least 21 days after the untimely notice was filed and served; or

(B) when the notice concerns a payment decrease, on the first payment due date after the date of the notice.

(4) ***Party in Interest's Objection.*** A party in interest who objects to ~~the~~ a payment change noticed under (b)(1) or (b)(2) may file and serve a motion to determine ~~whether the change is required to maintain payments under § 1322(b)(5)~~the change's validity. Unless the court orders otherwise, if no motion is filed ~~by~~ before the day ~~before~~ the new payment is due, the change goes into effect on that date.

(c) Fees, Expenses, and Charges Incurred After the Case Was Filed; Notice by the Claim Holder. The claim holder must file a notice itemizing all fees, expenses, and charges incurred after the case was filed that the holder asserts are recoverable

against the debtor or the debtor's principal residence. Within 180 days after the fees, expenses, or charges ~~were~~ are incurred, the notice must be filed and served on the individuals listed in (b)(1).~~:~~

~~• the debtor;~~

~~• the debtor's attorney; and~~

~~• the trustee.~~

(d) Filing Notice as a Supplement to a Proof of Claim. A notice under (b) or (c) must be filed as a supplement to ~~the~~ a proof of claim using Form 410S-1 or 410S-2, respectively. The notice is not subject to Rule 3001(f).

(e) Determining Fees, Expenses, or Charges. On a party in interest's motion ~~filed within one year after the notice in (c) was served~~, the court must, after notice and a hearing, determine whether paying any claimed fee, expense, or charge is required by the

underlying agreement and applicable nonbankruptcy law. ~~to cure a default or maintain payments under § 1322(b)(5).~~The motion must be filed within one year after the notice under (c) was served, unless a party in interest requests and the court orders a shorter period.

(f) Motion to Determine Status; Response; Court Determination.

(1) ***Timing; Content and Service.*** At any time after the date of the order for relief under Chapter 13 and until the trustee files the notice under (g)(1), the trustee or debtor may file a motion to determine the status of any claim described in (a). The motion must be prepared using Form 410C13-M1 and be served on:

- the debtor and the debtor's attorney, if the trustee is the movant;
- the trustee, if the debtor is the movant; and
- the claim holder.

(2) ***Response; Content and Service.*** If the claim holder disagrees with facts set forth in the motion, it must file a response within 21 days after the motion is served. The response must be prepared using Form 410C13-M1R and be served on the individuals listed in (b)(1).

(3) ***Court Determination.*** If the claim holder's response asserts a disagreement with facts set forth in the motion, the court must, after notice and a hearing, determine the status of the claim and enter an appropriate order. If the claim holder does not respond to the

motion or files a response agreeing with the facts set forth in it, the court may grant the motion based on those facts.

(fg) ~~Notice of the Final Cure Payment.~~ Trustee's End-of-Case Notice of Payments Made; Response; Court Determination.

(1) ~~*Contents of a Notice*~~ ***Timing and Content***. Within ~~30~~ 45 days after the debtor completes all payments due to the trustee under a Chapter 13 plan, the trustee must file a notice:

(A) stating ~~that the debtor has paid infull the~~ what amount ~~required~~, if any, the trustee paid to the claim holder to cure any default ~~on the claim~~and whether it has been cured; ~~and~~

(B) ~~the~~ stating what amount, if any, the trustee paid to the claim holder for contractual payments that came due

during the pendency of the case and whether contractual payments are current as of the date of the notice; and~~the claim holder of itsobligation to file and serve a response under (g).~~

(C) informing the claim holder of its obligation to ~~file and serve a response~~ respond under (g)(3).

(2) ***~~Serving the Notice~~ Service*.** The notice must be prepared using Form 410C13-N and be served on:

- the claim holder;
- the debtor; and
- the debtor's attorney.

(3) ***Response*.** The claim holder must file a response to the notice within 28 days after its service. The response, which is not subject to Rule 3001(f), must be filed as a

supplement to the claim holder's proof of claim. The response must be prepared using Form 410C13-NR and be served on the individuals listed in (b)(1).

~~(3) ***The Debtor's Right to File.*** The debtor may file and serve the notice if:~~

~~(A) the trustee fails to do so; and the debtor contends that the final cure payment has been made andall plan payments have been completed.~~

(4) ***Court Determination of a Final Cure and Payment.***

(A) *Motion*. After service of the response under (g)(3) or within 45 days after service of the trustee's notice under (g)(1) if no response is filed by the claim holder, the debtor or trustee may file a motion to determine

whether the debtor has cured all defaults and paid all required postpetition amounts on a claim described in (a). The motion must be prepared using Form 410C13-M2 and be served on the entities listed in (f)(1).

(B) *Response.* If the claim holder disagrees with the facts set forth in the motion, it must file a response within 21 days after the motion is served. The response must be prepared using Form 410C13-M2R and be served on the individuals listed in (b)(1).

(C) *Court Determination.* After notice and a hearing, the court must determine whether the debtor has cured all defaults and paid all

required postpetition amounts. If the claim holder does not respond to the motion or files a response agreeing with the facts set forth in it, the court may enter an appropriate order based on those facts.

~~**(g) Response to a Notice of the Final Cure Payment.**~~

~~**(1)** ***Required Statement.*** Within 21 days after the notice under (f) is served, the claim holder must file and serve a statement that:

~~(A) indicates whether:~~

~~(i) the claim holder agrees that the debtor has paid in full the amount required to cure any default on the claim; and~~

~~(ii) the debtor is otherwise current on all payments under § 1322(b)(5); and~~

~~(B) itemizes the required cure or postpetition amounts, if any, that the claim holder contends remain unpaid as of the statement's date.~~

~~(2) ***Persons to be Served.*** The holdermust serve the statement on:~~

- ~~the debtor;~~
- ~~the debtor's attorney; and~~
- ~~the trustee.~~

~~(3) ***Statement to be a Supplement.*** Thestatement must be filed as a supplement to the proof of claim and is not subject to Rule 3001(f).~~

~~**(h) Determining the Final Cure Payment.** On the debtor's or trustee's motion filed within 21 days after the statement under (g)is served, the court must, after notice and ahearing, determine whether the debtor has cured the default and made all required postpetition payments.~~

(~~i~~h) Claim Holder's Failure to Give Notice or Respond. If the claim holder fails to provide any information as required by ~~(b), (c), or (g)~~this rule, the court may, after notice and a hearing, ~~take one or both of these actions~~do one or more of the following:

(1) preclude the holder from presenting the omitted information in any form as evidence in a contested matter or adversary proceeding in the case—unless the court determines that the failure was substantially justified or is harmless; ~~and~~

(2) award other appropriate relief, including reasonable expenses and attorney's fees caused by the failure; and

(3) take any other action authorized by this rule.

Committee Note

The rule is amended to encourage a greater degree of compliance with its provisions and to allow assessments of a mortgage claim's status while a chapter 13 case is pending in order to give the debtor an opportunity to cure any

postpetition defaults that may have occurred. Stylistic changes are made throughout the rule, and its title and subdivision headings have been changed to reflect the amended content.

Subdivision (a), which describes the rule's applicability, is amended to delete the word "installment" in the phrase "contractual installment payment" in order to clarify the rule's applicability to reverse mortgages, which are not paid in installments.

In addition to stylistic changes, subdivision (b) is amended to provide more detailed provisions about notice of payment changes for home-equity lines of credit ("HELOCs") and to add provisions about the effective date of late payment change notices. The treatment of HELOCs presents a special issue under this rule because the amount owed changes frequently, often in small amounts. Requiring a notice for each change can be overly burdensome. Under new subdivision (b)(2), a HELOC claimant may choose to file only annual payment change notices—including a reconciliation figure (net overpayment or underpayment for the past year)—unless the payment change in a single month is for more than $10. This provision also ensures at least 21 days' notice before a payment change takes effect.

As a sanction for noncompliance, subdivision (b)(3) now provides that late notices of a payment increase do not go into effect until the first payment due date after the required notice period (at least 21 days) expires. The claim holder will not be permitted to collect the increase for the interim period. There is no delay, however, in the effective date of an untimely notice of a payment decrease.

The changes made to subdivisions (c) and (d) are largely stylistic. Stylistic changes are also made to

subdivision (e). In addition, the court is given authority, upon motion of a party in interest, to shorten the time for seeking a determination of the fees, expenses, or charges owed. Such a shortening, for example, might be appropriate in the later stages of a chapter 13 case.

Subdivision (f) is new. It provides a procedure for assessing the status of the mortgage at any point before the trustee files the notice under (g)(1). This optional procedure, which should be used only when necessary and appropriate for carrying out the plan, allows the debtor and the trustee to be informed of any deficiencies in payment and to reconcile records with the claim holder in time to become current before the case is closed. The procedure is initiated by motion of the trustee or debtor. An Official Form has been adopted for this purpose. The claim holder then must respond if it disagrees with facts stated in the motion, again using an Official Form to provide the required information. If the claim holder's response asserts such a disagreement, the court, after notice and a hearing, will determine the status of the mortgage claim. If the claim holder fails to respond or does not dispute the facts set forth in the motion, the court may enter an order favorable to the moving party based on those facts.

Under subdivision (g), within 45 days after the last plan payment is made to the trustee, the trustee must file a notice of final cure and payment. An Official Form has been adopted for this purpose. The notice will state the amount that the trustee has paid to cure any default on the claim and whether the default has been cured. It will also state the amount, if any, that the trustee has paid on contractual obligations that came due during the case and whether those payments are current as of the date of the notice. The claim holder then must respond within 28 days after service of the

notice, again using an Official Form to provide the required information.

Either the trustee or the debtor may file a motion for a determination of final cure and payment. The motion, using the appropriate Official Form, may be filed after the claim holder responds to the trustee's notice under (g)(1), or, if the claim holder fails to respond to the notice, within 45 days after the notice was served. If the claim holder disagrees with any facts in the motion, it must respond within 21 days after the motion is served, using the appropriate Official Form. The court will then determine the status of the mortgage. A Director's Form provides guidance on the type of information that should be included in the order.

Subdivision (h) was previously subdivision (i). It has been amended to clarify that the listed sanctions are authorized in addition to any other actions that the rule authorizes the court to take if the claim holder fails to provide notice or respond as required by the rule. Stylistic changes have also been made to the subdivision.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 8006. Certifying a Direct Appeal to the Court of Appeals[2]

* * * * *

(g) Request After Certification for ~~Leave to Take a Direct Appeal to~~ a Court of Appeals ~~After Certification~~ to Authorize a Direct Appeal. Within 30 days after the certification has become effective under (a), ~~a request for leave to take a direct appeal to a court of appeals must be filed~~ any party to the appeal may ask the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal by filing a petition with the circuit clerk in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 6(c).

---

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

[2] The changes indicated are to the restyled version of Rule 8006, not yet in effect.

Committee Note

Rule 8006(g) is revised to clarify that any party to the appeal may file a request that a court of appeals authorize a direct appeal. There is no obligation to do so if no party wishes the court of appeals to authorize a direct appeal.

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor 1 _____

Debtor 2 (Spouse, if filing) _____

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: _____ District of _____ (State)

Case number _____

Official Form 410

Proof of Claim

12/24

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies of any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to $500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) **that you received.**

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. **Who is the current creditor?**

   _____
   Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)

   Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____

2. **Has this claim been acquired from someone else?**

   ❑ No
   ❑ Yes. From whom? _____

3. **Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?**

   Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g)

Where should notices to the creditor be sent?	**Where should payments to the creditor be sent?** (if different)
_____ Name	_____ Name
_____ Number Street	_____ Number Street
_____ City State ZIP Code	_____ City State ZIP Code
Contact phone _____	Contact phone _____
Contact email _____	Contact email _____

Uniform claim identifier ~~for electronic payments in chapter 13~~ (if you use one):

__ __

4. **Does this claim amend one already filed?**

   ❑ No
   ❑ Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY

5. **Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?**

   ❑ No
   ❑ Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____

Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6. **Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?**
   - ❑ No
   - ❑ Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____ ____ ____ ____

7. **How much is the claim?** $_____. **Does this amount include interest or other charges?**
   - ❑ No
   - ❑ Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).

8. **What is the basis of the claim?**
   Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card.
   Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c).
   Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information.
   _____

9. **Is all or part of the claim secured?**
   - ❑ No
   - ❑ Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property.

   Nature of property:
   - ❑ Real estate. If the claim is secured by the debtor's principal residence, file a *Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment* (Official Form 410-A) with this *Proof of Claim.*
   - ❑ Motor vehicle
   - ❑ Other. Describe: _____

   Basis for perfection: _____
   Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.)

   Value of property: $_____
   Amount of the claim that is secured: $_____
   Amount of the claim that is unsecured: $_____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amounts should match the amount in line 7.)

   Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: $_____

   Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed)_____%
   - ❑ Fixed
   - ❑ Variable

10. **Is this claim based on a lease?**
    - ❑ No
    - ❑ Yes. **Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition.** $_____

11. **Is this claim subject to a right of setoff?**
    - ❑ No
    - ❑ Yes. Identify the property: _____

12. **Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?**

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

- ❑ No
- ❑ Yes. *Check one:*

	Amount entitled to priority
❑ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).	$_____
❑ Up to $3,350* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).	$_____
❑ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to $15,150*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).	$_____
❑ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).	$_____
❑ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).	$_____
❑ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(__) that applies.	$_____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/25 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to $500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

- ❑ I am the creditor.
- ❑ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.
- ❑ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.
- ❑ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgment that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have a reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date _____
MM / DD / YYYY

_____
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name _____
First name Middle name Last name

Title _____

Company _____
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address _____
Number Street

_____
City State ZIP Code

Contact phone _____ Email _____

Committee Note

The last line of Part 1, Box 3, is amended to permit use of the uniform claim identifier for all payments in cases filed under all chapters of the Code, not merely electronic payments in chapter 13 cases.

Official Form 410

Instructions for Proof of Claim

United States Bankruptcy Court 12/24

These instructions and definitions generally explain the law. In certain circumstances, such as bankruptcy cases that debtors do not file voluntarily, exceptions to these general rules may apply. You should consider obtaining the advice of an attorney, especially if you are unfamiliar with the bankruptcy process and privacy regulations.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to $500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both.
18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157 and 3571.

How to fill out this form

- **Fill in all of the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed.**
- **Fill in the caption at the top of the form.**
- **If the claim has been acquired from someone else, then state the identity of the last party** who owned the claim or was the holder of the claim and who transferred it to you before the initial claim was filed.
- **Attach any supporting documents to this form.** Attach redacted copies of any documents that show that the debt exists, a lien secures the debt, or both. (See the definition of *redaction* on the next page.)

  Also attach redacted copies of any documents that show perfection of any security interest or any assignments or transfers of the debt. In addition to the documents, a summary may be added. Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (called "Bankruptcy Rule") 3001(c) and (d).
- **Do not attach original documents because attachments may be destroyed after scanning.**
- **If the claim is based on delivering health care goods or services, do not disclose confidential health care information. Leave out or redact confidential information both in the claim and in the attached documents.**
- **A *Proof of Claim* form and any attached documents must show only the last 4 digits of any social security number, individual's tax identification number, or financial account number, and only the year of any person's date of birth.** See Bankruptcy Rule 9037.
- **For a minor child, fill in only the child's initials and the full name and address of the child's parent or guardian.** For example, write *A.B., a minor child* (*John Doe, parent, 123 Main St., City, State*). See Bankruptcy Rule 9037.

Confirmation that the claim has been filed

To receive confirmation that the claim has been filed, either enclose a stamped self-addressed envelope and a copy of this form or go to the court's PACER system (www.pacer.psc.uscourts.gov) to view the filed form.

Understand the terms used in this form

Administrative expense: Generally, an expense that arises after a bankruptcy case is filed in connection with operating, liquidating, or distributing the bankruptcy estate. 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Claim: A creditor's right to receive payment for a debt that the debtor owed on the date the debtor filed for bankruptcy. 11 U.S.C. §101 (5). A claim may be secured or unsecured.

Creditor: A person, corporation, or other entity to whom a debtor owes a debt that was incurred on or before the date the debtor filed for bankruptcy. 11 U.S.C. §101 (10).

Debtor: A person, corporation, or other entity who is in bankruptcy. Use the debtor's name and case number as shown in the bankruptcy notice you received. 11 U.S.C. § 101 (13).

Evidence of perfection: Evidence of perfection of a security interest may include documents showing that a security interest has been filed or recorded, such as a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, or financing statement.

Information that is entitled to privacy: A *Proof of Claim* form and any attached documents must show only the last 4 digits of any social security number, an individual's tax identification number, or a financial account number, only the initials of a minor's name, and only the year of any person's date of birth. If a claim is based on delivering health care goods or services, limit the disclosure of the goods or services to avoid embarrassment or disclosure of confidential health care information. You may later be required to give more information if the trustee or someone else in interest objects to the claim.

Priority claim: A claim within a category of unsecured claims that is entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. §507(a). These claims are paid from the available money or property in a bankruptcy case before other unsecured claims are paid. Common priority unsecured claims include alimony, child support, taxes, and certain unpaid wages.

Proof of claim: A form that shows the amount of debt the debtor owed to a creditor on the date of the bankruptcy filing. The form must be filed in the district where the case is pending.

Redaction of information: Masking, editing out, or deleting certain information to protect privacy. Filers must redact or leave out information entitled to **privacy** on the *Proof of Claim* form and any attached documents.

Secured claim under 11 U.S.C. §506(a): A claim backed by a lien on particular property of the debtor. A claim is secured to the extent that a creditor has the right to be paid from the property before other creditors are paid. The amount of a secured claim usually cannot be more than the value of the particular property on which the creditor has a lien. Any amount owed to a creditor that is more than the value of the property normally may be an unsecured claim. But exceptions exist; for example, see 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b) and the final sentence of 1325(a).

Examples of liens on property include a mortgage on real estate or a security interest in a car. A lien may be voluntarily granted by a debtor or may be obtained through a court proceeding. In some states, a court judgment may be a lien.

Setoff: Occurs when a creditor pays itself with money belonging to the debtor that it is holding, or by canceling a debt it owes to the debtor.

Uniform claim identifier: An optional 24-character identifier that some creditors use to facilitate ~~electronic~~ payment.

Unsecured claim: A claim that does not meet the requirements of a secured claim. A claim may be unsecured in part to the extent that the amount of the claim is more than the value of the property on which a creditor has a lien.

Offers to purchase a claim

Certain entities purchase claims for an amount that is less than the face value of the claims. These entities may contact creditors offering to purchase their claims. Some written communications from these entities may easily be confused with official court documentation or communications from the debtor. These entities do not represent the bankruptcy court, the bankruptcy trustee, or the debtor. A creditor has no obligation to sell its claim. However, if a creditor decides to sell its claim, any transfer of that claim is subject to Bankruptcy Rule 3001(e), any provisions of the Bankruptcy Code (11 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.) that apply, and any orders of the bankruptcy court that apply.

Do not file these instructions with your form.

United States Bankruptcy Court

_____ District of _____

In re _____, Debtor Case No. _____
Chapter 13

Motion Under Rule 3002.1(f)(1) to Determine the Status of the Mortgage Claim

The [trustee/debtor] states as follows:

1. The following information relates to the mortgage claim at issue:

Name of Claim Holder:_____ **Court claim no**. (if known):_____

Last 4 digits of any number used to identify the debtor's account: ___ ____ ____ ____

Property address: _____

_____
City State ZIP Code

2. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] disbursed payments to cure arrearages as follows:

a. Allowed amount of the prepetition arrearage, if any: $ _____

b. Total amount of the prepetition arrearage paid, if known: $ _____

c. Allowed amount of postpetition arrearage, if any: $ _____

d. Total amount of postpetition arrearage paid, if known: $ _____

e. Total amount of arrearages paid: $ _____

3. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] disbursed payments for postpetition fees, expenses, and charges as follows:

a. Amount of postpetition fees, expenses, and charges noticed and allowed under Rule 3002.1(c): $ _____

b. Amount of postpetition fees, expenses, and charges paid: $ _____

4. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] made the following payments on the postpetition contractual obligations: $ _____

5. I ask the court for an order under Rule 3002.1(f)(3) determining the status of the mortgage claim addressed by this motion and whether the payments required by the plan to be made as of the date of this motion have been made.

Signed: _____
(Trustee/Debtor)

Date: ____/____/_____

United States Bankruptcy Court
_____ District of _____

In re _____, Debtor Case No. _____
Chapter 13

Response to [Trustee's/Debtor's] Motion Under Rule 3002.1(f)(1) to Determine the Status of the Mortgage Claim

_____ (claim holder) states as follows:

1. The following information relates to the mortgage claim at issue:

Name of Claim Holder:_____ **Court claim no**. (if known):_____

Last 4 digits of any number used to identify the debtor's account: ___ ____ ____ ____

Property address: _____

_____
City State ZIP Code

2. Arrearages

Check one:

- ❑ As of the date of this response, the debtor has paid in full the amount required to cure any arrearage on this mortgage claim.
- ❑ As of the date of this response, the debtor has not paid in full the amount required to cure any arrearage on this mortgage claim. The total arrearage amount remaining unpaid as of the date of this response is:

  $ _____.

3. Postpetition Contractual Payments

Check all that apply:

- ❑ The debtor is current on all postpetition contractual payments, including all fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs. The claim holder attaches a payoff statement and provides the following information as of the date of this response:

  Date last payment was received on the mortgage: ____/_____/_____

  Date next postpetition payment from the debtor is due: ____/_____/_____

Amount of the next postpetition payment that is due: $_____

Unpaid principal balance of the loan: $_____

Additional amounts due for any deferred or accrued interest: $_____

Balance of the escrow account: $_____

Balance of unapplied funds or funds held in a suspense account: $_____

- ❑ The debtor is not current on all postpetition payments. The debtor is obligated for the postpetition payment(s) that first became due on: ____/_____/_____

- ❑ The debtor has fees, charges, expenses, negative escrow amounts, or costs due and owing. The total amount remaining unpaid as of the date of this response is $_____.

4. Itemized Payment History

Include if applicable:

Because the claim holder asserts that the arrearages have not been paid in full or states that the debtor is not current on all postpetition payments or that fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs are due and owing, the claim holder attaches an itemized payment history—using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5—disclosing the following amounts from the date of the bankruptcy filing through the date of this response:

- all prepetition and postpetition payments received;
- the application of all payments received;
- all fees, costs, escrow, and expenses assessed to the mortgage; and
- all amounts the creditor contends remain unpaid.

_____ Date ____/_____/_____
Signature

Print _____ Title _____
Name

Company _____

If different from the notice address listed on the proof of claim to which this response applies:

Address _____
Number Street

_____
City State ZIP Code

Contact phone (_____) _____– _____ Email _____

The person completing this response must sign it. Check the appropriate box:

- ❑ I am the claim holder.
- ❑ I am the claim holder's authorized agent.

Fill in this information to identify the case:
Debtor 1 _____
Debtor 2 (Spouse, if filing) _____
United States Bankruptcy Court for the: _____ District of _____ (State)
Case number _____

Official Form 410C13-N

Trustee's Notice of Payments Made

12/25

The trustee must file this notice in a chapter 13 case within 45 days after the debtor completes all payments due to the trustee. Rule 3002.1(g)(1).

Part 1: Mortgage Information

Name of claim holder: _____

Court claim no. (if known): _____

Last 4 digits of any number you use to identify the debtor's account: ____ ____ ____ ____

Property address:

_____
Number Street

_____

_____
City State ZIP Code

Part 2: Statement of Completion

On _____, debtor completed all payments due the trustee under the chapter 13 plan. A copy of the trustee's disbursement ledger for all payments to the claim holder is attached or may be accessed here: _____ (web address).

Part 3: Amount Needed to Cure Default

	Amount
a. Allowed amount of prepetition arrearage, if any:	$ _____
b. Total amount prepetition arrearage paid by the trustee as of date of notice:	$ _____
c. Allowed amount of postpetition arrearage, if any:	$ _____
d. Total postpetition arrearage paid by the trustee as of date of notice:	$ _____
e. Total amount of arrearages paid as of date of notice	$ _____

Has the debtor cured all arrearages?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Part 4: Postpetition Contractual Payment

Check one:

❑ Postpetition contractual payments are made by the debtor.

❑ Postpetition contractual payments are paid through the trustee.

If the trustee has made postpetition contractual payments, complete a-c below; otherwise leave blank.

a. Total amount of postpetition contractual payments made by the trustee as of date of notice: $ _____

b. Is the debtor current on postpetition contractual payments as of date of notice?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No

c. Next mortgage payment due: ____/_____
   MM / YYYY

Part 5: Postpetition Fees, Expenses, and Charges

Amount of allowed postpetition fees, expenses, and charges: $ _____

Amount of postpetition fees, expenses, and charges paid by the trustee as of date of notice: $ _____

Part 6: A Response Is Required by Bankruptcy Rule 3002.1(g)(3)

Within 28 days after service of this notice, the holder of the claim must file a response using Official Form 410C13-NR.

✘ _____ Date ____/_____/_____
Signature

Trustee _____
First Name Middle Name Last Name

Address _____
Number Street

_____
City State ZIP Code

Contact phone (_____) _____– _____ Email _____

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor 1 _____

Debtor 2 (Spouse, if filing) _____

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: _____ District of _____ (State)

Case number _____

Official Form 410C13-NR

Response to Trustee's Notice of Payments Made

12/25

The claim holder must respond to the Trustee's Notice of Payments Made within 28 days after it was served. Rule 3002.1(g)(2).

Part 1: Mortgage Information

Name of claim holder: _____

Court claim no. (if known): _____

Last 4 digits of any number you use to identify the debtor's account: ____ ____ ____ ____

Property address:

_____
Number Street

_____

_____
City State ZIP Code

Part 2: Amount Needed to Cure Default

Check all that are applicable:

- ❑ The amount required to cure any prepetition arrearage has been paid in full.
- ❑ The amount required to cure the prepetition arrearage has not been paid in full. Amount of prepetition arrearage remaining unpaid as of the date of this notice: $ _____.
- ❑ The amount required to cure any postpetition arrearage has been paid in full.
- ❑ The amount required to cure the postpetition arrearage has not been paid in full. Amount of postpetition arrearage remaining unpaid as of the date of this notice: $ _____.

Part 3: Postpetition Contractual Payment

- ❑ Debtor is current on all postpetition contractual payments, including all fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs. The claim holder attaches a payoff statement and provides the following information as of the date of this response:

  Date last payment was received on the mortgage: ____/_____/_____

Date next postpetition payment from the debtor is due: ____/_____/_____

Amount of the next postpetition payment that is due: $_____

Unpaid principal balance of the loan: $_____

Additional amounts due for any deferred or accrued interest: $_____

Balance of the escrow account: $_____

Balance of unapplied funds or funds held in a suspense account: $_____

❑ Debtor is not current on all postpetition contractual payments. The claim holder asserts that the debtor is obligated for the postpetition payment(s) that first became due on: ____/_____/_____.

❑ Debtor has fees, charges, expenses, negative escrow amounts, or costs due and owing. The claim holder asserts that the total amount remaining unpaid as of the date of this response is $_____.

Part 4 Itemized Payment History

If the claim holder disagrees that the prepetition arrearage has been paid in full, states that the debtor is not current on all postpetition payments, or states that fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs are due and owing, it must attach an itemized payment history—using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5—disclosing the following amounts from the date of the bankruptcy filing through the date of this response:

- all prepetition and postpetition payments received;
- the application of all payments received;
- all fees, costs, escrow, and expenses assessed to the mortgage; and
- all amounts the claim holder contends remain unpaid.

Part 5: Sign Here

The person completing this response must sign it. Check the appropriate box:

❑ I am the claim holder.

❑ I am the claim holder's authorized agent.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the information provided in this response is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and reasonable belief.

✘ _____ Date ____/_____/_____
Signature

_____
First Name Middle Name Last Name

_____
Number Street

_____
City State ZIP Code

Contact phone (_____) _____– _____ Email _____

United States Bankruptcy Court

_____ District of _____

In re _____, Debtor Case No. _____
Chapter 13

Motion Under Rule 3002.1(g)(4) to Determine Final Cure and Payment of Mortgage Claim

The [trustee/debtor] states as follows:

1. The following information relates to the mortgage claim at issue:

Name of Claim Holder:_____ **Court claim no**. (if known):_____

Last 4 digits of any number used to identify the debtor's account: ___ ____ ____ ____

Property address: _____

_____
City State ZIP Code

2. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] disbursed payments to cure arrearages as follows:

a. Allowed amount of the prepetition arrearage, if any: $ _____

b. Total amount of the prepetition arrearage paid, if known: $ _____

c. Allowed amount of postpetition arrearage, if any: $ _____

d. Total amount of postpetition arrearage paid, if known: $ _____

e. Total amount of arrearages paid: $ _____

3. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] disbursed payments for postpetition fees, expenses, and charges as follows:

a. Amount of postpetition fees, expenses, and charges noticed and allowed under Rule 3002.1(c): $ _____

b. Amount of postpetition fees, expenses, and charges paid: $ _____

4. As of the date of this motion, [I have/the trustee has] made the following payments on the postpetition contractual obligations: $ _____

5. I ask the court for an order under Rule 3002.1(g)(4) determining whether the debtor has cured all arrearages, if any, and paid all postpetition amounts required by the plan to be made as of the date of this motion.

Signed: _____
(Trustee/Debtor)

Date: ____/____/_____

United States Bankruptcy Court
_____ District of _____

In re _____, Debtor Case No. _____
Chapter 13

Response to [Trustee's/Debtor's] Motion to Determine Final Cure and Payment of the Mortgage Claim

_____ (claim holder) states as follows:

1. The following information relates to the mortgage claim at issue:

Name of Claim Holder:_____ **Court claim no**. (if known):_____

Last 4 digits of any number used to identify the debtor's account: ___ ____ ____ ____

Property address: _____

_____
City State ZIP Code

2. Arrearage Provided for by the Plan

Check one:

- ❑ As of the date of this response, Debtor has paid in full the amount required to cure any arrearage on this mortgage claim.

- ❑ As of the date of this response, Debtor has not paid in full the amount required to cure any arrearage on this mortgage claim. The total arrearage amount remaining unpaid as of the date of this response is:

  $ _____.

3. Postpetition Contractual Payments

Check all that apply:

- ❑ Debtor is current on all postpetition contractual payments, including all fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs. The claim holder attaches a payoff statement and provides the following information as of the date of this response:

  Date last payment was received on the mortgage: ___/___/____

  Date next postpetition payment from the debtor is due: ___/___/____

Amount of the next postpetition payment that is due: $_____

Unpaid principal balance of the loan: $_____

Additional amounts due for any deferred or accrued interest: $_____

Balance of the escrow account: $_____

Balance of unapplied funds or funds held in a suspense account: $_____

❑ Debtor is not current on all postpetition payments. The debtor is obligated for the postpetition payment(s) that first became due on: ____/_____/_____.

❑ Debtor has fees, charges, expenses, negative escrow amounts, or costs due and owing. The total amount remaining unpaid as of the date of this response is $_____.

4. Itemized Payment History

Include if applicable:

Because the claim holder disagrees that the arrearages have been paid in full or states that the debtor is not current on all postpetition payments or that fees, charges, expenses, escrow, and costs are due and owing, the claim holder attaches an itemized payment history—using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5—disclosing the following amounts from the date of the bankruptcy filing through the date of this response:

- all prepetition and postpetition payments received;
- the application of all payments received;
- all fees, costs, escrow, and expenses assessed to the mortgage; and
- all amounts the creditor contends remain unpaid.

_____ Date ____/_____/_____
Signature

Print _____ Title _____
Name

Company _____

If different from the notice address listed on the proof of claim to which this response applies:

Address _____
Number Street

_____
City State ZIP Code

Contact phone (_____) _____– _____ Email _____

The person completing this response must sign it. Check the appropriate box:

- ❑ I am the claim holder.
- ❑ I am the claim holder's authorized agent.

Committee Note

Official Forms 410C13-M1, 410C13-M1R, 410C13-N, 410C13-NR, 410C13-M2, and 410C13-M2R are new. They are adopted to implement new and revised provisions of Rule 3002.1 that prescribe procedures for determining the status of a home mortgage claim in a chapter 13 case.

Official Forms 410C13-M1 and 410C13-M1R implement Rule 3002.1(f). Form 410C13-M1 is used if either the trustee or the debtor moves to determine the status of a home mortgage at any time during a chapter 13 case prior to the trustee's Final Notice of Payments Made. If the trustee files the motion, she must disclose the payments she has made to the holder of the mortgage claim so far in the case. If the debtor, rather than the trustee, has been making the postpetition contractual payments, the trustee should state in part 4 that she has paid $0. If the debtor files the motion, he should provide information about any payments he has made and any payments made by the trustee of which the debtor has knowledge.

Within 21 days after service of the trustee's or debtor's motion, the holder of the mortgage claim must file a response, using Official Form 410C13-M1R, if it disputes any facts set forth in the motion. *See* Rule 3002.1(f)(2). The claim holder must indicate whether the debtor has paid the full amount required to cure any arrearage and whether the debtor is current on all postpetition payments. The claim holder must provide a payoff statement, or, if the claim holder says that the debtor is not current on all payments, it must attach an itemized payment history for the postpetition period, using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5.

Official Form 410C13-N is to be used by a trustee to provide the notice required by Rule 3002.1(g)(1) to be filed at the end of the case. This notice must be filed within 45 days after the debtor completes all payments due to the trustee, and it requires the trustee to report on the amounts the trustee paid to cure any arrearage, for postpetition mortgage obligations, and for postpetition fees, expenses, and charges. The trustee must also provide her disbursement ledger for all payments she made to the claim holder.

Within 28 days after service of the trustee's notice, the holder of the mortgage claim must file a response using Official Form 410C13-NR. *See* Rule 3002.1(g)(3). The claim holder must indicate whether the debtor has paid the full amount required to cure any arrearage and whether the debtor is current on all postpetition payments. If the claim holder says that the debtor is not current on all payments, it must attach an itemized payment history for the postpetition period, using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5. The response, which is not subject to Rule 3001(f), must be filed as a supplement to the claim holder's proof of claim.

Official Forms 410C13-M2 and 410C13-M2R implement Rule 3002.1(g)(4). Form 410C13-M2 is used if either the trustee or the debtor moves at the end of the case to determine whether the debtor has cured all arrearages and paid all required postpetition amounts. If the trustee files the motion, she must disclose the payments she has made to the holder of the mortgage claim. If the debtor, rather than the trustee, has been making the postpetition contractual payments, the trustee should state in part 4 that she has paid $0. If the debtor files the motion, he should provide information about any payments he has made and any

payments made by the trustee of which the debtor has knowledge.

Within 21 days after service of the trustee's or debtor's motion, the holder of the mortgage claim must file a response, using Official Form 410C13-M2R, if it disputes any facts set forth in the motion. *See* Rule 3002.1(g)(4)(B). The claim holder must indicate whether the debtor has paid the full amount required to cure any arrearage and whether the debtor is current on all postpetition payments. The claim holder must provide a payoff statement, or, if the claim holder says that the debtor is not current on all payments, it must attach an itemized payment history for the postpetition period, using the format of Official Form 410A, Part 5.

Excerpt from the May 11, 2023 Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules (revised July 11, 2023)

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

TO: Hon. John D. Bates, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Hon. Robin L. Rosenberg, Chair
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

DATE: May 11, 2023*

Introduction

The Civil Rules Advisory Committee met in West Palm Beach, FL, on March 28, 2023. Members of the public attended in person, and public on-line attendance was also provided. * * *

Part I of this report presents three items for action at this meeting:

* * * * *

(b) Rule 16(b)(3) and 26(f)(3) amendments—privilege logs: These small amendments were presented to the Standing Committee at its January 2023 meeting. At that time the Standing

* Revised to incorporate changes that were made during the June 6, 2023 meeting of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Committee had no problems with the rule changes, but questioned the length of the Committee Note. The Note has been shortened, and the Advisory Committee unanimously recommends that this preliminary draft of rule amendments be published for public comment in August 2023.

(c) New Rule 16.1 on managing MDL Proceedings: After several years of work by its MDL Subcommittee, the Advisory Committee unanimously recommended that the preliminary draft of a new Rule 16.1 to deal with MDL proceedings be published for public comment in August 2023.

I. Action Items

* * * * *

B. For publication: Amendments to Rule 26(f) and Rule 16(b) to call for development early in the litigation of a method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A)

These amendment proposals deal with what is called the "privilege log" problem. During the Standing Committee's January 2023 meeting, the proposed rule amendments elicited no concerns, but the length of the Committee Note was questioned by several members of the Standing Committee. The matter was remanded to the Advisory Committee. The Committee Note was shortened, and the Advisory Committee unanimously approved recommending that the amendment and Note be published, as revised, for public comment in August 2023.

* * * * *

Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions Governing Discovery

* * * * *

(f) Conference of the Parties; Planning for Discovery.

* * * * *

(3) ***Discovery Plan.*** A discovery plan must state the parties' views and proposals on:

* * * * *

(D) any issues about claims of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation materials, including the timing and method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) and—if the parties agree on a procedure to assert these claims after production—whether to ask the court to include their agreement in an order under Federal Rule of Evidence 502;

* * * * *

DRAFT COMMITTEE NOTE

Rule 26(f)(3)(D) is amended to address concerns about application of the requirement in Rule 26(b)(5)(A) that producing parties describe materials withheld on grounds of privilege or as trial-preparation materials. Compliance with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) can involve very large costs, often including a document-by-document "privilege log."

Rule 26(b)(5)(A) was adopted in 1993, and from the outset was intended to recognize the need for flexibility. Nevertheless, the rule has not been consistently applied in a flexible manner, sometimes imposing undue burdens.

This amendment directs the parties to address the question how they will comply with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) in their discovery plan, and report to the court about this topic. A companion amendment to Rule 16(b)(3)(B)(iv) seeks to prompt the court to include provisions about complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) in scheduling or case management orders.

This amendment also seeks to grant the parties maximum flexibility in designing an appropriate method for identifying the grounds for withholding materials. Depending on the nature of the litigation, the nature of the materials sought through discovery, and the nature of the privilege or protection involved, what is needed in one case may not be necessary in another. No one-size-fits-all approach would actually be suitable in all cases.

In some cases, it may be suitable to have the producing party deliver a document-by-document listing with explanations of the grounds for withholding the listed materials.

In some cases, some sort of categorical approach might be effective to relieve the producing party of the need to list many withheld documents. For example, it may be that communications between a party and outside litigation counsel could be excluded from the listing, and in some cases a date range might be a suitable method of excluding some materials from the listing requirement. These or other methods may enable counsel to reduce the burden and increase the effectiveness of complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A). But the use of categories calls for careful drafting and application keyed to the specifics of the action.

Requiring that discussion of this topic begin at the outset of the litigation and that the court be advised of the parties' plans or disagreements in this regard is a key purpose of this amendment. Production of a privilege log near the close of the discovery period can create serious problems. Often it will be valuable to provide for "rolling" production of materials and an appropriate description of the nature of the withheld material. In that way, areas of potential dispute may be identified and, if the parties cannot resolve them, presented to the court for resolution.

Early design of methods to comply with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) may also reduce the frequency of claims that producing parties have over-designated responsive materials. Such concerns may arise, in part, due to failure of the parties to communicate meaningfully about the nature of the privileges and materials involved in the given case. It can be difficult to determine whether certain materials are subject to privilege protection, and candid early communication about the difficulties to be encountered in making and evaluating such determinations can avoid later disputes.

Rule 16. Pretrial Conferences; Scheduling; Management

* * * * *

(b) Scheduling and Management.

* * * * *

(3) ***Contents of the Order.***

* * * * *

(B) *Permitted Contents.*

* * * * *

(iv) include the timing and method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) and any agreements the parties reach for asserting claims of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material after information is produced, including agreements reached under Federal Rule of Evidence 502;

* * * * *

DRAFT COMMITTEE NOTE

Rule 16(b) is amended in tandem with an amendment to Rule 26(f)(3)(D). In addition, two words—"and management"—are added to the title of this rule in recognition that it contemplates that the court will in many instances do more than establish a schedule in its Rule 16(b) order; the focus of this amendment is an illustration of such activity.

The amendment to Rule 26(f)(3)(D) directs the parties to discuss and include in their discovery plan a method for complying with the requirements in Rule 26(b)(5)(A). It also directs that the discovery plan address the timing for compliance with this requirement, in order to avoid problems that can arise if issues about compliance emerge only at the end of the discovery period.

Early attention to the particulars on this subject can avoid problems later in the litigation by establishing case-specific procedures up front. It may be desirable for the Rule 16(b) order to provide for "rolling" production that may identify possible disputes about whether certain withheld materials are indeed protected. If the parties are unable to resolve those disputes between themselves, it is often desirable to have them resolved at an early stage by the court, in part so that the parties can apply the court's resolution of the issues in further discovery in the case.

Because the specific method of complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) depends greatly on the specifics of a given case there is no overarching standard for all cases. In the first instance, the parties themselves should discuss these specifics during their Rule 26(f) conference; these amendments to Rule 16(b) recognize that the court can provide direction early in the case. Though the court ordinarily will give much weight to the parties' preferences, the court's order prescribing the method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) does not depend on party agreement.

Excerpt from the May 11, 2023 Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules
(revised July 11, 2023)

* * * * *

C. New Rule 16.1 on MDL proceedings—recommendation to publish for public comment

After a great deal of effort, the MDL Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee has developed an amendment proposal set forth below—the addition of a new Rule 16.1 on managing MDL proceedings. The MDL Subcommittee was originally appointed in 2017. It has had three chairs (two of whom went on to become Chairs of the Advisory Committee). After considering many proposed rule amendments, it reached a consensus on the appropriate way to address MDL proceedings in the Civil Rules—adoption of new Rule 16.1, addressed particularly to those proceedings.

Because the process of development involved consideration of a wide variety of issues and took a long time, it seems useful to introduce the current proposal with some background on the evolution of the Subcommittee's work. The initial submissions to the Committee raised a wide variety of issues. At the Committee's April 2018, meeting the MDL Subcommittee made its first report to the full Committee, listing ten discussion issues:

(1) The scope of any rule;

(2) The handling of master complaints and answers;

(3) Use of plaintiff fact sheets or requiring particularized pleading or requiring immediate submission of evidence by plaintiffs;

(4) Requiring each plaintiff to pay a full filing fee; with possible effect on Rule 20 joinder;

(5) Sequencing discovery;

(6) Requiring disclosure of third party litigation funding;

(7) Handling of bellwether trials, and requiring consent to holding such trials:

(8) Expanding interlocutory review of certain decisions in certain MDL proceedings;

(9) Coordinating MDL proceedings with parallel proceedings in state courts or other federal courts; and

(10) Formation of leadership counsel for plaintiffs and common fund arrangements.

A great deal of effort was spent examining the proposal to require disclosure of third party litigation funding. Eventually, the conclusion was that this topic, while perhaps very important, was not particularly salient in MDL proceedings. So TPLF remains on the Committee's agenda, and disclosure of such arrangements has been endorsed in some bills introduced in Congress, but it is no longer a feature of the MDL Subcommittee's work.

Even more effort was spent examining the possibility of expanded interlocutory review. As it developed, the proposal was to emulate Rule 23(f) on immediate review of class certification decisions. Very helpful submissions favoring and opposing such a rule change were submitted, and Subcommittee members participated in a large number of conferences and meetings with bar groups about this possibility. Eventually the decision was made that there was not such a need for expanded review in light of existing methods (including certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)), and that idea was put aside.

Attention focused, instead, on adding provisions specifically calibrated to MDL proceedings to Rule 26(f) and Rule 16(b), which were included in the agenda book for the full Committee's March 2022 meeting. By the time that meeting occurred, however, further outreach by the Subcommittee (including a conference involving transferee judges, plaintiff attorneys and defense attorneys organized by the Emory University's Institute for Complex Litigation and Mass Claims) had pointed up some difficulties with relying on Rule 26(f) as a vehicle for managing MDL proceedings. In particular:

> (1) It might often happen that a Rule 26(f) conference had already occurred in some actions before a Panel transfer order centralizing them in the transferee court, and perhaps that a schedule for activity in those actions had already been adopted in the transferor court. There would ordinarily be no occasion under Rule 26(f) for a second planning conference or report to the court. And after transfer by the Panel, there might not be any Rule 26(f) conferences in actions in which they had not already occurred before transfer.
>
> (2) It increasingly seemed valuable to provide the transferee court in MDL proceedings with the opportunity to appoint "coordinating counsel" to oversee the initial organization of the proceedings and assist the court in making its initial management order to guide the future course of the MDL proceedings.

These issues prompted the idea of a new Rule 16.1 to address MDL proceedings. Such a rule could assist the transferee court in addressing a variety of matters that often proved important in MDL proceedings. It could also provide a substitute for MDL proceedings for the Rule 26(f) meeting that is to occur in ordinary litigation. Initial sketches of such a rule, including alternative versions, were appended to the agenda book for the Standing Committee's June 2022 meeting.

After that Standing Committee meeting, these Rule 16.1 sketches were the focus of several further conferences. Both the American Association for Justice and the Lawyers for Civil Justice arranged for representatives of the Subcommittee to participate in conference with members of their organizations about the Rule 16.1 ideas. Importantly, three judicial representatives of the Subcommittee also attended the transferee judges conference, put on by the Judicial Panel. At that conference there was a special session with the transferee judges to receive feedback about the Rule 16.1 sketches, including the question which alternative approach seemed most suitable.

At its January 2023 meeting, the Standing Committee received a thorough report about progress on this front along the lines initially introduced during its June 2022 meeting.

With the extensive resulting information base, the Subcommittee went to work refining the Rule 16.1 proposal. This work included multiple meetings via Zoom and many more exchanges

of email about evolving drafts. Eventually, the Subcommittee reached consensus on a proposal to recommend for public comment. At its March 2023 meeting, the Advisory Committee unanimously recommended publication of this proposal for public comment in August 2023. The proposal has been revised since the Advisory Committee's March 2023 meeting in accordance with the suggestions of the style consultants.

One point discussed during the Advisory Committee meeting deserves mention. Proposed Rule 16.1(a), (c), and (d) all use the verb "should" with regard to the court's management of MDL proceedings. During the Advisory Committee meeting, concerns were raised about whether use of this verb made the proposed rule mere advice and not a genuine rule. One alternative suggested was "must, if appropriate."

The MDL Subcommittee caucused during the lunch break in the Advisory Committee meeting and concluded that the rule ought to use "should" in the points where the draft used that word. On the one hand, as the Committee Note recognizes, there may be some MDL proceedings in which no initial management conference is needed, so "must" would be too strong. And "must, if appropriate" would seem not significantly different from "should." The view was that "should" is the correct word to use in 16.1.

As also noted during the Advisory Committee meeting, quite a few other rules already use "should." See, e.g., Rule 1 (the rules "*should* be construed * * * to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination"); 15(a)(2) (court "*should* freely give leave [to amend]"); 15(b)(1) (court "*should* freely permit an amendment" if there is an objection at trial that evidence is not within the issues raised in the pleadings): 16(d) (after a pretrial conference "the court *should* issue an order reciting the action taken"); 25(a)(2) (if a party dies, the death "*should* be noted on the record"); 54(c) (final judgment "*should* grant the relief to which each party is entitled"); 56(a) (if the court grants summary judgment it "*should* state on the record the reasons for granting the motion"). At the same time, it might also be noted that the use of "must" in some rules may be questioned. See Rule 55(b)(1) (clerk "must" enter default judgment if a claim "is for a sum certain or that can be made certain by computation"). Though the public comment period may raise questions about this choice of word, "should" has been retained for purposes of publication.

Rule 16.1. Managing Multidistrict Litigation[*]

(a) INITIAL MDL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE. After the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation orders the transfer of actions, the transferee court should schedule an initial management conference to develop a management plan for orderly pretrial activity in the MDL proceedings.

(b) DESIGNATING COORDINATING COUNSEL FOR THE CONFERENCE. The transferee court may designate coordinating counsel to:

(1) assist the court with the conference; and

[*] At its June 6, 2023 meeting, the Standing Committee removed the word "Managing" from the title of proposed new Rule 16.1. Except where otherwise noted, other changes the Standing Committee made were stylistic in nature or to correct a typographical issue.

(2) work with plaintiffs or with defendants to prepare for the conference and prepare any report ordered under Rule 16.1(c).

(c) PREPARING A REPORT FOR THE CONFERENCE. The transferee court should order the parties to meet and prepare a report to be submitted to the court before the conference begins. The report must address any matter designated by the court, which may include any matter addressed in the list below or in Rule 16. The report may also address any other matter the parties wish to bring to the court's attention.

(1) whether leadership counsel should be appointed, and if so:

(A) the procedure for selecting them and whether the appointment should be reviewed periodically during the MDL proceedings;

(B) the structure of leadership counsel, including their responsibilities and authority in conducting pretrial activities;

(C) their role in settlement activities;

(D) proposed methods for them to regularly communicate with and report to the court and nonleadership counsel;

(E) any limits on activity by nonleadership counsel; and

(F) whether and, if so, when to establish a means for compensating leadership counsel;

(2) identifying any previously entered scheduling or other orders and stating whether they should be vacated or modified;

(3) identifying the principal factual and legal issues likely to be presented in the MDL proceedings;

(4) how and when the parties will exchange information about the factual bases for their claims and defenses;

(5) whether consolidated pleadings should be prepared to account for multiple actions included in the MDL proceedings;

(6) a proposed plan for discovery, including methods to handle it efficiently;

(7) any likely pretrial motions and a plan for addressing them;

(8) a schedule for additional management conferences with the court;

(9) whether the court should consider measures to facilitate settlement of some or all actions before the court, including measures identified in Rule 16(c)(2)(I);

(10) how to manage the filing of new actions in the MDL proceedings;

(11) whether related actions have been filed or are expected to be filed in other courts, and whether to consider possible methods for coordinating with them; and

(12) whether matters should be referred to a magistrate judge or a master.

(d) INITIAL MDL MANAGEMENT ORDER. After the conference, the court should enter an initial MDL management order addressing the matters designated under Rule 16.1(c)—and any other matters in the court's discretion. This order controls the MDL proceedings until the court modifies it.

DRAFT COMMITTEE NOTE

The Multidistrict Litigation Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1407, was adopted in 1968. It empowers the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer one or more actions for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings, to promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions. The number of civil actions subject to transfer orders from the Panel has increased significantly since the statute was enacted. In recent years, these actions have accounted for a substantial portion of the federal civil docket. There previously was no reference to multidistrict litigation in the Civil Rules and, thus, the addition of Rule 16.1 is designed to provide a framework for the initial management of MDL proceedings.

Not all MDL proceedings present the type of management challenges this rule addresses. On the other hand, other multiparty litigation that did not result from a Judicial Panel transfer order may present similar management challenges. For example, multiple actions in a single district (sometimes called related cases and assigned by local rule to a single judge) may exhibit characteristics similar to MDL proceedings. In such situations, courts may find it useful to employ procedures similar to those Rule 16.1 identifies for MDL proceedings in their handling of those multiparty proceedings. In both MDL proceedings and other multiparty litigation, the Manual for Complex Litigation also may be a source of guidance.

Rule 16.1(a). Rule 16.1(a) recognizes that the transferee judge regularly schedules an initial MDL management conference soon after the Judicial Panel transfer occurs to develop a management plan for the MDL proceedings. That initial MDL management conference ordinarily would not be the only management conference held during the MDL proceedings. Although holding an initial MDL management conference in MDL proceedings is not mandatory under Rule 16.1(a), early attention to the matters identified in Rule 16.1(c) may be of great value to the transferee judge and the parties.

Rule 16.1(b). Rule 16.1(b) recognizes the court may designate coordinating counsel—perhaps more often on the plaintiff than the defendant side—to ensure effective and coordinated discussion and to provide an informative report for the court to use during the initial MDL management conference.

While there is no requirement that the court designate coordinating counsel, the court should consider whether such a designation could facilitate the organization and management of

the action at the initial MDL management conference. The court may designate coordinating counsel to assist the court before appointing leadership counsel. In some MDL proceedings, counsel may be able to organize themselves prior to the initial MDL management conference such that the designation of coordinating counsel may not be necessary.

Rule 16.1(c). The court ordinarily should order the parties to meet to provide a report to the court about the matters designated in the court's Rule 16.1(c) order prior to the initial MDL management conference. This should be a single report, but it may reflect the parties' divergent views on these matters. The court may select which matters listed in Rule 16.1(c) or Rule 16 should be included in the report submitted to the court, and may also include any other matter, whether or not listed in those rules. Rules 16.1(c) and 16 provide a series of prompts for the court and do not constitute a mandatory checklist for the transferee judge to follow. Experience has shown, however, that the matters identified in Rule 16.1(c)(1)-(12) are often important to the management of MDL proceedings. In addition to the matters the court has directed counsel to address, the parties may choose to discuss and report about other matters that they believe the transferee judge should address at the initial MDL management conference.

Rule 16.1(c)(1). Appointment of leadership counsel is not universally needed in MDL proceedings. But, to manage the MDL proceedings, the court may decide to appoint leadership counsel. This provision calls attention to a number of topics the court might consider if appointment of leadership counsel seems warranted.

The first is the procedure for selecting such leadership counsel, addressed in subparagraph (A). There is no single method that is best for all MDL proceedings. The transferee judge has a responsibility in the selection process to ensure that the lawyers appointed to leadership positions are capable and experienced and that they will responsibly and fairly represent all[*] plaintiffs, keeping in mind the benefits of different experiences, skill, knowledge, geographical distributions, and backgrounds. Courts have considered the nature of the actions and parties, the qualifications of each individual applicant, litigation needs, access to resources, the different skills and experience each lawyer will bring to the role, and how the lawyers will complement one another and work collectively.

MDL proceedings do not have the same commonality requirements as class actions, so substantially different categories of claims or parties may be included in the same MDL proceeding and leadership may be comprised of attorneys who represent parties asserting a range of claims in the MDL proceeding. For example, in some MDL proceedings there may be claims by individuals who suffered injuries, and also claims by third-party payors who paid for medical treatment. The court may sometimes need to take these differences into account in making leadership appointments.

Courts have selected leadership counsel through combinations of formal applications, interviews, and recommendations from other counsel and judges who have experience with MDL proceedings. If the court has appointed coordinating counsel under Rule 16.1(b), experience with coordinating counsel's performance in that role may support consideration of coordinating counsel for a leadership position, but appointment under Rule 16(b) is primarily focused on coordination

[*] At its June 6, 2023 meeting, the Standing Committee removed the word "all".

of the Rule 16.1(c) meeting and preparation of the resulting report to the court for use at the initial MDL management conference under Rule 16.1(a).

The rule also calls for a report to the court on whether appointment to leadership should be reviewed periodically. Periodic review can be an important method for the court to manage the MDL proceeding.

In some MDL proceedings it may be important that leadership counsel be organized into committees with specific duties and responsibilities. Subparagraph (B) of the rule therefore prompts counsel to provide the court with specifics on the leadership structure that should be employed.

Subparagraph (C) recognizes that, in addition to managing pretrial proceedings, another important role for leadership counsel in some MDL proceedings is to facilitate possible settlement. Even in large MDL proceedings, the question whether the parties choose to settle a claim is just that—a decision to be made by those particular parties. Nevertheless, leadership counsel ordinarily play a key role in communicating with opposing counsel and the court about settlement and facilitating discussions about resolution. It is often important that the court be regularly apprised of developments regarding potential settlement of some or all actions in the MDL proceeding. In its supervision of leadership counsel, the court should make every effort to ensure that leadership counsel's participation in any settlement process is appropriate.

One of the important tasks of leadership counsel is to communicate with the court and with nonleadership counsel as proceedings unfold. Subparagraph (D) directs the parties to report how leadership counsel will communicate with the court and nonleadership counsel. In some instances, the court or leadership counsel have created websites that permit nonleadership counsel to monitor the MDL proceedings, and sometimes online access to court hearings provides a method for monitoring the proceedings.

Another responsibility of leadership counsel is to organize the MDL proceedings in accord with the court's management order under Rule 16.1(d). In some MDLs, there may be tension between the approach that leadership counsel takes in handling pretrial matters and the preferences of individual parties and nonleadership counsel. As subparagraph (E) recognizes, it may be necessary for the court to give priority to leadership counsel's pretrial plans when they conflict with initiatives sought by nonleadership counsel. The court should, however, ensure that nonleadership counsel have suitable opportunities to express their views to the court, and take care not to interfere with the responsibilities non-leadership counsel owe their clients.

Finally, subparagraph (F) addresses whether and when to establish a means to compensate leadership counsel for their added responsibilities. Courts have entered orders pursuant to the common benefit doctrine establishing specific protocols for common benefit work and expenses. But it may be best to defer entering a specific order until well into the proceedings, when the court is more familiar with the proceedings.

Rule 16.1(c)(2). When multiple actions are transferred to a single district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, those actions may have reached different procedural stages in the district courts from which cases were transferred ("transferor district courts"). In some, Rule 26(f) conferences

may have occurred and Rule 16(b) scheduling orders may have been entered. Those scheduling orders are likely to vary. Managing the centralized MDL proceedings in a consistent manner may warrant vacating or modifying scheduling orders or other orders entered in the transferor district courts, as well as any scheduling orders previously entered by the transferee judge.

Rule 16.1(c)(3). Orderly and efficient pretrial activity in MDL proceedings can be facilitated by early identification of the principal factual and legal issues likely to be presented. Depending on the issues presented, the court may conclude that certain factual issues should be pursued through early discovery, and certain legal issues should be addressed through early motion practice.

Rule 16.1(c)(4). Experience has shown that in MDL proceedings an exchange of information about the factual bases for claims and defenses can facilitate efficient management. Some courts have utilized "fact sheets" or a "census" as methods to take a survey of the claims and defenses presented, largely as a management method for planning and organizing the proceedings.

The level of detail called for by such methods should be carefully considered to meet the purpose to be served and avoid undue burdens. Whether early exchanges should occur may depend on a number of factors, including the types of cases before the court. For example, it is widely agreed that discovery from individual class members is often inappropriate in class actions, but with regard to individual claims in MDL proceedings exchange of individual particulars may be warranted.[*] And the timing of these exchanges may depend on other factors, such as whether motions to dismiss or other early matters might render the effort needed to exchange information unwarranted. Other factors might include whether there are legal issues that should be addressed (e.g., general causation or preemption) and the number of plaintiffs in the MDL proceeding.

Rule 16.1(c)(5). For case management purposes, some courts have required consolidated pleadings, such as master complaints and answers in addition to short form complaints. Such consolidated pleadings may be useful for determining the scope of discovery and may also be employed in connection with pretrial motions, such as motions under Rule 12 or Rule 56. The relationship between the consolidated pleadings and individual pleadings filed in or transferred to the MDL proceeding depends on the purpose of the consolidated pleadings in the MDL proceedings. Decisions regarding whether to use master pleadings can have significant implications in MDL proceedings, as the Supreme Court noted in *Gelboim v. Bank of America Corp.*, 574 U.S. 405, 413 n.3 (2015).

Rule 16.1(c)(6). A major task for the MDL transferee judge is to supervise discovery in an efficient manner. The principal issues in the MDL proceedings may help guide the discovery plan and avoid inefficiencies and unnecessary duplication.

Rule 16.1(c)(7). Early attention to likely pretrial motions can be important to facilitate progress and efficiently manage the MDL proceedings. The manner and timing in which certain

[*] At its June 6, 2023 meeting, the Standing Committee removed this sentence from the committee note.

legal and factual issues are to be addressed by the court can be important in determining the most efficient method for discovery.

Rule 16.1(c)(8). The Rule 16.1(a) conference is the initial MDL management conference. Although there is no requirement that there be further management conferences, courts generally conduct management conferences throughout the duration of the MDL proceedings to effectively manage the litigation and promote clear, orderly, and open channels of communication between the parties and the court on a regular basis.

Rule 16.1(c)(9). Even if the court has not* appointed leadership counsel, it may be that judicial assistance could facilitate the settlement of some or all actions before the transferee judge. Ultimately, the question whether parties reach a settlement is just that—a decision to be made by the parties. But as recognized in Rule 16(a)(5) and 16(c)(2)(I), the court may assist the parties in settlement efforts. In MDL proceedings, in addition to mediation and other dispute resolution alternatives, the court's use of a magistrate judge or a master, focused discovery orders, timely adjudication of principal legal issues, selection of representative bellwether trials, and coordination with state courts may facilitate settlement.

Rule 16.1(c)(10). Actions that are filed in or removed to federal court after the Judicial Panel has created the MDL proceedings are treated as "tagalong" actions and transferred from the district where they were filed to the transferee court.

When large numbers of tagalong actions are anticipated, some parties have stipulated to "direct filing" orders entered by the court to provide a method to avoid the transferee judge receiving numerous cases through transfer rather than direct filing. If a direct filing order is entered, it is important to address matters that can arise later, such as properly handling any jurisdictional or venue issues that might be presented, identifying the appropriate transferor district court for transfer at the end of the pretrial phase, how time limits such as statutes of limitations should be handled, and how choice of law issues should be addressed.

Rule 16.1(c)(11). On occasion there are actions in other courts that are related to the MDL proceedings. Indeed, a number of state court systems (e.g., California and New Jersey) have mechanisms like § 1407 to aggregate separate actions in their courts. In addition, it may sometimes happen that a party to an MDL proceeding may become a party to another action that presents issues related to or bearing on issues in the MDL proceeding.

The existence of such actions can have important consequences for the management of the MDL proceedings. For example, avoiding overlapping discovery is often important. If the court is considering adopting a common benefit fund order, consideration of the relative importance of the various proceedings may be important to ensure a fair arrangement. It is important that the MDL transferee judge be aware of whether such proceedings in other courts have been filed or are anticipated.

* The phrase "Even if the court has not" was changed to "Whether or not the court has" at the June 6, 2023 Standing Committee meeting.

Rule 16.1(c)(12). MDL transferee judges may refer matters to a magistrate judge or a master to expedite the pretrial process or to play a part in settlement negotiations. It can be valuable for the court to know the parties' positions about the possible appointment of a master before considering whether such an appointment should be made. Rule 53 prescribes procedures for appointment of a master.

Rule 16.1(d). Effective and efficient management of MDL proceedings benefits from a comprehensive management order. A management order need not address all matters designated under Rule 16.1(c) if the court determines the matters are not significant to the MDL proceedings or would better be addressed at a subsequent conference. There is no requirement under Rule 16.1 that the court set specific time limits or other scheduling provisions as in ordinary litigation under Rule 16(b)(3)(A). Because active judicial management of MDL proceedings must be flexible, the court should be open to modifying its initial management order in light of subsequent developments in the MDL proceedings. Such modification may be particularly appropriate if leadership counsel were appointed after the initial management conference under Rule 16.1(a).

* * * * *

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 16. Pretrial Conferences; Scheduling; Management

* * * * *

(b) Scheduling and Management.

* * * * *

(3) ***Contents of the Order.***

* * * * *

(B) *Permitted Contents*.

* * * * *

(iv) include the timing and method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) and any agreements the parties reach for asserting claims of

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material after information is produced, including agreements reached under Federal Rule of Evidence 502;

* * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 16(b) is amended in tandem with an amendment to Rule 26(f)(3)(D). In addition, two words – "and management" – are added to the title of this rule in recognition that it contemplates that the court will in many instances do more than establish a schedule in its Rule 16(b) order; the focus of this amendment is an illustration of such activity.

The amendment to Rule 26(f)(3)(D) directs the parties to discuss and include in their discovery plan a method for complying with the requirements in Rule 26(b)(5)(A). It also directs that the discovery plan address the timing for compliance with this requirement, in order to avoid problems that can arise if issues about compliance emerge only at the end of the discovery period.

Early attention to the particulars on this subject can avoid problems later in the litigation by establishing case-specific procedures up front. It may be desirable for the Rule 16(b) order to provide for "rolling" production that may

identify possible disputes about whether certain withheld materials are indeed protected. If the parties are unable to resolve those disputes between themselves, it is often desirable to have them resolved at an early stage by the court, in part so that the parties can apply the court's resolution of the issues in further discovery in the case.

Because the specific method of complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) depends greatly on the specifics of a given case there is no overarching standard for all cases. In the first instance, the parties themselves should discuss these specifics during their Rule 26(f) conference; these amendments to Rule 16(b) recognize that the court can provide direction early in the case. Though the court ordinarily will give much weight to the parties' preferences, the court's order prescribing the method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) does not depend on party agreement.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 16.1. Multidistrict Litigation

(a) Initial MDL Management Conference. After the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation orders the transfer of actions, the transferee court should schedule an initial management conference to develop a management plan for orderly pretrial activity in the MDL proceedings.

(b) Designating Coordinating Counsel for the Conference. The transferee court may designate coordinating counsel to:

(1) assist the court with the conference; and

(2) work with plaintiffs or with defendants to prepare for the conference and prepare any report ordered under Rule 16.1(c).

[1] New material is underlined in red.

(c) Preparing a Report for the Conference. The transferee court should order the parties to meet and prepare a report to be submitted to the court before the conference begins. The report must address any matter designated by the court, which may include any matter listed below or in Rule 16. The report may also address any other matter the parties wish to bring to the court's attention.

(1) whether leadership counsel should be appointed, and if so:

(A) the procedure for selecting them and whether the appointment should be reviewed periodically during the MDL proceedings;

(B) the structure of leadership counsel, including their responsibilities and authority in conducting pretrial activities;

(C) their role in settlement activities;

(D) proposed methods for them to regularly communicate with and report to the court and nonleadership counsel;

(E) any limits on activity by nonleadership counsel; and

(F) whether and, if so, when to establish a means for compensating leadership counsel;

(2) identifying any previously entered scheduling or other orders and stating whether they should be vacated or modified;

(3) identifying the principal factual and legal issues likely to be presented in the MDL proceedings;

(4) how and when the parties will exchange information about the factual bases for their claims and defenses;

(5) whether consolidated pleadings should be prepared to account for multiple actions included in the MDL proceedings;

(6) a proposed plan for discovery, including methods to handle it efficiently;

(7) any likely pretrial motions and a plan for addressing them;

(8) a schedule for additional management conferences with the court;

(9) whether the court should consider measures to facilitate settlement of some or all actions before the court, including measures identified in Rule 16(c)(2)(I);

(10) how to manage the filing of new actions in the MDL proceedings;

(11) whether related actions have been filed or are expected to be filed in other courts, and whether to consider possible methods for coordinating with them; and

(12) whether matters should be referred to a magistrate judge or a master.

(d) Initial MDL Management Order. After the conference, the court should enter an initial MDL management order addressing the matters designated under Rule 16.1(c) – and any other matters in the court's discretion. This order controls the MDL proceedings until the court modifies it.

Committee Note

The Multidistrict Litigation Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1407, was adopted in 1968. It empowers the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer one or more actions for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings, to promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions. The number of civil actions subject to transfer orders from the Panel has increased significantly since the statute was enacted. In recent years, these actions have accounted for a substantial portion of the federal civil docket. There previously was no reference to multidistrict litigation in the Civil Rules and,

thus, the addition of Rule 16.1 is designed to provide a framework for the initial management of MDL proceedings.

Not all MDL proceedings present the type of management challenges this rule addresses. On the other hand, other multiparty litigation that did not result from a Judicial Panel transfer order may present similar management challenges. For example, multiple actions in a single district (sometimes called related cases and assigned by local rule to a single judge) may exhibit characteristics similar to MDL proceedings. In such situations, courts may find it useful to employ procedures similar to those Rule 16.1 identifies for MDL proceedings in their handling of those multiparty proceedings. In both MDL proceedings and other multiparty litigation, the Manual for Complex Litigation also may be a source of guidance.

Rule 16.1(a). Rule 16.1(a) recognizes that the transferee judge regularly schedules an initial MDL management conference soon after the Judicial Panel transfer occurs to develop a management plan for the MDL proceedings. That initial MDL management conference ordinarily would not be the only management conference held during the MDL proceedings. Although holding an initial MDL management conference in MDL proceedings is not mandatory under Rule 16.1(a), early attention to the matters identified in Rule 16.1(c) may be of great value to the transferee judge and the parties.

Rule 16.1(b). Rule 16.1(b) recognizes the court may designate coordinating counsel -- perhaps more often on the plaintiff than the defendant side -- to ensure effective and coordinated discussion and to provide an informative report for the court to use during the initial MDL management conference.

While there is no requirement that the court designate coordinating counsel, the court should consider whether such a designation could facilitate the organization and management of the action at the initial MDL management conference. The court may designate coordinating counsel to assist the court before appointing leadership counsel. In some MDL proceedings, counsel may be able to organize themselves prior to the initial MDL management conference such that the designation of coordinating counsel may not be necessary.

Rule 16.1(c). The court ordinarily should order the parties to meet to provide a report to the court about the matters designated in the court's Rule 16.1(c) order prior to the initial MDL management conference. This should be a single report, but it may reflect the parties' divergent views on these matters. The court may select which matters listed in Rule 16.1(c) or Rule 16 should be included in the report submitted to the court, and may also include any other matter, whether or not listed in those rules. Rules 16.1(c) and 16 provide a series of prompts for the court and do not constitute a mandatory checklist for the transferee judge to follow. Experience has shown, however, that the matters identified in Rule 16.1(c)(1)-(12) are often important to the management of MDL proceedings. In addition to the matters the court has directed counsel to address, the parties may choose to discuss and report about other matters that they believe the transferee judge should address at the initial MDL management conference.

Rule 16.1(c)(1). Appointment of leadership counsel is not universally needed in MDL proceedings. But, to manage the MDL proceedings, the court may decide to appoint leadership counsel. This provision calls attention to a number of topics the court might consider if appointment of leadership counsel seems warranted.

The first is the procedure for selecting such leadership counsel, addressed in subparagraph (A). There is no single method that is best for all MDL proceedings. The transferee judge has a responsibility in the selection process to ensure that the lawyers appointed to leadership positions are capable and experienced and that they will responsibly and fairly represent plaintiffs, keeping in mind the benefits of different experiences, skill, knowledge, geographical distributions, and backgrounds. Courts have considered the nature of the actions and parties, the qualifications of each individual applicant, litigation needs, access to resources, the different skills and experience each lawyer will bring to the role, and how the lawyers will complement one another and work collectively.

MDL proceedings do not have the same commonality requirements as class actions, so substantially different categories of claims or parties may be included in the same MDL proceeding and leadership may be comprised of attorneys who represent parties asserting a range of claims in the MDL proceeding. For example, in some MDL proceedings there may be claims by individuals who suffered injuries, and also claims by third-party payors who paid for medical treatment. The court may sometimes need to take these differences into account in making leadership appointments.

Courts have selected leadership counsel through combinations of formal applications, interviews, and recommendations from other counsel and judges who have experience with MDL proceedings. If the court has appointed coordinating counsel under Rule 16.1(b), experience with coordinating counsel's performance in that role may support consideration of coordinating counsel for a leadership position, but appointment under Rule 16.1(b) is primarily focused on coordination of the Rule 16.1(c)

meeting and preparation of the resulting report to the court for use at the initial MDL management conference under Rule 16.1(a).

The rule also calls for a report to the court on whether appointment to leadership should be reviewed periodically. Periodic review can be an important method for the court to manage the MDL proceeding.

In some MDL proceedings it may be important that leadership counsel be organized into committees with specific duties and responsibilities. Subparagraph (B) of the rule therefore prompts counsel to provide the court with specifics on the leadership structure that should be employed.

Subparagraph (C) recognizes that, in addition to managing pretrial proceedings, another important role for leadership counsel in some MDL proceedings is to facilitate possible settlement. Even in large MDL proceedings, the question whether the parties choose to settle a claim is just that -- a decision to be made by those particular parties. Nevertheless, leadership counsel ordinarily play a key role in communicating with opposing counsel and the court about settlement and facilitating discussions about resolution. It is often important that the court be regularly apprised of developments regarding potential settlement of some or all actions in the MDL proceeding. In its supervision of leadership counsel, the court should make every effort to ensure that leadership counsel's participation in any settlement process is appropriate.

One of the important tasks of leadership counsel is to communicate with the court and with nonleadership counsel as proceedings unfold. Subparagraph (D) directs the parties to report how leadership counsel will communicate with the court and nonleadership counsel. In some instances, the

court or leadership counsel have created websites that permit nonleadership counsel to monitor the MDL proceedings, and sometimes online access to court hearings provides a method for monitoring the proceedings.

Another responsibility of leadership counsel is to organize the MDL proceedings in accord with the court's management order under Rule 16.1(d). In some MDLs, there may be tension between the approach that leadership counsel takes in handling pretrial matters and the preferences of individual parties and nonleadership counsel. As subparagraph (E) recognizes, it may be necessary for the court to give priority to leadership counsel's pretrial plans when they conflict with initiatives sought by nonleadership counsel. The court should, however, ensure that nonleadership counsel have suitable opportunities to express their views to the court, and take care not to interfere with the responsibilities non-leadership counsel owe their clients.

Finally, subparagraph (F) addresses whether and when to establish a means to compensate leadership counsel for their added responsibilities. Courts have entered orders pursuant to the common benefit doctrine establishing specific protocols for common benefit work and expenses. But it may be best to defer entering a specific order until well into the proceedings, when the court is more familiar with the proceedings.

Rule 16.1(c)(2). When multiple actions are transferred to a single district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, those actions may have reached different procedural stages in the district courts from which cases were transferred ("transferor district courts"). In some, Rule 26(f) conferences may have occurred and Rule 16(b) scheduling orders may have been entered. Those scheduling orders are likely to vary. Managing the centralized MDL proceedings

in a consistent manner may warrant vacating or modifying scheduling orders or other orders entered in the transferor district courts, as well as any scheduling orders previously entered by the transferee judge.

Rule 16.1(c)(3). Orderly and efficient pretrial activity in MDL proceedings can be facilitated by early identification of the principal factual and legal issues likely to be presented. Depending on the issues presented, the court may conclude that certain factual issues should be pursued through early discovery, and certain legal issues should be addressed through early motion practice.

Rule 16.1(c)(4). Experience has shown that in MDL proceedings an exchange of information about the factual bases for claims and defenses can facilitate efficient management. Some courts have utilized "fact sheets" or a "census" as methods to take a survey of the claims and defenses presented, largely as a management method for planning and organizing the proceedings.

The level of detail called for by such methods should be carefully considered to meet the purpose to be served and avoid undue burdens. Whether early exchanges should occur may depend on a number of factors, including the types of cases before the court. And the timing of these exchanges may depend on other factors, such as whether motions to dismiss or other early matters might render the effort needed to exchange information unwarranted. Other factors might include whether there are legal issues that should be addressed (e.g., general causation or preemption) and the number of plaintiffs in the MDL proceeding.

Rule 16.1(c)(5). For case management purposes, some courts have required consolidated pleadings, such as master complaints and answers in addition to short form complaints. Such consolidated pleadings may be useful for

determining the scope of discovery and may also be employed in connection with pretrial motions, such as motions under Rule 12 or Rule 56. The relationship between the consolidated pleadings and individual pleadings filed in or transferred to the MDL proceeding depends on the purpose of the consolidated pleadings in the MDL proceedings. Decisions regarding whether to use master pleadings can have significant implications in MDL proceedings, as the Supreme Court noted in *Gelboim v. Bank of America Corp.*, 574 U.S. 405, 413 n.3 (2015).

Rule 16.1(c)(6). A major task for the MDL transferee judge is to supervise discovery in an efficient manner. The principal issues in the MDL proceedings may help guide the discovery plan and avoid inefficiencies and unnecessary duplication.

Rule 16.1(c)(7). Early attention to likely pretrial motions can be important to facilitate progress and efficiently manage the MDL proceedings. The manner and timing in which certain legal and factual issues are to be addressed by the court can be important in determining the most efficient method for discovery.

Rule 16.1(c)(8). The Rule 16.1(a) conference is the initial MDL management conference. Although there is no requirement that there be further management conferences, courts generally conduct management conferences throughout the duration of the MDL proceedings to effectively manage the litigation and promote clear, orderly, and open channels of communication between the parties and the court on a regular basis.

Rule 16.1(c)(9). Whether or not the court has appointed leadership counsel, it may be that judicial assistance could facilitate the settlement of some or all actions before the transferee judge. Ultimately, the question

whether parties reach a settlement is just that -- a decision to be made by the parties. But as recognized in Rule 16(a)(5) and 16(c)(2)(I), the court may assist the parties in settlement efforts. In MDL proceedings, in addition to mediation and other dispute resolution alternatives, the court's use of a magistrate judge or a master, focused discovery orders, timely adjudication of principal legal issues, selection of representative bellwether trials, and coordination with state courts may facilitate settlement.

Rule 16.1(c)(10). Actions that are filed in or removed to federal court after the Judicial Panel has created the MDL proceedings are treated as "tagalong" actions and transferred from the district where they were filed to the transferee court.

When large numbers of tagalong actions are anticipated, some parties have stipulated to "direct filing" orders entered by the court to provide a method to avoid the transferee judge receiving numerous cases through transfer rather than direct filing. If a direct filing order is entered, it is important to address matters that can arise later, such as properly handling any jurisdictional or venue issues that might be presented, identifying the appropriate transferor district court for transfer at the end of the pretrial phase, how time limits such as statutes of limitations should be handled, and how choice of law issues should be addressed.

Rule 16.1(c)(11). On occasion there are actions in other courts that are related to the MDL proceedings. Indeed, a number of state court systems (e.g., California and New Jersey) have mechanisms like § 1407 to aggregate separate actions in their courts. In addition, it may sometimes happen that a party to an MDL proceeding may become a party to another action that presents issues related to or bearing on issues in the MDL proceeding.

The existence of such actions can have important consequences for the management of the MDL proceedings. For example, avoiding overlapping discovery is often important. If the court is considering adopting a common benefit fund order, consideration of the relative importance of the various proceedings may be important to ensure a fair arrangement. It is important that the MDL transferee judge be aware of whether such proceedings in other courts have been filed or are anticipated.

Rule 16.1(c)(12). MDL transferee judges may refer matters to a magistrate judge or a master to expedite the pretrial process or to play a part in settlement negotiations. It can be valuable for the court to know the parties' positions about the possible appointment of a master before considering whether such an appointment should be made. Rule 53 prescribes procedures for appointment of a master.

Rule 16.1(d). Effective and efficient management of MDL proceedings benefits from a comprehensive management order. A management order need not address all matters designated under Rule 16.1(c) if the court determines the matters are not significant to the MDL proceedings or would better be addressed at a subsequent conference. There is no requirement under Rule 16.1 that the court set specific time limits or other scheduling provisions as in ordinary litigation under Rule 16(b)(3)(A). Because active judicial management of MDL proceedings must be flexible, the court should be open to modifying its initial management order in light of subsequent developments in the MDL proceedings. Such modification may be particularly appropriate if leadership counsel were appointed after the initial management conference under Rule 16.1(a).

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE[1]

Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions Governing Discovery

* * * * *

(f) Conference of the Parties; Planning for Discovery.

* * * * *

(3) ***Discovery Plan.*** A discovery plan must state the parties' views and proposals on:

* * * * *

(D) any issues about claims of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation materials, including the timing and method for complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) and – if the parties

[1] New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

agree on a procedure to assert these claims after production – whether to ask the court to include their agreement in an order under Federal Rule of Evidence 502;

* * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 26(f)(3)(D) is amended to address concerns about application of the requirement in Rule 26(b)(5)(A) that producing parties describe materials withheld on grounds of privilege or as trial-preparation materials. Compliance with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) can involve very large costs, often including a document-by-document "privilege log."

Rule 26(b)(5)(A) was adopted in 1993, and from the outset was intended to recognize the need for flexibility. Nevertheless, the rule has not been consistently applied in a flexible manner, sometimes imposing undue burdens.

This amendment directs the parties to address the question how they will comply with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) in their discovery plan, and report to the court about this topic. A companion amendment to Rule 16(b)(3)(B)(iv) seeks to prompt the court to include provisions about complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) in scheduling or case management orders.

Requiring this discussion at the outset of litigation is important to avoid problems later on, particularly if objections to a party's compliance with Rule 26(b)(5)(A)

might otherwise emerge only at the end of the discovery period.

This amendment also seeks to grant the parties maximum flexibility in designing an appropriate method for identifying the grounds for withholding materials. Depending on the nature of the litigation, the nature of the materials sought through discovery, and the nature of the privilege or protection involved, what is needed in one case may not be necessary in another. No one-size-fits-all approach would actually be suitable in all cases.

In some cases, it may be suitable to have the producing party deliver a document-by-document listing with explanations of the grounds for withholding the listed materials.

In some cases some sort of categorical approach might be effective to relieve the producing party of the need to list many withheld documents. For example, it may be that communications between a party and outside litigation counsel could be excluded from the listing, and in some cases a date range might be a suitable method of excluding some materials from the listing requirement. These or other methods may enable counsel to reduce the burden and increase the effectiveness of complying with Rule 26(b)(5)(A). But the use of categories calls for careful drafting and application keyed to the specifics of the action.

Requiring that discussion of this topic begin at the outset of the litigation and that the court be advised of the parties' plans or disagreements in this regard is a key purpose of this amendment. Production of a privilege log near the close of the discovery period can create serious problems. Often it will be valuable to provide for "rolling" production of materials and an appropriate description of the nature of the withheld material. In that way, areas of

potential dispute may be identified and, if the parties cannot resolve them, presented to the court for resolution.

Early design of methods to comply with Rule 26(b)(5)(A) may also reduce the frequency of claims that producing parties have over-designated responsive materials. Such concerns may arise, in part, due to failure of the parties to communicate meaningfully about the nature of the privileges and materials involved in the given case. It can be difficult to determine whether certain materials are subject to privilege protection, and candid early communication about the difficulties to be encountered in making and evaluating such determinations can avoid later disputes.

APPENDIX

§ 440 Procedures for Committees on Rules of Practice and Procedure

This section contains the "Procedures for the Judicial Conference's Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure and Its Advisory Rules Committees," last amended in September 2011. JCUS-SEP 2011, p. 35.

§ 440.10 Overview

The Rules Enabling Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2071–2077, authorizes the Supreme Court to prescribe general rules of practice and procedure and rules of evidence for the federal courts. Under the Act, the Judicial Conference must appoint a standing committee, and may appoint advisory committees to recommend new and amended rules. Section 2073 requires the Judicial Conference to publish the procedures that govern the work of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the "Standing Committee") and its advisory committees on the Rules of Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, and Criminal Procedure and on the Evidence Rules. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2073(a)(1). These procedures do not limit the rules committees' authority. Failure to comply with them does not invalidate any rules committee action. *Cf.* 28 U.S.C. § 2073(e).

§ 440.20 Advisory Committees

§ 440.20.10 Functions

Each advisory committee must engage in "a continuous study of the operation and effect of the general rules of practice and procedure now or hereafter in use" in its field, taking into consideration suggestions and recommendations received from any source, new statutes and court decisions affecting the rules, and legal commentary. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 331.

§ 440.20.20 Suggestions and Recommendations

Suggestions and recommendations on the rules are submitted to the Secretary of the Standing Committee at the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. The Secretary will acknowledge the suggestions or recommendations and refer them to the appropriate advisory committee. If the Standing Committee takes formal action on them, that action will be reflected in the Standing Committee's minutes, which are posted on the judiciary's rulemaking website.

§ 440.20.30 Drafting Rule Changes

(a) Meetings

Each advisory committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Advisory committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the judiciary's rulemaking website, sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Preparing Draft Changes

The reporter assigned to each advisory committee should prepare for the committee, under the direction of the committee or its chair, draft rule changes, committee notes explaining their purpose, and copies or summaries of written recommendations and suggestions received by the committee.

(c) Considering Draft Changes

The advisory committee studies the rules' operation and effect. It meets to consider proposed new and amended rules (together with committee notes), whether changes should be made, and whether they should be submitted to the Standing Committee with a recommendation to approve for publication. The submission must be accompanied by a written report explaining the advisory committee's action and its evaluation of competing considerations.

§ 440.20.40 Publication and Public Hearings

(a) Publication

Before any proposed rule change is published, the Standing Committee must approve publication. The Secretary then arranges for printing and circulating the proposed change to the bench, bar, and public. Publication should be as wide as possible. The proposed change must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the judiciary's rulemaking website. The Secretary must:

(1) notify members of Congress, federal judges, and the chief justice of each state's highest court of the proposed change, with a link to the judiciary's rulemaking website; and

(2) provide copies of the proposed change to legal-publishing firms with a request to timely include it in publications.

(b) Public Comment Period

A public comment period on the proposed change must extend for at least six months after notice is published in the *Federal Register*, unless a shorter period is approved under paragraph (d) of this section.

(c) Hearings

The advisory committee must conduct public hearings on the proposed change unless eliminating them is approved under paragraph (d) of this section or not enough witnesses ask to testify at a particular hearing. The hearings are held at the times and places that the advisory committee's chair determines. Notice of the times and places must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the judiciary's rulemaking website. The hearings must be transcribed. Whenever possible, a transcript should be produced by a qualified court reporter.

(d) Expedited Procedures

The Standing Committee may shorten the public comment period or eliminate public hearings if it determines that the administration of justice requires a proposed rule change to be expedited and that appropriate notice to the public can still be provided and public comment obtained. The Standing Committee may also eliminate public notice and comment for a technical or conforming amendment if the Committee determines that they are unnecessary. When an exception is made, the chair must advise the Judicial Conference and provide the reasons.

§ 440.20.50 Procedures After the Comment Period

(a) Summary of Comments

When the public comment period ends, the reporter must prepare a summary of the written comments received and of the testimony presented at public hearings. If the number of comments is very large, the reporter may summarize and aggregate similar individual comments, identifying the source of each one.

(b) Advisory Committee Review; Republication

The advisory committee reviews the proposed change in light of any comments and testimony. If the advisory committee makes substantial changes, the proposed rule should be republished for an additional period of public comment unless the advisory committee determines that republication would not be necessary to achieve adequate public comment and would not assist the work of the rules committees.

(c) Submission to the Standing Committee

The advisory committee submits to the Standing Committee the proposed change and committee note that it recommends for approval. Each submission must:

(1) be accompanied by a separate report of the comments received;

(2) explain the changes made after the original publication; and

(3) include an explanation of competing considerations examined by the advisory committee.

§ 440.20.60 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The advisory committee's chair arranges for preparing the minutes of the committee meetings.

(b) Records

The advisory committee's records consist of:

- written suggestions received from the public;
- written comments received from the public on drafts of proposed rules;
- the committee's responses to public suggestions and comments;
- other correspondence with the public about proposed rule changes;
- electronic recordings and transcripts of public hearings (when prepared);
- the reporter's summaries of public comments and of testimony from public hearings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for committee meetings;
- minutes of committee meetings;
- approved drafts of rule changes; and
- reports to the Standing Committee.

(c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the judiciary's rulemaking website, except for general public correspondence about proposed rule changes and electronic recordings of hearings when transcripts are prepared. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the AO and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.20.30(a).

§ 440.30 Standing Committee

§ 440.30.10 Functions

The Standing Committee's functions include:

(a) coordinating the work of the advisory committees;

(b) suggesting proposals for them to study;

(c) considering proposals they recommend for publication for public comment; and

(d) for proposed rule changes that have completed that process, deciding whether to accept or modify the proposals and transmit them with its own recommendation to the Judicial Conference, recommit them to the advisory committee for further study and consideration, or reject them.

§ 440.30.20 Procedures

(a) Meetings

The Standing Committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the Committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the

reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the judiciary's rulemaking website, sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Attendance by the Advisory Committee Chairs and Reporters

The advisory committees' chairs and reporters should attend the Standing Committee meetings to present their committees' proposed rule changes and committee notes, to inform the Standing Committee about ongoing work, and to participate in the discussions.

(c) Action on Proposed Rule Changes or Committee Notes

The Standing Committee may accept, reject, or modify a proposed change or committee note, or may return the proposal to the advisory committee with instructions or recommendations.

(d) Transmission to the Judicial Conference

The Standing Committee must transmit to the Judicial Conference the proposed rule changes and committee notes that it approves, together with the advisory committee report. The Standing Committee's report includes its own recommendations and explains any changes that it made.

§ 440.30.30 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The Secretary prepares minutes of Standing Committee meetings.

(b) Records

The Standing Committee's records consist of:

- the minutes of Standing Committee and advisory committee meetings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for Standing Committee meetings;
- reports to the Judicial Conference; and
- official correspondence about rule changes, including correspondence with advisory committee chairs.

(c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the judiciary's rulemaking website, except for official correspondence about rule changes. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the AO and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.30.20(a).

Last revised (Transmittal 01-026) May 27, 2022

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
(Standing Committee)

Chair	Reporter
Honorable John D. Bates United States District Court Washington, DC	Professor Catherine T. Struve University of Pennsylvania Law School Philadelphia, PA

Members

Honorable Paul J. Barbadoro United States District Court Concord, NH	Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq. Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP San Francisco, CA
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr., Esq. Sullivan & Cromwell LLP New York, NY	Honorable William J. Kayatta, Jr. United States Court of Appeals Portland, ME
Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl Superior Court of the State of California Los Angeles, CA	Dean Troy A. McKenzie New York University School of Law New York, NY
Honorable Patricia A. Millett United States Court of Appeals Washington, DC	Honorable Lisa O. Monaco Deputy Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Andrew J. Pincus, Esq. Mayer Brown LLP Washington, DC	Honorable Gene E.K. Pratter United States District Court Philadelphia, PA
Honorable D. Brooks Smith United States Court of Appeals Duncansville, PA	Kosta Stojilkovic, Esq. Wilkinson Stekloff LLP Washington, DC
Honorable Jennifer G. Zipps United States District Court Tucson, AZ	

Consultants

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette Boston College Law School Newton Centre, MA	Professor Bryan A. Garner LawProse, Inc. Dallas, TX

Consultants (continued)

Professor Joseph Kimble
Thomas M. Cooley Law School
Lansing, MI

Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., Esq.
Bethesda, MD

Secretary to the Standing Committee

H. Thomas Byron III, Esq.
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Office of the General Counsel – Rules Committee Staff
Washington, DC

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Jay S. Bybee United States Court of Appeals Las Vegas, NV	Professor Edward Hartnett Seton Hall University School of Law Newark, NJ

Members

George W. Hicks, Jr., Esq. Kirkland & Ellis LLP Washington, DC	Professor Bert Huang Columbia Law School New York, NY
Honorable Leondra R. Kruger Supreme Court of California San Francisco, CA	Honorable Carl J. Nichols United States District Court Washington, DC
Honorable Elizabeth B. Prelogar Solicitor General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC	Danielle Spinelli, Esq. Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP Washington DC
Honorable Sidney R. Thomas United States Court of Appeals Billings, MT	Honorable Richard C. Wesley United States Court of Appeals Geneseo, NY
Lisa B. Wright, Esq. Office of the Federal Public Defender Washington, DC	

Liaisons

Honorable Daniel A. Bress (*Bankruptcy*) United States Court of Appeals San Francisco, CA	Andrew J. Pincus, Esq. (*Standing*) Mayer Brown LLP Washington, DC

Clerk of Court Representative

Molly Dwyer, Esq.
United States Court of Appeals
San Francisco, CA

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Rebecca B. Connelly United States Bankruptcy Court Harrisonburg, VA	Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Laura B. Bartell Wayne State University Law School Detroit, MI

Members

Honorable Daniel A. Bress United States Court of Appeals San Francisco, CA	Jenny L. Doling, Esq. J. Doling Law PC Palm Desert, CA
Honorable Michelle M. Harner United States Bankruptcy Court Baltimore, MD	Honorable Jeffery P. Hopkins United States District Court Cincinnati, OH
Honorable David A. Hubbert Deputy Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC	Honorable Ben Kahn United States Bankruptcy Court Greensboro, NC
Honorable Marcia S. Krieger United States District Court Denver, CO	Honorable Catherine P. McEwen United States Bankruptcy Court Tampa, FL
Debra L. Miller, Esq. Chapter 13 Bankruptcy Trustee South Bend, IN	Professor Scott F. Norberg Florida International University College of Law Miami, FL
Honorable J. Paul Oetken United States District Court New York, NY	Jeremy L. Retherford, Esq. Balch & Bingham LLP Birmingham, AL
Damian S. Schaible, Esq. Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP New York, NY	Honorable George H. Wu United States District Court Los Angeles, CA

Liaisons

Ramona D. Elliott, Esq.
(*U.S. Trustees*)
Executive Office for U.S. Trustees
Washington, DC

Honorable Laurel M. Isicoff
(*Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System*)
United States Bankruptcy Court
Miami, FL

Honorable William J. Kayatta, Jr.
(*Standing*)
United States Court of Appeals
Portland, ME

Clerk of Court Representative

Kenneth S. Gardner
United States Bankruptcy Court
Denver, CO

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Robin L. Rosenberg United States District Court West Palm Beach, FL	Professor Richard L. Marcus University of California Hastings College of the Law San Francisco, CA
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Andrew Bradt University of California, Berkeley Berkeley, CA

Members

Honorable Cathy Bissoon United States District Court Pittsburgh, PA	Honorable Jane Bland Supreme Court of Texas Austin, Texas
Honorable Jennifer C. Boal United States District Court Boston, MA	Honorable Brian M. Boynton Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
David J. Burman, Esq. Perkins Coie LLP Seattle, WA	Honorable David C. Godbey United States District Court Dallas, TX
Honorable Kent A. Jordan United States Court of Appeals Wilmington, DE	Honorable M. Hannah Lauck United States District Court Richmond, VA
Honorable R. David Proctor United States District Court Birmingham, AL	Joseph M. Sellers, Esq. Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC Washington, DC
Honorable Manish S. Shah United States District Court Chicago, IL	Dean A. Benjamin Spencer William & Mary Law School Williamsburg, VA
Ariana J. Tadler, Esq. Tadler Law LLP Manhasset, NY	Helen E. Witt, Esq. Kirkland & Ellis LLP Chicago, IL

Liaisons

Honorable D. Brooks Smith
(*Standing*)
United States Court of Appeals
Duncansville, PA

Honorable Catherine P. McEwen
(*Bankruptcy*)
United States Bankruptcy Court
Tampa, FL

Consultant

Professor Edward H. Cooper
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor, MI

Clerk of Court Representative

Carmelita Reeder Shinn, Esq.
United States District Court
Oklahoma City, OK

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable James C. Dever III United States District Court Raleigh, NC	Professor Sara Sun Beale Duke Law School Durham, NC
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Nancy J. King Vanderbilt University Law School Nashville, TN

Members

Honorable Andre Birotte, Jr. United States District Court Los Angeles, CA	Honorable Jane Boyle United States District Court Dallas, TX
Honorable Timothy Burgess United States District Court Anchorage, AK	Honorable Robert J. Conrad, Jr. United States District Court Charlotte, NC
Dean Roger A. Fairfax, Jr. American University Washington College of Law Washington, DC	Honorable Michael J. Garcia New York State Court of Appeals Albany, NY
Lisa Hay, Esq. Federal Public Defender Portland, OR	Honorable Bruce J. McGiverin United States District Court San Juan, PR
Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen United States Court of Appeals Pasadena, CA	Hon. Kenneth A. Polite, Jr. Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Catherine M. Recker, Esq. Welsh & Recker PC Philadelphia, PA	Susan M. Robinson, Esq. Thomas Combs & Spann PLLC Charleston, WV

Liaison

Honorable Paul J. Barbadoro
(*Standing*)
United States District Court
Concord, NH

Clerk of Court Representative

Angela E. Noble, Esq.
United States District Court
Miami, FL

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz United States District Court Minneapolis, MN	Professor Daniel J. Capra Fordham University School of Law New York, NY

Members

James P. Cooney III, Esq. Womble Bond Dickinson LLP Charlotte, NC	Honorable Shelly Dick United States District Court Baton Rouge, LA
Honorable Mark S. Massa Indiana Supreme Court Indianapolis, IN	Honorable Marshall L. Miller Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Honorable Thomas D. Schroeder United States District Court Winston Salem, NC	Arun Subramanian, Esq. Susman Godfrey L.L.P. New York, NY
Honorable Richard J. Sullivan United States Court of Appeals New York, NY	Rene L. Valladares, Esq. Office of the Federal Public Defender Las Vegas, NV

Consultant

Professor Liesa Richter
University of Oklahoma School of Law
Norman, OK

Liaisons

Honorable Robert J. Conrad, Jr. (*Criminal*) United States District Court Charlotte, NC	Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl (*Standing*) Superior Court of the State of California Los Angeles, CA
Honorable M. Hannah Lauck (*Civil*) United States District Court Richmond, VA	

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure
Judicial Conference of the United States
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building
Washington, DC 20544
uscourts.gov