

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 12, 2018 | Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance	1
Opening Business.....	2
Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting.....	3
Report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules	3
Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules	7
Report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules	12
Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules.....	15
Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules.....	19
Three Decades of the Rules Enabling Act	21
Judiciary Strategic Planning	22
Legislative Report.....	22
Concluding Remarks.....	22

ATTENDANCE

The Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (“Standing Committee” or “Committee”) held its spring meeting at the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, D.C., on June 12, 2018. The following members participated:

Judge David G. Campbell, Chair	Professor William K. Kelley
Judge Jesse M. Furman	Judge Carolyn B. Kuhl
Daniel C. Girard, Esq.	Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Esq.*
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr., Esq.	Judge Amy St. Eve
Judge Susan P. Graber	Judge Srikanth Srinivasan
Judge Frank Mays Hull	Judge Jack Zouhary
Peter D. Keisler, Esq.	

The advisory committees were represented by their chairs and reporters:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules –

Judge Michael A. Chagares, Chair
Professor Edward Hartnett, Reporter

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules –

Judge Dennis R. Dow, Incoming Chair
Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter
Professor Laura Bartell, Associate
Reporter

Advisory Committee on Civil Rules –

Judge John D. Bates, Chair
Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
Professor Richard L. Marcus, Associate
Reporter

Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules –

Judge Donald W. Molloy, Chair
Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter
Professor Nancy J. King, Associate
Reporter

Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules –

Judge Debra Ann Livingston, Chair
Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

*Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division, represented the Department of Justice on behalf of the Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General.

Providing support to the Committee were:

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette	Reporter, Standing Committee
Professor Catherine T. Struve	Associate Reporter, Standing Committee
Rebecca A. Womeldorf	Secretary, Standing Committee
Professor Bryan A. Garner	Style Consultant, Standing Committee
Professor R. Joseph Kimble	Style Consultant, Standing Committee
Bridget M. Healy	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Scott Myers	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Julie Wilson	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Frances F. Skillman	Paralegal Specialist, RCS
Shelly Cox	Administrative Specialist, RCS
Dr. Tim Reagan	Senior Research Associate, FJC
Patrick Tighe	Law Clerk, Standing Committee

OPENING BUSINESS

Judge Campbell called the meeting to order. He apologized to any Washington Capitals fans who would miss the Stanley Cup victory parade in D.C. because of the meeting.

He welcomed Judge Dennis Dow of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Missouri, who will be the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules beginning October 1, 2018. Because the current Chair, Judge Sandra Segal Ikuta, could not attend the meeting, Judge Dow is attending in her place. Judge Campbell also welcomed Professor Ed Hartnett who was recently appointed as Reporter to the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules. He also noted that Chief Justice Roberts reappointed Judges Bates and Molloy as Chairs of their respective Advisory Committees for another year. Judge St. Eve was recently appointed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and although Director Duff appointed Judge St. Eve to the Judicial Conference Committee on the Budget, Judge St. Eve graciously agreed to serve her remaining term on the Standing Committee.

Judge Campbell remarked that Judge Zouhary's tenure on the Standing Committee ends on September 30, 2018. Judge Zouhary will continue to help with the pilot projects going forward. He thanked Judge Zouhary for his service, noting that he is an innovator in district court case management.

In addition, Judge Campbell lamented the passing of Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., a longtime member of and consultant to the Standing Committee. Professor Hazard passed shortly after the Committee's meeting in January 2018, and Judge Campbell said that he will be greatly missed.

Lastly, Judge Campbell discussed Professor Dan Coquillette’s upcoming retirement from his role as Reporter to the Standing Committee in December 2018 but noted that Professor Coquillette will remain as a consultant thereafter. Chief Justice Roberts appointed Professor Catherine Struve as Associate Reporter, and we will ask the Chief Justice to appoint Professor Struve as Reporter while Dan transitions to a consulting role. Judge Campbell thanked Professor Coquillette for his service and looks forward to the celebration later this evening.

Rebecca Womeldorf directed the Committee to the chart summarizing the status of proposed rules amendments at each stage of the Rules Enabling Act process, which is included in the Agenda Book. Also included are the proposed rules approved by the Judicial Conference in September 2017, adopted by the Supreme Court, and transmitted to Congress in April 2018. If Congress takes no action, the rule package pending before Congress will become effective December 1, 2018.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion by a member, seconded by another, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee approved the minutes of the January 4, 2018 meeting.**

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Chagares and Professor Hartnett provided the report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules, which met on April 6, 2018, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Advisory Committee sought approval of five action items and presented a few information items.

Action Items

Appellate Rules 3 and 13 – Electronic Service. The Advisory Committee sought final approval for proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 3 and 13, both of which concern notices of appeal. The proposed amendments were published for public comment in August 2017 and received no comments.

The proposed amendments to Rules 3 and 13 reflect the increased reliance on electronic service in serving notice of filing notices of appeal. Rule 3 currently requires the district court clerk to serve notice of filing the notice of appeal by mail to counsel in all cases, and by mail or personal service on a criminal defendant. The proposed amendment changes the words “mailing” and “mails” to “sending” and “sends,” and deletes language requiring certain forms of service. Similarly, Rule 13 currently requires that a notice of appeal from the Tax Court be filed at the clerk’s office or mailed to the clerk. The proposed amendment allows the appellant to send a notice of appeal by means other than mail.

One Committee member remarked that use of “sends” and “sending” in Rule 3 seemed vague and inquired why more specific language was not used. Judge Chagares responded that a more general term was used to cover a variety of ways to serve notices of appeal, reflecting the various approaches courts use as they transition to electronic service.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rules 3 and 13.**

Appellate Rules 26.1, 28, and 32 – Disclosure Statements. The Advisory Committee sought final approval for proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 26.1, 28, and 32. The proposed amendment to Rule 26.1 changes the disclosure requirements in several respects designed to help judges decide whether they must recuse themselves. The proposed amendments to Rules 28 and 32 would change the term “corporate disclosure statement” to “disclosure statement.” These proposed amendments were published in August 2017. The proposed amendments to Rules 28 and 32 received no public comments whereas Rule 26.1 received a few.

The National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (“NACDL”) suggested that the Committee Note include additional language to help deter overuse of the government exception in 26.1(b) concerning organizational victims in criminal cases. In response, the Advisory Committee revised the Rule 26.1 Committee Note to more closely follow the Committee Note for Criminal Rule 12.4 and account for the NACDL comment. In addition, Charles Ivey suggested that Rule 26.1(c) include additional language referencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings and requiring that petitioning creditors be identified in disclosure statements. The Advisory Committee consulted Professor Gibson, Reporter to the Bankruptcy Rules Committee, and accepted Professor Gibson’s suggestion that no change was needed. Finally, two commentators argued that the meaning of 26.1(d) regarding intervenors was ambiguous. In response, the Appellate Rules Committee folded language from 26.1(d) regarding intervenors into a new last sentence in 26.1(a) and changed the title of subsection (a) to reflect that intervenors are subject to the disclosure requirement.

One member asked what constitutes a “nongovernment corporation” and whether this term includes entities such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are government-sponsored publicly traded companies. This member also questioned why Rule 26.1 was limited to corporations, noting that limited partnerships can raise similar issues as corporations. One Committee member stated that disclosures should be broader rather than narrower and did not see the harm in deleting “nongovernmental.” Another member questioned whether it is onerous to list governmental corporations. A different member reiterated that other types of entities can present similar problems as corporations.

Professor Struve noted that the goal of the proposed amendments to Rule 26.1 is to track the other disclosure provisions in the Civil, Criminal, and Bankruptcy Rules. Professor Cooper relayed the history of these disclosure statement rules, stating that the Civil Rules Committee decided to limit the disclosure statement to “nongovernment corporations” given the significant variation among local disclosure rules. Judge Chagares reiterated Professor Struve’s point that the purpose underlying the proposed change to Appellate Rule 26.1 is consistency with the other federal rules regarding disclosure statements. Professors Beale and King noted a memo by Neal Katyal exploring why the disclosure statement is limited to “nongovernmental corporations” and concluding that this limitation was not causing a practical problem.

A member noted the federal rules should be consistent with each other. However, a bigger problem is whether the newly consistent rules provide judges with adequate information for recusal. Judge Campbell said that there are two distinct issues: first, whether to approve Rule 26.1 to make it consistent with the other federal rules, and second, whether to change or revisit the current policy underlying the disclosure statement rules. He argued that the second question was not ripe for the Committee's consideration.

A member asked if 26.1(b)'s disclosure obligation is broader than 26.1(a). Judge Campbell responded that subsection (b) is parallel with Criminal Rule 12.4 whereas subsection (a) is parallel with Civil Rule 7.1. He reiterated that the scope of the disclosure obligation should perhaps be reconsidered at a later time.

A member suggested deleting "and intervenors" in Rule 26.1(a)'s title, and Judge Chagares concurred. For consistency with other subsection titles, another member recommended making "victim" and "criminal case" plural in Rule 26.1(b)'s title, as well as deleting the article "a" preceding "criminal case." The Committee's style consultants recommended making a few stylistic changes in subsection (c), including adding a semicolon after "and" as well as deleting "in the bankruptcy case" in item number (2).

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rules 26.1, 28, and 32, subject to the revisions made to Rule 26.1 during the meeting.**

Appellate Rule 25(d) – Proof of Service. The Advisory Committee sought final approval for a proposed amendment to Appellate Rule 25(d), which is designed to eliminate unnecessary proofs of service in light of electronic filing. This proposed amendment had previously been approved by the Standing Committee and submitted to the Supreme Court. But after discussion at the January 2018 meeting, the previously submitted version was withdrawn for revision to address the possibility that a document might be filed electronically but still require service through means other than the court's electronic filing system on a party who does not participate in electronic filing. The Advisory Committee now seeks final approval of the revised language. Judge Campbell thanked Professor Struve for noting the potential issue. Judge Chagares also noted a few minor changes that should be made, including adding a hyphen between "electronic filing" in 25(d)(1) and deleting the words "filing and" in the Committee Note. Judge Chagares noted the Advisory Committee's view that the proposed revision to 25(d) was technical in nature, and did not require republication.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 25(d), subject to the revisions made during the meeting.**

Appellate Rules 5, 21, 26, 32, and 39 – Proof of Service. If the proposed amendment to Appellate Rule 25(d) is approved, proofs of service will frequently be unnecessary. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee sought final approval without public comment of what it views as technical and conforming amendments to Rules 5, 21, 26, 32, and 39. Proposed amendments to

Rules 5, 21(a)(1), and 21(c) delete the phrase “proof of service” and add “and serve it,” consistent with Rule 25(d)(1). Rule 26(c) eliminates the “proof of service” term and simplifies the current rule for when three days are added for certain kinds of service. Current Rule 32(f) lists the items that are excluded when computing length limits, including “the proof of service.” Given the frequent occasions in which there would be no proof of service, the article “the” should be deleted. Given this change, the Advisory Committee agreed to delete all of the articles in the list of items. Rule 39(d) removes the phrase “with proof of service” and replaces it with “and serve.” Judge Chagares explained that the Advisory Committee did not think public comment was necessary for these technical, conforming amendments.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rules 5, 21, 26, 32, and 39.**

Appellate Rule 35 – En Banc Determinations. The Advisory Committee sought approval for publication of proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 35 and 40, which would establish length limits applicable to responses to petitions for rehearing en banc. Also, Rule 40 uses the term “answer” whereas Rule 35 uses the term “response.” The proposed amendment would change Rule 40 to use the term “response” for consistency.

Some members noted other inconsistencies between the two rules. For instance, one member stated that Rule 35(e) just concerns the length limit whereas Rule 40 imposes additional requirements. Professor Hartnett responded that although the Advisory Committee has formed a subcommittee to examine Rules 35 and 40 more comprehensively, the committee felt it appropriate to move forward with this amendment in the interim. Judge Campbell asked if the Advisory Committee has a time table for when this review will conclude, and Judge Chagares stated they hope to finish this review in the fall. One Committee member noted that clarifying the length limits in the appellate rules is generally helpful and important.

One Committee member commented that the Committee Note to Rule 35 states “a court,” instead of “the court” like the text of rule. The Committee’s style consultants concurred that “a” should be changed to “the.”

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendments to Rules 35 and 40, subject to the revisions made during the meeting.**

Information Items

Judge Chagares announced the formation of three subcommittees to examine: (1) Rule 3(c)(1)(B) and the merger rule; (2) Rule 42(b) regarding voluntary dismissals, and; (3) whether any amendments are appropriate in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hamer v. Neighborhood Hous. Servs. Of Chi.*, 138 S. Ct. 13 (2017). One member asked if the Rule 42(b) subcommittee will explore whether different rules regarding voluntary dismissals should exist for class actions, and Judge Chagares stated that the subcommittee is exploring why judicial discretion over voluntary dismissals may be necessary, including in the class action context.

In addition, Judge Chagares noted that the Advisory Committee examined the problem of appendices being too long and including too much irrelevant information, as well as how much the requirements vary by circuit. However, technology is changing quickly which may transform how appendices are done. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee decided to remove this matter from the agenda and to revisit it in three years. Judge Chagares stated that the Advisory Committee also removed from its agenda an item relating to Rule 29 and blanket consents to amicus briefs, and an item relating to whether “costs on appeal” in Rule 7 includes attorney’s fees. The Committee discussed the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Hall v. Hall*, 138 S. Ct. 1118 (2018), but that discussion did not give rise to an agenda item.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Incoming Chair Dennis Dow and Professors Gibson and Bartell presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which met on April 3, 2018, in San Diego, California. The Advisory Committee sought approval of eight action items and presented three information items.

Action Items

Bankruptcy Rule 4001(c) – Obtaining Credit. The Advisory Committee sought final approval for a proposed amendment to Bankruptcy Rule 4001(c), which details the process for obtaining approval of post-petition credit in a bankruptcy case. The proposed amendment would make this rule inapplicable to chapter 13 cases. The Advisory Committee received no comments on this proposed change. Some post-publication changes were made, such as adding a title and a few other stylistic changes. No Standing Committee members had any comments or questions about this proposed amendment.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 4001(c).**

Bankruptcy Rule 6007(b) – Abandonment or Disposition of Property. The Advisory Committee sought approval for a proposed amendment to Bankruptcy Rule 6007(b). The proposed amendments are designed to specify the parties to be served with a motion to compel the trustee to abandon property under § 554(b), and to make the rule consistent with the procedures set forth in Rule 6007(a). The Advisory Committee received some comments on this rule, some of which they accepted but others they declined to adopt. The Committee’s style consultants suggested changes to subpart (b) which would have improved the overall language. Because the purpose of the current amendment is simply to parallel the text of Rule 6007(a), the Advisory Committee declined to accept these suggestions, but will revisit the styling improvements if the restyling project goes forward.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 6007(b).**

Bankruptcy Rule 9036 – Notice and Service Generally; Deferral of Action on Rule 2002(g) and Official Form 410. These amendments are designed to expand the use of electronic noticing and service in bankruptcy courts. The proposed amendments to Rule 2002(g) would allow notices to be sent to email addresses designated on filed proofs of claims and proofs of interest. The published amendments to Rule 9036 allow not only clerks but also parties to provide notices or to serve documents through the court’s electronic-filing system. The proposed amendments to Official Form 410 add a check box for opting into email service and noticing.

The Advisory Committee received four comments, each raising concerns about the technological feasibility of the proposed changes and how conflicting email addresses supplied by creditors should be prioritized given the different mechanisms for supplying email addresses for service. The AO and technology specialists with whom the Advisory Committee consulted confirmed these concerns. Consequently, the Advisory Committee unanimously recommended deferring action on amendments to Rule 2002(g) and Official Form 410. By holding these amendments in abeyance, the Advisory Committee will have additional time to sort out these technological issues.

Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee recommends approving the amendments to Rule 9036. In Rule 9036, the word “has” in the second sentence of the Committee Note should be changed to “have.” One Committee member asked if the phrase “in either of these events” should be “in either of these cases,” and the Committee’s style consultants noted that they try not to use “case” unless referring to a lawsuit.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 9036, subject to the revision made during the meeting.**

Bankruptcy Rule 9037(h) – Motion to Redact a Previously Filed Document. The Advisory Committee sought approval for a proposed amendment to Bankruptcy Rule 9037, which adds a new subdivision (h) to address the procedure for redacting personal identifiers in previously filed documents that are not in compliance with Rule 9037(a). The Advisory Committee received comments on the proposed changes, including one seeking to expand the amendments to address how documents placed under seal by the bankruptcy court should be handled on appeal. The Advisory Committee rejected this concern as beyond the scope of the rule amendment.

Another comment suggested an explicit waiver of the filing fee if a party bringing the motion seeks to redact protected privacy information disclosed by a different party (i.e., a debtor motion to redact his or her social security number inappropriately revealed in an attachment to a creditor’s proof of claim). The Advisory Committee agreed with this sentiment but did not think that changing the rule was necessary because Judicial Conference guidelines already permit the court to waive the filing fee in this situation. A third commenter noted that nothing in the rule required filing the redacted document. In response, the Advisory Committee added language making it clear that the redacted document must be filed.

A final comment argued that restrictions on accessing the originally filed document should not go into effect until the redacted document is filed. The current rule as written imposes restrictions on the document once the motion to redact is filed. The Advisory Committee rejected this comment, finding such restrictions necessary and appropriate because other people will be made aware of this sensitive information when the motion to redact is filed.

Judge Campbell asked if the language of “promptly restrict” is sufficient to guide clerks and whether clerks know to restrict access to these documents upon the filing of a motion to redact. Judge Dow responded affirmatively and noted that the clerk member of the Advisory Committee advised that clerks already impose restrictions as a matter of course. Judge Chagares asked about the scope of the rule and whether it applies to an opinion, which is also a “document filed.” Judge Dow stated that it could, and Professor Bartell noted that the rule only applies to the protected privacy information listed in Rule 9037(a).

A member stated that he is generally supportive of the rule change and asked whether the rule should apply more broadly, including in the Civil and Criminal Rules. Professor Beale noted that the Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Rules, respectively, have considered this question and decided against a parallel rule change because outside the bankruptcy context, where the problem is more frequent, judges routinely and quickly handle these matters when they arise.

This same member also asked why the information is limited to the information listed in Rule 9037(a). Professors Gibson and Beale explained that Rule 9037(a) is the bankruptcy version of the privacy rules adopted by the advisory committees to limit certain information in court documents as required by the E-Government Act. Professor Capra noted that the E-Government Act does not prohibit going farther than the information listed and that the Committee could decide to prohibit disclosing additional information. He added that if the issue is taken up, it should apply across the federal rules and not just in bankruptcy.

A member questioned why the rule uses the term “entity.” Judge Dow explained that the term “entity” is a defined term in the Bankruptcy Code, and the broadly defined term even encompasses governmental entities.

This member also asked if the Advisory Committee considered any changes to 9037(g) regarding waiver. Professor Bartell explained that the waiver rule is still intact and that the Advisory Committee decided no change was needed. A member inquired about local court rules that address this waiver problem, and Professor Bartell noted that bankruptcy courts have such rules.

Another Committee member suggested adding language in the Committee Note stating that 9037(g) does not abrogate the “waiver” provision. Professor Gibson was reluctant to make that change absent discussion with the Advisory Committee. Judge Campbell stated that, under the current rule, a problem already exists. Parties are currently filing motions to redact, and in certain situations it is possible such a motion could conflict with the waiver provision. This rule just creates a formal procedure for filing a motion to redact. It does not affect the current case law regarding waiver.

Professor Hartnett asked what happens when the motion is granted and whether the court, not the party, is required to docket the redacted document. Professor Gibson noted that the filing party must attach the redacted document to its motion to redact and that the court has the responsibility to docket the redacted document. The Advisory Committee explored requiring the moving party to file the redacted document as a separate document, but rejected this approach.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 9037.**

Official Forms 411A and 411B – Power of Attorney. Proposed Official Forms 411A and 411B are used to execute power of attorney. As part of the Advisory Committee's Forms Modernization Project, prior versions of these forms were changed from Official Forms to Director's Forms 4011A and 4011B. However, Judge Dow explained that this created a problem because Bankruptcy Rule 9010(c) requires execution of a power of attorney on an Official Form, and these forms are no longer Official Forms. To rectify this problem, the Advisory Committee sought approval to re-designate Director's Forms 4011A and 4011B as Official Forms 411A and 411B. Because there would be no substantive changes for which comment would be helpful, the Advisory Committee sought final approval of the forms without publication.

Judge Campbell asked if the Judicial Conference can designate these forms as Official Forms, or if Supreme Court approval is required. Professor Gibson and Mr. Myers said that under the Rules Enabling Act, the Judicial Conference makes the final decision in approving Official Bankruptcy Forms, and that if it acts this September, the changes will become effective on December 1, 2018.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the designation of Director's Forms 4011A and 4011B as Official Forms 411A and 411B effective December 1, 2018.**

Bankruptcy Rule 2002(f), (h), and (k) – Notices. Bankruptcy Rule 2002 specifies the timing and content of numerous notices that must be provided in a bankruptcy case. The Advisory Committee sought approval to publish amendments to three of the rule's subdivisions for public comment. These amendments would: 1) require giving notice of the entry of an order confirming a chapter 13 plan; 2) limit the need to provide notice to creditors that do not file timely proofs of claim in chapter 12 and chapter 13 cases; and 3) add a cross-reference reflecting the relocation of the provision specifying the deadline for an objection to confirmation of a chapter 13 plan. The Standing Committee had no questions or comments about these proposed amendments.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendments to Rule 2002(f), (h), and (k).**

Bankruptcy Rule 2004(c) – Examinations. Rule 2004 provides for the examination of debtors and other entities regarding a broad range of issues relevant to a bankruptcy case. The

Advisory Committee sought approval to publish an amendment to 2004(c) adding a reference to electronically stored information to the title and first sentence of the subdivision. The Standing Committee had no questions or comments about this proposed amendment.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendment to Rule 2004(c).**

Bankruptcy Rule 8012 – Corporate Disclosure Statement. The Advisory Committee sought approval to publish an amendment to Rule 8012 concerning corporate disclosure statements in bankruptcy appeals. The amendment adds a new subdivision (b) to Rule 8012 to require disclosing the names of any debtors in an underlying bankruptcy case that are not revealed by the caption in an appeal and, for any corporate debtors in the underlying bankruptcy case, disclosing the information required of corporations under subdivision (a) of the rule. Other amendments track Appellate Rule 26.1 by adding a provision to subdivision (a) requiring disclosure by corporations seeking to intervene in a bankruptcy appeal, and make stylistic changes to what would become subdivision (c) regarding supplemental disclosure statements.

Professor Gibson noted that the reference to subdivision (c) will be dropped from the Committee Note. A Committee member asked if the term “corporation appearing” already captures corporations seeking to intervene. Professor Gibson responded that it might be better to track the language used in FRAP 26.1. The first sentence should read: “Any nongovernmental corporation that is a party to a proceeding in the district court” She also noted that Rule 8012(b) will incorporate the language changes made to FRAP 26.1(c) at the meeting today, including adding a semicolon before “and” as well as deleting “in the bankruptcy case” in item number (2).

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendment to Rule 8012, subject to the revisions made during the meeting.**

Information Items

Judge Dow stated that a Restyling Subcommittee is exploring whether to recommend that the Advisory Committee restyle the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. To inform this recommendation, the Committee’s style consultants produced a draft of a restyled Rule 4001. In consultation with the FJC, the Subcommittee is conducting a survey of interested parties, including judges, clerks of courts, and other bankruptcy organizations, which will conclude on June 15, 2018. The survey uses a restyled example of 4001(a). The Subcommittee will analyze the survey responses and make a recommendation to the Advisory Committee at its September 2018 meeting. Although only preliminary results were available at the time of the meeting, Judge Dow said that responses from most bankruptcy judges and clerks were positive.

Professor Capra asked whether the Bankruptcy Rules could be restyled given that they track language in the Bankruptcy Code. Judge Dow noted that the parallels with the Code do not prohibit restyling; rather, they provide a reason for caution in undertaking that restyling effort. He

emphasized that no decision on restyling has been made. Informed by the survey of interested parties, the Advisory Committee will consider the advantages and disadvantages of restyling and determine how, if at all, to move forward.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Molloy and Professors Beale and King presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules, which met on April 24, 2018, in Washington, D.C. The Advisory Committee sought approval of two action items and shared two information items.

Action Items

New Criminal Rule 16.1 – Pretrial Discovery Conference. Judge Molloy reviewed the history of the proposal, which originated as a suggestion by members of the defense bar to amend Rule 16 to address disclosure and discovery in complex criminal cases, including those involving voluminous information and electronically stored information. At Judge Campbell’s suggestion, a subcommittee held a mini-conference to gather information on the problem and potential solutions. Mini-conference participants included criminal defense attorneys from both large and small firms, public defenders, prosecutors, Department of Justice attorneys, discovery experts, and judges. This conference significantly helped the Advisory Committee develop the proposed new Rule 16.1 by, among other things, building consensus on what sort of rule was needed and whether the rule should apply to all criminal cases. One member echoed that the mini-conference was fantastic and helped the Advisory Committee reach consensus on this rule. Judge Campbell applauded the Advisory Committee for finding consensus.

The new rule has two new sections. The first section, Rule 16.1(a), requires that no later than 14 days after arraignment the attorneys for the government and defense must confer and try to agree on the timing and procedures for disclosure. The second section, Rule 16.1(b), states that after the discovery conference the parties may “ask the court to determine or modify the timing, manner, or other aspects of disclosure to facilitate preparation for trial.”

Publication of the rule produced six comments. One comment from the DOJ expressed concern that the new rule could be read to grant new discovery authorities that could undermine important legal protections. The Advisory Committee agreed and decided to conform the language of the proposed rule to the phrasing of Criminal Rule 16(d)(2)(A). Two comments addressed whether the rule required the government to confer with pro se litigants and the Advisory Committee, in turn, changed the rule’s language to “the government and the defendant’s attorney” reasoning that it would not be practical for the government to confer about discovery with each pro se defendant. Two commenters recommended relocating the rule, but the Advisory Committee rejected this suggestion. One commenter suggested adding “good faith” to the meet and confer requirement but the Advisory Committee had already explored and rejected this idea. Professor Beale noted that the words “try to agree” capture this idea of conferring in good faith.

Lastly, two comments concerned whether the new rule would displace local rules or orders imposing shorter times for discovery. As published, the Committee Note stated that the rule “does not displace local rules or standing orders that supplement its requirements or limit the authority

of the district court to determine the timetable and procedures for disclosure.” The Advisory Committee determined that the Committee Note affirms the district courts retain authority to impose additional discovery requirements by local rule or court order, and that no further clarification was needed.

Many Committee members expressed concern that the Committee Note did not address adequately the concern about displacing local rules. One member reads the note to authorize local rules that are inconsistent with Rule 16.1. Judge Bates said that this issue has come up in his court and he shares the same concern. Professor Capra stated that whether a local rule that supplements the Federal Rules is inconsistent remains an open question. Professor Marcus discussed the history of Civil Rule 83 dealing with local rules.

Judge Campbell proposed addressing this concern by adding the language “and are consistent with.” Professor Cooper suggested that it would be helpful to add a comment that the local rules must be consistent with the Federal Rules. He also proposed adding a citation to Rule 16 to ensure that Rule 16.1 is not interpreted as altering Rule 16’s discovery obligations. Judge Livingston echoed Professor Cooper’s concern that this last sentence is too freestanding and could benefit from a citation.

Professor Beale responded that this Committee Note language satisfied the interested parties and that she did not think that referencing other rules in the Committee Note is a good idea. Instead, she proposed adopting Judge Campbell’s proposal. A Committee member expressed similar sentiments asking why the Committee Note does not use the phrase “consistent with.” Judge Campbell reminded the Committee that the proposed language reflected an accord that had been carefully worked out among the interested parties.

After much discussion, consensus emerged to revise the last sentence in the third paragraph of the Committee Note as follows: “Moreover, the rule does not (1) modify statutory safeguards provided in security and privacy laws such as the Jencks Act or the Classified Information Procedures Act, (2) displace local rules or standing orders that supplement and are consistent with its requirements, or (3) limit the authority of the district court to determine the timetable and procedures for disclosure.”

Other Committee members raised stylistic concerns with Rule 16.1. In an email sent prior to the meeting, a Committee member raised some grammatical and stylistic comments about Rule 16.1, which Judge Molloy and the Reporters agree require revisions. First, the word “shortly” in the first sentence in the Committee Note should be replaced with “early in the process, no later than 14 days after arraignment,” to better track the language of the rule. Second, an errant underline between “it” and “displace” in the third paragraph of the Committee Note will be removed. Third, the phrase “determine or modify” will be added in the fifth paragraph of the Committee Note to more closely parallel the rule’s language. Lastly, this member also noted that the commas in Rule 16.1(b) should not be bolded.

Another Committee member proposed using words like “process” or “procedure” instead of “standard” in the third paragraph of the Committee Note reasoning that such terms better reflect that Rule 16.1 is instituting a new procedure. The Committee’s style consultants stated that the

word “procedure” would be appropriate to use. Judge Molloy and the Reporters agreed with this change.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed new Rule 16.1, subject to the revisions made during the meeting.**

Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings – Right to File a Reply. Judge Richard Wesley, a former member of the Standing Committee, raised this issue with the Advisory Committee, noting a conflict in the cases construing Rule 5(d) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings. This rule currently states that “[t]he moving party may submit a reply to the respondent’s answer or other pleading within a time fixed by the judge.” Although the Committee Note and history of the rule make clear an intent to give the inmate a right to file a reply, some courts have held that the inmate has no right to file a reply, but may do so only if permitted by the court. Other courts do recognize this as a right. After reviewing the case law, the Advisory Committee concluded that the text of the current rule contributes to a misreading of the rule by a significant number of district courts. A similar problem was found with regard to parallel language in Rule 5(e) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. The Advisory Committee agreed to correct this problem by placing the provision concerning the time for filing in a separate sentence, thereby making clear in the text of each rule that the moving party (or petitioner in § 2254 cases) has a right to file a reply.

Three comments were received during publication. The Advisory Committee determined that the issues raised by the comments were considered at length prior to publication and no changes were required. No Standing Committee members raised any questions or comments about this proposed amendment.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings.**

Information Items

Criminal Rule 16 – Pretrial Discovery Concerning Expert Witnesses. The Advisory Committee received two suggestions from district judges recommending that Rule 16’s provisions concerning pretrial discovery of expert testimony should be amended to provide expanded discovery similar to that under Civil Rule 26. Judge Molloy noted that there are many different kinds of experts, and criminal proceedings are not parallel in all respects to civil cases. Additionally, the DOJ has adopted new internal guidelines calling for significantly expanded discovery of forensic expert testimony. While there will not be a simple solution, there is consensus among the Advisory Committee members that the scope of pretrial disclosure of expert testimony is an important issue that should be addressed. The Advisory Committee will gather information from a wide variety of sources (including the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules) and also plans to hold a mini-conference.

Task Force on Protecting Cooperators. Judge St. Eve updated the Committee on the efforts of the Task Force on Protecting Cooperators. In April 2018, Director Duff sent 18 recommendations identified by the Task Force for implementation by the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”). A day before the Director’s scheduled meeting with the BOP, the BOP Director resigned, and that meeting did not occur. Since then, meetings have taken place with the BOP’s Acting Director, who had attended the Task Force meetings. He and his staff are preparing the BOP’s response, which they anticipate sending to Director Duff and the Task Force later this month. Some of the BOP Recommendations must be approved by the BOP union. Ms. Womeldorf has drafted the Task Force’s second and final report, which will be submitted sometime next month to Director Duff. Some of the Task Force’s recommendations may have to be considered by the Standing Committee and the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management. That said, Judge St. Eve stated that the Task Force’s work is coming to a close.

Judge Campbell noted that, last January, the Standing Committee reviewed the Advisory Committee’s decision not to recommend any rules implementing the CACM Interim Guidance or similar approaches to protecting cooperator information in case files and dockets based on the Task Force’s recommendations. The Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules will revisit this decision after the Task Force’s second and final report.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Bates and Professors Cooper and Marcus provided the report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, which met on April 10, 2018, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Advisory Committee sought approval of one action item and presented four information items.

Action Item

Rule 30(b)(6) – Deposition of an Organization. The Advisory Committee sought approval for publication of proposed amendments to Rule 30(b)(6) which would impose a duty to confer. In April 2016, a subcommittee was formed to consider a number of suggestions proposing amendments to Rule 30(b)(6). In the summer of 2017, the subcommittee invited comment on a preliminary list of possible rule changes. Over 100 comments were received. Discussions eventually focused on imposing a duty on the noticing and responding parties to confer in good faith. The Advisory Committee determined that such a requirement was the most promising way to improve practice under the rule.

As drafted, the duty to confer is iterative, and the proposed language requires the parties to confer about (1) the number and descriptions of the matters for examination and (2) the identity of each person who will testify. The first topic has not proved controversial; however, the second topic – the identity of the witnesses – has generated more discussion. Some fear the rule might be interpreted to require that organizations obtain the noticing party’s approval of its selection of witnesses. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee decided to keep the identity of witnesses as a topic of conferring, at least for the public comment process, because the proposal carries forward the present rule text stating that the named organization must designate the persons to testify on its behalf, and the Committee Note affirms that the choice of the designees is ultimately up to the organization.

Judge Bates noted that the Standing Committee received comments about the Advisory Committee's decision to include the identity of witnesses as a topic on which the parties must confer. Although these comments were addressed to the Standing Committee, he assured the Standing Committee that the Advisory Committee considered their substance when deciding to recommend publication. He noted that there is some force to the concerns stated in the comments, but that the Advisory Committee decided to include this topic because it is tied to the question of the matters for examination (the other question about which the parties must confer). Discussing what kind of person will have knowledge about a matter for examination may help avoid later disputes. Judge Bates also emphasized that the amendment only adds a requirement to confer; it does not require that the parties agree nor lessen the organization's ability to choose its witnesses.

Moreover, he cautioned that the comments to the Standing Committee are coming from only one segment of the bar, particularly from the defense bar and those who represent organizations who often must identify such witnesses. Interestingly, one letter from past, present, and upcoming Chairs of the ABA Section of Litigation did not raise concerns about the "identity" topic. That said, Judge Bates anticipates receiving many comments on this topic if the proposed amendment is approved for public comment, and he thinks comments from other groups will be informative. He guaranteed that these late submissions will be included as part of the Advisory Committee's broader assessment after public comment concludes.

Judge Campbell noted that the Standing Committee has received eight to ten last-minute comments about the proposed amendments to Rule 30(b)(6). This happens from time to time, but having received a number of them, he stated that the Standing Committee needs to clarify when it is appropriate to address comments directly to the Standing Committee. Clarification will help ensure that the public has fair notice of when to properly submit comments and that all commenters are treated equally. The Reporters discussed these questions at their lunch meeting today, and the Standing Committee will consider this procedural issue at its January 2019 meeting.

Many of these late comments noted by Judge Campbell expressed concern that the noticing party would have the ability to dictate the witnesses the organization must produce for deposition. In response, Judge Campbell stated that this is not the intent of the rule. Moreover, he noted that the rule also lists the matters for examination as a topic of conferring. Under the logic of the comments, it could be said that the organization now can dictate the matters for examination. Again, this is not the intent of the rule.

Lastly, Judge Bates reported that the Advisory Committee rejected adding a reference to Rule 30(b)(6)'s duty to confer in Rule 26(f) because Rule 26(f) conferences occur too early.

After this introduction, the Standing Committee engaged in a robust discussion about the Rule 30(b)(6) amendments. One member asked whether the conference must always occur and whether complex litigation concerns were driving this requirement. Professor Marcus responded that many complained about the inability to get the parties to productively engage on these matters and that the treatment here reflects repeat reports from the bar about issues with Rule 30(b)(6). This same member questioned whether the iterative nature of the confer requirement needs to be included in the rule. Judge Bates answered that it is important to signal in the rule the continuing

obligation to confer because the topics of the conference may not be resolved in an initial meeting. For example, the identity of the organization's witnesses may have to be decided once the matters for examination are confirmed. The member stated this is a helpful change to a real problem and that it avoids the "gotcha" element of Rule 30(b)(6) depositions by requiring more particularity.

Another member asked whether it may be wise to require parties to identify and produce documents they will use at the deposition. By providing all such documents in advance of the deposition, parties can better focus on the issues. Moreover, Rule 30(b)(6) notices often list the matters to be discussed and providing the documents to be used will enable parties to get more specific. Another member agreed, asserting that documents ought to be identified prior to the deposition. Professor Marcus noted that such a practice could help focus the issues, but it also could lead to parties dumping a bunch of documents they may not use.

One member suggested that identifying documents is a best practice and should be highlighted in the Committee Note to Rule 30(b)(6). Professor Coquillette responded that committee notes should not be used to discuss best practices but to illustrate what the rule means. A member noted that nothing in the proposed rule would prohibit providing the document in advance; in fact, it would not change what many lawyers already do. One member recommended deleting "at least some of" from the first paragraph of the Committee Note, which discusses how it may be productive to discuss other matters at the meet and confer such as the documents that will be used at the deposition.

Other members questioned why the rule does not address timing. One member proposed adding a provision requiring the parties to make such disclosures within a certain number of days before the deposition. Another member seconded this concern. Judge Bates stated that this is a rule about conferring, not about timing, and the Advisory Committee learned that timing is often not the real issue facing the bar.

Echoing a point raised in the letter from present, past, and incoming Chairs of the ABA Section of Litigation, one Committee member expressed concern about previous committee notes – the 1993 Committee Note stating that a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition counts as a single deposition (for purposes of the presumptive limit on the number of depositions), and the 2000 Committee Note indicating that, if multiple witnesses are identified, each witness may be deposed for seven hours. The member thought this approach could carry unintended consequences. Professor Marcus discussed the history of the seven-hour rule and stated that the Advisory Committee has twice studied this issue carefully, most recently when Judge Campbell served as Chair. Getting more specific seemed to generate more problems, and although the Advisory Committee considered this, they do not think there is a cure because any solution would lead to other problems. The Advisory Committee consequently concluded that a requirement to confer was a step in the right direction.

Committee members discussed at length the "identity" requirement. One member noted his agreement with the criticism that "identity" is unclear. He does not know if it is helpful to require conferencing about "identity." The member stated that he conducted an informal survey and said that this is not much of an issue, especially for good lawyers. Another member noted that she does not see Rule 30(b)(6) issues often unless they concern the scope of the deposition, which

the “matters for examination” topic addresses. She shared her colleague’s concern that “identity” is unclear.

Judge Bates noted that district court judges do not see many Rule 30(b)(6) issues, but the Advisory Committee heard from the practicing bar that problems do not always get to the judge. The proposal is responsive to the practicing bar’s concerns. Judge Campbell explained that they write rules for the weakest of lawyers and that the “identity” topic responds to the concerns of practitioners who complain that they cannot get organizations to identify the witnesses. Judge Bates reminded everyone that the proposed language is not final, but rather is the proposed language for public comment. The comments received thus far are from one constituency – members of the bar that primarily represent organizations – and comments have yet to be received from the rest of the bar.

Another Committee member remarked that the “identity” topic is important because it will inform the serving party whether the organization has no responsive witness and must identify a third party to depose. This member also suggested adding something encouraging the parties to ask the court for help in resolving their Rule 30(b)(6) disputes and to remind them of this practice’s efficacy. Judge Bates noted that committee notes typically do not remind parties to come to the court to resolve such disputes, and Professor Marcus noted that judicial members on the Advisory Committee objected to inclusion of this concept in an earlier draft.

Despite this conversation, a Committee member stated that he was still uncomfortable with the “identity” language. He proposed stating “and when reasonably available the identity of each person who will testify.” Another Committee member noted that such language would reinforce the iterative nature of the rule because organizations could identify witnesses shortly after conferring on the matters for examination.

Professor Cooper expressed skepticism about this Committee member’s proposal. After conferring with Judge Bates and Professor Marcus, Professor Cooper recommended adding “the organization will designate to” so that the topic for conferral will be “the identity of each person the organization will designate to testify.” The additional language – “the organization will designate to” – will reinforce that organizations maintain the right to choose who will testify and thus better respond to the concerns raised. If they make this change, they also recommended deleting the earlier use of “then.”

Another Committee member noted that the Committee Note’s use of the phrase “as necessary” was confusing and could be interpreted as requiring multiple conferences. He recommended instead: “The duty to confer continues if needed to fulfill the requirement of good faith.” Judge Bates liked this proposal, in part because it used fewer words and clarified the iterative nature of the rule.

After this discussion, Judge Campbell summarized the proposed modifications: (1) deleting “then” before the word “designate”; (2) deleting “who will” and adding “the organization will designate to”; (3) deleting “at least some of” from the first paragraph of the Committee Note; and (4) changing the wording of the penultimate sentence of the third paragraph of the Committee Note to read “The duty to confer continues if needed to fulfill the requirement of good faith.”

Judge Bates noted that they may need to explain the deletion of “then” in the Committee Note, and Judge Campbell said that he and Professors Cooper and Marcus can explore this after the meeting. If such language is needed, a proposal can be circulated to the Standing Committee for consideration and approval.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendment to Rule 30(b)(6), subject to the revisions made during the meeting.**

Information Items

Rules for Multidistrict Litigation. The subcommittee formed to consider creating rules for multidistrict litigation is still in the information gathering phase. Proposed legislation in Congress known as the Class Action Fairness Bill would affect procedures in MDL proceedings. Judge Bates noted that consideration of this subject will be a long process, and that the subcommittee is attending various conferences on MDLs. The subcommittee has identified eleven topics for consideration, including the scope of any rules and whether they would apply just to mass torts MDLs or all types of MDLs, the use of fact sheets and *Lone Pine* orders, rules regarding third-party litigation financing, appellate review, etc. He encouraged Committee members to provide the subcommittee their perspective on any of these topics. Judge Bates noted that the subcommittee has not decided if rules are necessary or whether a manual and increased education would be better alternatives.

Social Security Disability Review Cases. A subcommittee is considering a suggestion from the Administrative Conference of the United States to create rules governing Social Security disability appeals in federal courts. The subcommittee has not concluded its work, and whatever rules it may recommend, if any, still need to be considered by the Advisory Committee. The most significant issues concerning these types of proceedings are administrative delay within the Social Security Administration and the variation among districts both in local court practices and in rates of remand to the administrative process. Whatever court rules may be proposed will not address the administrative delay.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Livingston and Professor Capra delivered the report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules, which met on April 26-27, 2018, in Washington, D.C. The Advisory Committee presented two action items and seven information items.

Action Items

Evidence Rule 807 – Residual Exception. The Advisory Committee sought final approval for proposed amendments to Evidence Rule 807. Professor Capra reviewed the history of suggestions to amend the rule, noting that the Advisory Committee found that the rule was not working as well as it could. The proposal deletes the language requiring guarantees of trustworthiness “equivalent” to those in the Rule 803 and Rule 804 hearsay exceptions and instead

directs courts to determine whether a statement is supported by “sufficient” guarantees of trustworthiness in light of the totality of the circumstances of the statement’s making and any corroborating evidence. Subsections (a)(2) and (a)(4) are removed because they are at best redundant in light of other provisions in the Evidence Rules. The amendments also revise Rule 807(b)’s notice requirement, including by permitting the court, for good cause, to excuse a failure to provide notice prior to the trial or hearing.

One member asked if this proposal will increase the admissibility of hearsay evidence. Professor Capra noted that any increase will be marginal, perhaps in districts that adhere to a strict interpretation of the rule regarding “near miss” hearsay.

Ms. Shapiro noted the fantastic work Professor Capra did to help improve this rule and stated that the DOJ is incredibly grateful for his work.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Judicial Conference for approval the proposed amendments to Rule 807.**

Evidence Rule 404(b) – “Bad Acts” Evidence. The Advisory Committee sought approval to publish proposed amendments to Evidence Rule 404(b). Professor Capra explained various Rule 404(b) amendments considered and rejected by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee, however, accepted a proposed amendment from the DOJ requiring the prosecutor to provide notice of the non-propensity purpose of the evidence and the reasoning that supports that purpose. The Advisory Committee liked this suggestion because articulating the reasoning supporting the purpose for which the evidence is offered will give more notice to the defendant about the type of evidence the prosecutor will offer. The Advisory Committee also determined that the restyled phrase “crimes, wrongs, or other acts” should be restored to its original form: “*other* crimes, wrongs, or acts.” This would clarify that Rule 404(b) applies to other acts and not the acts charged.

Professor Bartell asked whether the Advisory Committee considered designating a specific time period for the prosecutor to provide notice. Professor Capra said the Advisory Committee considered this idea but thought it was too rigid.

One member inquired about implementing a notice requirement for civil cases. Professor Capra responded that notice was not necessary in civil cases because this information comes out during discovery. Judge Campbell also noted that lawyers in civil cases are not bashful about filing Rule 404 motions in limine.

Another member asked whether it would be better that subsection 404(b)(3) track the language of 404(b)(1) instead of stating “non-propensity purpose.” Professor Capra said the Advisory Committee will consider this idea during the public comment period.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication in August 2018 the proposed amendment to Rule 404(b).**

Information Items

Judge Livingston provided a brief update of the Advisory Committee's other work. First, the Advisory Committee decided not to proceed with rule changes to Evidence Rules 606(b) and 801(d)(1)(A).

Second, the Advisory Committee considered at its April 2018 meeting the results of the Symposium held at Boston College School of Law in October 2017 regarding forensic expert testimony, Rule 702, and *Daubert*. The Symposium proceedings are published in the Fordham Law Review. No formal amendments to Rule 702 have been considered yet but the Advisory Committee is exploring two possible changes: 1) an amendment focusing on forensic and other experts overstating their results and 2) an amendment that would address the fact that a fair number of courts have treated the reliability requirements of sufficient basis and reliable application in Rule 702 as questions of weight and not admissibility.

Lastly, Judge Grimm proposed amending Rule 106 regarding the rule of completeness to provide that: 1) a completing statement is admissible over a hearsay objection, and 2) the rule covers oral as well as written or recorded statements. The courts are not uniform in their treatment of Rule 106 issues, and the Advisory Committee decided to consider this proposal in more depth at its next meeting.

THREE DECADES OF THE RULES ENABLING ACT

To honor Professor Coquillette's thirty-four years of service to the Standing Committee and his upcoming retirement as Reporter to the Standing Committee, Judge Sutton – a former Chair of the Standing Committee – led a question and answer session with Professor Coquillette. The discussion was wide-ranging and provided current Committee members with helpful history on challenges faced by the rules committees over time. Professor Coquillette noted that the Rules Enabling Act ("REA") has been so successful in part because the Department of Justice played an integral role in the REA process. He thanked the DOJ for recognizing the value of the REA and for helping preserve its integrity. Although the Standing Committee must be sensitive to the political dynamics Congress faces, Professor Coquillette cautioned that the REA process should not become partisan football. He stated that the Committee must "check its guns at the door" and do the fair and just thing. It is so important that the Committee be seen as fair, Professor Coquillette explained, because the manner in which the Committee is perceived when reaching its decisions is vital to preserving the REA and faith in the rules process.

JUDICIARY STRATEGIC PLANNING

Brian Lynch, the Long-Range Planning Officer for the federal judiciary, discussed the strategic planning process and how the Standing Committee can provide feedback on the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary*. He emphasized that the Committee's reporting on long-term initiatives will help foster dialogue between the Executive Committee and other judicial committees.

Following Mr. Lynch’s presentation, Judge Campbell directed the Committee to a letter dated July 5, 2017, in which the Standing Committee provided an update on the rules committees’ progress in implementing initiatives in support of the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary*. Judge Campbell proposed updating this letter to reflect its ongoing initiatives that support the judiciary’s strategic plan. In 2019, the Committee will be asked to update the Executive Committee on its progress regarding these identified initiatives.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved authorizing Judge Campbell to update and forward to Chief Judge Carl Stewart correspondence reflecting the Committee’s long-term initiatives supporting the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary*.**

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Julie Wilson of the Rules Committee Staff (“RCS”) briefly delivered the legislative report. She noted that two new pieces of legislation have been proposed since January 2018 – namely, H.R. 4927 regarding nationwide injunctions, and the Litigation Funding Transparency Act of 2018 (S. 2815) regarding the disclosure of third-party litigation funding in class actions and MDLs. Neither bill has advanced through Congress. Ms. Wilson indicated that the RCS will continue to monitor these bills as well as others identified in the Agenda Book and will keep the Committee updated.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Before adjourning the meeting, Judge Campbell thanked the Committee members and other attendees for their preparation and contributions to the discussion. The Standing Committee will next meet on January 3, 2019 in Phoenix, Arizona. He reminded the Committee that at this next meeting it will confer about its policy regarding comments on proposed rules addressed directly to the Standing Committee outside the typical public comment period.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca A. Womeldorf
Secretary, Standing Committee