

COMMENTS FROM THE AUGUST 2024 PUBLICATION
OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RULES & FORMS

To view the proposed amendments for the **appellate rules** that were published for this comment period, please visit the Forms & Rules page of the judiciary's website at <https://www.uscourts.gov/> to download the 2024 preliminary draft of proposed amendments.

Comments were submitted through the regulations.gov portal under the following docket number: <https://www.regulations.gov/document/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0001>.

The comment period started August 15, 2024 and closed February 17, 2025.

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
1	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0003	Straw, Andrew	Amicus briefs are an expression of the First Amendment right to petition courts on matters of public interest. It costs virtually nothing to allow amicus briefs to be filed and they should always be allowed regardless of the consent of any party. The Court is under no obligation to do what an amicus wants, but it should always allow such statements in the public record. As a civil rights advocate for people with disabilities, it is exceptionally important to allow these briefs in civil rights cases, but the rule of allowing them without exception should apply to all cases.	
2	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0004	Washington Legal Foundation	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0004/attachment_1.pdf
3	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0005	Anonymous	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment anonymously.</p> <p>I agree with the changes to Rule 29. Amicus briefs have become a conduit for hyper-fixated interest groups, lobbying organizations, and partisan political entities to unduly influence the legal and factual proceedings of federal courts. Naturally, all amicus-filers will post lengthy comments in response to this Proposed Rule — indeed, this is what they love to do most! — lobbying complaints about “limiting access.” They will then go on to speak about how judges have the freedom to ignore any filed amicus briefs they choose. Most importantly, they will bemoan the reduction of their ability to prod their way into cases they have no direct connection to.</p> <p>Good. All judges know that receiving amicus briefs is like getting junk mail in that you might be fooled into reading a brief in the same way you might be fooled to reading junk mail that uses a font that resembles someone’s natural handwriting. However, at the end of the day, judges know that what’s in amicus briefs is much like what’s in junk mail: something written by an entity that wants to influence you to do something you’d otherwise not do, most often by emotional trickery and undergraduate-psychology-class marketing tactics.</p> <p>I urge that the proposed amendments for Rule 29 are adopted. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
4	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0006	Senator Sheldon Whitehouse & Congressman Hank Johnson	Please see the attached letter from Senator Sheldon Whitehouse and Congressman Hank Johnson.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0006/attachment_1.pdf
5	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0007	Hernandez, Simon	The Proposed Form 4 to apply for in forma pauperis in an appellate court will considerably ease those who are in need. As stated in the proposed amendment, the current Form 4 is overly complicated, intrusive, and includes unneeded information. If a court believes that someone is lying about their status, they can inquire. But why put up one more barrier for someone who already is struggling to navigate the complicated appellate process. For example, the current form includes the employment history of a filer for the last two years. This is not likely relevant to the process of establishing if they are qualified for in forma pauperis, the simplified form which includes only income and expenses will do the job. The Proposed Form 4 is an example of how a government form can be better and should.	
6	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0008	Senators Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, and John Thune	See Attached	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0008/attachment_1.pdf
7	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0009	Morrison, Alan	See Attached	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0009/attachment_1.pdf
8	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0010	Anonymous	The FRAP should be more flexible for incarcerated inmates	
9	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0011	Ravnitzky, Michael	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0011/attachment_1.pdf
10	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0012	Atlantic Legal Foundation	Atlantic Legal Foundation	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0012/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
11	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0013	Diamond, Maria	<p>Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure Administrative Office of the United States Courts One Columbus Circle, NE Washington, DC 20544</p> <p>Dear Committee Members:</p> <p>I submit this comment regarding the proposed amendments to FRCP 29. I am a civil litigator in Washington state who has practiced in both state and federal court systems for 41 years. My comment is based on my experience as an attorney who has litigated multiple cases through the appeals process and also submitted amicus briefs to the Washington State Supreme Court.</p> <p>Amicus briefs play an important role in educating judges on issues of wide-ranging importance. They provide an opportunity for experts, such as academics, non-profits, and think tanks, to educate the court on those issues. They assist judges by presenting ideas, arguments, theories, insights, factual background, and data not found in the parties' briefs. My primary concern regarding the proposed rule change is elimination of the party consent option, requiring leave of court for the filing of all amicus briefs. I believe this is a move in the wrong direction. In contrast to the proposal, the United States Supreme Court has changed its rules in the opposite direction, freely allowing the filing of amicus briefs without leave of court or consent of the parties. The proposed change will place additional burdens on the court that outweigh the purported concern over recusal issues.</p> <p>Furthermore, I am concerned about the proposed content restrictions. While I understand the desire to reduce redundancy, I seriously question how the proposed amendment will prevent redundancy without coordination between amici and the parties. The proposal may also significantly increase the rate of amicus denials, thereby chilling amicus curiae filings. This unintended consequence will deprive the courts of valuable assistance to aid their decision-making on issues of public importance.</p> <p>I applaud the committee's efforts to improve the appellate litigation process and thank you for your consideration of this comment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Maria S. Diamond Diamond Massong, PLLC</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
12	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0014	Anonymous	<p>Honorable John D. Bates Chair, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure Administrative Office of the United States Courts One Columbus Circle NE Washington, D.C. 20544</p> <p>Dear Judge Gates,</p> <p>Thank you for all the work the Advisory Committee has done regarding this issue and many others. I truly esteem the impartiality of the Courts in making decisions like this, based on the common interest and the Constitution rather than any partisan agenda. I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29 to enhance disclosure requirements for amicus curiae briefs — in fact, I would encourage the Committee to go further to strengthen the disclosure requirements. As a college student, and one who is deeply interested in politics and the law, I believe that I bring an important lay perspective on this issue: an issue that affects not just the courts but also the public.</p> <p>This amendment is important. Arguments brought up in amicus curiae briefs can affect judges and judicial decisions — and these judicial decisions can have a very real impact on the public at large. And, while I can not speak specifically on the governmental interest for amicus' disclosure, I can confidently state that it is in the American public interest for all of us to know who exactly is trying to influence our judicial system through amicus curiae briefs. Specifically, Rule 29(a)(4)(D), which requires a concise description of the amicus curiae and their pertinence in the case, is particularly valuable. It imposes almost no additional cost on the amicus while providing the public — along with the courts — important, accessible information. This would make it significantly quicker and simpler to observe court proceedings: the public would be given valuable insight into the major political voices on a subject. However, even beyond this change, the others described in the amendment can benefit the public interest. As Senator Whitehouse and Representative Johnson mention in their comment on the issue, the tactics of corporations and dark money groups trying to affect the judicial decision-making process have sharply intensified — and this amendment can try and shed light on these machinations. America does not belong to corporations or interest groups but rather to the American people. We — college students, young people, and average American citizens — have every right to have this disclosure, donor or otherwise, from these organizations. Meanwhile, this disclosure would not affect the First Amendment Rights of the amicus groups, as described in the Advisory Committee's report.</p> <p>I am quite shocked by, yet resigned to, the partisan politicization surrounding these disclosure enhancements. The government and the courts are designed to serve, and be responsive to, the American people. Amicus curiae briefs play a powerful role in American governance, and, therefore, it is in the interests of everyone — Democrat, Republican, or Independent — to have all of the information. Thank you for considering my comments on this amendment, and I strongly encourage the Judicial Conference to approve these changes.</p> <p>Most respectfully,</p>	
13	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0015	SIFMA	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0015/attachment_1.pdf
14	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0016	National Taxpayers Union Foundation and People United For Privacy Foundation	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0016/attachment_1.pdf
15	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0017	Andrade , Mia	I agree with the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. These changes are essential for improving the clarity, efficiency, and fairness of the appellate process. By updating the rules, we can ensure that the legal system remains responsive to contemporary issues, reducing unnecessary delays and ambiguities. This helps maintain the integrity of the judicial process and reinforces public confidence in the legal system, which is crucial for ensuring justice and fairness for all parties involved.	
16	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0018	U.S. Chamber of Commerce	See attached file.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0018/attachment_1.pdf
17	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0019	National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.	National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) comment letter of December 30, 2024, to Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States concerning proposed amendments for Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, relating to amicus briefs, is attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0019/attachment_1.pdf
18	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0020	Herman, Stephen	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0020/attachment_1.pdf
19	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0021	American Property Casualty Insurance Association	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0021/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
20	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0023	American Council of Life Insurers	ACLI Comments to the Proposed Amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0023/attachment_1.pdf
21	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0024	DRI Center for Law and Public Policy	Please find attached a comment on proposed changes to FRAP 23 from Lisa M. Baird in her capacity as chair of the DRI Center for Law and Public Policy's Amicus Committee.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0024/attachment_1.pdf
22	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0025	Anonymous	I strongly urge the passing of this rule to support fairness and justice in the judicial process.	
23	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0026	Young America's Foundation	Comment in Opposition to Proposed Changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0026/attachment_1.pdf
24	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0027	California Academy of Appellate Lawyers	Please see attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0027/attachment_1.pdf
25	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0028	Philanthropy Roundtable	Philanthropy Roundtable	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0028/attachment_1.pdf
26	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0029	Avital Fried, Myriam Gilles, Andrew Hammond, Alexander A. Reinert, Judith Resnik, Tanina Rostain, Anna Selbrede, Lauren Sudeall, and Julia Udell.	This comment, attached, is submitted by Avital Fried, Myriam Gilles, Andrew Hammond, Alexander A. Reinert, Judith Resnik, Tanina Rostain, Anna Selbrede, Lauren Sudeall, and Julia Udell.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0029/attachment_1.pdf
27	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0030	Lucas, Seth	Comment Letter from Zack Smith and Seth Lucas on Proposed FRAP 29 Amendments	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0030/attachment_1.pdf
28	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0031	Court Accountability	Please see attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0031/attachment_1.pdf
29	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0032	Federation of Defense & Corporate Counsel	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0032/attachment_1.pdf
30	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0033	Smoger, Gerson	See Attached	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0033/attachment_1.pdf
31	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0034	American Association for Justice	Comment with attachments from the American Association for Justice.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0034/attachment_1.pdf https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0034/attachment_2.pdf
32	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0035	Industry Coalition	See attached file.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0035/attachment_1.pdf
33	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0036	Travinski, Brian	I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step. I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
34	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0037	Allen, Timothy	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
35	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0038	Tavares , C	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
36	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0039	Porter, Ann	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
37	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0040	Nelson, James	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
38	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0041	McLaughlin, Kirk L	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
39	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0042	Stiver , Phil	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
40	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0043	Wendell, Jerome	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
41	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0044	Easterlin, Eric	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
42	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0045	Goebel, Michael	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
43	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0046	FLETCHER, CRAIG	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
44	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0047	Kloppenburg, Judy	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
45	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0048	Trump, Jim	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
46	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0049	White, Erich	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
47	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0050	Inkman, Michael	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
48	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0051	Sakach, Matthew	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
49	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0052	Ritter, Ann	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
50	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0053	Martinez , James	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
51	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0054	Easley, Terry	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
52	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0055	Caskey , Colin	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
53	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0056	Samalot, Diana	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
54	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0057	Horan, Pat	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
55	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0058	Taylor, Linda	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
56	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0059	Flinchbaugh, Norma Jean	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
57	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0060	Christie, Edwin	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
58	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0061	Swing, Jill	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
59	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0062	Salter, Janice	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
60	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0063	harkness, william	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
61	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0064	Bagby, John	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
62	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0065	Aloi, Sharon	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
63	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0066	Bauer, Cookie	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
64	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0067	Benshoof, Mary	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
65	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0068	Braniff, Thomas	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
66	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0069	Brenner, Joseph	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
67	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0070	Brown, MG	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
68	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0071	Brubaker , Terri	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
69	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0072	Bump, Jeff	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
70	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0073	Burger, Tracy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
71	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0074	Butcher , Riley	<p>WE THE PEOPLE STRONGLY OPPOSED the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create UNNECESSARY DELAYS in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks ALREADY have EFFECTIVE METHODS for FILTERING out UNHELPLFUL amicus briefs, so there is NO NEED for this additional BUREAUCRATIC TYRANNY!!!</p> <p>WE THE PEOPLE DEMAND THAT THE COMMITTEE to EXTERMINATE this HARMFUL proposal and WITHDRAW IT NOW!!!</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
72	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0075	Buttery, Joanne	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
73	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0076	Byrne, Patrick	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
74	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0077	Cutuli , Silvio	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
75	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0078	Dolleman, Douglas	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
76	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0079	DUNCAN, GAIL	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
77	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0080	Durbin, MD, Michael D.	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
78	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0081	Elkins, Dan	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
79	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0082	Ferguson, Shirley	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
80	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0083	Fleet, Ruby	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
81	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0084	Foy, Stephanie	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
82	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0085	Funk, Linda	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
83	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0086	Campbell, William R	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
84	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0087	Dibari, Robert	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
85	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0088	Feicht, Jeffrey	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
86	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0089	Foster, Price	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
87	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0090	Frick, Susan	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
88	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0091	Gallimore , Alexander	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
89	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0092	Garbutt, Patrick	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
90	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0093	Gheen, Nathan	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
91	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0094	Giusti, Primo	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
92	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0095	Glowaski, James	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
93	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0096	Gore, Robert	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
94	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0097	Grigsby, Leland	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
95	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0098	Grimes, George	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
96	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0099	Hamilton , Matt	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
97	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0100	Hanes, Pat	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
98	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0101	Harris, Lawrence	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
99	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0102	Hendrickson, Earlene	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
100	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0103	Hogue Sr., Robert	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
101	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0104	HOWE, DOUGLAS	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
102	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0105	Jacobs, Kenneth	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
103	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0106	James, Lynn	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
104	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0107	Jeffrey , Sandra	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
105	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0108	Johnson, Dean	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
106	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0109	Johnson, Roscoe	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
107	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0110	KAHL, WILLIAM	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, and would threaten First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
108	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0111	Kairys, Judy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
109	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0112	Keels, Suzie	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
110	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0113	Keuck Sr, Donald	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
111	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0114	Kiel, Donna	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
112	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0115	Klaras, Patricia	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
113	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0116	Kramer, Richard	<p>We need more, not less, access to the courts!</p> <p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
114	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0117	Krause, Joni	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
115	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0118	Krusec, Ann	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
116	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0119	Lapin, James	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
117	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0120	Lininger, Don	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
118	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0121	luft, karen	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
119	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0122	Maddox, Kirk	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
120	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0123	Marcus, Bruce	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
121	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0124	Marketon, Jill	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
122	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0125	Masciale, Debbie	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
123	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0126	Mattox, Karen	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
124	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0127	maynard, Nancy	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
125	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0128	McCormick, Francis	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
126	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0129	McMillan, Peri	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
127	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0130	McWilliams, Linda	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
128	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0131	Meinhardt, Steve	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
129	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0132	Meyer, Karen	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
130	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0133	Mohr, Robert	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
131	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0134	Montgomery, Norman	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
132	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0135	Morgan, Linda	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
133	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0136	Moutvic, Thomas	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
134	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0137	Moynahan, Eileen	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
135	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0138	Muraviev, Fred	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
136	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0139	Murphy, Joseph	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
137	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0140	National Association of Home Builders	Please see the attached letter from the National Association of Home Builders	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0140/attachment_1.pdf
138	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0141	Nieuwsma, David	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
139	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0142	O'Bryant, Ronda	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
140	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0143	odenwelder, miles	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
141	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0144	Osucha, Thomas	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
142	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0145	Bitner , Kathryn	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
143	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0146	Breese, Mark	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
144	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0147	Breite, Dave	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
145	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0148	Grannis, Scott	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
146	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0149	Miller, Jonathan	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
147	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0150	Miner, Steve	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
148	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0151	Morrison, Alan	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0151/attachment_1.pdf
149	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0152	Mott-Smith, Linda	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
150	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0153	Ostaszewski, John	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
151	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0154	Palmer, Brian R	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
152	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0155	Phinney, Craig	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
153	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0156	Prewitt, James	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
154	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0157	Pyle , Shirley	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
155	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0158	Rajagopalan , Gopal	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
156	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0159	Randolph, Betsy	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
157	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0160	Rapp, Sandra	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
158	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0161	Rardin, Delene	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
159	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0162	REDA, LOU	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
160	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0163	Riley, Luann	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
161	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0164	Robinson, Jamie	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
162	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0165	Rosinski, Katrin	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
163	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0166	Rouse, Marty	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
164	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0167	Roushar, Carrie	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
165	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0168	Rybak, Eliece	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
166	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0169	Rzeszutek, Candice	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
167	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0170	saltsman, audrey	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
168	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0171	Sanders, Donald	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
169	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0172	Schmiedl, Sally	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
170	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0173	SCHUMM, MICHAEL	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
171	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0174	SIMON, JAMES	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
172	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0175	Sorensen, manuel	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
173	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0176	St-Onge, Michael	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
174	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0177	Stickney, Karen	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
175	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0178	Stivaletti, Michael	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
176	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0179	Stivaletti, Michael	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
177	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0180	Sylvester, Yolanda	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
178	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0181	Szabo, Jeffrey	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
179	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0182	Szabo, Les	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
180	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0183	Tavares, Jeanne	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
181	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0184	Taylor, Kathy	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
182	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0185	Thallmayer, Jeanne Marie	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
183	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0186	Trahan, Boyce	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
184	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0187	Tregoning, Michael	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
185	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0188	Trepanier, Helen	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
186	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0189	Ward, Sharon	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
187	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0190	Weigold , Mark	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
188	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0191	Werre, Tim	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
189	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0192	Wessel, Robert	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
190	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0193	Wheelock, Tina	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
191	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0194	Whittaker, Greg	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
192	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0195	Williams , Carmela	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
193	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0196	Willmering, Jerome	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
194	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0197	Wolk, Robert	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
195	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0198	Yamamoto, Lillian	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
196	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0199	Steiner, Gregory	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
197	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0200	Coleman, Bob	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
198	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0201	Waldrup, Michelle	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
199	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0202	Donald, Matt	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
200	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0203	Fernando, Mike	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
201	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0204	Andres, Bonita	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
202	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0205	Norby, Rita	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
203	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0206	Whitmire, Charlotte	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
204	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0207	Southeastern Legal Foundation	Southeastern Legal Foundation's comment on the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure is attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0207/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
205	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0208	Wolfe, Jennifer	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
206	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0209	Farabaugh, Cecelia	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
207	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0210	Fanning, James	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
208	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0211	Norby, Rita	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
209	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0212	The Buckeye Institute	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0212/attachment_1.pdf
210	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0213	Alliance Defending Freedom	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0213/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
211	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0214	American Civil Liberties Union	Please see the attached file for the American Civil Liberties Union.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0214/attachment_1.pdf
212	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0215	Roderick & Solange MacArthur Justice Center	Submitting on behalf of the Roderick & Solange MacArthur Justice Center	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0215/attachment_1.pdf
213	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0216	Federal Public Defender, District of Nevada	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0216/attachment_1.pdf
214	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0217	Tolley, George	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0217/attachment_1.pdf
215	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0218	Americans for Prosperity Foundation	Please see attached. Thank you.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0218/attachment_1.pdf
216	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0219	Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law	Please see the attached comment letter on behalf of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0219/attachment_1.pdf
217	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0220	Committee on Appellate Courts of the California Lawyers Association's Litigation Section	Please see attached comment.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0220/attachment_1.pdf
218	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0221	The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society	Please see the attached comments on behalf of The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society opposing the proposed change to require a motion for leave to file amicus curiae briefs. Thank you for your consideration.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0221/attachment_1.pdf
219	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0222	NAACP Legal Defense Fund, HRC, LatinoJustice, NCLR, National Partnership for Women and Families, NELP, NWLC	Please see the attached file for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. ("LDF"), Human Rights Campaign ("HRC"), LatinoJustice PRLDEF ("LatinoJustice"), National Center for Lesbian Rights ("NCLR"), National Partnership for Women and Families (the "National Partnership"), National Employment Law Project ("NELP"), and National Women's Law Center ("NWLC") on the proposed changes to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 29.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0222/attachment_1.pdf
220	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0223	Storms, Don	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
221	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0224	Lee, Brian	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
222	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0225	Americans United for Separation of Church and State	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0225/attachment_1.pdf
223	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0226	Addison, Lance	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
224	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0227	Brubaker , Terri	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
225	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0228	Zaczyk, Patrick	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
226	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0229	Wolfe, Jennifer	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
227	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0230	Tregoning, Michael	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private</p>	
228	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0231	Barnes, Tony	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
229	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0232	Baxter, Debra	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
230	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0233	Thompson, Bruce	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
231	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0234	Thompson , Charlene	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
232	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0235	THOMAS, DAVID	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
233	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0236	Taylor, Marlys	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
234	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0237	Tanner, Richard	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
235	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0238	Swenson, Eloise	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
236	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0239	Stuart, Roger	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
237	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0240	Stiver , Phil	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
238	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0241	Steiner, Gregory	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
239	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0242	Sims, Patti A	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
240	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0243	Simonson, Sheila	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
241	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0244	Simon, James	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
242	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0245	Schech, Willo	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
243	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0246	Rybak, Eliece	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
244	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0247	Russell, Kathleen	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
245	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0248	Rudnick, Teri	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
246	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0249	Rudnick, Teri	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
247	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0250	Rubin, Larry	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
248	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0251	Robinson, David	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
249	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0252	Readey, Judy	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
250	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0253	Randolph, Betsy	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
251	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0254	Pongracz, Dorothy	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
252	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0255	Pacific Legal Foundation	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0255/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
253	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0256	Otta, Jack	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
254	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0257	Ott, Algene	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
255	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0258	Osucha, Thomas	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
256	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0259	O'Hara, Franque	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
257	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0260	O'Bryant, Ronda	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
258	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0261	O'Bryant, Ronda	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
259	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0262	Niehaus, Sally	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
260	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0263	Newton, Joan	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
261	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0264	New York Intellectual Property Law Association (NYIPLA)	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0264/attachment_1.pdf
262	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0265	Murphy, Norman	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
263	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0266	Morgan, Andrea	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
264	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0267	Moniz, Sandra	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
265	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0268	Messenger, David	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
266	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0269	McMillan, Peri	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
267	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0270	McGetrick, Harriett	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
268	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0271	Mace, Brenda	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
269	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0272	Ludwig, Lorena	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
270	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0273	Limbaugh, Velita	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
271	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0274	Lerwick, Lewis	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
272	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0275	Lerwick, Alan	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
273	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0276	Kuhlenschmidt, James	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
274	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0277	Kuhlenschmidt, Diane	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
275	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0278	Krusec, Ann	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
276	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0279	Kordelski, Bruce	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
277	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0280	Koller, William	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
278	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0281	Klaras, Patricia	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
279	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0282	Klaras, Patricia	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
280	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0283	Kerwin, Craig	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
281	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0284	Kern, Richard	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
282	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0285	Johnson, Dean	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
283	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0286	Jacobson, Wayne	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
284	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0287	Inkman, Michael	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
285	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0288	Golding, Robert	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
286	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0289	Barnes, John	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
287	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0290	Inzer, Carlene	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
288	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0291	Freese, Ray	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
289	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0292	Horan, Pat	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
290	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0293	Flynn, Daniel	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
291	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0294	Chase, Paul	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
292	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0295	Effland, Philip	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
293	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0296	Bogle, John	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
294	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0297	Hutchins, Cindy	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
295	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0298	Bains, David	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
296	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0299	Blanchard, Charles	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
297	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0300	Gift, Richard	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
298	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0301	Byrne, Patrick	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
299	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0302	Deutsch, Nathan	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
300	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0303	Delgado, Erick	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
301	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0304	Grigsby, Leland	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
302	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0305	Beynun, Kathleen	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
303	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0306	National Association of Manufacturers	National Association of Manufacturers' Comments on Proposed Amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0306/attachment_1.pdf
304	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0307	National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers	Comments of NACDL attached	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0307/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
305	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0308	harkness, william	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
306	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0309	Ameredes , Bill	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
307	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0310	American Academy of Appellate Lawyers	See attached letter.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0310/attachment_1.pdf
308	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0311	American Economic Liberties Project	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0311/attachment_1.pdf
309	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0312	Athayde, Olav	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
310	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0313	Babich, Frank	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
311	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0314	Bailey, Doris	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
312	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0315	Barclay, Beth	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
313	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0316	Bargy, Terry	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
314	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0317	Beppu, Debbie	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
315	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0318	Berry, Thomas	Please see the attached document for my comment.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0318/attachment_1.pdf
316	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0319	Biehl, Tim	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
317	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0320	Bird, Leonard	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
318	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0321	Blankenship, John	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
319	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0322	Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence	Please see the attached comment.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0322/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
320	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0323	Brant, Diana	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
321	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0324	Brookhart, Beverly	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
322	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0325	Brossette, McKinley	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
323	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0326	Buatti, Peter	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
324	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0327	Budke, Chris	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
325	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0328	Bunnell, Paul	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
326	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0329	Burchett, Chris	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
327	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0330	Burwell, Ed	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
328	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0331	Campbell, William R	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
329	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0332	Cararo, Ronald	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
330	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0333	carini, michael	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
331	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0334	Casey, Margie	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
332	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0335	Christman, Gary	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
333	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0336	Cochran, Paul	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
334	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0337	Cole, Ronald	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
335	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0338	Collins, Chad	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
336	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0339	Complex Insurance Claims Litigation Association	See attached file for Comments from the Complex Insurance Claims Litigation Association.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0339/attachment_1.pdf
337	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0340	COSAL	See attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0340/attachment_1.pdf
338	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0341	Cox, Nancy	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
339	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0342	Curl, Marjorie	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
340	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0343	David Gaffney Jr, David	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
341	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0344	Davidson, Elizabeth	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
342	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0345	de Alvarez, Elizabeth	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
343	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0346	Dolleman, Douglas	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
344	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0347	Dooley , Dee	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
345	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0348	doyle, april	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
346	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0349	Eastman, Carol	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
347	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0350	Electronic Frontier Foundation	<p>Please see the attached PDF with comments on FRAP 29 from the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF).</p>	<p>https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0350/attachment_1.pdf</p>

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
348	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0351	Endlich, M.	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
349	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0352	Fink, Susan	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
350	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0353	Free Speech Coalition and Free Speech Defense and Education Fund	<p>Please see attached the comments of Free Speech Coalition and Free Speech Defense and Education Fund, et al.</p>	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0353/attachment_1.pdf
351	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0354	funk, Linda	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
352	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0355	Galer, Stephen	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
353	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0356	Gallimore , Alexander	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
354	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0357	Glowaski, James	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
355	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0358	GOMEZ, VIRGINIA	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
356	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0359	Groomer, W. P.	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
357	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0360	Hall, Judy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
358	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0361	Henry, Charles	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
359	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0362	Hettrick, Amy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
360	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0363	Higgins, Nancy	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
361	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0364	HOWE, DOUGLAS	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
362	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0365	Hurd, Deborah	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
363	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0366	Independent Community Bankers of America	See attached file.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0366/attachment_1.docx
364	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0367	Ingersoll, Carol	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
365	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0368	Institute for Justice	See attached document commenting on proposed amendments to Rule 29.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0368/attachment_1.pdf
366	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0369	International Attestations, LLC	<p>This comment generated by the Honorable Melissa A. Kotulski of International Attestations, LLC (Registered Trademark) (IA) is developed at the prompting of the periodic and regular review of the rules through a rulemaking process that is generated by the U.S. Courts as presented by the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee (the Committee). For the 2025 Comment Period, the Committee presented its proposed rule-changes for the U.S. bodies of law pertaining to Appellate, Bankruptcy, and Evidence (Collectively, The Rules. Separately Appellate Rules, Bankruptcy Rules, and Evidence Rules).</p> <p>The Rules of Procedure for Evidence, Bankruptcy, and Appeals all touched upon amicus brief standards as well as in forma pauperis (IFP) considerations. Assuming they are in fact from this year's rules are from the three sub-committees, and not also presenting from Criminal and Civil Rulemaking bodies as well, the comments included here present a two-fold concern for the process in general as well as the text-based analysis of the revisions centered on (1) amicus length limits; & (2) IFP Form 4 revisions.</p> <p>IA proposes that the Judiciary Conference further consider preparations for the coming global events (North America's World Cup 2026, the Sesquicentennial for the U.S.A. & Los Angeles Olympics 2028) by enriching pathways for inclusion of American borne personages, whether individual, corporate, agency or other.</p>	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0369/attachment_1.pdf
367	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0370	Investment Company Institute	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0370/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
368	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0371	Jackson, David	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
369	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0372	Jacobs, Kenneth	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
370	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0373	Koerig, Steven	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before considering the briefs. Judges and clerks currently have ways to filter out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to withdraw this proposal.</p>	
371	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0374	Larsen, Allison	Please see attached.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0374/attachment_1.pdf
372	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0375	Laurent, Vicki	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
373	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0376	M Mauer, Irene	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts. This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
374	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0377	MacRae, Mary H MacRae	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
375	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0378	Macy, Bill	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
376	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0379	meehan, joseph	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
377	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0380	Megill, Joan	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
378	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0381	Morgan , Linda	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
379	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0382	Muraviev, Fred	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
380	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0383	Sylvester, Yolanda	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
381	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0384	Schechter, Duke	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
382	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0385	Nemecek, David	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
383	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0386	Oldahm, Elaine	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
384	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0387	Swanson, Justin	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
385	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0388	Parkhill, Gary	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
386	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0389	Watson, Pam	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
387	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0390	Windus, Donald	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
388	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0391	Stapelman, Sunny	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
389	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0392	Trainor, Les	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
390	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0393	Salinovich, Judy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
391	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0394	Salinovich, Judy	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal will not only create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles but will also severely limit the role that amici play in our judicial process, a role that has been crucial to ensuring fair and balanced rulings.</p> <p>Amici often provide the courts with critical insights that the parties to a case may not present. In many cases, amici play an important role in clarifying broader implications that go beyond the immediate interests of the parties involved. This kind of input helps the courts to issue rulings that consider the wider impact of their decisions.</p> <p>Requiring amici to seek court approval would slow down the process and discourage the submission of briefs, especially from smaller organizations and individuals who do not have the resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. Judges and their clerks are already proficient at filtering out unhelpful briefs, and this proposal would only add unnecessary steps to an already complex process.</p> <p>This rule change also threatens First Amendment rights by requiring amici to disclose financial details about their donors. Such a requirement would have a chilling effect on organizations and individuals who want to support causes they care about but are unwilling to have their personal information disclosed publicly.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and withdraw it to protect both the efficiency of the courts and the constitutional rights of those who support legal advocacy.</p>	
392	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0395	Shafer, Joanna	<p>I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. This proposal would severely undermine the efficiency of our judicial process and place unnecessary burdens on public-interest groups and individuals who participate in legal advocacy.</p> <p>Currently, the courts have an efficient process for handling amicus briefs. Judges and clerks are fully capable of filtering out unhelpful briefs without the need for additional steps. Requiring amici to file motions only increases the workload on the judiciary, delaying important cases and wasting resources. The Supreme Court, recognizing this inefficiency, has eliminated the need for amici to seek permission to file briefs, and there is no logical reason for appellate courts to go in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The proposed rule would disproportionately affect smaller organizations that rely on filing amicus briefs to make their voices heard in important legal decisions. Many of these groups provide valuable perspectives that help the courts make well-informed rulings. If this rule goes into effect, the uncertainty surrounding the filing of amicus briefs will discourage participation and reduce the diversity of viewpoints presented to the courts.</p> <p>This proposal is unnecessary and counterproductive. I urge you to withdraw it immediately and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
393	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0396	Theurer, Nancy	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, which would create unnecessary barriers for filing amicus curiae briefs.</p> <p>Forcing all amici to seek court permission before filing briefs would slow down the judicial process and discourage smaller organizations from participating.</p> <p>Worse, the proposal to require amici to disclose donor information raises serious constitutional concerns. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that organizations have a right to protect the privacy of their supporters. This rule would have a chilling effect on individuals and groups that want to contribute to important legal advocacy but fear exposure of their private affiliations.</p> <p>This proposal is both unnecessary and harmful. I strongly urge you to withdraw it and protect the integrity of the judicial process.</p>	
394	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0397	Weingand, Kurt	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	
395	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0398	Ponds, Billy	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>This rule would create unnecessary delays in the appellate process, as courts would be forced to review motions from amici before even considering the briefs themselves. Judges and clerks already have effective methods for filtering out unhelpful amicus briefs, so there is no need for this additional bureaucratic step.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to reconsider this harmful proposal and withdraw it.</p>	

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
396	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0399	Vandegrift, Pamela	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. This rule represents an unnecessary intrusion into a well-functioning system and threatens to limit access to the courts for many public-interest organizations.</p> <p>Judges are already capable of screening out unhelpful amicus briefs without additional motions. The proposal's claim that this will improve efficiency is misguided by forcing amici to seek leave to file, the rule would actually increase the burden on the courts. More motions, more delays, and more bureaucracy will be the result. Moreover, the proposal would require amici to disclose intrusive financial details, including donor information, which raises serious First Amendment concerns.</p> <p>Forcing organizations to reveal their financial supporters undercuts the fundamental right to free association. This chilling effect could deter many groups from participating in important legal matters, especially smaller organizations that rely on private donations to fund their advocacy.</p> <p>This proposal does more harm than good. It places additional burdens on the judiciary, limits the ability of organizations to advocate for justice, and threatens constitutional rights. I urge the Committee to reject it.</p>	
397	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0400	REDA, LOU	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed amendments to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29. These changes would require amici curiae to obtain court approval before filing briefs and disclose financial information, including donor identities. This is not only an unnecessary burden on the courts but also an attack on First Amendment rights.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose donor information threatens the right to free association. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that individuals and organizations have the right to associate privately without fear of public disclosure. Forcing amici to disclose their donors would discourage many from contributing, stifling the voices of smaller organizations that play a crucial role in advocating for justice and fairness in our legal system.</p> <p>This proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I urge the Committee to withdraw it</p>	
398	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0401	Senator Sheldon Whitehouse and Congressman Hank Johnson	Please see the attached additional Senator Sheldon Whitehouse and Congressman Hank Johnson.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0401/attachment_1.pdf
399	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0402	Court Accountability		https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0402/attachment_1.pdf
400	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0403	Native American Rights Fund	Please see the attached the Native American Rights Fund, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Northern Plains Indian Law Center.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0403/attachment_1.pdf
401	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0404	Rando, Robert	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.</p> <p>Limiting the input of amici by word count and/or permission to file not only infringes on the public's, or interested stakeholders', ability to exercise their First Amendment rights and to apprise the Courts of issues or unintended consequences of potential rulings, which the parties by virtue of their respective roles and/or word count limitations may not or cannot argue, it deprives the Courts of the perspective that escapes the myopic focus inherent in the appeals process.</p> <p>I strongly urge withdrawal of this proposal to protect the constitutional rights of those who in their capacity as "friends of the Court" enhance the potential for the Courts to reach well-informed and just decisions not only for the parties to the appeal but for the affected and interested members of society as well.</p>	
402	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0405	Retail Litigation Center	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0405/attachment_1.pdf
403	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0406	Jennings, Rachel	Please see attached letter.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0406/attachment_1.pdf
404	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0407	Hans, Gautam	Please see attached comment.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0407/attachment_1.pdf

#	Comment Number	Submitter	Comment	Attachment Files
405	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0408	American Legislative Exchange Council	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0408/attachment_1.pdf
406	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0409	Finell, Steven	See attached file(s)	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0409/attachment_1.pdf
407	USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0410	National Association of Manufacturers	See the attached document.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/USC-RULES-AP-2024-0001-0410/attachment_1.pdf