Minutes of Fall 2014 Meeting of
Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules
October 20, 2014
Washington, D.C.

I. Introductions

Judge Steven M. Colloton called the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules to order on Monday, October 20, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. at the Mecham Conference Center in the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, D.C. The following Advisory Committee members were present: Judge Michael A. Chagares, Justice Allison H. Eid, Judge Peter T. Fay, Judge Richard G. Taranto, Professor Amy Coney Barrett, Mr. Gregory G. Katsas, Professor Neal K. Katyal, and Mr. Kevin C. Newsom. Mr. Douglas Letter, Director of the Appellate Staff of the Civil Division, U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ"), and Mr. H. Thomas Byron III, also of the Civil Division, were present representing the Solicitor General. Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, Reporter for the Standing Committee; Mr. Jonathan C. Rose, the Standing Committee's Secretary and Rules Committee officer; Mr. Gregory G. Garre, liaison from the Standing Committee; Ms. Julie Wilson, Attorney Advisor in the Administrative Office ("AO"); Mr. Michael Ellis Gans, liaison from the appellate clerks; and Ms. Marie Leary from the Federal Judicial Center ("FJC") were also present. Mr. Robert Deyling, Counsel to the Committee on Codes of Conduct and Assistant General Counsel at the AO, attended part of the meeting, as did Mr. Joe S. Cecil and Ms. Catherine R. Borden of the FJC.

II. Approval of Minutes of April 2014 Meeting

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the Committee's April 2014 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.

III. Report on June 2014 Meeting of Standing Committee

Judge Colloton noted that the Standing Committee had approved for publication the Advisory Committee's proposals concerning inmate-filing provisions, length limits, and amicus filings in connection with rehearing. The Standing Committee, he observed, had made a few changes to the proposals prior to publication, and the Appellate Rules Committee had ratified those changes by email after the meeting.

The Reporter noted that Standing Committee members had provided additional guidance on aspects of the proposals. Two of those suggestions concern the inmate-filing provisions. The published proposal would amend Rules 4(c)(1) and 25(a)(2)(C) to make clear that a document filed by an inmate is timely if it is accompanied by evidence showing that the document was deposited in the institution's internal mail system on or before the due date and that postage was prepaid. If such evidence does not accompany the filing, proposed Rules 4(c)(1)(B) and

25(a)(2)(C)(ii) provide that the filing is nonetheless timely if the court of appeals "exercises its discretion to permit" the later filing of an appropriate declaration or notarized statement establishing timely deposit and prepayment of postage. A member suggested that "exercises its discretion to permit" be shortened to "permits"; one question for the Committee will be whether the longer phrase is worth retaining in order to emphasize the court of appeals' discretion whether to permit the later filing of the declaration or statement. A member also suggested that the rules be revised to omit any reference to notarized statements; the question here is whether there is any reason to include notarized statements as an alternative, given that executing a declaration in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746 presumably is easier for inmates than finding a notary.

Other suggestions concerned the proposed revisions to Rule 29. Proposed Rule 29(b) addresses amicus filings in connection with rehearing. Proposed Rule 29(b)(2) provides that non-governmental amici must obtain court leave to make such amicus filings; the prior draft's provision permitting non-governmental amicus filings based on party consent was deleted during the Standing Committee meeting in response to members' concerns about the possibility of strategic use of amicus filings to prompt recusal of particular judges. The discussion of such efforts to cause recusals through amicus filings also prompted a suggestion that the Committee consider whether the current Rule 29 – which authorizes amicus filings at the merits stage based on party consent – should be revised.

Another suggestion concerned the proposal to amend the length limits in the Appellate Rules. The proposal would set type-volume limits for filings prepared using a computer; as with Rule 32's current type-volume limits, the new type-volume limits would state alternatives in terms of line limits and word limits. A Standing Committee member asked whether it is necessary to retain line limits in addition to word limits. Mr. Gans noted that line limits would make type-volume limits a viable alternative for those who prepare their briefs using a typewriter.

Judge Colloton observed that, with respect to length limits, one important question is whether the proposals would permit a circuit to enlarge the length limits for briefs. The Reporter responded that Rule 32(e) explicitly permits the adoption of local rules that enlarge the length limits for briefs. However, Rule 28.1 – which applies to cross-appeals – does not include a provision similar to Rule 32(e); it might be worthwhile, the Reporter suggested, for the Committee to consider adding such a provision to Rule 28.1. The Reporter surmised that such an addition would not require re-publication of the proposals. A judge member of the Appellate Rules Committee observed that, in voting on the proposal at the Committee's spring 2014 meeting, he had relied on the idea that circuits could choose to authorize longer length limits for briefs.

Judge Colloton pointed out that the fall 2014 agenda materials included a memo describing the deliberations that led to the adoption of the 1998 amendments to Rule 32. The Committee's records, the Reporter observed, indicated that the 1998 amendments were supported

repeatedly by the assertion that, for briefs prepared on a computer, 50 pages was roughly equivalent to 14,000 words.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Item No. 08-AP-R (disclosure requirements)

Judge Colloton introduced this item, which concerns local circuit provisions that impose disclosure requirements beyond those set by the Appellate Rules. Judge Colloton noted that Judge Chagares, Professor Katyal, and Mr. Newsom had agreed to form a subcommittee on this topic, and he thanked them for their research. He thanked Mr. Deyling for attending the meeting in order to share the perspective of the Committee on Codes of Conduct. A central question, Judge Colloton noted, is whether there is information currently elicited by local circuit provisions but not required by the Appellate Rules that would be relevant to a judge's determination whether to recuse from a matter. A related question is whether, as to some types of information, the Appellate Rules Committee needs further guidance in order to assess the implications of such information for recusal determinations. Judge Colloton reported that the Chair of the Committee on Codes of Conduct had designated Judge Paul Kelly of the Tenth Circuit, a member of the Codes of Conduct Committee, to serve as a liaison to the Appellate Rules Committee in connection with this project.

Judge Colloton invited Judge Chagares, Professor Katyal, and Mr. Newsom to summarize the results of their research. Judge Chagares observed that recusal issues present a minefield for judges; despite judges' best efforts, it is possible that something relevant to recusal might be overlooked. He stated that, of the topics on which he had focused, the two key sets of issues concerned criminal appeals and bankruptcy appeals. Appellate Rule 26.1, Judge Chagares noted, applies to all types of appeals. However, some attorneys assert that Rule 26.1 does not apply to criminal appeals. The Third Circuit Clerk, at Judge Chagares's request, surveyed the other Circuit Clerks concerning corporate disclosures in criminal cases. The responses reported some resistance by attorneys to the application of Rule 26.1 in criminal cases, as well as a few instances in which a circuit had not been enforcing the rule in criminal cases. A benefit of the survey, Judge Chagares noted, was that it had sensitized the Circuit Clerks to the issue, which should improve enforcement of the Rule. Because appeals involving corporate criminal defendants are very rare, Judge Chagares suggested, it should not be necessary to consider amending Rule 26.1 to address this issue. Judge Chagares pointed out that, unlike Criminal Rule 12.4, Appellate Rule 26.1 does not require disclosures concerning crime victims. As to local provisions on this topic, the Third Circuit requires disclosures concerning organizational victims, while the Eleventh Circuit requires disclosures concerning all victims.

Judge Chagares noted the distinct challenges posed by bankruptcy appeals. Not everyone involved in the bankruptcy proceeding below is a party for purposes of analyzing recusal issues. An Advisory Opinion on this topic (Advisory Opinion No. 100), Judge Chagares observed, provided helpful guidance. The opinion states that parties, for this purpose, include the debtor,

members of the creditors' committee, the trustee, parties to an adversary proceeding, and participants in a contested matter. The Third Circuit's local provision on point roughly tracks this guidance; so does the Eleventh Circuit's provision, but that provision also requires disclosure of entities whose value may be substantially affected by the outcome.

Judge Colloton invited Judge Chagares to summarize his findings on the third topic that he had investigated – namely, a judge's connection with participants in the litigation. Judge Chagares noted that instances may arise when a judge on an appellate panel previously participated in the litigation. For example, Judge Chagares recalled an instance when a then-recently-elevated appellate judge discovered that an appeal involved a defendant whom he had arraigned while serving as a Magistrate Judge.

The Reporter noted that Criminal Rule 12.4 requires the government to make disclosures concerning organizational victims. In 2009, the Criminal Rules Committee – at the suggestion of the Codes of Conduct Committee – considered whether to expand Rule 12.4 to require disclosures concerning individual victims and to require disclosures by the organizational victims themselves. The Committee ultimately decided not to propose amendments making such changes; participants in the Committee discussions noted that requiring disclosures concerning individual victims would raise privacy concerns.

Professor Coquillette reminded the Committee that, under Appellate Rule 47, local circuit rules must be consistent with federal statutes and with the Appellate Rules. He observed that the requirement of "consistency" raises interesting questions: For instance, if the Appellate Rules impose a limited set of requirements concerning a given topic, can circuits impose additional local requirements concerning that same topic? The Reporter observed that, when Rule 26.1 was initially adopted, the drafters saw the Rule as setting minimum requirements to which a particular circuit was free to add.

An appellate judge member asked what disclosure requirements apply in proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2254 and 2255. The Reporter undertook to research this question. The member also asked whether Criminal Rule 12.4 defines the term "victim." The Reporter responded that Criminal Rule 1(b)(12) defines "victim" to mean a "crime victim" as defined in the Crime Victims' Rights Act.

Mr. Deyling stated that the topics discussed thus far seemed to him like topics worth exploring. He explained that the Codes of Conduct Committee's 2009 suggestion concerning crime victims arose from the Committee's desire to ensure that the courts' electronic conflicts screening program was picking up all the relevant conflicts. The Codes of Conduct Committee has altered its view, over time, concerning the significance of a judge's interest in a crime victim. The Committee's current view – which accords with the view found in relevant caselaw – is that recusal is necessary only if a judge has a substantial interest in a victim.

Judge Colloton, summarizing the Committee's discussion up to this point, suggested that

the Appellate Rules Committee might consider whether to adopt a provision reflecting Advisory Opinion No. 100's guidance concerning bankruptcy matters. The Committee could also consider adopting a provision requiring some disclosures concerning victims. On the other hand, he suggested, perhaps some caution is warranted because a provision requiring broad disclosure might suggest that certain interests require recusal when in fact they do not. It was noted that, in some instances, the recusal standard presents a judgment call that the judge must make based upon adequate information.

Judge Colloton invited Mr. Newsom to present his findings concerning the topics that he researched. Mr. Newsom turned first to disclosures by intervenors. It is rare, he observed, for intervention to occur in the first instance on appeal. But when such intervention does occur, the intervenor should be required to make the same disclosures as any party. Indeed, Mr. Newsom noted, some circuits have local provisions requiring intervenors to make the same types of disclosures as named parties.

Mr. Newsom next discussed local provisions requiring disclosures by amici. Local provisions take varying approaches concerning which amici must make disclosures and what those amici must disclose. As to the nature of the disclosure, a few circuits require amici to identify parent corporations (or, in one rule, parent companies); some other circuits require disclosure of any entities with a financial interest in the amicus brief. The subcommittee did not feel that it would be necessary for a national rule to require the latter sort of disclosure.

Mr. Newsom also noted local provisions that require disclosure of the identity and nature of parties to the litigation – such as the identity of pseudonoymous parties, or the members of a trade association. The idea behind such provisions, he observed, is to require disclosure concerning interested persons whose identity is not otherwise ascertainable from the filings on appeal.

Judge Colloton invited Mr. Deyling to comment on recusal issues that might be raised by amicus participation. Mr. Deyling conceded that the Codes of Conduct Committee had not provided comprehensive guidance on that topic, even in the Committee's unpublished compendium of summaries of its unpublished opinions. (That compendium, he explained, contains responses to specific requests for advice.) For the most part, Mr. Deyling noted, the Committee had not required recusal because of the participation of an organizational amicus, except in rare situations – for example, where a judge's spouse was involved in the affairs of an amicus. Advisory Opinion No. 63 states that the participation of an amicus that is a corporation does not require recusal if the judge's interest in the amicus would not be substantially affected by the outcome of the litigation and if the judge's impartiality could not reasonably be questioned. Judge Colloton noted that the Appellate Rules Committee might seek further guidance from the Codes of Conduct Committee concerning recusal issues raised by amicus filings.

A member asked whether there might be a concern that parties might engineer the

participation of a particular amicus in an effort to generate a recusal. Another member agreed that this could be a concern; he noted that when he is considering whether to file an amicus brief, he tries to avoid doing so in situations where the filing might trigger a recusal.

Mr. Deyling expressed agreement with Mr. Newsom's suggestion that an intervenor should be treated like any other party for purposes of disclosures. He noted as well that if an intervenor's participation raises a recusal issue, that issue will arise – even before intervention is granted – in connection with the *request* to intervene.

Judge Colloton observed that, when a judge owns shares in a member of a trade association and the trade association is a party to a lawsuit, the recusal issue will focus on whether the judge's interest in the member would be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding. Disclosure of the trade association's members would permit the judge to assess this question. Mr. Deyling noted that the question is who has the burden of discerning and disclosing such information.

Mr. Newsom pointed out that questions concerning real parties in interest can arise in a variety of situations. Mr. Byron noted that the Appellate Rules do not define who is a "party" or who counts as an "appellee"; what about those who do not actually participate in the litigation but who may benefit from it? Mr. Letter recalled that the Committee had previously considered defining "appellee" in the Appellate Rules, but the Committee had decided not to do so.

Summarizing this portion of the discussion, Judge Colloton noted that the Committee would further investigate questions relating to intervenors and amici, and that the Committee might seek further guidance concerning recusal obligations triggered by an amicus's participation.

Judge Colloton invited Professor Katyal to report on the results of his research. Professor Katyal noted that he had focused on disclosures concerning corporate relationships. The bottom line, he suggested, is that there is no need to change the disclosure requirements to address these topics. However, if the Committee is considering other possible amendments concerning disclosure requirements, then it might consider what parties other than corporations should be required to make disclosures under Rule 26.1. The D.C. Circuit's local provision, he observed, requires all nongovernmental, non-individual entities to make disclosures under Rule 26.1; this requirement encompasses, for example, joint ventures and partnerships. A prudent attorney representing such an entity would likely comply with existing Rule 26.1, but the Rule could be amended to cover such entities explicitly. The Reporter noted that Judge Easterbrook's comment – which initially provided one of the sources for this agenda item – had pointed out that Rule 26.1 is underinclusive because it covers only corporations and not other types of business entities.

The Committee might also consider what types of ownership interests might be encompassed within an amended disclosure rule. The D.C. Circuit's local provision requires

disclosure of any ownership interest – not merely stock ownership – that is greater than 10 percent. Professor Katyal noted that if the Committee were inclined to expand Rule 26.1 in this respect, it could propose amending the Rule to refer to "any publicly held entity that owns 10 percent or more of an ownership interest in the party." Such an amendment, he suggested, could be modestly helpful.

By contrast, Professor Katyal said, some other local requirements – such as the Eleventh Circuit's requirement that corporate parties disclose their full corporate title and stock ticker symbol – do not seem worthwhile candidates for inclusion in the national Rule. An appellate judge noted that the Eleventh Circuit had adopted its local disclosure requirements in an effort to avoid recusal problems. Mr. Gans reported that the Circuit Clerks face a complex task when assessing corporate disclosures; sometimes he finds that it is necessary to call counsel to obtain further information (including both some information currently required by Rule 26.1 and some additional information). Mr. Deyling noted that a judge's interest in a party's *subsidiary* would not trigger a recusal obligation.

By consensus, the Committee retained this item on its agenda. Judge Colloton noted that the Committee might seek further guidance from the Codes of Conduct Committee on particular issues.

B. Item Nos. 09-AP-D & 11-AP-F (response to Mohawk Industries)

Judge Colloton noted that, over the summer, he and the Reporter had worked with Judge Fay, Mr. Katsas, and Mr. Letter to consider whether it would be advisable to pursue an amendment that would address the appealability of orders concerning attorney-client privilege. He invited the Reporter to introduce the topic. The Reporter noted that it is difficult for a party aggrieved by a trial court's denial of a claim of attorney-client privilege to obtain review of that ruling. Mandamus review is relatively narrow. Disobeying a disclosure order in the hopes of generating a criminal contempt sanction is a problematic strategy, both because it requires a party to violate a court order and because there is no guarantee that the resulting sanction would fit within the category of *criminal* contempt sanctions (which are immediately appealable) rather than *civil* contempt sanctions (which typically are not). To obtain review under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), the would-be appellant not only must meet the criteria stated in that statute but also must obtain permission from both the district court and the court of appeals.

These difficulties, the Reporter noted, have generated proposals – such as that by Ms. Amy Smith – to grant the court of appeals discretion to hear interlocutory appeals from attorney-client privilege rulings. The subcommittee had taken seriously the possibility of creating such an avenue. But such a project would present drafting challenges. Which sorts of attorney-client privilege rulings should be encompassed within the provision? Should the provision also encompass work-product-protection rulings? Rulings concerning other types of privilege?

The Reporter noted that one relevant consideration is the degree to which such a new

provision would burden the courts of appeals. This question had been the subject of some debate in the *Mohawk Industries* case itself. The petitioner in *Mohawk Industries, Inc. v. Carpenter*, 558 U.S. 100 (2009), and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as an amicus in that case, had attempted to assess the experience of the Third, Ninth, and D.C. Circuits – each of which permitted collateral-order appeals from privilege rulings at the time that the Court decided *Mohawk Industries*. They found that on average only one such appeal per year had occurred in the three circuits combined. This finding accorded with Justice Alito's observation, during oral argument in *Mohawk Industries*, that he did not recall such appeals presenting problems in the Third Circuit while he was serving as a judge of that court. On the other hand, the Reporter pointed out, the one-appeal-per-year figure might be unduly low, because during the early part of the twelve-year period that was studied the availability of collateral-order review for privilege orders may not have been clear in all three circuits. And most of the appeals that occurred were taken by sophisticated litigators; if a Rule were adopted to create an avenue for interlocutory appeal, the greater visibility of such a provision might raise awareness and, thus, increase the number of attempted appeals. The Reporter pointed out that the pool of attorney-client privilege rulings is a large one. A search on WestlawNext for one year's worth of district-court opinions that used the term "attorney client privilege" pulled up over 1,000 decisions (mostly unreported).

During discussions held in summer 2014, members of the subcommittee had expressed interest in knowing the extent to which parties, post-*Mohawk Industries*, were able to obtain mandamus review of attorney-client privilege rulings. The Reporter had performed a non-exhaustive search for cases on point. She noted that, in order to obtain a writ of mandamus, the applicant must show that there is no other adequate means of relief, that the applicant has a clear and indisputable right to the writ, and that issuance of the writ is appropriate under the circumstances. The courts of appeals have considerable flexibility in deciding whether to employ mandamus review. While circuits vary in their willingness to employ mandamus review of privilege rulings, it seems plain that mandamus provides a tool with which a court of appeals, if it chooses, can address lower-court confusion or remedy severe adverse effects that would otherwise result from a disclosure order. Sometimes a court of appeals will deny redress on the ground that relief will later be available on review of the final judgment. But a strong showing of harm increases the chances of mandamus review, especially if an amicus filing or other information indicates that the ruling is also adversely affecting third parties. Novel and important questions are more likely to trigger mandamus review, but review can also occur where the lower court badly misapplied established law, where the ruling is especially harmful, or where federalism or separation-of-powers concerns are present.

Because issuance of the writ requires an elevated showing of error on the lower court's part, some have noted that there is a stigma attached to having entered an order that triggers issuance of the writ. But, the Reporter noted, it is possible that a petitioner might achieve its goal even if the court of appeals decides not to issue the writ. The order of decision sketched by the D.C. Circuit in *In re Kellogg Brown & Root, Inc.*, 756 F.3d 754 (D.C. Cir. 2014) ("*KBR*"), is interesting in this regard. In *KBR*, the court of appeals granted a writ of mandamus and vacated a

district court order that, the court found, had created a lot of uncertainty about the scope of the attorney-client privilege in business settings. The *KBR* court stated that the first question, in reviewing a request for such a writ, is whether the district court's privilege ruling was erroneous; if the ruling was erroneous, then the remaining question is whether the error is of a kind that would warrant issuance of the writ. *United States v. Jicarilla Apache Nation*, 131 S. Ct. 2313 (2011), also illustrates the potential for a party to secure a desired ruling even if it does not actually secure issuance of the writ. The Federal Circuit had found no error and denied a writ of mandamus; the Supreme Court reversed. The Court left it for the Federal Circuit to determine on remand whether to issue the writ in the light of the Court's opinion – but the Court also stated its assumption that, even if the writ did not issue, the Court of Federal Claims would follow the Court's holding on the relevant attorney-client privilege question.

Judge Colloton invited members of the subcommittee to share their thoughts on the matter. An attorney member stated that, with reluctance, he had concluded that it would not make sense to proceed with an amendment on this topic. The difficulty of obtaining interlocutory review is troubling, he noted, because while review of a final judgment can redress the erroneous *use* in a lawsuit of privileged information, such review cannot remedy the actual *disclosure* of that information. If mandamus review were unavailable for privilege rulings, he would be concerned; and even though such review does appear to be available, he is concerned that courts will not employ mandamus where the challenged ruling presents a close question. However, it would be an ambitious undertaking to draft a rule similar to Civil Rule 23(f) (which authorizes the courts of appeals to permit appeals from class certification orders). And, at present, there is not a great deal of evidence that key rulings are slipping through the cracks.

Mr. Letter expressed agreement with this analysis. An appellate judge member stated that it would be undesirable to create an avenue for permissive appeals from privilege rulings, because there would be a large number of requests for permission to take such appeals.

A motion was made and seconded to remove this item from the Committee's agenda. The motion passed by voice vote without opposition.

C. Item No. 13-AP-H (Ryan v. Schad and Bell v. Thompson / FRAP 41)

Judge Colloton introduced this item, which encompasses two principal questions: whether a court of appeals has discretion to stay its mandate following a denial of certiorari, and whether such a stay can result from mere inaction (i.e., from the court's failure to issue the mandate). Judge Colloton noted that a group composed of Justice Eid, Judge Taranto, and Professor Barrett had worked over the summer to consider possible amendments addressing these questions. Judge Colloton invited the Reporter to provide an overview of those discussions.

The Reporter first discussed the proposal to amend Rule 41(b) to require that stays of the mandate be effected by order rather than by inaction. Original Rule 41(b) had referred to the court's ability to enlarge "by order" the time before the mandate would issue. The words "by

order" were deleted during the 1998 restyling of the Appellate Rules. The Eleventh Circuit has adopted a local rule that helps to address the problem of stays through inaction, but most circuits do not have local provisions addressing this issue. And the opinions concurring in and dissenting from the grant of rehearing en banc in *Henry v. Ryan*, 766 F.3d 1059 (9th Cir. 2014), illustrate that this issue will continue to arise periodically.

On the question of the court of appeals' authority (if any) to stay the mandate after the denial of certiorari, the Reporter observed that the subcommittee had considered three options: Rule 41 could be amended to state explicitly that there is no such authority; or the Rule could be amended to provide for such stays in extraordinary circumstances; or the Committee could decide not to amend the Rule. Existing caselaw suggests that the authority to stay the mandate may arise not only from Rule 41 but also partly from the courts' inherent authority and partly from statutory authority. Caselaw suggests, for instance, that courts have inherent authority to stay the mandate in order to investigate whether a party committed a fraud on the court of appeals (caselaw recognizes power to recall the mandate in such circumstances, and logically, that caselaw should also support the authority to stay the mandate before it issues). 28 U.S.C. § 2106, which authorizes an appellate court to "require such further proceedings to be had as may be just under the circumstances," may also authorize stays of the mandate. The Reporter suggested that a Rule amendment could validly channel the courts' inherent authority in this area – for example, by banning stays of the mandate after denial of certiorari but leaving in place the courts of appeals' authority to *recall* the mandate in extraordinary circumstances.

An appellate judge member of the subcommittee stated that he was on the fence about the choices to be made here. He wondered whether the Rule could be amended to refer to the Supreme Court's discussion of the power to recall the mandate in "grave, unforeseen contingencies." This member expressed concern about the idea of amending the Rule in a way that relies (as a safety valve) on a power (to recall the mandate) that the Rules do not mention. If the Committee simply left the Rule untouched, this member said, he would worry less about the possibility that a court would conclude that the Rule displaces the inherent power to recall the mandate.

Another appellate judge member of the subcommittee stated that she favored the option (shown on pages 204-05 of the agenda materials) that would amend Rule 41(d)(2)(D) to state that "[u]nless it finds that extraordinary circumstances justify it in ordering a further stay, the court of appeals must issue the mandate immediately when a copy of a Supreme Court order denying the petition for writ of certiorari is filed." The third member of the subcommittee stated that she did not think the amendments that were under consideration would transgress the limits set by the Rules Enabling Act. This member expressed support for amending Rule 41 to require that any stays be accomplished "by order." She was torn about whether to amend the Rule to address the question of the court's power to stay the mandate; if such an amendment were to be pursued, she too would favor the option shown on pages 204-05 of the agenda materials.

Judge Colloton observed that Judge Fletcher, concurring in the grant of rehearing en banc

in *Henry v. Ryan*, argued that the "extraordinary circumstances" test discussed in *Ryan v. Schad*, 133 S. Ct. 2548 (2013) (per curiam), and *Bell v. Thompson*, 545 U.S. 794 (2005), applies only when the mandate was stayed solely for the purposes of allowing time for a party to petition for certiorari – not when there were other reasons for the stay.

An appellate judge member stated that he did not like the way that the current Rule is written. He suggested that the Rule should permit the court of appeals to issue a further stay "if it finds that extraordinary circumstances exist," and he stated that the Rule should require that the court explain those findings in the order. Another appellate judge suggested that the Committee consider whether there is a phrase, other than "extraordinary circumstances," that better captures the very narrow set of circumstances that the *Schad* and *Bell* Courts envisioned as potential bases for a further stay of the mandate.

The Reporter asked whether an amendment inserting the extraordinary-circumstances test into Rule 41(d)(2)(D) should be accompanied by an amendment to Appellate Rule 2. Rule 2 states that "a court of appeals may—to expedite its decision or for other good cause—suspend any provision of these rules in a particular case and order proceedings as it directs, except as otherwise provided in Rule 26(b)." Would the availability of authority to suspend the rules under Rule 2 frustrate the purpose of amending Rule 41? The Reporter suggested that it would not be necessary to amend Rule 2; it seems unlikely that a court would, in a given case, find that no extraordinary circumstances warranted a stay under Rule 41, but that there was good cause under Rule 2 to suspend the requirements of Rule 41. Committee members indicated agreement with the view that no amendment to Rule 2 was needed.

A member asked whether it would be worthwhile to hold off on any amendment to Rule 41 in order to see whether the Supreme Court grants review on the question of the stay of the mandate in *Henry v. Ryan*. An appellate judge asked, though, whether there would be any harm in proceeding with a proposed amendment in the meantime. The member responded that it might be better to hold off on the amendment if the Committee believes that the circumstance addressed by the amendment occur only rarely. And, this member suggested, there is always some risk of unintended consequences any time that a rule is amended.

An attorney member asked whether the Committee could publish for comment the proposal to amend Rule 41 to require that stays be effected "by order," and simultaneously solicit comment on whether the Rule should be amended to address the question of the court of appeals' authority to stay the mandate after denial of certiorari. Professor Coquillette responded that the typical way to solicit such comment would be to publish a proposed amendment addressing the authority question and also to highlight the issue in the memo that accompanies the published proposals. The attorney member observed that, if the Committee were to commence the process for adopting an amendment addressing the authority question, the Committee could withdraw the proposal if subsequent developments rendered it moot. Mr. Letter expressed agreement with this point. An appellate judge member noted that the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in *Henry v. Ryan* would be informative.

Turning back to the language of the option favored by some Committee members – which would amend Rule 41(d)(2)(D) to forbid a court of appeals to order a further stay "[u]nless it finds that extraordinary circumstances justify" such a stay – an appellate judge member asked whether it is necessary to include the reference to a finding, or whether instead "it finds that" could be deleted. Another appellate judge member noted that if the propriety of such a stay is challenged in the Supreme Court, the party defending the stay will articulate the basis for the stay. Mr. Letter suggested, though, that including the requirement of a finding might help to ensure that the court of appeals carefully considers the basis for the stay before entering the stay order.

By consensus, the Committee retained this item on the agenda, with the expectation of discussing it further at the Committee's spring 2015 meeting.

D. Item Nos. 08-AP-A, 11-AP-C, and 11-AP-D (changes to FRAP in light of CM/ECF)

Judge Colloton invited the Reporter to introduce these items, which concern matters relating to the shift to electronic filing and service. The Standing Committee's Case Management / Electronic Case Filing ("CM/ECF") Subcommittee, with Judge Chagares as its Chair and Professor Capra as its Reporter, has been leading a discussion among the advisory committees concerning possible amendments that would take account of the shift to electronic transmission and storage of documents and information. The Appellate Rules Committee has published for comment an amendment to Appellate Rule 26 that would abrogate the "three-day rule" as it applies to electronic service; similar proposals concerning the relevant Civil, Criminal, and Bankruptcy Rules have also been published for comment.

The Subcommittee has also discussed the possibility of drafting amendments that would adopt global definitions to adjust the Rules to the world of electronic filing and case management. The first portion of the Subcommittee's proposed template rule on this subject (set out at page 226 of the agenda book) would define "information in written form" to include electronic materials. This provision, the Reporter noted, seems both unproblematic and useful. The second portion of the template would define various actions that can be done with paper documents to include the analogous action performed electronically.

Adopting that second part of the template in the Appellate Rules would, the Reporter suggested, be more complicated. Such a rule should not pose problems for the operation of the starting points and end points of time periods under the Appellate Rules. The proposed template rule allows action to be taken electronically but does not address the ancillary effects of an actor's choice of electronic or other means of taking the action; thus, provisions addressing whether a filing is timely by reference to the filing method should be unaffected by the adoption of the template. It is more important, the Reporter argued, to focus on rules that discuss actions that might be taken electronically, rather than on Rules that address the ancillary timing effects of choices among different methods of filing or service.

One key topic concerns the filing of a notice of appeal as of right from a judgment of a district court, a bankruptcy appellate panel ("BAP"), or the United States Tax Court. The Appellate Rules set the time period for filing the notice of appeal, and they specify that the notice must be filed in the relevant lower court. As to notices of appeal filed in the Tax Court, the Appellate Rules specify the manner of filing the notice and they also specify how to determine the timeliness of the notice. The Appellate Rules also set special timeliness rules that can be employed by an inmate who files a notice of appeal. And the Appellate Rules (like the other sets of national Rules) include a time-computation provision that says how to determine when the "last day" of a period ends. But the Appellate Rules do not specify how to file a notice of appeal in a district court or with a BAP. Rather, Appellate Rule 1(a)(2) directs litigants who file a document in a district court to comply with the district court's practices. The template rule says that it governs actions discussed "[i]n these rules," so adopting that template as part of the Appellate Rules would not affect the manner of filing a notice of appeal in a district court or with a BAP. However, the template would affect the operation of Appellate Rule 13(a)(2), which specifies how to file the notice of appeal in the Tax Court; when read together with Rule 13(a)(2), the template would authorize electronic filing in the Tax Court. That would countermand the current practice of the Tax Court, which does not permit notices of appeal to be filed electronically (though it does have an electronic filing system for other types of filings). If the Appellate Rules Committee were to propose adopting the second part of the template, it would seem advisable to make an exception for notices of appeal from the Tax Court.

To get a sense of other types of actions on which the Committee might wish to focus when considering the operation of the second part of the template rule, the Reporter reviewed local circuit provisions relating to electronic filing and service. Some local circuit provisions state that certain actions may be taken electronically; other such provisions state that certain actions may *not* be taken electronically. Using those sets of provisions as a starting point, it is possible to see that there are some types of actions for which the application of the template rule would be harmless and even beneficial. Thus, for example, it may be useful to provide that actions such as the entry of judgments, or service by the clerk on a CM/ECF user, or non-case-initiating filings by a CM/ECF user, or service between parties who are CM/ECF users, can be done electronically. But there might be problems with a national rule that permits electronic completion of some other types of actions – such as filing case-initiating documents, or filing documents prior to a matter's docketing in the court of appeals, or filings under seal. It might not be easy, the Reporter suggested, to draft exemptions that would cover all of these areas.

Instead, the Reporter proposed that the Committee consider the possibility of adopting provisions that would mandate electronic filing and authorize electronic service, subject to certain exceptions. Currently, Appellate Rule 25(a)(2)(D) authorizes local rules to mandate electronic filing (subject to reasonable exceptions). The Appellate Rules do not currently authorize local rules to require electronic service; rather, the Appellate Rules allow electronic service only with the litigant's written consent. However, all of the circuits have local provisions specifying that registration to use CM/ECF constitutes consent to electronic service (which typically would mean service by means of the notice of docket activity generated by CM/ECF).

The circuits all presumptively require attorneys to file electronically, though they permit exemptions on a showing of sufficient cause. The circuits vary in whether and when they permit pro se litigants to file electronically.

The Reporter noted that the Civil Rules Committee, at its fall meeting, would be considering a proposal for a national rule that would make electronic filing mandatory (subject to exceptions based on good cause or on local rules). The proposal would also authorize electronic service (other than for initial process) irrespective of party consent (also subject to the good-cause and local-rule exceptions). The Reporter suggested that the Appellate Rules Committee might wish to consider amending the Appellate Rules to require CM/ECF filing (unless good cause is shown for, or a local rule permits or requires, paper or another non-CM/ECF mode of filing) and authorize service by means of the CM/ECF system's notice of docket activity (unless good cause is shown for exempting, or a local rule exempts, the person to be served from using CM/ECF). Judge Colloton noted that the Reporter's suggested language would authorize local rules to "permit or require" paper filings, whereas the language to be considered by the Civil Rules Committee referred only to local rules that "allow" paper filings. The Reporter argued that it would be desirable to authorize local rules to require paper filings, given the range of circumstances in which local circuit provisions currently evince a preference for paper filings.

Professor Coquillette noted that the importance of paper filings for certain purposes had also been a topic of discussion in the Bankruptcy Rules Committee. In particular, he observed, the Bankruptcy Rules Committee had discussed in some detail the topic of "wet" versus electronic signatures. Mr. Letter noted that the question of signatures has not seemed to present problems outside of the bankruptcy context. Professor Coquillette asked whether the e-filing and e-service provisions would be affected by the adoption of the next generation (NextGen) version of CM/ECF. Mr. Gans noted that the NextGen system is already being tested in the Second Circuit. One relevant change, he reported, would concern payment for filing case-initiating documents. Currently, the need to pay the filing fee presents a barrier to electronic filing of some case-initiating documents. The NextGen system will enable filers to make such payments via pay.gov.

Judge Colloton, summarizing the discussion thus far, noted that the Reporter was proposing that the Committee consider adopting part (a) of the Subcommittee's template rule (the portion stating that "[i]n these rules, [unless otherwise provided] a reference to information in written form includes electronically stored information") and that the Committee consider adopting national rules presumptively requiring electronic filing and presumptively authorizing electronic service (subject to the noted exceptions). He suggested that the Reporter convey to the Civil Rules Committee's Reporter the Appellate Rules Committee's discussion about the desirability of authorizing local rules to require, as well as to allow, paper filings. The Reporter undertook to draft proposed amendments to Appellate Rule 25 (concerning electronic filing and service) for consideration at the Committee's spring meeting.

The Reporter turned next to the proposal to amend Appellate Rule 25(d) so that it no longer requires a proof of service in instances when service is accomplished by means of the notice of docket activity generated by CM/ECF. Because twelve of the thirteen circuits have local provisions that make clear that the notice of docket activity does not replace the certificate of service, the Chair and Reporter had asked Mr. Gans to survey his colleagues to ascertain their views on this topic.

Mr. Gans reported that the local circuit provisions likely reflected the view that it would be improper to dispense with the certificate of service so long as Rule 25(d) seemed to require one. A majority of the Circuit Clerks favor amending Rule 25(d) to remove the certificate-of-service requirement in cases where all the litigants participate in CM/ECF – though they think that Rule 25(d) should continue to require the certificate of service when any of the parties is served by a means other than CM/ECF. But a substantial minority of the Circuit Clerks favor retaining the certificate-of-service requirement across the board. Sometimes attorneys may err in thinking that a particular litigant can be served through CM/ECF when that is not in fact the case (for instance, when a party who was filing electronically in the district court has not yet registered to file electronically in the appellate court). And when the clerk's office is checking to ensure that proper service occurred, the certificate of service can provide a starting point. But, Mr. Gans noted, the existence of a certificate of service does not remove the need for the clerk's office to check each filing against the service list to make sure that proper service occurred. It is time, he suggested, to eliminate the certificate-of-service requirement for cases where all filers are CM/ECF participants.

Judge Colloton directed the Committee's attention to the sketch on pages 242-43 of the agenda materials, which illustrated a possible amendment to Rule 25(d). An appellate judge member questioned the sketch's reference to "a notice of docket activity generated by CM/ECF." The Rules, he noted, do not usually use acronyms such as "CM/ECF," and it would be better to refer instead to the "official electronic filing system." The Reporter promised to revise the wording of the sketch in preparation for the Committee's spring meeting.

V. New Business

Judge Colloton noted that a federal appellate judge had suggested that the Committee consider amending the Appellate Rules to state that Appellate Rule 29 establishes the exclusive means by which a non-litigant may communicate with the court about a pending case, and that non-litigants must not contact judges of the court directly. Judge Colloton invited the Reporter to discuss this suggestion.

The Reporter noted that, in certain rare emergencies, it may be necessary for a litigant's counsel to make direct contact with a judge of the court of appeals – for example, to make an emergency request for a stay of execution. But it is difficult to imagine circumstances that would justify a non-litigant in making a direct contact with an appellate judge about a pending case. Indeed, if a judge received such a communication, Canon 3(A)(4) of the Code of Conduct for

United States Judges would direct the judge to notify the parties about the communication and allow them an opportunity to respond. However, most circuits do not have local provisions specifying that such communications are inappropriate. The only pertinent provision (encompassing non-party communications) that the Reporter was able to find was Federal Circuit Rule 45(d), which provides that all correspondence and calls concerning cases "must be directed to the clerk." Other circuits may use less formal means to make the same point; for example, the Seventh Circuit's web page on "Contact Information" makes clear that all inquiries and contacts should be directed to the Clerk's Office.

An initial question for the Committee, the Reporter suggested, is whether national rulemaking on this topic is warranted. Mr. Letter noted that care would be required in drafting rules concerning non-party communications to the court. In cases involving national security issues, the government – as a non-party – might engage in ex parte, in camera communications with a district judge. Thus, any rule limiting ex parte communications by non-parties might require a carve-out for situations implicating national security. An attorney member noted as well that if such a rule were adopted, it might be implicated by casual mentions of a case at a cocktail party.

An appellate judge member suggested that this issue is likely to arise only very rarely and that there is no need for a national rule on the subject. Two other appellate judge members expressed agreement with this suggestion. Judge Colloton asked Mr. Gans what would happen if the Judge received an unsolicited letter from a non-party and forwarded it to the Clerk's Office. Mr. Gans stated that he would send the non-party a generic response; the Clerk's Office, he noted, often receives communications forwarded to the Office by the Chief Judge. Mr. Gans expressed doubt about the need for rulemaking on this topic.

Judge Colloton wondered if the reason for the rulemaking suggestion is that a judge might wish to have a provision in the Rules that can be cited to a lay person. Professor Coquillette suggested, however, that if the goal is to educate non-lawyers, a statement on the court's website is likely to be more effective than a provision in the Rules. Mr. Byron questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Appellate Rules to attempt to regulate the conduct of non-lawyers who are not parties to a proceeding in the court of appeals.

A motion was made that this item not be added to the Committee's study agenda. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote without opposition.

VI. Other information items

Judge Colloton noted that the Civil / Appellate Subcommittee has been re-convened. Judge Scott Matheson will chair the Subcommittee. Judge Fay, Mr. Newsom, and Mr. Letter have agreed to serve as the Appellate Rules Committee's representatives on the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will focus its efforts on two items. One is the topic of "manufactured finality" – i.e., the doctrine that addresses efforts by a would-be appellant to "manufacture"

appellate jurisdiction over an appeal from the disposition of fewer than all the claims in an action by dismissing the remaining claims. The second item concerns the operation of Civil Rule 62, which addresses supersedeas bonds.

Judge Colloton reported that the Criminal Rules Committee had formed a subcommittee to consider a proposal by Judge Jon Newman that Criminal Rule 52(c) be amended to permit appellate review of unraised sentencing error that did not rise to the level of plain error so long as the error was prejudicial and redressing it would not require a new trial. The Appellate Rules Committee's Reporter had participated in the Subcommittee's conference calls on this topic. After speaking with Judge Newman by telephone to discuss his proposal, the Subcommittee members had decided not to recommend proceeding with the proposed amendment.

Judge Colloton observed that the Civil Rules Committee's Rule 23 Subcommittee is planning to convene mini-conferences to obtain the views of knowledgeable participants concerning various aspects of class action practice. Judge Robert Dow, the Chair of the Subcommittee, has agreed that the topics of inquiry will include appeals by class action objectors. Mr. Rose noted that the Subcommittee might hold such an event in connection with the Civil Rules Committee's April 2015 meeting in Washington, D.C.

VII. Date of spring 2015 meeting

Judge Colloton reminded the Committee members that the Committee's spring meeting would be held on April 23 and 24, 2015.

VIII. Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 1:45 p.m. on October 20, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine T. Struve
Reporter