



skearns@kirkland.com

To: Rules\_Comments@ao.uscourts.gov

02/16/2004 10:48 PM

cc:

Subject: Rule 32.1 Comment

RECEIVED  
2/17/04

03-AP-460

I attach a comment to proposed Rule 32.1. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Susan Kearns  
Associate  
Kirkland & Ellis LLP  
655 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Kirkland & Ellis LLP or Kirkland & Ellis International.

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@kirkland.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

\*\*\*\*\*



KearnsRule32[1].1letter.dc

Susan E. Kearns  
To Call Writer Directly:  
202 879-5220  
skearns@kirkland.com

Dir. Fax: 202 879-5200

February 16, 2004

Peter G. McCabe  
Secretary, Committee on Rules of Practice and  
Procedure  
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts  
One Columbus Circle, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20544

Re: *Proposed Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1*

Dear Mr. McCabe:

I write in opposition to the proposed Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1. I am an attorney in private practice in Washington, DC, and I specialize in appellate work. I have read several of the letters that have been written, including those by the Chief Judges of the Federal Circuit and the Second Circuit, in opposition to the rule, and I have found them to be quite persuasive.

Let me just add a quick word from the perspective of a young lawyer in private practice. I am opposed to Rule 32.1 because it will indisputably increase the burdens of conducting legal research. The Advisory Committee has stated in the note accompanying the proposed rule that approximately 80% of the opinions issued by the Courts of Appeals are unpublished dispositions. A change in the rule that permits those opinions to be cited therefore will instantly *quintuple* the universe of precedent that must be consulted on any given point of law. Most, if not all of these cases, will be duplicative of what already exists in published dispositions. Little of what appears to be new will ultimately prove useful. Those "new" statements will likely prove to be nothing more than the imprecise phrases typical of unpublished dispositions. And even if a proposition appeared on point, its relevance will be extremely difficult to assess given that the unpublished disposition rarely provides a complete statement of the facts relevant to the decision. The new rule will therefore seriously increase the time and resources necessary to research a legal proposition without providing any significant benefits to that endeavor.

The Office of Management and Budget does not require the Advisory Committee to engage in a formal cost-benefit analysis, but it seems pretty clear that practitioners would believe Rule 32.1 flunks that test. The new rule should not be approved.

Peter G. McCabe  
February 16, 2004  
Page 2

Sincerely,

Susan Kearns