COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 17-18, 2004
Washington, D.C.
Minutes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTENDANCE

The mid-year meeting of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure was held in Washington, D.C. on Thursday and Friday, June 17-18, 2004. All the members were present:

Judge David F. Levi, Chair
David J. Beck, Esquire
David M. Bernick, Esquire
Charles J. Cooper, Esquire
Judge Sidney A. Fitzwater
Judge Harris L Hartz
Dean Mary Kay Kane
Judge Mark R. Kravitz
Associate Attorney General Robert D. McCallum
Patrick F. McCartan, Esquire
Judge J. Garvan Murtha
Judge Thomas W. Thrash, Jr.
Justice Charles Talley Wells

Providing support to the committee were: Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, reporter to the committee; Peter G. McCabe, secretary to the committee and Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; John K. Rabiej, chief of the Rules Committee Support Office of the Administrative Office; James N. Ishida and Robert P. Deyling, senior attorneys in the Office of Judges Programs of the Administrative Office; Professor Steven Gensler, Supreme Court Fellow with the Administrative Office; Brooke D. Coleman, law clerk to Judge Levi; Joe Cecil of the Research Division of the Federal Judicial Center; and Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr. and Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., consultants to the committee.

Representing the advisory committees were:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules —
Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., Chair
Professor Patrick J. Schiltz, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules —
Judge A. Thomas Small, Chair
Professor Jeffrey W. Morris, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules —
Judge Lee H. Rosenthal, Chair
Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules —
Judge Edward E. Carnes, Chair
Professor David A. Schlueter, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules —
Judge Jerry E. Smith, Chair
Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

Also taking part in the meeting on behalf of the Department of Justice was John S. Davis, Associate Deputy Attorney General.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Levi reported that no major amendments to the rules were scheduled to take effect on December 1, 2004. He noted that the Supreme Court had recommitted the proposed amendment to FED. R. EVID. 804(b)(3) — governing the hearsay exception for statements against penal interest — in light of its recent decision in *Crawford v. Washington.* In *Crawford,* the Court substantially revised its Confrontation Clause jurisprudence, thus making the proposed rule amendment inappropriate. He added that the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules had decided to defer consideration of any

hearsay exception amendments until adequate case law develops to determine the meaning and implications of the *Crawford* case.

Judge Levi pointed out that the federal courts were facing a severe budget crisis that could result in substantial layoffs and furloughs of court staff. He explained that it was important for the committee to consider its rules decisions in the light of their impact on the resources of the courts. He noted that amendments have been proposed to the bankruptcy rules that could save the courts more than a million dollars in postage and handling costs by facilitating electronic notices and use of the national Bankruptcy Noticing Center. He explained that the committee would be asked to expedite the rulemaking process to achieve the anticipated savings earlier.

Judge Levi said that the project to restyle the civil rules was achieving excellent progress. The Style Subcommittee, he noted, had now reached the landmark of having completed a first draft of all 86 rules.

Judge Levi reported that the E-Government Subcommittee had met the day before the committee meeting to refine the guidance that it would provide the advisory committees in drafting rules amendments to implement the E-Government Act of 2002. The statute requires that rules be promulgated under the Rules Enabling Act to protect privacy and security concerns implicated by posting court case files on the Internet.

Judge Levi noted that the Court Administration and Case Management Committee had been working diligently on privacy and security issues for three years and had offered constructive comments on the latest proposed guidance to the advisory committee. He added that the E-Government Subcommittee had made a great deal of progress at its meeting in addressing a number of difficult policy and practical questions raised when court documents that had been practically obscure in the past are now posted on the Internet. He observed that there will likely have to be some differences in detail among the amendments proposed by the advisory committees. The bankruptcy rules, he noted, will be the most affected by privacy concerns because of the heavy use of social security numbers in bankruptcy cases.

Judge Levi reported that he attends most of the meetings of the advisory committees. Each committee, he observed, has a different personality, reflecting in part the style of its chair and reporter and the role of the Department of Justice. He emphasized that the rules process is blessed with great chairs and reporters, and the work product of the committees is truly outstanding.

Judge Levi noted that the Chief Justice had extended Judge Alito's term as chair of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules for an additional year. He also reported that Judge Susan Bucklew had been selected to replace Judge Carnes as chair of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules and Judge Thomas Zilly had been selected to replace Judge

Small as chair of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules. He said that Judge Carnes and Judge Small had been outstanding and successful committee chairs, and they would be sorely missed. He also reported that the Standing Committee would greatly miss the important contributions of two of its distinguished lawyer members whose terms are about to expire — Charles Cooper and Patrick McCartan. Finally, noting Professor Cooper's 10th anniversary as reporter to the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, Judge Levi emphasized that one of the highlights of his legal career had been to work closely with Professor Cooper.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The committee voted without objection to approve the minutes of the last meeting, held on January 15-16, 2004.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Mr. Rabiej reported that the Administrative Office was monitoring 34 bills introduced in the 108th Congress that would affect the federal rules.

He noted that legislation was still pending, proposed by the bail bond industry, that would directly amend the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and limit the authority of a judge to forfeit a bond. He said that the bill had been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, but was opposed by the Judicial Conference. The legislation, he said, had not reached the House floor, thanks to efforts by the Administrative Office and the Department of Justice. He added that: (1) there had been recent communications with representatives of the bail bond industry, but the industry had not changed its essential position; and (2) there has been no action on the bill in the Senate.

Mr. Rabiej noted that legislation sponsored jointly by the Judicial Conference and the Department of Justice should be be enacted shortly to amend the E-Government Act. Under the present law, a party has the right to file an unredacted version of a document under seal with the court. In accordance with the revised E-Government Act, the public file would contain only a redacted version of the document or a reference list identifying redacted information accessible only to the parties and the court. He added that the E-Government Subcommittee and the advisory committees are now implementing the rulemaking requirements of the Act.

Mr. Rabiej reported that the Class Action Fairness Act was expected to be brought to the Senate floor for debate sometime in June.

He noted that comprehensive crime victims' rights legislation had passed the Senate in April 2004 on a 96-1 vote. It would give criminal victims a broad array of rights in such areas as protection against the accused, notice of proceedings, being heard at court proceedings, conferring with prosecutors, and receiving restitution. He added that the legislation was expected to pass the House of Representatives, but the chair of the House Judiciary Committee appeared to be holding up the legislation for tactical reasons.

Mr. Rabiej said that the crime victims legislation will have an impact on the criminal rules. He explained that the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules had a separate proposal ready for final approval that would amend FED. R. CRIM. P. 32 to extend the right of allocution to victims of all crimes, not just victims of violence or sexual abuse.

Mr. Rabiej reported that two more bills had been introduced in the preceeding week that appeared to be moving quickly through the legislative process. First, he said, a hearing would be held within a week on H.R. 4547, a bill designed to protect children from drug violence. He noted that it would directly amend FED. R. CRIM. P. 11 to impose additional conditions on a court before it may accept a plea agreement. The second new bill (H.R. 4571), designed to limit "frivolous filings," would directly amend FED. R. CIV. P. 11 by mandating that a judge impose sanctions for a violation of the rule.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. Cecil pointed out that the agenda book for the committee meeting contained a status report on the educational and research projects of the Federal Judicial Center. (Agenda Item 4)

He reported that the Center was completing work on developing a new weighted caseload formula for the district courts. He explained that the study had been completed without requiring judges to keep detailed diaries of their daily activities.

Mr. Cecil noted that the Center had also completed a report comparing class actions in the federal and state courts. Among other things, the report addresses why attorneys bring cases in one court system rather than the other and finds few differences between federal and state judges and cases. Finally, he pointed to a new Center report on sealed court settlements. One of the findings of the report is that only 1 of every 227 civil cases in the federal courts contains a sealed settlement.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Alito and Professor Schiltz presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Alito's memorandum and attachments of May 14, 2004. (Agenda Item 6)

Amendments for Final Approval

FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(6)

Judge Alito said that the proposed amendments to Rule 4(a)(6) (reopening the time to file an appeal) provides an avenue of relief for parties who fail to file a timely appeal because they have not received notice of the entry of judgment against them. The amendment allows a court to reopen the time to appeal if certain conditions are met. First, the court must find that the party did not receive notice of the judgment within 21 days after entry. Second, the party must move to reopen the time to appeal within 7 days after receiving notice of the entry of judgment. And third, the party must move to reopen within 180 after entry of the judgment.

Judge Alito pointed out that use of the word "notice," appearing twice in the rule, has been unclear. Most courts have interpreted the existing rule as requiring that the type of notice required to trigger the 7-day period to reopen be written notice. Others, though, have included other types of communications. The proposed amendment, he said, offers a clear solution by specifying that notice must be the formal clerk's office notice required under FED. R. CIV. P. 77(d).

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. APP. P. 26(a)(4) and 45(a)(2)

Judge Alito stated that the proposed amendments to Rule 26 (computing time) and 45 (when court is open) would replace the incorrect phrase "Presidents' Day" with "Washington's Birthday," the official, statutory name of the holiday.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. APP. P. 27(d)(1)(E)

Judge Alito explained that Rule 32 (form of briefs) sets out typeface and type-style requirements. But Rule 27, which specifies the requirements for motions, does not. The proposed amendment would add a new Subdivision (E) to Rule 27(d)(1) to make it clear

that the typeface requirements of Rule 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Rule 32(a)(6) apply to motions papers.

Judge Alito said that the proposed amendment had received support during the public comment period, although one comment suggested increasing the number of words allowed in motions. He said that there was also some sentiment to express the length limits in terms of words, rather than pages. But, he explained, clerks of court favor a page limit because it is much easier to verify.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. APP. P. 28(c) & (h), 28.1, 32(a)(7)(C), and 34(d)

Judge Alito reported that the current rules say very little about briefing in cases involving cross-appeals. As a result, local rules fill in the gaps with procedural guidance. The advisory committee, he said, recommended moving the few provisions in the current national rules addressing cross-appeals into a new Rule 28.1 and adding several new provisions to fill the gaps in the existing rules. The new Rule 28.1 (cross-appeals) would parallel Rule 28 (briefs). In addition, conforming amendments would be made to Rule 28(c) (briefs), 32(a)(7)(C) (certificate of compliance), and 34(d) (oral argument).

The provisions of the new rule, he said, follow the local rules of every circuit save one. They would authorize four briefs and specify their lengths and colors. (1) The appellant's principal brief would be limited to 14,000 words. (2) The appellee's combined response brief and cross-appeal principal brief would be limited to 16,500 words. (3) The appellant's response and reply brief would be limited to 14,000 words. (4) Finally, the appellees's reply brief would be limited to 7,000 words.

Judge Alito said that the lawyers who had commented on the proposal uniformly had recommended higher word limits, while the judges who had commented wanted fewer words. Professor Schiltz added that the local rules of the circuits generally prescribe word limits of 14,000, 14,000, and 7,000 for the four briefs. The advisory committee, he said, had decided to increase the second brief to 16,500 words because it serves two functions — responding to the appellant's principal brief and initiating the principal brief in the cross-appeal.

Several members said that the advisory committee's proposal to authorize an additional 2,500 words for the second brief was a sound compromise that should accommodate most cases and result in fewer motions by attorneys seeking word extensions.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

Judge Alito reported that the the proposed new Rule 32.1 (citing judicial dispositions) had attracted more than 500 public comments.

He noted that the proposed rule enjoyed the support of the major bar associations. It would equalize the treatment of unpublished opinions with other types of non-precedential materials presented to the courts of appeals. The rule, he emphasized, would merely prevent a court of appeals from prohibiting the citation of unpublished opinions. It would not require a court to give unpublished opinions any weight or precedential value, or even to pay any attention to them. It would just allow the parties to cite them. He said that prohibiting the citation of court opinions undermines confidence in the courts of appeals and the judiciary. It implies that there is something second-class about unpublished opinions. The practice, he said, is very difficult to explain to lay people and most practitioners.

On the other hand, he pointed out, opponents of the rule claim that it will have an adverse impact on judges because they will have to spend more of their limited time on crafting unpublished opinions. This, it is claimed, would both detract from the quality of judges' published opinions and lead to the issuance of more one-sentence orders. He noted, too, that opponents of the rule assert that it will inevitably require lawyers to take the time to read unpublished opinions and increase expenses for their clients.

Judge Alito emphasized that the advisory committee had taken the adverse comments very seriously, but it had concluded that there is simply no empirical support for them. He noted that a number of the federal circuits currently permit citation of unpublished opinions. The committee, he said, had not received any comments from judges on the courts allowing citation that the practice has increased their work. Moreover, he added, the trend at both the federal and state levels is moving away from non-citation rules.

Judge Alito said that, as a result of the public comments, the advisory committee had deleted from the proposed rule a clause that would have prohibited a court of appeals from prohibiting or restricting citation of unpublished opinions "unless that prohibition or restriction is generally imposed upon the citation of all judicial opinions, orders, judgments, or other written dispostions."

Judge Levi observed that the sheer size of the body of comments was daunting, even though many of the comments seemed to copy each other. He congratulated Professor Schiltz for a superb job in summarizing the comments.

One of the members suggested that the key issue was not citation, but the status of unpublished opinions. He pointed out that the committee note refers to unpublished opinions as "official actions" of the court. But, he noted, they are commonly crafted by law clerks and only endorsed by judges. They do not receive the same scrutiny as published opinions and clearly do not represent the views of the full court. The proposed rule, he said, would elevate unpublished opinions into actions of the court and give them a status that they do not presently have. He recommended that the proposal be deferred and the circuits be given time to issue their own rules addressing the contents and effect of unpublished opinions. He added that this approach would promote transparency, for the circuits would articulate what they are doing with regard to unpublished opinions.

One lawyer-member suggested that local non-citation rules pose a serious perception problem for the courts of appeals. He said that it is difficult to explain to a client that a court has decided a similar case in the recent past, but the case cannot be cited to the same court. He added that, regardless of precedential value, an unpublished opinion is in fact an official disposition by a government body.

Two members pointed out that the proposed rule had given rise to concern among state-court leadership as to the use by the federal courts of unpublished state-court opinions. For example, a federal court applying the doctrine in *Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins* might cite an unpublished state-court opinion as establishing binding state law in a way that the opinion was not intended to be used. Judge Alito responded that the advisory committee's deliberations had focused on citing a federal circuit court's own decisions, not on citing state-court opinions. Moreover, he said, the rule does not address what weight is to be given to unpublished opinions. He added, though, that he would not object to amending the rule to limit its application specifically to federal opinions.

One participant pointed out that unpublished opinions are widely available today, and the circuits are free to give them precedence or not, as they see fit. He argued that lawyers should be free to call a court's attention to cases decided by their colleagues that have similar facts and issues. Other panels of the court, he said, should be made aware of what one panel has done with a similar pattern of facts, particularly in sentencing guideline cases. He added that it would be beneficial for courts to look at their unpublished opinions as part of their efforts to achieve consistency and reliability in circuit case law.

One member observed that there are very strong arguments on both sides of the issue, but on balance he favored allowing the courts of appeals to continue their non-

citation policies. He said that the adverse consequences predicted by opponents of the rule might well come to pass. He emphasized the vital need for courts to have a two-tiered opinion system because some cases simply do not deserve the same time and attention as others. He also said that he was not convinced that it is appropriate to compare unpublished opinions of a court of appeals with other types of nonprecedential materials cited to the court. Unpublished opinions, he said, inevitably carry far more weight with the lawyers and the court because they have been signed off on by three judges of the deciding court.

One member noted that he had been struck by how strongly a number of judges feel about the issue. He said that the arguments on both sides appear to be empirical in nature, but they are essentially not provable at this point. He stressed the need for empirical research and suggested that the committee not be put in the position of accepting one side of the argument and rejecting the other without further data. He argued that appropriate research would focus on the practices and results in those circuits that allow citation of unpublished opinions. He conjectured that it should be possible to obtain good empirical data because several circuits now allow citation.

Judge Levi said that he agreed and had spoken with the Federal Judicial Center about what shape an empirical study might take. He emphasized that the proposed rule was very controversial. And in dealing with controversial matters, he said, the rules committees have consistently sought strong empirical support for proposed amendments. In this case, he noted, nine circuits now allow citation of unpublished opinions, and four do not. Researchers, for example, could examine the courts that allow citation to see whether disposition times have lengthened or the number of judgment orders has increased. In addition, judges and lawyers might be surveyed to examine the practical impact of citation policy on their work. Lawyers might be surveyed to examine whether citation policy affects the costs of legal practice. Attention might also be directed to the four circuits that prohibit citation to see whether there are any special conditions in those circuits that make them different.

Judge Levi added that it would not be advisable to seek Judicial Conference approval of the proposed new rule at this time without supporting empirical data. Obtaining the data would better inform the committee and take much of the passion out of the debate. If the data turn out to support the proposed rule, he said, the committee would be in a much better position to secure Conference approval.

Several participants endorsed Judge Levi's approach, citing the great sensitivity of the issue among circuit judges, the need for a period of reflection, and the value of gathering whatever empirical data can be produced. One member added that there were powerful arguments in favor of the proposed amendment, but it would be a mistake institutionally to go forward with a rule that has generated so much opposition. He said

that, as a matter of basic policy, the committee should proceed with a controversial proposal only if: (1) there is a compelling need for the rule; and (2) the committee is convinced that the opposition is clearly wrong. Other participants endorsed this analysis, emphasizing the need for empirical information and institutional restraint. They added that a year's delay for study would not cause any harm and may even lead some opponents to reassess their positions.

Judge Alito agreed that a study would be helpful, especially since opposition to the rule was based largely on empirical observations. Mr. Cecil added that the Research Division of the Federal Judicial Center was prepared to conduct the research. He cautioned, however, that the results of the study may not in fact solve the committee's problems. The key issue, he said, is how judges perform their work in chambers. That, he said, is a matter of utmost sensitivity.

Judge Kravitz moved to have the committee take no action on the proposed new Rule 32.1 and return it to the advisory committee, with the expectation that the advisory committee will work with the Federal Judicial Center to conduct appropriate empirical studies. The studies, for example, would explore the practical experience in the circuits that have adopted local rules allowing citation of unpublished opinions. The advisory committee would then have the discretion to make a fresh decision on the matter and return to the standing committee with a proposal, or not.

One member asked that the record reflect that the committee's discussion of the matter and its returning the rule to the advisory committee did not reflect a judgment by the Standing Committee on the merits of the proposal. Rather, he said, the committee's concerns were directed purely to instutional values and the rulemaking process. Judge Kravitz agreed to the clarification.

One member added that the advisory committee should take advantage of the delay to explore the impact of the rule on citing unpublished state-court opinions.

The committee without objection approved Judge Kravitz's motion by voice vote. Therefore, it decided to take no action on the proposed new Rule 32.1, return it to the advisory committee, and recommend that appropriate empirical study be undertaken.

FED. R. APP. P. 35(a)

Judge Alito reported that Rule 35(a) (en banc determination) and 28 U.S.C. § 46(c) both specify that "a majority of the circuit judges who are in regular active service" may order that an appeal or other proceeding be heard or reheard en banc. Although the standard applies to all the courts of appeals, he said, the circuits are divided in

interpreting the provision when one or more active judges are disqualified in a particular case. Seven circuits follow the "absolute majority" approach, counting disqualified judges in the base to calculate a majority. Six circuits follow the "case majority" approach, requiring a majority only of the active judges who are not recused.

Judge Alito emphasized that the advisory committee believes that whatever the rule means, it should mean the same all across the country. There is no principled basis, he said, for having different interpretations of the same rule. The primary objective of the proposed amendment, thus, was to promote national uniformity. The advisory committee, he said, believed that the better interpretation is the case majority approach because it is most consistent with what Congress must have intended in enacting the statute. He noted that 28 U.S.C. § 46(c) uses the phrase "circuit judges . . . in regular active service" twice. In the second sentence, the phrase clearly does not include disqualified judges, since disqualified judges obviously cannot participate in a case heard en banc. The proposed amendment to Rule 35(a), he added, was not meant to alter or affect the quorum requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Judge Small and Professor Morris presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Small's memorandum and attachments of May 17, 2004. (Agenda Item 7)

Amendments for Final Approval

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1007

Judge Small reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 1007 (lists, schedules, and statements) would require a debtor to file a mailing matrix with the court, a practice now required universally by local court rules. The matrix must include the names and addresses of all entities listed on Schedules D-H, including holders of executory contracts and unexpired leases.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 3004 and 3005

Judge Small explained that the proposed amendments to Rules 3004 (filing of claims by a debtor or trustee) and 3005 (filing of a claim, acceptance, or rejection by codebtor) deal with the situation where an entity other than the creditor files a proof of claim. The amendments to Rule 3004 make it clear that the third party may not file a proof of claim until the exclusive time has expired for the creditor to file its own proof of claim. In addition, FED. R. BANKR. P. 3005 would no longer permit the creditor to file a proof of claim to supersede the claim filed by the debtor or trustee. Instead, the creditor could amend the proof of claim filed by the debtor or trustee. The changes would make the rules consistent with § 501(c) of the Bankruptcy Code.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 4008

Judge Small reported that Rule 4008 (reaffirmation agreement) would be amended to establish a deadline of 30 days after entry of the order of discharge to file a reaffirmation agreement with the court. He said that some public comments had recommended a shorter period, and the advisory committee had considered a deadline of 10 days following discharge. But, he explained, the shorter time limit would not be practical because it takes several days for the the noticing center to process and distribute discharge notices.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 7004

Judge Small reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 7004 (process and service) would authorize the clerk of court to sign, seal, and issue a summons electronically. He noted that the rule does not address the service requirements for a summons, which are set out elsewhere in Rule 7004.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 9006

Judge Small stated that Rule 9006 (time) would be amended to remove any doubt that the additional three-day period given a responding party to act when service is made

on the party by specified means — by mail, by leaving it with the clerk, by electronic means, or by other means consented to by the party served — are added after a rule's prescribed period to act expires.

The committee considered and approved the proposed amendment to Rule 9006 in conjunction with a proposed parallel amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 6(e).

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

OFFICIAL FORMS 6-G, 16-D, and 17

Judge Small reported that the proposed amendments to the forms had not been published because they were technical in nature. The change to Form 6-G is required to conform the form to the proposed amendment to Rule 1007, and the revisions to Forms 16-D and 17 reflect the abrogation of Official Form 16-C in 2003. He asked that: (1) the changes to Form 16-D and 17 take effect on December 1, 2004; and (2) the change to Form 6-G take effect on December 1, 2005, to coincide with the effective date of the proposed amendments to Rule 1007.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments to the forms for final approval by voice vote.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. BANKR. P. 1009, 4002, and OFFICIAL FORM 6-I

Judge Small pointed out that the proposed amendments to Rule 1009 (amendments to schedules and statements), Rule 4002 (debtor's duties), and Form 6-I (schedule of debtors' current income) had been proposed by the Executive Office for United States Trustees. He noted that the amendment to Rule 4002 was controversial.

The U.S. trustee organization had asked the committee for a rule that would require debtors to bring a substantial number of documents with them to the meeting of creditors under § 341 of the Code. The proposal, he said, had attracted the attention and strong opposition of the debtors' bar. The advisory committee had received more than 80 letters from attorneys opposing the proposal, even though the committee had not approved or published it.

Judge Small noted that the advisory committee's consumer subcommittee had met in Washington to consider the proposal, and it had invited several knowledgeable trustees and attorneys to participate, along with representatives of the U.S. trustee organization. At the meeting, the subcommittee decided that the most of the proposed changes were not needed.

The full committee, however, decided to adopt a compromise amendment to Rule 4002 that would require debtors to bring with them to the § 341 meeting a government-issued picture identification, evidence of their social security number, evidence of their current income (such as a pay stub), their most recent federal income tax return, and statements for each of their depository accounts. That, he said, was the proposal that the advisory committee sought authority to publish.

Judge Small said that the proposed amendment to Rule 1009 specifies that if the debtor files an incorrect social security number, he or she must correct it and notify all those who received notice of the incorrect number.

The proposed change to Form 6-I would extend to Chapter 7 cases the requirement that a debtor divulge a non-filing spouse's income. The form's mandate to divulge currently applies only to Chapter 12 and 13 cases.

The committee without objection approved the proposed rule amendments for publication by voice vote. It also approved without objection the proposed amendment to the Official Form by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 7004

Judge Small explained that under the current Rule 7004 (process and service), the debtor's attorney must be served only if the summons and complaint are served on the debtor by mail. The proposed amendment would make it clear that the debtor's attorney must be served with a copy of any summons and complaint against the debtor, regardless of the manner of service on the debtor. The rule would also allow the attorney to request that service be made electronically.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(g) and 9001

Judge Small reported that the changes to Rule 2002 (notices) and 9001 (general definitions) were designed in large part to facilitate noticing national creditors. The proposed amendment to Rule 2002(g) would allow creditors to make arrangements with a

"notice provider" to have notices sent to them at a preferred address or addresses. Notices would normally be sent electronically, but the rule also covers the sending of paper notices to central addresses. The amendment to Rule 9001 would define a "notice provider" as any entity approved by the Administrative Office to give notice to creditors at a preferred address or addresses under the proposed amendment to Rule 2002(g).

Judge Small explained that the amendments could result in significant financial benefits to the judiciary and taxpayers because more creditors would sign up for electronic service of court notices. In light of the potential cost savings, the advisory committee had decided to pursue "fast track" promulgation of these two amendments — as well as the amendment to Rule 9036 approved by the Standing Committee in January 2004, which specifies that notice by electronic means is complete on transmission.

Under the fast track proposal, the rules would become effective on December 1, 2005, rather than December 1, 2006. They would be published for public comment in August 2004. Comments would be due by mid-February 2005. The advisory committee and Standing Committee could approve them by mail ballot and submit them to the Judicial Conference for approval at its March 2005 session. They would then be sent immediately to the Supreme Court, which could act on them before May 1, 2005. Mr. Rabiej added that the Court would be given copies of the amendments well in advance of the March 2005 Conference session to give the justices time to review them carefully.

Judge Small said that the advisory committee had carefully considered the rules at three meetings, and he did not anticipate any controversy over them. Professor Morris added that even though the primary thrust of the rules was to facilitate electronic notice, there would also be savings in processing paper notices under the rules because notice providers will be able to bundle notices to creditors and save postage costs.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

The committee also approved expediting approval of the amendments, together with the proposed amendment to Rule 9036 approved by the Standing Committee in January 2004.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Rosenthal and Professor Cooper presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Rosenthal's memorandum and attachments of May 17, 2004. (Agenda Item 8)

Amendments for Final Approval

FED. R. CIV. P. 6(e)

Judge Rosenthal reported that the proposed change to Rule 6(e) (additional time allowed following certain kinds of service) had been referred by the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules, which was considering parallel changes to FED. R. APP. P. 26(c). Under the existing Rule 6(e), there is some uncertainty in calculating the three additional days given a party to act when service is made on the party by mail, leaving it with the clerk of court, electronic means, or other means consented to by the party served.

The proposed clarifying amendment would specify that the three days are added after the prescribed period otherwise expires under Rule 6(a). Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays would be included in counting the additional three days, but the last day cannot be a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. Judge Rosenthal added that the committee note sets forth a number of practical examples calculating the time period.

One member asked why the advisory committee had not used the term "calendar days," as used in the appellate rules. Judge Rosenthal responded that the committee had considered that option, but had decided not to use "calendar days" because it is not found anywhere else in the civil rules.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CIV. P. 27(a)(2)

Judge Rosenthal said that the proposed change in Rule 27 (deposition before action or pending appeal) would merely correct an outdated reference in the rule to former Rule 4(d), which deals with serving a copy of the petition and a notice stating the time and place of a deposition hearing. The corrected reference makes clear that all forms of service under Rule 4 can be used to serve a petition to perpetuate testimony.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CIV. P. 45(a)

Judge Rosenthal reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 45 (subpoena) would close a small gap in the rule by requiring that a deposition subpoena state the method for recording testimony.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

SUPPLEMENTAL RULE B(1)(a)

Judge Rosenthal stated that the proposed amendment to Supplemental Rule B (attachment and garnishment) would bring the rule into conformity with case law. The amendment specifies that the time for determining whether a defendant is "found" in a district is the time that the verified complaint praying for attachment and the affidavit required by Rule B(1)(b) are filed.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

SUPPLEMENTAL RULE C(6)(b)

Judge Rosenthal reported that the proposed amendment to Supplemental Rule C(6) (responsive pleadings and interrogatories) would correct an oversight made during the course of the 2000 amendments to the rule. It would delete the rule's reference to a time 10 days after completed publication under Rule C(4). That rule requires publication of notice only if the property is not released within 10 days after execution of process. Execution of process will always be earlier than publication.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

Amendments for Publication

SUPPLEMENTAL RULE G

Professor Cooper explained that civil forfeiture proceedings have long been governed by the Supplementary Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims because of tradition, the in rem nature of forfeiture proceedings, and many forfeiture statutes expressly invoking the supplemental rules. But, he said, the relationship had come under considerable strain because of an explosion in the number of civil forfeiture proceedings. In particular, court interpretations of the supplemental rules in forfeiture cases have been cited by the admiralty bar as creating problems for maritime practice.

Professor Cooper noted that the supplemental rules had been amended in 2000 to draw some distinctions between forfeiture and admiralty practice. At about the same time, Congress enacted the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act, which required a number of other changes in the rules as they apply to civil forfeiture proceedings. Soon after

enactment of the legislation, the Department of Justice approached the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, suggesting that it was time to consolidate all the civil forfeiture procedures into a single supplemental rule that would be consistent with the new statute.

Professor Cooper said that the advisory committee had appointed a subcommittee that produced a proposed new Rule G after several conference calls, a meeting in December 2003, and substantial input from the Department of Justice and the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. The new rule, he said, was ready for publication, together with conforming amendments to SUPPLEMENTAL RULES A, C, and E and FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(1)(E).

Professor Cooper pointed out that the advisory committee had devoted a great deal of attention to a proposal by the Department of Justice to define in the rule what "standing" is needed to assert a claim to property once the government initiates a civil forfeiture action. The Department had proposed that the rule limit standing to a person qualifying as an "owner" within the statutory definition of the innocent-owner defense. The committee, however, concluded that defining standing to file a claim should be left to developing case law, not the rules. Instead, proposed Rule G(8) only sets forth the procedural framework for determining a claimant's standing and deciding a claimant's motion to dismiss.

In the same vein, Professor Cooper reported that the advisory committee had not included a provision in the new rule barring the use of FED. R. CRIM. P. 41(g) to accomplish the return of property outside Rule G. This issue, too, would be left to case law development.

Professor Cooper proceeded to describe the provisions of the new rule. He noted that subdivision (1) specifies that Rule G governs in rem forfeiture actions arising from federal statutes. It also states that Supplemental Rules C and E and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure apply to the extent that Rule G does not address an issue.

Subdivision (2) would replace the particularized pleading in the existing rule with a statement of sufficiently detailed facts to support a reasonable belief that the government will be able to meet its burden of proof at a trial.

Subdivision (3), dealing with arrest warrants, would provide that only the court, on a finding of probable cause, may issue a warrant to arrest property not in the government's possession or not subject to a judicial restraining order. The existing rule allows issuance of a summons and warrant by the clerk without a probable-cause finding. In addition, the proposed rule would require the warrant and any supplemental service to be served as soon as practicable, unless the court orders a different time. Professor

Cooper noted that the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers had expressed concern that the change would encourage courts to permit more filings under seal. But, he added, the rule does not address when it is appropriate to file under seal. It merely reflects the consequences for execution when sealing or a stay is ordered.

Professor Cooper noted that subdivision (4), the basic notice requirement, reflects the traditional practice of publishing notice of an in rem action. For the first time, the rule would recognize publication on an official government-created Internet forfeiture site to provide a single, easily identified means of notice. He pointed out that there is no such site now, but if the government were to establish one, it would provide more effective notice than newspaper publication.

In addition, proposed paragraph (4)(b) would require the government to send individual notice of the action and a copy of the complaint to any person who reasonably appears to be a potential claimant, based on the facts known to the government. Although the National Association of Defense Lawyers had asked for formal service of the summons in the manner required by FED. R. CIV. P. 4, the proposed rule does not require that level of service. Rather, due process requirements are satisfied by practical means reasonably calculated to accomplish actual notice.

The proposed rule also specifies that the notice must be sent by means reasonably calculated to reach the potential claimant. Notice may be sent to the attorney if the potential claimant has an attorney, and that this may be the most effective notice in many cases. Notice to an incarcerated person must be sent to the place of incarceration. The rule, however, does not attempt to deal with the due process problems implicated by *Dusenbery v. United States,* 534 U.S. 161 (2002), where a particular prison has deficient procedures for delivering notice to prisoners.

Subdivisions (4) and (5) together set out deadlines for filing claims and motions. Professor Cooper pointed out that the provision dealing with filing an answer or motion under FED. R. CIV. P. 12 had generated advisory committee discussion. Subdivision 5(b) integrates regular Rule 12 practice within 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(4)(B) by providing that an answer or motion be filed no later than 20 days after a claim is filed.

Professor Cooper pointed out that under subdivision (5), a claim must identify the claimant and state the claimant's interest in the property. If the claim is filed by a person asserting an interest in the property as a bailee, it must identify the bailor.

Subdivision (6) would allow the government to serve special interrogatories under FED. R. CIV. P. 33 limited to the claimant's identity and relationship to the property. The purpose, he said, is to elicit information promptly so the government can move to dismiss

for lack of standing. The government need not respond to a claimant's motion to dismiss until 20 days after the claimant has answered the interrogatories.

Professor Cooper noted that subdivision (7) would allow property to be sold on an interlocutory basis. The court could order the property sold, for example, if it were perishable or at risk of diminution of value. Likewise, it could be ordered sold if the expense of keeping the property is excessive, or if the court finds other good cause.

Professor Cooper pointed out that subdivision (8) governs motions. He noted that paragraph (8)(A) states that a party with standing to contest the lawfulness of the seizure of property may move to suppress use of the property as evidence. He explained that the advisory committee had deleted a reference in the proposed rule to constitutional standing under the Fourth Amendment. Likewise, a party who establishes standing to contest forfeiture may move to dismiss the action under FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b). At any time before trial, the government may also move to strike a claim or answer because the claimant lacks standing. Professor Cooper pointed out that the court must decide the government's motion before any motion by the claimant to dismiss the action. The claimant has the burden of establishing standing based on a preponderance of the evidence.

Professor Cooper stated that paragraph (8)(d) deals with a petition to release property under the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act. The venue provision in the rule had been inserted at the request of the Department of Justice. It is derived from the statute and serves as a guide to practitioners. It makes clear that a civil forfeiture action is a "civil action" eligible for transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1404. Finally, Professor Cooper noted that the rule contains a provision allowing a claimant to seek to mitigate a forfeiture under the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment.

Judge Rosenthal reported that the Style Subcommittee had reviewed the proposed rule and had suggested a few improvements in language. She asked for and received permission to adopt the Style Subcommittee suggestions without having to return to the Standing Committee before publication.

Judge Rosenthal added that the advisory committee anticipated that a significant number of comments would be received during the publication period, but from a narrow section of the bar. Judge Levi and Professor Cooper pointed out that the committee had benefitted greatly from the excellent suggestions and input from the Department of Justice and the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

The committee without objection approved the proposed new rule for publication by voice vote.

SUPPLEMENTAL RULES A, C, and E and FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(1)(E)

Professor Cooper reported that the proposed changes to Supplemental Rules A, C, and E and FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(1)(E) were conforming amendments to account for the consolidation of civil forfeiture provisions into the new Rule G. He noted that the amendment to Rule 26(a)(1)(E) (initial disclosures) would add civil forfeiture actions to the list of cases exempted from the initial disclosure requirements.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CIV. P. 50(b)

Judge Rosenthal reported that the proposed amendments to Rule 50(b) would remove a trap that occurs when a party moves for judgment as a matter of law under Rule 50(a) before the close of all the evidence and then fails to renew the motion at the close of all the evidence. The revised rule, she said, would delete the requirement that a renewal motion be made at the close of all the evidence. It responds to court decisions that have begun to move away from a strict interpretation of the current rule requiring that a post-verdict motion be supported by a motion for judgment as a matter of law at the literal close of all the evidence. Professor Cooper added that the amendments are fully consistent with the Seventh Amendment.

In addition, the rule would be amended to add a time limit of 10 days after discharge of the jury for a party to make a post-trial motion when a trial ends without a verdict or with a verdict that does not dispose of all issues suitable for resolution by verdict.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY
FED. R. CIV. P. 16, 26, 33, 34, 37, and 45 and FORM 35

Judge Rosenthal reported that the package of "electronic discovery" amendments was the product of a lengthy and thorough examination by the advisory committee into whether the current rules are adequate to regulate discovery of electronically stored information. She pointed out that the committee had enjoyed invaluable cooperation and input from the bar on the project, and it had conducted three productive conferences with lawyers, judges, and law professors on electronic discovery. She thanked Professor Capra and Fordham Law School for hosting the most recent conference, held in New York in

February 2004. She also thanked Kenneth Withers of the Federal Judicial Center for his major assistance and wise counsel.

Judge Rosenthal explained that the advisory committee had initiated the electronic discovery project with a good deal of skepticism regarding the need for rule changes. But as the project progressed and lawyers articulated their experiences, she said, the committee moved to a consensus that the existing discovery rules do not fit current practice as well as they should. The committee, she emphasized, had reached the conclusion that the national rules needed to be amended and the amendments were needed now.

Judge Rosenthal pointed out that the materials in the committee's agenda book demonstrate that there are many real differences between electronic discovery and other types of discovery. For one thing, computer-stored information is dynamic and often changes without active human intervention. Unlike paper information, moreover, computer information may be incomprehensible without the machine and software that created it.

She said that the bar had informed the committee that discovery had become more difficult, burdensome, and costly because the current rules — even though they are very flexible — are simply not specific enough with regard to electronic discovery. She pointed out that some federal district courts now have local rules in place governing electronic discovery, and pertinent case law is beginning to develop. In addition, state court systems have issued or are considering rules to deal with electronic discovery. She concluded that if the advisory committee were to wait too long to propose amendments to the national rules, it would run the risk of having local rules proliferate and wide variations develop in federal practice.

Judge Rosenthal summarized the advisory committee's key proposals, pointing out that they would: (1) require parties and the court early in a case to discuss issues relating to electronically stored information and privilege waiver; (2) clarify and modernize the definition of discoverable electronic information; (3) address the form in which electronically stored information must be produced; and (4) provide a procedure for handling inadvertent privilege waivers.

She explained that the committee had heard repeatedly from lawyers that privilege review of discovery materials is very time consuming and expensive. Electronically stored information, moreover, presents special problems because privileged information, though not readily visible, may be embedded in electronic documents or found in metadata. She emphasized that the proposed amendments respect the Rules Enabling Act and avoid dealing with the substance of privilege law. Rather, they only set forth a procedure for retrieving inadvertently produced privileged information.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f) and FORM 35

Professor Cooper said that the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f) (conference of the parties) were non-controversial. They would require the parties at the 26(f) conference to discuss any issues relating to preserving discoverable information and to include in their discovery plan: (1) any issues relating to disclosure or discovery of electronically stored information, including the form in which it should be produced; and (2) whether, on agreement of the parties, the court should enter an order protecting the right to assert privilege after production of privileged information. He noted that the latter item was a response to concerns expressed to the committee by members of the bar regarding the enormous burden imposed by having to screen voluminous documents for privilege.

He said that it was generally accepted that the discovery process moves much more quickly and efficiently when the parties in a case agree on how to deal with privilege issues. He said that the proposed amendment contemplates that the parties will enter an agreement. The court order will enhance the status of the agreement and may well affect future waiver litigation. In addition, Form 35 would be amended to include a new section dealing with disclosure of electronic information and privilege protection.

FED. R. CIV. P. 16(b)

Professor Cooper reported that the proposed amendments to FED. R. CIV. P. 16(b) (scheduling and planning) would alert the court to the need, early in the litigation, to address the handling of discovery of electronically stored information and to consider adopting the parties' agreement for protection against privilege waiver.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(5)

Professor Cooper explained that the proposed amendment to FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(5) (claims of privilege or protection of trial preparation materials) specifies that when a party produces information without intending to waive a claim of privilege, it may, within a reasonable time, notify any party receiving the information that it claims a privilege. The receiving party must then promptly return or destroy the specified information and any copies. Professor Cooper added that the committee note specifies that the amendment does not address the controversial question of whether there has in fact been a privilege waiver. It merely provides a procedure for addressing privilege issues.

One member said that the proposed waiver provision would not make a real difference in practice. Parties, he said, will still have to review all documents in order to avoid the danger that a state court may find a waiver of privilege. He urged the

committee to publish a much more ambitious proposal that would address the waiver issue itself. He suggested that this would be a great opportunity for the committee to make a major improvement in practice.

Judge Rosenthal responded that the advisory committee was very sympathetic to that approach, but it had opted for a more cautious amendment because of concerns over the limits of the Rules Enabling Act. The statute specifies that any rule "creating, abolishing, or modifying an evidentiary privilege shall have no force or effect unless approved by Act of Congress." (28 U.S.C. § 2074) Another participant added that privilege issues implicate fundamental questions of federalism that rules committees should approach with hesitancy.

Other participants countered, though, that a bolder waiver proposal to protect parties against inadvertent waiver of privilege would in fact be consistent with the Rules Enabling Act. They asserted that a federal rules provision could specify that an inadvertent turnover of privileged material through the federal discovery process does not constitute a waiver of privilege. The provision, they said, would be procedural in nature, not substantive. It would not address the scope of the privilege itself. Instead, it would merely address the procedural consequences arising as a result of the mandatory federal discovery process. In other words, if a court requires a party to produce materials through the federal discovery rules, those rules can prescribe the character of the privilege waiver without modifying the content of the privilege itself.

One member pointed out that the advisory committee's proposed amendment may put a court in an awkward position because its order may not effectively bind third parties or prevail in a later proceeding before another court. He noted that there is a split in state law as to whether third parties are bound.

One member pointed out, though, that the proposed amendment would still be a valuable change because — despite uncertainty as to the scope of the privilege protection — parties are in a much better position with a court order than without one. Judge Rosenthal added that the pertinent committee note addresses the issue in general terms by stating that a court order adopting the parties' agreement "advances enforcement of the agreement betweeen the parties and adds protection againt nonparty assertions that privilege has been waived."

Another member noted that the proposed new Rule 26(b)(5)(B) states that a party receiving privileged information must promptly return or destroy it upon being notified by the producing party that it intends to assert a claim of privilege. He suggested that the rule might be amended to require the receiving party to certify that they have in fact destroyed the information in question.

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)

Judge Rosenthal reported that the proposed new Rule 26(b)(2)(C) (discovery scope and limits) would establish a two-tiered approach to electronic discovery. A producing party would automatically have to turn over requested information that is "reasonably accessible." Even if it makes a showing that the information sought is not "reasonably accessible," the requesting party may then ask the court to order discovery of the information "for good cause." She pointed out that this approach is similar to the two-tiered approach embodied in the 2000 amendments to Rule 26(b)(1), under which parties may obtain discovery automatically as to matters "relevant to the claim or defense of any party," but they may ask the court for good cause to order discovery of any matter "relevant to the subject matter involved in the action."

One member pointed out that there is no provision in the proposed amendments explicitly addressing the sharing of discovery costs. He noted that judges already have general authority under Rule 26 to shift discovery costs, but recommended that the proposed amendments themselves, or the accompanying committee notes, specify that a judge may assess part or all of the costs of certain discovery requests on the requesting party. One member suggested that language covering cost sharing be added to the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(2)(C). Judge Rosenthal responded that it might be preferable to include such language in the committee note, rather than the rule.

Professor Cooper pointed out that the committee note in fact quotes the *Manual for Complex Litigation*, instructing that certain forms of production be conditioned upon a showing of need or the sharing of expenses. He pointed out, however, that the Standing Committee has been very sensitive to cost sharing or cost bearing, and it is a controversial concept for many members of the bar. Mr. Rabiej added that language regarding cost shifting had been proposed by the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules in the 2000 amendments to Rule 26, but it had been removed by the Standing Committee.

Judge Kravitz moved to add language at the end of the proposed amendment to Rule 26(b)(2)(C) to specify that if a responding party shows that requested information is not reasonably accessible, the court may order discovery of the information "on such terms as the court may determine." He added that no explicit language as to cost sharing should be included in the text of the rule itself, but a reference to costs could be included in the committee note.

The committee without objection approved Judge Kravitz's motion by voice vote.

FED. R. CIV. P. 33

Judge Rosenthal noted that the proposed amendment to Rule 33(d) (option to produce business records in response to interrogatories) makes it clear that a party may respond to interrogatories by using electronically stored information.

FED. R. CIV. P. 34

Judge Rosenthal explained that the proposed amendments to Rule 34(a) (production of documents and inspection of tangible things) draw a new distinction between "electronically stored information" and "documents." The word "document" in the current rule, she said, is simply not adequate to capture all the types of information stored on computers. The proposed rule, thus, would acknowledge explicitly the expanded importance and variety of electronically stored information subject to discovery. She also pointed out that under the amendment copying, testing, and sampling would apply explicitly both to electronically stored information and tangible things.

She noted that the proposed amendments to Rule 34(b) permit a party to specify the form in which it wants electronically stored information to be produced. If no request is made as to form, or if there is no agreement by the parties, the producing party may turn over the information in the form in which it is ordinarily maintained or in an electronically searchable form. One member suggested that the term "electronically accessible" might be more appropriate than "electronically searchable."

FED. R. CIV. P. 45

Judge Rosenthal reported that Rule 45 (subpoenas) would be amended to conform it to the various changes proposed in the discovery rules to address electronically stored information.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments to Rules 16, 26, 33, 34, and 45 and Form 35 for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CIV. P. 37

Judge Rosenthal reported that the committee had approved a limited "safe harbor" provision in Rule 37 (sanctions for failure to cooperate in discovery) that would give a party protection when information that it is asked to produce has been destroyed or lost through the routine business operation of its computer systems. The loss would occur, for example, when information is destroyed as a result of recycling back-up tapes or automatically overwriting deleted information. She reported that this was the only provision among the proposed amendments in which there had been any disagreement

within the advisory committee. She pointed out, though, that the disagreement had been only as to the actual language of the proposed amendment, and not as to the need for including a limited safe harbor provision in the rules.

As a consequence, she explained, the advisory committee had decided to present the Standing Committee with two alternative versions of a safe harbor provision in FED. R. CIV. P. 37(f). She added that the committee clearly preferred Alternative 1, but several members also wanted to publish Alternative 2 for public comment. Both alternatives, she said, are very narrow. The essential difference between them concerns the standard of culpability applicable to the producing party. Alternative 1 would establish a reasonableness standard, while Alternative 2 would require intentional or reckless conduct. She reported that one member of the advisory committee strongly opposed publishing the second alternative because it would inappropriately limit a court's discretion.

Judge Rosenthal said that whether or not both alternate versions are published, it should be made clear in the publication that the committee is continuing to consider both culpability standards and would like to generate public comment specifically directed to them.

One participant emphasized that Rule 37 deals with sanctions for violation of discovery obligations. But, he said, spoliation issues are generally governed by a separate body of law. He pointed out that what occurs before a case is filed in the district court is not, and cannot be, covered by the rules. Thus, he said, the rules committees should focus on a party's obligation under applicable discovery law, not on spoliation. He suggested that the committee note state explicitly that spoliation is governed by a different body of law, even though discovery and spoliation issues often tend to blend in practice.

He added that the culpability standard under discovery law is negligence, including intentional neglect. But, he said, the key problem is not so much the applicable standard as the boundary of obligations arising before a case is filed and discovery obligations that attach after a case has been filed. Other members pointed out that lawyers' legal and ethical obligations before filing are clearly established by existing law.

One member said that even though the bar had made a compelling case for a safe harbor at the recent Fordham conference, it appeared that any effective protective provision would lie outside the scope of the rules. He suggested that it would take legislation to achieve the sort of protection that the bar seeks. Other members responded, though, that an effective safe harbor provision could indeed be crafted with some additional work.

In light of the difficult competing considerations and the committee discussions, Judge Rosenthal agreed to craft some additional language to address the concerns expressed by the participants. She emphasized the need to include a safe harbor provision together with the rest of the proposed electronic discovery amendments because all the amendments fit together as part of a single, interrelated package.

On the second day of the meeting, Judge Rosenthal presented the committee with revised language for both the text of the proposed Rule 37 amendments and the accompanying committee note. She noted that the proposed revisions would make it clear that the rule does not address the actions of a party before a case is filed.

Judge Rosenthal said that the recommendation of the advisory committee was to publish only one alternative for public comment. But, she said, that version would include appropriate brackets and footnotes to draw the attention of the public to the fact that the committee would continue to study what standard of fault must be met to take a party out of the safe harbor protection.

Dean Kane moved to approve publication of the proposed amendment, together with appropriate cover language —— to be drafted by the advisory committee — directing the public's attention to the committee's desire to receive public comment on the applicable culpability standard and the other issues identified by the committee. The motion was approved without objection by voice vote.

Amendments for Delayed Publication

1. Pure Style Revisions

FED. R. CIV. P. 38-63, except FED. R. CIV. P. 45

Judge Rosenthal reported that the advisory committee was planning to publish the complete set of restyled civil rules as a single package in February 2005. She noted that the Standing Committee at earlier meetings had approved publication of restyled Rules 1-37 and 45. She asked for authority to publish the current batch of proposed amendments — Rules 38-63, except Rule 45 — subject to further refinement before publication. And she reported that the remaining civil rules, Rules 64-86, would be presented to the Standing Committee at its January 2005 meeting.

Judge Rosenthal said that the advisory committee, in partnership with the Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee and its consultants, would continue to make refinements in the language of the rules. It would also resolve a series of "global" style

issues and present a completed style package of all the civil rules at the January 2005 meeting.

The committee without objection authorized delayed publication of the proposed amendments by voice vote.

2. "Style-Substance" Amendments

FED. R. CIV. P. 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 26, 30, 31, 36, 40

Judge Rosenthal reported that the goal of the restyling project was very narrow — simply to restate the present language of the civil rules as clearly as possible in consistent English without any change in meaning. Nevertheless, she said, as part of the restyling effort, the advisory committee had approved a limited number of minor, non-controversial improvements in language that are arguably more than purely stylistic in nature. She pointed out that the proposed changes, although possibly substantive, reflect sound common sense, universal current practice, or the likely intention of the drafters. Accordingly, she said, the advisory committee would like authority to publish in tandem with the style package a separate track of proposed "style-substance" changes to Rules 4(k), 8(a) & (d), 9(h), 11(a), 14(b), 16(c)(1), 26(g), 30(b), 31(c), 36(b), and 40. She added that a few additional minor "style-substance" changes might be presented to the Standing Committee at the January 2005 meeting.

One member spoke against including the proposed deletion of Rule 8(d)(1) in the "style-substance" package. Although the proposed committee note suggested that the current rule is redundant and no longer needed, the member said that it might be helpful to retain it. Judge Rosenthal responded that it was important to restrict the "style-substance" package to purely non-controversial items. Thus, in light of the objection expressed, the advisory committee would drop the proposal from the list of proposed amendments.

The committee without objection approved the proposed "style-substance" amendments for deferred publication by voice vote.

Informational Item

Judge Rosenthal reported that the advisory committee had published a proposed new FED. R. CIV. P. 5.1 (constitutional challenge to a statute) to implement 28 U.S.C. § 2403 and replace the final three sentences of FED. R. CIV. P. 24(c). The statute and current rule require a court to certify to the attorney general of the United States or a state when a federal or state statute has been drawn into question. In addition, the rule requires

a party challenging the constitutionality of a statute to call the court's attention to its duty to certify.

Judge Rosenthal pointed out that the reporting obligation is routinely — and unintentionally — violated, perhaps because it is buried in Rule 24. Thus, the advisory committee had proposed moving the reporting requirements from Rule 24 to the proposed new Rule 5.1 in order to attract attention to the reporting obligations by locating them next to the rules that require notice by service and pleading.

In addition, the new rule would have added a requirement that a party drawing into question the constitutionality of a statute serve the pertinent attorney general by mail with a Notice of Constitutional Question and a copy of the underlying court pleading or motion. The advisory committee had thought that the additional requirement would impose only a slight burden on the challenging party.

Judge Rosenthal pointed out that there had been few public comments on the rule. But, she said, concerns emerged in the advisory committee that the new notice and mailing obligation was unwise and should be reexamined. Accordingly, the committee decided to defer the proposed new rule and not present it at this time to the Standing Committee for final approval.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Carnes and Professor Schlueter presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Carnes's memorandum and attachment of May 18, 2004. (Agenda Item 9)

Amendments for Final Approval

FED. R. CRIM. P. 12.2(d)

Judge Carnes reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 12.2(d) (failure to comply with the requirement to give notice of an insanity defense or submit to a mental examination) would fill a gap created in the 2002 amendments to the rule. The current rule provides no sanction when the defendant does not comply with the requirement to disclose the results and reports of an expert examination. He pointed out that a comment had been received from the defense bar that the proposed amendment goes too far. But, he noted that the decision to impose a sanction is discretionary with the court.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 29(c), 33(b), 34(b), and 45(b)

Judge Carnes explained that the proposed amendments to Rule 29 (motion for a judgment of acquittal), Rule 33 (motion for a new trial), Rule 34 (motion to arrest judgment), and Rule 45 (computing time) would remove the requirement that the court rule on a post-trial motion within seven days after a guilty verdict or after the court discharges the jury.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 32(i)(4)

Judge Carnes said that the proposed amendment to Rule 32(i)(4) (opportunity to speak at sentencing) would extend the right of allocution — which currently applies only to victims of crimes of violence or sexual abuse — to victims in all felony cases. The rule, he said, allows the victim either to speak at sentencing or to submit a written statement to the judge. If a crime involves multiple victims, the rule gives the court discretion to limit the number of victims who will address the court.

Judge Carnes added that Congress was likely to pass comprehensive legislation in the near future dealing with victims' rights. He said that the legislation, among other things, would give a wide array of rights to victims of all offenses, including victims of petty offenses and other misdemeanors. He stated that if the pending legislation were enacted, the committee should ask to withdraw the rule.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.1(b) and (c)

Judge Carnes reported that the proposed amendments to Rule 32.1 (revoking or modifying probation or supervised relief) would address an oversight in the rules by giving the defendant the right to allocution at a revocation or modification hearing.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for final approval by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 59

Judge Carnes reported that the proposed new Rule 59 (matters before a magistrate judge) would set forth the procedures for a district judge to review the decision of a

magistrate judge. He explained that the rule is derived in part from FED. R. CIV. P. 72. It distinguishes between "dispositive" and "nondispositive" matters, but does not attempt to define the terms, which are widely used in case law.

Judge Carnes pointed out that on a nondispositive matter, the district judge must consider any timely objections to the magistrate judge's order and set aside any part of the order that is contrary to law or clearly erroneous. But if a party fails to object within 10 days after being served with a copy of the magistrate judge's order, it waives its right to review.

As for dispositive matters, the district judge must decide de novo any recommendation of the magistrate judge to which an objection has been filed. A party's failure to object within 10 days after being served with a copy of the magistrate judge's recommended disposition waives its right to review. There is no need for the district judge to review de novo any matter to which there has not been a timely objection. Nevertheless, despite the waiver provision, the district judge retains authority to review any decision or recommendation of the magistrate judge, whether or not objections are timely filed.

One member said that he supported the rule, but he had a general problem with the way time is computed under this and some other rules. The proposed rule, he pointed out, states that a party must file an objection "within 10 days after being served with a copy" of the magistrate judge's order or recommendation. He pointed out that judges have no way of telling when a party has actually been served with a copy of a particular document. He suggested that consideration be given at a future committee meeting to addressing this uncertainty in computing time.

The committee without objection approved the proposed new rule for final approval by voice vote.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. CRIM. P. 5(c)

Judge Carnes reported that two amendments were proposed to Rule 5(c)(3) (initial appearance in a district other than the one where the offense was committed). First, the amendment to Rule 5(c)(3)(C) would remove a reference to Rule 58(b)(2)(G). That rule, in turn, would be amended to eliminate a conflict with Rule 5.1(a) regarding the defendant's right to a preliminary examination. Second, the amendment to Rule 5(c)(3)(D) would take account of advances in technology and permit a magistrate judge to accept a warrant by any "reliable electronic means," rather than just by "facsimile."

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 32.1(a)(5)

Judge Carnes explained that the proposed change to Rule 32.1 (revoking or modifying probation or supervised release) was similar to that proposed for Rule 5(c). It would authorize a magistrate judge to accept a copy of a judgment, warrant, or warrant application by "reliable electronic means."

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 40(a) and (e)

Judge Carnes said that the proposed revision of Rule 40(a) (arrest for failing to appear in another district) would fill a gap in the rules by giving a magistrate judge explicit authority to set conditions of release for a defendant who has been arrested only for violation of conditions of release set in another district. He pointed out that the current rule refers only to a defendant who has been arrested for failure to appear altogether, and not to one who has only violated conditions of release.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 41

Judge Carnes reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 41(e) (issuing a search warrant) would permit a magistrate judge to use "reliable electronic means" to issue warrants. In that respect, it parallels the proposed amendments to Rules 5 and 32.1.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. CRIM. P. 58(b)

Judge Carnes explained that the proposed amendment to Rule 58(b)(2)(G) (initial appearance in a petty offense or other misdemeanor case) would remove a conflict between that rule and Rule 5.1 (preliminary examination) and clarify the advice that must be given to a defendant during an initial appearance.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

Informational Items

FED. R. CRIM. P. 29

Associate Attorney General McCallum expressed the concerns of the Department of Justice regarding the May 2004 decision of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules to reject the Department's proposed amendments to Rule 29 (motion for a judgment of acquittal). The proposal would have required a judge to defer ruling on a motion for a judgment of acquittal until after the jury has returned a verdict. The current rule gives a judge discretion to rule on an acquittal motion either before or after verdict.

Mr. McCallum pointed out that a district judge's granting of an acquittal motion before a jury verdict is a non-appealable action due to the Double Jeopardy Clause of the U. S. Constitution. It is the only area, he said, in which the government has no right to correct an improper action of a trial judge. An appeal does lie, however, when a judge grants a motion for acquittal after a jury verdict.

He emphasized that United States attorneys are deeply troubled by the current rule and certain specific experiences that they have had under it. He noted that the original proposal of the Department had been to amend the rule to require a district judge to defer a ruling on an acquittal motion until after the jury returns a verdict. The aim, he said, was not to limit judicial discretion, but to address the timing of the judge's action, which has important constitutional consequences.

He explained that members had expressed concerns at the October 2003 advisory committee meeting that the Department's proposal might be too broad. They suggested that it is entirely appropriate for a judge to grant a dismissal before judgment in certain circumstances — particularly in the case of a hung jury or a multiple-defendant or multiple-count case. The advisory committee, he said, had asked the Department to consider crafting modifications to its proposal to address these two situations.

Mr. McCallum reported that the Criminal Division had prepared an amendment to deal with hung juries, but it was unable to devise a satisfactory amendment to address the problems of multiple defendants and multiple counts. But, he said, Judge Levi developed a very helpful, alternate proposal that would allow a judge to grant a dismissal before verdict conditioned upon the defendant waiving double-jeopardy rights and permitting an appeal by the government.

He said that because of the importance of this matter, the Department would like to present additional written materials and make a case for amending Rule 29 to the Standing Committee at its next meeting. If the Standing Committee were then to agree with the Department's recommendation — or with Judge Levi's alternate proposal or some other variation — it might propose an amendment itself. But, he noted, a more likely result would be for the Standing Committee to remand the matter back to the advisory committee with a direction to explore every possible alternative to achieve the result of preserving the government's right to appeal. He added that the Department would provide a comprehensive constitutional-law analysis of the Double Jeopardy Clause and craft appropriate devices to avoid procedural traps. In short, he emphasized, the Department would like to work cooperatively with the Standing Committee to figure out a way to meet the government's concerns.

Judge Carnes reported that Administrative Office staff had prepared statistics on how often pre-verdict dismissals are granted in the federal courts. In the Fiscal Year 2002, for example, more than 80,000 felony defendants were disposed of in the district courts. Of that total, 3,000 were tried before a jury, and Rule 29 motions were granted in only 37 cases. He warned that the numbers may not be exact because of reporting difficulties in trying to pinpoint pre-verdict acquittals. Neverthless, he said, the number of dismissals under Rule 29 is extremely small. This, he explained, was a primary reason why the majority of the advisory committee were persuaded that there was no compelling case to amend the rule. He pointed out, though, that several members of the advisory committee were very much concerned that when a judge grants a pre-verdict dismissal mistakenly or in questionable circumstances, it reflects badly on the judicial system. In that regard, he noted that the Department had presented the committee with some anecdotes of district judges arguably abusing the process.

Judge Carnes further explained that several members of the advisory committee were concerned that certain prosecutors overcharge. Thus, judges should be able to winnow out groundless charges before a case is submitted to the jury. For that reason, he said, the advisory committee had asked the Department to consider amending its proposal to retain the authority of a trial judge to dismiss specific counts in a multiple-count case or certain defendants in a multi-defendant case. But, he explained, neither the Department nor the advisory committee could fashion a satisfactory proposal addressing those situations.

Judge Carnes said that the issues had been thoroughly explored by the advisory committee, including Judge Levi's alternate solution. If the matter were referred back to the advisory committee, he said, the same result would prevail again. Judge Levi agreed with this assessment, but he added that the Department should have a further opportunity to make a case. He pointed out that the Department has a vital role in the Rules Enabling Act process, and it has been supportive of the process. Therefore, he said, if the

Department concludes that a matter is very important to the government and it asks the Standing Committee to take a second look, the committee should accommodate the request.

Judge Levi pointed out that it is very common in rulemaking for empirical data to show that a particular problem is statistically insignificant. But the rejoinder by proponents of an amendment is always that the small number of problem occurrences in fact represents important matters. He recommended that the committee allow the Department to make its case at the January 2005 meeting. He suggested that the Department consider producing additional information, focusing particularly on the character of the actual cases in which it believes a pre-verdict dismissal was improperly granted and the government denied its right to appeal. He added that the Standing Committee might decide to return the proposal to the advisory committee with instructions.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Smith and Professor Capra presented the report of the advisory committee, as set forth in Judge Smith's memorandum and attachment of May 15, 2004. (Agenda Item 5)

Judge Smith explained that it is the policy of the advisory committee for proposed amendments to evidence rules generally to be limited to resolving case law conflicts in the courts. The committee's presumption, thus, is strongly against amending the rules. The four rules amendments recommended for publication, he said, would resolve serious conflicts in the courts.

Amendments for Publication

FED. R. EVID. 404(a)

Judge Smith reported that the proposed amendments to Rule 404(a) (admissibility of character evidence) would resolve a case law conflict regarding the admissibility in a civil case of character evidence offered as circumstantial proof of conduct. He noted that courts routinely admit such information into evidence in criminal cases. A minority of courts have also permitted its use in civil cases. The proposed amendment would allow the evidence only in criminal cases.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. EVID. 408

Judge Smith reported that the proposed amendments to Rule 408 (compromise and offers to compromise) would resolve three important conflicts in the case law as to the admissibility of statements and offers made in settlement negotiations. He added that the proposals had been substantially debated and reworked by the advisory committee.

Judge Smith pointed out that the first amendment would resolve the split in the case law regarding the admissibility in later criminal prosecutions of statements and offers made in civil settlement negotiations. He pointed out that the Department of Justice strongly supported allowing the use in criminal cases of admissions made earlier during settlement negotiations, noting that they can be critical evidence to establish guilt in certain cases. After much debate, he said, the advisory committee agreed to present an amendment that would authorize the use of admissions of fault in later criminal prosecutions, but not allow admission of the fact that there has been a civil settlement or negotiations. He emphasized that the committee had worked hard to reach the proper balance between protecting settlement negotiations and allowing critical evidence to be used in criminal cases.

Second, Judge Smith reported that the proposed amendments would resolve a conflict in case law by prohibiting the use of statements made in settlement negotiations when offered to impeach a witness through a prior inconsistent statement or through contradiction. He noted that the proposal reinforces the main purposes of the rule — to promote unfettered settlement discussions.

Third, the proposed amendments would resolve a conflict over whether offers of compromise may be admitted in favor of the party who made the offer. The proposal would bar a party from introducing its own statements and offers when offered to prove the validity, invalidity, or amount of the claim. Judge Smith said that the advisory committee was of the view that a party should not be able to waive unilaterally the protections of the rule because introduction of the evidence would show implicitly that the opposing party had also entered into a settlement agreement. Exclusion of such evidence would not be required, though, when offered for other purposes, such as to prove the bias or prejudice of a witness.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendments for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. EVID. 606(b)

Judge Smith reported that the proposed amendment to Rule 606(b) (juror as a witness) would limit the testimony of a juror regarding the validity of a verdict to whether

there has been a clerical mistake in reporting the verdict. He explained that some courts have also allowed juror testimony on a broader basis, such as to explore whether the jury understood the court's instructions or the impact of their actions. He added that the proposed amendment is very narrowly designed to protect jury deliberations and prevent invasions of the jury process. He pointed out, however, that testimony could still be allowed from a juror as to fraud or outside influence.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

FED. R. EVID. 609(a)(2)

Judge Smith reported that Rule 609(a)(2) (impeachment by evidence of conviction of a crime) provides for automatic impeachment of a witness with evidence that the witness has been convicted of a crime that "involved dishonesty or false statement." The problem, he said, is in determining which crimes involve dishonesty or false statement.

Most prior convictions, he noted, occur in other jurisdictions, especially state courts. The issue for the federal court is to determine the extent to which it may look behind the prior conviction to determine whether it involved dishonesty or false statement. Some courts, he said, make the determination by looking only at the actual elements of the crime for which the witness was found guilty. Other courts, though, allow a more detailed inquiry into the facts of the case.

Judge Smith explained that the proposed amendment takes a middle position. It would allow automatic impeachment of a witness if an underlying act of dishonesty or false statement can be "readily determined." Judges, thus, would have discretion to look behind the elements of the crime to the facts of the case. But it is contemplated that their review would be to make a quick determination, such as by reviewing the charging documents, that a crime involved dishonesty or false statement. The court, though, should not conduct a minitrial on the issue. He added that a similar problem exists under the Sentencing Guidelines, where district judges may have to look behind the elements of a crime to determine whether a prior conviction of the defendant had been for a crime of violence. Professor Capra added that the committee note sets forth some examples of key documents that could be used by judges to make the determination of dishonesty or false statement.

The committee without objection approved the proposed amendment for publication by voice vote.

Informational Items

Professor Capra explained that these four proposals complete a package of amendments that the advisory committee had been considering for several meetings. He said that the advisory committee did not have plans to bring forward to the Standing Committee in the near future other potential amendments that it had under consideration. In addition, he said, the advisory committee would continue to examine the hearsay exceptions, but it will not propose any amendments until the full impact of *Crawford v. Washington* has been determined.

REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

Judge Fitzwater presented the report of the Technology Subcommittee. (Agenda Item 10)

He reported that the E-Government Act of 2002 requires all federal courts to post on the Internet all case documents filed electronically or filed in paper and converted to electronic form. The Act also mandates the promulgation under the Rules Enabling Act of new federal rules addressing security and privacy concerns raised by electronic posting of case documents. The Standing Committee, he noted, had created the E-Government Subcommittee to coordinate the task of drafting appropriate revisions to the rules, and it asked representatives of other Judicial Conference committees to serve on the subcommittee.

He explained that the subcommittee had asked Professor Capra to develop a template that each advisory committee could use to develop appropriate amendments to their own rules. He pointed out that each of the advisory committees had reviewed the template and had raised a number of policy issues. In addition, the Department of Justice and other interested parties had offered practical and helpful comments on the template.

Judge Fitzwater reported that the E-Government Subcommittee met just before the Standing Committee meeting and revised the template in several respects. He emphasized that in making policy choices, the subcommittee had worked from the Judicial Conference's recent privacy policy statements and the assumptions made by the Court Administration and Case Management Committee. The revised template, he said, would now be sent back to the advisory committees for further consideration at their autumn meetings.

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

The next committee meeting was scheduled for Thursday and Friday, January 13-14, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter G. McCabe
Secretary