

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of June 6, 2016 | Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance	1
Introductory Remarks	2
Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting.....	2
Visit of Chief Justice Roberts	3
Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules.....	3
Report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules	5
Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules.....	7
Report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules	10
Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules	11
Report of the Administrative Office	15
Concluding Remarks.....	15

ATTENDANCE

The Judicial Conference on Rules of Practice and Procedure held its fall meeting in Washington, D.C., on June 6, 2016. The following members participated in the meeting:

Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair	Professor William K. Kelley
Associate Justice Brent E. Dickson	Judge Patrick J. Schiltz
Roy T. Englert, Jr., Esq.	Judge Amy St. Eve
Daniel C. Girard, Esq.	Professor Larry D. Thompson
Judge Neil M. Gorsuch	Judge Richard C. Wesley
Judge Susan P. Graber	Judge Jack Zouhary

The following attended on behalf of the advisory committees:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules – Judge Steven M. Colloton, Chair Professor Gregory E. Maggs, Reporter	Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules – Judge Donald W. Molloy, Chair Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter Professor Nancy J. King, Associate Reporter
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules – Judge Sandra Segal Ikuta, Chair Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter Professor Michelle M. Harner, Associate Reporter	Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules – Judge William K. Sessions III, Chair Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules – Judge John D. Bates, Chair Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter Professor Richard L. Marcus, Associate Reporter	

The Honorable Sally Quillian Yates, Deputy Attorney General, represented the Department of Justice, along with Diana Erbsen, Joshua Gardner, Elizabeth J. Shapiro, and Natalia Sorgente.

Other meeting attendees included: Judge David G. Campbell; Judge Robert M. Dow; Judge Paul W. Grimm; Sean Marlaire, staff to the Court Administration and Case Management Committee (CACM); Professor Bryan A. Garner, Style Consultant; Professor R. Joseph Kimble, Style Consultant; and Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., Consultant.

Providing support to the Committee:

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette	Reporter, Standing Committee
Rebecca A. Womeldorf	Secretary, Standing Committee
Julie Wilson	Attorney Advisor, RCSO
Scott Myers	Attorney Advisor, RCSO
Bridget M. Healy	Attorney Advisor, RCSO
Shelly Cox	Administrative Specialist
Hon. Jeremy D. Fogel	Director, FJC
Emery G. Lee	Senior Research Associate, FJC
Tim Reagan	Senior Research Associate, FJC
Derek A. Webb	Law Clerk, Standing Committee
Amelia G. Yowell	Supreme Court Fellow, AO

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Sutton called the meeting to order. He first acknowledged a number of imminent departures from the Standing Committee effective October 1, 2016: Justice Brent Dickson, Roy Englert, Judge Neil Gorsuch, and Judge Patrick Schiltz are ending their terms as members of the Standing Committee and Judge Steve Colloton is ending his term as Chair of the Appellate Rules Advisory Committee, a position that will be assumed by Judge Gorsuch. Judge Sutton offered remarks on the contributions each has made to the Committee over the years and warmly thanked them for their service.

Judge Sutton recognized three individuals for reaching milestones of service to the Committee. Rick Marcus has served for twenty years as the Associate Reporter to the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules. Dan Capra has served for twenty years as the Reporter to the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules. And Joe Spaniol has served twenty-five years as a style consultant to the Standing Committee.

Finally, Dan Coquillette took a moment to thank Judge Sutton, whose tenure as Chair of the Standing Committee comes to an end October 1, 2016.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Standing Committee approved the minutes of the January 7, 2016 meeting.**

VISIT OF CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS

Chief Justice Roberts and Jeffrey Minear, the Counselor to the Chief Justice, visited the Standing Committee. Chief Justice Roberts made some brief remarks. He thanked the members of the Committee for their service and acknowledged, as an alumnus of the Appellate Rules Committee himself, that such service could be a significant commitment of time. And he congratulated the Committee on the new discovery rules that went into effect on December 1, 2015, rule amendments he highlighted in his 2015 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Sessions and Professor Capra provided the report on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules, which met on April 29, 2016, in Washington, D.C. Judge Sessions presented two action items and a number of information items.

Action Items

RULE 803(16) – The first matter for final approval was an amendment to Rule 803(16), the ancient documents exception to the hearsay rule, to limit its application to documents prepared before January 1, 1998. The version of Rule 803(16) published for comment would have eliminated the exception entirely. After hearing from many lawyers who continue to rely on the ancient documents exception, the Advisory Committee decided against eliminating the exception. Instead, the Advisory Committee revised its proposal to provide a cutoff date for the application of the exception. The Advisory Committee decided against leaving the exception in its current form because, unlike certain “ancient” hard copy documents, the retention of electronically-stored information beyond twenty years does not by itself suggest reliability. Judge Sessions acknowledged that any cutoff date will have a degree of arbitrariness, but also observed that electronically-stored information (known as “ESI”) first started to explode around 1998 and that the ancient documents exception itself set an arbitrary time period of twenty years for its applicability.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 803(16), as amended after publication, for submission to the Judicial Conference for final approval.**

RULE 902(13) & (14) – The second matter for final approval was an amendment to Rule 902 to add two new subdivisions ((13) and (14)) that would allow for the authentication of certain electronic evidence through certification by a qualified person without requiring that person to testify in person. The first provision would allow self-authentication of machine-generated information upon a submission of a certification prepared by a qualified person. The second provision would provide a similar certification procedure for a copy of data taken from an electronic device, medium, or file. The proposals for new Rules 902(13) and 902(14) would have the same effect as current Rules 902(11) and 902(12), which permit a foundation witness to establish the authenticity of business records by way of certification. One Committee member suggested providing instructions on the application of the rule with the inclusion of examples in the Committee Note. After discussion, Professor Capra agreed to do that.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rule 902 (13) and (14) for submission to the Judicial Conference for final approval.**

Information Items

Judge Sessions highlighted several information items on behalf of the Advisory Committee.

GUIDE FOR AUTHENTICATING ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE – The Standing Committee discussed the use and dissemination of the draft Guide for Authenticating Electronic Evidence. Written by Judge Grimm, Gregory Joseph, and Professor Capra, the manual would be for the use of the bench and bar and can be amended as necessary to keep pace with technological advances. The manual will be published by the Federal Judicial Center (FJC). The manual is not an official publication of the Advisory Committee itself. The members of the Standing Committee discussed the manual, noting its great value to judges and practitioners who regularly deal with the issue of authenticating electronic evidence, and expressed deep gratitude to its three authors for their work creating it and to the FJC for its assistance with publication.

POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE NOTICE PROVISIONS IN THE EVIDENCE RULES – The Advisory Committee has been considering ways to amend and make more uniform several notice provisions throughout the Federal Rules of Evidence. For the notice provision of Rule 807(b), the Residual Exception to the hearsay rule, the Advisory Committee is inclined to add a good cause exception to excuse lack of timely notice of the intent to offer statements covered under this exception. The Advisory Committee is also inclined to require that notice under 807(b) be written and not just oral. For the notice provision of Rule 404(b), the Advisory Committee is inclined to remove the requirement that the defendant in a criminal case must first specifically request that the government provide notice of their intent to offer evidence of previous crimes or other bad acts against the defendant. The Advisory Committee concluded that this requirement in Rule 404 was an unnecessary trap for the unwary lawyer and differs from most local rules. Finally, the Advisory Committee has concluded that the notice provisions in Rules 412, 413, 414, and 415 should not be changed through the Rules Enabling Act process as those rules were congressionally enacted and, in any event, are rarely used.

RESIDUAL EXCEPTION: RULE 807 – Judge Sessions reported on the symposium held in connection with the Advisory Committee’s fall 2015 Chicago meeting regarding the potential elimination of the categorical hearsay exceptions (excited utterance, dying declaration, etc.) in favor of expanding the residual hearsay exception. The lawyers who testified before the Advisory Committee unanimously opposed the elimination of the hearsay exceptions. The Advisory Committee agrees that the exceptions should not be eliminated. But the Advisory Committee continues to consider expansion of the residual exception to allow the admission of reliable hearsay even absent “exceptional circumstances.” The Advisory Committee included a working draft of amended Rule 807 in the agenda materials. It is planning a symposium in the fall to continue to discuss possible amendments to Rule 807, to be held at Pepperdine School of Law.

TESTIFYING WITNESS’S PRIOR INCONSISTENT STATEMENT: RULE 801(d)(1)(A) – The Advisory Committee is considering an expansion beyond what Rule 801(d)(1)(A) currently allows, which

are prior inconsistent statements made under oath during a formal proceeding. The Advisory Committee has rejected the idea of expanding the rule to cover all prior inconsistent statements, but continues to consider inclusion of prior inconsistent statements that have been video recorded.

EXCITED UTTERANCES: RULE 803(2) – The Advisory Committee considered four separate proposals to amend or eliminate Rule 803(2) on the grounds that “excited utterances” are not necessarily reliable. It determined not to take up any of the suggestions given the impact on other rules, as well as an FJC report regarding various social science studies on Rule 803(2) which provided some empirical support for the proposition that immediacy and excitedness tend to guarantee reliability.

CONVERTING CATEGORICAL HEARSAY EXCEPTIONS INTO GUIDELINES – At the suggestion of Judge Milton Shadur, the Advisory Committee considered reconstituting the categorical hearsay exceptions as standards or guidelines rather than binding rules. The Advisory Committee ultimately decided against doing so.

CONSIDERATION OF A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO RULE 803(22) – At the suggestion of Judge Graber, the Advisory Committee considered eliminating two exceptions to Rule 803(22): convictions from nolo contendere pleas and misdemeanor convictions. The Advisory Committee concluded that retaining each of these exceptions was warranted.

RULE 704(b) – Similarly, the Advisory Committee determined not to proceed with suggestions to eliminate Rule 704(b) or to create a specific rule regarding electronic communication and hearsay.

IMPLICATIONS OF *CRAWFORD* – The Advisory Committee continues to monitor case law developments after the Supreme Court’s decision in *Crawford v. Washington*, in which the Court held that the admission of “testimonial” hearsay violates the accused’s right to confrontation unless the accused has an opportunity to confront and cross-examine the declarant.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Colloton and Professor Maggs provided the report on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules, which met on April 5, 2016, in Denver, Colorado. Judge Colloton advised that Judge Gorsuch will be the new chair of the Advisory Committee as of October 2016.

Judge Colloton reported that the Advisory Committee had four action items in the form of four sets of proposed amendments to be published this upcoming summer for which it sought the approval of the Standing Committee.

Action Items

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO RULES 8, 11, AND 39(e)(3) – The first set of amendments recommended for publication were amendments to Rules 8(a)(1)(B), 8(a)(2)(E), 8(b), 11(g), and 39(e)(3) to conform to the amendment to Rule of Civil Procedure 62 by revising any clauses that use the antiquated term “supersedeas bond.” The language would be changed to “bond or other

security” as appropriate in each of the rules. Judge Colloton noted that the Civil Rules Committee would discuss the amendment to Rule 62 later in the meeting. He added that the Style Consultants suggested a minor edit to proposed Rule 8(b) (adding the word “a” before “stipulation” on line 16) after the publication of the agenda book materials, and that the Advisory Committee accepted the edit. The Standing Committee discussed the phrase “surety or other security provider” and whether “security provider” contained within it the term “surety” and made minor edits to the proposed amendments.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication for public comment the proposed conforming amendments to Rules 8(a)(1)(B), 8(a)(2)(E), 8(b), 11(g), and 39(e)(3), contingent on the Standing Committee’s approval of the proposed amendment to Civil Rule 62 later in the meeting.**

LIMITATIONS ON THE FILING OF AMICUS BRIEFS BY PARTY CONSENT: RULE 29(a) – The proposed amendment to Rule 29(a) would allow a court to prohibit or strike the filing of an amicus brief based on party consent where the filing of the brief might cause a judge’s disqualification. This amendment would ensure that local rules that forbid the filing of an amicus brief when the filing could cause the recusal of one or more judges would be consistent with Rule 29(a). Professor Coquillette observed that, as important as preserving room for local rules may be, congressional committees in the past have responded to the proliferation of local rules by urging the Rules Committee to allow them only if they respond to distinctive geographic, demographic, or economic realities that prevail in the different circuits. Judge Colloton explained that this proposed amendment is particularly relevant to the rehearing en banc process which traditionally has been decentralized and subject to local variations. He further explained that the Advisory Committee discussed and rejected expanding the exception to other types of amicus filings. The Advisory Committee made minor stylistic edits to the proposed amended rule.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication for public comment the proposed amendment to Rule 29(a).**

APPELLATE FORM 4 – Litigants seeking permission to proceed in forma pauperis are currently required by Appellate Form 4 to provide the last four digits of their Social Security number. Given the potential security and privacy concerns associated with Social Security numbers, and the consensus of the clerks of court that the last four digits of a Social Security number are not needed for any purpose, the Advisory Committee proposes to amend Form 4 by deleting this question.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved for publication for public comment the proposed amendment to Appellate Form 4.**

REVISION OF APPELLATE RULE 25 TO ADDRESS ELECTRONIC FILING, SIGNATURES, SERVICE, AND PROOF OF SERVICE – In conjunction with the publication of the proposed amendment to Civil Rule 5, and in an effort to achieve an optimal degree of uniformity, the Advisory Committee

proposes to amend Appellate Rule 25 to address electronic filing, signatures, service, and proof of service. The proposed revision generally requires all parties represented by counsel to file electronically. The Standing Committee discussed the use of “person” versus “party” throughout the proposed amended rule, as well as the use of these phrases in the companion Criminal and Civil Rules. One minor stylistic amendment was proposed. The Standing Committee decided to hold over the vote to approve publication of the proposed amendment to Rule 25 until the discussion regarding Civil Rule 5.

Information Item

Judge Colloton discussed whether Appellate Rules 26.1 and 29(c) should be amended to require additional disclosures to provide further information for judges in determining whether to recuse themselves. It is an issue that the Advisory Committee will consider at its fall meeting.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Bates and Professors Cooper and Marcus provided the report on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, which met on April 14, 2016, in Palm Beach, Florida. The Advisory Committee had four action items in the form of three sets of proposed amendments to be published this upcoming summer and the pilot project proposal.

Action Items

RULE 5 – The Advisory Committees for Civil, Appellate, Bankruptcy, and Criminal Rules have recently worked together to create uniform provisions for electronic filing and service across the four sets of rules to achieve an optimal degree of uniformity. Professor Cooper explained that the Advisory Committee for Criminal Rules wisely decided to create their own stand-alone rule, proposed Criminal Rule 49.

With regard to filing, the proposed amendment to Rule 5 requires a party represented by an attorney to file electronically unless nonelectronic filing is allowed by the court for good cause or is allowed or required by local rule. It allows unrepresented parties to file electronically if permitted by court order or local rule. And it provides that an unrepresented party may be required to file electronically only by court order or by a local rule that includes reasonable exceptions. Under the amended rule, a paper filed electronically would constitute a written paper for purposes of the rules.

With regard to service, the amended rule provides that a paper is served by sending it to a registered user by filing it with the court’s electronic filing system or by sending it by other electronic means if that person consents in writing. In addition, service is complete upon filing via the court’s electronic filing system. Rule 5(b)(3), which allows electronic service only if a local rule authorizes it, would be abrogated to avoid inconsistency with the amended rule.

The Standing Committee discussed the use of the terms “person” and “party” throughout Rule 5 and across other sets of rules and agreed to consider this issue further after the meeting.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Civil Rule 5 for publication for public comment.**

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved for publication for public comment the proposed amendment to Appellate Rule 25 that conforms to the amended Civil Rule 5.**

RULE 23 – Judge Bates detailed six proposed changes to Rule 23, many of which concern settlements in class action lawsuits. Rule 23(c)(2)(B) extends notice consideration to a class proposed to be certified for settlement. Rule 23(e) applies the settlement procedural requirements to a class proposed to be certified for purposes of settlement. Rule 23(e)(1) spells out what information parties should give the courts prior to notice and under what circumstances courts should give notice to the parties. Rule 23(e)(2) lays out general standards for approval of the proposed settlement. Rule 23(e)(5) concerns class action objections, requiring objectors to state to whom the objection applies, requiring court approval for any payment for withdrawing an objection or dismissing an appeal, and providing that the indicative ruling procedure be used if an objector seeks approval of a payment for dismissing an appeal after the appeal has already been docketed. Finally, Rule 23(f) specifies that an order to give notice based on a likelihood of certification under Rule 23(e)(1) is not appealable and extends to 45 days the amount of time for an appeal if the United States is a party. Judge Robert Dow, the chair of the Rule 23 Subcommittee, explained the outreach efforts by the subcommittee and stated that many of the proposed changes would provide more flexibility for judges and practitioners. The Rule 23 Subcommittee, under Judge Dow’s leadership and with research support from Professor Marcus, has devoted years to generating these proposed amendments, organized multiple conferences around the country with class action practitioners, and considered many other possible amendments.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed package of amendments to Civil Rule 23 for publication for public comment.**

RULE 62 – Judge Bates reported that a subcommittee composed of members of the Appellate and Civil Rules Committees and chaired by Judge Scott Matheson laid the groundwork for amendments to Rule 62. The proposed amendment includes three changes to the rule. First, Rule 62(a) extends the automatic stay from 14 days to 30 days in order to eliminate the “gap” between the 14-day automatic stay and the 28 days allowed for various post-judgment motions. Second, it recognizes the court’s authority to dissolve the automatic stay or replace it with a court-ordered stay for a longer duration. Third, Rule 62(b) clarifies that security other than a bond may be posted. Another organizational change is a proposed new subsection (d) that would include language from current subsections (a) and (c). Judge Bates added that the word “automatic” would be removed from the heading of Rule 62(c) and that conforming edits will be made to the proposed rule to accommodate changes made to the companion Appellate Rules. Professor Cooper stated that Rule 65.1 would be conformed to Appellate Rules 8, 11, and 39 after the conclusion of the meeting.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Civil Rule 62 for publication for public comment. It also approved granting to the Civil Rules Advisory Committee the authority to make amendments to Rule 65.1 to conform it to Appellate Rules 8, 11, and 39 with the goal of seeking approval of the Standing Committee in time to publish them simultaneously in August 2016. Finally, with the amendment to Civil Rule 62 officially approved for publication, it also approved for publication the proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 8(a)(1)(B), 8(a)(2)(E), 8(b), 11(g), and 39(e)(3) which all conform to the amended Civil Rule 62.**

PILOT PROJECTS – Judge Campbell provided the report of the Pilot Projects Subcommittee, which included participants from the Standing Committee, CACM, and the FJC. The Subcommittee has collected and reviewed a lot of information, including working with focus groups of lawyers with experience with these types of discovery regimes. As a result of this work, the Advisory Committee seeks approval to forward the Mandatory Initial Discovery Pilot Project and Expedited Procedures Pilot Project to the Judicial Conference for approval. The first project would test a system of mandatory initial discovery requests to be adopted in each participating court. The second would test the effectiveness of court-wide adoption of practices that, under the current rules, have proved effective in reducing cost and delay.

Judge Campbell proceeded to detail each pilot project and asked for comments and suggestions on the proposals. For the first pilot project, Judge Campbell explained the proposed procedures. The Standing Committee then discussed whether or not all judges in a district would be required to participate in the pilot project, how to choose the districts that should participate, and how to measure the results of the pilot studies. Judge Bates noted the Advisory Committee's strong support of the project. Several Standing Committee members voiced their support as well.

For the second pilot project, many of the procedures are already available, and the purpose of the pilot project is to use education and training to achieve greater use of available procedures. Judge Campbell advised the Committee that CACM has created a case dashboard that will be available to judges via CM/ECF, and that judges will be able to use this tool to monitor the progress of their cases. The pilot would require a bench/bar meeting each year to monitor progress.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to the Judicial Conference of the (i) Mandatory Initial Discovery Pilot Project and (ii) Expedited Procedures Pilot Project, with delegated authority for the Advisory Committee and the Pilot Projects Subcommittee to make refinements to the projects as discussed by the Committee.**

Information Items

EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS REGARDING 2015 CIVIL RULES PACKAGE – Judge Bates outlined some of the efforts undertaken by the Advisory Committee and the FJC to educate the bench and the bar about the 2015 discovery reforms of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Among other efforts, he mentioned the production of several short videos, a 90-minute webinar, plenary sessions at

workshops for district court judges and magistrate judges, segments on the discovery reforms at several circuit court conferences, and other programs sponsored by the American Bar Association.

Judge Bates advised that a subcommittee has been formed, chaired by Judge Ericksen, to consider possible amendments to Rule 30(b)(6). Professor Cooper stated that the Advisory Committee is considering amending Rule 81(c) in light of a concern that it may not adequately protect against forfeiture of the right to a jury trial after a case has been removed from state court.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Molloy and Professors Beale and King provided the report for the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules, which met on April 18, 2016, in Washington, D.C. He reported that the Advisory Committee had three action items in the form of three proposed amendments to be published this upcoming summer for which it sought the approval of the Standing Committee.

Action Items

RULE 49 – Judge Molloy explained the proposed new stand-alone rule governing electronic service and filing in criminal cases. The Advisory Committee determined to have a stand-alone rule for criminal cases rather than to continue the past practice of incorporating Civil Rule 5 by reference. The proposed amendments to Rule 49 track the general order of Civil Rule 5 rule and much of its language. Unlike the civil rule, Rule 49's discussion of electronic filing and service comes before nonelectronic filing and service in the new criminal rule. Both rules provide that an unrepresented party must file nonelectronically unless allowed to file electronically by court order or local rule. But one substantive difference between the two rules is that, under Civil Rule 5, an unrepresented party may be required to file electronically by court order or local rule. A second substantive difference is that all nonparties must file and serve nonelectronically in the absence of a contrary court order or local rule. This conforms to the current architecture of CM/ECF which only allows the government and the defendant to file electronically in a criminal case. Third, proposed Rule 49 contains language borrowed from Civil Rule 11(a) regarding signatures.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rules 49 for publication for public comment.**

RULE 45(c) – The proposed amendment to Rule 45(c) is a conforming amendment. It replaces the reference to Civil Rule 5 with a reference to Rule 49(a)(4)(C),(D), and (E).

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rules 45(c) for publication for public comment.**

RULE 12.4 – The proposed amendment to Rule 12.4, changes the required disclosures for statements under Rule 12.4 regarding organizational victims. It permits a court, upon the showing of good cause, to relieve the government of the burden of filing a statement identifying any organizational victim. The proposed amendments reflect changes to the Code of Judicial Conduct and require a party to file the Rule 12.4(a) statement within 28 days after the defendant’s initial appearance. The Standing Committee briefly discussed similar potential changes to the Appellate Rules regarding disclosure of organizational victims. And the Advisory Committee discussed removing the word “supplemental” from the title and body of Rule 12.4(b) in order to avoid potential confusion.

Upon motion, seconded by a member, and on a voice vote: **The Standing Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rule 12.4 for publication for public comment.**

Information Items

Judge Molloy reviewed several of the pending items under consideration by the Advisory Committee. The Cooperator Subcommittee continues to consider the problem of risk of harm to cooperating defendants and the kinds of procedural protections that might alleviate this problem. The Subcommittee includes representatives from the Advisory Committee, Standing Committee, CACM, and the Department of Justice. The Advisory Committee has formed subcommittees to consider suggested amendments to Criminal Rule 16 dealing with discovery in complex criminal cases and Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings regarding petitioner reply briefs. And in response to an op-ed by Judge Jon Newman, the Advisory Committee will consider the wisdom of reducing the number of peremptory challenges in federal trials.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Judge Sandra Ikuta and Professors Gibson and Harner presented the report on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which met on March 31, 2016, in Denver, Colorado. The Advisory Committee had nine action items, and sought final approval for three of the items: Rule 1001; Rule 1006, and technical changes to certain official forms.

Action Items

RULE 1001 – The first item was a request for final approval of Rule 1001, dubbed the “civility rule” by Judge Ikuta, which was published in August 2015 to track changes to Civil Rule 1. Judge Ikuta explained that the Advisory Committee considered the comments submitted, but made no changes to the published version of the amended rule.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rule 1001 for submission to the Judicial Conference for final approval.**

RULE 1006 – The second item was a proposed change to Rule 1006(b), also published for comment in August 2015. The rule explains how a person filing a petition in bankruptcy can pay

the filing fee in installments, as allowed by statute. The proposed amendment clarified that courts may not refuse to accept petitions or summarily dismiss a case because the petitioner failed to make an initial installment payment at the time of filing (even if such a payment was required by local rule). Judge Ikuta said that the Advisory Committee considered the comments submitted, but made no changes to the published version of the amended rule.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rule 1006 for submission to the Judicial Conference for final approval.**

TECHNICAL CHANGES TO OFFICIAL FORMS – Judge Ikuta next described the Advisory Committee’s recommendation for retroactive approval of technical changes to nine official forms. She explained that the Judicial Conference at its March 2016 meeting approved a new process for making technical amendments to official bankruptcy forms. Under the new process, the Advisory Committee makes the technical changes, subject to retroactive approval by the Committee and report to the Judicial Conference. Judge Sutton thanked Judge Ikuta for developing the new streamlined approval process for technical changes to official bankruptcy forms.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed technical changes to Official Forms 106E/F, 119, 201, 206, 206E/F, 309A, 309I, 423, and 424, for submission to the Judicial Conference for final approval.**

Judge Ikuta reported that the Advisory Committee had six additional action items in the form of six sets of proposed amendments to be published this upcoming summer for which it sought the approval of the Committee.

Before focusing on these specific recommendations, however, Judge Ikuta first suggested that the Committee adopt a procedure for more systematically coordinating publication and approval of amendments that affect multiple rules across different advisory committees. The chair recommended that the Rules Committee Support Office lead the coordination effort over the next year and that the Committee then evaluate whether further refinement of the process is needed. Judge Ikuta next explained and sought approval for a package of conforming amendments:

RULE 5005(a)(2) – Judge Ikuta said that the proposed amendments to Rule 5005(a)(2) would make the rule consistent with the proposed amendment to Civil Rule 5(d)(3).

RULES 8002(c), 8011(a)(2)(C), OFFICIAL FORM 417A, RULE 8002(b), RULES 8013, 8015, 8016, 8022, OFFICIAL FORM 417C, PART VIII APPENDIX, AND RULE 8017 – Judge Ikuta next discussed proposed changes to Rules 8002(c), 8011(a)(2)(C), and Official Form 417A; Rule 8002(b) (regarding timeliness of tolling motions); Rules 8013, 8015, 8016, 8022, Official Form 417C, and Part VIII Appendix (regarding length limits), and Rule 8017 (regarding amicus filings). The rule and form changes were proposed to conform to pending and proposed changes to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

RULE 8002(a)(5) – The new subdivision (a)(5) to Rule 8002 includes a provision similar to FRAP 4(a)(7) specifying when a judgment or order is “entered” for purposes of appeal.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the package of conforming amendments to Rules 5005(a)(2), 8002(c), 8011(a)(2)(C), Official Form 417C, Part VIII Appendix, Rule 8017, and Rule 8002(a)(5) for publication for public comment.**

RULES 3015 AND 3015.1 – Judge Ikuta explained that the Advisory Committee published the first version of the plan form and nine related rule amendments in August 2013. The Advisory Committee received a lot of comments, made significant changes, and republished in 2014. During the second publication, the Advisory Committee again received many comments, including one comment signed by 144 bankruptcy judges who opposed a national official form for chapter 13 plans. Late in the second comment period, the Advisory Committee received a comment proposing that districts be allowed to opt out of the national plan if their local plan form met certain requirements. Many of the bankruptcy judges who opposed a national plan form supported the “opt-out” proposal.

At its fall 2015 meeting, the Advisory Committee approved the national plan form and related rule amendments, but voted to defer submitting those items for final approval pending further consideration of the opt-out proposal. The Advisory Committee reached out to bankruptcy interest groups, made refinements to the opt-out proposal, and received support from most interested parties, including many of the 144 opposing judges.

The proposed amendment to Rule 3015 and new Rule 3015.1 would implement the opt-out provision. Rule 3015 would require that the national chapter 13 plan form be used unless a district adopts a local district-wide form plan that complies with requirements set forth in proposed new Rule 3015.1. The Advisory Committee determined that a third publication period would allow for full vetting of the opt-out proposal, but it recommended a shortened three-month public comment period because of the narrow focus of the proposed change. To avoid confusion, the Advisory Committee recommended that opt-out rules be published in July 2016, a month earlier than the rules and forms to be published in August 2016.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendments to Rule 3015 and 3015.1 for publication for public comment.**

RULE 8006 – The Advisory Committee proposed to amend subdivision (c) of Rule 8006 to allow a bankruptcy court, bankruptcy appellate panel, or district court to file a statement in support of or against a direct appeal certification filed by the parties.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 8006 for publication for public comment.**

RULE 8018.1 – This new rule would help guide district courts in light of the Supreme Court’s *Stern v. Marshall* trilogy of cases (*Stern*, *Arkison* and *Wellness*). Proposed Rule 8018.1 would address a situation where the bankruptcy court has mistakenly decided a *Stern* claim by allowing the district court to treat the bankruptcy court’s erroneous final judgment as proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to be decided de novo without having to remand the case to the bankruptcy court.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed Rule 8018.1 for publication for public comment.**

RULE 8023 – The proposed amendment to Rule 8023 would add a cross-reference to Rule 9019 to remind the parties that when they enter a settlement and move to dismiss an appeal, they may first need to obtain the bankruptcy court’s approval of the settlement first.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 8023 for publication for public comment.**

OFFICIAL FORM 309F – Judge Ikuta said that the Advisory Committee recommended publication of amendments to five official bankruptcy forms. The first of the five forms was a proposed amendment to Official Form 309F. The form currently requires that a creditor who wants to assert that certain corporate and partnership debts are not dischargeable must file a complaint by a specific deadline. A recent district court decision evaluated the relevant statutory provisions and concluded that the form is incorrect and that no deadline should be imposed. The Advisory Committee agreed that the statute is ambiguous, and therefore proposed that Official Form 309F be amended to avoid taking a position.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Official Form 309F for publication for public comment.**

OFFICIAL FORMS 25A, 25B, 25C, AND 26 – Four forms, Official Forms 25A, 25B, 25C (the small business debtor forms), and 26 (Periodic Report Regarding Value, Operations, and Profitability) were renumbered as 425A, 425B, 425C and 426 to conform with the remainder of the Forms Modernization Project, and revised to be easier to understand and more consistent with the Bankruptcy Code.

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Official Forms 25A, 25B, 25C, 26 for publication for public comment.**

Information Items

Judge Ikuta, Professor Elizabeth Gibson, and Professor Michelle Harner discussed the Advisory Committee’s two information items. The first item was about the status of the Advisory Committee’s proposal to add a new subdivision (h) to Rule 9037 in response to a suggestion

from CACM. Judge Ikuta and Professor Gibson explained that although the Advisory Committee approved an amendment, it decided to delay its recommendation for publication until the Advisory Committees for Appellate, Criminal and Civil Rules can decide whether to add a similar procedure to their privacy rules. Professor Harner summarized the second information item regarding the Advisory Committee's decision not to recommend any changes at this time to Rule 4003(c) in response to a suggestion.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY – Rebecca Womeldorf discussed the Executive Committee's *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* which lays out various goals and priorities for the federal judiciary. She invited members to review this report and offer any input or feedback that they might have to her or Judge Sutton for inclusion in communications back to the Executive Committee.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT – There are bills currently pending in the House of Representatives and Senate intended to prevent proposed Criminal Rule 41 from becoming effective. Members of the Rules Committee have discussed this proposed rule with various members of Congress to respond to their concerns and explain the purpose and limited scope of the proposed rule.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Judge Sutton thanked the Reporters for all their impressive work and Rebecca Womeldorf and the Rules Committee Support Office for helping to coordinate the meeting. Professor Coquillette thanked Judge Sutton again for all of his work as Chair of the Standing Committee over the past four years. Judge Sutton concluded the meeting. The Standing Committee will next meet in Phoenix, Arizona, on January 3–4, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca A. Womeldorf
Secretary, Standing Committee