### COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

**OFTHE** 

### JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

ALICEMARIE H. STOTLER CHAIR

> PETER G. McCABE SECRETARY

**CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES** 

JAMES K. LOGAN APPELLATE RULES

ADRIAN G. DUPLANTIER BANKRUPTCY RULES

PAUL V. NIEMEYER CIVIL RULES

D. LOWELL JENSEN CRIMINAL RULES

FERN M. SMITH EVIDENCE RULES

TO:

Honorable Alicemarie H. Stotler, Chair, and Members of the Standing

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM:

Honorable James K. Logan, Chair

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

DATE:

December 5, 1996

The Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules has very little to report and will not be presenting any items for action by the Standing Committee. The Advisory Committee did not meet this fall because it decided to delay work on any new projects until after the close of the comment period on the "style" packet, which period ends December 31, 1996.

Since the Standing Committee's meeting last June, however, the Advisory Committee has completed two tasks.

1. Further improvement of the proposed changes to Form 4. Pursuant to a request from the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, last June the Advisory Committee presented for your consideration a revised Form 4 from the appendix of forms that accompanies the appellate rules. The Supreme Court rules require parties desiring to proceed in forma pauperis to file an affidavit or declaration in the form prescribed by Appellate Form 4. The Clerk advised that Form 4 needs to be changed to include more detailed financial information. At almost the same time, the Congress passed legislation affecting in forma pauperis appeals by prisoners. The legislation requires detail on "all assets" of the prisoner and requires a certified statement of the receipts, expenditures, and balances in the prisoner's institutional account during the preceding six months. At the June meeting the Standing Committee approved in principle the recommended changes in Form 4 but further simplification of the language was suggested.

Bryan Garner redrafted the form using simpler language and the Advisory Committee conferred by telephone on final changes to the language. The form as redrafted was published in August along with proposed changes in Appellate Rules 5 and 5.1.

2. Advisory Committee's self-evaluation. In October Judge Wm. Terrell Hodges, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States, asked each of the Judicial Conference committees to conduct a self-evaluation. Because the Executive Committee plans to review the self-evaluations at a February 1997 meeting and the Advisory Committee did not plan to meet prior to that time, I polled the members of the Advisory Committee by mail. On the basis of their responses I prepared a draft of the self-evaluation for review by the members of the Advisory Committee. With their approval, the report was submitted. In short, we recommend the committee's continued existence.

With regard to the style project, thus far we have received surprisingly few comments; they are generally favorable. The comments contain some suggestions for improvement and clarification as well as some new substantive suggestions; the latter will be placed on the Advisory Committee's docket for later consideration.

Table 1 To 1

An updated version of the Advisory Committee's Table of Agenda Items is included for your information.

## Advisory Committee on the Federal Appellate Rules Table of Agenda Items -- Revised December 1996

Current Status	Under study by reporter Discussion with Supreme Court Clerk to precede any further action 10/90 Additional drafts requested 12/91 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/92 Standing Committee requested that Advisory Committee reconsider 6/92 Draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/93. Check all other FRAP for cross-references to "suggestions" for rehearing en banc Approved by Standing Committee for publication to bench and bar 6/93 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97	Under study See notes under item 89-5	Discussion on-going 4/91 Consideration of interlocutory review of rulings on class certification. Referral from Civil Rules Committee 6/93
Source	Mr. Robert St. Vrain (CA-8)	Hon. Jon Newman (CA-2) Mr. St. Vrain (CA-8)	Federal Courts Study Committee Judicial Improvement Act of 1990, P.L. No. 101-650; and Federal Courts Administration Act of 1992, P.L. No. 102-572
Proposal	Amendment of FRAP 35(c).	Amend FRAP 35(b) and (c) to change "suggestion" for an en banc to a "petition" for an en banc.	Final decision by rule/expanding interlocutory appeal by rule.
FRAP Item	69-5	90-1	91-3

Current Status	Reporter asked to draft language 12/91 Approved for submission to Standing Committe
Source	Mr. Greacen (CA-5)
Proposal	Typeface, re: rule 32.
FRAP Item	91-4

### **Current Status**

tee 11/92

Approved by Standing Committee for publication Advisory Committee approved new drafts for to bench and bar 12/92

Standing Committee approved new draft for resubmission to Standing Committee for republication 5/93

Published 11/93 publication 6/93

Advisory Committee approved new draft for submission to Standing Committee for republication 4/94

Approved by Standing Committee for republication 6/94

Published 9/94

New draft approved by Advisory Committee 4/95 Standing Committee referred back to Advisory

New draft approved by Advisory Committee 10/65 Committee 6/96

Standing Committee approved new draft for

Published 4/96 publication 1/96

FRAP Item	Proposal	Source	Current Status
91-9	Amendment of Rule 32(a) to require counsel to include their telephone	Local Rules Project	Approved for submission to Standing Comm 12/91
	numbers on the covers of briefs and appendices.		1/92

Current Status	Reporter asked to draft language 12/91 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 10/92 Standing Committee referred the proposal back to to Advisory Committee for further consideration 12/92 New draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/93 Approved by Standing Committee for publication to bench and bar 6/93 Published 11/93 Advisory Committee approved new draft for submission to Standing Committee for republication 4/94 Approved by Standing Committee for republished 9/94 Approved for resubmission to Standing Committee 4/95 Standing Committee approved forwarding to Judicial Conference 6/95 Became effective 12/1/96	Further study recommended 12/91
Source	Local Rules Project	Local Rules Project &
<u>Proposal</u>	Amendment of Rule 21 so that a petition for mandamus does not bear the name of the district judge and the judge is represented <u>pro forma</u> by counsel for the party opposing the relief unless the judge requests an order permitting the judge to appear.	Uniform plan for publication of opinions.
FRAP Iten	- - - 	91-17

Local Rules Project & Further study recommended 12/91 Federal Courts Study Committee

	S	Current Status	For future discussion 12/91 Approved in substance; Reporter to prepare new draft 9/93 Discussion of new draft postponed until fall meeting 4/94 Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style Subcommittee Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97	For future discussion 12/91 Approved in substance; Reporter to prepare new draft 9/93
de d		Source	CA-5 in response to Local Rules Project	CA-5 in response to Local Rules Project
		Proposal	Page limits for and contents of amicus briefs.	Amendment of Rule 35 to specify contents of suggestions for rehearing en banc.
		FRAP Item	91-24	91-25

Standing Committee 4/95
Published 9/95
Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96

Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style

Revised draft approved for submission to

Subcommittee

meeting 4/94

Discussion of new draft postponed until fall

forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be

Current Status	Mr. Kopp asked to prepare memo 12/91 Held over 10/92 Subcommittee appointed 4/93 Approved in substance; subcommittee to prepare new draft 9/93 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/94 Approved by Standing Committee for publication 6/94 Published 9/94	Approved for resubmission to Standing Committee 4/95 Standing Committee referred back to Advisory Committee 6/95 New draft approved by Advisory Committee 10/95 Standing Committee approved new draft for publication 1/96 Published 4/96	Subcommittee consisting of Judges Logan and Williams and Mr. Kopp to consult with Reporter Report from FIC pending 1/93 On hold pending views of Solicitor General 4/93 Approved in substance, subcommittee to
Source	Advisory Committee		Solicitor General Starr
Proposal	Updating Rule 27.		Amendment of Rule 35 to include intercircuit conflict as ground for seeking en banc.
FRAP Item	91-28		92-4

# Subcommittee Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/97; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97

Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style

meeting 4/94

prepare new draft 9/93 Discussion of new draft postponed until fall

Current Status	Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/93 Approved by Standing Committee for publication to bench and bar 6/93 Published 11/93 Advisory Committee approved new draft for submission to Standing Committee for republication 4/94 Approved by Standing Committee for republication 6/94 Published 9/94 Revised draft approved for resubmission to Standing Committee 4/95 Standing Committee 4/95 Standing Committee approved forwarding to Judicial Conference 6/95 Approved by Judicial Conference 9/95 Became effective 12/1/96	On hold pending views of Solicitor General 4/93	Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style Subcommittee Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96
Source	Advisory Committee	Attorney General Barr and Standing Committee	Advisory Committee
Proposal	Amendment of Rule 25 re "most expeditious form except special delivery".	Consideration of local rules that do not exempt government attorneys from being required to join court bar or from paying admission fees.	Amend Rule 41 re: 7-day period for issuance of mandate.
FRAP Item	92-5	92-11	93-3

Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97

Current Status	Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style Subcommittee Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97	Diaft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style Subcommittee Subcommittee Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled	Draft approved 10/94 to be submitted to Style Subcommittee] Revised draft approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/95 Published 9/95 Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee 7/96; will be forwarded to Judicial Conference with restyled rules 8/97	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion
Source	Advisory Committee	Mr. Joseph Spaniol	Solicitor General Days	Mr. Alan Morrison	Mr. Wm. Johnson, Sr. & Mr. Kenneth Bonds
<u>Proposal</u>	Amend Rule 41 re: length of time for stay of mandate.	Amend Rule 26.1 to delete use of term "affiliate."	Amend Rule 41 re: effective date of mandate.	Amend Civil Rule 23 so class members do not need to intervene to appeal.	Amend Rules 3 and 24 re: denial of in forma pauperis status.
FRAP Item	93-4	93-5	93-6	95-1	95-2

Current Status	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion	Awaiting initial discussion	Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee for publication 7/96 Published 8/96	Approved for submission to Standing Committee 4/96 Approved by Standing Committee for publication 7/96 Published 8/96	Awaiting initial discussion
Source	Hon. Stephen Williams (CA-DC)	Mr. James B. Doyle	Hon. Frank Easterbrook (CA-7)	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Wm. Suter, Clerk of the Supreme Court	Hon. R. Posner (CA-7)
<u>Proposal</u>	Amend Rule 15(f) to conform to recent amendments to 4(a)(4).	Amend computation of time to conform to Civil Rules method.	Amend Rule 31 to require submission of digitally readable copy of brief, when available.	Amend Rule 3(d) & 15(5) to require appellant/petitioner to serve copies of notice of appeal.	Amend Rule 4(a)(5) to make it clear that a "good cause" extension is available after expiration of original period.	Does Rule 4(a)(7) repeal collateral order doctrine?	Amend Rules 5 & 5.1 so that time for ordering transcript runs from entry of order granting permission to appeal.	Amend Form 4 to obtain information about living expenses.	Amend Rule 4(b) so that an extension of time to file a notice of appeal can be granted in a criminal case even without excusable neglect.
FRAP Item	95-3	95-4	95-5	95-6	95-7	95-8	95-9	96-1	96-2

- B

Current Status	Awaiting initial discussion
Source	Advisory Committee
<u>Proposal</u>	Add presumption against oral argument for all matters other than the substance of the appeal (in Rule 34?).
FRAP Item	96-3