

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF  
BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

---

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE CHIEF JUSTICE, THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE THAT HAVE BEEN ADOPTED BY THE SUPREME COURT, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. 2075; ADDED BY PUBLIC LAW 88-623, SEC. 1 (AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 103-394, SEC. 104(f)); (108 STAT. 4110) AND 28 U.S.C. 331; JUNE 25, 1948, CH. 646 (AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 110-177, SEC. 101(b)); (121 STAT. 2534)



APRIL 29, 2016.—Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered  
to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

59-011

WASHINGTON : 2016



SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
*Washington, DC, April 28, 2016.*

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to submit to the Congress the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to Section 2075 of Title 28, United States Code.

Accompanying these rules are the following materials submitted to the Court for its consideration pursuant to Section 331 of Title 28, United States Code: transmittal letters to the Court; redline versions of the rules with Committee Notes; excerpts from the Reports of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure to the Judicial Conference of the United States; excerpts from the Reports of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; and a Memorandum to the Court from James C. Duff, Secretary of the Judicial Conference of the United States, with attachments.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. ROBERTS, Jr.,  
*Chief Justice.*

April 28, 2016

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORDERED:

1. That the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure be, and they hereby are, amended by including therein amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 1010, 1011, 2002, 3002.1, 7008, 7012, 7016, 9006, 9027, and 9033, and new Rule 1012.

[*See infra* pp. \_\_\_\_\_.]

2. That the foregoing amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure shall take effect on December 1, 2016, and shall govern in all proceedings in bankruptcy cases thereafter commenced and, insofar as just and practicable, all proceedings then pending.

3. That THE CHIEF JUSTICE be, and hereby is, authorized to transmit to the Congress the foregoing amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure in accordance with the provisions of Section 2075 of Title 28, United States Code.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL  
RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE**

**Rule 1010. Service of Involuntary Petition and  
Summons**

(a) SERVICE OF INVOLUNTARY PETITION AND SUMMONS. On the filing of an involuntary petition, the clerk shall forthwith issue a summons for service. When an involuntary petition is filed, service shall be made on the debtor. The summons shall be served with a copy of the petition in the manner provided for service of a summons and complaint by Rule 7004(a) or (b). If service cannot be so made, the court may order that the summons and petition be served by mailing copies to the party's last known address, and by at least one publication in a manner and form directed by the court. The summons and petition may be served on the party anywhere. Rule 7004(e) and Rule 4(*l*) F.R.Civ.P. apply when service is made or attempted under this rule.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 2 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Rule 1011. Responsive Pleading or Motion in Involuntary Cases**

(a) WHO MAY CONTEST PETITION. The debtor named in an involuntary petition may contest the petition. In the case of a petition against a partnership under Rule 1004, a nonpetitioning general partner, or a person who is alleged to be a general partner but denies the allegation, may contest the petition.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) CORPORATE OWNERSHIP STATEMENT. If the entity responding to the involuntary petition is a corporation, the entity shall file with its first appearance, pleading, motion, response, or other request addressed to the court a corporate ownership statement containing the information described in Rule 7007.1.

**Rule 1012. Responsive Pleading in Cross-Border Cases**

(a) WHO MAY CONTEST PETITION. The debtor or any party in interest may contest a petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding.

(b) OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES; WHEN PRESENTED. Objections and other responses to the petition shall be presented no later than seven days before the date set for the hearing on the petition, unless the court prescribes some other time or manner for responses.

(c) CORPORATE OWNERSHIP STATEMENT. If the entity responding to the petition is a corporation, then the entity shall file a corporate ownership statement containing the information described in Rule 7007.1 with its first appearance, pleading, motion, response, or other request addressed to the court.

## 4 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Rule 2002. Notices to Creditors, Equity Security Holders, Administrators in Foreign Proceedings, Persons Against Whom Provisional Relief is Sought in Ancillary and Other Cross-Border Cases, United States, and United States Trustee**

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) NOTICE OF PETITION FOR RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN PROCEEDING AND OF COURT'S INTENTION TO COMMUNICATE WITH FOREIGN COURTS AND FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES.

(1) *Notice of Petition for Recognition.* After the filing of a petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding, the court shall promptly schedule and hold a hearing on the petition. The clerk, or some other person as the court may direct, shall forthwith give the debtor, all persons or bodies authorized to administer foreign proceedings of the debtor, all entities against whom provisional relief is being sought under §1519 of the Code, all parties to



## FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE 5

litigation pending in the United States in which the debtor is a party at the time of the filing of the petition, and such other entities as the court may direct, at least 21 days' notice by mail of the hearing. The notice shall state whether the petition seeks recognition as a foreign main proceeding or foreign nonmain proceeding and shall include the petition and any other document the court may require. If the court consolidates the hearing on the petition with the hearing on a request for provisional relief, the court may set a shorter notice period, with notice to the entities listed in this subdivision.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 6 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Rule 3002.1. Notice Relating to Claims Secured by  
Security Interest in the Debtor's  
Principal Residence**

(a) IN GENERAL. This rule applies in a chapter 13 case to claims (1) that are secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence, and (2) for which the plan provides that either the trustee or the debtor will make contractual installment payments. Unless the court orders otherwise, the notice requirements of this rule cease to apply when an order terminating or annulling the automatic stay becomes effective with respect to the residence that secures the claim.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Rule 7008. General Rules of Pleading**

Rule 8 F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary proceedings. The allegation of jurisdiction required by Rule 8(a) shall also contain a reference to the name, number, and chapter of the case under the Code to which the adversary proceeding relates and to the district and division where the case under the Code is pending. In an adversary proceeding before a bankruptcy court, the complaint, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party complaint shall contain a statement that the pleader does or does not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court.

8 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Rule 7012. Defenses and Objections—When and How  
Presented—By Pleading or Motion—  
Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) APPLICABILITY OF RULE 12(b)-(i)  
F.R.CIV.P. Rule 12(b)-(i) F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary  
proceedings. A responsive pleading shall include a  
statement that the party does or does not consent to entry of  
final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court.

**Rule 7016. Pretrial Procedures**

(a) PRETRIAL CONFERENCES; SCHEDULING; MANAGEMENT. Rule 16 F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary proceedings.

(b) DETERMINING PROCEDURE. The bankruptcy court shall decide, on its own motion or a party's timely motion, whether:

- (1) to hear and determine the proceeding;
- (2) to hear the proceeding and issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law; or
- (3) to take some other action.

10 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Rule 9006. Computing and Extending Time; Time for Motion Papers**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) ADDITIONAL TIME AFTER SERVICE BY MAIL OR UNDER RULE 5(b)(2)(D) OR (F) F.R.CIV.P. When there is a right or requirement to act or undertake some proceedings within a prescribed period after being served and that service is by mail or under Rule 5(b)(2)(D) (leaving with the clerk) or (F) (other means consented to) F.R.Civ.P., three days are added after the prescribed period would otherwise expire under Rule 9006(a).

\* \* \* \* \*

**Rule 9027. Removal**

## (a) NOTICE OF REMOVAL.

(1) *Where Filed; Form and Content.* A notice of removal shall be filed with the clerk for the district and division within which is located the state or federal court where the civil action is pending. The notice shall be signed pursuant to Rule 9011 and contain a short and plain statement of the facts which entitle the party filing the notice to remove, contain a statement that upon removal of the claim or cause of action, the party filing the notice does or does not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court, and be accompanied by a copy of all process and pleadings.

\* \* \* \* \*

12 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

(e) PROCEDURE AFTER REMOVAL.

\* \* \* \* \*

(3) Any party who has filed a pleading in connection with the removed claim or cause of action, other than the party filing the notice of removal, shall file a statement that the party does or does not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court. A statement required by this paragraph shall be signed pursuant to Rule 9011 and shall be filed not later than 14 days after the filing of the notice of removal. Any party who files a statement pursuant to this paragraph shall mail a copy to every other party to the removed claim or cause of action.

\* \* \* \* \*



**Rule 9033. Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

(a) SERVICE. In a proceeding in which the bankruptcy court has issued proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, the clerk shall serve forthwith copies on all parties by mail and note the date of mailing on the docket.

\* \* \* \* \*



JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES  
*Presiding*

JAMES C. DUFF  
*Secretary*

October 9, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: The Chief Justice of the United States and  
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court

From: James C. Duff *James C. Duff*

RE: TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF  
BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

By direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to the authority conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 331, I transmit herewith for consideration of the Court proposed amendments to Rules 1010, 1011, 2002, 3002.1, and 9006, and new Rule 1012 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, which were approved by the Judicial Conference at its September 2015 session. The Judicial Conference recommends that the amendments be approved by the Court and transmitted to the Congress pursuant to law.

For your assistance in considering the proposed amendments, I am transmitting: (i) "clean" copies of the affected rules incorporating the proposed amendments and accompanying Committee Notes; (ii) a redline version of the same; (iii) an excerpt from the September 2015 Report of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure to the Judicial Conference; and (iv) an excerpt from the May 2015 Report of the Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

Attachments

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL  
RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE\***

1 **Rule 1010. Service of Involuntary Petition and**  
2 **Summons; ~~Petition for Recognition of a~~**  
3 **~~Foreign Nonmain Proceeding~~**

4 (a) SERVICE OF INVOLUNTARY PETITION  
5 AND SUMMONS; ~~SERVICE OF PETITION FOR~~  
6 ~~RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN NONMAIN~~  
7 ~~PROCEEDING.~~ On the filing of an involuntary petition or  
8 a petition for recognition of a foreign nonmain proceeding,  
9 the clerk shall forthwith issue a summons for service.  
10 When an involuntary petition is filed, service shall be made  
11 on the debtor. ~~When a petition for recognition of a foreign~~  
12 ~~nonmain proceeding is filed, service shall be made on the~~  
13 ~~debtor, any entity against whom provisional relief is sought~~  
14 ~~under § 1519 of the Code, and on any other party as the~~  
15 ~~court may direct.~~ The summons shall be served with a  
16 copy of the petition in the manner provided for service of a

---

\* New material is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through.

## 2 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

17 summons and complaint by Rule 7004(a) or (b). If service  
18 cannot be so made, the court may order that the summons  
19 and petition be served by mailing copies to the party's last  
20 known address, and by at least one publication in a manner  
21 and form directed by the court. The summons and petition  
22 may be served on the party anywhere. Rule 7004(e) and  
23 Rule 4(*l*) F.R.Civ.P. apply when service is made or  
24 attempted under this rule.

25 \* \* \* \* \*

**Committee Note**

Subdivision (a) of this rule is amended to remove provisions regarding the issuance of a summons for service in certain chapter 15 proceedings. The requirements for notice and service in chapter 15 proceedings are found in Rule 2002(q).

## FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE 3

1 **Rule 1011. Responsive Pleading or Motion in**  
2 **Involuntary and Cross-Border Cases**

3 (a) WHO MAY CONTEST PETITION. The debtor  
4 named in an involuntary petition, ~~or a party in interest to a~~  
5 ~~petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding,~~ may  
6 contest the petition. In the case of a petition against a  
7 partnership under Rule 1004, a nonpetitioning general  
8 partner, or a person who is alleged to be a general partner  
9 but denies the allegation, may contest the petition.

10 \* \* \* \* \*

11 (f) CORPORATE OWNERSHIP STATEMENT. If  
12 the entity responding to the involuntary petition ~~or the~~  
13 ~~petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding~~ is a  
14 corporation, the entity shall file with its first appearance,  
15 pleading, motion, response, or other request addressed to  
16 the court a corporate ownership statement containing the  
17 information described in Rule 7007.1.

4 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Committee Note**

This rule is amended to remove provisions regarding chapter 15 proceedings. The requirements for responses to a petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding are found in Rule 1012.

1 **Rule 1012. Responsive Pleading in Cross-Border Cases**

2 (a) WHO MAY CONTEST PETITION. The debtor  
3 or any party in interest may contest a petition for  
4 recognition of a foreign proceeding.

5 (b) OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES; WHEN  
6 PRESENTED. Objections and other responses to the  
7 petition shall be presented no later than seven days before  
8 the date set for the hearing on the petition, unless the court  
9 prescribes some other time or manner for responses.

10 (c) CORPORATE OWNERSHIP STATEMENT. If  
11 the entity responding to the petition is a corporation, then  
12 the entity shall file a corporate ownership statement  
13 containing the information described in Rule 7007.1 with  
14 its first appearance, pleading, motion, response, or other  
15 request addressed to the court.

## 6 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Committee Note**

This rule is added to govern responses to petitions for recognition in cross-border cases. It incorporates provisions formerly found in Rule 1011. Subdivision (a) provides that the debtor or a party in interest may contest the petition. Subdivision (b) provides for presentation of responses no later than 7 days before the hearing on the petition, unless the court directs otherwise. Subdivision (c) governs the filing of corporate ownership statements by entities responding to the petition.



1 **Rule 2002. Notices to Creditors, Equity Security**  
2 **Holders, Administrators in Foreign**  
3 **Proceedings, Persons Against Whom**  
4 **Provisional Relief is Sought in Ancillary**  
5 **and Other Cross-Border Cases, United**  
6 **States, and United States Trustee**

7 \* \* \* \* \*

8 (q) NOTICE OF PETITION FOR RECOGNITION  
9 OF FOREIGN PROCEEDING AND OF COURT'S  
10 INTENTION TO COMMUNICATE WITH FOREIGN  
11 COURTS AND FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES.

12 (1) *Notice of Petition for Recognition.* After  
13 the filing of a petition for recognition of a foreign  
14 proceeding, the court shall promptly schedule and  
15 hold a hearing on the petition. The clerk, or some  
16 other person as the court may direct, shall forthwith  
17 give the debtor, all persons or bodies authorized to  
18 administer foreign proceedings of the debtor, all  
19 entities against whom provisional relief is being  
20 sought under §1519 of the Code, all parties to

34 \* \* \* \* \*

Subdivision (q) is amended to clarify the procedures for giving notice in cross-border proceedings. The amended rule provides, in keeping with Code § 1517(c), for the court to schedule a hearing to be held promptly on the

## FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE 9

petition for recognition of a foreign proceeding. The amended rule contemplates that a hearing on a request for provisional relief may sometimes overlap substantially with the merits of the petition for recognition. In that case, the court may choose to consolidate the hearing on the request for provisional relief with the hearing on the petition for recognition, see Rules 1018 and 7065, and accordingly shorten the usual 21-day notice period.

## 10 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

1 **Rule 3002.1. Notice Relating to Claims Secured by**  
2 **Security Interest in the Debtor's**  
3 **Principal Residence**

4 (a) IN GENERAL. This rule applies in a chapter 13  
5 case to claims (1) that are (1) secured by a security interest  
6 in the debtor's principal residence, and (2) for which the  
7 plan provides that either the trustee or the debtor will make  
8 contractual installment payments provided for under  
9 § 1322(b)(5) of the Code in the debtor's plan. Unless the  
10 court orders otherwise, the notice requirements of this rule  
11 cease to apply when an order terminating or annulling the  
12 automatic stay becomes effective with respect to the  
13 residence that secures the claim.

14 \* \* \* \* \*

**Committee Note**

Subdivision (a) is amended to clarify the applicability of the rule. Its provisions apply whenever a chapter 13 plan provides that contractual payments on the debtor's home mortgage will be maintained, whether they will be paid by the trustee or directly by the debtor. The reference to § 1322(b)(5) of the Code is deleted to make

clear that the rule applies even if there is no prepetition arrearage to be cured. So long as a creditor has a claim that is secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence and the plan provides that contractual payments on the claim will be maintained, the rule applies.

Subdivision (a) is further amended to provide that, unless the court orders otherwise, the notice obligations imposed by this rule cease on the effective date of an order granting relief from the automatic stay with regard to the debtor's principal residence. Debtors and trustees typically do not make payments on mortgages after the stay relief is granted, so there is generally no need for the holder of the claim to continue providing the notices required by this rule. Sometimes, however, there may be reasons for the debtor to continue receiving mortgage information after stay relief. For example, the debtor may intend to seek a mortgage modification or to cure the default. When the court determines that the debtor has a need for the information required by this rule, the court is authorized to order that the notice obligations remain in effect or be reinstated after the relief from the stay is granted.

## 12 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

1 **Rule 9006. Computing and Extending Time; Time for**  
 2 **Motion Papers**

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4 (f) ADDITIONAL TIME AFTER SERVICE  
 5 BY MAIL OR UNDER RULE 5(b)(2)(D), ~~(E)~~, OR (F)  
 6 F.R.CIV.P. When there is a right or requirement to act or  
 7 undertake some proceedings within a prescribed period  
 8 after ~~service~~being served and that service is by mail or  
 9 under Rule 5(b)(2)(D) (leaving with the clerk), ~~(E)~~, or (F)  
 10 (other means consented to) F.R.Civ.P., three days are added  
 11 after the prescribed period would otherwise expire under  
 12 Rule 9006(a).

13 \* \* \* \* \*

**Committee Note**

Subdivision (f) is amended to remove service by electronic means under Civil Rule 5(b)(2)(E) from the modes of service that allow three added days to act after being served.

Rule 9006(f) and Civil Rule 6(d) contain similar provisions providing additional time for actions after being

served by mail or by certain modes of service that are identified by reference to Civil Rule 5(b)(2). Rule 9006(f)—like Civil Rule 6(d)—is amended to remove the reference to service by electronic means under Rule 5(b)(2)(E). The amendment also adds clarifying parentheticals identifying the forms of service under Rule 5(b)(2) for which three days will still be added.

Civil Rule 5(b)—made applicable in bankruptcy proceedings by Rules 7005 and 9014(b)—was amended in 2001 to allow service by electronic means with the consent of the person served. Although electronic transmission seemed virtually instantaneous even then, electronic service was included in the modes of service that allow three added days to act after being served. There were concerns that the transmission might be delayed for some time, and particular concerns that incompatible systems might make it difficult or impossible to open attachments. Those concerns have been substantially alleviated by advances in technology and widespread skill in using electronic transmission.

A parallel reason for allowing the three added days was that electronic service was authorized only with the consent of the person to be served. Concerns about the reliability of electronic transmission might have led to refusals of consent; the three added days were calculated to alleviate these concerns.

Diminution of the concerns that prompted the decision to allow the three added days for electronic transmission is not the only reason for discarding this indulgence. Many rules have been changed to ease the task of computing time by adopting 7-, 14-, 21-, and 28-day

## 14 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

periods that allow “day-of-the-week” counting. Adding three days at the end complicated the counting, and increased the occasions for further complication by invoking the provisions that apply when the last day is a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday.

Electronic service after business hours, or just before or during a weekend or holiday, may result in a practical reduction in the time available to respond. Extensions of time may be warranted to prevent prejudice.

Eliminating Rule 5(b) subparagraph (2)(E) from the modes of service that allow three added days means that the three added days cannot be retained by consenting to service by electronic means. Consent to electronic service in registering for electronic case filing, for example, does not count as consent to service “by any other means” of delivery under subparagraph (F).

Subdivision (f) is also amended to conform to a corresponding amendment of Civil Rule 6(d). The amendment clarifies that only the party that is served by mail or under the specified provisions of Civil Rule 5—and not the party making service—is permitted to add three days to any prescribed period for taking action after service is made.



EXCERPT FROM THE SEPTEMBER 2015  
REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES:

\* \* \* \* \*

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

*Rules \* \* \* \* \* Recommended for Approval and Transmission*

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules submitted proposed new Rule 1012, proposed amendments to Rules 1010, 1011, 2002, 3002.1, and 9006(f) \* \* \* \* \* with a recommendation that they be approved and transmitted to the Judicial Conference. The proposed amendments were circulated to the bench, bar, and public for comment in August 2013 \* \* \* \* \*, and were offered for approval as published except as noted below.

Rules 1010, 1011, and 2002, and New Rule 1012

The proposed amendments to Rules 1010, 1011, and 2002, and proposed new Rule 1012 are intended to improve procedures for international bankruptcy cases. Shortly after chapter 15 (Ancillary and Other Cross-Border Cases) was added to the Bankruptcy Code in 2005, the Bankruptcy Rules were amended to insert new provisions governing cross-border cases. Among the new provisions were changes to Rules 1010 and 1011, which previously governed only involuntary bankruptcy cases, and Rule 2002, which governs notice. The proposed new rule and amendments would: (1) remove the chapter 15-related provisions from Rules 1010 and 1011; (2) create a new Rule 1012 (Responsive Pleading in Cross-Border Cases) to govern responses to a chapter 15 petition; and (3) augment Rule 2002 to clarify the procedures for giving notice in cross-border proceedings. One comment received will be treated as a suggestion for later

consideration. The Advisory Committee determined to recommend approval of the amended rules as published.

Rule 3002.1

Rule 3002.1 applies only in chapter 13 cases and requires creditors whose claims are secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence to provide the debtor and the trustee notice of any changes in the periodic payment amount or the assessment of any fees or charges during the bankruptcy case. This rule intended to ensure that debtors who attempt to maintain their home mortgage payments while they are in chapter 13 will have the information they need to do so.

The proposed amendments seek to clarify three matters on which courts have disagreed: (1) the rule applies whenever a debtor will make ongoing mortgage payments during the chapter 13 case, whether or not a prepetition default is being cured; (2) the rule applies regardless of whether it is the debtor or the trustee who is making the payments to the mortgagee; and (3) the rule generally ceases to apply when an order granting relief from the stay becomes effective with respect to the debtor's residence.

Four comments were submitted on the proposed amendments. Two of them addressed the difficulty of applying the rule to home equity lines of credit, for which changes in payment amount are frequent and often de minimis. The other comments were supportive of the amendments. The Advisory Committee determined to recommend approval of the amended rule as published.

Rule 9006(f)

The amendment to Rule 9006(f) would eliminate the 3-day extension to time periods when service is made electronically. The amendment was initially proposed by the CM/ECF

Subcommittee and was published simultaneously with similar amendments to Civil Rule 6(d), Appellate Rule 26(c), and Criminal Rule 45(c) as part of the 3-day rule package. Five comments were submitted on the proposed bankruptcy rule amendment, including one by the Department of Justice similar to its comments on the other Advisory Committees' parallel amendments. To maintain uniformity with the Committee Notes of the other rules in the 3-day rule package, the Advisory Committee agreed to the addition of language to the Committee Note to address the concerns raised by the Department of Justice. The Standing Committee concurred with the minor modification.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Standing Committee concurred with the Advisory Committee's recommendations above.

**Recommendation:** That the Judicial Conference:

- a. Approve the proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 1010, 1011, 2002, 3002.1, 9006(f), and new Rule 1012, and transmit them to the Supreme Court for consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law;

\* \* \* \* \*

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair

Dean C. Colson  
Brent E. Dickson  
Roy T. Englert, Jr.  
Gregory G. Garre  
Neil M. Gorsuch  
Susan P. Graber  
David F. Levi

Patrick J. Schiltz  
Amy J. St. Eve  
Larry D. Thompson  
Richard C. Wesley  
Sally Yates  
Jack Zouhary

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON  
CHAIR  
REBECCA A. WOMELDORF  
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON  
APPELLATE RULES

SANDRA SEGAL IKUTA  
BANKRUPTCY RULES

DAVID G. CAMPBELL  
CIVIL RULES

REENA RAGGI  
CRIMINAL RULES

WILLIAM K. SESSIONS III  
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair  
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

**FROM:** Honorable Sandra Segal Ikuta, Chair  
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

**DATE:** May 6, 2015

**RE:** Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

**I. Introduction**

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules met on April 20, 2015, in Pasadena, California.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Committee now seeks the Standing Committee's final approval of one proposed new rule and five rule amendments that were published in August 2014.

\* \* \* \* \*

**II. Action Items**

**A. Items for Final Approval**

\* \* \* \* \*

**Action Item 1. Rules 1010, 1011, and 2002, and proposed new Rule 1012 (governing responses to, and notices of hearings on, chapter 15 petitions for recognition).** These amendments and addition to the Bankruptcy Rules are intended to improve procedures for international bankruptcy cases. Shortly after chapter 15 (Ancillary and Other Cross-Border Cases) was added to the Bankruptcy Code in 2005, the Bankruptcy Rules were amended to insert new provisions governing cross-border cases. Among the new provisions were changes to Rules 1010 and 1011, which previously governed only involuntary bankruptcy cases, and Rule 2002, which governs notice. The currently proposed amendments to the Bankruptcy Rules would make three changes: (i) remove the chapter 15-related provisions from Rules 1010 and 1011; (ii) create a new Rule 1012 (Responsive Pleading in Cross-Border Cases) to govern responses to a chapter 15 petition; and (iii) augment Rule 2002 to clarify the procedures for giving notice in cross-border proceedings.

Only one comment was submitted regarding the proposed rule changes. The Pennsylvania Bar Association expressed general approval of the proposed amendments, but suggested that Rule 1012 (Responsive Pleading in Cross-Border Cases) contain a cross-reference to Rule 1004.2 (Petition in Chapter 15 Cases). The latter rule prescribes a procedure for challenging the designation in a chapter 15 petition of the debtor's center of main interests. The Bar Association explained that "Rule 1004.2(b) sets forth those parties that should be served in connection with challenges to a debtor's designation in a petition." It suggested that objections and responses to a petition under proposed Rule 1012(b) should be served in the same manner.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed rules as published. It concluded that the Bar Association's comment should be treated as a new suggestion that the notice provisions of Rule 1004.2(b) should be made applicable to all objections and responses to a chapter 15 petition rather than just to challenges to the designation of the debtor's center of main interests. The Committee has added this suggestion to its list of matters for future consideration.

**Action Item 2. Rule 3002.1 (Notice Relating to Claims Secured by Security Interest in the Debtor's Principal Residence).** This rule, which applies only in chapter 13 cases, requires creditors whose claims are secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence to provide the debtor and the trustee notice of any changes in the periodic payment amount or the assessment of any fees or charges while the bankruptcy case is pending. The rule was promulgated in 2011 in order to ensure that debtors who attempt to maintain their home mortgage payments while they are in chapter 13 will have the information they need to do so.

The proposed amendments that were published last summer seek to clarify three matters on which courts have disagreed:

- 1) The rule applies whenever a debtor will make ongoing mortgage payments during the chapter 13 case, whether or not a prepetition default is being cured.
- 2) The rule applies regardless of whether it is the debtor or the trustee who is making the payments to the mortgagee.
- 3) The rule generally ceases to apply when an order granting relief from the stay becomes effective with respect to the debtor's residence.

Four comments were submitted on the proposed amendments. Two of them addressed the difficulty of applying the rule to home equity lines of credit, for which payment amount changes are frequent and often de minimis. The other comments were supportive of the amendments.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the amendments to Rule 3002.1 as published. The issue of the rule's applicability to home equity lines of credit was considered by the Committee at the fall 2014 meeting, and publication of a proposed amendment to address that issue will be sought later as part of a larger package of related amendments.

**Action Item 3. Rule 9006(f) (Computing and Extending Time).** Among the proposed amendments published last summer was an amendment to Rule 9006(f) that would eliminate the 3-day extension to time periods when service is made electronically. The amendment was initially proposed by the Standing Committee's CM/ECF Subcommittee. It was published simultaneously with similar amendments to Civil Rule 6(d), Appellate Rule 26(c), and Criminal Rule 45(c).

Five comments were submitted on the proposed bankruptcy rule amendment. One expressed support for the amendment, and two raised questions about how this time computation change would apply to pending cases or would interact with other rules. A fourth comment, submitted by a bankruptcy clerk, expressed concern about having different deadlines for parties in response to service of a single document. The final comment was submitted by the Department of Justice and was similar to the comments it submitted on the other advisory committees' parallel amendments. The comment raised concerns about possible prejudice caused by end-of-day or beginning-of-weekend electronic service and suggested an addition to the Committee Note that would note the court's authority to grant extensions of time to prevent unfairness in such situations.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the amendment as published. While the Committee preferred not to revise the Committee Note in response to the DOJ's comment, it agreed to the addition of the following language if needed to maintain uniformity with the Committee Notes of the other advisory committees: "The ease of making electronic service after business hours, or just before or during a weekend or holiday, may result in a practical reduction in the time available to respond. Extensions of time may be warranted to prevent prejudice."

\* \* \* \* \*



## JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544


THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES  
*Presiding*

JAMES C. DUFF  
*Secretary*

October 29, 2015

## MEMORANDUM

To: The Chief Justice of the United States  
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court

From: James C. Duff 

RE: SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL  
RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

By direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States (Judicial Conference), pursuant to the authority conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 331, I transmit for consideration of the Court a supplemental transmittal of proposed amendments to Rules 7008, 7012, 7016, 9027, and 9033 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. This package, known as the “*Stern* Amendments,” was previously approved by the Judicial Conference at its September 2013 session and submitted to the Court but withdrawn from consideration because of pending litigation on the Court’s docket that implicated the subject matter of the *Stern* Amendments.

For reasons explained in the attached materials, the Judicial Conference now resubmits the *Stern* Amendments for the Court’s consideration. This package supplements our transmittal dated October 9, 2015, of proposed amendments to Rules 1010, 1011, 2002, 3002.1, and 9006, and new Rule 1012. The Judicial Conference recommends that these supplemental amendments be approved by the Court and transmitted to Congress pursuant to law.

For your assistance in considering the proposed amendments, I am transmitting: (i) “clean” copies of the affected rules incorporating the proposed amendments and accompanying Committee Notes; (ii) a redline version of the same; (iii) a Memorandum of Action by the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference explaining the timing of its approval of the *Stern* Amendments; (iv) the October 16, 2015, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure Memorandum to Chief Judge William B. Traxler, Jr., requesting expedited consideration of the *Stern* Amendments; (v) the October 14, 2015, Bankruptcy Rules Advisory Committee Memorandum regarding the *Stern* Amendments; (vi) an excerpt from the September 27, 2013, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules; and (vii) an excerpt from the May 8, 2013, Bankruptcy Rules Advisory Committee Report.

Attachments

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL  
RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE\***

1   **Rule 7008. General Rules of Pleading**

2           Rule 8 F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary proceedings.

3   The allegation of jurisdiction required by Rule 8(a) shall  
4   also contain a reference to the name, number, and chapter  
5   of the case under the Code to which the adversary  
6   proceeding relates and to the district and division where the  
7   case under the Code is pending. In an adversary  
8   proceeding before a bankruptcy ~~judge~~court, the complaint,  
9   counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party complaint shall  
10   contain a statement ~~that the proceeding is core or non-core~~  
11   ~~and, if non-core~~ that the pleader does or does not consent to  
12   entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy  
13   judgecourt.

---

\* New material is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through.



## 2 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

**Committee Note**

The rule is amended to remove the requirement that the pleader state whether the proceeding is core or non-core and to require in all proceedings that the pleader state whether the party does or does not consent to the entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court. Some proceedings that satisfy the statutory definition of core proceedings, 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), may remain beyond the constitutional power of a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate finally. The amended rule calls for the pleader to make a statement regarding consent, whether or not a proceeding is termed non-core. Rule 7012(b) has been amended to require a similar statement in a responsive pleading. The bankruptcy judge will then determine the appropriate course of proceedings under Rule 7016.

1 **Rule 7012. Defenses and Objections—When and How**  
 2 **Presented—By Pleading or Motion—**  
 3 **Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings**

4 \* \* \* \* \*

5 (b) APPLICABILITY OF RULE 12(b)-(i)  
 6 F.R.CIV.P. Rule 12(b)-(i) F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary  
 7 proceedings. A responsive pleading ~~shall admit or deny an~~  
 8 ~~allegation that the proceeding is core or non-core.~~ If the  
 9 response is that the proceeding is non-core, it shall include a  
 10 statement that the party does or does not consent to entry of  
 11 final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy judge court. ~~In~~  
 12 ~~non-core proceedings final orders and judgments shall not~~  
 13 ~~be entered on the bankruptcy judge's order except with the~~  
 14 ~~express consent of the parties.~~

**Committee Note**

Subdivision (b) is amended to remove the requirement that the pleader state whether the proceeding is core or non-core and to require in all proceedings that the pleader state whether the party does or does not consent to the entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court. The

## 4 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

amended rule also removes the provision requiring express consent before the entry of final orders and judgments in non-core proceedings. Some proceedings that satisfy the statutory definition of core proceedings, 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), may remain beyond the constitutional power of a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate finally. The amended rule calls for the pleader to make a statement regarding consent, whether or not a proceeding is termed non-core. This amendment complements the requirements of amended Rule 7008(a). The bankruptcy judge's subsequent determination of the appropriate course of proceedings, including whether to enter final orders and judgments or to issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, is a pretrial matter now provided for in amended Rule 7016.

1 **Rule 7016. ~~Pre-Trial Procedures; Formulating Issues~~**

2 (a) PRETRIAL CONFERENCES; SCHEDULING;  
3 MANAGEMENT. Rule 16 F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary  
4 proceedings.

5 (b) DETERMINING PROCEDURE. The bankruptcy  
6 court shall decide, on its own motion or a party's timely  
7 motion, whether:

8 (1) to hear and determine the proceeding;

9 (2) to hear the proceeding and issue proposed  
10 findings of fact and conclusions of law; or

11 (3) to take some other action.

**Committee Note**

This rule is amended to create a new subdivision (b) that provides for the bankruptcy court to enter final orders and judgment, issue proposed findings and conclusions, or take some other action in a proceeding. The rule leaves the decision as to the appropriate course of proceedings to the bankruptcy court. The court's decision will be informed by the parties' statements, required under Rules 7008(a), 7012(b), and 9027(a) and (e), regarding consent to the entry of final orders and judgment. If the bankruptcy court

6 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

chooses to issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, Rule 9033 applies.

1   **Rule 9027. Removal**

2       (a) NOTICE OF REMOVAL.

3           (1) *Where Filed; Form and Content.* A notice  
4       of removal shall be filed with the clerk for the district  
5       and division within which is located the state or  
6       federal court where the civil action is pending. The  
7       notice shall be signed pursuant to Rule 9011 and  
8       contain a short and plain statement of the facts which  
9       entitle the party filing the notice to remove, contain a  
10      statement that upon removal of the claim or cause of  
11      ~~action the proceeding is core or non-core and, if non-~~  
12      ~~core, that the party filing the notice does or does not~~  
13      consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the  
14      bankruptcy judge~~court~~, and be accompanied by a copy  
15      of all process and pleadings.

16                                   \* \* \* \* \*

## 8 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

17 (e) PROCEDURE AFTER REMOVAL.

18 \* \* \* \* \*

19 (3) Any party who has filed a pleading in  
20 connection with the removed claim or cause of action,  
21 other than the party filing the notice of removal, shall  
22 file a statement ~~admitting or denying any allegation in~~  
23 ~~the notice of removal that upon removal of the claim~~  
24 ~~or cause of action the proceeding is core or non-core.~~  
25 ~~If the statement alleges that the proceeding is non-~~  
26 ~~core, it shall state~~ that the party does or does not  
27 consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the  
28 bankruptcy ~~judge~~court. A statement required by this  
29 paragraph shall be signed pursuant to Rule 9011 and  
30 shall be filed not later than 14 days after the filing of  
31 the notice of removal. Any party who files a  
32 statement pursuant to this paragraph shall mail a copy

33 to every other party to the removed claim or cause of  
34 action.

35 \* \* \* \* \*

### Committee Note

Subdivisions (a)(1) and (e)(3) are amended to delete the requirement for a statement that the proceeding is core or non-core and to require in all removed actions a statement that the party does or does not consent to the entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court. Some proceedings that satisfy the statutory definition of core proceedings, 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), may remain beyond the constitutional power of a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate finally. The amended rule calls for a statement regarding consent at the time of removal, whether or not a proceeding is termed non-core.

The party filing the notice of removal must include a statement regarding consent in the notice, and the other parties who have filed pleadings must respond in a separate statement filed within 14 days after removal. If a party to the removed claim or cause of action has not filed a pleading prior to removal, however, there is no need to file a separate statement under subdivision (e)(3), because a statement regarding consent must be included in a responsive pleading filed pursuant to Rule 7012(b). Rule 7016 governs the bankruptcy court's decision whether to hear and determine the proceeding, issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, or take some other action in the proceeding.



## 10 FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

1 **Rule 9033. Review of Proposed Findings of Fact and**  
 2 **Conclusions of Law—~~in Non-Core~~**  
 3 **~~Proceedings~~**

4 (a) SERVICE. ~~In non-core proceedings heard~~  
 5 ~~pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(1),~~In a proceeding in which  
 6 the bankruptcy court has issued the bankruptcy judge shall  
 7 file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. ~~The~~  
 8 clerk shall serve forthwith copies on all parties by mail and  
 9 note the date of mailing on the docket.

10 \* \* \* \* \*

### Committee Note

Subdivision (a) is amended to delete language limiting this provision to non-core proceedings. Some proceedings that satisfy the statutory definition of core proceedings, 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), may remain beyond the constitutional power of a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate finally. If the bankruptcy court decides, pursuant to Rule 7016, that it is appropriate to issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law in a proceeding, this rule governs the subsequent procedures.



JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

WILLIAM B. TRAXLER, JR.  
CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(864) 241-2730  
(864) 241-2732 FAX  
wbtr@ca4.uscourts.gov

Memorandum of Action

Executive Committee  
Judicial Conference of the United States

October 20, 2015

The Executive Committee conducted a mail ballot, which concluded on October 20, 2015. All members participated.

The Executive Committee acted on the following matter:

Amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure

At its September 2013 session, the Judicial Conference approved and transmitted to the United States Supreme Court amendments to Rules 7008, 7012, 7016, 9027, and 9033 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure proposed by the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure in response to the Supreme Court's decision in *Stern v. Marshall*, 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011). In November 2013, at the request of the Rules Committee, the Executive Committee acting on behalf of the Judicial Conference, withdrew the amendments in light of pending Supreme Court litigation implicating the amendments and recommitted the amendments to the Rules Committee for further consideration following a decision in the litigation. Following a decision in *Wellness Int'l Network, Ltd. v. Sharif*, 135 S. Ct. 1932 (2015), the Rules Committee has determined that the proposed amendments should move forward as originally drafted. It recommended that the amendments be approved and resubmitted to the Supreme Court in sufficient time to be considered during this rulemaking cycle in order to put in place as soon as possible a process for allowing parties expressly to consent to bankruptcy-judge adjudication of claims otherwise requiring adjudication by an Article III judge. The Executive Committee agreed to act on behalf of the Judicial Conference, on an expedited basis, to approve the amendments and transmit them to the Supreme Court for consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

William B. Traxler, Jr.

Committee: Paul J. Barbadoro  
James C. Duff  
Merrick B. Garland  
Federico A. Moreno  
William Jay Riley

10/22/2015

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

**JEFFREY S. SUTTON**  
CHAIR

**REBECCA WOMELDORF**  
SECRETARY

October 16, 2015

**CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**STEVEN M. COLLOTON**  
APPELLATE RULES

**SANDRA S. IKUTA**  
BANKRUPTCY RULES

**JOHN D. BATES**  
CIVIL RULES

**DONALD W. HOLLOY**  
CRIMINAL RULES

**WILLIAM K. SESSIONS, III**  
EVIDENCE RULES

The Honorable William B. Traxler, Jr.  
Chief Judge  
United States Court of Appeals  
C.F. Haynsworth Federal Building and  
United States Courthouse  
300 East Washington Street, Room 222  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

Dear Chief Judge Traxler:

I write with a request. In 2013, the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference withdrew from the Supreme Court's consideration a set of Amendments to the Bankruptcy Rules (the "*Stern* Amendments") that the Judicial Conference previously had approved and forwarded to the Court for approval. The reason for the withdrawal, as the attached memoranda from me and Judge Ikuta explain in more detail, was pending litigation at the Court that implicated the legal and constitutional premises of the *Stern* Amendments. The Supreme Court recently removed the legal cloud hanging over the *Stern* Amendments when it held that the Constitution permits a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate claims otherwise requiring Article III adjudication if the parties consent to determination by a bankruptcy judge. *See Wellness Int'l Network, Ltd. v. Sharif*, 135 S. Ct. 1932 (2015).

That development leaves us with a choice. Namely, should we resubmit the *Stern* Amendments immediately to the Court to be considered during this rulemaking cycle or should we wait for the next rulemaking cycle? The choice affects whether the Amendments, if approved, go into effect on December 1, 2016 or December 1, 2017. The Bankruptcy Rules Committee and the Standing Committee recently each unanimously re-approved the *Stern* Amendments and unanimously agreed that we should resubmit them to the Court during this rulemaking cycle—in order to put in place as soon as possible a process for allowing parties expressly to consent to bankruptcy-judge adjudication if they wish. We now urge the Executive Committee to do the same on behalf of the Judicial Conference. Waiting until the March 2016 Judicial Conference to re-approve the Amendments, we fear, will not give the Supreme Court time to consider the package during this rulemaking cycle. On top of that, the Conference

The Honorable William B. Traxler, Jr.  
Chief Judge  
October 16, 2015  
Page 2

previously approved the precise Amendments in 2013, and the Executive Committee previously authorized their withdrawal in 2013. It is my understanding that, if we re-submit the *Stern* Amendments by early November, the Supreme Court should be able to consider them during this rulemaking cycle.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this request, and thank you in advance for considering it.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jeffrey S. Sutton

JSS:jmf  
Attachments

cc: James C. Duff  
Jeffrey P. Minear  
The Honorable Sandra S. Ikuta

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

**JEFFREY S. SUTTON**  
CHAIR

**REBECCA WOMELDORF**  
SECRETARY

October 14, 2015

**CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**STEVEN M. COLLOTON**  
APPELLATE RULES

**SANDRA S. IKUTA**  
BANKRUPTCY RULES

**DAVID G. CAMPBELL**  
CIVIL RULES

**REENA RAGGI**  
CRIMINAL RULES

**WILLIAM K. SESSIONS, III**  
EVIDENCE RULES

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair  
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

**FROM:** Honorable Sandra Segal Ikuta, Chair  
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

**DATE:** October 14, 2015

**RE:** Submission to the Supreme Court of Previously Approved *Stern* Amendments

**I. Introduction**

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend that a set of Bankruptcy Rules amendments ("the *Stern* amendments"), which were previously approved by the Standing Committee and the Judicial Conference, be sent forward to the Supreme Court.

The memorandum provides background information about the *Stern* amendments, which the Committee originally proposed in response to *Stern v. Marshall*, 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011), as well as providing information about the Court's subsequent decision in *Wellness International Network v. Sharif*, which held that the Constitution permits a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate claims otherwise requiring Article III adjudication if the parties knowingly and voluntarily consent (expressly or implicitly) to determination by the bankruptcy judge. 135 S. Ct. 1932 (2015). The memorandum also explains why the Committee recommends that the *Stern* amendments be submitted to the Supreme Court now rather than as part of the 2016 submission of amendments (which will take effect on December 1, 2017).

## II. The *Stern* Amendments

In *Stern v. Marshall*, the Supreme Court held that the bankruptcy court lacked authority under Article III to hear and enter a final judgment on a state-law counterclaim by the estate against a creditor who had filed a claim against the estate. Such adjudication is expressly authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), which classifies it as a core proceeding. Nevertheless, the Court concluded that the exercise of that authority in this case by the non-Article III bankruptcy judge was constitutionally impermissible because the proceeding did not fall within the “public rights” exception to Article III and the bankruptcy judge was not acting as a mere adjunct of the Article III courts. The Court further concluded that the objecting creditor had not consented to the bankruptcy court’s adjudication of the counterclaim.

In 2011 the Committee began considering whether the Bankruptcy Rules needed to be amended in response to *Stern*. Existing Rules 7008 (General Rules of Pleading) and 7012 (Defenses and Objections) require parties to adversary proceedings to state in the complaint and the responsive pleading whether the proceeding is core or non-core and, if non-core, whether the pleader consents to entry of final judgment by the bankruptcy judge.<sup>1</sup> Rule 7012(b) further states that in “non-core proceedings final orders and judgments shall not be entered on the bankruptcy judge’s order except with the express consent of the parties.”

The Committee concluded that *Stern* had created an ambiguity concerning the meaning of the terms core and non-core. The case demonstrated that a proceeding might be designated core by the statute but be beyond the constitutional authority of a bankruptcy court to hear and determine, at least without the parties’ consent. Thus it would be constitutionally non-core. The Committee therefore decided to propose amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 7008(a) and 7012(b) that would eliminate the distinction between core and non-core proceedings and would require parties in all proceedings to state in their pleadings whether they do or do not consent to entry of a final judgment or order by the bankruptcy judge. A similar amendment was proposed to Rule 9027(a) and (e) (Removal). The sentence in Rule 7012(b) prohibiting a bankruptcy court from entering a final order or judgment in a non-core proceeding without the express consent of the parties was proposed to be deleted. The Committee also proposed amendments to Rule 7016 (Pre-Trial Procedures), which would direct the bankruptcy court to determine the authority it would exercise in a proceeding—whether it would hear and determine it, hear and issue proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, or take some other action. The final revision included in the *Stern* amendments was to Rule 9033 (Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law), which would omit the rule’s limitation to non-core proceedings. These amendments, which are attached to this memorandum, were published for public comment in August 2012.

<sup>1</sup> Rule 7008(a) provides in part: “In an adversary proceeding before a bankruptcy judge, the complaint, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party complaint shall contain a statement that the proceeding is core or non-core and, if non-core, that the pleader does or does not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy judge.” Rule 7012(b) provides in part: “A responsive pleading shall admit or deny an allegation that the proceeding is core or non-core. If the response is that the proceeding is non-core, it shall include a statement that the party does or does not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy judge.”

The *Stern* amendments were given final approval by the Standing Committee in June 2013 and by the Judicial Conference in September 2013. Later in the fall of 2013, the Judicial Conference withdrew the amendments from the Supreme Court due to the Court's decision to hear *Executive Benefits Insurance Agency v. Arkison*, 134 S. Ct. 2165 (2014). That case presented the issue, among others, of whether Article III permits a bankruptcy court, with the express or implied consent of the parties, to enter a final judgment on a *Stern* claim. Because the proposed *Stern* amendments rely on the validity of consent, it was determined that the Court should not be asked to approve them while that issue was pending before it.

The Supreme Court decided *Arkison* in June 2014 without reaching the consent issue.<sup>2</sup> But a few weeks later, the Court granted *certiorari* in *Wellness*, which also presented the issue of the constitutional validity of party consent to the adjudication by a bankruptcy judge of a *Stern* claim. As a result, the *Stern* amendments remained on hold awaiting a decision in *Wellness*.

### III. The Supreme Court Upholds Consent in *Wellness*

In ruling on the constitutional validity of consent in *Wellness*, the Court looked to its decision in *Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Schor*, 478 U.S. 833 (1986), for guidance. There the Court held that Article III's "guarantee of an impartial and independent federal adjudication" serves two functions: (1) protection of the personal rights of litigants and (2) maintenance of the separation of powers of the branches of the federal government. *Id.* at 848. *Schor* held that, as a personal right, the protection is freely waivable. *Id.* But, as the Court explained in *Wellness*, *Schor* also held that "[t]o the extent that this structural principle is implicated in a given case"—but only to that extent—"the parties cannot by consent cure the constitutional difficulty." 135 S. Ct. at 1943.

*Wellness* therefore examined "whether allowing bankruptcy courts to decide *Stern* claims by consent would 'impermissibly threate[n] the institutional integrity of the Judicial Branch.'" *Id.* at 1944. It concluded that there was no such threat; based on its examination of the degree of control Article III courts exercise over bankruptcy judges and the absence of evidence that Congress sought to "aggrandize itself or humble the Judiciary." *Id.* at 1945. As a result, the Court held that "Article III permits bankruptcy courts to decide *Stern* claims submitted to them by consent." *Id.* at 1949.

In Part III of the opinion, the Court examined the nature of the consent required. It concluded that neither the Constitution nor 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(2) requires the parties to give their express consent to bankruptcy court adjudication. But whether such consent is express or implied, the Court stated, it must be knowing and voluntary. Thus the "key inquiry" in determining whether there is implied consent, said the Court, "is whether 'the litigant or counsel was made aware of the need for consent and the right to refuse it, and still voluntarily appeared

<sup>2</sup> *Arkison* did, however, confirm that *Stern* claims could be treated as non-core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(c), as the rule amendments had assumed. See 134 S. Ct. at 2174 ("Accordingly, because these *Stern* claims fit comfortably within the category of claims governed by § 157(c)(1), the Bankruptcy Court would have been permitted to follow the procedures required by that provision, *i.e.*, to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the District Court to be reviewed *de novo*.").

to try the case' before the non-Article III adjudicator." *Id.* at 1948. The Court emphasized that "notification of the right to refuse' adjudication by a non-Article III court 'is a prerequisite to any inference of consent.'" *Id.*

Although the Court rejected the debtor's argument that consent to bankruptcy court adjudication must be express, it noted that Bankruptcy Rules 7008 and 7012 require parties to state in their pleadings whether or not they consent to bankruptcy court adjudication of non-core proceedings. The Court said that it is a "good practice" for courts to seek such express statements and that "[s]tatutes or judicial rules may require express consent where the Constitution does not." *Id.* at 1948 n.13.<sup>3</sup>

#### IV. The Committee's Analysis and Conclusion

At its fall meeting on October 1, the Committee voted unanimously to proceed with the *Stern* amendments as originally drafted and approved, rather than propose a set of rule amendments that would take a different approach to expressing party consent to bankruptcy court adjudication. As discussed above, the pending amendments are based on the constitutional validity of party consent to non-Article III adjudication of *Stern* and non-core claims, which *Wellness* upholds. They provide for express consent in the parties' pleadings. If all the parties to a proceeding consent to bankruptcy court adjudication, no court would have to determine whether the proceeding is one that the bankruptcy court could have heard and determined in the absence of consent. On the other hand, if all of the parties do not consent in their pleadings, the bankruptcy court would determine whether the proceeding is constitutionally and statutorily core—in which case it could enter a final judgment—or a *Stern* or non-core proceeding—in which case it could do no more than submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the district court.

Members of the Committee recognized that requiring express consent goes beyond the constitutional minimum announced in *Wellness* and that an express consent approach could result in more non-core and *Stern* claims being adjudicated in the district court. That is because parties who might decline to give express consent (if it is required) might otherwise be deemed to have implicitly consented to bankruptcy court adjudication of non-core and *Stern* claims under an implied consent approach. The express consent approach has the advantage, however, of clarity. A court can examine pleadings to determine if the parties in fact consented, thereby eliminating a more uncertain, retrospective determination of whether one or more parties voluntarily and knowingly gave implied consent. Furthermore, it is a procedure that the Court in *Wellness* declared to be a good practice even if implied consent otherwise suffices. *See id.* at

---

<sup>3</sup> Justice Alito, in a separate opinion, concurred with the majority opinion in part and concurred in the judgment. 135 S. Ct. at 1949. He agreed that Article III permits a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate a *Stern* claim with the consent of the parties, but he thought that the majority should not have addressed implied consent. Instead, he concluded that "respondent forfeited any *Stern* objection by failing to present that argument properly in the courts below." *Id.* *Stern* claims, he wrote, are not "exempt from ordinary principles of appellate procedure." *Id.* Although the majority opinion did not discuss forfeiture, the Court did remand for the Seventh Circuit to decide "whether Sharif's actions evinced the requisite knowing and voluntary consent, and also whether, as *Wellness* contends, Sharif forfeited his *Stern* argument below." *Id.*



1948 n.13 (explaining that express statements of consent “ensure irrefutably that any waiver of the right to consent to Article III adjudication is knowing and voluntary and . . . limit subsequent litigation over the consent issue”).

In deciding to recommend that the *Stern* amendments be resubmitted to the Supreme Court, the Committee considered but rejected two alternative approaches that had been suggested to the Committee. The first alternative was to adopt a procedure similar to the one used to obtain parties’ consent to a magistrate judge’s adjudication of civil actions. Under this approach, the parties would receive notice of their opportunity to consent to adjudication by a bankruptcy judge (instead of a district judge), but would also be reminded that the parties “are free to withhold consent without adverse substantive consequences.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 73(b)(2). The Committee concluded that it would be difficult to implement this more conservative approach in the current bankruptcy context. District courts by standing orders have referred all bankruptcy cases and proceedings to the bankruptcy courts as an initial matter, and bankruptcy judges have authority to adjudicate proceedings that are constitutionally and statutorily core without party consent. Because the Supreme Court has not yet provided clear guidance regarding which claims are core and which are non-core *Stern* claims,<sup>4</sup> there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding when parties would have a right to withhold consent to bankruptcy court adjudication.

The other approach rejected by the Committee was a procedure similar to the rule preserving the right to a jury trial. Under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[a] party waives a jury trial unless its demand is properly served and filed.” Under this approach, a party’s initial pleading would have to include a demand for adjudication before a district judge; otherwise the party would waive that right, and a bankruptcy judge would be authorized to hear the proceeding and enter a final judgment. Some members of the Committee questioned whether such a procedure would satisfy the Court’s standard in *Wellness* for implied consent. Quoting from *Roell v. Withrow*, 538 U.S. 580, 590 n.5 (2003), *Wellness* said that “‘notification of the right to refuse’ adjudication by a non-Article III court ‘is a prerequisite to any inference of consent.’” 135 S. Ct. at 1948. Moreover, *Wellness* itself indicated the Court’s preference for express consent, stating that “it is a good practice for courts to seek express statements of consent or nonconsent” in order to “limit subsequent litigation over the consent issue.” *Id.* at 1948 n.13. Other members were opposed to the affirmative-demand approach for the practical reason that the previously approved amendments could be promulgated sooner than a new set of proposed rules that would have to be published for public comment, and it was thought that bankruptcy judges wanted clarifying amendments as soon as possible.

#### V. The Committee’s Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Standing Committee ask the Judicial Conference to submit the *Stern* amendments to the Supreme Court this fall (which would be slightly after the

<sup>4</sup> Because the Court in *Wellness* did not decide whether the claim in question was a *Stern* claim, it provided no further guidance about the scope of *Stern* or how to determine whether a claim listed as core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2) is beyond the bankruptcy court’s authority to adjudicate without the consent of the parties. 135 S. Ct. at 1942 n.7 (noting that the opinion “does not address, and expresses no view on, . . . [whether] the Seventh Circuit erred in concluding the claim in count V of [the] complaint was a *Stern* claim”).

submission of the amendments that the Judicial Conference approved in September). By submitting these *Stern* amendments to the Supreme Court now, rather than in the next cycle of submissions to the Court, the *Stern* amendments could take effect as early as December 2016, rather than a year later. The Committee believes it is important to provide needed clarity to the bankruptcy community as soon as possible regarding how bankruptcy courts can proceed on a consent basis to adjudicate *Stern* claims.

Attachment

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON  
CHAIR  
JONATHAN C. ROSE  
SECRETARY

September 27, 2013

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON  
APPELLATE RULES  
EUGENE R. WEDOFF  
BANKRUPTCY RULES  
DAVID G. CAMPBELL  
CIVIL RULES  
REENA RAGGI  
CRIMINAL RULES  
SIDNEY A. FITZWATER  
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Scott S. Harris, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States  
**FROM:** Jeffrey S. Sutton  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules

This memorandum summarizes the amendments to the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure that will take effect on December 1, 2014, if (1) the Supreme Court adopts the proposed amendments and transmits them to Congress no later than May 1, 2014, and (2) Congress does not reject or defer the proposed amendments. Part I addresses the amendments of significant interest, including the arguments made for and against the amendments and the Rules Committees' reasons for proceeding with them. Part II addresses the proposals that generated little or no interest during the public comment period. A more comprehensive explanation of the Committees' deliberations with respect to each amendment was submitted to the Judicial Conference of the United States and is attached to this memorandum. In the last rulemaking cycle, the Standing Committee delivered the proposed amendments to the Court in January 2013. In delivering the amendments earlier to the Court this year, we hope to give the Court more time to consider them and, if the Court wishes, to resolve its work on the amendments earlier in the Term.

**I. Proposed Amendments of Significant Interest**

**A. Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure**

**1. Bankruptcy Rules 7008, 7012, 7016, 9027, and 9033**

**a. Brief Description**

The proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 7008, 7012, 7016, 9027, and 9033 respond to *Stern v. Marshall*, 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011). Consistent with the United States Code, 28 U.S.C. § 157, the current Bankruptcy Rules distinguish between core and non-core bankruptcy proceedings

and contemplate that a bankruptcy judge has more limited authority to resolve non-core proceedings. *Stern* held that a bankruptcy judge lacked authority under Article III of the Constitution to enter a final judgment in a proceeding that qualified as “core” under the Code, thus establishing that a proceeding could be “core” as a statutory matter but “non-core” (and thus non-permissible) as a constitutional matter. In response to *Stern*, the amendments propose three key changes: (1) they remove the distinction between “core” and “non-core” proceedings in the Bankruptcy Rules, namely in Rules 7008, 7012, 9027, and 9033; (2) they require parties to state at the outset whether they consent to entry of final orders or judgment by a bankruptcy judge in all adversary proceedings, not just in “non-core” proceedings as the current rules provide; and (3) they direct bankruptcy courts under Rule 7016 to decide the proper treatment of all proceedings, including whether to handle the proceeding at all, whether to entertain the proceeding and offer proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, or whether to take some other action.

**b. Arguments in Favor**

- Responds to *Stern v. Marshall* by removing the distinction between “core” and “non-core” proceedings and by requiring all pleadings to contain a statement as to whether the pleader consents to the entry of a final judgment by the bankruptcy court.

**c. Objections/Comments**

The Advisory Committee received eight comments, largely supportive of the proposed amendments, that raised five issues:

- whether to retain the terms “core” and “non-core”;
- whether references to the “bankruptcy court” in the proposed amendments should revert to the “bankruptcy judge,” the term currently used;
- whether to provide procedures for treating as proposed findings and conclusions a bankruptcy judge’s decision entered as a final order or judgment when that decision is later determined to be beyond the bankruptcy judge’s final adjudicatory power;
- whether to require a statement as to consent when a litigant proceeds by motion before filing a formal pleading; and
- whether to provide that a litigant may consent to final adjudication by a bankruptcy judge with respect to part, but not the whole, of a proceeding.

d. The Advisory Committee's Reasoning

*Stern* recognized the possibility that a “core” proceeding under the United States Code may lie beyond the constitutional power of a bankruptcy judge. The amendments seek to alleviate potential administrative confusion by eliminating the terms “core” and “non-core” from Rules 7008, 7012, 9027, and 9033, and by requiring a statement regarding consent in all proceedings.

In rejecting the first three concerns raised during the public comment period, the Committee reasoned that: (1) retaining the distinction between core and non-core pleadings was no longer useful and potentially confusing, because the status of a matter as “core” under 28 U.S.C. § 157 does not necessarily establish the bankruptcy court’s authority to adjudicate the matter; (2) the term “bankruptcy court” is more useful than “bankruptcy judge,” because it eliminates the possibility that a party’s consent might be understood to apply only to adjudication by a particular bankruptcy judge; and (3) a rule providing for treatment of a bankruptcy judge’s final order issued without authority as proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law would require extensive rule amendments to deal with the deadlines and the scope of objections to proposed findings and conclusions. The Committee concluded that the last two issues raised useful ideas for future rulemaking but did not warrant changes to the proposed amendments. The Advisory Committee and the Standing Committee unanimously supported the amendments.

e. *Arkison*

On June 24, 2013, the Court granted review in *Executive Benefits Insurance Agency v. Arkison*, No. 12-1200, adding a wrinkle to the Court’s deliberations over the consent portion of the rules package. At issue in *Arkison* (among other things) is whether Article III permits bankruptcy courts to resolve a proceeding based on the express or implied consent of the parties. At the earliest, the Court will hear oral argument in the case in January 2014. To the extent the Court wishes to review the rules package earlier in the Term than it has in years past, it may wish to give preliminary approval (or disapproval) to the rest of the package while making its final decision on this amendment contingent on the *Arkison* ruling. If the Court later authorizes consent-based bankruptcy court decisions in *Arkison* before May 1, 2014, and if the Court otherwise agrees with the merits of this proposal, *Arkison* will not stand in the way of approving this part of the package during this rulemaking cycle. On the other hand, if the Court rejects consent-based bankruptcy court decisions in *Arkison* or is unable to decide *Arkison* before May 1, it may wish to send this part of the package back to the Advisory Committee or to hold onto this part of the package until potential approval in May 2015 along with the next package.

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON  
CHAIR  
  
JONATHAN C. ROSE  
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON  
APPELLATE RULES

EUGENE R. WEDOFF  
BANKRUPTCY RULES

DAVID G. CAMPBELL  
CIVIL RULES

REENA RAGGI  
CRIMINAL RULES

SIDNEY A. FITZWATER  
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

**To:** Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair  
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

**From:** Honorable Eugene R. Wedoff, Chair  
Advisory Committee on Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure

**Date:** May 8, 2013

**Re:** Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules met on April 2 and 3, 2013, in New York, New York, at the United States Bankruptcy Court. The draft minutes of that meeting accompany this report as Appendix C. The Committee's actions fall into three categories.

First, the Advisory Committee took action on the proposed rule and form amendments that were published for comment in August 2012. Forty-six comments were submitted in response to the publication, some of which addressed multiple rules and forms. The comments were considered in a series of subcommittee conference calls, at a meeting of the Forms Modernization Project, and in Committee discussions at the New York meeting. (The comments are summarized below, along with a discussion of the changes that the Committee made in response.) The Advisory Committee now seeks the Standing Committee's final approval and transmission to the Judicial Conference of most of the published items: the revision of the Part VIII rules and amendments to ten other rules and five official forms. Because the Committee

made significant changes after publication to one set of published forms—the means test forms—it requests that those forms be republished.

\* \* \* \* \*

Part II of this report discusses the action items, grouped as follows:

(A1) matters published in August 2012 for which the Advisory Committee seeks approval for transmission to the Judicial Conference—amendments to Rules 1014, 7004, 7008, 7012, 7016, 7054, 8001-8028, 9023, 9024, 9027, and 9033, and Official Forms 3A, 3B, 6I, and 6J;

\* \* \* \* \*

## II. Action Items

### A. Items for Final Approval

*A1. Amendments Published for Comment in August 2012.* The Advisory Committee recommends that the proposed rule and form amendments that are discussed below be approved and forwarded to the Judicial Conference. It recommends that the amended forms take effect on December 1, 2013. The text of the amended rules and forms is set out in Appendix A.

**Action Item 1.** Rules 7008, 7012, 7016, 9027, and 9033 would be amended in response to *Stern v. Marshall*, 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011). The Bankruptcy Rules follow the Judicial Code's division between core and non-core proceedings. The current rules contemplate that a bankruptcy judge's adjudicatory authority is more limited in non-core proceedings than in core proceedings. For example, parties are required to state whether they do or do not consent to final adjudication by the bankruptcy judge in non-core proceedings. There is no comparable requirement for core proceedings. *Stern*, which held that a bankruptcy judge did not have authority under Article III of the Constitution to enter final judgment in a proceeding deemed core under the Judicial Code, has introduced the possibility that such a proceeding may nevertheless lie beyond the power of a bankruptcy judge to adjudicate finally. In other words, a proceeding could be "core" as a statutory matter but "non-core" as a constitutional matter.

The Advisory Committee proposed to amend the Bankruptcy Rules in three respects. First, the terms core and non-core would be removed from Rules 7008, 7012, 9027, and 9033 to avoid possible confusion in light of *Stern*. Second, parties in all bankruptcy proceedings (including removed actions) would need to state whether they do or do not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy judge. Third, Rule 7016, which governs pretrial procedures, would be amended to direct bankruptcy courts to decide the proper treatment of proceedings.

The Advisory Committee received eight comments on all or part of these proposed amendments. In the main, the comments expressed support for the amendments but raised five issues:

- (1) whether to retain the terms “core” and “non-core”;
- (2) whether references to the “bankruptcy court” in the published amendments should revert to the “bankruptcy judge,” the term that is currently used;
- (3) whether to provide procedures for treating as proposed findings and conclusions a bankruptcy judge’s decision entered as a final order or judgment when that decision is later determined to be beyond the bankruptcy judge’s final adjudicatory power;
- (4) whether to require a statement as to consent when a litigant proceeds by motion before filing a formal pleading; and
- (5) whether to provide that a litigant may consent to final adjudication by a bankruptcy judge with respect to part, but not the whole, of a proceeding.

After reviewing the comments, the Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the published amendments. With respect to the first three issues raised by the comments, these points were thoroughly considered before publication of the amendments. The Advisory Committee did not find the comments to raise new concerns that would justify revisiting those issues. Issues (4) and (5), on the other hand, had not been considered previously. The Advisory Committee nevertheless concluded that the comments raising those issues, although presenting possible suggestions for future rulemaking, did not require alteration of the published amendments. Similarly, the Advisory Committee concluded that a comment by the Bankruptcy Clerks Advisory Group regarding the requirement of service of notice by mail under current Rules 9027 and 9033 might be considered for future rulemaking but was beyond the scope of the *Stern*-related amendments. The comments are set out in more detail in Appendix A.

\* \* \* \* \*

