

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
Meeting of January 4, 2018 | Phoenix, Arizona

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance	1
Opening Business.....	2
Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting.....	3
Task Force on Protecting Cooperators.....	3
Report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules	4
Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules.....	7
Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules	11
Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules.....	12
Report of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules	13
Report of the Administrative Office	15
Concluding Remarks.....	16

ATTENDANCE

The Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure held its spring meeting at the JW Marriott Camelback Inn in Scottsdale, Arizona, on January 4, 2018. The following members participated in the meeting:

Judge David G. Campbell, Chair	Professor William K. Kelley
Judge Jesse M. Furman	Judge Carolyn B. Kuhl
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr., Esq.	Judge Amy St. Eve
Daniel C. Girard, Esq.	Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Esq.*
Judge Susan P. Graber	Judge Srikanth Srinivasan
Judge Frank Mays Hull	Judge Jack Zouhary
Peter D. Keisler, Esq.	

The following attended on behalf of the Advisory Committees:

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules – Judge Michael A. Chagares, Chair Professor Gregory E. Maggs, Reporter	Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules – Judge Donald W. Molloy, Chair Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter Professor Nancy J. King, Associate Reporter
Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules – Judge Sandra Segal Ikuta, Chair Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter	Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules – Judge Debra Ann Livingston, Chair Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules – Judge John D. Bates, Chair Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter Professor Richard L. Marcus, Associate Reporter	

* Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Deputy Director of the Department of Justice’s Civil Division, represented the Department on behalf of the Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General.

Providing support to the Committee were:

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette	Reporter, Standing Committee
Professor Catherine T. Struve (by telephone)	Associate Reporter, Standing Committee
Rebecca A. Womeldorf	Secretary, Standing Committee
Professor Bryan A. Garner	Style Consultant, Standing Committee
Professor R. Joseph Kimble	Style Consultant, Standing Committee
Julie Wilson (by telephone)	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Scott Myers (by telephone)	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Bridget Healy (by telephone)	Attorney Advisor, RCS
Shelly Cox	Administrative Specialist, RCS
Dr. Tim Reagan	Senior Research Associate, FJC
Patrick Tighe	Law Clerk, Standing Committee

OPENING BUSINESS

Judge Campbell called the meeting to order. He introduced the Committee's new members, Judge Srinivasan of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Judge Kuhl of the Los Angeles Superior Court, and attorney Bob Giuffra of Sullivan & Cromwell's New York Office, as well as other first-time attendees supporting the meeting.

He announced that Chief Justice Roberts appointed Cathie Struve Associate Reporter to the Standing Committee and that Dan Coquillette will retire as Reporter to the Standing Committee at the end of 2018. Dan Coquillette will continue to serve as a consultant to the Standing Committee. Judge Campbell thanked Professor Coquillette for his tremendous support and guidance throughout the years.

Judge Campbell also welcomed Judge Livingston as the new Chair of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules. He also informed the Standing Committee that Professor Greg Maggs was nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and once confirmed, Professor Maggs will be ineligible to continue as Reporter to the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules. He thanked Professor Maggs for his service.

For the new members, Judge Campbell explained the division of agenda items at the Standing Committee's January and June meetings. The January meeting tends to be an informational meeting with few action items, which is true for today's meeting. The January meeting typically serves to get the Standing Committee up to speed on what is happening in the advisory committees so that the Standing Committee is better prepared to make decisions at its June meeting, where proposals are approved for publication or transmission to the Supreme Court. The Committee's January meeting also serves to provide feedback to the advisory committees on pending proposals. Judge Campbell encouraged all Committee members to speak up on issues and topics raised by the advisory committees.

Rebecca Womeldorf directed the Committee to the chart, included in the Agenda Book, that summarizes the status of current rules amendments in a three-year cycle. This chart shows

the breadth of work underway in the rules process, whether technical or substantive rules changes. The chart also details proposed rules pending before the U.S. Supreme Court that, if approved, would become effective December 1, 2018. Between now and May 1, 2018, the Committee will receive word if the Supreme Court has approved the rules. If so, the Court and the Committee will prepare a package of materials for Congress. Around the end of April, there will be an order on the U.S. Supreme Court's website noting that the proposed rules have been transmitted to Congress. If Congress takes no action, this set of rules becomes effective December 1, 2018.

The chart also notes which proposed rules are published for comment and public hearings, whether in D.C. or elsewhere in the country. If there is insufficient interest, the public hearings are cancelled. So far, we have not had requests to testify about these published rules, but have received some written comments. These rules will most likely come before the Committee for final approval in June 2018.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon a motion by a member, seconded by another, and by voice vote: **The Standing Committee approved the minutes of the June 12-13, 2017 meeting.**

TASK FORCE ON PROTECTING COOPERATORS

Judge Campbell and Judge St. Eve updated the Committee on the Task Force on Protecting Cooperators. Judge Campbell began by reviewing the origins of the Cooperators Task Force, from a letter by the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management ("CACM") detailing various recommendations to address harm to cooperators to Judge Sutton's referral of CACM's recommendation for various rules-related amendments to the Criminal Rules Committee. Director Duff also formed a Task Force on Protecting Cooperators to address various practices within the judiciary, the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP"), and the Department of Justice ("DOJ") that might address the problem in a comprehensive way.

Judge St. Eve provided an overview of the Task Force, noting that Judge Kaplan serves as Chair. She explained that the Task Force has explored what is driving harm to cooperators and what the Task Force can do to address the problem. There are four separate working groups within the Task Force – namely, a BOP Working Group, a CM/ECF Working Group, a DOJ Working Group, and a State Practices Working Group. Judge St. Eve reviewed the work completed or underway by each working group. The State Practices Working Group explored and did not identify any state practices that could be adopted by the federal courts to address harm to cooperators.

One challenge the Task Force faces is the variety of policies and procedures used by federal district courts across the country to reduce harm to cooperators, from the District of Maryland to the Southern District of New York. The DOJ Working Group is trying to synthesize and identify commonalities among disparate local policies and procedures.

The BOP Working Group found consistent themes and issues, and Judge St. Eve noted that BOP has been incredibly cooperative throughout this process. The BOP does not collect statistics documenting the extent of the harm to cooperators. Harm is occurring, primarily at high and medium security prisons, not low security facilities. Within these high and medium security prisons, prisoners are often forced by other inmates to “show their papers,” such as sentencing transcripts and plea agreements, to demonstrate that they are not cooperators. These papers can be electronically accessed through PACER and CM/ECF.

As a result of these findings, the BOP Working Group will recommend that the BOP make these sentencing-related documents contraband within the prisons. Because some prisoners need access to these documents, BOP will work with wardens to establish facilities within the prisons where prisoners can securely access these documents. The Group is also recommending that BOP punish individuals for pressuring and threatening cooperators. Some recommended changes will require approval from BOP’s union prior to implementation.

Another major issue is developing other types of limitations to place on PACER and CM/ECF to reduce the identification of cooperators, consistent with First Amendment and other concerns. On January 17, the CM/ECF Working Group will meet in Washington D.C. to hear from federal public defenders on this issue. The full Task Force meets on January 18.

Judge Campbell noted that the Committee does not have jurisdiction over BOP Policy or CM/ECF remote access. However, the question for the Committee is whether and what rules-based changes can be made to further help address this problem.

Judge Bates asked whether the Task Force has received any feedback from the defense bar about limiting incarcerated individuals’ access. Judge St. Eve noted that a federal defender is on the Task Force and that federal defenders support limiting access within BOP so long as prisoners can still access their documents when necessary for appeals and other court proceedings.

Professor Coquillette asked why the BOP cannot collect empirical data, and Judge St. Eve responded that the Task Force considered proposing such a recommendation. The Task Force decided against this recommendation after the BOP voiced concerns that collecting the data will create more harm than good. Judge Campbell noted the FJC survey, which provides anecdotal evidence in which judges reported over 500 instances of harm to cooperators, including 31 murders, and that much of this harm stemmed from the ability to identify cooperators from court documents. This FJC survey was a major impetus for the CACM letter. One committee member noted that he believes that the problem of harm to cooperators is better addressed by the BOP, instead of through rules changes. Judge St. Eve emphasized that BOP officials – especially BOP staff working at high and medium security facilities – know that harm to cooperators is a problem and are committed to better addressing it.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Judge Molloy provided the report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules, focusing largely on the Advisory Committee's decision to oppose adopting CACM-recommended rules to reduce harm to cooperators. As noted earlier, CACM recommended that the Standing Committee amend various criminal rules to reduce harm to cooperators. The Committee referred the CACM recommendation to the Criminal Rules Committee, which created the Cooperator Subcommittee, also chaired by Judge Kaplan.

At the Advisory Committee meeting in October 2017, the Cooperator Subcommittee presented its research and recommendations about CACM-based rules amendments. In drafting rule amendments consistent with CACM's proposal, the Subcommittee balanced competing interests – namely, transparency and First Amendment concerns with harm reduction concerns. After many meetings, the Subcommittee concluded that amendments to Criminal Rules 11, 32, 35, 47, and 49 would be required to implement CACM's recommendations, and the Subcommittee drafted these amendments for further discussion.

The Subcommittee's draft amendments engendered a lively discussion at the Advisory Committee meeting. Judge Kaplan and the DOJ abstained from voting. The Advisory Committee as a whole voted on two questions. First, the Advisory Committee unanimously agreed that the draft rules amendments would implement CACM's proposals. Second, the Advisory Committee agreed, albeit with two dissenting votes, not to recommend these amendments.

With this overview, Judge Molloy sought discussion about whether the Committee agreed with the Advisory Committee's decision. To assist the Committee, Professors Beale and King provided an overview of the various proposed amendments to Criminal Rules 11, 32, 35, 47, and 49, that had been considered.

One Committee member questioned how defense bar advocacy is impaired when plea agreements are sealed on a case-by-case basis because defense attorneys are not losing any information that they otherwise would have. Professor King noted that sealing practices vary district-by-district, so a rule about sealing on a case-by-case basis would not reduce access to that information in districts that rarely or never seal. Professor King also noted that the defense bar indicated that the terms of plea agreements are important, that they need this information in order to assess their client's proposed plea agreement, and that sealing plea agreements in every case would impair their ability to do this. Another member asked about whether sealing the plea agreements in every case would prevent others from identifying cooperators. Professor Beale responded that it would prevent others from identifying cooperators through plea agreements, but that there are other ways to learn about cooperators – through lighter sentences, Brady disclosures, etc. She articulated that the Advisory Committee did not think that Rule 11 was an effective response to the problem, especially given that this rule change would be a transition to secrecy.

One member asked whether constitutional challenges have been raised in districts that have implemented aggressive sealing tactics in order to protect cooperators. Judge St. Eve noted that she is not aware of any constitutional challenges. This may reflect that these districts have received buy-in as to sealing practices from prosecutors, defenders, and judges prior to implementation. Professor Beale noted that some instances of constitutional challenges by an individual do exist.

Judge Campbell interjected to respond to a few comments raised by committee members. First, he stated that there is no way to absolutely prevent cooperator identity from becoming known but that this does not mean steps cannot be taken that will reduce the dissemination of such information. Moreover, there seem to be ways to reduce the identification of cooperators without increased sealing, whether by changing the appearance of the docket on CM/ECF or adopting the “master sealed event” approach implemented in the District of Arizona. Judge Campbell emphasized that the Advisory Committee should not give up on amendments that would not result in more secrecy.

More generally, many Committee members asked questions about the overall implications of CACM-based rules changes. One member inquired whether these rules changes would (negatively) affect non-cooperators who would no longer be able to demonstrate their non-cooperation status. Professor King noted that this is a tricky issue and that the effect of rule-based changes on non-cooperators is one reason why the defense bar has no unanimous position on this topic. Another member asked whether the CACM-based rules changes would encourage more cooperation. From the Task Force perspective, Judge St. Eve said it is not part of the Task Force’s mission to consider whether rules or policy changes would encourage more cooperation. The Task Force’s charter focuses on ways to reduce harm to cooperators. One member voiced support for more judicial education on how to reduce harm to cooperators.

Another member noted that harm to cooperators has been occurring long before CM/ECF and that cooperator information can be learned from many sources other than CM/ECF. This member asked whether the Task Force believed that there would be some benefit from a national policy instead of the disparate local policy approach. Judge St. Eve stated that the Task Force thinks a national policy is the best option, and the DOJ is considering a national approach as well. However, due to local variation, the Task Force is facing the challenging question of what that national policy should be. Professor Capra noted that in 2011 a Joint CACM/Rules Committee considered this issue and determined that a national policy or approach is not feasible. Judge St. Eve stated that the Task Force is aware of this 2011 conclusion. Professor Beale noted one advantage to a rules-based change is that proposed rules would be published for public comment. In addition, rules promulgated through the Rules Enabling Act process would also obviously have national enforcement effect.

In light of this discussion, Judge Campbell asked whether the Committee agreed with the Advisory Committee’s decision not to adopt the CACM rules-based changes. Before soliciting feedback, Judge Campbell noted that the DOJ did not take a position on these CACM rules-based amendments because DOJ wants to wait until the Task Force concludes its work. He also stated that some Advisory Committee members questioned whether the Advisory Committee

could revisit rules changes depending on the outcome of the Task Force's work. Unless the Committee disagrees with the decision not to adopt the CACM rules-based changes at this time, the Advisory Committee opted, if necessary, to revisit these rules after the Task Force concludes its work.

Many members voiced agreement with the Advisory Committee's decision to reject the CACM rules-based amendments. One member supported the District of Arizona's approach, and another noted that, without empirical data about the causes of the problem, the Advisory Committee's position seemed wise. This member also stated that CM/ECF seems to be a problem and that CM/ECF should be changed. Another member thought consideration of any rules changes should wait until the CM/ECF Working Group makes its recommendations. One member suggested that achieving a national policy is difficult and the source of the problem stems from the BOP. This member believed that the harms from rules-based changes exceed the benefits.

Judge Molloy concluded his report by providing updates about the Advisory Committee's other work. After the mini-conference on complex criminal litigation, the Advisory Committee recommended that the FJC prepare a Manual on Complex Criminal Litigation, which would parallel the Manual on Complex Civil Litigation. The Advisory Committee is also considering a few new rules amendments. First, the Cooperator Subcommittee is considering amending Rule 32(e)(2) to remove the requirement to give the PSR to the defendant. This change could help address one aspect of the cooperator identification problem. Second, the Advisory Committee rejected a proposal to amend Rule 43 to permit sentencing by videoconference. Third, the Advisory Committee is considering re-examining potential changes to Rule 16 regarding expert disclosure in light of an article by Judge Paul Grimm. Lastly, the Advisory Committee is considering changes to Rule 49.2, which would limit remote access in criminal cases akin to the remote access limitations imposed by Civil Rule 5.2. However, the Advisory Committee is holding in abeyance its final recommendation on this rule change until after the Task Force concludes its work.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Judge Bates presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, which included only informational items and no action items.

Rule 30(b)(6): The Subcommittee on Rule 30(b)(6) began with a broad focus, but it has narrowed the issues under consideration, primarily through examination and input from the bar. There is little case law on this topic in part because these problems are often resolved before judicial involvement or with little judicial involvement. The Subcommittee received more than 100 written comments on its proposed amendment ideas, and the feedback revealed strong competing views, often dependent upon whether the commenter typically represents plaintiffs or defendants.

Based on this input, the Subcommittee on Rule 30(b)(6) is focusing on amending Rule 30(b)(6) to require that the parties confer about the number and description of matters for

examination. The Subcommittee is, however, still tinkering with the language. The Subcommittee is also receiving additional input on some select topics, including whether to add language to Rule 26(f) listing Rule 30(b)(6) depositions as a topic of consideration.

In terms of timeline, the Subcommittee will make a recommendation to the Advisory Committee at its April 2018 meeting. Its recommendation, if any, will be presented to the Standing Committee in June 2018.

One member asked why the judicial admissions issue was eliminated as an issue to be addressed. The Subcommittee concluded that there is little utility to a rules-based approach to this problem. Although tension in the case law exists, the cases are typically sanction-based cases related to bad behavior. The Subcommittee is concerned that a rule change directed to the judicial admissions issue could create more problems than it would solve.

Some members voiced support for adding a “meet and confer” element to Rule 30(b)(6), noting that it would help encourage parties to agree on the topics of depositions before the deposition and thereby reduce litigation costs. Others were skeptical that the parties would actually meet and confer to flesh out topics for the depositions. One member suggested that the benefit of this rule change would not exceed the work necessary to change the rule. Judge Campbell noted that this is a unique problem for a frequently used discovery tool. The Advisory Committee investigated this problem ten years ago and concluded that it was too difficult to devise a rule change to reduce the problem. Based on the comments raised, Judge Campbell wondered whether education of the bar, through a best practices or guidance document for Rule 30(b)(6), may be a better solution than a rule change.

Social Security Disability Review: The Administrative Conference of the United States (“ACUS”) proposed creating uniform procedural rules governing judicial review of social security disability benefit determinations by the Social Security Administration. The Social Security Administration supports ACUS’s proposal. The Advisory Committee is in the early stages of considering this proposal, and in November 2017, it met with representatives from ACUS, the Social Security Administration, the DOJ, and claimants’ representatives. At this meeting, it became clear that a rules-based approach would not address the major issues with respect to social security review, including the high remand rate, lengthy administrative delays, and variations within the substantive case law governing social security appeals.

The Advisory Committee created a Social Security Subcommittee to consider the ACUS proposal. The Subcommittee will focus on potential rules governing the initiation of the case (e.g., filing of a complaint and an answer) and electronic service options. The Subcommittee will not consider special rules for discovery because this does not appear to be a major issue.

Some broad issues remain for the Subcommittee’s determination, including the kind of rules it would devise, the placement of the rules (e.g., within the Civil Rules), concerns relating to substance-specific rulemaking, and whether to devise procedural rules for all administrative law cases. The Subcommittee thus far is not inclined to draft procedural rules for all types of administrative law cases, which can vary greatly. Although the Social Security Administration

would like rules regarding page limits and filing deadlines, the Civil Rules do not typically include such specifications. The Subcommittee will provide an update to the Advisory Committee at its April meeting and to the Standing Committee in June.

One member asked about transsubstantivity, noting that the admiralty rules do not fit well within the Civil Rules and that rules governing judicial review of one administrative agency seem to raise even greater transsubstantivity concerns because such rules would be less general. This member asked whether the Subcommittee has considered that procedural rules for all administrative law cases would seem to raise fewer transsubstantive concerns than social security rules alone. Judge Bates said that the Subcommittee has not considered this issue yet but will be considering transsubstantivity concerns. Professor Cooper raised an empirical question about the extent to which all administrative law review cases focus primarily or solely on the administrative record.

One member encouraged the Subcommittee to consider Appellate Rules 15 and 20 when devising particular rules governing review of social security benefits decisions. Professor Struve seconded this suggestion. Another member asked about how the specialized rules for habeas corpus and admiralty came about under the Rules Enabling Act. Professors Cooper and Marcus provided an overview of the formation of these rules and noted that the habeas corpus rules are a good analogy for creating specialized rules for social security decisions.

Another member asked whether the Subcommittee is considering the patchwork of local district court rules governing social security review. The Subcommittee is looking at the panoply of local rules and how these rules impact the time for review at the district court level. Professor Cooper noted that there is not a wide divergence in the amount of time it takes courts to review social security decisions. Judge Campbell noted that 52 out of 94 district courts have their own procedural rules and that, according to the Social Security Administration's estimates, uniform rules would save the agency around 2-3 hours per case. Because the Social Security Administration handles around 18,000 cases per year, uniform rules would result in significant cost savings for the agency.

Multidistrict Litigation ("MDL") Proceedings: The Advisory Committee has received some proposals to draft specialized rules governing MDL proceedings, some of which parallel legislation pending in Congress such as HR 985. Business and defense interests have submitted these proposals, and none is from the plaintiff side. Judge Bates provided an overview of these various proposals, noting the focus on mass tort litigation.

The Advisory Committee has created an MDL Subcommittee, headed by Judge Bob Dow (who also headed the Class Action Subcommittee). The Subcommittee has a significant amount to learn. The Subcommittee has received written comments from the defense bar but it has yet to hear from the plaintiffs' bar, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, judges who have handled significant numbers of MDLs, and the academic community. The Subcommittee is currently creating a reading list as well as identifying research projects. The Subcommittee also has to explore how it wants to proceed, and given these factors adoption of rules, if any, will be a long and careful process. The Subcommittee will take six to twelve months gathering

information. Judge Campbell clarified that the Rules Enabling Act process guarantees that it would take at least three years before any rules are adopted (assuming any are proposed), but that these proposals are receiving careful attention.

Some members noted that this an important and valuable area to investigate given that MDLs comprise a significant portion of the federal docket. Because these cases often require considerable flexibility, innovation, and discretion, others expressed skepticism about the necessity or ability to devise a specialized set of rules for MDL proceedings. Another member noted that devising such rules may be difficult given that mass tort MDLs raise different issues and problems than antitrust MDLs, for example.

One member suggested that the Subcommittee consider the process for appointing lead counsel in light of Civil Rule 23(g)'s objective standard and how lead counsels are appointed under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. Another member recommended speaking with experienced MDL litigators. Other members recommended attending a variety of MDL conferences occurring around the country in 2018 as well as considering the best practices materials compiled by the MDL Panel.

Third-Party Litigation Finance: The Advisory Committee has received a proposal which would require automatic disclosure of third-party litigation financing agreements under Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(v). Although this proposal does not pertain only to MDLs, the MDL Subcommittee is charged with exploring it. The Advisory Committee considered similar proposals in 2014 and 2016 but did not recommend any changes to the Civil Rules. Like the previous proposals, this proposal presents a definitional problem regarding what constitutes third-party litigation financing. It is also controversial, with a clear division between the plaintiff and defense bars, and it presents significant ethical questions. It is not clear that the Advisory Committee would have reconsidered this proposal again so soon, but because third-party litigation financing issues were raised within the MDL proposals, the Advisory Committee decided to examine these issues further as part of the rulemaking proposals for MDLs.

Other Proposals: The Advisory Committee received a proposal to amend Rule 71.1(d)(3)(B)(i) to discard the preference for publishing notice of a condemnation action in a newspaper published in the county where the property is located. The Advisory Committee will further explore this proposal, and the Department of Justice has indicated that it does not have a problem with eliminating the preference. The Advisory Committee wants to further explore the implications of eliminating the preference.

Another proposal received by the Advisory Committee was to amend Rule 16 so that a judge assigned to manage and adjudicate a case could not also serve as a "settlement neutral." The Advisory Committee removed this matter from its agenda because it is not clear that there is a problem that a rule amendment could or should solve.

The Advisory Committee was also asked to explore the initial discovery protocols for the Fair Labor Standards Act – a request which parallels earlier efforts regarding initial discovery protocols for employment cases alleging adverse action. The Advisory Committee hopes judges

consider these protocols favorably, but it did not think the Advisory Committee should endorse these protocols. The Advisory Committee concerns itself with rules adopted through the Rules Enabling Act process and does not endorse work developed by other entities outside the rulemaking process.

Pilot Project Updates: Two courts, the District of Arizona and the Northern District of Illinois, have enlisted in the Mandatory Initial Discovery project. It is too early to report feedback on its results. Judge Campbell noted that the project has been going well in the District of Arizona, stating that initial feedback has been positive and that the district has experienced fewer issues than expected. He suspects, however, that problems may arise during summary judgment and trial phases for cases filed after May 1 when parties request that district judges exclude evidence not disclosed during the mandatory initial discovery periods. The district judges in Arizona are anticipating this and are prepared to handle the problems as they arise. Judge Campbell also applauded the FJC's efforts with developing and implementing this project. Judge St. Eve reported that the Mandatory Initial Discovery project rolled out very smoothly in the Northern District of Illinois and that the district has received positive feedback thus far.

The Expedited Procedures project has been stalled for want of participating district courts. The Advisory Committee has enlisted Judge Jack Zouhary to spearhead its efforts to drum up participation. The Advisory Committee has found courts often indicate initial support for the pilot, but ultimately decline to participate. Their support typically wanes due to vacancies, caseloads, or lack of unanimous participation by judges within a district. The project's requirements have been modified to permit more flexibility and to allow for less than unanimous participation by district judges within a given district.

Judge Zouhary noted his district agreed to participate in the Expedited Procedures project because his district already had similar rules in place, albeit using different terminology. A letter of endorsement for the project has been drafted, and some organizations, including the American College of Trial Lawyers, the Federal Bar Association, the FJC, the NYU Civil Jury Project, and the American Board of Trial Advocates, have expressed excitement for the project and are considering joining the letter.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Judge Ikuta gave the report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules. At its September 2017 meeting, the Advisory Committee recommended publishing changes to two rules: Rule 2002(h) (Notices to Creditors Whose Claims are Filed) and Rule 8012 (Corporate Disclosure Statement). Because the proposed amendments relate to a bankruptcy rule and an appellate rule that were published in August 2017, however, the Advisory Committee is waiting to review any comments before finalizing proposed language. The Advisory Committee plans to present the proposed changes at the Committee's June meeting.

Judge Ikuta discussed four additional information items: (1) withdrawal of a prior proposal to amend Rule 8023 (Voluntary Dismissals), (2) updates to national instructions for bankruptcy forms, (3) a suggestion to eliminate Rule 2013 (Public Record of Compensation

Awarded to Trustees, Examiners, and Professionals), and (4) preliminary consideration of a proposal to restyle the bankruptcy rules.

The Advisory Committee decided to withdraw its prior recommendation to amend Rule 8023. Judge Ikuta said the proposed amendment was intended to be a reminder that a bankruptcy trustee who is party to an appeal may need bankruptcy court approval before seeking to dismiss the appeal. The Advisory Committee's Department of Justice representative raised a concern, however, that the change would be difficult for appellate clerks to administer. The Advisory Committee agreed that the proposed amendment could cause confusion, which outweighed the benefit of the proposed change. It therefore voted to withdraw the proposal from consideration.

The Advisory Committee updated national instructions for certain forms. Judge Ikuta explained that the December 1, 2017 amendments to Rule 9009 (Form) restricted the ability of bankruptcy courts to modify official forms, with certain exceptions. One exception allows for modifications that are authorized by national instructions. After learning the courts routinely modify certain notice-related forms to provide additional local court information, and that model court orders included as part of some official forms are often modified by courts to provide relevant details, the Advisory Committee approved national instructions that would permit these practices to continue.

The Advisory Committee is also looking into a suggestion from a bankruptcy clerk that it should eliminate or amend Rule 2013. The intent of the rule is to avoid cronyism between the bankruptcy bar and the courts. It requires the bankruptcy clerk to maintain a public record of fees awarded to trustees, attorneys, and other professionals employed by trustees and to provide an annual report of such fees to the United States trustee. The suggestion stated that compliance with this rule is spotty, and because a report regarding fees can be generated and provided on request, there is no need to keep systematic records. Judge Ikuta said that the Advisory Committee, with help from the FJC, will gather more information about current compliance with the rule before taking any steps. It expects to consider the issue at its spring 2018 meeting.

Finally, the Advisory Committee is considering whether it should commence the process of restyling the Bankruptcy Rules. The Advisory Committee is taking a phased approach before making this big decision. First, it is studying whether any restyling is warranted, given the close connection of the Bankruptcy Rules to the Bankruptcy Code and the use of many statutory terms throughout the rules. The Advisory Committee will also consider the views of its stakeholders, and it has asked the FJC to help it obtain input from users of the Bankruptcy Rules regarding the pros and cons of restyling. Because any input would be more meaningful and valuable if bankruptcy judges and practitioners could consider some exemplars of restyled rules, the Advisory Committee has asked the Committee's style consultants to assist in developing such exemplars from the eight rules in Part IV of the Bankruptcy Rules.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Livingston provided the report for the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules. The Advisory Committee met on October 26 and 27, 2017, at the Boston College Law School,

where the law school and Dean Vincent Rougeau were gracious hosts. She advised that she had no action items to report, but that there were several information items.

The Advisory Committee held a symposium in connection with its meeting. The symposium focused on forensic expert testimony, Rule 702, and Daubert. The topics discussed included the 2016 President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology's ("PCAST") report on forensic science in criminal courts and a potential "best practices" manual. The conference participants shared an interest in ensuring that expert testimony comported with Rule 702, but the focus was not on potential amendments to Rule 702, but instead, the applications of the rule. Some conference attendees suggested that a best practice manual might be more helpful than potential rule amendments. Judge Livingston stated that the Advisory Committee will discuss the findings from the conference at its spring 2018 meeting.

Judge Campbell noted that a panel of judges and lawyers at the Boston College event also raised concerns about possible abuses of Daubert motions in civil cases, and he suggested that the Civil Rules Advisory Committee be apprised of these concerns. Dan Capra noted a potential circuit split related to the admissibility of forensic evidence.

Next, Judge Livingston advised that the Advisory Committee published a proposed amendment to Rule 807, and that the public comment period is open until mid-February. The Advisory Committee will discuss all comments at its meeting in the spring.

The Advisory Committee is also considering a possible amendment to Rule 801(d)(1)(A) (prior inconsistent statement under oath). It sought informal input on a possible amendment in the fall of 2017, and it also obtained results from a survey conducted by the FJC. The Advisory Committee will consider the input at its spring meeting. A committee member noted that one possible area of consideration for the Advisory Committee is jury instructions regarding prior consistent statements.

The Advisory Committee is considering a possible amendment to Rule 404(b) (crimes, wrongs, or other acts); however, disagreement exists within the Advisory Committee regarding a circuit split between the Third and Seventh Circuits. There is further disagreement about how the rule is being employed, and the Advisory Committee has discussed the three principal purposes of the rule, including the chain of reasoning, the balancing test, and additions to the notice provision. Judge Campbell noted the similarities to the discussion surrounding Civil Rule 30(b)(6), where there is a disagreement regarding whether an amendment is needed. Another member added that while much of the discussion is about criminal cases, any changes would impact civil cases as well.

Other items that will be considered by the Advisory Committee at its spring meeting include possible amendments to Rule 606(b) (in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*) and to Rules 106 and 609(a)(1).

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Judge Chagares provided the report for the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules, which included several informational items and one discussion item. First, as to the discussion

item, Judge Chagares reviewed the proposed amended rules pending before the Supreme Court for consideration, including the proposed amendments to Rule 25(d). The proposed amendment to Rule 25(d) would eliminate the requirement of proof of service when a document is filed through a court's electronic-filing system, replacing "proof of service" with "filed and served." Given the pending amendment to Rule 25(d), the Advisory Committee decided that references to "proof of service" in Rules 5(a)(1), 21(a)(1) and (c), 26(c), and 39(d)(1) should be removed. Judge Chagares explained that these proposed amendments are technical and that the Advisory Committee did not believe publication of the technical changes was necessary.

During this discussion, several committee members raised concerns about the use of "filed and served" in Rule 25(d), suggesting elimination of the term "and served." Judge Campbell noted that while a document filed electronically is served automatically, those not filed electronically need the instruction in the rule. Committee members made suggestions for various stylistic edits to the proposed rule amendments, and the Committee's style consultants offered their views on the proposed language and edits, including present versus past tense. One committee member raised concerns about eliminating the proof of service language in Rule 39, given the subject-matter of the rule. Judge Campbell suggested adding to the committee notes an instruction regarding service and a reference to Rule 25. The group discussed possible language for the committee notes, and Judge Campbell recommended that the Advisory Committee consider these comments and present the revised package of rules and committee notes to the Committee in June, after consideration of the discussion at the meeting.

Following this meeting, the Advisory Committee, in consultation with the Standing Committee, determined to withdraw the proposed amendments to Rule 25(d)(1) from the Supreme Court's consideration. The Advisory Committee will consider the comments made at the Standing Committee meeting regarding Rule 25(d), as well as those regarding Rules 5(a)(1), 21(a)(1) and (c), 26(c), and 39(d)(1), and it will present an amended set of proposed rule amendments for the Committee's consideration at its June 2018 meeting.

Judge Chagares reviewed several information items. The Advisory Committee considered at its November 2017 meeting a suggestion to amend Rule 29 to permit cities and Indian tribes to file amicus briefs without leave of court. The Advisory Committee considered but deferred action on the proposal five years ago, and after discussion at its November 2017 meeting, the Advisory Committee decided to take no further action. It is a problem that rarely, if ever, arises in litigation. Judge Campbell noted that most Indian tribes appear before federal court via private firms, not through government lawyers, and this could cause more recusal issues.

Judge Chagares advised that the Advisory Committee considered several other issues at its November 2017 meeting. These included a proposal to amend Rule 3(c)(1)(B), which as currently drafted may present a potential trap for the unwary. After discussion, a subcommittee was formed to study the issue. The Advisory Committee also considered a suggestion to amend Rules 10, 11, and 12 in light of advances made with electronic filing and the impact on the record on appeal. After discussion, the Advisory Committee determined that most clerks' offices have procedures to manage these issues, and that with upcoming upgrades to CM/ECF, some issues raised may be resolved. The Advisory Committee thus determined to remove the

suggestion from its agenda. The Advisory Committee discussed a potential issue related to Rule 7 and whether attorney fees are “costs on appeal” under the rule. The Advisory Committee determined to inform the Civil Rules Committee of the issue and to form a subcommittee to monitor any developments.

Finally, Judge Chagares noted several items that the Advisory Committee may consider at upcoming meetings, including concerns about judges deciding issues outside of those addressed in briefing, the use of appendices, and the dismissal of appeals after settlement agreements. A Committee member raised a concern that the dismissal issue could be substantive rather than procedural, and Judge Chagares stated that this concern would be considered by the Advisory Committee when the issue is discussed.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Rebecca Womeldorf provided the report from the Rules Committee Staff (“RCS”). The Standing Committee reviewed Scott Myers’ report regarding instances where committees need to coordinate regarding proposed rule changes which implicate other rules. Ms. Womeldorf added that treatment of bonds for costs on appeal under Appellate Rule 7 and treatment of the proof of service references across the Appellate and Civil Rules will continue to require coordination between these various committees.

Julie Wilson provided an overview of congressional activity implicating the Federal Rules. In general, Ms. Wilson noted that, although the RCS is monitoring many pending bills, not much movement has occurred in the past few months. Ms. Wilson first briefly reviewed pending congressional legislation which would directly amend the Federal Rules. The Senate Judiciary Committee held in November 2017 a hearing on “The Impact of Lawsuit Abuse on American Small Businesses and Job Creators,” which focused on a variety of bills which would directly amend the Federal Rules, including the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (“LARA”). No action, however, has occurred regarding these pieces of legislation, including LARA, since that hearing. The RCS continues to monitor these bills for further development.

The RCS has also offered mostly informal feedback and comments to Congress on other bills which would not directly amend but rather require review of the Federal Rules by the Standing Committee. This includes the Safeguarding Addresses from Emerging (SAFE) at Home Act, which was introduced in September 2017 by Senator Roy Blunt and would require federal courts and several agencies to comply with state address confidentiality programs. This proposed legislation raises concerns about service under the Federal Rules, and RCS communicated this feedback to Senator Blunt’s staffer but has not heard anything in response. Representative Bob Goodlatte also introduced in October 2017 the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, which would limit federal courts’ authority to deny Congress’s ability to appear as an amicus curiae. The RCS communicated its concern to congressional staffers that this legislation would lengthen the time of appeals.

A few developments occurred in the past month as well. On November 30, 2017, the House Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, held a hearing on “The

Role and Impact of Nationwide Injunctions by District Courts.” Although the hearing did not concern a specific piece of legislation, Rep. Goodlatte reiterated his interest in this issue, and Professor Samuel Bray, who submitted a proposal to the Civil Rules Committee earlier this year regarding nationwide injunctions, spoke at this hearing. The RCS will continue to monitor for the introduction of any specific pieces of legislation regarding nationwide injunctions.

The Committee lastly considered what advice it could provide to the Executive Committee regarding which goals and strategies outlined in the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* should receive priority attention over the next two years. After discussion, the Committee authorized Judge Campbell to report the sense of the Committee on these issues to the Judiciary’s Planning Coordinator.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Judge Campbell concluded the meeting by thanking the Committee members and other attendees for their participation. The Committee will next meet on June 12, 2018, in Washington, D.C.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca A. Womeldorf
Secretary, Standing Committee