

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
OF THE UNITED STATES**

September 16, 2025

The Judicial Conference of the United States convened on September 16, 2025, pursuant to the call of the Chief Justice of the United States issued under 28 U.S.C. § 331. The Chief Justice presided, and the following members of the Conference were present:

First Circuit:

Chief Judge David Jeremiah Barron
Judge William E. Smith,
District of Rhode Island

Second Circuit:

Chief Judge Debra Ann Livingston
Chief Judge Margo K. Brodie,
Eastern District of New York

Third Circuit:

Chief Judge Michael A. Chagares
Judge Mitchell S. Goldberg,
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Fourth Circuit:

Chief Judge Albert Diaz
Judge John Bailey,
Northern District of West Virginia

Fifth Circuit:

Chief Judge Jennifer Walker Elrod
Chief Judge Debra M. Brown,
Northern District of Mississippi

Sixth Circuit:

Chief Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton
Judge S. Thomas Anderson,
Western District of Tennessee

Seventh Circuit:

Chief Judge Diane S. Sykes
Chief Judge Virginia M. Kendall,
Northern District of Illinois

Eighth Circuit:

Chief Judge Steven M. Colloton
Chief Judge Roberto A. Lange,
District of South Dakota

Ninth Circuit:

Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia
Judge Leslie E. Kobayashi,
District of Hawaii

Tenth Circuit:

Chief Judge Jerome A. Holmes
Judge William Paul Johnson,
District of New Mexico

Eleventh Circuit:

Chief Judge William H. Pryor, Jr.
Judge Lisa Wood,
Southern District of Georgia

District of Columbia Circuit:

Chief Judge Srikanth Srinivasan
Chief Judge James Emanuel Boasberg,
District of Columbia

Federal Circuit:

Chief Judge Kimberly A. Moore

Court of International Trade:

Chief Judge Mark Barnett

Also participating in this session of the Conference were the following current or incoming Judicial Conference committee chairs: Circuit Judges Nancy L. Moritz, Amy J. St. Eve, Michael Y. Scudder, Richard J. Sullivan, William B. Traxler, Jr., and Timothy M. Tymkovich; District Judges John D. Bates, Nancy Ellen Brasel, David G. Campbell, Edmond E-Min Chang, James C. Dever III, Jesse M. Furman, Nicholas G. Garaufis, Darrin P. Gayles, Robert James Jonker, William L. Osteen, Jr., Mary Elizabeth Phillips, Robin L. Rosenberg, Cathy Seibel, Rodney W. Sippel, Glenn T. Suddaby, and Gregory F. Van Tatenhove; and Bankruptcy Judges Rebecca Buehler Connelly and Julie Ann Manning. Attending as the bankruptcy judge and magistrate judge observers, respectively, were Bankruptcy Judge Alan S. Trust and Magistrate Judge Timothy Adam Baker. James N. Ishida of the Fourth Circuit represented the circuit executives.

Participating from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts were Judge Robert J. Conrad, Jr., Director; Lee Ann Bennett, Deputy Director; William S. Meyers, General Counsel; Joshua C. Lewis, Judicial Conference Secretariat Officer, and Ivy Cheng, Attorney Advisor, Judicial Conference Secretariat; Melanie F. Gilbert, Legislative Affairs Officer; and Peter P. Kaplan, Public Affairs Officer. Judge Robin L. Rosenberg, Director, and Clara J. Altman, Deputy Director, Federal Judicial Center, as well as Judge Carlton W. Reeves, Chair, and Kenneth P. Cohen, Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, also participated, as did Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., Counselor to the Chief Justice and Ethan V. Torrey, Supreme Court Legal Counsel.

Attorney General Pamela Bondi addressed the Conference on matters of mutual interest to the judiciary and the Department of Justice. Senators Susan Collins, Ted Cruz, and Sheldon Whitehouse and Representatives Steny Hoyer, Darrell Issa, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jim Jordan, and Jamie Raskin spoke on matters pending in Congress of interest to the Conference.

REPORTS

Judge Conrad reported to the Judicial Conference on the judicial business of the courts and on matters relating to the Administrative Office. Judge Rosenberg spoke to the Conference about Federal Judicial Center programs, and Judge Reeves reported on United States Sentencing Commission activities. Judge St. Eve presented a special report on the fiscal year 2026 budgetary outlook.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION

The Judicial Conference approved a recommendation of the Executive Committee to adopt the following resolution recognizing the substantial contributions made by the Judicial Conference committee chairs whose terms of service end in 2025:

The Judicial Conference of the United States recognizes with appreciation, respect, and admiration the following judicial officers:

HONORABLE NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
Committee on Intercircuit Assignments

HONORABLE WILLIAM B. TRAXLER, JR.
Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability

HONORABLE JOHN D. BATES
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

HONORABLE ROBIN L. ROSENBERG
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

HONORABLE JAMES C. DEVER III
Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules

Appointed as committee chairs by the Chief Justice of the United States, these outstanding jurists have played a vital role in the administration of the federal court system. These

judges served with distinction as leaders of their Judicial Conference committees while, at the same time, continuing to perform their duties as judges in their own courts. They have set a standard of skilled leadership and earned our deep respect and sincere gratitude for their innumerable contributions. We acknowledge with appreciation their commitment and dedicated service to the Judicial Conference and to the entire federal judiciary.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Since its approval by the Judicial Conference in September 2010 (JCUS-SEP 10, pp. 5-6), the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary (Strategic Plan)* has served as a framework for national policy deliberations. The approach to planning for the Judicial Conference and its committees, also approved by the Judicial Conference in September 2010, calls for a review of the *Strategic Plan* every five years. Starting in the summer of 2024, Judicial Conference committees were asked to consider significant policy changes, trends affecting the judiciary, progress that had been achieved and issues to be addressed, and other challenges facing the judiciary since the *Strategic Plan* was last updated in 2020 (JCUS-SEP 2020, pp. 13-14). Committees were then asked to propose updates and revisions to the *Strategic Plan*. In consultation with the Chief Justice, an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Group was established to review committee proposals for revisions and prepare a draft of a new plan. The Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Group circulated the draft plan to Judicial Conference committees for their review and feedback. In August 2025, the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Group submitted a proposed *Strategic Plan* to the Executive Committee for consideration and recommendation to the Judicial Conference. At this session, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, the Judicial Conference approved the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary*.

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

The Executive Committee—

- Approved final fiscal year (FY) 2025 financial plans for the Salaries and Expenses, Defender Services, Court Security, and Fees of Jurors and Commissioners accounts.

- Approved interim FY 2026 financial plans for the Salaries and Expenses, Defender Services, Court Security, and Fees of Jurors and Commissioners accounts.
- Approved protocols for written correspondence issued by the AO Director in his or her capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

COMMITTEE ON AUDITS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ACCOUNTABILITY

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Audits and Administrative Office (AO) Accountability reported that it was updated on the status and results of various audits and engagements, including audits of bankruptcy trustees, community defender organizations, the judiciary’s retirement funds, and the judiciary’s appropriations and cyclical financial audits of court units and federal public defender organizations (FPDOs). The Committee also was updated on the upgrade to the Judiciary Integrated Financial Management System (JIFMS), the judiciary’s accounting system of record, which is expected to be completed in the summer of 2025, and the subsequent implementation of changes to the judiciary’s financial reporting model. The Committee also was updated on the status of Government Accountability Office studies of federal judiciary operations. Additionally, the Committee was briefed on corrective actions underway in response to recommendations from completed audits, operational reviews, and internal reviews and on ongoing developments in the internal control program for the courts, FPDOs, and AO programs. The Committee also was briefed on the status of the activities of the Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Working Group, which met in April 2025.

COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY SYSTEM

SELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND REAPPOINTMENT REGULATIONS

On recommendation of the Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System, the Judicial Conference approved revisions to the *Regulations for the Selection, Appointment, and Reappointment of United States Bankruptcy Judges*,

Guide to Judiciary Policy, Volume 3, Chapter 3. The revisions update language on judicial recruitment and hiring, as well as make minor stylistic and clarifying changes.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System reported that it received an update from the Federal Judicial Center on the status of its study to develop new bankruptcy case weights, which began in October 2023. The Committee continued to defer consideration of whether to identify additional courts to participate in the bankruptcy judgeship vacancy pilot, approved by the Judicial Conference in September 2014 (JCUS-SEP 2014, p. 7), until bankruptcy filings increase further. The Committee also discussed case assignment issues that have arisen in bankruptcy courts in recent years in connection with chapter 11 and chapter 15 cases and directed the chair to transmit guidance that bankruptcy courts should avoid establishing a panel or designating a group of judges for the purpose of assigning such cases. The Committee will continue to consider potential policy in this area, in collaboration with the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management. Finally, the Committee approved amendments to the *Director's Guidelines for the Bankruptcy Administrator Program* designed, among other things, to conform policy with current practices within the bankruptcy administrator (BA) program, promote national consistency and uniformity, and update compensation for standing trustees in the BA program.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET REQUEST

After considering the budget requests of the program committees, the Committee on the Budget recommended to the Judicial Conference a fiscal year (FY) 2026 budget request of \$9.0 billion in discretionary appropriations, which is 7.6 percent above assumed discretionary appropriations for FY 2026, but \$55.1 million below the funding levels requested by the program committees. The Judicial Conference approved the Committee's FY 2027 budget request, subject to amendments necessary as a result of (a) new legislation, (b) actions of the

Judicial Conference, (c) changes in standard inflation factors or funding assumptions, or (d) any other reason the Executive Committee considers necessary and appropriate.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on the Budget reported that it discussed the status and outlook of FY 2026 appropriations and the continued importance of congressional outreach, especially in the current highly contentious budget environment. The Committee was also briefed on the judiciary’s effort to replace the Probation and Pretrial Case Tracking Systems (PACTS) with a new system, PACTS360, and the Case Management Modernization project.

COMMITTEE ON CODES OF CONDUCT

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Codes of Conduct reported that since its last report to the Judicial Conference in March 2025, the Committee received 15 requests for a private Committee opinion and issued 15 such opinions. During this period, the average response time to a request was 10 days. In addition, the Committee chair responded to 69 requests for informal advice, individual Committee members responded to 280 requests, and Committee staff counsel responded to 578 requests, for a total of 927 responses to requests for informal advice during the past 6 months.

COMMITTEE ON COURT ADMINISTRATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT

JUROR WORKERS’ COMPENSATION COVERAGE

Since 1974, the Judicial Conference has sought the extension of workers’ compensation coverage under the Federal Employees’ Coverage Act to jurors injured while commuting to or from court (JCUS-MAR 1974, p. 20; JCUS-MAR 1979, p. 45). In light of the restrictive budget environment, as well as a lack of data suggesting that the current absence of this coverage is discouraging juror service, the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management recommended that the

Judicial Conference rescind this legislative proposal. The Conference adopted the Committee’s recommendation.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management reported that it endorsed in principle the Administrative Office’s (AO) revised plan to accelerate development of a modernized case management system, but conditioned final approval of the plan on the completion and favorable outcome of an independent consultant’s evaluation requested by the Committee on Information Technology. As part of the Committee’s efforts to modernize the judiciary’s data policies, the Committee also endorsed data access guidelines for the AO and other judiciary users of the Enterprise Data Warehouse in connection with the modernized case management system. The Committee endorsed guidance developed by the Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System concerning case assignment practices for chapter 11 and chapter 15 cases. As part of the Committee’s efforts to protect cooperation information contained in court filings, the Committee agreed to request, in coordination with the Committee on Criminal Law and the Committee on Defender Services, that the Federal Judicial Center update its 2016 study on the severity and scope of harm to cooperators and on approaches taken by local districts to protect cooperation information.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAW

FORMS FOR JUDGMENTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

On recommendation of the Committee on Criminal Law, the Judicial Conference approved a revised Form AO 245 SOR (Judgment in a Criminal Case Attachment—Statement of Reasons) and Form AO 245E SOR (Judgment in a Criminal Case for Organizational Defendants Attachment—Statement of Reasons) to conform to recent amendments to the *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines*, to clarify certain provisions, and to facilitate improved data collection and reporting.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Criminal Law reported on its continuing discussion of potential ways of incorporating evidence-based strategies into pretrial services,

including: (1) efforts to encourage greater use among judges of the pretrial release dashboard tool; and (2) a study being conducted by the Federal Judicial Center that will examine differences in detention and release rates among similarly situated districts. The Committee endorsed a proposal to undertake a new strategic assessment of the probation and pretrial services system and, as a result, included funding for this effort as part of the Committee's fiscal year 2027 budget request. The Committee also discussed and endorsed technical, conforming, and non-controversial amendments to the *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Volume 8, Part E (Post-Conviction Supervision), and Part K (Cybercrime). Finally, the Committee was provided information on the ongoing initiative to replace the Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System (PACTS) with a new system, PACTS360.

COMMITTEE ON DEFENDER SERVICES

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Defender Services reported that it discussed and unanimously supported various proposals intended to improve the independence of the defense function in the federal judiciary. This includes potential changes in policy and legislation to (1) transfer all panel management functions, including panel selection and voucher review and approval, to federal public defender organizations to alleviate the conflict of interest created when presiding judges determine compensation and resources for only one side of a criminal justice system—the defense; and (2) eliminate the four-year terms of appointment for federal public defenders to bring their positions in line with other judiciary unit executives (that have no terms), such as clerks of court and chief probation officers, and to allow federal public defenders to make representational decisions that are best for their clients without fear of retribution during the reappointment process. Finally, the Committee reported that it will continue to encourage, through outreach and other means, compliance with Judicial Conference policy regarding the establishment of federal defender organizations (FDOs) in the two remaining districts that operate without one.

The Committee also received an update on the dire budget outlook due to insufficient funding from Congress and expressed concern about the Defender Services program's anticipated inability, starting mid-summer 2025, to pay Criminal Justice Act (CJA) panel attorneys and service providers in a timely manner and to staff FDOs at a level sufficient to address rising criminal caseloads, particularly given the substantial rise in federal capital prosecutions. The Committee discussed the

Defender Services program’s recruitment and retention challenges, especially in localities where attorneys can earn more doing state and local public defense work, and voted to request that the Federal Judicial Center study the sufficiency of FDO pay and CJA panel attorney hourly rates. The Committee was also updated on efforts to enhance the cybersecurity posture of the federal defender community. Finally, the Committee recommended to the Committee on Judicial Resources that it request Judicial Conference approval of four positions to establish a national Supreme Court Advocacy Project to improve the quality of representation for CJA clients before the Supreme Court of the United States in response to comments by multiple justices.

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE JURISDICTION

CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT REMAND ORDERS

To resolve conflicting interpretations of whether the Class Action Fairness Act—explicitly authorizing appellate review of district court orders granting or denying a motion to remand a class action to state court—also authorizes appellate review of sua sponte remand orders, the Committee on Federal-State Jurisdiction recommended that the Judicial Conference seek legislation to amend the Class Action Fairness Act to clarify that 28 U.S.C. § 1453(c)(1) applies to both orders on a motion and sua sponte remand orders. The Committee noted that the ambiguity may result from a drafting oversight and that it is unlikely that resolving it as recommended would impose an unreasonable burden on courts of appeal. The Conference adopted the Committee’s recommendation.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Federal-State Jurisdiction reported that it continued its analysis of the citizenship of unincorporated entities for the purpose of venue. The Committee received a report from its state chief justice members, discussing, among other items, courts and artificial intelligence, judicial security, reforms to legal education and bar admissions, and state legislation concerning the independence of state courts. The Committee also discussed recent developments, congressional hearings, and pending legislation relating to national injunctions.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Financial Disclosure reported that it was updated on the continuing development and implementation of the Judiciary Electronic Filing System (JEFS), the new electronic financial disclosure filing and release system, including its anticipated national implementation in early 2026. The Committee approved revisions to the financial disclosure regulations and Judiciary Financial Disclosure Filing Instructions (Filing Instructions) to reflect new processes associated with the transition to using JEFS for filing all reports. The Committee also approved revisions to the Filing Instructions to clarify and enhance the guidance on excepted investment funds.

As of May 23, 2025, the Committee had received 4,583 financial disclosure reports and certifications filed in the legacy financial disclosure system for calendar year 2023 (out of a total of 4,588 required to file), including 1,334 annual reports from Supreme Court justices and Article III judges; 304 annual reports from bankruptcy judges; 567 annual reports from magistrate judges; 1,799 annual reports from judicial employees; and 579 reports from nominee, initial, and final filers.

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

LONG RANGE PLAN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 612 and on recommendation of the Committee on Information Technology, the Judicial Conference approved the fiscal year (FY) 2026 update to the *Long Range Plan for Information Technology in the Federal Judiciary*. Funds for the judiciary's information technology program will be spent in accordance with this plan.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Information Technology reported that it received an update on efforts to modernize the judiciary's Case Management/Electronic Case Files (CM/ECF) system, including a revised project plan to accelerate the timeline for the Case Management Modernization project due to cybersecurity vulnerabilities and

preliminary cost estimates based on the revised project plan. The Committee has requested an independent consultant validate the revised accelerated project plan before providing final approval of the plan. The Committee was also briefed on other efforts to protect case files, including implementing multifactor authentication for PACER and the Administrative Office's (AO) plan to share model CM/ECF continuity of operations plans with courts. The Committee also received a detailed report on the progress of modernization initiatives being pursued under the *IT Modernization and Cybersecurity Strategy*. The Committee received an update on the AO's progress on developing the *IT Workforce Strategic Plan*, which was anticipated to be submitted to the judiciary's Chief Information Officer by July 2025. Additionally, the Committee discussed existing policy governing the use of personally owned devices to access judiciary non-public networks and systems and the possible requirement for judiciary users to register their personally owned devices in a mobile device management system before accessing the network. Recognizing the sensitivity of this topic, the Committee requested that the AO suggest preliminary policy options for the Committee's consideration at its December 2025 meeting. The Committee approved policy language for inclusion in the *Guide to Judiciary Policy* requiring court and federal public defender office adherence to the IT Asset Management standard. Finally, the Committee approved a budget request for FY 2027 for the Judiciary Information Technology Fund.

COMMITTEE ON INTERCIRCUIT ASSIGNMENTS

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Intercircuit Assignments reported that 53 Article III judges undertook 90 intercircuit assignments from January 1, 2025, to June 30, 2025. During this time, the Committee continued to disseminate information about intercircuit assignments and aided courts requesting assistance by identifying and obtaining judges willing to take assignments. The Committee also reviewed and concurred with five proposed intercircuit assignments of bankruptcy judges and eight of magistrate judges.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL JUDICIAL RELATIONS

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on International Judicial Relations reported on international rule of law work to which federal judges contributed since the Committee's last report

to the Judicial Conference. The Committee considered reports addressing work by federal judges in rule of law programs from the Supreme Court of the United States; Administrative Office; Committee on Defender Services; Federal Judicial Center; Federal Court Clerks Association; Congressional Office for International Leadership; U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; and U.S. Departments of Justice and State. The Committee received a briefing from the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona and current Chair of the Judicial Vetting Commission of the Republic of Moldova, Scott Bales, about the Commission’s work since 2023 to strengthen the integrity and accountability of the Moldovan judiciary. The Committee also considered recent budget and program cuts in the executive branch that have significantly affected U.S. government development assistance abroad, and how they impact the federal judiciary’s involvement in work to advance the administration of justice worldwide.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on the Judicial Branch reported that it discussed recent legislative items of interest to the judiciary, including those related to judicial security, judgeships, the budget, and workplace conduct. The Committee discussed the importance of congressional outreach, in coordination with the Office of Legislative Affairs. The Committee was briefed on civics education and outreach activities across the judiciary and received a report on *The Honorable Robert A. Katzmann Conference on Civics Education and the Federal Courts* held in St. Louis, Missouri in April 2025. The Committee also discussed methods of improving the public’s understanding of and trust and confidence in the courts, including through greater media outreach to the public.

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND DISABILITY

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability reported that it discussed and considered complaint-related matters under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364 (Act), and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial Disability Proceedings (Rules). The Committee approved updates to the publicly available, online Digest of Authorities on the Act. The Committee considered

and agreed to provide additional guidance to chief judges and circuit judicial councils on several policy and process issues referred by the Executive Committee that arose in connection with a judicial impeachment matter. The Committee also discussed and approved a protocol that provides guidance to chief judges and judicial councils on handling institutional reviews after a judicial conduct and disability complaint has been concluded. The Committee and its staff have also continued to address inquiries regarding the Act and the Rules, and to give other assistance as needed to circuit judicial councils and chief judges.

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL RESOURCES

DISTRICT COURT CASE WEIGHTS

Weighted caseload per judgeship is one of the factors considered in determining the need for additional district judgeships. The Judicial Conference approved the current district court case weights in March 2016 based on a study periodically conducted by the Federal Judicial Center (JCUS-MAR 2016, p. 19). Given that judges do not currently receive any statistical credit for work on motions for compassionate release and to modify or reduce sentences under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c), despite the high volume of such motions filed in district courts, the Committee on Judicial Resources recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, effective October 1, 2025, the following interim case weights for motions filed under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) to use until the next district court case weighting study is conducted:

- a. an interim case weight of 0.63 for motions for modification of a term of imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), i.e., compassionate release; and
- b. an interim case weight of 0.031 for motions filed pursuant to any other part of 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c).

EXCEPTIONS TO CHAMBERS STAFFING LIMITATIONS

Judicial Conference guidelines authorize bankruptcy judges to have two chambers staff positions (JCUS-SEP 1979, pp. 75-76) and allow a judge to employ only one chambers law clerk at Judiciary Salary Plan (JSP)-14 or above

(JCUS-SEP 1994, pp. 57-59). In March 2025, the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the Judicial Conference on an expedited basis, approved a recommendation of the Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System to grant a request from the Tenth Circuit Judicial Council for the multidistrict designation of the chief bankruptcy judge in the Eastern District of Oklahoma to serve in the Northern District of Oklahoma for five years (JCUS-MAR 2025, p. 5). To assist with work arising from this multidistrict designation, the chief judge requested an exception to both Judicial Conference policies to retain his current JSP-14 law clerk while additionally hiring the JSP-14 law clerk of a retired bankruptcy judge from the Northern District of Oklahoma as well as a third chambers staff position to help with administrative matters in both districts. On recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Resources, the Judicial Conference approved exceptions to policies allowing the chief judge of the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the duration of his multi-district designation to (1) retain two JSP-14 career law clerks and (2) hire as a third chambers staff member a judicial assistant or paralegal, JSP-11.

RECRUITMENT, RELOCATION, AND RETENTION BONUSES

The Judicial Conference in 2001 established a recruitment, retention, and relocation bonus program for hard-to-fill Court Personnel System positions using decentralized funds (JCUS-SEP 2007, p. 22), and in 2022 expanded it to include hard-to-fill non-chambers JSP positions (JCUS-SEP 2022, p. 19). Noting concerns about the challenges of attracting and retaining qualified court reporters, the Committee on Judicial Resources recommended that the Judicial Conference amend the *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Volume 12, Chapter 6, §§ 655 and 670 to expand the recruitment, relocation, and retention bonus policies for hard-to-fill positions to include court reporter positions. The Conference approved the recommendation.

COMMON SUPPORT FUNCTIONS STAFFING FORMULA

Staffing necessary to perform information technology and organizational support functions in district clerks' offices and bankruptcy clerks' offices—to include human resources, training, budget and finance, procurement, space and facilities, property management, emergency management and continuity of operations, and mail—is currently evaluated through court unit-specific work measurement processes for incorporation into the judiciary's staffing formulas for these respective offices. Based on the results of a study demonstrating an empirical justification to measure common support functions across program areas and the potential for such an approach to improve precision in allocating resources, and noting that separating

support functions from operational functions in work measurement studies might allow the judiciary to be more responsive to needed updates in either area, the Committee on Judicial Resources recommended that the Judicial Conference approve a common support functions staffing formula to replace court unit-specific measurements of organizational support and information technology functions in the staffing formulas for district clerks' offices and bankruptcy clerks' offices for implementation beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2027, that provides 3,755.4 full-time equivalent positions based on statistical year 2024 workload data. The Conference approved the recommendation.

DEFENDER SERVICES FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

In September 2020, the Judicial Conference approved 2 full-time equivalent attorney positions for the establishment of a Defender Services Capital Fellowship and 12 full-time equivalent attorney positions for the establishment of a pilot Defender Services Non-Capital Fellowship of up to 4 years, to be considered for inclusion in the judiciary's FY 2022 budget request (JCUS-SEP 2020, p. 32). The pilot was intended to permit an evaluation of its efficacy in creating a pipeline of attorneys qualified to provide representation under the Criminal Justice Act that reflects broad outreach and inclusion of a wide range of backgrounds and perspectives based on two full cycles of the two-year fellowship, and unless extended would conclude by August 2026. In 2024, the Committee on Defender Services requested that the Committee on Judicial Resources recommend that the Judicial Conference approve extending the pilot for an additional four years through 2030 to allow sufficient time to provide a full review of the initial four-year pilot without disruption to the program, noting the two-year advance planning that the budget process requires and the time needed to review and evaluate pilot program data. Pending the completion of work by an Executive Committee working group appointed in August 2024 to review various judiciary diversity, equity, and inclusion programs, the Committee on Judicial Resources recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, extending the pilot for one additional year through FY 2027 (JCUS-SEP 2024, pp. 20-21).

After being advised that the working group had identified no concerns with the program's continued operation, the Committee on Defender Services requested that the Committee on Judicial Resources resubmit its recommendation to the Judicial Conference that the pilot be extended until FY 2030. On recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Resources, the Conference approved extending the pilot Defender Services Non-Capital Fellowship (12 full-time equivalent attorney positions)

for an additional 3 years through FY 2030 to allow sufficient time to provide a full review of the initial 4-year pilot without disruption to the program.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Judicial Resources reported that it approved the allocation of court law clerk positions for FYs 2026 and 2027 under Track III of the court law clerk program established by the Judicial Conference in September 2021 (JCUS-SEP 2021, pp. 20-21). The Committee established a subcommittee on human capital strategies that will consider and make recommendations to the Committee on issues relating to staffing resources to support judges and other strategic human capital challenges. Additionally, the Committee submitted to the Committee on the Budget a proposed FY 2027 budget request for programs under the Committee’s jurisdiction that was equivalent to a 4.2 percent increase over the FY 2026 assumed obligations.

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SECURITY

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Judicial Security reported that it submitted to the Committee on the Budget a proposed fiscal year 2027 budget request to support court security officer (CSO) positions, Federal Protective Service (FPS) security services, security systems and equipment managed by the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), and staff to support overall program administration at the USMS and the Administrative Office (AO). The Committee was updated on efforts to protect judges’ personally identifiable information (PII) through the judiciary’s PII Reduction and Redaction Program and ongoing efforts to raise awareness about the need for state-level online privacy legislation. The Committee also reported that it met with then-Acting USMS Director Mark Pittella, FPS Director Faron K. Paramore, and representatives from the General Services Administration to discuss security issues impacting the judiciary and courthouses. Additionally, the Committee requested that its Subcommittee on Operations, Technology, and Education review the CSO Staffing Standards with AO staff and consider whether an independent review of the CSO Program may be warranted.

COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGES SYSTEM

CHANGES IN MAGISTRATE JUDGE POSITIONS

After considering the recommendations of the Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System and the views of the Administrative Office and the affected district courts and circuit judicial councils, the Judicial Conference agreed to (a) authorize the conversion of the part-time magistrate judge position in Johnstown in the Western District of Pennsylvania to a full-time magistrate judge position in Johnstown, and discontinue the part-time position upon the filling of the new full-time position at that location; (b) authorize a new full-time magistrate judge position in Nashville or Columbia in the Middle District of Tennessee; (c) authorize a new full-time magistrate judge position in Pocatello in the District of Idaho; (d) authorize a new full-time magistrate judge position in Orlando or Ocala in the Middle District of Florida; and (e) redesignate the location of the part-time magistrate judge position in Bellingham to Mount Vernon in the Western District of Washington.

SELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND REAPPOINTMENT REGULATIONS

On recommendation of the Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System, the Judicial Conference amended the Regulations on the Selection, Appointment, and Reappointment of Magistrate Judges, *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Volume 3, Chapter 4, to update language on judicial recruitment and hiring and clarify certain other provisions.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System reported that it considered eight district-wide surveys of magistrate judge positions and, where appropriate, endorsed suggestions regarding magistrate judge utilization in those districts. Between its December 2024 and June 2025 meetings, the Committee, through its chair, approved filling 14 magistrate judge position vacancies in 12 district courts (JCUS-MAR 2024, pp. 19-20), and the Committee approved requests for the recall of a retired magistrate judge in 2 districts. At its June 2025 meeting, the Committee also approved requests from three district courts to fill a magistrate judge position vacancy and requests from five courts for the recall, extension of recall, or

extension of staff or clerk’s office support, for six retired magistrate judges. The Committee reaffirmed its decision to disseminate the Federal Judicial Center’s final report on matters relating to the magistrate judge selection and appointment process widely and agreed that the report should be published after the September 2025 Judicial Conference session.

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 29 (Brief of an Amicus Curiae) and 32 (Form of Briefs, Appendices, and Other Papers), the Appendix of Length Limits, and Form 4, together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed amendments and authorized their transmittal to the Supreme Court of the United States for consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 1007 (Lists, Schedules, Statements, and Other Documents; Time to File), 2007.1 (Appointing a Trustee or Examiner in a Chapter 11 Case), 3001 (Proof of Claim), 3018 (Chapter 9 or 11—Accepting or Rejecting a Plan), 5009 (Closing a Chapter 7, 12, 13, or 15 Case; Declaring Liens Satisfied), 9006 (Computing and Extending Time; Motions), 9014 (Contested Matters), 9017 (Evidence), and new Rule 7043 (Taking Testimony), together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed amendments and authorized their transmittal 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.

The Conference also approved, on recommendation of the Committee, a proposed amendment to Official Form 410S1 (Notice of Mortgage Payment Change), effective in all bankruptcy proceedings commenced after December 1, 2025, and, insofar as just and practicable, all proceedings pending on December 1, 2025.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference a proposed amendment to Evidence Rule 801 (Definitions That Apply to This Article; Exclusions from Hearsay), together with a committee note explaining its purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed amendment and authorized its transmittal to the Supreme Court for consideration with a recommendation that it be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure reported on its continued review of proposed rule or form amendments for final approval or publication for public comment and received reports on the status of other proposals under consideration. The Committee approved publication of proposed amendments to an Appellate Rule, a Bankruptcy Form, Civil Rules, a Criminal Rule, and an Evidence Rule. The Committee also approved for publication and public comment proposed new Evidence Rule 707 to set standards for admissibility of machine-generated evidence introduced without the presence of a testifying expert. The Committee discussed the use of artificial intelligence in court proceedings, with a focus on proposals relating to evidentiary issues. The Committee also received information about possible amendments to the evidence rules to address “deepfake” evidence that may be difficult to detect. Other information presented to the Committee included the issue of self-authentication of records in cases involving proof of Indian blood and Indian status. The Committee also received reports on possible appellate rule amendments, including a new rule regarding intervention on appeal and amendments relating to administrative stays. The Committee continued its consideration of issues related to filing documents under seal, third-party funding of litigation, privacy concerns related to the use of social security numbers and the use of a minor’s initials in public court filings, and use of remote testimony in court proceedings.

COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND FACILITIES

COURTHOUSE PROJECT PRIORITIES

The *Federal Judiciary Courthouse Project Priorities (CPP)* identifies the judiciary's priorities for new courthouse construction. Part I lists the projects for which the judiciary will request funding in its annual budget submission, while Part II consists of the judiciary's out-year courthouse construction priorities. The priority order of all projects on Part I is maintained until a project is fully funded, at which time the project is removed from the list. The priority order of projects on Part II is updated each year based on the project's urgency evaluation rating, which is developed as part of the judiciary's Asset Management Planning process (JCUS-MAR 2008, p. 26). On recommendation of the Committee on Space and Facilities, the Judicial Conference adopted a fiscal year (FY) 2027 *CPP*, which carried forward all the projects on Part I and Part II of the FY 2026 *CPP*, and elevated the project in McAllen, Texas from Part II to Part I. The projects on the FY 2027 *CPP* were approved in the following priority order:

- a. Part I: (1) Hartford, Connecticut; (2) Chattanooga, Tennessee; (3) Bowling Green, Kentucky; (4) Anchorage, Alaska; and (5) McAllen, Texas; and
- b. Part II: (1) Greensboro/Winston Salem, North Carolina; (2) Sherman/Plano, Texas; (3) Dallas, Texas; (4) Rochester, New York; (5) Macon, Georgia; and (6) Norfolk, Virginia.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Space and Facilities reported that it approved, subject to funding availability, 16 requests for Component B funding pursuant to the Judicial Conference-approved rent allotment methodology (JCUS-SEP 2007, pp. 36-37), and 2 requests for supplemental funding for No Net New projects in support of the Judicial Conference's No Net New policy adopted in September 2013 (JCUS-SEP 2013, p. 32). The Committee decided to sunset its Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Strategic Budget Initiative (SBI), as SBI has concluded and its work will be used to support future space and rent reduction initiatives. Finally, the Committee met with the General Services Administration's Public Buildings Service Commissioner, who briefed the Committee on significant matters impacting the judiciary, including

organizational restructuring, cost estimation for courthouse construction projects, and rent and service issues relating to existing courthouses and other federal facilities.

FUNDING

All of the foregoing recommendations that require the expenditure of funds for implementation were approved by the Judicial Conference subject to the availability of funds and to whatever priorities the Conference might establish for the use of available resources.

Chief Justice of the United States
Presiding