Agenda E-19 (Summary)
Rules
March 2019

SUMMARY OF THE

REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

This report is submitted for the record and includes information on the following for the Judicial Conference:

- Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure ..... pp. 2-4
- Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ..... pp. 5-8
- Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ..... pp. 8-10
- Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure ..... pp. 11-12
- Federal Rules of Evidence ..... pp. 12-15
- Other Matters ..... pp. 15-16

Agenda E-19
Rules
March 2019

REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

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

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee or Committee) met on January 3, 2019. All members were present.

Representing the advisory committees were Judge Michael A. Chagares, Chair, and Professor Edward Hartnett, Reporter, of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules; Judge Dennis Dow, Chair, Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter, and Professor Laura Bartell, Associate Reporter, of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Judge John D. Bates, Chair, Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter, and Professor Richard L. Marcus, Associate Reporter, of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules; Judge Donald W. Molloy, Chair, Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter, and Professor Nancy J. King, Associate Reporter, of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules; and Judge Debra Ann Livingston, Chair, and Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter, of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules.

Also participating in the meeting were Professor Catherine T. Struve (by telephone), the Standing Committee's Reporter; Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, Professor Joseph Kimble, and Professor Bryan A. Garner, consultants to the Standing Committee; Rebecca A. Womeldorf, the Standing Committee's Secretary; Bridget Healy (by telephone), Scott Myers, and Julie Wilson, Rules Committee Staff Counsel; Ahmad Al Dajani, Law Clerk to the Standing Committee; Judge John S. Cooke, Director, and Dr. Tim Reagan, Senior Research Associate, of the Federal Judicial Center (FJC); and Judge Kent A. Jordan, member of the Advisory Committee on Civil

Rules. Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division, represented the Department of Justice on behalf of the Deputy Attorney General Rod J. Rosenstein.

In addition to its general business, including a review of the status of pending rules amendments in different stages of the Rules Enabling Act process, the Committee received and responded to reports from the five rules advisory committees and engaged in discussion of three information items.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

The Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules presented no action items.

Information Items

Possible Amendment to Rule 3 – the Content of Notices of Appeal

At its fall 2018 meeting, the Advisory Committee continued discussion of possible amendments to clarify the content of notices of appeal under Rule 3. Some cases apply an *expressio unius* rationale to conclude that a notice of appeal that designates a final judgment plus one interlocutory order limits the appeal to that order. Other courts treat a notice of appeal that designates the final judgment as reaching all interlocutory orders that merged into the judgment, even if the notice of appeal also references a specific interlocutory order in addition to the judgment.

The Advisory Committee is considering whether Rule 3 should contain some statement of the merger rule – the rule that earlier interlocutory orders merge into the final judgment. The Advisory Committee is also considering whether the phrase "or part thereof" should be deleted from Rule 3(c)(1)(B)'s directive that an appellant "designate the judgment, order, or part thereof being appealed" because the phrase has been read to require the designation of each order sought to be reviewed. The Advisory Committee is mindful that any amendment to Rule 3 would

require an amendment to Form 1 (the form notice of appeal). Finally, as part of its consideration of Rule 3, the Advisory Committee is considering whether to address problems in appeals from orders denying reconsideration.

Proposal to Amend Rule 42(b) – Agreed Dismissals

The Advisory Committee is considering a proposal to amend Rule 42(b). The current rule provides that the circuit clerk "may" dismiss an appeal "if the parties file a signed dismissal agreement specifying how costs are to be paid and pay any fees that may be due." Some have suggested that a dismissal in these circumstances should be mandatory. Prior to the 1998 restyling of the rules that intended no substantive change, Rule 42(b) used the word "shall" instead of "may" dismiss. Rule 42(b) also provides that "no mandate or other process may issue without a court order." The Advisory Committee believes that the key distinction is between situations in which the parties seek nothing but a dismissal of the appeal, and situations in which the parties seek some judicial action in addition to dismissal.

Where the parties seek additional judicial action, the parties cannot control that judicial action. However, where the parties seek nothing but a simple dismissal of the appeal, mandatory dismissal might be appropriate, if not constitutionally compelled.

The Advisory Committee will continue to discuss whether the rule should mandate dismissal upon presentation to the clerk of an agreed dismissal request. If it decides to recommend that dismissal be made mandatory in some or all such circumstances, one approach would be simply to change the existing word "may" in Rule 42(b) to "must" or "will." Another option would be to revise the rule more thoroughly to mirror Supreme Court Rule 46, which provides more detailed guidance than current Rule 42(b) on the appropriate treatment of dismissal agreements or motions, including the circumstances under which dismissal is mandatory.

Comprehensive Review of Rule 35 (En Banc Determination) and Rule 40 (Petition for Panel Rehearing)

The proposed amendments to Rules 35 and 40 that were published for public comment in August 2018 would create length limits for responses to petitions for rehearing. The consideration of those proposed changes prompted the Advisory Committee to consider the significant disparities between Rules 35 and 40. The disparities are traceable to the time when parties could petition for panel rehearing (covered by Rule 40) but could not petition for rehearing en banc (covered by Rule 35), although parties could "suggest" rehearing en banc. The Advisory Committee continues to consider different approaches to harmonize the two rules.

Given that many local rules address the relationship between panel rehearing and rehearing en banc, the Advisory Committee will consider whether there are local practices that should be adopted in Rules 35 and 40.

Counting of Votes by Departed Judges

Finally, the Advisory Committee has started considering how to handle the vote of a judge who leaves the bench, whether by death, resignation, impeachment, or expiration of a recess appointment. The question arises when an opinion has been drafted or a judge has voted in conference, and the judge leaves the bench before the opinion is filed by the court. This is a recurrent issue, and one treated differently across the circuits. One possibility is to amend Rule 36 to provide that an opinion may issue if it has been delivered to the clerk for filing before the judge leaves the bench. A subcommittee has been formed to consider this issue. The Committee recognizes that a case currently pending before the Supreme Court may affect this issue.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules presented one action item for the Standing Committee regarding restyling of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, but no action is needed by the Judicial Conference at this time.

Information Items

Restyling of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure

At its fall 2017 meeting, the Advisory Committee established a Restyling Subcommittee to consider restyling the Bankruptcy Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. The proposed project follows similar restyling of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure in 1998, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure in 2002, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in 2005, and the Federal Rules of Evidence in 2011. To inform its decision, the Restyling Subcommittee worked with the FJC and the Standing Committee's style consultants to solicit feedback from the bankruptcy community. A survey, along with a restyled version of Rule 4001(a) offered as an exemplar of the final product, was sent to all bankruptcy judges and clerks of court, as well as leaders of interested organizations. A link to the survey was also posted on the federal judiciary's website.

The FJC received and analyzed completed surveys from 307 respondents, including 142 bankruptcy judges, 40 bankruptcy clerks, 19 respondents from organizations, and 109 members of the public. Over two-thirds of all respondents in every category supported restyling of the Bankruptcy Rules. Some respondents expressed concern that restyling could introduce unintended consequences, and that project members should take great care to avoid changes in a rule's meaning. Given the positive response to the survey, the Restyling Subcommittee recommended going forward with the project, consistent with the unique features of the Bankruptcy Rules.

The Bankruptcy Rules have not previously been restyled because bankruptcy is particularly statute-driven, and many rules echo statutory language. Bankruptcy is a highly technical area of practice, and one particularly prone to terms of art as well as generally understood terms, concepts, and procedures. To ensure consistency and clarity in the revised rules, the Restyling Subcommittee recommended, and the Advisory Committee agreed, that the linkage between the Bankruptcy Code and the Bankruptcy Rules should presumptively be retained, even if application of restyling guidelines might arguably improve or simplify existing statutory language.

The Advisory Committee recommended that the Standing Committee authorize commencement of the restyling process with the understanding that the Advisory Committee retains authority to decide whether to recommend any restyled rule to the Standing Committee for publication and, ultimately, final approval. The Standing Committee discussed the considerable deference due to the Advisory Committee in restyling and accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendation, noting that final approval of the Advisory Committee's recommendation rests, as always, with the Standing Committee.

The Advisory Committee provided a tentative timeline for restyling the rules, which anticipates publishing the restyled rules for public comment in three batches beginning in August 2020 as follows:

Parts I and II of the Rules	August 2020 – February 2021
Parts III, IV, V, and VI of the Rules	August 2021 – February 2022
Parts VII, VIII, and IX of the Rules	August 2022 – February 2023

Although the Advisory Committee expects to restyle the rules in batches and obtain public comment on each group as it is restyled, none of the restyled rules would become effective until all groups have been approved. Absent delays and assuming approvals by the

Conference and the Supreme Court, and no contrary action by Congress, the full set of restyled rules would go into effect December 1, 2024. These dates are aspirational, however, and may change as the project develops.

Expansion of the Use of Electronic Noticing and Service

In August 2017, proposed amendments to two rules and one Official Form that were intended to expand the use of electronic noticing and service in the bankruptcy courts were published for public comment. Rule 2002(g) (Addressing Notices) would allow notices to be sent to email addresses designated on filed proofs of claims and proofs of interest, and Official Form 410 would be amended to add a checkbox for opting into email service and noticing. As published, the amendments to Rule 9036 (Notice or Service Generally) would allow clerks and parties to provide notices or serve most documents through the court's electronic-filing system on registered users of that system. It also would allow service or noticing on any person by any electronic means consented to in writing by that person.

In response to publication, several comments raised substantial issues about the proposed amendments. Those issues fall into three groups: (1) technological feasibility; (2) priorities if there are different email addresses for the same creditor; and (3) miscellaneous wording suggestions. Based on consideration of the comments and the logistics of implementing the proposed email opt-in procedure, the Advisory Committee voted at its spring 2018 meeting to hold back the amendments to Rule 2002(g) and Official Form 410, but to move forward with the amendments to Rule 9036, with minor revisions. The Standing Committee recommended and the Judicial Conference approved the proposed amendments to Rule 9036 in September 2018, and that revised rule is on track to go into effect December 1, 2019.

After the spring 2018 Advisory Committee meeting, the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management (CACM Committee) submitted a suggestion for a further

amendment to Rule 9036 that would require mandatory electronic service on most "high volume notice recipients," a category that would initially be composed of entities that receive more than 100 court-generated paper notices from one or more courts in a calendar month. The CACM Committee's suggestion built upon a 2015 suggestion submitted by the Administrative Office's (AO) Bankruptcy Judges Advisory Group, the Bankruptcy Clerks Advisory Group, and the Bankruptcy Noticing Working Group. The prior suggestion was rejected as being inconsistent with § 342(e) and (f) of the Bankruptcy Code, which allow a chapter 7 or 13 creditor to insist upon receipt of notices at a particular physical address. The CACM Committee's version of the proposed mandatory electronic service requirement would be "subject to the right to file a notice of address pursuant to § 342(e) or (f) of the Code."

The CACM Committee strongly urged the adoption of the high-volume-notice-recipient program in order to achieve substantial savings. The AO has estimated that the savings could reach $3 million or more a year.

The Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Business Issues is evaluating the CACM Committee's suggestion as well as revisions to proposed Rule 2002(g) and Official Form 410 that address the concerns raised in the comments. The subcommittee hopes to present drafts for Advisory Committee review at its spring 2019 meeting.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules presented no action items.

Information Items

The Advisory Committee met on November 1, 2018. Discussion focused primarily on reports from two subcommittees tasked with long-term projects, as well as consideration of new suggestions related to expanding the scope of disclosure statements in Rule 7.1.

Multidistrict Litigation Subcommittee

Since November 2017, a subcommittee has been considering suggestions that specific rules be developed for multidistrict litigation (MDL) proceedings. Over the past year, the subcommittee has engaged in a substantial amount of fact gathering, in part with valuable assistance from the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML). The outreach has included participating in several conferences hosted by different constituencies, including transferee judges. The purpose of the fact gathering is to identify issues on which rules changes might focus. While the subcommittee's work remains in an early stage, the information gathered thus far has allowed it to identify six issues for consideration: (1) early procedures to winnow out unsupportable claims; (2) interlocutory appellate review; (3) formation and funding of plaintiff steering committees; (4) trial issues (e.g., bellwether trials); (5) settlement promotion, review, and approval; and (6) third party litigation funding. Going forward, the subcommittee will continue to gather information with the assistance of the JPML and the FJC.

Social Security Disability Review Subcommittee

As previously reported, a subcommittee has been formed to consider a suggestion by the Administrative Conference of the United States that the Judicial Conference develop uniform procedural rules for cases under the Social Security Act in which an individual seeks district court review of a final administrative decision of the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). With input from both claimant and government representatives, as well as the Advisory Committee and Standing Committee, the subcommittee developed draft rules to assist in focusing the discussion. While the subcommittee has not determined whether to recommend new rules, there is a growing consensus that the scope of any such rules would be limited to cases seeking review of a single administrative record, and would focus on pleading, briefing, and timing.

Disclosure Statements

Expanding the scope of the disclosure statements required by Civil Rule 7.1 and the analogous provisions in Appellate Rule 26.1, Bankruptcy Rule 8012, and Criminal Rule 12.4 has been the subject of several suggestions in recent years. The Advisory Committee has determined to move forward with a suggestion that it amend Rule 7.1 to include a nongovernmental corporation that seeks to intervene, a change that will parallel the proposed amendments to Appellate Rule 26.1 (approved by the Conference at its September 2018 session and forwarded to the Supreme Court on October 24, 2018) and Bankruptcy Rule 8012 (published for public comment on August 15, 2018). At its November 2018 meeting, the Advisory Committee also kept on its agenda a suggestion to address the problem of determining the citizenship of a limited liability company (or similar entity) in diversity cases by requiring that the names and citizenship of any member or owner of such an entity be disclosed.

Proposed Amendment to Rule 30(b)(6) Published for Public Comment

On August 15, 2018, a proposed amendment to Rule 30(b)(6), the rule that addresses deposition notices or subpoenas directed to an organization, was published for public comment. The proposed amendment requires the parties to confer about the number and descriptions of the matters for examination, and the identity of each witness the organization will designate to testify. The comment period closes on February 15, 2019. A public hearing was held in Phoenix, Arizona on January 4, 2019. Twenty-five witnesses presented testimony. A second hearing is scheduled to be held in Washington, DC on February 8, 2019. Fifty-five witnesses have asked to testify.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

The Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules presented no action items.

Information Items

The Advisory Committee met on October 24, 2018. A large portion of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the work of the Rule 16 Subcommittee. The Advisory Committee also determined to retain on its agenda a suggestion to amend Rule 43.

Expert Disclosures

As previously reported, the Advisory Committee added to its agenda two suggestions from district judges that pretrial disclosure of expert testimony in criminal cases under Rule 16 be expanded to more closely parallel the more robust expert disclosure requirements in Civil Rule 26. The Advisory Committee devoted a portion of its October 2018 meeting to a presentation by the Department of Justice on its development and implementation of new policies governing disclosure of forensic and non-forensic evidence.

The Rule 16 Subcommittee will consider whether an amendment is warranted and, if so, what features any recommended amendment should contain. To assist in its work, the subcommittee is planning to hold a mini-conference this spring. Participants will include prosecutors, private practitioners, and federal defenders.

Defendant's Presence at Plea and Sentencing

At its October 2018 meeting, the Advisory Committee created a subcommittee to consider the panel's suggestion in *United States v. Bethea*, 888 F.3d 864 (7th Cir. 2018), that "it would be sensible" to amend Rule 43(a)'s requirement that the defendant must be physically present for the plea and sentencing.

Although the Advisory Committee has twice rejected suggestions that it expand the use of video conferencing for pleas or sentencing, members concluded the issue should be revisited

given the explicit invitation in *Bethea*. The subcommittee is tasked with assessing the need for a narrow exception to the requirement of physical presence, how such an exception could be defined, what safeguards would be necessary, including the procedures needed to ensure a knowing and intelligent waiver, and how to accommodate the right to counsel when the defendant and counsel are in different locations.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules presented no action items.

Information Items

The Advisory Committee met on October 19, 2018. At that meeting, the Advisory Committee conducted a roundtable discussion with a panel of invited judges, practitioners, and academics regarding four agenda items, including two proposed amendments to Rule 702, proposed amendments to Rule 106, and proposed amendments to Rule 615. Each is discussed below. The roundtable discussion provided the Advisory Committee with helpful insight, background, and suggestions.

Possible Amendments to Rule 702

Addressing Forensics. The Advisory Committee has been exploring the appropriate response to the recent scientific studies regarding the potential unreliability of certain forensic evidence. A subcommittee was appointed to consider possible treatment of forensics, as well as the weight/admissibility question discussed below. After extensive discussion, the subcommittee concluded that it would be difficult to draft a new freestanding rule on forensic expert testimony because any such rule would have an inevitable and problematic overlap with Rule 702. Further, the subcommittee concluded it would not be advisable to set forth detailed requirements

regarding forensic evidence in rule text because substantial debate exists in the scientific community as to appropriate requirements.

The Advisory Committee agreed with the subcommittee's recommendations and is considering ways other than rule changes to assist courts and litigants in meeting the challenges of forensic evidence. These include assisting the FJC with judicial education. The Advisory Committee continues to consider a proposal to amend Rule 702 to focus on one important aspect of expert testimony: the problem of overstating results (for example, by stating an opinion as having a "zero error rate" when that conclusion is not supportable by the methodology).

Admissibility/Weight. The Advisory Committee is also considering an amendment to Rule 702 that would address some courts' apparent treatment of the Rule 702 requirements of sufficient basis and reliable application as questions of weight rather than admissibility, without finding that the proponent has met these admissibility factors by a preponderance of the evidence. Extensive case law research suggests confusion on whether courts should apply the admissibility requirements of a preponderance of evidence under Rule 104(a), or the lower standard of prima facie proof under Rule 104(b). Based on the roundtable discussion and other information, the Advisory Committee will continue to consider whether an amendment to Rule 702 is necessary to clarify that the court must find these admissibility requirements met by a preponderance of the evidence.

Possible Amendment to Rule 106

Over its last three meetings, the Advisory Committee has been considering whether Rule 106, the rule of completeness, should be amended. Rule 106 provides that if a party introduces all or part of a written or recorded statement in such a way as to be misleading, the opponent may require admission of a completing statement to correct the misimpression. The Advisory Committee has focused on whether Rule 106 should be amended to provide: (1) that a

completing statement is admissible over a hearsay objection; (2) that the rule covers oral as well as written or recorded statements; and (3) more specific language about when the rule is triggered (i.e., by a "misleading" statement) and when a completing portion must be admitted (i.e., when it corrects the misleading impression). The roundtable discussion provided important input on these questions.

Possible Amendments to Rule 615

The Advisory Committee considered a suggestion to amend Rule 615, the rule on sequestering witnesses. The suggestion noted three concerns: (1) the rule provides no discretion for a court to deny a motion to sequester; (2) there is no timing requirement for when a party must invoke the rule, so it would be possible for a party to make a mid-trial request for exclusion of witnesses from the courtroom after some witnesses had already testified; and (3) there should be an explicit exemption from exclusion for expert witnesses to substitute for the current vague exemption for witnesses who are "essential to presenting the party's claim or defense." These proposed changes were raised at the roundtable discussion, and the Advisory Committee obtained valuable information, especially from the participating judges.

The Advisory Committee rejected the proposal to make sequestration discretionary. The mandatory nature of the rule was adopted because it is counsel, and not the court, that is likely to be aware of the risks of tailoring trial testimony. Also, discretion still exists in the rule given the exceptions to exclusion provided. Similarly, the Advisory Committee determined that the concerns regarding timing and an explicit exemption from exclusion for expert witnesses were not pervasive or significant issues.

In researching the operation of Rule 615, the Advisory Committee found another issue that has produced a conflict among the courts. The issue involves the scope of a Rule 615 order

and whether it applies only to exclude witnesses from the courtroom, as stated in the text of the rule, or extends outside the confines of the courtroom to prevent prospective witnesses from being advised of trial testimony. The Advisory Committee has agreed to further consider an amendment that would clarify the extent of an order under Rule 615.

Proposed Amendment to Rule 404(b) Published for Public Comment

On August 15, 2018, the Advisory Committee published for public comment a proposed amendment to Rule 404(b), the rule that addresses character evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts. The proposal would expand the prosecutor's notice obligations by requiring that the prosecutor "articulate in the notice the non-propensity purpose for which the prosecutor intends to offer the evidence and the reasoning that supports the purpose." Three comments have been submitted thus far.

OTHER ITEMS

The Standing Committee's agenda also included three information items. First, the Committee was briefed on the status of legislation introduced in the 115th Congress that would directly or effectively amend a federal rule of procedure.

Second, the Committee engaged in a discussion of whether to develop procedures for handling submissions outside the standard public comment period, including those addressed directly to the Standing Committee rather than to the relevant advisory committee. Based on that discussion, the Reporter to the Committee will draft proposed procedures to be discussed at the June 2019 meeting.

Third, Committee members were provided with materials summarizing the September 12, 2018 long-range planning meeting of Conference committee chairs and members of the Executive Committee, as well as the status of the strategic initiatives meant to support

implementation of the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* that have been identified by each Judicial Conference committee.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Campbell, Chair

Jesse M. Furman	Peter D. Keisler
Daniel C. Girard	William K. Kelley
Robert J. Giuffra Jr.	Carolyn B. Kuhl
Susan P. Graber	Rod J. Rosenstein
Frank M. Hull	Srikanth Srinivasan
William J. Kayatta Jr.	Amy J. St. Eve