



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courtinfo.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: January 24, 2012

Title	Agenda Item Type
Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement of Protective Orders Issued by Tribal Courts	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
Adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; amend rule 2.300; approve form DV-610	July 1, 2012
Recommended by	Date of Report
California Tribal Court/State Court Forum Hon. Richard Blake, Cochair Hon. Dennis M. Perluss., Cochair	December 6, 2011
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	Contact
Hon. Kimberly Nystrom-Geist, Cochair Hon. Dean Stout, Cochair	Ann Gilmour, 415-865-4207 ann.gilmour@jud.ca.gov Jennifer Walter, 415-865-7687 jennifer.walter@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The California Tribal Court/State Court Forum and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommend adopting a new rule of court, amending another rule, and approving a new form to establish an efficient and consistent statewide procedure for California superior courts to register protective orders issued by tribal courts in California under Family Code section 6404. Registration of tribal court protective orders will help ensure that law enforcement agencies enforce these orders uniformly and consistently.

Recommendation

The California Tribal Court/State Court Forum and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2012:

1. Adopt rule 5.386 to require, if a tribal court requests, the court in the county where the tribal court is located to adopt a written procedure or local rule to permit the fax or electronic filing of any tribal protective order that is entitled to be registered pursuant to Family Code section 6404, and
2. Amend rule 2.300 which addresses fax filing in civil, probate, and family law proceedings to clarify that it does not apply to the fax filing of tribal court protective orders covered by this rule; and
3. Approve *Fax Transmission Cover Sheet for Registration of Tribal Court Protective Order* (form DV-610), a cover sheet for the fax filing of tribal court protective orders.

Previous Council Action

In 1989 the Legislature enacted AB 677 (1989 Stats. Ch. 1100) which required the Judicial Council to establish pilot projects concerning fax filing. The purpose was to assess the extent of savings due to implementation of fax filing. Following successful completion of the pilot projects, the Judicial Council adopted a general rule on fax filing requirements in civil cases, rule 2002, effective January 1, 1992. The rule has since been amended several times, but none of the amendments address tribal court protective orders. In 1998, the Judicial Council adopted rule 1406.5 and Form JV-520 to authorize courts to adopt local rules for fax filing in juvenile cases.

Rationale for Recommendation

In 2008 and 2009, using federal grant funding, the Administrative Office of the Courts undertook the Native American Communities Justice Project (NACJP)¹ This project engaged Native American communities in identifying needs relating to family violence. Among the issues of concern identified during this project were the barriers to having protective orders issued by tribal courts registered and enforced. There are approximately seventeen tribal courts in California, many of which issue protective orders. Federal and state law mandate full faith and credit and enforcement of tribal court protective orders by superior courts and law enforcement agencies. (18 U.S.C. § 2265; Fam. Code §§ 6401 - 6405). However, tribal court judges and tribal advocates report that in practice, protective orders issued by tribal courts are not uniformly and consistently enforced because tribal courts and tribal law enforcement agencies in California do not have access to the law enforcement databases maintained by the California Department of Justice. If California state and local law enforcement officials are not able to verify the validity of tribal court protective orders in the statewide protective order database, also known as the

¹ For more information about this project and copies of the reports see <http://www.courts.ca.gov/8117.htm>

California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS), these orders are generally not enforced.

Currently, California law provides for the registration of tribal court protective orders with the superior court by means of Judicial Council form DV-600 Register Out-of-State Restraining Order. However, the current registration procedure poses challenges to Native American victims and results in public safety concerns. In most jurisdictions, the current procedure requires parties to go to the superior court to file the original tribal court protective order and form DV-600 to ensure the order's entry into the statewide database. Because many tribal courts in California are in remote locations and many victims of domestic violence lack transportation, this procedure poses significant challenges for litigants and has resulted in delayed enforcement of valid court orders.

In several counties, tribal courts and the local superior courts have adopted protocols to allow for the fax registration of tribal court protective orders with the superior court. These local protocols have removed barriers that Native American victims of domestic violence face in obtaining protection. However, not all tribal and superior courts have reached similar arrangements. Some tribal court judges report ongoing problems with registration and enforcement of protective orders. Reasons include lack of awareness and understanding of tribal court protective orders, the need for clients to travel long distances to the nearest superior court, and individual court users' lack of access to transportation.

To address these problems, the California Tribal Court/State Court Forum (forum) and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee propose an efficient statewide registration procedure for tribal court protective orders. Once a tribal court protective order is registered with a California superior court, it would automatically be entered into the statewide database as if it were a superior court protective order, in the same way that a superior court protective order is entered.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This proposal was circulated for comment as part of the spring 2011 invitation-to-comment cycle from April 21 to June 20. It was distributed to appellate presiding justices, appellate court administrators, trial court presiding judges, trial court executive officers, judges, county counsel, district attorneys, parents' and children's attorneys, social workers, and probation officers—the committee also sought comment from the Joint Rules Working Group of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee and tribal leaders, tribal advocates and tribal court judges throughout the state. A total of seven individuals or organizations submitted comments on this proposal. Four agreed with the proposal, two agreed with the proposal if modified and one did not indicate a position on the proposal. The full text of the comments received and responses of the forum and the committee are set out in the attached comment chart at pages 9 through 18.

The comments focused on whether the proposed rule should mandate a local procedure and fax cover sheet, whether the proposed cover sheet should be a mandatory form and should be filed with the court, and what procedures the courts should follow to confirm receipt of a tribal court protective order. The commentators agreed that the rule should mandate a local procedure. While one court recommended that the proposed form DV-610 be adopted as a mandatory form and include all the information the local superior court would need to register the order, another court opposed the adoption of form DV-610, finding the proposed form unhelpful. The forum and the committee recognize the importance of establishing a local procedure to ensure that the local superior court receives all the information it needs to register a tribal court protective order. However, rather than mandate a specific procedure or a specific form, the forum and committee agreed with those commentators who wanted the superior courts to have the flexibility to develop their own local procedures and, either use the proposed optional cover sheet or develop their own. The forum and committee believe that such procedures and forms are best developed locally in consultation with tribal courts.

One commentator suggested including check boxes in form DV-610 for the person making the request to indicate how he or she wished to receive confirmation that the faxed request was received. The forum and the committee agreed that such check boxes would be helpful and added them to the proposed form.

One commentator recommended that the rule be revised to include language clarifying that the court is not required to retain or file a copy of the cover sheet. The forum and committee made those revisions.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

As alternatives to this proposal, the forum and the committee considered two options. First, the forum and committee considered taking no action at this time. Second, the forum and committee considered developing statewide procedures through rules of court. The forum and committee concluded that inaction would not address the public safety concerns and problems raised by tribal courts. They also concluded that recommending a statewide rule, alone would not allow for procedures to be tailored to local needs and conditions. Therefore, the forum and committee recommend adopting a rule of court and associated optional form which, upon the request of a tribal court located within the county, would mandate a local court to develop a local rule or protocol to provide for the facsimile or e-filing of tribal court protective orders. This option is responsive to the concerns expressed by stakeholders during the NACJP project and ensures tribal court protective orders may be effectively and efficiently registered with the state courts, but it imposes no burdens on those courts where there is either no need for such a rule or protocol at this time, or where there are already existing arrangements with the tribal courts. It allows procedures to be tailored to local needs and conditions.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Expected costs and operational impacts include the creation of new forms and local procedures to implement the fax filing requirements in those jurisdictions where a local tribal court makes such a request.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This proposal supports Goal I (Access, Fairness, and Diversity) and Goal IV (Quality of Justice and Service to the Public) of the judicial branch strategic plan.

Attachments

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.330 and 5.386 at pages 6–7
2. *Fax Transmission Cover Sheet for Registration of Tribal Court Protective Order* (form DV-610), at page 8
3. Chart of Comments, at pages 9–18

Rule 2.300 of the California Rules of Court is amended and rule 5.386 is adopted, effective July 1, 2012, to read:

1 **Rule 2.300 Application**

2
3 (a) Proceedings to which rules apply

4
5 The rules in this chapter apply to civil, probate, and family law proceedings in all trial
6 courts. Rule 5.386 applies to fax filing of a protective order issued by a tribal court. Rule
7 5.522 applies to fax filing in juvenile law proceedings.

8
9 (b) ***

10
11
12 **Rule 5.386. Procedures for filing a tribal court protective order**

13
14 (a) **Request for written procedures for filing a tribal court protective order**

15
16 At the request of any tribal court located within the county, a court must adopt a written
17 procedure or local rule to permit the fax or electronic filing of any tribal court protective
18 order that is entitled to be registered under Family Code section 6404.

19
20 (b) **Process for registration of order**

21
22 The written procedure or local rule developed in consultation with the local tribal court or
23 courts must provide a process for:

- 24
25 (1) The tribal court or courts to contact a representative of the superior court to inform
26 him or her that a request for registration of a tribal court protective order will be
27 made;
28
29 (2) Confirmation of receipt of the request for registration of the order; and
30
31 (3) Return of copies of the registered order to the tribal court or the protected person.

32
33 (c) **No filing fee required**

34
35 In accordance with Family Code section 6404(b), no fee may be charged for the fax or
36 electronic filing registration of a tribal court protective order.

37
38 (d) **Facsimile coversheet**

39
40 The Fax Transmission Cover Sheet for Registration of Tribal Court Protective Order
41 (form DV-610) or similar cover sheet established by written procedure or local rule must
42 be used when fax filing a tribal court protective order. The cover sheet must be the first

1 page transmitted, to be followed by any special handling instructions needed to ensure that
2 the document will comply with local rules. Neither the cover sheet nor the special handling
3 instructions are to be filed in the case. The court is not required to keep a copy of the cover
4 sheet.

Fax Transmission Cover Sheet for Registration of Tribal Court Protective Order

Fill in court name and street address:

Superior Court of California, County of

Fill in case number:

Case Number:

To:
From:

1 Protected person (name or names):

2 Restrained person (name):

3 Please file the following transmitted form DV-600 and attached Tribal Court Protective Order issued by the tribal court.

4 This fax contains a total of _____ pages, including the cover sheet.

5 Date fax sent: _____

6 Name and contact information of tribal court that issued order:
Name of court: _____
Mailing address: _____
Telephone number: _____
Fax number: _____
Contact person: _____
E-mail (if the court has one): _____
Tribal Court case file number: _____

7 Please confirm receipt of this request by contacting:

- the tribal court contact person by telephone.
- the tribal court contact person by e-mail.
- other (describe):

8 Please process and send copies to tribe at the address above or

- protected person at the mailing address on the attached Tribal Court Protective Order
- other (describe):

9 Other instructions:

If you do not receive all pages or have any other problems or questions about this transmission, please call (name): _____ at (telephone number): _____.

DRAFT
Not approved by the
Judicial Council

SPR11-53**Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement** (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Hon. I.P. Aspery, Supervising Judge, Riverside County Superior Court	A	No substantive comments.	No response required.
2.	The Executive Committee of the Family Law Section of the State Bar of California (FLEXCOM)	A/M	<p>FLEXCOM suggests the following modifications:</p> <p>A. Rule 5.386: Procedures for Filing a Tribal Court Protective Order.</p> <p>This proposed rule needs to clarify that these orders may only be faxed directly from the tribal court to the superior court otherwise there is no method to ascertain validity or accuracy. In addition, the rule is vague as to exactly how the protected person will obtain his/her copy of the order. This must be clarified so that the courts can verify that the order is in the hands of the protected person.</p>	The forum and the committee have considered this comment and recommend leaving the flexibility that the rule provides to local superior and tribal courts to address such specifics in the local procedures that they develop.
3.	Superior Court of Monterey County, Eva Minu, Operations Manager	A	No substantive comments.	No response required.
4.	John Hueston, President, Orange County Bar Association	A	No substantive comments.	No response required.
5.	Superior Court of Riverside County Staff Michael Capelli	A	As to the request for specific comments as to what the appropriate procedures should look like to confirm receipt of a fax and return conformed copies to the tribal court. If faxed or emailed, the court suggests an email confirmation to the tribal court that the protective order was received would be appropriate. A conformed copy of the tribal court protective orders could also be returned via email, however certified copies would have to	The forum and committee have considered the comment and recommend that the specific procedures to confirm receipt of a faxed or emailed registration request are best developed locally by the superior courts in consultation with the tribal courts.

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			be returned via mail or picked up by the tribal court or protected person.	
6.	Superior Court of Sacramento County, Robert Turner ASO II	N/I	<p>5.386 (a) - "Electronic filing" is a broad term that incorporates many options which various courts may or may not use. The phrase "as deemed by the court" needs to be added.</p> <p>A "written procedure" implies a guideline and thus the word "should" would be better used than "must".</p> <p>5.386 (b) (1) - If this information is being transmitted electronically then it's redundant to refer to a representative. Verbal communication is not required in an electronic process.</p> <p>5.386 (b) (2) - This rule is trying to establish e-</p>	<p>The forum and the committee understand that not all courts may currently be permitting facsimile or electronic filing. Rule 5.386 would require a local court to adopt such procedures for the registration of tribal court protective orders at the request of a local tribal court. The rule would not prescribe the content of these procedures and a process for electronic filing would not be required but is among the options available to permit filing of tribal court protective orders.</p> <p>The forum and committee have considered the comment and decided not to change the wording from "must" to "should." The content of the procedures may be developed at a local level to meet local needs and conditions, but upon the request of a local tribal court, a local court must adopt some form of process to allow for the facsimile or electronic registration of tribal court protective orders.</p> <p>The rule would cover either electronic or facsimile transmission of requests for registration of protective orders. Timely registration of protective orders is crucial to victim protection. The concern is to have a means of communication to ensure timely response to each request for the registration of a tribal court protective order.</p> <p>Because timely registration and entry of protective</p>

SPR11-53**Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement** (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>filing language to an electronic paper process. Sending paper electronically varies little from sending paper via the mail. Confirmation is made when the parties receive the certified copies.</p> <p>Recommendation: Delete #2.</p> <p>5.386 (b) - This is duplicative to existing statute. There is no need to repeat. Delete.</p> <p>5.386 (c) - Creating a special fax cover sheet for optional use is meaningless. The cover sheet provides no more information than a standard fax cover sheet. This becomes a form the AOC will need to maintain but will see little, if any, use.</p> <p>Recommendation: Delete the form.</p>	<p>orders is crucial to victim safety, the rule envisions a means of confirmation of receipt of the order (such as an email or phone call) that would be faster than waiting for the mailed return of certified copies.</p> <p>Currently courts are generally permitted to charge a fee for the facsimile filing of most documents. While Family Code section 6404 (b) states that no fee may be charged to register a protective order, it does not specifically say anything about facsimile filing. The forum and committee felt that it was important to clarify that no fee should be charged for the facsimile registration of these orders.</p> <p>The forum and the committee have determined that it is important to have some form of cover sheet with the request for registration of the tribal court protective order. In response to this comment and the comment received by the Superior Court of San Diego County, which recommended that the form be made mandatory, the forum and the committee revised the rule to require that a cover sheet be used, either the DV-610 or a similar form to be established by local written procedure or rule.</p>
7.	Superior Court of San Diego County Michael M. Roddy, Executive Officer,	AM	<p><i>"1. What are appropriate procedures to confirm receipt of fax or emailed registration requests and how to get conformed copies of orders from the superior court to the tribal court and</i></p>	<p>The forum and committee posed this question in the invitation to comment and appreciate the specific suggestions.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p><i>ultimately to the protected person.”</i></p> <p>-- Rule 5.386(b) could be changed as follows: “The written procedure or local rule developed in consultation with the local tribal court or courts may <i>must</i> provide a process for: ...” This approach would leave it to the superior court and tribal court(s) to determine how receipt will be confirmed and how conformed copies will be sent to the tribal court and/or protected person(s).</p> <p>-- In item 7, form DV-610 already appears to provide an adequate way for the person making a registration request by fax to specify how copies should be transmitted to the tribal court and ultimately to the protected person. The more difficult question is how to process emailed requests. As stated above, rule 5.386(b) could require the local rule or written procedure to specify procedures for confirming receipt and distributing conformed copies. Alternatively, rule 5.386 will need to provide a procedure for transmitting conformed copies of registered orders by mail, fax, or e-mail to the tribal court(s).</p> <p>-- An additional item on Form DV-610, inserted between items 6 and 7, could provide options with check boxes for the person making the request to indicate how he or she wishes to receive confirmation that the faxed request was received, for example:</p>	<p>The forum and committee agree and changed “may” to “must”.</p> <p>The forum and committee concluded that the facsimile transmission cover sheet appropriately includes discussion of receipt of copies. However, local superior courts and tribal courts are in a better position to develop locally tailored procedures that best meet their needs. Accordingly, rule 5.386 (b) (3) allows local courts and tribes to develop their own procedures concerning the return of copies of the registered order to the tribal court.</p> <p>The forum and committee agree and have revised the form to include these check boxes.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>Please confirm receipt of this request by contacting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> the tribal court contact person by telephone<input type="checkbox"/> the tribal court contact person by e-mail<input type="checkbox"/> other (describe) <p>-- Additionally, rule 5.386 could state that if no instructions are provided with the registration request, the “Presumption of filing” provisions contained in rule 2.304(d) will apply.</p>	<p>The forum and committee have considered the comment and concluded the presumption of filing contained in rule 2.304(d) serves a different purpose than the confirmation of receipt is intended to achieve in the context of the registration of tribal court protective orders.</p> <p>The presumption of filing contained in rule 2.304 (d) preserves a litigant’s rights in the event that a faxed document is not filed by the court due to some difficulty of the court.</p> <p>The goal of filing a tribal court protective order with the local superior court is to facilitate entry through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) into the California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). Although protective orders issued by tribal courts are legally enforceable without such registration, in practice law enforcement may delay enforcement or fail to enforce them. A process to confirm receipt of the tribal court orders is necessary to ensure that they are expeditiously entered into CARPOS. It is not clear that the presumption of filing contained in rule 2.304 (d) would address this concern.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>“2. Whether rule 5.522(g) should be amended to permit courts to use fax machines currently dedicated to the receipt of fax filed documents in juvenile proceedings to also be used for receipt of faxed registrations of tribal court protective orders.”</p> <p>-- Rather than amending rule 5.522(g), a rule of court having statewide application, wouldn't it make more sense to allow each court, when drafting its local rule or written procedure under rule 5.386(a)-(b), to [1] decide whether to use its juvenile court fax machine for receipt of faxed registrations of tribal court protective orders and, if it decides to do so, [2] provide for that use in its local rule or written procedure? Courts may well find it problematic to use their juvenile court fax machines for other types of documents because of the mandatory precautions for protecting confidentiality when receiving faxes in juvenile court. In other words, a court may prefer to use a different fax machine for non-confidential fax transmissions.</p> <p>3. <i>Unsolicited comments/queries:</i></p> <p>-- It is unclear from proposed rule 5.386, as currently drafted, which division of the superior court would receive registration requests from tribal courts.</p>	<p>The forum and the committee agree with the commentator's concerns and withdraw their recommendation to amend rule 5.522 (g).</p> <p>The forum and the committee agree that the local superior court is in the best position to decide which division of the court should receive the registration requests.</p> <p>The proposal- SPR11-36, entitled Family Law: New, Restructured, and Amended Family Law Rules of Court (http://www.courts.ca.gov/SPR11-36.pdf) addresses where rule 5.386 fits within Title 5 of the California Rules of Court. In the</p>

SPR11-53**Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement** (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>The proposed rule contemplates a written procedure or local rule by which a tribal court would inform a representative of the superior court “that a request for registration of a tribal court protective order will be made,” but it does not specify where the request should be sent once it is received by the “representative of the superior court” – criminal, family, domestic violence, juvenile? Shouldn’t that also be addressed in the local rule or written procedure?</p> <p>-- How will rule 5.386 fit into Title 5 -- Family and Juvenile Rules? Will it be part of Division 1 (Family Rules) in a new chapter (Chapter 8) following Chapter 7, Rules for Title IV-D Support Actions (rules 5.300-5.375)? Will it be part of Division 2 (Rules Applicable in Family and Juvenile Proceedings), Chapter 1, Contact and Coordination (rules 5.400-5.475)? Or will it stand alone in a new Division and/or Chapter for tribal court protective orders?</p> <p>-- Under rule 5.386(c), use of the DV-610 cover sheet is optional (as opposed to rule 2.304, which mandates use of form MC-005, and rule 5.522, which mandates use of form JV-520). Should some type of cover sheet be required (i.e., either the DV-610 or a cover sheet produced by the tribal court)? If a superior</p>	<p>reorganization proposed by SPR11-36, rule 5.386 would be Division 1 (Family Rules), Chapter 11(Domestic Violence Cases).</p> <p>Subject to any specific procedures for filing that may be provided for in the local procedures or rules, the request for registration would be filed in the same division of the court that currently handles the registration of requests to register out of state protective orders per the DV-600 form.</p> <p>See discussion above. Rule 5.386 will be part of Division 1 (Family Rules), Chapter 11 (Domestic Violence Cases) as reorganized by SPR11-36.</p> <p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>court receives a DV-600 and a tribal court protective order without a cover sheet or a completed DV-610, will the superior court have all the information it needs to register the protective order (e.g., the information requested in items 6-8 of the DV-610)?</p> <p>-- Rule 2.304(b) states, “Neither the cover sheet nor the special handling instructions are to be filed in the case. ... The court is not required to keep a copy of the cover sheet.” Similarly rule 5.522(e) states, “The court is not required to retain or file a copy of the cover sheet.” Should a similar provision be added to rule 5.386?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed changes to Rule 5.386</p> <p>Subd. (a), line 17 – Insert “court” after “tribal” (“tribal <u>court</u> protective order”)</p> <p>Subd. (b), line 23 – Suggest changing “may” to “must” (see comments above).</p> <p>Subd. (b)(3), line 31 – Insert “or the protected person(s)” after “tribal court” (“Return of certified copies of the registered order to the tribal court <u>or the protected person(s).</u>”) for consistency with form DV-610, item 7.</p> <p>Subd. (c), line 41 – Suggest changing “may” to “must.” The use of a cover sheet should be mandatory because if a cover sheet is not used,</p>	<p>The proposal has been revised in response to this comment. However, rather than requiring that the DV-610 be used, the rule has been revised to provide that either the DV-610 or “...a similar cover sheet established by written procedure or local rule must be used...” This will allow the local courts flexibility in adopting forms that are suited to local needs.</p> <p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>the faxed documents might not be correctly processed. (See, e.g., rules 2.304(b) and 5.522(e) [mandatory use of cover sheet].)</p> <p>Suggest adding the following sentences after the existing sentence: “The cover sheet must be the first page transferred. The court is not required to retain or file a copy of the cover sheet.” (E.g., rule 5.522(e).)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed changes to Form DV-610</p> <p>Title and Footer – Insert “Court” after “Tribal” (“Tribal Court Protective Order”)</p> <p>Top right box – Delete “Clerk stamps date here when form is filed” because cover sheet will not be filed.</p> <p>Item 1 – Suggest changing “name” to “name(s)” in the event there is more than one person named in the protective order.</p> <p>Item 4 – Insert comma before “including” (see, e.g., form JV-520, item 1c).</p> <p>Item 8 – Delete “<i>insert</i>” in parentheticals because it is unnecessary.</p> <p>If you do not receive all pages or have any other problems or questions about this transmission, please call (<i>insert name</i>): _____ at (<i>insert telephone number</i>): _____.</p>	<p>The rule has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p>

SPR11-53

Tribal Court Protective Orders: Registration and Enforcement (adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386; revise rule 2.300; approve form DV- 610)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>Left footer – Change as follows for consistency with other Judicial Council forms. (Note: If kept as is, correct typo in website by deleting “i” from “courtis.”)</p> <p>Judicial Council of California, www.courtis.ca.gov Form Adopted for Mandatory Use New January 1, 2012, Optional Form Judicial Council of California Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386 DV-610 [New January 1, 2012]</p> <p>Right footer – Change as follows for consistency with other Judicial Council forms.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1 of 1 DV-610, Page 1 of Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.386 www.courts.ca.gov</p>	<p>The form has been revised in response to this comment.</p> <p>This revision was not made because the forum and committee decided that this form should remain an optional form.</p> <p>The forum and committee confirmed the consistency of the footer with standards of Judicial Council forms.</p>