



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: October 16, 2017
Time: 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the September 11, 2017 meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by October 13, 2017, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Jessica Craven Goldstein. Only written comments received by October 13, 2017, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-4)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Review of Modernization Project Rules Proposal: Proposed Amendments to Title 2, Chapter 3, Division 2 of the California Rules of Court (Action Requested)

Review the proposed amendments to title 2, chapter 3, division 2 of the California Rules of Court. The proposed amendments reduce redundancies and improve consistency between California Rules of Court governing electronic service and electronic filing in the trial courts, and provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure that provide statutory authority for permissive and mandatory electronic service and electronic filing in the courts. The proposal also includes amendments to make limited organizational changes to the rules to improve their logical ordering. Decide whether to approve the proposed amendments for submission to the Judicial Council.

Presenter: Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney, Legal Services Office, Judicial Council of California

Item 4


Update/Report on the Placer Court Hosting Consortium

An update and report on the Placer Court Hosting Center. The Placer Court Hosting Center transition project is jointly funded by the Judicial Council of California and the participating Superior Courts.

Presenter: Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Placer Superior Court

A D J O U R N M E N T

Adjourn

The background of the slide features a large, faint, circular seal of the Judicial Council of Pennsylvania. The seal contains a central figure holding a scale and a sword, surrounded by various symbols of justice and law. The text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF PENNSYLVANIA" is visible around the perimeter of the seal, and the year "1926" is at the bottom.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting

October 16, 2017

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script

*Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. Marsha G. Slough



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

*Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology
Advisory Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Review of Modernization Project Rules Proposal: Proposed Amendments to Title 2, Chapter 3, Division 2 of the California Rules of Court

*Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney, Legal Services Office, Judicial
Council of California*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Placer Court Hosting Consortium

*Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Placer Superior
Court*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Adjourn

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 11, 2017

12:00 - 1:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Mr. Jake Chatters; Hon. Ming W. Chin; David E. Gunn; Ms. Audra Ibarra; Hon. Gary Nadler; and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Incoming Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Shama H. Mesiwala; and Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Rick Feldstein

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Mr. Robert Oyung, Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Daphne Light; and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the July 10, 2017 meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams.

Action: The committee discussed the activities of ITAC and received the report.

Item 3

Review of Workplans for ITAC-Assigned Futures Commission Directives

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer of the Judicial Council, provided an update and report on the workplans for the ITAC-assigned Futures Commission directives. The directives are to study the feasibility of and resource requirements for developing and implementing pilot projects of three technologies: remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings; voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers; and intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services.

Action: The committee asked questions and discussed the workplans. Following the discussion, the committee unanimously voted to approve the workplans for submission to the Judicial Council authorizing updates as appropriate.

Item 4

Update/Report on the Judicial Branch Technology Summit

Update: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, JCTC Vice-Chair, provided an update and report on the work related to the Judicial Branch Technology Summit that was held in conjunction with the Statewide Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and the Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) on August 23 and 24, 2017.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 5

Welcome new members/Farewell to members

Update: Justice Slough welcomed new members and stated that she was looking forward to working with them on the upcoming projects. Justice Slough thanked outgoing members for their dedicated service while also stating farewell.

Action: Incoming and outgoing members addressed the committee. Outgoing members stated that they appreciated the opportunity to be a part of the policy making body and also expressed their appreciation to staff for their hard work. Incoming members stated they looked forward to participating on the committee.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
October 11, 2017	Please review
To	Deadline
Judicial Council Technology Committee Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	October 16, 2017
From	Contact
Information Technology Advisory Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee Hon. Ann I. Jones, Chair	Andrea L. Jaramillo 916-263-0991 phone andrea.jaramillo@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Rules Proposal (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)	

Background

This spring, the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (CSCAC) circulated a rules proposal for public comment that would amend several rules related to electronic service and electronic filing found in title 2, division 3, chapter 2 of the California Rules of Court. The proposed amendments are intended to improve the organization of the rules, improve the rules' consistency with the Code of Civil Procedure, and reduce redundancies between the rules and the Code of Civil Procedure. Specifically, the rules proposal would ensure consistency and redundancy between the rules and Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 (section 1010.6), which provides statutory authority for permissive and mandatory electronic filing and service. The proposal conforms the rules to changes to section 1010.6 and the addition of section 1013b to the Code of Civil Procedure in

legislation that the Judicial Council sponsored in 2017 to ensure the rules are current when the legislation goes into effect. The proposal also makes limited organizational changes to the rules to improve their logical ordering.

Six commenters submitted specific comments in response to the Invitation to Comment. ITAC's Rules and Policy Subcommittee and the CSCAC's Unlimited Case and Complex Litigation Subcommittee considered the proposal and the comments received on May 23, 2017. A number of the proposed rule changes are designed to align with amendments to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the addition of Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b. These legislative changes were part of Judicial Council-sponsored legislation introduced this year as Assembly Bill 976. As of the date of the subcommittees' May 23, 2017 meeting, the Assembly had made changes to AB 976 that would have necessitated additional rule changes, beyond the original proposal, to be effective January 1, 2018. The subcommittees held the rule proposal pending the outcome of AB 976.

AB 976 continued to be amended throughout the legislative session and was ultimately passed on September 14, 2017 and signed by the governor on September 27, 2017. The final version of AB 976 retained the changes to Code of Civil Procedure with which the proposed rule amendments were designed to be consistent. The final version of AB 976 also added language that will necessitate additional rule changes, but the required effective date for those rule changes moved from January 1, 2018 to January 1, 2019.¹ On September 27, 2017, the subcommittees voted to recommend the proposal for Judicial Council adoption. On October 10, 2017, ITAC and CSCAC are held meetings to consider and vote on the proposal. Both ITAC and CSCAC voted to recommend adoption by the Judicial Council.

Staff have prepared a draft Judicial Council report for the committee's reference and a copy of the draft report (minus the report's attachments) is included with the attachments to this memo.

Staff Recommendations

Recommend the proposed rule amendments for Judicial Council adoption at its November 2017 meeting.

¹ Specifically, AB 976 amends Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to require, effective January 1, 2019, that parties expressly consent to electronic service. Under AB 976, "The act of electronic filing shall not be construed as express consent." This will necessitate a change to rule 2.251(b) during next year's rules cycle because the rule allows for the act of electronic filing to serve as consent for electronic service. AB 976 also requires the Judicial Council to develop a form for withdrawal of consent.

In addition, AB 976 requires that the Judicial Council adopt a rule by January 1, 2019 setting forth a procedure for electronic signatures on electronically filed documents.

Attachments and Links

1. Text of proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259.
2. Comment chart with committee responses.
3. AB 976 (Stats. 2017, ch. 319).
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB976
4. Draft Judicial Council Report (minus attachments to the report)

Rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective January 1, 2018, to read:

1 **Rule 2.250. Construction and definitions**

2
3 (a) * * *

4
5 (b) **Definitions**

6
7 As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

- 8
9 (1) A “document” is a pleading, a paper, a declaration, an exhibit, or another
10 filing submitted by a party or other person, or by an agent of a party or other
11 person on the party’s or other person’s behalf. A document is also a notice,
12 order, judgment, or other issuance by the court. A document may be in paper
13 or electronic form.
14
15 (2) “Electronic service” is service of a document on a party or other person by
16 either electronic transmission or electronic notification. Electronic service
17 may be performed directly by a party or other person, by an agent of a party
18 or other person, including the party’s or other person’s attorney, through an
19 electronic filing service provider, or by a court.
20
21 (3) “Electronic transmission” means the transmission of a document by
22 electronic means to the electronic service address at or through which a party
23 or other person has authorized electronic service.
24
25 (4) “Electronic notification” means the notification of a party or other person that
26 a document is served by sending an electronic message to the electronic
27 service address at or through which the party or other person has authorized
28 electronic service, specifying the exact name of the document served and
29 providing a hyperlink at which the served document can be viewed and
30 downloaded.
31
32 (5) “Electronic service address” ~~of a party~~ means the electronic address at or
33 through which the party or other person has authorized electronic service.
34
35 (6) An “electronic filer” is a party or other person filing a document in electronic
36 form directly with the court, by an agent, or through an electronic filing
37 service provider.
38
39 (7) “Electronic filing” is the electronic transmission to a court of a document in
40 electronic form. For the purposes of this chapter, this definition concerns the
41 activity of filing and does not include the processing and review of the
42 document, and its entry into the court records, which are necessary for a
43 document to be officially filed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

(8) An “electronic filing service provider” is a person or entity that receives an electronic filing from a party or other person for retransmission to the court or for electronic service on other parties or other persons, or both. In submission of filings, the electronic filing service provider does so on behalf of the electronic filer and not as an agent of the court.

~~(9) “Regular filing hours” are the hours during which a court accepts documents for filing at its filing counter.~~

~~(10) “Close of business” is 5 p.m. or any other time on a court day at which the court stops accepting documents for filing at its filing counter, whichever is earlier. The court must provide notice of its close of business time electronically. The court may give this notice in any additional manner it deems appropriate.~~

Advisory Committee Comment

The definition of “electronic service” has been amended to provide that a party may effectuate service not only by the electronic transmission of a document, but also by providing electronic notification of where a document served electronically may be located and downloaded. This amendment is intended to modify the rules on electronic service to expressly authorize electronic notification as a legally effective alternative means of service to electronic transmission. This rules amendment is consistent with the amendment of Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, effective January 1, 2011, to authorize service by electronic notification. (See Stats. 2010, ch. 156 (Sen. Bill 1274).) The amendments change the law on electronic service as understood by the appellate court in *Insys, Ltd. v. Applied Materials, Inc.* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 1129, which interpreted the rules as authorizing electronic transmission as the only effective means of electronic service.

Rule 2.251. Electronic service

(a) Authorization for electronic service

When a document may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or fax transmission, the document may be served electronically under Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.

(b) Electronic service by consent of the parties

(1) Electronic service may be established by consent ~~of the parties in an action~~. A party or other person indicates that the party or other person agrees to accept electronic service by:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

(A) Serving a notice on all parties and other persons that the party or other person accepts electronic service and filing the notice with the court. The notice must include the electronic service address at which the party or other person agrees to accept service; or

(B) Electronically filing any document with the court. The act of electronic filing is evidence that the party or other person agrees to accept service at the electronic service address the party or other person has furnished to the court under rule 2.256(a)(4). This subparagraph (B) does not apply to self-represented parties or other self-represented persons; they must affirmatively consent to electronic service under subparagraph (A).

(2) A party or other person that has consented to electronic service under (1) and has used an electronic filing service provider to serve and file documents in a case consents to service on that electronic filing service provider as the designated agent for service for the party or other person in the case, until such time as the party or other person designates a different agent for service.

(c) **Electronic service required by local rule or court order**

(1) A court may require parties to serve documents electronically in specified actions by local rule or court order, as provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.

(2) A court may require other persons to serve documents electronically in specified actions by local rule, as provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.

~~(3)~~(2) Except when personal service is otherwise required by statute or rule, a party or other person that is required to file documents electronically in an action must also serve documents and accept service of documents electronically from all other parties or persons, unless:

(A) The court orders otherwise, or

(B) The action includes parties or persons that are not required to file or serve documents electronically, including self-represented parties or other self-represented persons; those parties or other persons are to be served by non-electronic methods unless they affirmatively consent to electronic service.

1 ~~(4)~~(3) Each party or other person that is required to serve and accept service of
2 documents electronically must provide all other parties or other persons in the
3 action with its electronic service address and must promptly notify all other
4 parties, other persons, and the court of any changes under ~~(f)~~(g).

5
6 **(d) Additional provisions for electronic service required by court order**

7
8 (1) If a court has adopted local rules for permissive electronic filing, then the court
9 may, on the motion of any party or on its own motion, provided that the order
10 would not cause undue hardship or significant prejudice to any party, order all
11 parties in any class action, a consolidated action, a group of actions, a
12 coordinated action, or an action that is complex under rule 3.403 to serve all
13 documents electronically, except when personal service is required by statute or
14 rule.

15
16 (2) A court may combine an order for mandatory electronic service with an order
17 for mandatory electronic filing as provided in rule 2.253(c).

18
19 (3) If the court proposes to make any order under (1) on its own motion, the court
20 must mail notice to any parties that have not consented to receive electronic
21 service. The court may electronically serve the notice on any party that has
22 consented to receive electronic service. Any party may serve and file an
23 opposition within 10 days after notice is mailed, electronically served, or such
24 later time as the court may specify.

25
26 (4) If the court has previously ordered parties in a case to electronically serve
27 documents and a new party is added that the court determines should also be
28 ordered to do so under (1), the court may follow the notice procedures under (2)
29 or may order the party to electronically serve documents and in its order state
30 that the new party may object within 10 days after service of the order or by
31 such later time as the court may specify.

32
33 **~~(d)~~(e) Maintenance of electronic service lists**

34
35 A court that permits or requires electronic filing in a case must maintain and make
36 available electronically to the parties and other persons in the case an electronic
37 service list that contains the parties' or other persons' current electronic service
38 addresses, as provided by the parties or other persons that have filed electronically
39 in the case.
40

1 **(e)(f) Service by the parties and other persons**

2
3 (1) Notwithstanding ~~(d)~~(e), parties and other persons that have consented to or
4 are required to serve documents electronically are responsible for electronic
5 service on all other parties and other persons required to be served in the
6 case. A party or other person may serve documents electronically directly, by
7 an agent, or through a designated electronic filing service provider.

8
9 (2) A document may not be electronically served on a nonparty unless the
10 nonparty consents to electronic service or electronic service is otherwise
11 provided for by law or court order.

12
13 **(f)(g) Change of electronic service address**

14
15 (1) A party or other person whose electronic service address changes while the
16 action or proceeding is pending must promptly file a notice of change of
17 address electronically with the court and must serve this notice electronically
18 on all other parties and all other persons required to be served.

19
20 (2) A party's or other person's election to contract with an electronic filing
21 service provider to electronically file and serve documents or to receive
22 electronic service of documents on the party's or other person's behalf does
23 not relieve the party or other person of its duties under (1).

24
25 (3) An electronic service address is presumed valid for a party or other person if
26 the party or other person files electronic documents with the court from that
27 address and has not filed and served notice that the address is no longer valid.

28
29 **(g)(h) Reliability and integrity of documents served by electronic notification**

30
31 A party or other person that serves a document by means of electronic notification
32 must:

33
34 (1) Ensure that the documents served can be viewed and downloaded using the
35 hyperlink provided;

36
37 (2) Preserve the document served without any change, alteration, or modification
38 from the time the document is posted until the time the hyperlink is
39 terminated; and

40
41 (3) Maintain the hyperlink until either:
42

- 1 (A) All parties in the case have settled or the case has ended and the time
2 for appeals has expired; or
3
4 (B) If the party or other person is no longer in the case, the party or other
5 person has provided notice to all other parties and other persons
6 required to receive notice that it is no longer in the case and that they
7 have 60 days to download any documents, and 60 days have passed
8 after the notice was given.
9

10 **(h)(i) When service is complete**

- 11
12 (1) Electronic service of a document is complete ~~at the time of the electronic~~
13 ~~transmission of the document or at the time that the electronic notification of~~
14 ~~service of the document is sent.~~ as provided in Code of Civil Procedure
15 section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.
16
17 (2) If an electronic filing service provider is used for service, the service is
18 complete at the time that the electronic filing service provider electronically
19 transmits the document or sends electronic notification of service.
20
21 ~~(2) If a document is served electronically, any period of notice, or any right or~~
22 ~~duty to act or respond within a specified period or on a date certain after~~
23 ~~service of the document, is extended by two court days, unless otherwise~~
24 ~~provided by a statute or a rule.~~
25
26 ~~(3) The extension under (2) does not extend the time for filing:~~
27
28 ~~(A) A notice of intent to move for a new trial;~~
29
30 ~~(B) A notice of intent to move to vacate the judgment under Code of Civil~~
31 ~~Procedure section 663a; or~~
32
33 ~~(C) A notice of appeal.~~
34
35 ~~(4) Service that occurs after the close of business is deemed to have occurred on~~
36 ~~the next court day.~~
37

38 **(i)(j) Proof of service**

- 39
40 (1) Proof of electronic service ~~may be by any of the methods~~ shall be made as
41 provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b. 1013a, ~~with the~~
42 ~~following exceptions:~~
43

1 ~~(A) The proof of electronic service does not need to state that the person~~
2 ~~making the service is not a party to the case.~~

3
4 ~~(B) The proof of electronic service must state:~~

5
6 ~~(i) The electronic service address of the person making the service, in~~
7 ~~addition to that person's residence or business address;~~

8
9 ~~(ii) The date of the electronic service, instead of the date and place of~~
10 ~~deposit in the mail;~~

11
12 ~~(iii) The name and electronic service address of the person served, in~~
13 ~~place of that person's name and address as shown on the~~
14 ~~envelope; and~~

15
16 ~~(iv) That the document was served electronically, in place of the~~
17 ~~statement that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail~~
18 ~~with postage fully prepaid.~~

19
20 ~~(2) Proof of electronic service may be in electronic form and may be filed~~
21 ~~electronically with the court.~~

22
23 ~~(3)(2) Under rule 3.1300(c), proof of electronic service of the moving papers must~~
24 ~~be filed at least five court days before the hearing.~~

25
26 ~~(4)(3) The party filing the proof of electronic service must maintain the printed~~
27 ~~form of the document bearing the declarant's original signature and must~~
28 ~~make the document available for inspection and copying on the request of the~~
29 ~~court or any party to the action or proceeding in which it is filed, in the~~
30 ~~manner provided in rule 2.257(a). If a person signs a printed form of a proof~~
31 ~~of electronic service, the party or other person filing the proof of electronic~~
32 ~~service must comply with the provisions of rule 2.257(a).~~

33
34 ~~(j)(k) **Electronic service by or on court**~~

35
36 ~~(1) The court may electronically serve documents any notice, order, judgment, or~~
37 ~~other document issued by the court in the same manner that parties may serve~~
38 ~~documents by electronic service. as provided in Code of Civil Procedure~~
39 ~~section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.~~

40
41 ~~(2) A document may be electronically served on a court if the court consents to~~
42 ~~electronic service or electronic service is otherwise provided for by law or~~
43 ~~court order. A court indicates that it agrees to accept electronic service by:~~

- 1
2 (A) Serving a notice on all parties and other persons in the case that the
3 court accepts electronic service. The notice must include the electronic
4 service address at which the court agrees to accept service; or
5
6 (B) Adopting a local rule stating that the court accepts electronic service.
7 The rule must indicate where to obtain the electronic service address at
8 which the court agrees to accept service.
9

10 **Advisory Committee Comment**

11
12 **Subdivisions (c)–(d).** Court-ordered electronic service is not subject to the provisions in Code of
13 Civil Procedure section 1010.6 requiring that, where mandatory electronic filing and service are
14 established by local rule, the court and the parties must have access to more than one electronic
15 filing service provider.
16

17 **Rule 2.252. General rules on electronic filing of documents**

18
19 **(a) In general**

20
21 A court may provide for electronic filing of documents in actions and proceedings
22 as provided under Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the rules in this
23 chapter.
24

25 **(b) Direct and indirect electronic filing**

26
27 Except as otherwise provided by law, a court may provide for the electronic filing
28 of documents directly with the court, indirectly through one or more approved
29 electronic filing service providers, or through a combination of direct and indirect
30 means.
31

32 **(c) ~~Effect of document filed electronically~~ No effect on filing deadline**

33
34 ~~(1)—A document that the court or a party files electronically under the rules in this~~
35 ~~chapter has the same legal effect as a document in paper form.~~
36

37 ~~(2)—Filing a document electronically does not alter any filing deadline.~~
38

39 **(d) Filing in paper form**

40
41 When it is not feasible for a party or other person to convert a document to
42 electronic form by scanning, imaging, or another means, a court may allow that
43 party or other person to file the document in paper form.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

(e) Original documents

In a proceeding that requires the filing of an original document, an electronic filer may file an electronic copy of a document if the original document is then filed with the court within 10 calendar days.

(f) Application for waiver of court fees and costs

The court ~~may~~ must permit electronic filing of an application for waiver of court fees and costs in any proceeding in which the court accepts electronic filings.

(g) Orders and judgments

The court may electronically file any notice, order, minute order, judgment, or other document prepared by the court.

(h) Proposed orders

Proposed orders may be filed and submitted electronically as provided in rule 3.1312.

Rule 2.253. Permissive electronic filing, mandatory electronic filing, and electronic filing by court order

(a) Permissive electronic filing by local rule

A court may permit parties by local rule to file documents electronically in any types of cases, ~~directly or through approved electronic service providers~~, subject to the conditions in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and the rules in this chapter.

(b) Mandatory electronic filing by local rule

A court may require parties by local rule to electronically file documents in civil actions directly with the court, or directly with the court and through one or more approved electronic filing service providers, or through more than one approved electronic filing service provider, subject to the conditions in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, the rules in this chapter, and the following conditions:

- (1) The court must specify the types or categories of civil actions in which parties or other persons are required to file and serve documents

1 electronically. The court may designate any of the following as eligible for
2 mandatory electronic filing and service:

- 3
4 (A) All civil cases;
5
6 (B) All civil cases of a specific category, such as unlimited or limited civil
7 cases;
8
9 (C) All civil cases of a specific case type, including but not limited to,
10 contract, collections, personal injury, or employment;
11
12 (D) All civil cases assigned to a judge for all purposes;
13
14 (E) All civil cases assigned to a specific department, courtroom or
15 courthouse;
16
17 (F) Any class actions, consolidated actions, or group of actions,
18 coordinated actions, or actions that are complex under rule 3.403; or
19
20 (G) Any combination of the cases described in subparagraphs (A) to (F),
21 inclusive.

- 22
23 (2) Self-represented parties or other self-represented persons are exempt from
24 any mandatory electronic filing and service requirements adopted by courts
25 under this rule and Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.
26
27 (3) In civil cases involving both represented and self-represented parties or other
28 persons, represented parties or other persons may be required to file and serve
29 documents electronically; however, in these cases, each self-represented
30 party or other person is to file, serve, and be served with documents by non-
31 electronic means unless the self-represented party or other person
32 affirmatively agrees otherwise.
33
34 (4) A party or other person that is required to file and serve documents
35 electronically must be excused from the requirements if the party or other
36 person shows undue hardship or significant prejudice. A court requiring the
37 electronic filing and service of documents must have a process for parties or
38 other persons, including represented parties or other represented persons, to
39 apply for relief and a procedure for parties or other persons excused from
40 filing documents electronically to file them by conventional means.
41
42 (5) Any fees charged by the court or an electronic filing service provider shall be
43 consistent with the fee provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.

1 for no more than the cost actually incurred by the court in providing for the
2 electronic filing and service of the documents. Any fees charged by an
3 electronic filing service provider shall be reasonable.
4

5 ~~(6)~~ Any fees for electronic filing charged by the court or by an electronic filing
6 service provider must be waived when deemed appropriate by the court,
7 including providing a waiver of the fees for any party that has received a fee
8 waiver.
9

10 ~~(7)~~(6) Any document required to be electronically filed with the court under this
11 subdivision that is received electronically after the close of business on any
12 day is deemed to have been filed on the next court day, unless by local rule
13 the court provides that any document required to be electronically filed with
14 the court under this subdivision that is received electronically before
15 midnight on a court day is deemed to have been filed on that court day, and
16 any document received electronically after midnight is deemed filed on the
17 next court day. The effective date of filing any document received
18 electronically is prescribed by Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6. This
19 paragraph provision concerns only the effective date of filing. Any document
20 that is received electronically must be processed and satisfy all other legal
21 filing requirements to be filed as an official court record.
22

23 ~~(8)~~(7) A court that adopts a mandatory electronic filing program under this
24 subdivision must report semiannually to the Judicial Council on the operation
25 and effectiveness of the court's program.
26

27 **(c) Electronic filing and service required by court order**
28

29 (1) If a court has adopted local rules for permissive electronic filing, then ~~The~~ the
30 court may, on the motion of any party or on its own motion, provided that the
31 order would not cause undue hardship or significant prejudice to any party,
32 order all parties in any class action, a consolidated action, a group of actions,
33 a coordinated action, or an action that is complex under rule 3.403 to:

34
35 ~~(A) Serve all documents electronically, except when personal service is~~
36 ~~required by statute or rule;~~

37
38 ~~(B) File~~ file all documents electronically; ~~or~~

39
40 ~~(C) Serve and file all documents electronically, except when personal~~
41 ~~service is required by statute or rule.~~
42

1 **Subdivision (c).** Court-ordered electronic filing ~~and service~~ under this subdivision ~~are~~is not
2 subject to the provisions in (b) and Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 requiring that, where
3 mandatory electronic filing and service are established by local rule, the court and the parties
4 must have access to more than one electronic filing service provider.
5

6 **Rule 2.254. Responsibilities of court**
7

8 **(a) Publication of electronic filing requirements**
9

10 Each court that permits or mandates electronic filing must publish, in both
11 electronic and print formats, the court's electronic filing requirements.
12

13 **(b) Problems with electronic filing**
14

15 If the court is aware of a problem that impedes or precludes electronic filing ~~during~~
16 ~~the court's regular filing hours~~, it must promptly take reasonable steps to provide
17 notice of the problem.
18

19 **(c) Public access to electronically filed documents**
20

21 Except as provided in rules 2.250–2.259 and 2.500–2.506, an electronically filed
22 document is a public document at the time it is filed unless it is sealed under rule
23 2.551(b) or made confidential by law.
24

25 **Rule 2.255. Contracts with electronic filing service providers**
26

27 **(a) Right to contract**
28

- 29 (1) A court may contract with one or more electronic filing service providers to
30 furnish and maintain an electronic filing system for the court.
31
32 (2) If the court contracts with an electronic filing service provider, it may require
33 electronic filers to transmit the documents to the provider.
34
35 (3) If the court contracts with an electronic service provider or the court has an
36 in-house system, the provider or system must accept filing from other
37 electronic filing service providers to the extent the provider or system is
38 compatible with them.
39

40 **(b) Provisions of contract**
41

42 ~~The court's contract with an electronic filing service provider may allow the~~
43 ~~provider to charge electronic filers a reasonable fee in addition to the court's filing~~

1 ~~fee. The contract may also allow the electronic filing service provider to make other~~
2 ~~reasonable requirements for use of the electronic filing system.~~

3
4 (1) The court's contract with an electronic filing service provider may:

5
6 (a) Allow the provider to charge electronic filers a reasonable fee in addition to
7 the court's filing fee;

8
9 (b) Allow the provider to make other reasonable requirements for use of the
10 electronic filing system.

11
12 (2) The court's contract with an electronic filing service provider must comply with
13 requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.

14
15 **(c) Transmission of filing to court**

16
17 An electronic filing service provider must promptly transmit any electronic filing
18 and any applicable filing fee to the court.

19
20 **(d) Confirmation of receipt and filing of document**

21
22 (1) An electronic filing service provider must promptly send to an electronic filer
23 its confirmation of the receipt of any document that the filer has transmitted
24 to the provider for filing with the court.

25
26 (2) The electronic filing service provider must send its confirmation to the filer's
27 electronic service address and must indicate the date and time of receipt, in
28 accordance with rule 2.259(a).

29
30 (3) After reviewing the documents, the court must promptly transmit to the
31 electronic filing service provider and the electronic filer the court's
32 confirmation of filing or notice of rejection of filing, in accordance with rule
33 2.259.

34
35 **(e) Ownership of information**

36
37 All contracts between the court and electronic filing service providers must
38 acknowledge that the court is the owner of the contents of the filing system and has
39 the exclusive right to control the system's use.

40

1 **Rule 2.256. Responsibilities of electronic filer**

2
3 **(a) Conditions of filing**

4
5 Each electronic filer must:

- 6
- 7 (1) Comply with any court requirements designed to ensure the integrity of
8 electronic filing and to protect sensitive personal information;
 - 9
 - 10 (2) Furnish information the court requires for case processing;
 - 11
 - 12 (3) Take all reasonable steps to ensure that the filing does not contain computer
13 code, including viruses, that might be harmful to the court's electronic filing
14 system and to other users of that system;
 - 15
 - 16 (4) Furnish one or more electronic service addresses, in the manner specified by
17 the court, ~~at which the electronic filer agrees to accept service.~~ This only
18 applies when the electronic filer has consented to or is required to accept
19 electronic service;
 - 20
 - 21 (5) Immediately provide the court and all parties with any change to the
22 electronic filer's electronic service address. This only applies when the
23 electronic filer has consented to or is required to accept electronic service;
24 and
 - 25
 - 26 (6) If the electronic filer uses an electronic filing service provider, provide the
27 electronic filing service provider with the electronic address at which the filer
28 is to be sent all documents and immediately notify the electronic filing
29 service provider of any change in that address.
 - 30

31 **(b) Format of documents to be filed electronically**

32
33 A document that is filed electronically with the court must be in a format specified
34 by the court unless it cannot be created in that format. The format adopted by a
35 court must meet the following requirements:

- 36
- 37 (1) The software for creating and reading documents must be in the public
38 domain or generally available at a reasonable cost.
 - 39
 - 40 (2) The printing of documents must not result in the loss of document text,
41 format, or appearance.
 - 42

1 (3) The document must be text searchable when technologically feasible without
2 impairment of the document's image.

3
4 If a document is filed electronically under the rules in this chapter and cannot be
5 formatted to be consistent with a formatting rule elsewhere in the California Rules
6 of Court, the rules in this chapter prevail.

7
8 **Advisory Committee Comment**

9
10 **Subdivision (b)(3).** The term "technologically feasible" does not require more than the
11 application of standard, commercially available optical character recognition (OCR) software.

12
13 **Rule 2.257. Requirements for signatures on documents**

14
15 **(a) Documents signed under penalty of perjury**

16
17 When a document to be filed electronically provides for a signature under penalty
18 of perjury; of any person, the following applies the document is deemed to have
19 been signed by that person if filed electronically provided that either of the
20 following conditions is satisfied:

21
22 (1) The declarant has signed the document using a computer or other technology
23 in accordance with procedures, standards, and guidelines established by the
24 Judicial Council; or

25
26 ~~(1)(2) The declarant~~ The document is deemed signed by the declarant if, before
27 filing, the declarant has physically signed a printed form of the document. (2)
28 By electronically filing the document, the electronic filer certifies that (1) has
29 been complied with and that the original, signed document is available for
30 inspection and copying at the request of the court or any other party. Local
31 child support agencies may maintain original, signed pleadings by way of an
32 electronic copy in the statewide automated child support system and must
33 maintain them only for the period of time stated in Government Code section
34 68152(a). If the local child support agency maintains an electronic copy of
35 the original, signed pleading in the statewide automated child support system,
36 it may destroy the paper original. In the event this second method of
37 submitting documents electronically under penalty of perjury is used, the
38 following conditions apply:

39
40 (A)(3) At any time after the electronic version of the document is filed,
41 any other party may serve a demand for production of the
42 original signed document. The demand must be served on all
43 other parties but need not be filed with the court.

1
2 (B)(4) Within five days of service of the demand under ~~(3)(A)~~, the party
3 or other person on whom the demand is made must make the
4 original signed document available for inspection and copying by
5 all other parties.

6
7 (C)(5) At any time after the electronic version of the document is filed,
8 the court may order the filing party or other person to produce the
9 original signed document in court for inspection and copying by
10 the court. The order must specify the date, time, and place for the
11 production and must be served on all parties.

12
13 (D) Notwithstanding (A)–(C), local child support agencies may
14 maintain original, signed pleadings by way of an electronic copy
15 in the statewide automated child support system and must
16 maintain them only for the period of time stated in Government
17 Code section 68152(a). If the local child support agency
18 maintains an electronic copy of the original, signed pleading in
19 the statewide automated child support system, it may destroy the
20 paper original.

21
22 **(b) Documents not signed under penalty of perjury**

23
24 If a document does not require a signature under penalty of perjury, the document
25 is deemed signed by the party if the document is filed electronically.

26
27 **(c) Documents requiring signatures of opposing parties**

28
29 When a document to be filed electronically, such as a stipulation, requires the
30 signatures of opposing parties, the following procedure applies:

- 31
32 (1) The party filing the document must obtain the signatures of all parties on a
33 printed form of the document.
- 34
35 (2) The party filing the document must maintain the original, signed document
36 and must make it available for inspection and copying as provided in (a)(2) of
37 this rule and Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6. The court and any other
38 party may demand production of the original signed document in the manner
39 provided in ~~(a)(3)–(5)(2)(A)–(C)~~.
- 40
41 (3) By electronically filing the document, the electronic filer indicates that all
42 parties have signed the document and that the filer has the signed original in
43 his or her possession.

1
2 **(d) Digital signature**

3
4 A party is not required to use a digital signature on an electronically filed
5 document.

6
7 **(e) Judicial signatures**

8
9 If a document requires a signature by a court or a judicial officer, the document
10 may be electronically signed in any manner permitted by law.

11
12 **Advisory Committee Comment**

13
14 **Subdivision (a)(1).** The standards and guidelines for electronic signatures that satisfy the
15 requirements for an electronic signature under penalty of perjury are [will be] contained in the
16 Trial Court Records Manual.

17
18 **Rule 2.259. Actions by court on receipt of electronic filing**

19
20 **(a) Confirmation of receipt and filing of document**

21
22 **(1) Confirmation of receipt**

23
24 When a court receives an electronically submitted document, the court must
25 promptly send the electronic filer confirmation of the court's receipt of the
26 document, indicating the date and time of receipt. A document is considered
27 received at the date and time the confirmation of receipt is created.

28
29 **(2) Confirmation of filing**

30
31 If the document received by the court under (1) complies with filing
32 requirements and all required filing fees have been paid, the court must
33 promptly send the electronic filer confirmation that the document has been
34 filed. The filing confirmation must indicate the date and time of filing and is
35 proof that the document was filed on the date and at the time specified. The
36 filing confirmation must also specify:

- 37
38 (A) Any transaction number associated with the filing;
39
40 (B) The titles of the documents as filed by the court; and
41
42 (C) The fees assessed for the filing.
43

1 (3) *Transmission of confirmations*

2
3 The court must send receipt and filing confirmation to the electronic filer at
4 the electronic service address the filer furnished to the court under rule
5 2.256(a)(4). The court must maintain a record of all receipt and filing
6 confirmations.

7
8 (4) *Filer responsible for verification*

9
10 In the absence of the court's confirmation of receipt and filing, there is no
11 presumption that the court received and filed the document. The electronic
12 filer is responsible for verifying that the court received and filed any
13 document that the electronic filer submitted to the court electronically.

14
15 **(b) Notice of rejection of document for filing**

16
17 If the clerk does not file a document because it does not comply with applicable
18 filing requirements or because the required filing fee has not been paid, the court
19 must promptly send notice of the rejection of the document for filing to the
20 electronic filer. The notice must state the reasons that the document was rejected
21 for filing.

22
23 ~~(e) Document received after close of business~~

24
25 ~~A document that is received electronically by the court after the close of business is~~
26 ~~deemed to have been received on the next court day, unless the court has provided~~
27 ~~by local rule, with respect to documents filed under the mandatory electronic filing~~
28 ~~provisions in rule 2.253(b)(7), that documents received electronically before~~
29 ~~midnight on a court day are deemed to have been filed on that court day, and~~
30 ~~documents received electronically after midnight are deemed filed on the next court~~
31 ~~day. This provision concerns only the effective date of filing; any document that is~~
32 ~~electronically filed must be processed and satisfy all other legal filing requirements~~
33 ~~to be filed as an official court record.~~

34
35 **(c)(d) Delayed delivery**

36
37 If a technical problem with a court's electronic filing system prevents the court
38 from accepting an electronic filing ~~during its regular filing hours~~ on a particular
39 court day, and the electronic filer demonstrates that he or she attempted to
40 electronically file the document on that day, the court must deem the document as
41 filed on that day. This subdivision does not apply to the filing of a complaint or any
42 other initial pleading in an action or proceeding.

43

1 **(d)(e)Endorsement**

- 2
- 3 (1) The court’s endorsement of a document electronically filed must contain the
- 4 following: “Electronically filed by Superior Court of California, County of
- 5 _____, on _____ (date),” followed by the name of the court clerk.
- 6
- 7 (2) The endorsement required under (1) has the same force and effect as a
- 8 manually affixed endorsement stamp with the signature and initials of the
- 9 court clerk.
- 10
- 11 (3) A complaint or another initial pleading in an action or proceeding that is filed
- 12 and endorsed electronically may be printed and served on the defendant or
- 13 respondent in the same manner as if it had been filed in paper form.
- 14

15 **(e)(f) Issuance of electronic summons**

- 16
- 17 (1) On the electronic filing of a complaint, a petition, or another document that
- 18 must be served with a summons, the court may transmit a summons
- 19 electronically to the electronic filer in accordance with this subdivision and
- 20 Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.
- 21
- 22 (2) The electronically transmitted summons must contain an image of the court’s
- 23 seal and the assigned case number.
- 24
- 25 (3) Personal service of the printed form of a summons transmitted electronically
- 26 to the electronic filer has the same legal effect as personal service of a copy
- 27 of an original summons.
- 28

SPR17-25**Technology: Rules Modernization Project** (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Litigation By The Numbers By Julie Goren, Author/Publisher 13351 Cumpston St. Sherman Oaks, California 91401 Telephone: 818-787-9799 Email: julie@litigationbythenumbers.com	AM	<p>With regard to the specific comments requested, I agree with the third option: retain the terms but refer to 1010.6.</p> <p>Other comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. Rule 2.250(b)(1): I realize this language has been around for years, and is likely beyond the scope of the Invitation, but I am just now noticing it. Why is there a need to provide a specific definition of “document” for this chapter? The term is used in 157 different C.C.P. sections (including 1010.6) and has never before required definition. I suggest deleting it entirely. Alternatively, it should be revised. The phrase “or another filing submitted,” can easily be interpreted to mean that the term refers only to filed documents, i.e., not written discovery demands or responses. It would follow, then, that Rule 2.250(b)(2)’s definition of electronic service refers only to filed documents. This is obviously not the intent nor the practice.</p> <p>2. Rule 2.250(b)(8): Is the insertion of “or persons” supposed to be “or other persons”?</p> <p>3. Rule 2.251(a): We unfortunately won’t know how C.C.P. section 1010.6 will read until AB 976 is passed. The</p>	<p>The committees appreciate the comment responding to this question.</p> <p>The modification suggested does go beyond the scope of proposal. However, the committees may consider the suggestion as a part of a future proposal.</p> <p>Yes. The committees have modified the language to include “other persons.”</p> <p>The committees appreciate the attention to AB 976, which has now. The express consent requirement will apply January 1, 2019 and</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25**Technology: Rules Modernization Project** (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>iteration drafted on 4/20/17 seems inconsistent with Rule 2.251(a). The amendment states: “(2) (A) If a document may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission, electronic service of the document is not authorized unless a party or other person has expressly consented on the appropriate Judicial Council form to receive electronic delivery in that specific action or the court has ordered electronic service on a represented party or other represented person under subdivision (c) or (d). (B) If a document is required to be served by certified or registered mail, electronic service of the document is not authorized.” I suggest that, in order not to be inconsistent with whatever C.C.P. section 1010.6 ultimately says, Rule 2.251(a) be amended to something like: “A document may be served electronically where authorized by [C.C.P. section 1010.6].”</p> <p>4. Rule 2.251(b)(1): The first sentence should be deleted. I don’t believe that “established” has any meaning here. Electronic service is agreed to, authorized, effected ...what is “established” supposed to mean?</p> <p>5. Rule 2.251(b)(1)(A): The first insertion of “or other persons” is incorrect; service of the notice must be on all parties, so it should be “and other persons.”</p>	<p>the committees anticipate developing a rules proposal to conform the rules to statute.</p> <p>The modification suggested is beyond the scope of the proposal. However, the committees may consider the suggestion as a part of a future proposal.</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification.</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>6. Rule 2.251(b)(1)(B): The current iteration of C.C.P. section 1010.6 seems to indicate that the parties can only expressly consent. If so, this subsection is inconsistent. Again, perhaps something like: “A party or other person may consent to accept electronic service as provided in [C.C.P. section 1010.6].”</p> <p>7. Rule 2.251(e): The first insertion of “or other persons” is incorrect; the list must be made available to the parties, so it should be “and other persons.”</p> <p>8. Rule 2.251(i): Insert “deemed” ... “Electronic service of a document is deemed complete.” That term is included in the current iteration of the proposed amendment to C.C.P. section 1010.6. In addition, instead of “as provided for under [C.C.P. section 1010.6] it should say “as provided in ...” [The revisions variously use: “provided in,” “provided for under,” and “provided under.”]</p> <p>9. Rule 2.251(j): The reference to rule 257(a) needs to be changed to 2.257(a).</p> <p>10. Rule 2.251(k): Instead of “as provided for under [C.C.P. section 1010.6] it should say “as provided in ...”</p>	<p>AB 976 has passed with an express consent requirement added to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to apply January 1, 2019. The committees anticipate developing a rules proposal to conform the rules to statute.</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification.</p> <p>AB 976 passed with the “deemed complete” language. The committees may consider the insertion of “deemed complete” as part of a future proposal.</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification to “as provided in.”</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification.</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification to “as provided in.”</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
2.	<p>One Legal, LLC. By Mark L. Schwartz, Court Integration Manager 504 Redwood Blvd. #223 Novato, CA 94947 mschwartz@onelegal.com Tel. 415-475-6254</p>	NI	<p>1. Page 7, Request for Specific Comments: We like the 3rd bullet point option “Retain the terms, but refer back to section 1010.6...” While eService is not a new concept to us, it is to many law firms and so to define it is helpful. Our eService trainings touch on the rule and statute for that reason which is why we think eliminating these definitions entirely would be a bad idea. Keeping it in both the rule and the statute, however, <i>is</i> unnecessary.</p> <p>2. Page 8, (b)(1) “document”: This current definition of a document (...or another filing), including the additional language, could be construed as meaning a document that IS NOT a filing, notice, order, judgment or other issuance, cannot be eServed since (b)(2) below defines eService as “service of a document.” Interrogatories and Notices of Deposition are two (2) examples of documents that do not fall within the definition of a document as described in section (b)(1).</p>	<p>The committees appreciate the comment responding to this question.</p> <p>The modification suggested is beyond the scope of proposal. However, the committees may consider the suggestion as a part of a future proposal.</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25**Technology: Rules Modernization Project** (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>3. Page 9, (b)(9) and (b)(10) “Regular filing hours and Close of business”: We completely agree with removing these two sub-sections. They were confusing, especially since many courts have different hours on different days.</p> <p>4. Page 14, <i>new</i> (j)(3) “The party filing the proof...”: The added last sentence is missing the “2.” Should be 2.257(a) not 257(a).</p> <p>5. Page 16, (3) Original documents: Many “eFiling courts” have specifically listed documents which cannot be eFiled, including Wills. Since a Will is, or can be, an original document, perhaps some clarifying language is needed as this section conflicts with what those courts are doing.</p> <p>6. Page 17, 2.253(b)(1): While no changes were made to this rule it made us realize there may be an issue with some eFiling courts that are mandating case types OTHER than Civil (e.g. Family, Probate). I don’t believe the definition of “Civil”</p>	<p>The committees appreciate the comment.</p> <p>The committees agree with the modification.</p> <p>The committees may consider the suggestion as a part of a future proposal.</p> <p>The committees appreciate the comment, but it is beyond the scope of the proposed rule amendments.</p> <p>Under rule 1.6(3), “‘Civil case’ means a case prosecuted by one party against another for the declaration, enforcement, or protection of a</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>includes these case types and I suggest adding more specific language while the “hood is open.” Here are a couple of reasons why we don’t think the definition of Civil includes such case types as Family and Probate:</p> <p>a. CRC 2.300(a) (A section of the Filing and Service by Fax rules) reads in part (emphasis added): The rules in this chapter apply to <i>civil, probate, and family law</i> proceedings in all trial courts.</p> <p>b. CCP section 308 defines parties in a <i>civil action</i> as <i>plaintiff</i> and <i>defendant</i>.</p> <p>7. Page 23, 2.257(a)(1) Documents signed under penalty of perjury: The additional language allowing for “either 1 or 2” is a great improvement because it will allow filers to submit documents without first scanning them. We also like the addition of electronic signatures as that language will ameliorate confusion and lessen rejections of submitted eFilings for those filers who choose to “e-Sign” their documents. A great step in the right direction!</p>	<p>right or the redress or prevention of a wrong. Civil cases include all cases except criminal cases and petitions for habeas corpus.” Accordingly, it is broadly inclusive of many civil case types. A “general civil case” has a more narrow definition and excludes various case types including family and probate cited as examples in the comment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1.6(4).)</p> <p>The committees appreciate the support.</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25**Technology: Rules Modernization Project** (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
3.	Orange County Bar Association By Michael L. Baroni, President P.O. Box 6130 Newport Beach, CA 92658	A	<p>OCBA’S only concern with this proposal is that it pre-supposes an effective date of Jan 1, 2018 for the Judicial Council legislation amending C.C.P. §1010.6 and enacting a new C.C.P. §1013b, which legislation is necessary for some but not all of these proposed rule changes. The timing for adoption of these Rule changes must be specifically coordinated with the legislation enactment or else many changes herein will have to be delayed or removed.</p> <p>The OCBA is confused by the request for specific comments: Some members believe that the request seeks clarification as to whether all definitions contained in Rule 2.250(b) should be retained while other members believe the request only seeks advice on keeping the three statutory definitions in one form or another. With regard to the request for specific comments, the OCBA believes that it would be preferable for ease of administration to retain each of the terms, but refer back to section 1010.6 for the statutory definitions and also preferable to retain the additional</p>	<p>The committees appreciate the comment and the rules proposal is timed to coincide with the effective date of AB 976, the legislation impacting the proposal. AB 976 has passed. The committees anticipate developing rule changes in the future to coincide with provisions of AB 976 that apply on January 1, 2019.</p> <p>The committees appreciate the comments responding to the specific questions.</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			non-statutory definitions at (1),(5),(6),(7), and (8) as within the Council’s authority and helpful to the Court, parties, and other persons.	
4.	<p>State Bar of California Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services By Sharon Djemal, Chair 180 Howard Street San Francisco, California 94105 Tel: 415-538-2267 Fax: 415-538-2552</p>	A	<p>Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1010.6 and rule 2.250(b) contain definitions of “electronic service,” “electronic transmission,” and “electronic notification.” The rule 2.250(b) definitions mirror the section 1010.6 definitions, but the rule provides a more comprehensive scheme of definitions than does section 1010.6. The advisory committee retained the duplicative definitions to preserve this comprehensive scheme. <p>With respect to the definitions of “electronic service,” “electronic transmission,” and “electronic notification” in rule 2.250(b), the advisory committee seeks comments on whether it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to include the terms and their definitions in the rules; 	The committees appreciate the comments responding to the specific questions.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminate the terms and their definitions; ▪ Retain the terms, but refer back to section 1010.6 for the definitions (e.g., “Electronic service” has the same meaning as defined in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6”); or ▪ Modify the definitions in some other way. <p>It is better to retain the duplicative terms and their definitions in the rule so that practitioners and especially self-represented litigants have the full comprehensive scheme without having to refer back to section 1010.6.</p> <p>Additional Comments</p> <p>With respect to the “reasonable requirements” to access the electronic filing system, it would greatly benefit low income clients to explicitly state that Electronic Filing Services Providers (EFSPs) cannot require indigents to have either a credit card, debit card, or bank account to utilize the EFSP’s services. In the past, some</p>	<p>The committees appreciate the comments, but it is beyond the scope of the proposed rule changes. However, the committees may consider the suggestion as a part of a future proposal.</p>

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>EFSPs have required a credit card to create an account, even if that credit card was never billed, and that creates an insurmountable barrier to those without access to credit or banking services.</p> <p>Additionally, EFSPs should have to comply with accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is another way they cannot require users not use, for example, a screen reader to use the site in a reasonable manner.</p>	
5.	<p>Superior Court of Los Angeles County 111 N. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90012</p>	A	No specific comment.	The committees appreciate the support.
6.	<p>Superior Court of San Diego County By Mike Roddy, Court Executive Officer County Courthouse 220 West Broadway San Diego, California 92101</p>	AM	The proposal to eliminate references to “close of business” and “regular filing hours” in rule 2.250(b)(9) and (10) appears to provide different levels of access to the courts. A litigant without access to the internet would be limited to the office hours of a legal aid provider or the public library, neither of which are typically open until midnight.	The committees appreciate the comments. The elimination of “close of business” and “regular filing hours” conform the rules to statute. AB 976 changed the applicable electronic service and filing time frames in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to “12:00 a.m. and 11:59:59 p.m.”

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.

SPR17-25

Technology: Rules Modernization Project (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			This would also provide different levels of access for counties with permissive e-filing. Those who do not utilize e-filing would be limited to submit filings in a drop-box by 5 p.m. or when the courthouse closes.	

DRAFT

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: November 16-17, 2017

Title	Agenda Item Type
Rules Modernization	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259	January 1, 2018
Recommended by	Date of Report
Information Technology Advisory Committee	October 3, 2017
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair	Contact
Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee	Andrea L. Jaramillo, (916) 263-0991
Hon. Ann I. Jones, Chair	andrea.jaramillo@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

As part of the Rules Modernization Project, the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (CSCAC) recommend amending several rules related to electronic service and electronic filing. The amendments are intended to improve the organization of the rules; improve the rules' consistency with the Code of Civil Procedure, including consistency with recently enacted legislation; and reduce redundancies between the rules and the Code of Civil Procedure.

Recommendation

ITAC and CSCAC recommend that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2018:

1. Amend rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259 to ensure consistency, improve clarity, and reduce redundancy between the rules and the Code of Civil Procedure.

The text of the amended rules and the new and revised forms are attached at pages **X-X (TBD)**.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council sponsored legislation this year to amend section 1010.6 and enact section 1013b in the Code of Civil Procedure (hereafter, section 1010.6 and 1013b). The legislation passed the Legislature in Assembly Bill 976 on September 14, 2017. In brief, the legislation:

- Authorizes electronic filing and service by and on persons other than parties,
- Authorizes electronic signatures on electronically filed documents,
- Provides for a consistent effective date of filing across courts and case types,
- Codifies the effective date of electronic service,
- Consolidates mandatory electronic filing provisions,
- Codifies mandatory electronic service provisions,
- Codifies protections for self-represented persons, and
- Codifies procedures governing proof of electronic service.

Rationale for Recommendation

The proposed amendments improve consistency and reduce redundancy between the rules and the Code of Civil Procedure, including ensuring the rules are consistent with statutory changes that will be effective January 1, 2018. The proposed amendments also make limited organizational changes to the rules to improve their logical ordering. The benefits of these changes will be improved clarity in the rules and avoidance of rule language that conflicts with statutory language.

Add provisions related to electronic filing and service by or on a nonparty

With the enactment of AB 976, section 1010.6 authorizes electronic filing by and electronic service by and on “other persons” rather than just parties. To ensure that the trial court rules are consistent with this change, the proposal amends rules 2.250–2.253 and 2.257 to reference “other persons” in addition to parties.

“Other person” was intentionally not defined in section 1010.6 because comprehensively identifying those who fall in the category of “other person” who may be involved in a case without being a party would be overly complicated and variable. However, in a few instances in the rules, the addition of “other person” without any limiting language may result in an overly broad scope or confusion. Accordingly, ITAC recommends using limiting language to provide clarity. For example, under the proposed amendment to rule 2.251(e), governing maintenance of electronic service lists, a court would need to “maintain and make available electronically to the parties or other persons in the case an electronic service list. . .” (Italics added.) This would ensure that the electronic service list does not need to be made available to all other persons in the world who might request it, but rather is limited to other persons involved in the case. In addition, under the proposed amendment to rule 2.251(f)(1), governing service by parties and other persons, “parties and other persons that have consented to or are required to serve

documents electronically are responsible for electronic service on all other parties and other persons required to be served in the case.” (Italics added.) The purpose of the limiting language here is to ensure the scope of responsibility for performing electronic service is not overly broad. Even if an “other person” agreed to electronic service, there is no obligation created by electronic service rules to electronically serve that particular document on the “other person” if that person is not someone required to be served a particular document.

Add provisions for electronic signatures on electronically filed documents.

With the passage of AB 976, section 1010.6 authorizes the use of electronic signatures on electronically filed documents signed under penalty of perjury. To remain consistent with section 1010.6, the proposal amends rule 2.257, governing requirements for signatures on documents, to include a provision for electronic signatures.

Section 1010.6 leaves the creation of specific procedures, standards, or guidelines under the authority of the Judicial Council. ITAC recommends including an advisory committee comment to explain that the guidelines will be contained in the *Trial Court Records Manual*.

Eliminate references to “close of business” and “regular filing hours” for effective date of electronic filing and service

Effective January 1, 2018, section 1010.6 will set a consistent effective date of filing and service across courts and case types. Under the amendments enacted in AB 976, documents received electronically by a court between 12:00 a.m. and 11:59:59 p.m. on a court day are deemed filed on that court day. Similarly, documents served electronically between 12:00 a.m. and 11:59:59 p.m. on a court day are deemed served on that court day. To remain consistent with section 1010.6, the proposal eliminates the definition of “close of business” under rule 2.250(b)(10), governing definitions. In addition, the proposal eliminates references to close of business in rule 2.251, which relates to electronic service, and rules 2.253 and 2.259, which relate to electronic filing. Finally, the proposal eliminates the definition of and references to “regular filing hours” found in rules 2.250(b)(9), 2.254(b), and 2.259(d).

Eliminate mandatory electronic filing and service fee provisions that will become redundant

With the passage of AB 976, section 1010.6 no longer has the provision that authorized a mandatory electronic filing and service pilot project in the Superior Court of Orange County, but rather now has provision authorizing mandatory electronic filing and service by local rule in any court. The fee provisions in rule 2.253(b)(5)–(6) will be duplicative of section 1010.6 and are largely eliminated in favor of a succinct provision that any fees charged by a court or electronic filing service provider shall be consistent with section 1010.6.

Eliminate provisions governing proof of electronic service that will become redundant

AB 976 added section 1013b to the Code of Civil Procedure to codify proof of electronic service requirements. Because section 1013b will fill the statutory gap that a rule had been filling, the proposal eliminates rule provisions that are duplicative of section 1013b.

Clarify that issuances by a court can fall within the definition of “document”

Section 1010.6(a)(3) allows the court to electronically serve “any document issued by the court.” However, Section 1010.6 does not define “document.” Rather, rule 2.250(b) provides a definition but currently does not include any documents issued by a court within its scope. The proposal adds that a notice, order, judgment, or other issuance by the court is included in the definition of “document.”

Reorganize rules on electronic filing and electronic service required by court order

Section 1010.6(c) authorizes courts to require parties to file and serve documents electronically by court order in certain types of cases. Under the rules, both electronic filing and electronic service required by court order are addressed in rule 2.253(c). However, the heading of rule 2.253, “Permissive electronic filing, mandatory electronic filing, and electronic filing by court order,” indicates that only electronic filing is within its scope. Rule 2.251, “Electronic service,” includes some provisions for electronic service by court order but is not comprehensive, as additional provisions are located in rule 2.253. To resolve this inconsistency and improve clarity, the proposal adds a new subdivision (d) to rule 2.251 concerning electronic service by court order. In addition, the scope of subdivision (c) of rule 2.253 is narrowed to encompass only electronic filing by court order to keep it topically consistent with the rest of the rule.

Eliminate rule provisions that are duplicative of section 1010.6

Owing to the historical development of the rules and section 1010.6 (with the rules sometimes preceding the statutes in addressing electronic filing and electronic service), duplicative provisions exist between the two. The proposal eliminates some rule provisions that duplicate those in section 1010.6. The benefit of eliminating redundant provisions is that the Judicial Council will not need to make rule amendments to replicate changes to section 1010.6. In turn, this will reduce the risk of the rules and section 1010.6 becoming inconsistent with one another.

Specifically, the proposal eliminates provisions for the extension of time associated with electronic service under rule 2.251(h) (relettered (i) under the proposal) as those provisions merely duplicate section 1010.6(a)(4)(A). The proposal also eliminates those provisions in rule 2.252(c)(1) on the legal effect of documents filed electronically that duplicate those in section 1010.6(b)(1).

The proposal does not eliminate the definitions of “electronic service,” “electronic transmission,” and “electronic notification” that are the same as those in section 1010.6. Rule 2.250(b) provides a more comprehensive scheme of definitions than does section 1010.6 and includes terms that are undefined in that section (e.g., the term “document”).

Amend fee provisions to be more consistent with section 1010.6

Rule 2.255 provides for contracting between the courts and electronic filing service providers (EFSPs). Rule 2.255(b) allows permissible provisions of any such contract to include “reasonable fees” charged by an EFSP and “reasonable requirements” imposed by the EFSP for

users to access the electronic filing system. The proposal splits rule 2.255(b) into two subdivisions: (b)(1) contains the same permissive language that existed in the rule previously, and (b)(2) includes a new mandatory provision that the contract must comply with the requirements of section 1010.6. The proposal will help avoid any gaps between what a contract may provide and what it must provide. By statute, any fees an EFSP charges for processing a payment for filing fees and other court fees “shall not exceed the costs incurred for processing the payment.” (§ 1010.6(b)(7).) Existing rule 2.255(b) does not take this specific requirement into account. Retaining the permissive language in the proposal continues to allow “reasonable fees” to be charged and for providers to make “reasonable requirements,” but adding in the mandatory piece places a limit. The mandatory piece refers back to section 1010.6 generally, rather than duplicating specific language such as the new limit on fees for processing a payment in section 1010.6(b)(7). This is to avoid redundancy with existing section 1010.6, and inconsistency with amendments to section 1010.6 that the Legislature may make in the future.

Finally, rule 2.252, which provides general rules for electronic filing, includes permissive language on whether a court permits applications for fee waivers in proceedings in which the court accepts electronic filings. Under rule 2.252(f), a court “may” permit the application to be filed electronically. This is inconsistent with section 1010.6(b)(6), which states, “The court *shall* permit a party or attorney to file an application for waiver of court fees and costs, in lieu of requiring the payment of the filing fee, *as part of the process involving the electronic filing of a document.*” (Italics added.) Accordingly, the proposal amends rule 2.252(f) to reflect section 1010(b)(6)’s requirement that courts to allow the application for fee waiver to be filed electronically in any proceeding in which the court accepts electronic filings.

Clarify responsibilities of electronic filers

Rule 2.256 governs the responsibilities of electronic filers. Under the existing rules, as a condition of electronic filing, an electronic filer must “[f]urnish one or more electronic service addresses, in the manner specified by the court, at which the electronic filer agrees to accept service.” (Rule 2.256(a)(4).) The proposal strikes the phrase “at which the electronic filer agrees to accept electronic service” because, by definition, an electronic service address *is* an electronic address through which one has authorized electronic service. (Rule 2.250(b)(5) [defining “electronic service address”].)

In addition, the proposal adds the following limitation to rule 2.256(a)(4): “This only applies when the electronic filer has consented to or is required to accept electronic service.” Under rule 2.251(b)(1)(B), the act of electronically filing a document acts as consent to receive electronic service except with self-represented parties, who must affirmatively consent to receive electronic service. Accordingly, a self-represented party may be an electronic filer but may not have the responsibility to provide an electronic service address because he or she has not affirmatively consented to receive electronic service. Accordingly, the rule amendment is intended to clarify which electronic filers have the responsibility to furnish an electronic service address. Similarly, under rule 2.256(a)(5), an electronic filer must “[i]mmediately provide the court and all parties with any change to the electronic filer’s electronic service address.” The proposal adds that

“[t]his only applies when the electronic filer has consented to or is required to accept electronic service” to clarify the scope of electronic filers that must provide such notice.

Alternatives Considered

With the enactment of AB 976, the committees believe many of the proposed rule changes will be necessary to avoid inconsistency and confusion between the rules and Code of Civil Procedure. Other changes, though not strictly necessary, would improve and clarify the rules. Hence, alternatives to the proposed changes were not considered appropriate.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

The advisory committees expect that the rule proposal will provide greater clarity in the rules for parties, attorneys, courts, and other court users, and improved consistency between the rules and the Code of Civil Procedure.

Attachments and Links

1. Text of proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court, rules 2.250, 2.251, 2.252, 2.253, 2.254, 2.255, 2.256, 2.257, and 2.259, at pages **AA-BB (TBD)**
2. Chart of comments, at pages **XX-YY (TBD)**
3. AB 976 (Stats. 2017, ch. **TBD**),
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB976

Status Reports



- Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Projects
- Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Case Management System Replacement Projects
- Placer Court Hosting Consortium



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
October 2, 2017	Please Review
To	Deadline
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	N/A
Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair	Contact
Judicial Council Technology Committee	Kathleen Fink, Manager
From	415-865-4094
Kathleen Fink, Manager,	kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov
Judicial Council Information Technology	
Subject	
Civil Case Management System (V3)	
Replacement Projects: Status September 1 – September 30, 2017	

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: The California Department of Technology (CDT) will conduct project reviews during their quarterly meetings with Rob Oyung and John Wordlaw. Rob will summarize the courts' V3 Conversion Project status reports for this meeting. This streamlined process will ensure CDT continues to be apprised of project status while minimizing administrative overhead.

The monthly Project Status meeting was held on September 18, 2017. The team discussed in-depth proposed ramp-down scenarios for V3 and the projected impacts, from a low impact scenario to a high impact scenario. Costs and savings will be discussed at an upcoming Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

October 2, 2017

Page 2

Ventura: Court reported a productive week ahead, including an executive decision meeting and strategy planning day with vendor, Journal Technologies, and staff that will result in a high-level project plan. Beginning September 25, the testing team will have dedicated testing and initiate its 10-day sprint cycles.

San Diego: Court reported project plan is under review; also, that it is conducting meetings with the vendor, Tyler Technologies.

Sacramento: Court reported work is underway with vendor, Thomson Reuters, on the contract amendment; and will conduct interviews for project manager this week.

Orange: Court reported development of project plan and requests that JC IT review. The court has established its development and QA environments and is setting up code management.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair

HON. DANIEL J. BUCKLEY
Vice-chair

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie
Mr. Jake Chatters
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Hon. David E. Gunn
Ms. Audra Ibarra
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Date

October 2, 2017

To

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

From

David Koon
Manager, Judicial Council Information
Technology

Subject

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement
Projects - Status July 27 – September 26,
2017

Action Requested

Please Review

Deadline

N/A

Contact

David Koon
David.koon@jud.ca.gov

Members of the Judicial Council Technology Committee:

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine Sustain Courts which received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the Sustain Justice Edition case management system with a modern CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: The SJE Courts and Judicial Council IT staff are continuing to work on identifying the installment payments and high-level project milestones to be included in each court's Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA).

Next Steps: Draft each court's IBA based upon the installment payments and high-level milestones identified so that work can begin to implement a new CMS.

Further updates will be provided in upcoming meetings. Thank you.

Quarterly Project Monitoring Report

Report Period: 07/01/2017-09/30/2017
Report Date: 07/06/2017
Court Name: Placer
Prepared By: Greg Harding



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Project Name	Placer County Hosting Center
Court Project Manager	Greg Harding
IBA Number	1033111
IBA Effective Date	11/1/2016
IBA End Date	4/30/2019
Project Start Date	October 2015
Estimated Finish Date	January 2018
Estimated % Complete	80%

1. Accomplishments / Plans

Accomplishments during *this Reporting Period*:

- DMV connectivity for Plumas, Sierra and Lake.
- Site to Site connectivity for Plumas, Lake, Modoc, Trinity and San Benito
- Lake Interface project kick off
- San Benito Interface project kick off
- Plumas final data copy requested and scheduled for pickup
- Plumas PST files loaded
- Plumas local data files copied
- Lake Local file copy requested

Plans during the *next Reporting Period*:

- Plumas Go-Live October 2, 2017
- Sierra Go-Live October 2, 2017
- Trinity Go-Live October 16, 2017
- Lake Go-Live November 6th, 2017
- San Benito Go-Live December 11th, 2017

2. Risks and Issues

Issue Status (Issues requiring resolution or others that may affect the proposed approach baseline):

- Lake and San Benito Interface are a risk as they are not completed and tested.

Change Status (Considerations or new course of actions that change the proposed approach):

-

Risk Status (Report risks to the current approach, any risks discovered, and proposed risk responses):

- AT&T Field Engineer is changing based on availability. The newly assigned engineers are being brought up to speed on the project.

3. Scheduled Milestones / Deliverables

List any Milestones that are late as well as Milestones due in the next 4 to 6 weeks (as applicable).

Milestone	Due Date (Actual)	Status
WBS 15.1 – Plumas/Sierra go-live plan created	August 2017	Complete
WBS 15.2 – Plumas/Sierra CMS hosting transition complete	Pending	On-Schedule
WBS 15.3 – Plumas/Sierra Managed Court services transition complete	Pending	On-Schedule
WBS 16.1 Lake go live plan created	Pending	Waiting for Plumas go-live to be complete. This will provide the base line.
		On-Schedule

4. Payment Schedule and Milestones


List IBA payment milestones that have been completed, are yet to be completed, total IBA amount and payments remaining to be made.

IBA Installment Payments	IBA Installment Amount	IBA Payment Date	IBA Actual Payment
Court signs executed contracts with vendors	\$265,599.00		
Court develops all hardware and software specifications	\$470,901.00		
Total IBA Amount	\$736,500.00		
Remaining IBA Amount To Be Paid	\$736,500.00		


Project Tracking Milestones	Project Milestone Target Date	Project Milestone Actual Date	N/A For Project Milestone Tracking
WBS 1 – CCTC Requirements Document Completed	NOV 16	DEC 16	
WBS2 – Server Design	MAR17	FEB 17	
WBS3 – Server Build	APR17	APR17	
WBS4 – Network and Connectivity Design	JAN 17	JAN 17	
WBS5 – Network and Connectivity Implemented with connectivity to CCTC	MAY 17	JUNE 17	
WBS6 – Information Systems Framework and Security Policies Developed and Implemented	JUL17	AUG 17	
WBS7 – DMV Service Transition	JUL 17	AUG 17	
WBS7.1 – DMV DISA Approval	MAR 17	FEB 17	
WBS7.2 – DMV Connectivity Configured and implemented	JUN 17	APR17	
WBS9 – Interface rework completed	JUL 17	TBD	
WBS10 – SJE Core Environments Created	MAY 17	MAY 17	
WBS11 – Initial SJE Data Copy	MAY 17	MAY 17	
WBS12 – Non-CMS Applications Installed	JUN 17	MAY 17	
WBS 13 – UAT of CCTC connectivity	SEPT 17	Pending Plumas go-live	
WBS14 –UAT of SJE and interfaces including DMV	AUG 17	AUG 17	
WBS15 – UAT of “managed court” services	SEPT 17	OCT 17	
WBS 15.1 – Plumas/Sierra go-live plan created	AUG 17	AUG 17	
WBS 15.2 – Plumas/Sierra CMS hosting transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 15.3 – Plumas/Sierra Managed Court services transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 15.4 – Plumas/Sierra transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 16.1 Lake go live plan created	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 16.2 Lake CMS hosting transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 16.3 Lake Managed Court services transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 16.4 Lake transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 17.1 Trinity go-live plan created	SEPT 17	Sept 17	
WBS 17.2 Trinity CMS hosting transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 17.3 Trinity Managed Court services transition complete	NA	TBD	

WBS 17.4 Trinity transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 18.1 San Benito go-live plan created	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 18.2 San Benito CMS hosting transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 18.3 San Benito Managed Court services transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 18.4 San Benito transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 19.1 Modoc go-live plan created	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 19.2 Modoc CMS hosting transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	
WBS 19.3 Modoc Managed Court services transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	
WBS 19.2 Modoc transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	


Signature of authorized court representative

BY (Authorized Signature)  /s/ Jake Chatters
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING Jake Chatters

Signature of authorized JC Information Technology Manager

BY (Authorized Signature) 
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING

Signature of authorized JC Budget Services Director

BY (Authorized Signature) 
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING