

The meeting was called to order on Friday, January 26, 2007, at 12:25 by Chairman Tim Van Ronzelen. Those in attendance included: Jeffrey Ray, Rod Nichols, John Appelquist, Brian Gaddy, Denise Henning, Denise Drake, Chris Harlan, Michael Berry, Todd Bartels, Bill Terry (Operations Manager) and Paige Wymore-Wynn (Chief Deputy Clerk).

Tim informed the group that the Reappointment Committee for Magistrate Judge Robert Larsen had completed their interviews and review of the letters submitted and voted unanimously to approve his reappointment. Tim commented on the overwhelming positive nature of the feedback along with the interviews. The court has also voted and approved the recommendation of the committee for the Reappointment of Magistrate Judge Robert Larsen.

The progress on the local rule for CM/ECF was reviewed by the committee. Bill Terry had e-mailed several district samples of the language utilized by other courts. The overall recommendation was to keep it brief and to the point. Jeff Ray presented a suggested rule which is attached to the minutes as Attachment 1. There was some discussion over whether this should be submitted as Local Rule 5.1 or if we could do as Arkansas where the rule governing CM/ECF is a separate local rule altogether. Bill Terry will check and see if the numbering for local rules must stay consistent with the federal rules or not. The committee was asked to review the attached rules and offer any comments and/or approvals within a two week period so as the Local Rule could be submitted to the Court en banc at their March 2, 2007 meeting.

The next item for the committee was the possibility of creating a uniform model of a Protective Order. It was discussed at the last meeting and the suggestion was made to have a standard Protective Order in the areas of General Civil, Commercial, Criminal and Employment. Several of those in attendance that practice in Criminal made the point that a Protective Order is only utilized on rare occasions and wouldn't really be used. The discussion focused on the fact that there are about 4 -5 stock paragraphs in every Protective Order that contain the same information. Therefore, having a standard with that information along with an area where a selection could be made to specify the Order according to the case, would seem to save time and expense. It was also suggested that making the fact that you might file a Protective Order part of the Scheduling Conference. Paige Wymore-Wynn suggested that Bill Terry and her ask their colleagues via a listserv if any other courts have a standardized Protective Order and if so, get copies of it. They will then forward that information to the committee. In addition, a subcommittee was named to review and draft language to be used on this project. Those on the subcommittee include: Michael Berry, Chair; Denise Drake, Rod Nichols, Denise Henning and Todd Bartels.

Michael Berry mentioned that he was talking to Judge Laughrey and there was some discussion about Declaratory Judgment and the time involved with replies regarding summary judgement. It was briefed by Michael with the decision that the committee could be thinking about this subject for further discussion in future meetings.

The next meeting date was not set however, after discussion with Pat Brune, Clerk, it was suggested that the committee meet on Thursday, April 12, 2007 at noon.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

## **LOCAL CIVIL RULES**

### **5.1 MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING**

Unless otherwise expressly provided for by these rules or by court order or by exceptional circumstances preventing electronic filing, all litigants and other interested parties represented by legal counsel shall electronically file all pleadings and documents (including initiating documents) in connection with a case on the Court's CM/ECF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES MANUAL, available on the Court's web site.

### **SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS BY ELECTRONIC MEANS**

Documents may be served through the court's transmission facilities by electronic means to the extent and in the manner authorized by the CM/ECF Administrative Manual approved by the court. Transmission of the Notice of Electronic Filing through the court's transmission facilities constitutes service of the filed document upon each party in the case who is registered as a Filing User. Any other party or parties shall be served documents according to these Local Rules and either the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.