

From: Robinson, Richard (ConnApp)
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 4:36 PM
To: Del Ciampo, Joseph; Bright, William
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Thanks Judge Bright for bringing it to our attention. Thank you Joe, your solution sounds perfect.

RAR

From: Del Ciampo, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:25 AM
To: Bright, William
Cc: Robinson, Richard
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

That's fine, Judge. They will remain pending until I am told to move them forward. Thank you.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Deputy Director, Legal Services
Connecticut Judicial Branch
100 Washington Street, 3rd Floor
Hartford, CT 06106

e-mail: Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov

Tel: (860) 706-5120
Fax: (860) 566-3449

This e-mail and any attachments/links transmitted with it are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege, work product doctrine, or other confidentiality provision. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, dissemination, distribution, use or action taken in reliance on the contents of this communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this in error and delete this e-mail and any attachments/links from your system. Any inadvertent receipt or transmission shall not be a waiver of any privilege or work product protection. The Connecticut Judicial Branch does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this communication which arise as a result of e-mail transmission, or for any viruses that may be contained therein. If verification of the contents of this e-mail is required, please request a hard-copy version.

From: Bright, William
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:22 AM
To: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Cc: Robinson, Richard
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Thanks Joe. I think we should give the new CAJ for civil an opportunity to weigh in on all of these before presenting them to the Rules Committee. So, can we hold off on the third one for now? I hope there will be a new CAJ in place before the next meeting, but I am not sure whether he/she will be up to speed.

From: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:18 AM
To: Bright, William
Cc: Robinson, Richard
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Dear Judge Bright,

I have reviewed the list of matters pending before the Rules Committee and have determined that the following, in addition to the issue set out below regarding Section 13-28(c), are matters that you have received from or raised with the Rules Committee in your capacity as CAJ Civil and/or Chair of the Civil Commission:

- Proposal referred by Justice Eveleigh regarding whether an automobile's "black box" is included in a discovery order involving a ruling on Section 13-3. **(On 9-18-17, RC referred matter to Judge Bright for consideration by Civil Workgroup.)**
- Proposal by Judge Bright to include Medicare questions in standard discovery. **(These questions were removed from the Form 202 recommendations of Rules Committee on May 15, 2017 prior to Judges' Annual Meeting in June 2017. On May 15, 2017 based on comments received from Judge Stevens, the Rules Committee referred matter and Judge Stevens's comments to Civil Commission for its consideration.)**
- Issue concerning whether an attorney admitted pro hac vice in a municipal or state hearing or proceeding needs to re-apply for permission to appear when that issue is filed as an administrative appeal to the Superior Court. **(This issue was raised with Judge Bright, Court Operations, and Legal Services in August 2017 and it was decided that based on the rule as it now stands, an additional application with the applicable fee should be filed. It was also decided by Judge Bright that this should be raised with the Rules Committee to discuss and decide whether the rule should be modified to avoid the additional application and/or fee.)**

As regards the third item concerning attorneys admitted pro hac vice, with your permission, I can move that forward through the Rules Committee. Please let me know if you need anything further. Have a good day.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Deputy Director, Legal Services
Connecticut Judicial Branch
100 Washington Street, 3rd Floor
Hartford, CT 06106

e-mail: Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov

Tel: (860) 706-5120
Fax: (860) 566-3449

This e-mail and any attachments/links transmitted with it are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege, work product doctrine, or other confidentiality provision. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, dissemination, distribution, use or action taken in reliance on the contents of this communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this in error and delete this e-mail and any attachments/links from your system. Any inadvertent receipt or transmission shall not be a waiver of any privilege or work product protection. The Connecticut Judicial Branch does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this communication which arise as a result of e-mail transmission, or for any viruses that may be contained therein. If verification of the contents of this e-mail is required, please request a hard-copy version.

From: Bright, William
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 11:46 AM
To: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

That would be great. Thanks.

From: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 11:44 AM
To: Bright, William
Subject: RE: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Dear Judge Bright,

Thank you. I will take care of this.

I will also review my Rules Committee Pending List for items that you have received or offered in your capacity as CAJ and we can discuss how you wish to proceed on those. Have a good day.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Deputy Director, Legal Services
Connecticut Judicial Branch
100 Washington Street, 3rd Floor
Hartford, CT 06106

e-mail: Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov

Tel: (860) 706-5120
Fax: (860) 566-3449

This e-mail and any attachments/links transmitted with it are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege, work product doctrine, or other confidentiality provision. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, dissemination, distribution, use or action taken in reliance on the contents of this communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this in error and delete this e-mail and any attachments/links from your system. Any inadvertent receipt or transmission shall not be a waiver of any privilege or work product protection. The Connecticut Judicial Branch does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this communication which arise as a result of e-mail transmission, or for any viruses that may be contained therein. If verification of the contents of this e-mail is required, please request a hard-copy version.

From: Bright, William
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:34 AM
To: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Subject: FW: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Joe,

In light of my impending (hopefully) departure from the Rules Committee and the civil CAJ role, I am forwarding this to you for consideration at the next Rules Committee meeting. I will also send it to the new civil CAJ. I do think the incongruity is worth addressing. As I previously said, I am going to miss working with you and the Rules Committee.

From: John D. Tower [<mailto:jtower@crameranderson.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 8:54 AM
To: Bright, William
Cc: Christopher J. Sochacki; Abigail Miranda
Subject: quick note on problematic PB provisions

Your Honor – I have no pending cases before you, so am writing to you fast to point out a problem in our current PB discovery rules.

PB § 13-28(c) allows us to compel non-party witnesses to cough up docs within **15 days** while § 13-27(g) now gives parties, due to its incorporation of PB §§ 13-9 – 13-11, **60 days** to produce docs sought in Notices of Deposition, unless we go through the hassle of getting a court to order a shorter time (or stipulate to shorter time with counsel). So non-parties fact more onerous discovery responsibilities than litigants? Makes no sense to me whatsoever.

Thank you sir.

Best, J.Tower

John D. Tower, Esq.
Cramer & Anderson LLP
51 Main Street
New Milford, CT 06776
Voice: (860) 355-2631
Fax: (860) 355-9460
E-mail: jtower@crameranderson.com

This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and delete this message from your files. Thank you.