

7-5

Proposal by Judge Abrams/Court Operations to amend Section 23-68 regarding interactive audio visual devices to permit any person to appear by such device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority. On 1-22-19, RC tabled matter to February meeting to allow Counsel to conduct research on matter. **On 2-11-19, RC directed Counsel to share research on IAV devices w/Judge Abrams and Court Operations for their consideration and comments by March meeting. Comments received.**

Del Ciampo, Joseph

From: McGann, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 3:54 PM
To: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Cc: Abrams, James; Albis, Michael A.; Hess, Krista; Gillett, Alexandra
Subject: RE: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices
Attachments: Practice Book sec. 23-68 proposed revision (rev. 3-14-19).docx

Good afternoon Joe,

Attached is a revised proposal to amend PB sec. 23-68 for consideration by the Rules Committee on 3/18. Judge Abrams is starting a jury trial on Monday and Judge Albis has a large short calendar that day, so neither will be available to present the draft rule to the committee. Please let us know if you have any concerns, and thanks again for your help.

Best,
Nancy

Nancy McGann
Deputy Director, Civil Matters
Connecticut Judicial Branch
225 Spring Street, 2nd Floor
Wethersfield, CT 06109
Phone: 860-263-2734

From: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:04 PM
To: Abrams, James <James.Abrams@jud.ct.gov>; Hess, Krista <Krista.Hess@jud.ct.gov>; McGann, Nancy <Nancy.McGann@jud.ct.gov>; Albis, Michael A. <Michael.Albis@jud.ct.gov>
Subject: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices

Dear Judges Abrams and Albis, Krista and Nancy,

At its meeting on February 11, 2019, the Rules Committee considered the attached proposal by Judge Abrams and Court Operations to amend Section 23-68 regarding interactive audio visual devices to permit "any person" to appear by such device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority, and considered the attached research presented to the Committee regarding the proposal. After discussion, the Committee tabled the matter and directed me to provide you with the research for review and comment. Once you have reviewed the research, if you wish to resubmit the proposal or submit a different

version of it, please send such to my attention. The next meeting of the Rules Committee is scheduled for March 18, 2019.

Please let me know if you have any comments. Thank you.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Director of 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.

Sec. 23-68. Where Presence of Person May Be by Means of an Interactive Audiovisual Device

(a) Upon motion of any party, and at the discretion of the judicial authority, any ~~[party or counsel]~~ party, counsel, witness, or other participant in a proceeding may appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device at any proceeding in any civil matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the small claims section, or any family matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the family support magistrate division.

(b) Upon order of the judicial authority, an incarcerated individual may be required to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device in any civil or family matter.

(c) For purposes of this section, an interactive audiovisual device must operate so that the judicial authority; any party and his or her counsel, if any; and any person appearing by means of an interactive audiovisual device pursuant to a court order under this section [and the judicial authority] can see and communicate with each other simultaneously. In addition, a procedure by which an incarcerated individual and his or her counsel can confer in private must be provided.

(d) Unless otherwise required by law or unless otherwise ordered by the judicial authority, prior to any proceeding in which a person appears by means of an interactive audiovisual device, copies of all documents which may be offered at the proceeding shall be provided to all counsel and self-represented parties in advance of the proceeding.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to limit the discretion of the judicial authority to deny a request to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device where, in the judicial authority's judgment, the interest of justice or the presentation of the case require that the party, ~~[or] counsel, witness, or other participant in the proceeding~~ appear in person.

(f) For purposes of this section, judicial authority includes family support magistrates and magistrates appointed by the chief court administrator pursuant to General Statutes § 51-193f.

Commentary: The rule has been amended to permit witnesses and other participants in a proceeding to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority. This revision broadens the application of the rule to include appearances by means of an interactive audiovisual device by expert witnesses or other witnesses, which will increase the court's flexibility in scheduling matters, minimize the inconvenience to witnesses, and reduce the costs of litigation.

Del Ciampo, Joseph

From: Albis, Michael A.
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:43 PM
To: Abrams, James; Hess, Krista; McGann, Nancy; Greenfield, Johanna
Cc: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Subject: RE: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices

Similar to Judge Abrams, I'm in favor of the concept of the proposed change and would be comfortable with any of the alternative proposals suggested as to identifying who might be eligible to appear by interactive AV device. Just as a suggestion, maybe a middle ground blending the various proposals might work, like "any party, counsel, witness, or other participant in the proceedings." But, again, I'm okay with any of the different versions that the Rules Committee may choose.

From: Abrams, James
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:55 AM
To: Hess, Krista <Krista.Hess@jud.ct.gov>; McGann, Nancy <Nancy.McGann@jud.ct.gov>; Albis, Michael A. <Michael.Albis@jud.ct.gov>; Greenfield, Johanna <Johanna.Greenfield@jud.ct.gov>
Subject: RE: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices

Krista,

[Sigh].

While I think the original proposed language is better because it is simpler, I am fine with the alternative you highlight. That being said, I think we all realize that it will have no effect whatsoever in stemming the feared flurry of motions seeking to allow everyone in the world to appear via videoconferencing.

If they want to get all wonky, however, I'd ask if witnesses have "a legal right or obligation to participate in a proceeding" if they appear voluntarily instead of being subpoenaed?

At the end of the day, I'll support whatever Rules will accept. We've all got better things to do.

Jim Abrams

From: Hess, Krista
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:29 PM
To: Abrams, James <James.Abrams@jud.ct.gov>; McGann, Nancy <Nancy.McGann@jud.ct.gov>; Albis, Michael A. <Michael.Albis@jud.ct.gov>; Greenfield, Johanna <Johanna.Greenfield@jud.ct.gov>
Subject: RE: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices

Good afternoon, Judge Abrams, Judge Albis, Johanna and Nancy,

I read the opinion from legal and I wanted to see what you all thought. I agree the intent of the proposed rule was to expand the use and applicability of video conferencing for civil, small claims, housing, family and FSM matters. I have concerns, however, that broadening the language to only enumerate those three categories (attorneys, parties or witnesses), does not achieve the overarching goal of integrating video conferencing into our day-to-day court process (pretrials, status conferences, etc). For example, I would not want to exclude entities such as out of state insurance adjusters from appearing via video. So, from that perspective, there's some benefit to crafting a broader rule that relies on the court's discretion.

Towards that end, I have attached the *Motion to Appear at Civil, Small Claims, Housing, Family Proceeding by Video Conference* form JD-CL-144, that we created in 2017. The form has not yet been distributed to the clerks or posted on the internet, as we are still developing the clerk's office/IT procedure for how these motions will be processed (mostly from the IT side of things). However, you can see that the filer must provide the court with a reason why they are asking to appear via video,, and only upon leave of court, may they do so. As the legal opinion suggests, we do not know what the volume of these motions would be, but, to date, the volume of motions to appear via video conference is fairly low (I have some rough stats I could provide if you were interested).

I wondered if we could think about one of the options proposed in the memo - "Upon motion of any party and at the discretion of the judicial authority, any person who has a legal right or obligation to participate in the proceeding may appear by interactive audiovisual device at any proceeding in a civil matter, including any jurisdiction within the small claims section, or any family matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the family support magistrate division."

Presumably, this language would be broad enough to encompass other entities such as witnesses and insurance adjusters, but it's not so broad as to include friends, members of the public, et al.

Just curious what you all thought.

Thanks,

Krista

Krista Hess
Director of Court Operations
Connecticut Judicial Branch
225 Spring Street, 2nd Floor
Wethersfield, CT 06109
Phone: 860-263-2734

From: Del Ciampo, Joseph

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:04 PM

To: Abrams, James <James.Abrams@jud.ct.gov>; Hess, Krista <Krista.Hess@jud.ct.gov>; McGann, Nancy <Nancy.McGann@jud.ct.gov>; Albis, Michael A. <Michael.Albis@jud.ct.gov>

Subject: Proposal to Amend Section 23-68 Regarding Interactive Audio Visual Devices

Dear Judges Abrams and Albis, Krista and Nancy,

At its meeting on February 11, 2019, the Rules Committee considered the attached proposal by Judge Abrams and Court Operations to amend Section 23-68 regarding interactive audio visual devices to permit "any person" to appear by such device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority, and considered the attached research presented to the Committee regarding the proposal. After discussion, the Committee tabled the matter and directed me to provide you with the research for review and comment. Once you have reviewed the research, if you wish to resubmit the proposal or submit a different

version of it, please send such to my attention. The next meeting of the Rules Committee is scheduled for March 18, 2019.

Please let me know if you have any comments. Thank you.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Director of 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.

Del Ciampo, Joseph

previous
materials



To: RC 2018/2019 Members
Subject: Item 6-7 Research

Dear Judges,

On January 22, 2019, the Rules Committee considered a proposal by Hon. James W. Abrams, Chief Administrative Judge, Civil Matters, to amend Section 23-68 regarding interactive audiovisual devices to permit any person to appear by such device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority. After discussion, the Committee tabled the matter to the its February meeting to allow my office to conduct general research on the matter. Attached is a memorandum that points out various items that you may wish to consider in connection with this proposal.

Joseph J. Del Ciampo
Director of 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.



LEGAL SERVICES

Shanna O'Donnell, *Administrative Trainee*

100 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106
T: 860-706-5120 F: 860-566-3449
jud.ct.gov

Memo

To: Director Joseph Del Ciampo
From: Shanna O'Donnell
Date: February 6, 2019
Re: Proposed revisions to Practice Book section 23-68, item 5-11 on the 1/22/19 Rules Committee agenda.

You asked me to review the proposed amendments to Practice Book section 23-68. These amendments were proposed by Judge Abrams and Court Operations and expand the existing rule regarding appearances by interactive audiovisual device (IAD) by parties and counsel in civil (including small claims) and family (including family support magistrate) matters to permit such appearances by any person upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority.

Analysis of Language of Proposed Revisions

Replacing "any party or counsel" with "any person" in subsections (a) and (c) of Practice Book section 23-68 creates some ambiguity in the rule, which may have unintended consequences. Careful amendment to the language of this section should resolve those ambiguities, as outlined below.

Section 23-68 (a)

"Upon motion of any party, and at the discretion of the judicial authority, any [party or counsel] person may appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device at any proceeding in any civil matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the small claims section, or any family matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the family support magistrate division."

As proposed, this revision does not limit the "person" appearing by IAD to someone who is already legally involved in the underlying case. It would theoretically allow a party to file motions asking to have the judge, a juror, a friend, or an individual otherwise not involved in the case to appear by IAD. While the granting of this motion is left to the discretion of the judge and will prevent such events from occurring, there is no check on the number and frequency of such motions that a party could file.

If intent of this revision, as explained in the Commentary, is limited to allowing parties, witnesses, or counsel to appear by IAD, then the proposed rule could be amended to innumerate those three categories as follows:

"Upon motion of any party, and at the discretion of the judicial authority, any party, counsel, or witness may appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device at any proceeding in any civil matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the small claims section, or any family matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the family support magistrate division."

If the intent is to provide for the judges or jurors or other individuals to attend hearings by IAD in the future without listing them directly, perhaps it could be reworded as "any person who has a legal right or obligation to participate in the proceeding".

Section 23-68 (c)

"For purposes of this section, an interactive audiovisual device must operate so that any party and his or her counsel, if any, any person and the judicial authority can see and communicate with each other simultaneously. In addition, a procedure by which an incarcerated individual and his or her counsel can confer in private must be provided."

As proposed, this revision does not limit "any person" to the specific individual that the motion contemplated in section 23-68 (a) concerns. Read literally, this paragraph could be read to allow any individual (i.e. a member of the public otherwise uninvolved in the case) to claim a right to be able to see and communicate with the court, the parties, and counsel in any case involving an IAD. The proposal could be amended to address this issue. Suggested language:

"An interactive audiovisual device must operate so that the judicial authority; any party and his or her counsel, if any; and any person appearing by means of an interactive audiovisual device pursuant to a court order under this section can see and communicate with each other simultaneously. In addition, a procedure by which an incarcerated individual appearing pursuant to this section and his or her counsel can confer in private must be provided."

Impact on Other Rules or Procedures

Oaths

Under Practice Book section 5-3, oaths shall be administered to witnesses as they take the stand at trial. If witnesses are allowed to testify by IAD, this section would need to be amended and a means to take an oath by IAD specified. Currently, Practice Book section 5-11 allows for appearance by IAD in cases involving orders of protection. In those instances, the specific language is "The court shall provide for the administration of an oath to such party or child prior to the taking of such testimony as required by law." Similar language could be used with the revised section 23-68.

Section 1-22 of the Connecticut General Statutes provides for the ceremony to be used when administering an oath and does not specifically address the physical presence of the person taking the oath. In practice, incarcerated parties appearing by IAD in family support magistrate matters are placed under oath by the courtroom clerk using the IAD.

Witness Fees

Currently, section 52-260 of the Connecticut General Statutes sets compensation for witnesses, based on a daily rate for attendance and a fee for mileage for travel to the place of trial. This statute would likely need to be amended to state that any witness appearing by IAD will not

receive mileage. Otherwise, as written, an individual appearing by IAD would still be paid a fee for travel, even if the witness need not travel at all.

Under section 52-143 (d) of the Connecticut General Statutes, witnesses summoned by the state are to be paid by the clerk at the court on the day they appear and must give the subpoena to the clerk. This statute would need to be amended to address the payment of fees to individuals appearing by IAD.

Subpoenas

Currently, the form of the subpoena specified by section 52-144 of the Connecticut General Statutes commands someone to appear at a specific date and time at a specific location. If the proposed revision to Practice Book section 23-68 is intended to allow for the appearance by IAD of subpoenaed witnesses, the subpoena form and process would need to be amended.

Section 7-19 of the Practice Book allows for subpoenas to "compel the attendance of necessary witnesses." If subpoenas are to be used for the appearance of a witness by IAD, this section may need to be amended, or section 23-68 could specify that appearing by IAD is equivalent to physical presence where rules and statutes describe "attending", "attendance", "presence" or "appearing before." There are already provisions that IAD can take the place of a physical appearance that is required by the rules. For example, section 23-40 of the Practice Book, regarding court appearance in habeas corpus matters, states "[...] the physical appearance in court of the petitioner or the subject of the petition may, in the discretion of the judicial authority, be made by means of an interactive audiovisual device [...]"

There may also need to be procedures or rules put in place regarding the timing of the issuance of subpoenas related to the filing of a motion for IAD appearance. It is unclear if the party intending to call a witness should subpoena the witness first and then file the IAD motion, which might necessitate another subpoena, or to do the reverse and file the IAD motion before the subpoena.

At this time, there is no requirement that the potential witness be notified that a party has moved to have that witness appear by video. Some individuals might have reason to object to appearing via IAD, whether technical, cultural, or personal. As they are not parties, they may not receive notice that a motion has been filed, and may not know of the case at all unless they already received a subpoena. Section 23-68 may need to include a provision for notice to the witness and some path to attempt to quash or object to being called to testify by IAD.

~~5-11~~ (6-7)

Proposal by Judge Abrams/Court Operations to amend Section 23-68 regarding interactive audio visual devices to permit any person to appear by such device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT



CHAMBERS OF
JAMES W. ABRAMS
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE -
CIVIL MATTERS/
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE -
NEW HAVEN JUDICIAL DISTRICT

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NEW HAVEN AT NEW HAVEN
235 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06510
TELEPHONE: (203) 503-6830 FAX: (203) 789-6826

Via Regular Mail and Email

January 16, 2018

Hon. Andrew J. McDonald, Chair
Rules Committee of the Superior Court
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: Proposed Revisions to Practice Book § 23-68

Dear Justice McDonald:

I write in my role as Chief Administrative Judge for Civil Matters. Enclosed is a proposed revision to Practice Book § 23-68 which would allow judges the discretion to permit witnesses to testify via audiovisual device. It comes with my strong recommendation.

Please feel free to contact me if I can answer any questions or be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

James W. Abrams

cc: Joseph Del Ciampo, Esq.

Sec. 23-68. Where Presence of Person May Be by Means of an Interactive Audiovisual Device

(a) Upon motion of any party, and at the discretion of the judicial authority, any [party or counsel] person may appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device at any proceeding in any civil matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the small claims section, or any family matter, including all proceedings within the jurisdiction of the family support magistrate division.

(b) Upon order of the judicial authority, an incarcerated individual may be required to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device in any civil or family matter.

(c) For purposes of this section, an interactive audiovisual device must operate so that any party and his or her counsel, if any, any person, and the judicial authority can see and communicate with each other simultaneously. In addition, a procedure by which an incarcerated individual and his or her counsel can confer in private must be provided.

(d) Unless otherwise required by law or unless otherwise ordered by the judicial authority, prior to any proceeding in which a person appears by means of an interactive audiovisual device, copies of all documents which may be offered at the proceeding shall be provided to all counsel and self-represented parties in advance of the proceeding.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to limit the discretion of the judicial authority to deny a request to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device where, in the judicial authority's judgment, the interest of justice or the presentation of the case require that the party or counsel appear in person.

(f) For purposes of this section, judicial authority includes family support magistrates and magistrates appointed by the chief court administrator pursuant to General Statutes § 51-193/.

Commentary: The rule has been amended to permit any person to appear by means of an interactive audiovisual device upon motion and at the discretion of the judicial authority. This revision broadens the application of the rule to include appearances by means of an interactive audiovisual device by expert witnesses or other witnesses, which will increase the court's flexibility in scheduling matters, minimize the inconvenience to witnesses, and reduce the costs of litigation.