

Minutes
JUDGES' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON E-FILING
Bridgeport Juvenile, 1st Floor Conference Room
Wednesday May 28, 2014 - 2:00 – 4:00 PM

Those attending: Hon. Patrick L. Carroll III, Hon. Barbara Bellis; Hon. Elizabeth Bozzuto; and Hon. Barbara Jongbloed.

Staff in attendance: Joseph D'Alesio; Patrick Deak; Lucio DeLuca; Tais Ericson; Melissa Farley; Johanna Greenfield; Alice Mastrony; Roberta Palmer; and Terry Walker.

1. Welcome & Acceptance of Minutes from 12/23/2013 - Judge Carroll welcomed the group and the minutes were approved unanimously.
2. Recent Technology Issues – Redaction, Encryption, Email Filings Judge Bellis / PJ Deak – Recently a redaction issue resulting from a filer incorrectly using a redaction program was brought to the attention of court operations. A review of files showed that the issue was limited to a single filer, who has corrected the issue. After discussion, the committee decided that a message would be posted reminding people to check the success of any redaction method used before filing documents with the court. In addition to posting on the E-Services Welcome page, a similar notice will be sent to bar groups.

A second issue involved information sent by email from law firms in connection with foreclosure mediation. The material sent contains personal identifying information, and some firms are encrypting the information to protect it. When court personnel try to read the information, they must sign up for passwords to access any encryption programs used by filers. The discussion was whether the Branch should have a policy regarding encryption programs to be used when filing or submitting documents to the courts to standardize the method used. Terry Walker will have someone from JIS look into the Microsoft Live encryption program. P.J. Deak, Terry Walker and Roberta Palmer will then work on a policy regarding encryption.

A related question is when the documents are submitted: is it upon receipt or is it when they can be read? Certain deadlines for setting up pre-mediation meetings, for example, key off the date the documents are received by the foreclosure mediators, and mediators are required to report the date of receipt. After discussion, the suggestion was to contact the filer and ask that they drop the documents off to the mediator in those situations where the documents are encrypted and the mediator is unable to de-encrypt them.

A third issue concerned the filing of pleadings by e-mail to the Regional Family Trial Docket. No procedures are in place to permit the filing of e-mailed pleadings, although e-mailed pleadings do not differ substantially from fax filed pleadings. After discussion, it was decided that since this seems to be an isolated practice, Judge Carroll will address it with the people involved.

3. Electronic Memos of Decision and the Reporter of Judicial Decisions Joe D'Alesio / Melissa Farley – The Law Tribune has asked if it would be possible to obtain electronic copies of decisions from the Reporter of Judicial Decisions. Currently, the decisions are sent by the clerks to the Reporter of Judicial Decisions on paper. With the prevalence of electronic files in civil matters, having an electronic method would be much easier for the Judicial Branch as well as the newspapers. Even for decisions in paper files, the process for making a paper copy and for scanning an electronic copy are the same essentially. Tais Ericson will look into this question and come up with a better mechanism for accomplishing it.

4. Gate-Keeper Question for Viewing CSSD Reports/Other Documents? – The recommendation to include a “gatekeeper question” that would appear prior to viewing certain reports and documents filed pursuant to Sec. 25-60 and Sec. 25-60A of the Practice Book is part of a larger discussion about permissions to view sealed documents in general. Some of the discussion was about the unique nature of the 25-60 and 60A reports and evaluations, the need for access for court employees in order to do their jobs, the need for a gatekeeper question and/or an audit trail in the electronic filing system, whether such question/audit trail should be extended to all sealed documents, the assignment of rights to specific employees to view certain documents, and the training provided to staff. A meeting will be set up with CSSD managers, judicial administration, and court operations managers to discuss these issues.
5. Clarify Family Document Access— A related question concerns any documents in any electronic file statewide, including sealed documents. After discussion, the following decisions were made:
 - Through the case look-up on the public Internet site, any unsealed document should be viewable at any courthouse statewide.
 - Through E-Services, a non-appearing attorney or SRP cannot see documents in family cases unless they have an appearance, and in the case of an SRP, an appearance and electronic access.
 - The ability to view sealed documents will be addressed at the meeting referenced in #4 above.
6. Clarify Go-Live Date and Relationship to Case Return Date— P.J. Deak discussed the difference between a “go-live date” for family and the “go-live date” for civil. With civil cases, going paperless could be a clean line: any case with a return date on or after January 1, 2010 would be wholly electronic. This could be done because the ability to e-file pre-dated the transition to wholly electronic files. For family cases, the ability to e-file will coincide with the transition to wholly electronic files. Case filed on or after a specific date will be electronic, but with a go-live date in December, there is a possibility that a wholly electronic case could have a return date in 2014 or in 2015. After discussion, the committee decided that a go-live date of December 15, 2014 would be acceptable, even though there would not be a clean line as there is in civil cases.
7. Office of Attorney General – Family Data Extract & State Assistance Questions – Information on the responses to state assistance questions has not been captured as data by the system in the past. It now will be captured and the recommendation is that it be part of data captured, shared with the attorney general, who needs this information to do their job, and viewable in the clerk’s site, but not displayed on the public site or through E-Services to non-appearing parties and not included in the regular data that we sell. The committee accepted that recommendation.
8. Family JOE-Q – Optional or Mandatory for paper files – The committee decided after brief discussion to make the use of the JOE-Q in existing paper family files optional when family e-filing begins since these files will not be electronic.
9. Clarify Policy Regarding Resulting Family Motions – There was some confusion when went paperless in civil cases on the question of whether a clerk should still enter result codes on the motions and objections in addition to the electronic order that is in the file. The recommendation is that it should be made clear that staff should continue to result motions and objections. The committee approved this recommendation.
10. Electronic Service Agreement For The Plaintiff – Judge Berger /PJ Deak - Currently, a defendant can agree to accept electronic service on the appearance that is filed with the court. However, a plaintiff, whose

appearance is on the summons form or on the manuscripted summons, does not have that same option. The discussion was whether the form should be revised to include the same language that appears on the appearance form regarding electronic service. The committee agreed that the forms should be revised.

11. Deactivating Judges Edison IDs – PJ Deak – Lucio – The list of judges in Edison is very long, and when a judge resigns or leaves the bench, we deactivate other IDs and passwords. Should this also be done in Edison? The committee agreed that if the judge resigns or leaves, the ID should be deactivated.
12. Report Back: Electronic Certification of Copies– P.J. Deak reported that he had spoken with the federal court about the electronic certification of court documents in the federal courts, and this is something that the federal courts have been doing. He also reported that there is a system available, or we could build something with the CV/FA system, that would add a unique identifier next to the seal and provide access to a database where someone could check that identifier in order to verify the validity of the certification. He will look into this system and report back further.
13. Priority Items for Summer/Fall 2014: – P.J. Deak reviewed the upcoming items, including the development and roll-out of scanning applications for self-represented parties and attorneys on Court Service Center computers, deployment of family hardware, develop and roll out streamlined assignment of prefixes to individual calendaring cases and additional reports for individual calendaring; prepare for the roll-out of a pilot in Hartford for the extract of family support magistrate orders for CCSES, implement any changes in connection with civil protection orders, which will be processed through the civil system to allow data to be connected to the Protective Order Registry; and develop an E-Services Support Call log.
14. Report Back: Hartford Pendente Lite/Post Judgment Short Calendar - Judge Bozzuto and P.J. Deak reported that P.J.'s Team met with JIS about the development of separate calendars for post judgment and *pendente lite* motions. This addition of a designator seems like a small change but it actually impacts the essence of how the short calendar works. JIS estimates that it be about a month of work to do the coding that is needed, but the larger issue is the testing of that coding to be certain it works as it should without disturbing anything else. The overall projection is four months, and it should be done during a block of time when we are not coding anything else major. The two options would be right after the December release or after phase two, which come fairly quickly after phase one. After discussion, the committee agreed that this item would be done after phase two.
15. Status: Migrating Housing into CV/FA – PJ Deak and Roberta Palmer reported that we are moving additional GA housing courts into the civil family system, and are now exploring having one of the Forecourt courts move into the civil/family system. To go much further, we will need to add additional court locations into the civil/family system. Discussions with JIS to get a time estimate for this item are underway.
16. Request for Magistrate Calendaring System – PJ Deak and Johanna Greenfield talked about a request from CFSM Colella for an automated scheduling system for the magistrates. The scheduling of small claims magistrates is done through an Access database, and this request was to have a scheduling system in Edison. The suggestion was that a scheduling database could be developed outside of Edison – perhaps by the technology group in Judge Support Services. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.

The items remaining on the agenda will be put over to the agenda for the next meeting in September.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.