

PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF

Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy and Civil Procedure

Request for Comment

Comments are sought on Amendments to:

Bankruptcy Rules 2002, 3002, 3007, 3012, 3015, 4003, 5005, 5009, 7001, 9006, and 9009, and Official Forms 17A, 17B, 17C, 22A-1, 22A-1Supp, 22A-2, 22B, 22C-1, 22C-2, 101, 101A, 101B, 104, 105, 106Sum, 106A/B, 106C, 106D, 106E/F, 106G, 106H, 106Dec, 107, 112, 113, 119, 121, 318, 423, and 427

Civil Rules 1, 4, 6, 16, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 55, 84, and Appendix of Forms

All Written Comments are Due by
February 15, 2014



THE UNITED STATES COURTS

Prepared by the
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the
Judicial Conference of the United States

AUGUST 2013

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON
CHAIR

JONATHAN C. ROSE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON
APPELLATE RULES

EUGENE R. WEDOFF
BANKRUPTCY RULES


DAVID G. CAMPBELL
CIVIL RULES

REENA RAGGI
CRIMINAL RULES

SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

TO: THE BENCH, BAR, AND PUBLIC

FROM: Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair 
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

DATE: August 15, 2013

RE: Request for Comments on Proposed Rules and Forms Amendments

The Judicial Conference Advisory Committees on Bankruptcy and Civil Rules have proposed amendments to their respective rules and forms, and requested that the proposals be circulated to the bench, bar, and public for comment. The proposed amendments, rules committee reports, and other information are attached and posted on the Judiciary's website at <http://www.uscourts.gov/rulesandpolicies/rules.aspx>.

Opportunity for Public Comment

All comments on these proposed amendments will be carefully considered by the rules committees, which are composed of experienced trial and appellate lawyers, judges, and scholars. Please provide any comments on the proposed amendments, whether favorable, adverse, or otherwise, as soon as possible but **no later than February 15, 2014**. Comments concerning the proposed amendments may be submitted electronically by following the instructions at <http://www.uscourts.gov/RulesAndPolicies/rules/proposed-amendments.aspx>. Hard copy submissions may be mailed to the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Suite 7-240, Washington, D.C., 20544. All comments are made part of the official record and are available to the public.

Members of the public who wish to present testimony may appear at public hearings on these proposals. The Advisory Committees on the Bankruptcy and Civil Rules will hold hearings on the proposed amendments on the following dates:

- Civil Rules in Washington, D.C., on November 7, 2013, in Phoenix, Arizona, on January 9, 2014, and in Dallas, Texas, on February 7, 2014;
- Bankruptcy Rules and Official Forms in Chicago, Illinois, on January 17, 2014, and in Washington, D.C., on January 31, 2014.

If you wish to testify, you must notify the Committee at the above addresses **at least 30 days before the scheduled hearing**.

After the public comment period, the Advisory Committees will decide whether to submit the proposed amendments to the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure. At this time, the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure has not approved these proposed amendments, except to authorize their publication for comment. The proposed amendments have not been submitted to or considered by the Judicial Conference or the Supreme Court.

The proposed amendments would become effective on December 1, 2015, if they are approved, with or without revision, by the relevant Advisory Committee, the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Judicial Conference, and the Supreme Court, and if Congress does not act to defer, modify, or reject them. Except as otherwise noted, the revisions to the Official Bankruptcy Forms would become effective on December 1, 2014, if they are approved by the rules committees and the Judicial Conference.

If you have questions about the rulemaking process or pending rules amendments, please contact Jonathan C. Rose, Chief, Rules Committee Support Office, or Benjamin J. Robinson, Counsel, Committees on Rules of Practice and Procedure, at 202-502-1820 or visit <http://www.uscourts.gov/rulesandpolicies/rules.aspx>.

**PART II: FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
AND APPENDIX OF FORMS**

Letter of transmittal to Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair,
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, from Judge
David G. Campbell, Chair, Advisory Committee on Civil
Rules (May 8, 2013, as supplemented June 2013)... 259

Letter of transmittal to Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair,
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, from Judge
David G. Campbell, Chair, Advisory Committee on Civil
Rules (December 5, 2012, as supplemented June 2013)... 278

“DUKE RULES” PACKAGE

Rule 1. Scope and Purpose. 281

Rule 4. Summons. 282

Rule 16. Pretrial Conferences; Scheduling;
Management. 284

Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions
Governing Discovery. 289

Rule 30. Depositions by Oral Examination. 300

Rule 31. Depositions by Written Questions. 303

Rule 33. Interrogatories to Parties. 305

Rule 34. Producing Documents, Electronically
Stored Information, and Tangible Things,
or Entering onto Land, for Inspection and
Other Purposes. 306

Rule 36. Requests for Admission. 310

Rule 37.	Failure to Make Disclosures or to Cooperate in Discovery; Sanctions.....	312
----------	--	-----

RULE 37(e)

Rule 37(e).	Failure to Make Disclosures or to Cooperate in Discovery; Sanctions.....	314
-------------	--	-----

APPENDIX OF FORMS & RELATED RULES

Rule 84.	Forms.	329
Appendix.	Appendix of Forms.....	330
Rule 4.	Summons.	331

OTHER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Rule 6.	Computing and Extending Time; Time for Motion Papers.	337
Rule 55.	Default; Default Judgment.	339

PART III: MISCELLANEOUS

Procedures for the Judicial Conference’s Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure and Its Advisory Rules Committees.	341
Membership of Judicial Conference Rules Committees.	349
State Bar Associations’ Points of Contact to the Rules Committees.	352

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON
CHAIR

JONATHAN C. ROSE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON
APPELLATE RULES

EUGENE R. WEDOFF
BANKRUPTCY RULES

DAVID G. CAMPBELL
CIVIL RULES

REENA RAGGI
CRIMINAL RULES

SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

From: Honorable David G. Campbell, Chair
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

Date: May 8, 2013, as supplemented June 2013

Re: Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

INTRODUCTION

This report accompanies publication for comment of proposed amendments to Civil Rules 1, 4, 16, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, and 37, and abrogation of Rule 84 and the Rule 84 official forms. These amendments were approved for publication at the January 2013, and June 2013 meetings of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the Standing Committee), and the explanation of the proposals is taken from the Advisory Committee's May 8, 2013, report to the Standing Committee.

The Civil Rules Advisory Committee met at the University of Oklahoma College of Law on April 11-12, 2013.* * * This report has been prepared by Professor Cooper, Committee Reporter, with Professor Marcus, Associate Reporter, and various subcommittee chairs.

Part I.A. of this Report presents for action a proposal recommending publication for comment of revisions to Rules 1, 4, 16, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, and 37. These recommendations are little changed from the proposals that were presented for discussion, but not for action, at the January meeting of the Standing Committee. They form a package developed in response to the central themes that emerged from the conference held at the Duke Law School in May 2010.

Participants urged the need for increased cooperation; proportionality in using procedural tools, most particularly discovery; and early, active judicial case management.

Part I.B. presents for action a proposal recommending publication for comment of a revised Rule 37(e). Publication was approved at the January 2013 meeting of the Standing Committee, recognizing that the Advisory Committee would consider several matters discussed at the January meeting and report back to this June meeting. The revisions provide both remedies and sanctions for failure to preserve discoverable information that should have been preserved. In addition, they describe factors to be considered both in determining whether information should have been preserved and also in determining whether a failure was willful or in bad faith. This report restates the reasons for the recommendation, describes the outcome of deliberations by the Discovery Subcommittee and Advisory Committee in addressing the matters raised at the January meeting, and also lists the questions that will be specifically flagged in the request for public comment.

Part I.C. presents for action a recommendation to approve for publication a proposal that would abrogate Rule 84 and the Rule 84 official forms. This proposal includes amendments of Rule 4(d)(1)(C) and (D) that direct use of official Rule 4 Forms that adopt what now are the Form 5 request to waive service and the Form 6 waiver.

* * * * *

PART I: ACTION ITEMS

A. RULES 1, 4, 16, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37: ACTION TO RECOMMEND PUBLICATION OF "DUKE RULES" PACKAGE

The 2010 Duke Conference bristled with ideas for reducing cost and delay in civil litigation, including many that seem suitable subjects for incorporation in the rules. Advanced drafts were discussed at the January meeting of the Standing Committee. Suggestions made during the meeting and other refinements were explored in two conference calls of the Duke Conference Subcommittee. The Advisory Committee recommends publication for comment of the package presented to it by the Subcommittee.

In January, Judge Koeltl, chair of the Duke Conference Subcommittee, recalled that three main themes were repeatedly stressed at the Duke Conference. Proportionality in discovery, cooperation among lawyers, and early and active judicial case management are highly valued and, at times, missing in action. The Subcommittee worked on various means of advancing these goals. The package of rules changes has evolved over a period of nearly three years through many drafts and meetings and discussions in Advisory Committee meetings. The Committee is unanimous in proposing that each part of the amendments be recommended for publication.

The rules proposals are grouped in three sets. One set looks to improve early and effective judicial case management. The second seeks to enhance the means of keeping discovery proportional to the action. The third hopes to advance cooperation. The rules involved in these

three sets overlap. The changes are described first, set-by-set. The rules texts showing the changes follow, along with Committee Notes.

Case-management Proposals

The case-management proposals reflect a perception that the early stages of litigation often take far too long. “Time is money.” The longer it takes to litigate an action, the more it costs. And delay is itself undesirable. The most direct aim at early case management is reflected in Rules 4(m) and 16(b). Another important proposal relaxes the Rule 26(d)(1) discovery moratorium to permit early delivery of Rule 34 requests to produce, setting the time to respond to begin at the first Rule 26(f) conference.

Rule 4(m): Rule 4(m) would be revised to shorten the time to serve the summons and complaint from 120 days to 60 days. The effect will be to get the action moving in half the time. The amendment responds to the commonly expressed view that four months to serve the summons and complaint is too long. Concerns that circumstances occasionally justify a longer time to effect service are met by the court’s duty, already in Rule 4(m), to extend the time if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure to serve within the specified time.

The Department of Justice has reacted to this proposal by suggesting that shortening the time to serve will exacerbate a problem it now encounters in condemnation actions. Rule 71.1(d)(3)(A) directs that service of notice of the proceeding be made on defendant-owners “in accordance with Rule 4.” This wholesale incorporation of Rule 4 may seem to include Rule 4(m). Invoking Rule 4(m) to dismiss a condemnation proceeding for failure to effect service within the required time, however, is inconsistent with Rule 71.1(i)(C), which directs that if the plaintiff “has already taken title, a lesser interest, or possession of” the property, the court must award compensation. This provision protects the interests of owners, who would be disserved if the proceeding is dismissed without awarding compensation but leaving title in the plaintiff. The Department regularly finds it necessary to explain to courts that dismissal under Rule 4(m) is inappropriate in these circumstances, and fears that this problem will arise more frequently because it is frequently difficult to identify and serve all owners even within 120 days.

The need to better integrate Rule 4(m) with Rule 71.1 is met by amending Rule 4(m)’s last sentence: “This subdivision (m) does not apply to service in a foreign country under Rule 4(f) or 4(j)(1) or to service of a notice under Rule 71.1(d)(3)(A).” The Department of Justice believes that this amendment will resolve the problem. The Department does not believe that there is any further need to consider the integration of Rule 4 with Rule 71.1(d)(3)(A).

Rule 16(b)(2): Time for Scheduling Order: Rule 16(b)(2) now provides that the judge must issue the scheduling order within the earlier of 120 days after any defendant has been served or 90 days after any defendant has appeared. Several Subcommittee drafts cut these times in half, to 60 days and 45 days. The recommended revision, however, cuts the times to 90 days after any defendant is served or 60 days after any defendant appears. The reduced reductions reflect concerns that in many cases it may not be possible to be prepared adequately for a productive scheduling conference in a shorter period. These concerns are further reflected in the addition of a new provision that allows the judge to extend the time on finding good cause for delay. The

Committee believes that even this modest reduction in the presumed time will do some good, while affording adequate time for most cases.

The Department of Justice, however, expressed some concerns about accelerating time lines at the onset of litigation. Many of the reasons are much the same as those that underlie the Rule 12 provisions allowing it 60 days to answer. It is not just that the Department is a vast and intricate organization. Its clients often are other vast and intricate government agencies. The time required to designate the right attorneys in the Department is followed by the time required to identify the right people in the client agency to work with the attorneys and to begin gathering the information necessary to litigate. More generally, the Department has expressed the view that shortening the time to serve and the time to enter a scheduling order will not do much to advance things. It is important that lawyers have time at the beginning of an action to think about the case, and to discuss it with each other. More time to prepare will make for a better scheduling conference, and for more effective discovery in the end. The Note should reflect that extensions should be liberally granted for the sake of better overall efficiency.

Other attorneys have expressed similar concerns that there are cases in which it is not feasible to prepare for a meaningful scheduling conference on an accelerated schedule. A defendant may take time to select its attorneys, compressing the apparent schedule. And some cases are inherently too complex to allow even a preliminary working grasp of likely litigation needs in the presumptive times allowed.

These concerns persuaded the Subcommittee to relax its initial proposal, which would have cut the present times in half, to 60 days after service or 45 days after an appearance. They also were responsible for adding the new provision that authorizes the court to delay the scheduling order beyond the specified times for good cause. This provision would provide more time than the current rule, but only in appropriate cases, and seems protection enough, both for complex cases in general and for the special needs of the Department of Justice.

Rule 16(b): Actual Conference: Present Rule 16(b)(1)(B) authorizes issuance of a scheduling order after receiving the parties' Rule 26(f) report or after consulting "at a scheduling conference by telephone, mail, or other means."

The Committee believes that an actual conference by direct communication among the parties and court is very valuable. It considered a proposal that would require an actual conference in all actions, except those in exempted categories. This proposal was rejected in the end after hearing from several judges and lawyers at the mini-conference hosted by the Subcommittee in Dallas that there are cases in which the judge is confident that a Rule 26(f) report prepared by able lawyers provides a sound basis for a scheduling order without further ado. But if there is to be a scheduling conference, the Committee believes it should be by direct communication; "mail, or other means" are not effective. This change is effected by requiring consultation "at a scheduling conference," striking "by telephone, mail, or other means." The Committee Note makes it clear that a conference can be held face-to-face, by telephone, or by other means of simultaneous communication.

A separate issue has been held in abeyance. Rule 16(b)(1) exempts “categories of actions exempted by local rule” from the scheduling order requirement. It may be attractive to substitute a uniform national set of exemptions, uniform not only for Rule 16(b) but integrated with the exemptions from initial disclosure. Actions exempt from initial disclosure also are exempt from the discovery moratorium in Rule 26(d) and the parties’ conference required by Rule 26(f). Exempting the same categories of actions from the scheduling order requirement would simplify the rules and should respond to similar concerns. But it has seemed better to await further inquiry into the categories now exempted by local rules, and to explore the reasons for exemptions not now made in Rule 26(a)(1)(B). This topic is being developed for possible future action.

Rules 16(b)(3), 26(f): Additional Subjects: Three subjects are proposed for addition to the Rule 16(b)(3) list of permitted contents of a scheduling order. Two of them are also proposed for the list of subjects in a Rule 26(f) discovery plan. Those two are described here; the third is noted separately below.

The proposals would permit a scheduling order and discovery plan to provide for the preservation of electronically stored information and to include agreements reached under Rule 502 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Each is an attempt to remind litigants that these are useful subjects for discussion and agreement. The Evidence Rules Committee is concerned that Rule 502 remains underused; an express reference in Rule 16 may promote its more effective use.

Rule 16(b)(3): Conference Before Discovery Motion: This proposal would add a new Rule 16(b)(3)(v), permitting a scheduling order to “direct that before moving for an order relating to discovery the movant must request a conference with the court.”

Many courts, but less than a majority, now have local rules similar to this proposal. Experience with these rules shows that an informal pre-motion conference with the court often resolves a discovery dispute without the need for a motion, briefing, and order. The practice has proved highly effective in reducing cost and delay.

The Subcommittee considered an alternative that would have required a conference with the court before any discovery motion. In the end, it concluded that at present it is better simply to encourage this practice. Many judges do not require a pre-motion conference now. It is possible that local conditions and practices in some courts establish effective substitutes. Absent a stronger showing of need, it seems premature to adopt a mandate, but the consideration of this practice should encourage its use.

Rule 26(d)(1): Early Rule 34 Requests: The Subcommittee considered at length a variety of proposals that would allow discovery requests to be made before the parties’ Rule 26(f) conference. The purpose of the early requests would not be to start the time to respond. Instead, the purpose is to facilitate the conference by allowing consideration of actual requests, providing a focus for specific discussion. In the end, the proposal has been limited to Rule 34 requests to produce.

The proposal adds a new Rule 26(d)(2), better set out in full than summarized:

(2) *Early Rule 34 Requests.*

(A) *Time to Deliver.* More than 21 days after the summons and complaint are served on any party, a request under Rule 34 may be delivered:

(i) to that party by any other party, and

(ii) by that party to any plaintiff or to any other party that has been served.

(B) *When Considered Served.* The request is considered as served at the first Rule 26(f) conference.

A corresponding change would be made in Rule 34(b)(2)(A), setting the time to respond to a request delivered under Rule 26(d)(2) within 30 days after the parties' first Rule 26(f) conference.

Some participants in the mini-conference — particularly those who typically represent plaintiffs — said they would take advantage of this procedure to advance the Rule 26(f) conference and early discovery planning. Concrete disputes as to the scope of discovery could then be brought to the attention of the court at a Rule 16 conference. Others expressed skepticism, wondering why anyone would want to expose discovery strategy earlier than required and fearing that initial requests made before the conference are likely to be unreasonably broad and to generate an inertia that will resist change at the conference.

After considering these concerns, the Subcommittee concluded that the opportunity should be made available to advance the Rule 26(f) conference by providing a specific focus for discussion of Rule 34 requests, which often involve heavy discovery burdens. Little harm will be done if parties fail to take advantage of the opportunity, and real benefit may be gained if they do.

Proportionality: Discovery Proposals

Several proposals seek to promote responsible use of discovery proportional to the needs of the case. The most important address the scope of discovery directly by amending Rule 26(b)(1), and by promoting clearer responses to Rule 34 requests to produce. Others tighten the presumptive limits on the number and duration of depositions and the number of interrogatories, and for the first time add a presumptive limit of 25 to the number of requests for admission other than those that relate to the genuineness of documents. Yet another explicitly recognizes the present authority to issue a protective order specifying an allocation of expenses incurred by discovery.

Rule 26(b)(1): Proportionality By Adopting Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) Cost-Benefit Analysis: In 1983, the Committee thought to have solved the problems of disproportionate discovery by adding the provision that has come to be lodged in present Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii). This rule directs that “on motion or on its own, the court must limit the frequency or extent of discovery otherwise allowed

by these rules if it determines that * * * (iii) the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, considering the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, the importance of the issues at stake in the action, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues." The final sentence of present Rule 26(b)(1) also provides explicitly that "All discovery is subject to the limitations imposed by Rule 26(b)(2)(C)."

Although the rule now directs that the court "must" limit discovery, on its own and without motion, it cannot be said to have realized the hopes of its authors. Surveys produced in connection with the Duke Conference by various groups, including the Federal Judicial Center, the ABA Section of Litigation, the National Employment Lawyer's Association, and Lawyers for Civil Justice, indicate that excessive discovery occurs in a worrisome number of cases, particularly those that are complex, involve high stakes, and generate contentious adversary behavior. The number of these cases and the burdens they impose present serious problems. These problems have not yet been solved.

Several proposals were considered to limit the general scope of discovery provided by Rule 26(b)(1) by adding a requirement of "proportionality." Addition of this term without definition, however, generated concerns that it would be too open-ended to support uniform or even meaningful implementation. Limiting it to "reasonably proportional" did not allay those concerns. At the same time, many participants in the mini-conference expressed respect for the principles embodied in Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii), finding it suitably nuanced and balanced. The problem is not with the rule text but with its implementation — it is not invoked often enough to dampen excessive discovery demands.

These considerations frame the proposal to revise the scope of discovery defined in Rule 26(b)(1) by transferring the analysis required by present Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) to become a limit on the scope of discovery, so that discovery must be

proportional to the needs of the case considering the amount in controversy, the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the parties's resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.

A corresponding change is made by amending Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) to cross-refer to (b)(1): the court remains under a duty to limit the frequency or extent of discovery that exceeds these limits, on motion or on its own.

Other changes as well are made in Rule 26(b)(1). The rule was amended in 2000 to introduce a distinction between party-controlled discovery and court-controlled discovery. Party-controlled discovery is now limited to "matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense." That provision is carried forward in proposed Rule 26(b)(1). Court-controlled discovery is now authorized to extend, on court order for good cause, to "any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action." The Committee Note made it clear that the parties' claims or defenses are those identified in the pleadings. The proposed amendment deletes the "subject matter involved in the action" from the scope of discovery. Discovery should be limited to the parties' claims or defenses. If discovery of information relevant to the claims or defenses identified in

the pleadings shows support for new claims or defenses, amendment of the pleadings may be allowed when appropriate.

Rule 26(b)(1) also would be amended by revising the penultimate sentence: “Relevant information need not be admissible at the trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.” This provision traces back to 1946, when it was added to overcome decisions that denied discovery solely on the ground that the requested information would not be admissible in evidence. A common example was hearsay. Although a witness often could not testify that someone told him the defendant ran through a red light, knowing who it was that told that to the witness could readily lead to admissible testimony. This sentence was amended in 2000 to add “Relevant” as the first word. The 2000 Committee Note reflects concern that the “reasonably calculated” standard “might swallow any other limitation on the scope of discovery.” “Relevant” was added “to clarify that information must be relevant to be discoverable * * *.” Despite the 2000 amendment, many cases continue to cite the “reasonably calculated” language as though it defines the scope of discovery, and judges often hear lawyers argue that this sentence sets a broad standard for appropriate discovery.

To offset the risk that the provision addressing admissibility may defeat the limits otherwise defining the scope of discovery, the proposal is to revise this sentence to read: “Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.” The limits defining the scope of discovery are thus preserved. The purpose of the amendment is to carry through the purpose underlying the 2000 amendment, with the hope that this further change will at last overcome the inertia that has thwarted this purpose.

A portion of present Rule 26(b)(1) is omitted from the proposed revision. After allowing discovery of any matter relevant to any party’s claim or defense, the present rule adds: “including the existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any documents or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons who know of any discoverable matter.” Discovery of such matters is so deeply entrenched in practice that it is no longer necessary to clutter the rule text with these examples.

Several discovery rules cross-refer to Rule 26(b)(2) as a reminder that it applies to all methods of discovery. Transferring the restrictions of (b)(2)(C)(iii) to become part of (b)(1) makes it appropriate to revise the cross-references to include both (b)(1) and (b)(2). The revisions are shown throughout the proposed rules.

Proportionality: Rule 26(c): Allocation of Expenses: Another proposal adds to Rule 26(c)(1)(B) an explicit recognition of the authority to enter a protective order that allocates the expenses of discovery. This power is implicit in present Rule 26(c), and is being exercised with increasing frequency. The amendment will make the power explicit, avoiding arguments that it is not conferred by the present rule text. The Committee soon will begin to focus on proposals advanced by some groups that greater changes should be made in the general presumption that the responding party should bear the costs imposed by discovery requests. It will be some time, however, before the Committee determines whether any broader recommendations might be made.

Proportionality: Rules 30, 31, 33, and 36: Presumptive Numerical Limits: Rules 30 and 31 establish a presumptive limit of 10 depositions by the plaintiffs, or by the defendants, or by third-party defendants. Rule 30(d)(1) establishes a presumptive time limit of 1 day of 7 hours for a deposition by oral examination. Rule 33(a)(1) sets a presumptive limit of “no more than 25 written interrogatories, including all discrete subparts.” There are no presumptive numerical limits for Rule 34 requests to produce or for Rule 36 requests to admit. The proposals reduce the limits in Rules 30, 31, and 33. They add to Rule 36, for the first time, presumptive numerical limits. A presumptive limit of 25 Rule 34 requests to produce was studied at length but ultimately abandoned.

The proposals would reduce the presumptive limit on the number of depositions from 10 to 5, and would reduce the presumptive duration to 1 day of 6 hours. Rules 30 and 31 continue to provide that the court must grant leave to take more depositions “to the extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2).”

Reducing the presumptive limit on the number of depositions was considered at length. Some judges at the Duke Conference expressed the view that civil litigators over-use depositions, apparently holding the view that every witness who testifies at trial must be deposed beforehand. These judges noted that they regularly see lawyers effectively cross-examine witnesses in criminal trials without the benefit of depositions, a practice widely viewed as sufficient to satisfy the demands of due process. The judges also observed that they rarely, if ever, see witnesses effectively impeached with deposition transcripts. At the same time, many parties are opting to resolve their disputes through private arbitration or mediation services that are less expensive than civil litigation because they do not involve depositions, and yet these alternatives are thought sufficient to reach resolution of important disagreements.

Research by the FJC further supports these concerns, and also suggests that a presumptive limit of 5 depositions will have no effect in most cases. Emery Lee returned to the data base compiled for the 2010 FJC study to measure the frequency of cases with more than 5 depositions by plaintiffs or by defendants. The data base itself was built by excluding several categories of actions that are not likely to have discovery. The data for numbers of depositions were further limited by counting only cases in which there was at least one deposition. Drawing from reports by plaintiffs of how many depositions the plaintiffs took and how many depositions the defendants took, and parallel reports by defendants, the numbers ranged from 14% to 23% of cases with more than 5 depositions by the plaintiff or by the defendant. With one exception, the estimates were that 78% or 79% of these cases had 10 or fewer depositions. Other findings are that each additional deposition increases the cost of an action by about 5%, and that estimates that discovery costs were “too high” increase with the number of depositions. While a causal relationship cannot be established, when both plaintiffs and defendants take more than five depositions, about 43% of plaintiffs’ lawyers and 45% of defendants’ lawyers report that they consider the discovery costs to be too high relative to their clients’ stakes in the litigation.

On the other hand, many comments say that the present limit of 10 depositions works well — that leave is readily granted when there is good reason to take more than 10, and that parties do not wantonly take more than 5 depositions simply because the presumptive limit is 10.

More pointedly, some lawyers who represent individual plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases have urged that they commonly need more than 5 depositions to establish their claims.

In short, it appears that less than one-quarter of federal court civil cases result in more than five depositions, and even fewer in more than ten. The question is whether it will be useful to revise Rules 30 and 31 to establish a lower presumptive threshold for potential judicial management. Reducing the presumptive limit from 10 to 5 depositions per side will not affect the great bulk of litigation. On the other hand it will affect litigation where the discovery costs are highest and the complaints about disproportionate discovery are greatest. Setting the limit at 5 does not mean that motions and orders must be made in every case that deserves more than 5 — the parties can be expected to agree, and should manage to agree, in most of these cases. But the lower limit can be useful in inducing reflection on the need for depositions, in prompting discussions among the parties, and — when those avenues fail — in securing court supervision. The Committee Note addresses the concerns expressed by those who oppose the new limit by stressing that leave to take more than 5 depositions must be granted when appropriate. The fear that lowering the threshold will raise judicial resistance seems ill-founded. Courts are willing now to grant leave to take more than 10 depositions per side in actions that warrant a greater number. The argument that they will become reluctant to grant leave to take more than 5, or more than 10, is not persuasive.

Considering judicial experience and the FJC findings, and aiming to decrease the cost of civil litigation, making it more accessible for average citizens, the Committee is persuaded that the presumptive number of depositions should be reduced. Hopefully, the change will result in an adjustment of expectations concerning the appropriate amount of civil discovery.

Shortening the presumptive length of a deposition from 7 hours to 6 hours reflects revision of earlier drafts that would have reduced the time to 4 hours. The 4-hour limit was prompted by experience in some state courts. Arizona, for example, adopted a 4-hour limit several years ago. Judges in Arizona federal courts often find that parties stipulate to 4-hour limits based on their favorable experience with the state rule. But several comments have suggested that for many depositions, 4 hours do not suffice. At the same time, several others have observed that squeezing 7 hours of deposition time into one day, after accounting for lunch time and other breaks, often means that the deposition extends well into the evening. Judges also have noted that 6 hours of trial time makes for a very full day when lunch and breaks are considered. The reduction to 6 hours is intended to reduce the burden of deposing a witness for 7 hours in one day, but without sacrificing the opportunity to conduct a complete examination.

The proposal to reduce the presumptive number of Rule 33 interrogatories to 15 has not attracted much concern. There has been some concern that 15 interrogatories are not enough even for some relatively small-stakes cases. As with Rules 30 and 31, the Subcommittee has concluded that 15 will meet the needs of most cases, and that it is advantageous to provide for court supervision when the parties cannot reach agreement in the cases that may justify a greater number.

Rule 36 requests to admit are an established part of the rules, whether they be regarded as true “discovery” devices or as a device for framing the issues more directly than is accomplished

even by contention interrogatories. The proposal to add a presumptive limit of 25 expressly exempts requests to admit the genuineness of documents, avoiding any risk that the limit might cause problems in document-heavy litigation. This proposal did not draw much criticism from those who commented on Subcommittee deliberations. (The Subcommittee also considered provisions that would generally defer the time for admissions to the completion of other discovery, but in the end decided that early requests can be useful.)

Proportionality: Rule 34 Objections and Responses: Discovery burdens can be pushed out of proportion to the reasonable needs of a case by those asked to respond, not only those who make requests. The Subcommittee considered adding to Rule 26(g) a provision that signing a discovery request, response, or objection certifies that it is “not evasive.” That proposal was put aside in the face of concerns that “evasive” is a malleable concept, and that malleability will invite satellite litigation.

More specific concerns underlie Rule 34 proposals addressing objections and actual production. Objections are addressed in two ways. First, Rule 34(b)(2)(B) would require that the grounds for objecting to a request be stated with specificity. This language is borrowed from Rule 33(b)(4), where it has served well. Second, Rule 34(b)(2)(C) would require that an objection “state whether any responsive materials are being withheld on the basis of that objection.” This provision responds to the common lament that Rule 34 responses often begin with a “laundry list” of objections, then produce volumes of materials, and finally conclude that the production is made subject to the objections. The requesting party is left uncertain whether anything actually has been withheld. Providing that information can aid the decision whether to contest the objections. The Committee Note also explains that it is proper to state limits on the extent of the search without further elaboration — for example, that the search was limited to documents created on or after a specified date, or maintained by identified sources.

Actual production is addressed by new language in Rule 34(b)(2)(B) and a corresponding addition to Rule 37(a)(3)(B)(iv). Present Rule 34 recognizes a distinction between permitting inspection of documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things, and actually producing copies. The distinction, however, is not clearly developed in the rule. If a party elects to produce materials rather than permit inspection, the current rule does not indicate when such production is required to be made. The new provision directs that a party electing to produce must state that copies will be produced, and directs that production be completed no later than the time for inspection stated in the request or a later reasonable time stated in the response. The Committee Note recognizes the value of “rolling production” that makes production in discrete batches. Rule 37 is amended by adding authority to move for an order to compel production if “a party fails to produce documents.”

Cooperation

Reasonable cooperation among adversaries is vitally important to successful use of the resources provided by the Civil Rules. Participants at the Duke Conference regularly pointed to the costs imposed by hyperadversary behavior and wished for some rule that would enhance cooperation.

It would be possible to impose a duty of cooperation by direct rule provisions. The provisions might be limited to the discovery rules alone, because discovery behavior gives rise to many of the laments, or could apply generally to all litigation behavior. Consideration of drafts that would impose a direct and general duty of cooperation faced several concerns. Cooperation is an open-ended concept. It is difficult to identify a proper balance of cooperation with legitimate, even essential, adversary behavior. A general duty might easily generate excessive collateral litigation, similar to the experience with an abandoned and unlamented version of Rule 11. And there may be some risk that a general duty of cooperation could conflict with professional responsibilities of effective representation. These drafts were abandoned.

What is proposed is a modest addition to Rule 1. The parties are made to share responsibility for achieving the high aspirations expressed in Rule 1: “[T]hese rules should be construed, administered, and employed by the court and the parties to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding.” The Note observes that most lawyers and parties conform to this expectation, and notes that “[e]ffective advocacy is consistent with — and indeed depends upon — cooperative and proportional use of procedure.”

As amended, Rule 1 will encourage cooperation by lawyers and parties directly, and will provide useful support for judicial efforts to elicit better cooperation when the lawyers and parties fall short. It cannot be expected to cure all adversary excesses, but it will do some good.

Package

These proposals constitute a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. Together, these proposals can do much to reduce cost and delay. Still, each part must be scrutinized and stand, be modified, or fall on its own. The proposals are not interdependent in the sense that all must be adopted to achieve meaningful gains.

* * * * *

B. RULE 37(e): ACTION TO RECOMMEND PUBLICATION OF REVISED RULE 37(e)

The Civil Rules Advisory Committee began working on preservation and sanctions shortly after the May 2010, Duke Conference. During that conference, the E-Discovery Panel recommended adoption of rule provisions to address these concerns. That work has involved one full-day conference, repeated discussions during Advisory Committee meetings, and approximately twenty lengthy conference calls by the Advisory Committee’s Discovery Subcommittee. At its November 2012, meeting the Advisory Committee voted to recommend that the Standing Committee approve the resulting draft amendment to Rule 37(e) for publication in August 2013, in conjunction with the expected publication of the package of case-management and related proposals presented in Part I.A. The Standing Committee considered Rule 37(e) at its January, 2013, meeting and preliminarily approved publication subject to consideration of several issues raised during that meeting. The Advisory Committee reviewed those issues and made several modifications to the draft amendment. The revised draft was presented to the Standing Committee at its June 2013, meeting and approved for publication for public comment.

This section of the report provides background on the proposed amendment and identifies several questions on which the Advisory Committee particularly invites public comment.

Need for Action

The Advisory Committee was first advised of the emerging difficulties presented by discovery of electronically stored information in 1997, but the nature of those problems and the ways in which rules might respond productively to them remained uncertain for some time. Eventually, about a decade ago, it decided to proceed to try to draft rule amendments that addressed a variety of issues on which concern had then focused, leading to the 2006 E-Discovery amendments to the Civil Rules.

One of those amendments was a new Rule 37(e), which provided protection against sanctions “under these rules” for loss of electronically stored information due to the “routine, good-faith operation of an electronic information system.” The Committee Note to that rule observed that the routine operation might need to be altered due to the prospect of litigation, and mentioned that a “litigation hold” would sometimes be needed.

The amount and variety of digital information has expanded enormously in the last decade, and the costs and burdens of litigation holds have escalated as well. On December 13, 2011, the House Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the costs of American discovery that largely focused on the costs of preservation. Those costs warrant attention.

The Discovery Subcommittee developed three general models of possible rule-amendment approaches which it presented to the participants in its full-day mini-conference in September, 2011, and summarized as follows:

Category 1: A preservation rule incorporating considerable specificity about when and how information must be preserved in anticipation of litigation. Submissions the Committee received from various interested parties provided a starting point in drafting some such specifics. A basic question is whether a single rule with very specific preservation provisions could reasonably apply to the wide variety of civil cases filed in federal court. A related issue is whether changing technology would render such a rule obsolete by the time it became effective, or soon thereafter. Even worse, it might be counter-productive. For example, a rule triggering a duty to preserve when a prospective party demands that another prospective party begin preservation measures (among the triggers suggested) could lead to overreaching demands, counter-demands, and produce an impasse that could not be resolved by a court because no action had yet been filed.

Category 2: A more general preservation rule could address a variety of preservation concerns, but only in more general terms. It would, nonetheless, be a "front end" proposal that would attempt to establish reasonableness and proportionality as touchstones for assessing preservation obligations. Compared to Category 1 rules, then, the question would be whether something along these lines would really provide value at all. Would it be too general to be helpful?

Category 3: This approach would address only sanctions, and would in that sense be a “back end” rule. It would likely focus on preservation decisions, making the most serious sanctions unavailable if the party who lost information acted reasonably. In form, however, this approach would not contain any specific directives about when a preservation obligation arises or the scope of the obligation. By articulating what would be “reasonable,” however, it might cast a long shadow over preservation without purporting directly to regulate it. It could also be seen as offering “carrots” to those who act reasonably, rather than relying mainly on “sticks,” as a sanctions regime might be seen to do.

All three categories were presented during the September, 2011, mini-conference on preservation and sanctions. This conference gathered together about 25 practicing lawyers and judges from around the country with extensive experience on these topics. Building on that knowledge, the Subcommittee decided to focus on the Category 3 approach. The Category 1 approach was too rigid, and failed to take account of the wide variety of litigation in federal courts. The Category 2 approach could produce the problems that result from rigid rules, but provide no certitude about what would be “enough” preservation.

A central objective of the proposed new Rule 37(e) is to replace the disparate treatment of preservation/sanctions issues in different circuits by adopting a single standard. In addition, the amended rule makes it clear that — in all but very exceptional cases in which failure to preserve “irreparably deprived a party of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation” — sanctions (as opposed to curative measures) could be employed only if the court finds that the failure to preserve was willful or in bad faith, and that it caused substantial prejudice in the litigation. The proposed rule therefore rejects *Residential Funding Corp. v. DeGeorge Fin. Corp.*, 306 F.3d 99 (2d Cir. 2002), which stated that negligence is sufficient culpability to support sanctions.

The proposed amendment seeks to further uniformity in another way. Current Rule 37(e) only precludes “sanctions under these rules.” It does not address resort to inherent power. Because the proposed amendment affirmatively provides authority for sanctions for failure to preserve discoverable information, it should remove any occasion to rely on inherent power. Similarly, there would be no need to worry under the amended rule about whether the failure to retain information violated a court order even though Rule 37(b) sanctions ordinarily can be imposed only for violation of an order. Finally, unlike current Rule 37(e), the proposed amendment applies to all discoverable information, not just electronically stored information.

Another central focus of the proposed amendment is to encourage use of curative measures. Thus, Rule 37(e)(1)(A) authorizes a variety of measures to reduce or cure the consequences of loss of information, and the Committee Note repeatedly recognizes that those measures should be preferred to imposing sanctions if they can substantially undo the litigation harm resulting from the failure to preserve.

Required Finding of Willfulness or Bad Faith

Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i) provides a uniform national standard permitting a court to impose sanctions or give an adverse inference jury instruction only on a finding that the party to be sanctioned has acted willfully or in bad faith. It should provide significantly more protection than has been true in some circuits.

Some thought was given to whether it would be helpful to try in the Note to define willfulness or bad faith, but the conclusion was that it would not be useful. The courts have considerable experience dealing with these concepts, and efforts to capture that experience in Note language seemed more likely to produce problems than provide help. As noted below, the Committee invites public comments on whether an effort should be made to provide a definition of these terms, and if so what that definition should include.

Even if the court finds willfulness or bad faith, the rule permits sanctions only if the loss caused “substantial prejudice” in the litigation. This prejudice need not be as cataclysmic as the prejudice that would justify sanctions under (B)(ii) in the absence of willfulness or bad faith, but it is still a significant additional finding the court must make before imposing a sanction. As pointed out in the Committee Note, using alternative sources of information or other curative measures may often reduce any prejudice sufficiently to preclude sanctions. Another question on which the Committee invites public comment is whether an additional definition of “substantial prejudice” would be helpful, and if so what it should say.

Sanctions in Absence of Willfulness or Bad Faith

In a very narrow group of cases, Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(ii) permits sanctions in the absence of a finding of willfulness or bad faith. The stimulus behind this provision is that there is a body of cases that appear to support such sanctions in exceptional circumstances. *See, e.g., Flury v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.*, 427 F.3d 939 (11th Cir. 2005) (reversing district court’s failure to dismiss action after plaintiff disposed of allegedly defective car before defendant could examine it); *Silvestri v. General Motors Corp.*, 271 F.3d 583 (4th Cir. 2001) (affirming dismissal of action because plaintiff failed to retain allegedly defective air bag to permit defendant to examine it).

Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(ii) permits sanctions when the loss of information “irreparably deprived a party of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation.” That is a more demanding requirement than the “substantial prejudice” that must be found to justify sanctions under (B)(i) when willfulness or bad faith is proved. The rule is further narrowed by the requirement that the court look to all the claims or defenses in the actions; such a crippling loss of evidence justifies sanctions only if the affected claim or defense was central to the litigation.

Finally, the rule focuses on whether the catastrophic loss was caused by “the party’s actions.” If the loss occurs even though the party took reasonable steps to preserve information, due perhaps to a natural disaster or malicious action of a third person, curative measures may be warranted but sanctions are not.

As noted below, one question on which the Committee invites public comment is whether this provision should be retained in the rule. Removing (B)(ii) from the rule would likely prevent sanctions in the absence of a finding of willfulness or bad faith, even in cases like the ones cited above. Limiting the rule to electronically stored information might lessen that effect.

Applying to All Discoverable Information

Current Rule 37(e) is limited to loss of electronically stored information. The amended rule, however, applies to sanctions for loss of any discoverable information. As noted below, one issue on which the Committee invites public comment is whether it would be better to limit the rule's protections to loss of electronically stored information. If so, it might be possible to remove (B)(ii), which authorizes sanctions in the absence of a finding of willfulness or bad faith.

One argument for limiting the rule to electronically stored information is that the sort of catastrophic litigation effect that would warrant imposing sanctions in the absence of willfulness or bad faith usually occurs only with tangible evidence, such as the instrumentality that inflicted harm. But it is unclear whether that is universally true now, and whether that will continue to be true in the future. In addition, there could be substantial difficulties drawing a meaningful dividing line between electronically stored information and other discoverable information.

Replacing Current Rule 37(e)

When Rule 37(e) was added in 2006 to provide some protection against sanctions for failure to preserve, some objected that it would not provide significant protection. Since then, the rule has been invoked only rarely. Some say it has provided almost no relief from growing preservation burdens. The recommendation is to abrogate current Rule 37(e) and replace it entirely with the amended rule.

As pointed out in the Committee Note, the proposed amendment is designed to provide more protection against sanctions than current Rule 37(e). It should provide protection in any situation in which the current rule would provide protection. In addition, because it is not limited to “sanctions under these rules,” the amended rule would protect against a wider variety of possible grounds for sanctions.

As noted below, one question on which the Committee invites comment is whether there is a reason to retain the provisions of current Rule 37(e) if proposed Rule 37(e) is adopted.

Guidance Regarding Preservation

As mentioned above, there was early consideration of rule provisions including precise directives about trigger, scope, duration and other aspects of preservation, but the difficulties of providing such specifics led to a rule proposal focusing on sanctions. The rule does not attempt to prescribe new or different rules on what must be preserved. As the Committee Note states, that obligation was not created by rule, but recognized by many court decisions. The amendment does not seek to change the obligation.

Rule 37(e)(2) does attempt, however, to provide general guidance for parties contemplating their preservation obligations. It lists a variety of considerations that a court should take into account in making a determination both about whether the party failed to preserve information “that should have been preserved” and also whether that failure was willful or in bad faith. One goal of Rule 37(e)(2) is to provide the parties with guidance on how to approach preservation decisions.

Invitation for Public Comment

The Committee looks forward to public comment on all aspects of the proposed amendment to Rule 37(e). It invites comments on the following questions:

1. Should the rule be limited to sanctions for loss of electronically stored information? Current Rule 37(e) is so limited, and much commentary focuses on the preservation problems resulting from the proliferation of such information. But the dividing line between “electronically stored information” and other discoverable matter may be uncertain, and may become more uncertain in the future, and loss of tangible things or documents important in litigation is a recurrent concern in litigation today.

2. Should Rule 37(b)(1)(B)(ii) be retained in the rule? This provision is focused on the possibility that one side's failure to preserve evidence may catastrophically deprive the other side of any meaningful opportunity to litigate, and permits imposition of sanctions even absent a finding of willfulness or bad faith. It has been suggested that limiting the rule to loss of electronically stored information would make (B)(ii) unnecessary. Does this provision add important flexibility to the rule?

3. Should the provisions of current Rule 37(e) be retained in the rule? As stated in the Committee Note, the amended rule appears to provide protection in any situation in which current Rule 37(e) would apply.

4. Should there be an additional definition of “substantial prejudice” under Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i)? One possibility is that the rule could be augmented by directing that the court should consider all factors, including the availability of reliable alternative sources of the lost or destroyed information, and the importance of the lost information to the claims or defenses in the case.

5. Should there be an additional definition of willfulness or bad faith under Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i)? If so, what should be included in that definition?

C. RULE 84: ACTION TO RECOMMEND PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED ABROGATION, AMENDMENT TO RULE 4(d)(1)(D)

The Committee recommends approval to publish for comment proposals that would abrogate Rule 84 and the Official Forms, amending Rule 4(d)(1)(D) to incorporate present Forms 5 and 6 as official Rule 4 Forms.

Official forms are attached to the Appellate, Bankruptcy, and Civil Rules. The Appellate and Civil Forms have been generated through the full Enabling Act Process. Bankruptcy Rule 9009 distinguishes two types of forms. “Official Forms prescribed by the Judicial Conference of the United States shall be observed and used with alterations as may be appropriate.” These Forms are developed through the Enabling Act committees, but the final step is approval by the Judicial Conference without going on to the Supreme Court or Congress. Rule 9009 further recognizes that the Director of the Administrative Office “may issue additional forms for use under the Code. The forms shall be construed to be consistent with these rules and the Code.” The Administrative Office produces forms for use in criminal prosecutions, but these forms are not “official.” (Former Criminal Rule 58 and the official forms were abrogated in 1983; the Committee Note explained that they were unnecessary.) A subcommittee formed of representatives of the advisory committees examined these differences. It reported that forms play different roles in the different forms of litigation, and that there is no apparent reason to adopt a uniform approach across the different sets of rules and advisory committees.

With this reassurance of independence, the Rule 84 Subcommittee was formed to study Rule 84 and Rule 84 forms. It gathered information about the general use of the forms by informal inquiries that confirmed the initial impressions of Subcommittee members. Lawyers do not much use these forms, and there is little indication that they often provide meaningful help to pro se litigants. And as discussed further below, the pleading forms live in tension with recently developing approaches to general pleading standards.

From this beginning, the Subcommittee considered several alternative approaches. The simplest would be to leave Rule 84 and the Rule 84 forms where they lie. The most burdensome would be to take on full responsibility for maintaining the forms in a way that ensures a good fit with contemporary practice and needs, and perhaps developing additional forms to address many of the subjects that are not now illustrated by the forms. The work required to maintain the forms through the full Enabling Act process would divert the energies of all actors in the process from other work that, over the years, has seemed more important. Other approaches also were considered.

The Subcommittee came to believe that the best approach is to abrogate Rule 84 and the Rule 84 forms. Several considerations support this conclusion. One important consideration is the amount of work that would be required to assume full responsibility for maintaining the forms. Another consideration is that many alternative sources provide excellent forms. One source is the Administrative Office.

A further reason to abrogate Rule 84 is the tension between the pleading forms and emerging pleading standards. The pleading forms were adopted in 1938 as an important means of educating bench and bar on the dramatic change in pleading standards effected by Rule 8(a)(2). They — and all the other forms — were elevated in 1948 from illustrations to a status that “suffice[s] under these rules.” Whatever else may be said, the ranges of topics covered by the pleading forms omit many of the categories of actions that comprise the bulk of today’s federal docket. And some of the forms have come to seem inadequate, particularly the Form 18 complaint for patent infringement. Attempting to modernize the existing forms, and perhaps to create new forms to address such claims as those arising under the antitrust laws (*Twombly v.*

Bell Atlantic, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)) or implicating official immunity (*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937 (2009)), would be an imposing and precarious undertaking. Such an undertaking might be worthwhile if in recent years the pleading forms had provided meaningful guidance to the bar in formulating complaints, but they have not. The Committee's work has suggested that few if any lawyers consult the forms when drafting complaints.

Abrogation need not remove the Enabling Act committees entirely from forms work. The Administrative Office has a working group on forms that includes six judges and six court clerks. They have produced a number of civil forms that are quite good. The forms are available on the Administrative Office web site, some of them in a format that can be filled in, and others in a format that can be downloaded for completion by standard word-processing programs. The working group is willing to work in conjunction with the Advisory Committee. If Rule 84 is abrogated, a conservative initial approach would be to appoint a liaison from the Advisory Committee to work with the working group. New and revised forms could be reviewed, perhaps by a Forms Subcommittee. Experience with this process would shape the longer-term relationships. The forms for criminal prosecutions have been developed successfully with only occasional review by the Criminal Rules Committee. Similar success may be hoped for with the Civil Rules. The Administrative Office forms, moreover, would have to win their way by intrinsic merit, unaided by official status. A court dissatisfied with a particular form would not be obliged to accept it.

Two forms require special consideration. Rule 4(d)(1)(D) requires that a request to waive service of process be made by Form 5. The Form 6 waiver is not required, but is closely tied to Form 5. It would be possible simply to remove this requirement, perhaps substituting a recital in the rule of the elements that must be included in the request and in the waiver. The corresponding Administrative Office forms are identical to Form 5 and virtually identical to Form 6. But without something in Rule 4(d) to mandate their use, the Administrative Office forms might not be uniformly employed. An alternative would be to adopt a request form and a waiver form, as part of Rule 4. These forms were carefully developed as part of creating Rule 4(d), and might be carried forward into Rule 4 without change.

These questions were discussed with the Standing Committee last January. With the support provided by that discussion, the Advisory Committee has concluded that the best course is to abrogate Rule 84. Forms 5 and 6 should be preserved by amending Rule 4(d)(1)(D) to incorporate them, recast as Rule 4 Forms and attached directly to Rule 4. These changes are accomplished by the rule texts, Committee Notes, and Forms set out below. The Committee recommends that they be approved for publication this summer.

* * * * *

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

JEFFREY S. SUTTON
CHAIR

JONATHAN C. ROSE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEVEN M. COLLOTON
APPELLATE RULES

EUGENE R. WEDOFF
BANKRUPTCY RULES

DAVID G. CAMPBELL
CIVIL RULES

REENA RAGGI
CRIMINAL RULES

SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

From: Honorable David G. Campbell, Chair
Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

Date: December 5, 2012, as supplemented June 2013

Re: Report of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

INTRODUCTION

This report accompanies publication for comment of proposed amendments to Rules 6(d) and 55(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. These amendments were approved for publication at the January 2013 meeting of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the Standing Committee), and the explanation of the proposals is taken from the Advisory Committee's December 5, 2012, report to the Standing Committee.

The Civil Rules Advisory Committee met at the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in Washington, D.C., on November 2, 2012.* * * This report has been prepared by Professor Cooper, Committee Reporter, with Professor Marcus, Associate Reporter, and various subcommittee chairs.

* * * * *

Three other items are presented for action. One seeks approval to publish an amendment of Rule 6(d) to correct an inadvertent oversight in conforming former rule text to style conventions. The second seeks approval to publish a modest revision of Rule 55(c) to clarify a

latent ambiguity that has caused some confusion. Both of these proposals seek approval for publication when they can be included in a package with more substantial rule proposals.

* * * * *

PART I: ACTION ITEMS

* * * * *

B. RULE 6(d): ACTION TO RECOMMEND PUBLICATION OF REVISED RULE 6(d)

The Committee recommends * * * revision of Rule 6(d) for publication at an appropriate time. * * * The purpose of the revision is to defeat the argument that a party who must act within a specified time after making service can extend the time to act by choosing a method of service that provides added time.

Before Rule 6(d) was amended in 2005 it provided the extra time to act when a party had a right or was required to act within a prescribed period after service “upon the party” if the paper or notice “is served upon the party” by the designated means. Only the party served, not the party making service, could claim the extra three days.

When Rule 6(d) was revised in 2005 for other purposes, it was restyled according to the conventions adopted for the Style Project. “[A]fter service” seemed a useful economy of words. The problem is that at least three rules allow a party to act within a specified time after making service.

Rule 14(a)(1) requires permission to serve a third-party complaint only if the third-party plaintiff files the complaint “more than 14 days after serving its original answer.” Rule 15(a)(1)(A) allows a party to amend a pleading once as a matter of course “within * * * 21 days after serving it” if the pleading is not one to which a responsive pleading is required. Rule 38(b)(1) allows a party to demand a jury trial by “serving the other parties with a written demand * * * no later than 14 days after the last pleading directed to the issue is served.”

A literal reading of present Rule 6(d) would, for example, allow a defendant to extend the Rule 15(a)(1)(A) period to amend once as a matter of course to 24 days by choosing to serve the answer by any of the means specified in Rule 6(d).

It seems worthwhile to correct this unintended artifact of drafting, although the reason may be no more than to undo an unintended change. Allowing the 3 extra days does not seem a matter of great moment. There is no sign that the present rule has caused any problems in practice; it was pointed out in a law review article,¹ not by anguished courts or litigants. It is

¹James J. Duane, *The Federal Rule of Civil Procedure That Was Changed by Accident: A Lesson in the Perils of Stylistic Revision*, 62 S.C.L. Rev. 41 (2010).

possible to read the present rule to allow 3 added days only after being served, looking back to the pre-2005 language. That possibility, however, may be the best reason to amend to make “being served” explicit. A defendant, for example, might read the present rule literally, and deliberately take 24 days to amend an answer. Reading “being served” into the rule might prove a trap for the wary. Even then, it seems unlikely that a court would deny leave to amend — or to implead, or demand jury trial — over a 3-day delay in presenting a plausible position.

C. RULE 55(c): ACTION TO RECOMMEND PUBLICATION OF REVISED RULE 55(c)

A latent ambiguity may be found in the interplay of Rule 55(c) with Rules 54(b) and 60(b). The question arises when a default judgment does not dispose of all claims among all parties to an action. Rule 54(b) directs that the judgment is not final unless the court directs entry of final judgment. Rule 54(b) also directs that the “judgment” “may be revised at any time before the entry of a judgment adjudicating all the claims and all the parties’ rights and liabilities.” Rule 55(c) provides simply that the court “may set aside a default judgment under Rule 60(b).” Rule 60(b), in turn provides a list of reasons to “relieve a party * * * from a final judgment, order, or proceeding * * *.”

Close reading of the three rules together establishes that relief from a default judgment is limited by the demanding standards of Rule 60(b) only if the default judgment is made final under Rule 54(b) or when there is a final judgment adjudicating all claims among all parties. Several cases described in a memorandum by Judge Arthur I. Harris, however, show that several courts have recognized the risk that unreflected reading of Rule 55(c) may lead a court astray.

Rule 55(c) is easily clarified by adding a single word. If the question had been recognized at the time, the change would have been suitable for the Style Project. The change can be recommended now, although it may be better to schedule publication for comment with a suitable package of proposals.

* * * * *

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL
RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE***

1 **Rule 1. Scope and Purpose**

2 These rules govern the procedure in all civil actions
3 and proceedings in the United States district courts, except
4 as stated in Rule 81. They should be construed, ~~and~~
5 administered, and employed by the court and the parties to
6 secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of
7 every action and proceeding.

Committee Note

Rule 1 is amended to emphasize that just as the court should construe and administer these rules to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action, so the parties share the responsibility to employ the rules in the same way. Most lawyers and parties cooperate to achieve these ends. But discussions of ways to improve the administration of civil justice regularly include pleas to discourage overuse, misuse, and abuse of procedural tools that increase cost and result in delay. Effective advocacy is consistent with — and indeed depends upon — cooperative and proportional use of procedure.

* New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

1 **Rule 4. Summons**

2 * * * * *

3 **(m) Time Limit for Service.** If a defendant is not served
4 within ~~120~~60 days after the complaint is filed, the court—
5 on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must
6 dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant
7 or order that service be made within a specified time. But
8 if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court
9 must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.
10 This subdivision (m) does not apply to service in a foreign
11 country under Rule 4(f) or 4(j)(1). or to service of a notice
12 under Rule 71.1(d)(3)(A).

13 * * * * *

Committee Note

The presumptive time for serving a defendant is reduced from 120 days to 60 days. This change, together with the shortened times for issuing a scheduling order set by amended Rule 16(b)(2), will reduce delay at the beginning of litigation.

The final sentence is amended to make it clear that the reference to Rule 4 in Rule 71.1(d)(3)(A) does not include Rule 4(m). Dismissal under Rule 4(m) for failure to make timely service would be inconsistent with the limits on dismissal established by Rule 71.1(i)(C).

1 **Rule 16. Pretrial Conferences; Scheduling;**
2 **Management**

3 * * * * *

4 **(b) Scheduling.**

5 (1) ***Scheduling Order.*** Except in categories of
6 actions exempted by local rule, the district
7 judge — or a magistrate judge when
8 authorized by local rule — must issue a
9 scheduling order:

10 (A) after receiving the parties' report
11 under Rule 26(f); or

12 (B) after consulting with the parties'
13 attorneys and any unrepresented
14 parties at a scheduling conference ~~by~~
15 ~~telephone, mail, or other means.~~

16 (2) ***Time to Issue.*** The judge must issue the
17 scheduling order as soon as practicable, but

18 ~~in any event~~ unless the judge finds good
19 cause for delay, the judge must issue it
20 within the earlier of ~~120~~90 days after any
21 defendant has been served with the
22 complaint or ~~90~~60 days after any defendant
23 has appeared.

24 **(3) *Contents of the Order.***

25 * * * * *

26 **(B) *Permitted Contents.*** The scheduling
27 order may:

28 * * * * *

29 **(iii)** provide for disclosure, ~~or~~
30 discovery, or preservation of
31 electronically stored
32 information;

33 **(iv)** include any agreements the
34 parties reach for asserting

35 claims of privilege or of
36 protection as trial-preparation
37 material after information is
38 produced, including
39 agreements reached under
40 Federal Rule of Evidence
41 502;
42 (v) direct that before moving for
43 an order relating to
44 discovery, the movant must
45 request a conference with the
46 court;[‡]
47 * * * * *

Committee Note

The provision for consulting at a scheduling conference by “telephone, mail, or other means” is deleted. A scheduling conference is more effective if the court and

[‡] Present (v) and (vi) would be renumbered.

parties engage in direct simultaneous communication. The conference may be held in person, by telephone, or by more sophisticated electronic means.

The time to issue the scheduling order is reduced to the earlier of 90 days (not 120 days) after any defendant has been served, or 60 days (not 90 days) after any defendant has appeared. This change, together with the shortened time for making service under Rule 4(m), will reduce delay at the beginning of litigation. At the same time, a new provision recognizes that the court may find good cause to extend the time to issue the scheduling order. In some cases it may be that the parties cannot prepare adequately for a meaningful Rule 26(f) conference and then a scheduling conference in the time allowed. Because the time for the Rule 26(f) conference is geared to the time for the scheduling conference or order, an order extending the time for the scheduling conference will also extend the time for the Rule 26(f) conference. But in most cases it will be desirable to hold at least a first scheduling conference in the time set by the rule.

Three items are added to the list of permitted contents in Rule 16(b)(3)(B).

The order may provide for preservation of electronically stored information, a topic also added to the provisions of a discovery plan under Rule 26(f)(3)(C). Parallel amendments of Rule 37(e) recognize that a duty to preserve discoverable information may arise before an action is filed, and may be shaped by pre-filing requests to preserve and responses to them.

The order also may include agreements incorporated in a court order under Evidence Rule 502 controlling the effects of disclosure of information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product protection, a topic also added to the provisions of a discovery plan under Rule 26(f)(3)(D).

Finally, the order may direct that before filing a motion for an order relating to discovery the movant must request a conference with the court. Many judges who hold such conferences find them an efficient way to resolve most discovery disputes without the delay and burdens attending a formal motion, but the decision whether to require such conferences is left to the discretion of the judge in each case.

1 **Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions**
2 **Governing Discovery**

3 * * * * *

4 **(b) Discovery Scope and Limits.**

5 (1) *Scope in General.* Unless otherwise limited
6 by court order, the scope of discovery is as
7 follows: Parties may obtain discovery
8 regarding any nonprivileged matter that is
9 relevant to any party's claim or defense and
10 proportional to the needs of the case,
11 considering the amount in controversy, the
12 importance of the issues at stake in the
13 action, the parties' resources, the importance
14 of the discovery in resolving the issues, and
15 whether the burden or expense of the
16 proposed discovery outweighs its likely
17 benefit. Information within this scope of

18 discovery need not be admissible in
19 evidence to be discoverable.—including
20 the existence, description, nature, custody,
21 condition, and location of any documents or
22 other tangible things and the identity and
23 location of persons who know of any
24 discoverable matter. For good cause, the
25 court may order discovery of any matter
26 relevant to the subject matter involved in the
27 action. Relevant information need not be
28 admissible at the trial if the discovery
29 appears reasonably calculated to lead to the
30 discovery of admissible evidence. All
31 discovery is subject to the limitations
32 imposed by Rule 26(b)(2)(C).

33 (2) *Limitations on Frequency and Extent.*

34 (A) *When Permitted.* By order, the court
35 may alter the limits in these rules on
36 the number of depositions, ~~and~~
37 interrogatories, and requests for
38 admissions, or on the length of
39 depositions under Rule 30. ~~By order~~
40 ~~or local rule, the court may also limit~~
41 ~~the number of requests under~~
42 Rule 36.

43 * * * * *

44 (C) *When Required.* On motion or on its
45 own, the court must limit the
46 frequency or extent of discovery
47 ~~otherwise allowed by these rules or~~
48 ~~by local rule~~ if it determines that:

49 * * * * *

50 (iii) the ~~burden or expense of the~~
51 proposed discovery is outside
52 the scope permitted by
53 Rule 26(b)(1) ~~outweighs its~~
54 ~~likely benefit, considering the~~
55 ~~needs of the case, the amount~~
56 ~~in controversy, the parties’~~
57 ~~resources, the importance of~~
58 ~~the issues at stake in the~~
59 ~~action, and the importance of~~
60 ~~the discovery in resolving the~~
61 ~~issues.~~

62 * * * * *

63 (c) **Protective Orders.**

64 (1) **In General.** * * * The court may, for good
65 cause, issue an order to protect a party or
66 person from annoyance, embarrassment,

67 oppression, or undue burden or expense,
68 including one or more of the following:

69 * * * * *

70 (B) specifying terms, including time and
71 place or the allocation of expenses,
72 for the disclosure or discovery;

73 * * * * *

74 (d) **Timing and Sequence of Discovery.**

75 (1) **Timing.** A party may not seek discovery
76 from any source before the parties have
77 conferred as required by Rule 26(f), except:

78 (A) in a proceeding exempted from
79 initial disclosure under
80 Rule 26(a)(1)(B); or

81 (B) when authorized by these rules,
82 including Rule 26(d)(2), by
83 stipulation, or by court order.

- 84 **(2) Early Rule 34 Requests.**
- 85 **(A) Time to Deliver.** More than 21 days
- 86 after the summons and complaint are
- 87 served on a party, a request under
- 88 Rule 34 may be delivered:
- 89 (i) to that party by any other
- 90 party, and
- 91 (ii) by that party to any plaintiff
- 92 or to any other party that has
- 93 been served.
- 94 **(B) When Considered Served.** The
- 95 request is considered as served at the
- 96 first Rule 26(f) conference.
- 97 **(23) Sequence.** Unless, ~~on motion,~~ the parties
- 98 stipulate or the court orders otherwise for
- 99 the parties' and witnesses' convenience and
- 100 in the interests of justice:

101 (A) methods of discovery may be used in
102 any sequence; and

103 (B) discovery by one party does not
104 require any other party to delay its
105 discovery.

106 * * * * *

107 (f) **Conference of the Parties; Planning for Discovery.**

108 * * * * *

109 (3) ***Discovery Plan.*** A discovery plan must
110 state the parties' views and proposals on:

111 * * * * *

112 (C) any issues about disclosure, ~~or~~
113 discovery, or preservation of
114 electronically stored information,
115 including the form or forms in which
116 it should be produced;

117 (D) any issues about claims of privilege
118 or of protection as trial-preparation
119 materials, including — if the parties
120 agree on a procedure to assert these
121 claims after production — whether
122 to ask the court to include their
123 agreement in an order under Federal
124 Rule of Evidence 502;
125 * * * * *

Committee Note

The scope of discovery is changed in several ways. Rule 26(b)(1) is revised to limit the scope of discovery to what is proportional to the needs of the case. The considerations that bear on proportionality are moved from present Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii). Although the considerations are familiar, and have measured the court's duty to limit the frequency or extent of discovery, the change incorporates them into the scope of discovery that must be observed by the parties without court order.

The amendment deletes the former provision authorizing the court, for good cause, to order discovery of any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the

action. Proportional discovery relevant to any party's claim or defense suffices. Such discovery may support amendment of the pleadings to add a new claim or defense that affects the scope of discovery.

The former provision for discovery of relevant but inadmissible information that appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence is also amended. Discovery of nonprivileged information not admissible in evidence remains available so long as it is otherwise within the scope of discovery. Hearsay is a common illustration. The qualifying phrase — “if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence” — is omitted. Discovery of inadmissible information is limited to matter that is otherwise within the scope of discovery, namely that which is relevant to a party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case. The discovery of inadmissible evidence should not extend beyond the permissible scope of discovery simply because it is “reasonably calculated” to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Rule 26(b)(2)(A) is revised to reflect the addition of presumptive limits on the number of requests for admission under Rule 36. The court may alter these limits just as it may alter the presumptive limits set by Rules 30, 31, and 33.

Rule 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) is amended to reflect the transfer of the considerations that bear on proportionality to Rule 26(b)(1). The court still must limit the frequency or extent of proposed discovery, on motion or on its own, if it is outside the scope permitted by Rule 26(b)(1).

Rule 26(b)(2)(C) is further amended by deleting the reference to discovery “otherwise allowed by these rules or local rule.” Neither these rules nor local rules can “otherwise allow” discovery that exceeds the scope defined by Rule 26(b)(1) or that must be limited under Rule 26(b)(2)(C).

Rule 26(c)(1)(B) is amended to include an express recognition of protective orders that specify terms allocating expenses for disclosure or discovery. Authority to enter such orders is included in the present rule, and courts are coming to exercise this authority. Explicit recognition will forestall the temptation some parties may feel to contest this authority.

Rule 26(d)(1)(B) is amended to allow a party to deliver Rule 34 requests to another party more than 21 days after that party has been served even though the parties have not yet had a required Rule 26(f) conference. Delivery may be made by any party to the party that has been served, and by that party to any plaintiff and any other party that has been served. Delivery does not count as service; the requests are considered to be served at the first Rule 26(f) conference. Under Rule 34(b)(2)(A) the time to respond runs from service. This relaxation of the discovery moratorium is designed to facilitate focused discussion during the Rule 26(f) conference. Discussion at the conference may produce changes in the requests. The opportunity for advance scrutiny of requests delivered before the Rule 26(f) conference should not affect a decision whether to allow additional time to respond.

Former Rule 26(d)(2) is renumbered as (d)(3) and amended to recognize that the parties may stipulate to case-specific sequences of discovery.

Rule 26(f)(3) is amended in parallel with Rule 16(b)(3) to add two items to the discovery plan — issues about preserving electronically stored information and court orders on agreements to protect against waiver of privilege or work-product protection under Evidence Rule 502. Parallel amendments of Rule 37(e) recognize that a duty to preserve discoverable information may arise before an action is filed, and may be shaped by prefiling requests to preserve and responses to them.

1 **Rule 30. Depositions by Oral Examination**

2 **(a) When a Deposition May Be Taken.**

3 * * * * *

4 **(2) *With Leave.*** A party must obtain leave of
5 court, and the court must grant leave to the
6 extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2):

7 **(A)** if the parties have not stipulated to
8 the deposition and:

9 **(i)** the deposition would result in
10 more than ~~10~~5 depositions
11 being taken under this rule or
12 Rule 31 by the plaintiffs, or
13 by the defendants, or by the
14 third-party defendants;

15 * * * * *

16 **(d) Duration; Sanction; Motion to Terminate or**
17 **Limit.**

18 (1) *Duration.* Unless otherwise stipulated or
19 ordered by the court, a deposition is limited
20 to one day of 7 6 hours. The court must
21 allow additional time consistent with
22 Rule 26(b)(1) and (2) if needed to fairly
23 examine the deponent or if the deponent,
24 another person, or any other circumstance
25 impedes or delays the examination.

26 * * * * *

27 **Committee Note**

Rule 30 is amended to reduce the presumptive number of depositions to 5 by the plaintiffs, or by the defendants, or by the third-party defendants. Rule 30(a)(2), however, continues to direct that the court must grant leave to take more depositions to the extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2). And Rule 30(a)(2)(A) continues to recognize that the parties may stipulate to a greater number. Just as cases frequently arise in which one or all sides reasonably need more than 10 depositions, so there will be still more cases that reasonably justify more than 5. First-line reliance continues to rest on the parties to recognize the cases in which more depositions are required, acting in accord with Rule 1. But if the parties fail to agree, the court

is responsible for identifying the cases that need more, recognizing that the context of particular cases often will justify more. The court's determination is guided by the scope of discovery defined in Rule 26(b)(1) and the limiting principles stated in Rule 26(b)(2).

Rule 30(d) is amended to reduce the presumptive limit of a deposition to one day of 6 hours. Experience with the present 7-hour presumptive limit suggests that a deposition begun in the morning often runs into evening hours after accounting for breaks. Six hours should suffice for most depositions, and encourage efficient use of the time while providing a less arduous experience for the deponent.

1 **Rule 31. Depositions by Written Questions**

2 **(a) When a Deposition May Be Taken.**

3 * * * * *

4 **(2) *With Leave.*** A party must obtain leave of
5 court, and the court must grant leave to the
6 extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2):

7 **(A)** if the parties have not stipulated to
8 the deposition and:

9 **(i)** the deposition would result in
10 more than ~~10~~5 depositions
11 being taken under this rule or
12 Rule 30 by the plaintiffs, or
13 by the defendants, or by the
14 third-party defendants;

15 * * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 31 is amended to adopt for depositions by written questions the same presumptive limit of 5 depositions by the plaintiffs, or by the defendants, or by the third-party defendants as is adopted for Rule 30 depositions by oral examination.

1 **Rule 33. Interrogatories to Parties**

2 **(a) In General.**

3 **(1) Number.** Unless otherwise stipulated or
4 ordered by the court, a party may serve on
5 another party no more than ~~25~~15
6 interrogatories, including all discrete
7 subparts. Leave to serve additional
8 interrogatories may be granted to the extent
9 consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2).

10 * * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 33 is amended to reduce from 25 to 15 the presumptive limit on the number of interrogatories to parties. As with the reduction in the presumptive number of depositions under Rules 30 and 31, the purpose is to encourage the parties to think carefully about the most efficient and least burdensome use of discovery devices. There is no change in the authority to increase the number by stipulation or by court order. As with other numerical limits on discovery, the court should recognize that some cases will require a greater number of interrogatories, and set a limit consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2).

1 **Rule 34. Producing Documents, Electronically**
2 **Stored Information, and Tangible Things, or Entering**
3 **onto Land, for Inspection and Other Purposes**

4 * * * * *

5 **(b) Procedure.**

6 * * * * *

7 **(2) Responses and Objections.**

8 * * * * *

9 **(A) Time to Respond.** The party to
10 whom the request is directed must
11 respond in writing within 30 days
12 after being served or — if the request
13 was delivered under Rule 26(d)(2)
14 — within 30 days after the parties’
15 first Rule 26(f) conference. A shorter
16 or longer time may be stipulated to
17 under Rule 29 or be ordered by the
18 court.

19 **(B)** *Responding to Each Item.* For each
20 item or category, the response must
21 either state that inspection and
22 related activities will be permitted as
23 requested or state ~~an objection to the~~
24 ~~request~~ the grounds for objecting to
25 the request with specificity,
26 including the reasons. The
27 responding party may state that it
28 will produce copies of documents or
29 of electronically stored information
30 instead of permitting inspection. The
31 production must then be completed
32 no later than the time for inspection
33 stated in the request or a later
34 reasonable time stated in the
35 response.

electronically stored information rather than simply permitting inspection. The response to the request must state that copies will be produced. The production must be completed either by the time for inspection stated in the request or by a later reasonable time specifically identified in the response. When it is necessary to make the production in stages the response should specify the beginning and end dates of the production.

Rule 34(b)(2)(C) is amended to provide that an objection to a Rule 34 request must state whether anything is being withheld on the basis of the objection. This amendment should end the confusion that frequently arises when a producing party states several objections and still produces information, leaving the requesting party uncertain whether any relevant and responsive information has been withheld on the basis of the objections. An objection that states the limits that have controlled the search for responsive and relevant materials qualifies as a statement that the materials have been “withheld.” Examples would be a statement that the search was limited to materials created during a defined period, or maintained by identified sources.

1 **Rule 36. Requests for Admission**

2 **(a) Scope and Procedure.**

3 (1) *Scope.* A party may serve on any other
4 party a written request to admit, for purposes
5 of the pending action only, the truth of any
6 matters within the scope of Rule 26(b)(1)
7 relating to:

8 (A) facts, the application of law to fact,
9 or opinions about either; and

10 (B) the genuineness of any described
11 document.

12 (2) *Number.* Unless otherwise stipulated or
13 ordered by the court, a party may serve no
14 more than 25 requests to admit under
15 Rule 36(a)(1)(A) on any other party,
16 including all discrete subparts. The court
17 may grant leave to serve additional requests

18 to the extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1)

19 and (2).[‡]

20 * * * * *

Committee Note

For the first time, a presumptive limit of 25 is introduced for the number of Rule 36(a)(1)(A) requests to admit the truth of facts, the application of law to fact, or opinions about either. “[A]ll discrete subparts” are included in the count, to be determined in the same way as under Rule 33(a)(1). The limit does not apply to requests to admit the genuineness of any described document under Rule 36(a)(1)(B). As with other numerical limits on discovery, the court should recognize that some cases will require a greater number of requests, and set a limit consistent with the limits of Rule 26(b)(1) and (2).

[‡] Present (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) would be renumbered.

1 **Rule 37. Failure to Make Disclosures or to Cooperate**
2 **in Discovery; Sanctions**

3 **(a) Motion for an Order Compelling Disclosure or**
4 **Discovery.**

5 * * * * *

6 **(2) *Specific Motions.***

7 * * * * *

8 **(B) *To Compel a Discovery Response.*** A
9 party seeking discovery may move
10 for an order compelling an answer,
11 designation, production, or
12 inspection. This motion may be
13 made if:

14 * * * * *

15 **(iv)** a party fails to produce
16 documents or fails to respond
17 that inspection will be

18 permitted — or fails to
19 permit inspection — as
20 requested under Rule 34.

21 * * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 37(a)(3)(B)(iv) is amended to reflect the common practice of producing copies of documents or electronically stored information rather than simply permitting inspection. This change brings item (iv) into line with paragraph (B), which provides a motion for an order compelling “production, or inspection.”

1 **Rule 37. Failure to Make Disclosures or to Cooperate**
2 **in Discovery; Sanctions**

3 * * * * *

4 ~~(e) **Failure to Provide Electronically Stored**~~
5 ~~**Information.** Absent exceptional circumstances, a~~
6 ~~court may not impose sanctions under these rules on~~
7 ~~a party for failing to provide electronically stored~~
8 ~~information lost as a result of the routine, good faith~~
9 ~~operation of an electronic information system.~~

10 **(e) Failure to Preserve Discoverable Information.**

11 **(1) Curative measures; sanctions.** If a party
12 failed to preserve discoverable information
13 that should have been preserved in the
14 anticipation or conduct of litigation, the
15 court may:

16 **(A) permit additional discovery, order**
17 **curative measures, or order the party**

18 to pay the reasonable expenses,
19 including attorney's fees, caused by
20 the failure; and
21 (B) impose any sanction listed in Rule
22 37(b)(2)(A) or give an adverse-
23 inference jury instruction, but only if
24 the court finds that the party's
25 actions:
26 (i) caused substantial prejudice
27 in the litigation and were
28 willful or in bad faith; or
29 (ii) irreparably deprived a party
30 of any meaningful
31 opportunity to present or
32 defend against the claims in
33 the litigation.

- 34 (2) *Factors to be considered in assessing a*
35 *party's conduct.* The court should consider
36 all relevant factors in determining whether a
37 party failed to preserve discoverable
38 information that should have been preserved
39 in the anticipation or conduct of litigation,
40 and whether the failure was willful or in bad
41 faith. The factors include:
- 42 (A) the extent to which the party was on
43 notice that litigation was likely and
44 that the information would be
45 discoverable;
- 46 (B) the reasonableness of the party's
47 efforts to preserve the information;
- 48 (C) whether the party received a request
49 to preserve information, whether the
50 request was clear and reasonable,

51 and whether the person who made it
52 and the party consulted in good faith
53 about the scope of preservation;
54 (D) the proportionality of the
55 preservation efforts to any
56 anticipated or ongoing litigation; and
57 (E) whether the party timely sought the
58 court's guidance on any unresolved
59 disputes about preserving
60 discoverable information.

61

* * * * *

Committee Note

In 2006, Rule 37(e) was added to provide protection against sanctions for loss of electronically stored information under certain limited circumstances, but preservation problems have nonetheless increased. The Committee has been repeatedly informed of growing concern about the increasing burden of preserving information for litigation, particularly with regard to electronically stored information. Many litigants and prospective litigants have emphasized their uncertainty

about the obligation to preserve information, particularly before litigation has actually begun. The remarkable growth in the amount of information that might be preserved has heightened these concerns. Significant divergences among federal courts across the country have meant that potential parties cannot determine what preservation standards they will have to satisfy to avoid sanctions. Extremely expensive overpreservation may seem necessary due to the risk that very serious sanctions could be imposed even for merely negligent, inadvertent failure to preserve some information later sought in discovery.

This amendment to Rule 37(e) addresses these concerns by adopting a uniform set of guidelines for federal courts, and applying them to all discoverable information, not just electronically stored information. The amended rule is not limited, as is the current rule, to information lost due to “the routine, good-faith operation of an electronic information system.” The amended rule is designed to ensure that potential litigants who make reasonable efforts to satisfy their preservation responsibilities may do so with confidence that they will not be subjected to serious sanctions should information be lost despite those efforts. It does not provide “bright line” preservation directives because bright lines seem unsuited to a set of problems that is intensely context-specific. Instead, the rule focuses on a variety of considerations that the court should weigh in calibrating its response to the loss of information.

Amended Rule 37(e) supersedes the current rule because it provides protection for any conduct that would be protected under the current rule. The current rule

provides: “Absent exceptional circumstances, a court may not impose sanctions under these rules on a party for failing to provide electronically stored information lost as a result of the routine, good-faith operation of an electronic information system.” The routine good faith operation of an electronic information system should be respected under the amended rule. As under the current rule, the prospect of litigation may call for altering that routine operation. And the prohibition of sanctions in the amended rule means that any loss of data that would be insulated against sanctions under the current rule would also be protected under the amended rule.

Amended Rule 37(e) applies to loss of discoverable information “that should have been preserved in the anticipation or conduct of litigation.” This preservation obligation was not created by Rule 37(e), but has been recognized by many court decisions. It may in some instances be triggered or clarified by a court order in the case. Rule 37(e)(2) identifies many of the factors that should be considered in determining, in the circumstances of a particular case, when a duty to preserve arose and what information should have been preserved.

Except in very rare cases in which a party’s actions cause the loss of information that irreparably deprives another party of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation, sanctions for loss of discoverable information may only be imposed on a finding of willfulness or bad faith, combined with substantial prejudice.

The amended rule therefore forecloses reliance on inherent authority or state law to impose litigation sanctions in the absence of the findings required under Rule 37(e)(1)(B). But the rule does not affect the validity of an independent tort claim for relief for spoliation if created by the applicable law. The law of some states authorizes a tort claim for spoliation. The cognizability of such a claim in federal court is governed by the applicable substantive law, not Rule 37(e).

An amendment to Rule 26(f)(3) directs the parties to address preservation issues in their discovery plan, and an amendment to Rule 16(b)(3) recognizes that the court's scheduling order may address preservation. These amendments may prompt early attention to matters also addressed by Rule 37(e).

Subdivision (e)(1)(A). When the court concludes that a party failed to preserve information that should have been preserved in the anticipation or conduct of litigation, it may adopt a variety of measures that are not sanctions. One is to permit additional discovery that would not have been allowed had the party preserved information as it should have. For example, discovery might be ordered under Rule 26(b)(2)(B) from sources of electronically stored information that are not reasonably accessible. More generally, the fact that a party has failed to preserve information may justify discovery that otherwise would be precluded under the proportionality analysis of Rule 26(b)(1) and (2)(C).

In addition to, or instead of, ordering further discovery, the court may order curative measures, such as

requiring the party that failed to preserve information to restore or obtain the lost information, or to develop substitute information that the court would not have ordered the party to create but for the failure to preserve. The court may also require the party that failed to preserve information to pay another party's reasonable expenses, including attorney fees, caused by the failure to preserve. Such expenses might include, for example, discovery efforts caused by the failure to preserve information. Additional curative measures might include permitting introduction at trial of evidence about the loss of information or allowing argument to the jury about the possible significance of lost information.

Subdivision (e)(1)(B)(i). This subdivision authorizes imposition of the sanctions listed in Rule 37(b)(2)(A) for willful or bad-faith failure to preserve information, whether or not there was a court order requiring such preservation. Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i) is designed to provide a uniform standard in federal court for sanctions for failure to preserve. It rejects decisions that have authorized the imposition of sanctions -- as opposed to measures authorized by Rule 37(e)(1)(A) -- for negligence or gross negligence. It borrows the term "sanctions" from Rule 37(b)(2), and does not attempt to prescribe whether such measures would be so regarded for other purposes, such as an attorney's professional responsibility.

This subdivision protects a party that has made reasonable preservation decisions in light of the factors identified in Rule 37(e)(2), which emphasize both reasonableness and proportionality. Despite reasonable efforts to preserve, some discoverable information may be

lost. Although loss of information may affect other decisions about discovery, such as those under Rule 26(b)(1), (b)(2)(B), and (b)(2)(C), sanctions may be imposed only for willful or bad faith actions, unless the exceptional circumstances described in Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(ii) are shown.

The threshold under Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i) is that the court find that lost information should have been preserved; if so, the court may impose sanctions only if it can make two further findings. First, the court must find that the loss of information caused substantial prejudice in the litigation. Because digital data often duplicate other data, substitute evidence is often available. Although it is impossible to demonstrate with certainty what lost information would prove, the party seeking sanctions must show that it has been substantially prejudiced by the loss. Among other things, the court may consider the measures identified in Rule 37(e)(1)(A) in making this determination; if these measures can sufficiently reduce the prejudice, sanctions would be inappropriate even when the court finds willfulness or bad faith. Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i) authorizes imposition of Rule 37(b)(2) sanctions in the expectation that the court will employ the least severe sanction needed to repair the prejudice resulting from loss of the information.

Second, it must be established that the party that failed to preserve did so willfully or in bad faith. This determination should be made with reference to the factors identified in Rule 37(e)(2).

Subdivision (e)(1)(B)(ii). This subdivision permits

the court to impose sanctions in narrowly limited circumstances without making a finding of either bad faith or willfulness. The need to show bad faith or willfulness is excused only by finding an impact more severe than the substantial prejudice required to support sanctions under Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i). It still must be shown that a party failed to preserve discoverable information that should have been preserved. In addition, it must be shown that the party's actions irreparably deprived a party of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation.

The first step under this subdivision is to examine carefully the apparent importance of the lost information. Particularly with electronically stored information, alternative sources may often exist. The next step is to explore the possibility that curative measures under subdivision (e)(1)(A) can reduce the adverse impact. If a party loses readily accessible electronically stored information, for example, the court may direct the party to attempt to retrieve the information by alternative means. If such measures are not possible or fail to restore important information, the court must determine whether the loss has irreparably deprived a party of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation.

The "irreparably deprived" test is more demanding than the "substantial prejudice" that permits sanctions under Rule 37(e)(1)(B)(i) on a showing of bad faith or willfulness. Examples might include cases in which the alleged injury-causing instrumentality has been lost. A plaintiff's failure to preserve an automobile claimed to have defects that caused injury without affording the defendant

manufacturer an opportunity to inspect the damaged vehicle may be an example. Such a situation led to affirmance of dismissal, as not an abuse of discretion, in *Silvestri v. General Motors Corp.*, 271 F.3d 583 (4th Cir. 2001). Or a party may lose the only evidence of a critically important event. But even such losses may not irreparably deprive another party of any meaningful opportunity to litigate. Remaining sources of evidence and the opportunity to challenge the evidence presented by the party who lost discoverable information that should have been preserved, along with possible presentation of evidence and argument about the significance of the lost information, should often afford a meaningful opportunity to litigate.

The requirement that a party be irreparably deprived of any meaningful opportunity to present or defend against the claims in the litigation is further narrowed by looking to all the claims in the litigation. Lost information may appear critical to litigating a particular claim or defense, but sanctions should not be imposed — or should be limited to the affected claims or defenses — if those claims or defenses are not central to the litigation.

A special situation arises when discoverable information is lost because of events outside a party's control. A party may take the steps that should have been taken to preserve the information, but lose it to such unforeseeable circumstances as flood, earthquake, fire, or malicious computer attacks. Curative measures may be appropriate in such circumstances — this is information that should have been preserved — but sanctions are not. The loss is not caused by “the party's actions” as required by (e)(1)(B).

Subdivision (e)(2). These factors guide the court when asked to adopt measures under Rule 37(e)(1)(A) due to loss of information or to impose sanctions under Rule 37(e)(1)(B). The listing of factors is not exclusive; other considerations may bear on these decisions, such as whether the information not retained reasonably appeared to be cumulative with materials that were retained. With regard to all these matters, the court's focus should be on the reasonableness of the parties' conduct.

The first factor is the extent to which the party was on notice that litigation was likely and that the information lost would be discoverable in that litigation. A variety of events may alert a party to the prospect of litigation. But often these events provide only limited information about that prospective litigation, so that the scope of discoverable information may remain uncertain.

The second factor focuses on what the party did to preserve information after the prospect of litigation arose. The party's issuance of a litigation hold is often important on this point. But it is only one consideration, and no specific feature of the litigation hold -- for example, a written rather than an oral hold notice -- is dispositive. Instead, the scope and content of the party's overall preservation efforts should be scrutinized. One focus would be on the extent to which a party should appreciate that certain types of information might be discoverable in the litigation, and also what it knew, or should have known, about the likelihood of losing information if it did not take steps to preserve. The court should be sensitive to the party's sophistication with regard to litigation in evaluating preservation efforts; some litigants, particularly individual

litigants, may be less familiar with preservation obligations than other litigants who have considerable experience in litigation. Although the rule focuses on the common law obligation to preserve in the anticipation or conduct of litigation, courts may sometimes consider whether there was an independent requirement that the lost information be preserved. The court should be sensitive, however, to the fact that such independent preservation requirements may be addressed to a wide variety of concerns unrelated to the current litigation. The fact that some information was lost does not itself prove that the efforts to preserve were not reasonable.

The third factor looks to whether the party received a request to preserve information. Although such a request may bring home the need to preserve information, this factor is not meant to compel compliance with all such demands. To the contrary, reasonableness and good faith may not require any special preservation efforts despite the request. In addition, the proportionality concern means that a party need not honor an unreasonably broad preservation demand, but instead should make its own determination about what is appropriate preservation in light of what it knows about the litigation. The request itself, or communication with the person who made the request, may provide insights about what information should be preserved. One important matter may be whether the person making the preservation request is willing to engage in good faith consultation about the scope of the desired preservation.

The fourth factor emphasizes a central concern -- proportionality. The focus should be on the information

needs of the litigation at hand. That may be only a single case, or multiple cases. Rule 26(b)(1) is amended to make proportionality a central factor in determining the scope of discovery. Rule 37(e)(2)(D) explains that this calculation should be made with regard to “any anticipated or ongoing litigation.” Prospective litigants who call for preservation efforts by others (the third factor) should keep those proportionality principles in mind.

Making a proportionality determination often depends in part on specifics about various types of information involved, and the costs of various forms of preservation. The court should be sensitive to party resources; aggressive preservation efforts can be extremely costly, and parties (including governmental parties) may have limited resources to devote to those efforts. A party may act reasonably by choosing the least costly form of information preservation, if it is substantially as effective as more costly forms. It is important that counsel become familiar with their clients’ information systems and digital data -- including social media -- to address these issues. A party urging that preservation requests are disproportionate may need to provide specifics about these matters in order to enable meaningful discussion of the appropriate preservation regime.

Finally, the fifth factor looks to whether the party alleged to have failed to preserve as required sought guidance from the court if agreement could not be reached with the other parties. Until litigation commences, reference to the court may not be possible. In any event, this is not meant to encourage premature resort to the court; amendments to Rule 26(f)(3) direct the parties to address

preservation in their discovery plan, and amendments to Rule 16(c)(3) invite provisions on this subject in the scheduling order. Ordinarily the parties' arrangements are to be preferred to those imposed by the court. But if the parties cannot reach agreement, they should not forgo available opportunities to obtain prompt resolution of the differences from the court.

1 **Rule 84. Forms**

2 **[Abrogated (Apr. __, 2015, eff. Dec. 1, 2015).]**

3 ~~The forms in the Appendix suffice under these rules~~
4 ~~and illustrate the simplicity and brevity that these rules~~
5 ~~contemplate.~~

Committee Note

Rule 84 was adopted when the Civil Rules were established in 1938 “to indicate, subject to the provisions of these rules, the simplicity and brevity of statement which the rules contemplate.” The purpose of providing illustrations for the rules, although useful when the rules were adopted, has been fulfilled. Accordingly, recognizing that there are many excellent alternative sources for forms, including the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Rule 84 and the Appendix of Forms are no longer necessary and have been abrogated.

1

APPENDIX OF FORMS

2

Abrogated [(Apr. __, 2015, eff. Dec. 1, 2015).]

1 **Rule 4. Summons**

2 * * * * *

3 **(d) Waiving Service.**

4 **(1) *Requesting a Waiver.*** * * * The plaintiff
5 may notify such a defendant that an action
6 has been commenced and request that the
7 defendant waive service of a summons. The
8 notice and request must:

9 * * * * *

10 **(C)** be accompanied by a copy of the
11 complaint, 2 copies of ~~a~~ the waiver
12 form appended to this Rule 4, and a
13 prepaid means for returning the
14 form;

15 **(D)** inform the defendant, using ~~text~~
16 ~~prescribed in Form 5~~ the form
17 appended to this Rule 4, of the

18 consequences of waiving and not

19 waiving service;

20 * * * * *

21 ~~Form 5.~~**Rule 4** Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive
22 Service of Summons.

23 (Caption—~~See Form 1.~~)

24 To (name the defendant or — if the defendant is a
25 corporation, partnership, or association — name an
26 officer or agent authorized to receive service):

27 **Why are you getting this?**

28 A lawsuit has been filed against you, or the entity
29 you represent, in this court under the number shown above.
30 A copy of the complaint is attached.

31 This is not a summons, or an official notice from
32 the court. It is a request that, to avoid expenses, you waive
33 formal service of a summons by signing and returning the
34 enclosed waiver. To avoid these expenses, you must return
35 the signed waiver within (give at least 30 days or at least
36 60 days if the defendant is outside any judicial district of
37 the United States) from the date shown below, which is the
38 date this notice was sent. Two copies of the waiver form
39 are enclosed, along with a stamped, self-addressed
40 envelope or other prepaid means for returning one copy.
41 You may keep the other copy.

42 **What happens next?**

43 If you return the signed waiver, I will file it with the
 44 court. The action will then proceed as if you had been
 45 served on the date the waiver is filed, but no summons will
 46 be served on you and you will have 60 days from the date
 47 this notice is sent (see the date below) to answer the
 48 complaint (or 90 days if this notice is sent to you outside
 49 any judicial district of the United States).

50 If you do not return the signed waiver within the
 51 time indicated, I will arrange to have the summons and
 52 complaint served on you. And I will ask the court to
 53 require you, or the entity you represent, to pay the expenses
 54 of making service.

55 Please read the enclosed statement about the duty to
 56 avoid unnecessary expenses.

57 I certify that this request is being sent to you on the
 58 date below.

59 ~~(Date and sign—See Form 2.)~~

60 Date: _____

61 _____
 62 (Signature of the attorney
 63 or unrepresented party)

64 _____
 65 (Printed name)

66 _____
67 (Address)

68 _____
69 (E-mail address)

70 _____
71 (Telephone number)

72 ~~Form 6-~~Rule 4 Waiver of the Service of Summons.

73 (Caption — ~~See Form 1-~~)

74 To (name the plaintiff's attorney or the unrepresented
75 plaintiff):

76 I have received your request to waive service of a
77 summons in this action along with a copy of the complaint,
78 two copies of this waiver form, and a prepaid means of
79 returning one signed copy of the form to you.

80 I, or the entity I represent, agree to save the expense
81 of serving a summons and complaint in this case.

82 I understand that I, or the entity I represent, will
83 keep all defenses or objections to the lawsuit, the court's
84 jurisdiction, and the venue of the action, but that I waive
85 any objections to the absence of a summons or of service.

86 I also understand that I, or the entity I represent,
87 must file and serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12
88 within 60 days from _____, the date
89 when this request was sent (or 90 days if it was sent outside

90 the United States). If I fail to do so, a default judgment will
91 be entered against me or the entity I represent.

92 (Date and sign—See Form 2.)

93 Date: _____

94 _____

95 (Signature of the attorney
96 or unrepresented party)

97 _____

98 (Printed name)

99 _____

100 (Address)

101 _____

102 (E-mail address)

103 _____

104 (Telephone number)

105 (Attach the following to ~~Form 6~~)

106 **Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Expenses of Serving a**
107 **Summons**

108 Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
109 requires certain defendants to cooperate in saving
110 unnecessary expenses of serving a summons and complaint.
111 A defendant who is located in the United States and who
112 fails to return a signed waiver of service requested by a

113 plaintiff located in the United States will be required to pay
114 the expenses of service, unless the defendant shows good
115 cause for the failure.

116 “Good cause” does *not* include a belief that the
117 lawsuit is groundless, or that it has been brought in an
118 improper venue, or that the court has no jurisdiction over
119 this matter or over the defendant or the defendant’s
120 property.

121 If the waiver is signed and returned, you can still
122 make these and all other defenses and objections, but you
123 cannot object to the absence of a summons or of service.

124 If you waive service, then you must, within the time
125 specified on the waiver form, serve an answer or a motion
126 under Rule 12 on the plaintiff and file a copy with the
127 court. By signing and returning the waiver form, you are
128 allowed more time to respond than if a summons had been
129 served.

130 ~~(Date and sign—See Form 2.)~~

Committee Note[§]

Abrogation of Rule 84 and the other official forms requires that former Forms 5 and 6 be directly incorporated into Rule 4.

[§] For this publication and solicitation of public comment, new material is underlined in red (but not italics), material directly incorporated into Rule 4 from current Forms 5 and 6 appears in black, and matter to be omitted from current Forms 5 and 6 is lined through.

1 **Rule 6. Computing and Extending Time; Time for**
2 **Motion Papers**

3 * * * * *

4 **(d) Additional Time After Certain Kinds of Service.**

5 When a party may or must act within a specified
6 time after ~~service~~ being served and service is made
7 under Rule 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F), 3 days are
8 added after the period would otherwise expire under
9 Rule 6(a).

Committee Note

What is now Rule 6(d) was amended in 2005 “to remove any doubt as to the method for calculating the time to respond after service by mail, leaving with the clerk of court, electronic means, or by other means consented to by the party served.” A potential ambiguity was created by substituting “after service” for the earlier references to acting after service “upon the party” if a paper or notice “is served upon the party” by the specified means. “[A]fter service” could be read to refer not only to a party that has been served but also to a party that has made service. That reading would mean that a party who is allowed a specified time to act after making service can extend the time by choosing one of the means of service specified in the rule, something that was never intended by the original rule or

the amendment. Rules setting a time to act after making service include Rules 14(a)(1), 15(a)(1)(A), and 38(b)(1). “[A]fter being served” is substituted for “after service” to dispel any possible misreading.

1 **Rule 55. Default; Default Judgment**

2 * * * * *

3 (c) **Setting Aside a Default or a Default Judgment.**

4 The court may set aside an entry of default for good
5 cause, and it may set aside a final default judgment
6 under Rule 60(b).

7 * * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 55(c) is amended to make plain the interplay between Rules 54(b), 55(c), and 60(b). A default judgment that does not dispose of all of the claims among all parties is not a final judgment unless the court directs entry of final judgment under Rule 54(b). Until final judgment is entered, Rule 54(b) allows revision of the default judgment at any time. The demanding standards set by Rule 60(b) apply only in seeking relief from a final judgment.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Procedures for the Judicial Conference’s Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure and Its Advisory Rules Committees

(as codified in *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Vol. 1, § 440)

§ 440 Procedures for Committees on Rules of Practice and Procedure

This section contains the “Procedures for the Judicial Conference’s Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure and Its Advisory Rules Committees,” last amended in September 2011. [JCUS-SEP 2011](#), p. __.

§ 440.10 Overview

The Rules Enabling Act, [28 U.S.C. §§ 2071–2077](#), authorizes the Supreme Court to prescribe general rules of practice and procedure and rules of evidence for the federal courts. Under the Act, the Judicial Conference must appoint a standing committee, and may appoint advisory committees to recommend new and amended rules. Section 2073 requires the Judicial Conference to publish the procedures that govern the work of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the “Standing Committee”) and its advisory committees on the Rules of Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, and Criminal Procedure and on the Evidence Rules. See [28 U.S.C. § 2073\(a\)\(1\)](#). These procedures do not limit the rules committees’ authority. Failure to comply with them does not invalidate any rules committee action. Cf. [28 U.S.C. § 2073\(e\)](#).

§ 440.20 Advisory Committees

§ 440.20.10 Functions

Each advisory committee must engage in “a continuous study of the operation and effect of the general rules of practice and procedure now or hereafter in use” in its field, taking into consideration suggestions and recommendations received from any source, new statutes and court decisions affecting the rules, and legal commentary. See [28 U.S.C. § 331](#).

§ 440.20.20 Suggestions and Recommendations

Suggestions and recommendations on the rules are submitted to the Secretary of the Standing Committee at the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. The Secretary will acknowledge the suggestions or recommendations and refer them to the appropriate advisory committee. If the Standing Committee takes formal action on them, that action will be reflected in the Standing Committee’s minutes, which are posted on the [judiciary’s rulemaking website](#).

§ 440.20.30 Drafting Rule Changes

(a) Meetings

Each advisory committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Advisory committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Preparing Draft Changes

The reporter assigned to each advisory committee should prepare for the committee, under the direction of the committee or its chair, draft rule changes, committee notes explaining their purpose, and copies or summaries of written recommendations and suggestions received by the committee.

(c) Considering Draft Changes

The advisory committee studies the rules' operation and effect. It meets to consider proposed new and amended rules (together with committee notes), whether changes should be made, and whether they should be submitted to the Standing Committee with a recommendation to approve for publication. The submission must be accompanied by a written report explaining the advisory committee's action and its evaluation of competing considerations.

§ 440.20.40 Publication and Public Hearings

(a) Publication

Before any proposed rule change is published, the Standing Committee must approve publication. The Secretary then arranges for printing and circulating the proposed change to the bench, bar, and public. Publication should be as wide as possible. The proposed change must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#). The Secretary must:

- (1) notify members of Congress, federal judges, and the chief justice of each state's highest court of the proposed change, with a link to the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#); and
- (2) provide copies of the proposed change to legal-publishing firms with a request to timely include it in publications.

(b) Public Comment Period

A public comment period on the proposed change must extend for at least six months after notice is published in the *Federal Register*, unless a shorter period is approved under paragraph (d) of this section.

(c) Hearings

The advisory committee must conduct public hearings on the proposed change unless eliminating them is approved under paragraph (d) of this section or not enough witnesses ask to testify at a particular hearing. The hearings are held at the times and places that the advisory committee's chair determines. Notice of the times and places must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#). The hearings must be recorded. Whenever possible, a transcript should be produced by a qualified court reporter.

(d) Expedited Procedures

The Standing Committee may shorten the public comment period or eliminate public hearings if it determines that the administration of justice requires a proposed rule change to be expedited and that appropriate notice to the public can still be provided and public comment obtained. The Standing Committee may also eliminate public notice and comment for a technical or conforming amendment if the Committee determines that they are unnecessary. When an exception is made, the chair must advise the Judicial Conference and provide the reasons.

§ 440.20.50 Procedures After the Comment Period

(a) Summary of Comments

When the public comment period ends, the reporter must prepare a summary of the written comments received and of the testimony presented at public hearings. If the number of comments is very large, the reporter may summarize and aggregate similar individual comments, identifying the source of each one.

(b) Advisory Committee Review; Republication

The advisory committee reviews the proposed change in light of any comments and testimony. If the advisory committee makes substantial changes, the proposed rule should be republished for an additional period of public comment unless the advisory committee determines that republication would not be necessary to achieve adequate public comment and would not assist the work of the rules committees.

(c) Submission to the Standing Committee

The advisory committee submits to the Standing Committee the proposed change and committee note that it recommends for approval. Each submission must:

- (1) be accompanied by a separate report of the comments received;
- (2) explain the changes made after the original publication; and
- (3) include an explanation of competing considerations examined by the advisory committee.

§ 440.20.60 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The advisory committee's chair arranges for preparing the minutes of the committee meetings.

(b) Records

The advisory committee's records consist of:

- written suggestions received from the public;
- written comments received from the public on drafts of proposed rules;
- the committee's responses to public suggestions and comments;
- other correspondence with the public about proposed rule changes;
- electronic recordings and transcripts of public hearings (when prepared);
- the reporter's summaries of public comments and of testimony from public hearings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for committee meetings;
- minutes of committee meetings;

- approved drafts of rule changes; and
 - reports to the Standing Committee.
- (c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), except for general public correspondence about proposed rule changes and electronic recordings of hearings when transcripts are prepared. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.20.30(a).

§ 440.30 Standing Committee

§ 440.30.10 Functions

The Standing Committee's functions include:

- (a) coordinating the work of the advisory committees;
- (b) suggesting proposals for them to study;
- (c) considering proposals they recommend for publication for public comment; and
- (d) for proposed rule changes that have completed that process, deciding whether to accept or modify the proposals and transmit them with its own recommendation to the Judicial Conference, recommit them to the advisory committee for further study and consideration, or reject them.

§ 440.30.20 Procedures

- (a) Meetings

The Standing Committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the Committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Attendance by the Advisory Committee Chairs and Reporters

The advisory committees' chairs and reporters should attend the Standing Committee meetings to present their committees' proposed rule changes and committee notes, to inform the Standing Committee about ongoing work, and to participate in the discussions.

(c) Action on Proposed Rule Changes or Committee Notes

The Standing Committee may accept, reject, or modify a proposed change or committee note, or may return the proposal to the advisory committee with instructions or recommendations.

(d) Transmission to the Judicial Conference

The Standing Committee must transmit to the Judicial Conference the proposed rule changes and committee notes that it approves, together with the advisory committee report. The Standing Committee's report includes its own recommendations and explains any changes that it made.

§ 440.30.30 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The Secretary prepares minutes of Standing Committee meetings.

(b) Records

The Standing Committee's records consist of:

- the minutes of Standing Committee and advisory committee meetings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for Standing Committee meetings;
- reports to the Judicial Conference; and
- official correspondence about rule changes, including correspondence with advisory committee chairs.

(c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the judiciary's rulemaking website, except for official correspondence about rule changes. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the Administrative Office of the United

States Courts and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.30.20(a).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

JUDGE JEFFREY S. SUTTON, CHAIR

Honorable James M. Cole
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Chief Justice Wallace B. Jefferson
Supreme Court of Texas

Dean C. Colson, Esq.

Dean David F. Levi

Roy T. Englert, Jr., Esq.

Judge Patrick J. Schiltz

Gregory G. Garre, Esq.

Larry D. Thompson, Esq.

Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

Judge Richard C. Wesley

Judge Marilyn L. Huff

Judge Diane P. Wood

Judge Jack Zouhary

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette, Reporter
Jonathan C. Rose, Secretary

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

JUDGE STEVEN M. COLLOTON, CHAIR

Professor Amy Coney Barrett

Neal Katyal, Esq.

Judge Michael A. Chagares

Kevin C. Newsom, Esq.

Judge Robert Michael Dow, Jr.

Judge Richard G. Taranto

Justice Allison Eid
Supreme Court of Colorado

Honorable Donald B. Verrilli, Jr.
Solicitor General
U.S. Department of Justice

Judge Peter T. Fay

Professor Catherine T. Struve, Reporter

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

JUDGE EUGENE R. WEDOFF, CHAIR

Michael St. Patrick Baxter, Esq.	J. Christopher Kohn, Esq. Director, Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division U.S. Department of Justice
Judge Jean C. Hamilton	
Judge Arthur I. Harris	
Judge Sandra Segal Ikuta	David A. Lander, Esq.
Judge Robert James Jonker	Jill A. Michaux, Esq.
Judge Adalberto Jose Jordan	Professor Edward R. Morrison
Richardo I. Kilpatrick, Esq.	Judge Elizabeth L. Perris
	Judge Amul R. Thapar
	Judge Judith H. Wizmur

Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson, Reporter
Professor Troy A. McKenzie, Associate Reporter

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

JUDGE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, CHAIR

John M. Barkett, Esq.	Dean Robert H. Klonoff
Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.	Judge John G. Koeltl
Honorable Stuart F. Delery Assistant Attorney General Civil Division U.S. Department of Justice	Judge Scott M. Matheson, Jr.
Judge Paul S. Diamond	Judge Michael W. Mosman
Parker C. Folse, Esq.	Judge David E. Nahmias
Judge Paul W. Grimm	Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
Peter D. Keisler, Esq.	Judge Gene E. K. Pratter

Professor Edward H. Cooper, Reporter
Professor Richard L. Marcus, Associate Reporter

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

JUDGE REENA RAGGI, CHAIR

Carol A. Brook, Esq. Federal Public Defender	Professor Andrew D. Leipold
Judge Morrison C. England, Jr.	Judge Donald W. Molloy
Mark Filip, Esq.	Honorable Mythili Raman Acting Assistant Attorney General Criminal Division U.S. Department of Justice
Chief Justice David E. Gilbertson Supreme Court of South Dakota	Judge Timothy R. Rice
Judge John F. Keenan	John S. Siffert, Esq.
Judge David M. Lawson	Judge James B. Zagel

Professor Sara Sun Beale, Reporter
Professor Nancy J. King, Associate Reporter

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

CHIEF JUDGE SIDNEY A. FITZWATER, CHAIR

Justice Brent R. Appel Supreme Court of Iowa	A. J. Kramer, Esq.
Judge Anita B. Brody	Judge William K. Sessions III
Edward C. DuMont, Esq.	Paul Shechtman, Esq.
Stuart M. Goldberg Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General U.S. Department of Justice	Judge John A. Woodcock, Jr.

Professor Daniel J. Capra, Reporter

**STATE BAR ASSOCIATIONS'
POINTS OF CONTACT
TO THE RULES COMMITTEES**

Alabama State Bar
J. Anthony McLain, Esquire

Alaska Bar Association
Bruce A. Moore, Esquire

State Bar of Arizona
William G. Klain, Esquire

Arkansas Bar Association
Karen K. Hutchins, Executive Director

The State Bar of California
Saul Berkovitch, Esquire

Colorado Bar Association
Charles C. Turner, Executive Director

Connecticut Bar Association
Elizabeth J. Stewart, Esquire

Delaware State Bar Association
Gregory B. Williams, Esquire

The District of Columbia Bar
Candace Smith-Tucker, Esquire

The Florida Bar
Patricia Barksdale, Esquire

Georgia State Bar Association
Glen M. Darbyshire, Esquire

Hawaii State Bar Association
Howard G. McPherson, Esquire

Idaho State Bar
Diane K. Minnich, Executive Director

Illinois State Bar Association
Charles J. Northrup, General Counsel

Indiana State Bar Association
Thomas A. Pyrz, Esquire

The Iowa State Bar Association
Mollie Pawlosky, Esquire

Kansas Bar Association
*Joseph Molina, Director of Government
Affairs*

Kentucky Bar Association
Norman E. Harned, Esquire

Louisiana State Bar Association
Loretta Lawson, Executive Director

Maine State Bar
Karen Frink Wolf, Esquire

Maryland State Bar Association
Keith R. Truffer, Esquire

Massachusetts Bar Association
Martin W. Healy, Esquire

State Bar of Michigan
*Janet K. Welch, Executive Director
Cliff Flood, General Counsel*

Minnesota State Bar Association
*Nancy Mischel, Associate Executive
Director*

The Mississippi Bar
Larry Houchins, Executive Director

The Missouri Bar
Robert Stoeckl, Esquire

State Bar of Montana
Betsy Brandborg, Esquire

Nebraska State Bar Association
Terry R. Wittler, Esquire

State Bar of Nevada
Kimberly Farmer, Esquire

New Hampshire Bar Association
Dan Wise, Communications Director

New Jersey State Bar Association
D. Todd Sidor, Esquire

State Bar of New Mexico
Judge Carl J. Butkus, Esquire

New York State Bar Association
Sharon M. Porcellio, Esquire

North Carolina Bar Association
*Kim Crouch, Director of Governmental
Affairs Office*

State Bar Association of North Dakota
William A. Neumann, Esquire

Ohio State Bar Association
Jessica Emch, Esquire

Oklahoma Bar Association
James C. Milton, Esquire

Oregon State Bar
Hon. Michael W. Mosman

Pennsylvania Bar Association
Susan E. Etter, Esquire

Rhode Island Bar Association
*Helen Desmond McDonald, Executive
Director*

South Carolina Bar
*Charmy Medlin, Membership Services
Director*

South Dakota Bar
*Thomas C. Barnett, Jr., Executive
Director*

Tennessee Bar Association
Allan F. Ramsaur, Esquire

State Bar of Texas
Michael McCrum, Esquire

Utah State Bar
Hon. James T. Blanch

Vermont Bar Association
Robert M. Paolini, Executive Director

The Virginia Bar Association
Yvonne McGhee, Esquire

Virginia State Bar
*Mary Yancey Spencer, Deputy Executive
Director*

Washington State Bar Association
Elizabeth Turner, Esquire

The West Virginia State Bar
Anita R. Casey, Esquire

State Bar of Wisconsin
Sarah A. Zylstra, Esquire

Wyoming State Bar
Sleeter C. Dover, Esquire



THE UNITED STATES COURTS

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building
Washington, DC 20544
uscourts.gov