### STATE OF MINNESOTA

#### IN SUPREME COURT

ADM09-8009 (Formerly CX-89-1863) APPELLATE COURTS

OCT 14 2011

ORDER ESTABLISHING DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MINNESOTA GENERAL RULES OF PRACTICE FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS

The Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General Rules of Practice filed a report on September 28, 2011, proposing amendments to the Minnesota General Rules of Practice for the District Courts. This court will consider the proposed amendments after soliciting and reviewing comments on the proposal.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that any individual wishing to provide written statements in support of or opposition to the proposed amendments shall submit twelve copies addressed to Bridget Gernander, Clerk of the Appellate Courts, 25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., St. Paul, Minnesota 55155, no later than November 14, 2011. A copy of the committee's report containing the proposed amendments in annexed to this order.

Dated: October <u>/4</u>, 2011

BY THE COURT:

Marcher Solden
Lorie S. Gridea
Chief Justice

# CX-89-1863 STATE OF MINNESOTA IN SUPREME COURT



In re:

**Supreme Court Advisory Committee** on General Rules of Practice

# **Recommendations of Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General Rules of Practice**

# REPORT September 28, 2011

Hon. Kathryn Messerich Chair

> Hon. David Stras Liaison Justice

Hon. Steven J. Cahill, Moorhead Hon. Joseph T. Carter, Hastings Hon. Mel I. Dickstein, Minneapolis Francis Eggert, Winsted Jennifer L. Frisch, Minneapolis Joan Hackel, Saint Paul Hon. Rosanne Nathanson, Saint Paul Dan C. O'Connell, Saint Paul Paul Reuvers, Bloomington Daniel Rogan, Minneapolis Hon. Shari Schluchter, Bemidji Erica Strohl, Minneapolis Hon. Robert D. Walker, Fairmont

Michael B. Johnson, Saint Paul Staff Attorney

David F. Herr, Minneapolis Reporter

#### Introduction

The advisory committee met twice during 2011 to consider two separate rules revision projects that have been underway for several years. First, this report contains the recommendations of the advisory committee on the implementation of the Court's March 11, 2011, Order on the use of video and audio recording of court proceedings in Minnesota. Second, this report sets forth the advisory committee's recommendations on the revisions to the rules in family law matters as initially brought to the Court by the 2009 "Divorce Camp" recommendations of the Minnesota Chapter of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers. Both issues have been considered by the advisory committee over several meetings spanning several years.

## **Summary of Recommendations**

The committee's specific recommendations are briefly summarized as follows:

- 1. The committee believes it has developed, with the assistance of the Media Petitioners on the issue of "Cameras in the Courtroom" before this Court, a workable set of recommended ground rules to guide the implementation of a pilot project rule set forth in this Court's March 11, 2011, Order, as amended by its order of April 21, 2011. The ground rules are set forth as modifications to Rule 4.03.
- 2. Many of the recommendations advanced in the "Divorce Camp Report" in 2009, are worthy of adoption by the Court, and they are set forth, with recommended modifications by this advisory committee, in Recommendation 2 of this report.
- 3. The advisory committee considered recommendations regarding the modification of the timing provisions for motion practice in family law matters, generally

lengthening the briefing schedules and adopting in part the timing changes made in the federal courts in 2009. The committee believes any changes in the timing rules for family law matters should only be considered when the 2009 federal court timing changes are formally taken up in Minnesota for possible application in all proceedings.

4. The committee received numerous comments on the subject of the family law rules (Rules 301 through 314) and the interaction of these rules with the rules governing the expedited child-support enforcement process (Rules 351 through 379). The expedited-process rules were adopted initially by a group focusing on, and comprised of, the regular participants in that process. The committee believes that group should be encouraged to consider the impact of these family law rules on the expedited process and whether their adoption presents the occasion for further rule changes in the expedited-process rules.

#### **Effective Date**

Based on the comments received by the advisory committee during its consideration of these rule revision projects, the Court may receive comments during its comment period or at a hearing, if the Court determines to hold one. Notwithstanding those comments, the committee believes the rule amendments in this report related to family law proceedings can probably be considered fairly and fully with a public comment period and adopted to take effect on January 1, 2012. The rule amendments related to video and audio recording of court proceedings can be made effective immediately.

# **Comments to Rules**

The committee has completely revamped the Advisory Committee Comments to Rules 301 through 313 with the intention that these new comments would completely replace any prior comments. The committee has drawn heavily from the comments of the AAML Divorce Camp Draft and adopts those comments to the extent they are incorporated in the Advisory Committee Comments.

The committee believes all prior comments should be formally abrogated because of their bulk, their obsolescence, and the fact that they have been incorporated in new comments to the extent they continue to have value.

# **Style of Report**

The specific recommendations are reprinted in traditional legislative format, with new wording <u>underscored</u> and deleted words <del>struck through</del>. Markings are omitted for the new advisory committee comments, regardless of their derivation.

Respectfully submitted,

MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GENERAL RULES OF PRACTICE Recommendation 1: The Court should codify the role of the media coordinators in the rules on cameras in the courtroom.

#### Introduction

By order dated March 11, 2011, the Court established a two-year pilot project on video and audio recording in civil cases beginning on July 1, 2011. The Order directed the advisory committee to work with the Media Petitioners and identify media coordinators who will facilitate interaction between the courts and the media. The Order also directed the committee to monitor the implementation of the pilot project and report to the court on any needed rules changes.

Regarding media coordinators, the advisory committee has worked with the Media Petitioners through their attorney, Mark Anfinson, and has identified a list of media coordinators for the various areas of the state. The list is posted on the state court website (www.mncourts.gov) and will be updated as the need arises.

Early on in the advisory committee discussions that preceded this committee's initial report to this Court (dated October 29, 2010) there was general consensus that media coordinators would be expected to resolve all issues related to pooling of cameras and microphones, and to explain to persons requesting video and audio coverage the local practices and procedures of the court related to audio and video coverage in their respective areas (e.g., what equipment and preparation is needed or permitted in certain courthouses and courtrooms). Representatives of the media are already meeting with various judges around the state to begin discussions of the logistics that need to be addressed and to demonstrate the audio and video technology involved. There is

agreement that the media coordinator's role and related process, including participation in data collection and monitoring of the pilot project, should be codified for the benefit of all.

Procedurally, Rule 4.03 requires that requests for camera coverage must go to the presiding judge with notice to all parties as far in advance as practicable, but no later than 10 days prior to the hearing. The rule does not reference media coordinators or the state's Court Information Office. The advisory committee is aware that Wisconsin has a rule that calls for appointment of media coordinators but does not clearly spell out their roles, and that in practice some Wisconsin media coordinators screen all media requests for their local courts, and some do not. The advisory committee recommends that any person requesting audio or video coverage of a civil proceeding should also be required to notify the respective media coordinator of the request in advance of submitting the request, if possible, or as soon thereafter as possible, and that the media coordinators should be required to keep the state's Court Information Office apprised of all requests for audio and video coverage of civil trial court proceedings.

Regarding data collection and monitoring, the Court's March 11, 2011, Order establishing the pilot project rejected the research study options proposed in the advisory committee's October 29, 2010, report. One of the rejected options was a formal research study, and the other option was a scaled down study that would rely on informal surveys of participants. The advisory committee considered several different approaches that would permit monitoring but not rise to the level of the options previously rejected by the Court.

At the outset, the Media Petitioners expressed the opinion that they have the continuing burden to demonstrate the success of the pilot project and a strong incentive to see that it is accurately tracked and measured. To that end the Media Petitioners, through their attorney, have developed a 25-element form that media coordinators would use to collect basic information such as the judge, parties, attorneys and dates of all camera usage and requests for usage during the pilot project. This data would permit solicitation of comments from participants at the point(s) in time that the committee considered was most appropriate.

One approach the committee considered involved media coordinators advising participants at or near the time of the camera usage that they could submit comments at a designated location on the main state court website. Comments submitted would be accessible to the public and would be used by the advisory committee in monitoring the pilot project and making recommendations. This would be followed up by a general, published notice from the advisory committee 18 months into the pilot project soliciting comments from any interested persons. The rationale included the view that confidential surveys may be ineffective in maintaining confidentiality if the prediction that few civil cases will be covered becomes fact; with low numbers, it may be relatively easy to identify survey respondents.

Other approaches included a confidential survey less extensive than the options rejected by the Court but soliciting some feedback. Use of a pass code or a requirement to identify the case involved may be necessary to prevent ballot box stuffing, and could allow participants to respond according to their own time frame.

Some advisory committee members thought that the solicitation of comments should occur at or near the time of the camera usage or the opportunity to collect information may be lost. Other members thought that some participants may not want to comment while a case or an appeal is pending, and a different perspective may exist once a little time has elapsed since the camera usage. Ultimately the committee recommends that solicitation using a confidential survey should occur no later than 18 months into the pilot project utilizing a survey form to be developed jointly by the committee reporter and staff, and the court's information office and Research and Evaluation unit, and approved after circulation to committee members. It is also recommended that media coordinators should also track the length of proceedings covered by cameras, and that aggregate data collected by the coordinators should be posted to a bulletin board so that all can access it.

Proposed modifications to Rule 4.03 incorporating the role of media coordinators is set forth below. Additional edits proposing headings to Rule 4.03 are added to improve readability.

#### **Specific Recommendation:**

1

2

3

4

5

6

Rule 4.03 should be amended as follows:

# Rule 4.03. Procedures Relating to Requests for Audio or Video Coverage of District Court Proceedings

(a) <u>Notice</u>. Unless notice is waived by the trial judge, the media shall provide written notice of their intent to cover district court proceedings by either audio or video means to the trial judge, all counsel of record, and any parties appearing without counsel as far in advance as practicable, and at least 10 days before the commencement of the

hearing or trial. <u>In civil proceedings subject to the pilot project authorized by supreme</u>

court order, the media shall also notify their respective media coordinator identified as

provided under part (e) of this rule of the request to cover proceedings in advance of

submitting the request to the trial judge, if possible, or as soon thereafter as possible.

- or video coverage, the party shall provide written notice of the party's objections to the presiding judge, the other parties, and the media requesting coverage as soon as practicable, and at least 3 days before the commencement of the hearing or trial in cases where the media have given at least 10 days' notice of their intent to cover the proceedings. The judge shall rule on any objections and make a decision on audio or video coverage before the commencement of the hearing or trial. However, the judge has the discretion to limit, terminate, or temporarily suspend audio or video coverage of an entire case or portions of a case at any time.
- (c) <u>Witness Information and Objection to Coverage</u>. At or before the commencement of the hearing or trial in cases with audio or video coverage, each party shall inform all witnesses the party plans to call that their testimony will be subject to audio or video recording unless the witness objects in writing or on the record before testifying.
- (d) Appeals. No ruling of the trial judge relating to the implementation or management of audio or video coverage under this rule shall be appealable until the trial has been completed, and then only by a party.

28	(e) Media Coordinators for Civil Pilot Project. For civil proceedings
29	subject to the pilot project authorized by order of the supreme court, media coordinators
30	for various areas of the state shall be identified on the main state court web site. The
31	media coordinators shall facilitate interaction between the courts and the electronic media
32	during the course of the pilot project. Responsibilities of the media coordinators include:
33	(i) Compiling basic information (e.g., case identifiers, judge, parties,
34	attorneys, dates and coverage duration) on all requests for use of audio or video
35	coverage of civil trial court proceedings for their respective court location(s) as
36	identified on the main state court web site, and make aggregate forms of the
37	information publicly available;
38	(ii) Notifying the state Court's Information Office of all requests for audio
39	and video coverage of civil trial court proceedings for their respective court
40	location(s) as identified on the main state court web site.;
41	(iii) Explaining to persons requesting video or audio coverage of civil trial
42	court proceedings for their respective court location(s) the local practices,
43	procedures, and logistical details of the court related to audio and video coverage;
14	(iv) Resolving all issues related to pooling of cameras and microphones
45	related to video or audio coverage of civil trial court proceedings for their
46	respective court location(s);
47	(v) Making available to participants in the pilot project survey information
48	as directed by the supreme court's advisory committee on the general rules of

practice.

**Recommendation 2:** The Court Should Amend the Rules of Family Court

> Procedure, Set Forth in General Rules of Practice 301 to 314 and Should Invite Consideration of Changes to the Rules Applicable to the Expedited Child Support Process,

Rules 351 through 379.

# **Introduction**

303.02

303.03

303.04

Form of Motion

**Motion Practice** 

Ex Parte and Emergency Relief

72

73

74

These amendments are explained in the Introduction to this report, and in the Advisory Committee Comments to the individual rules.

# **Specific Recommendation**

The Minnesota General Rules of Practice should be amended as follows:

50		Minnesota General Rules of Practice for the District Courts
51		Includes amendments effective January 1, 2010
52		
53		TITLE IV. RULES OF FAMILY COURT PROCEDURE
54		DARTA DROCEEDINGS MOTIONS AND ORDERS
55 56		PART A. PROCEEDINGS, MOTIONS, AND ORDERS
57	<b>Rule 301.</b>	Applicability of Rules Scope; Time
58	301.01	Applicable Statute or Rule
59	301.02	Time
60		
61		RULE 301. SCOPE; TIME
		Roll 301. Scot E, Tivil
		Rolle 301. Score, Tivie
62	Rule 301.0	1 Applicablibilty of Rules
	Rule 301.0	
62 63		1 Applicablibilty of Rules
62	Rule 302.	1 Applicablibilty of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties
62 63		1 Applicablibilty of Rules
62 63 64	Rule 302.	1 Applicablibilty of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties
62 63 64 65	Rule 302.	1 Applicablibilty of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties  Commencement of Proceedings  Continuances
62 63 64 65 66	Rule 302. 302.01 302.02	1 Applicablibilty of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties  Commencement of Proceedings  Continuances
62 63 64 65 66 67	Rule 302. 302.01 302.02 302.03	1 Applicablibilty of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties  Commencement of Proceedings  Continuances  Time
62 63 64 65 66 67 68	Rule 302. 302.01 302.02 302.03 302.04	1 Applicablibity of Rules  Commencement; Continuance; Time; Parties Commencement of Proceedings Continuances — Time — Designation of Parties

75	303.05	Orders to Show Cause
76	303.06	Orders and Decrees Requiring Child Support or Maintenance
77	<b>Rule 304.</b>	Scheduling of Cases
78	304.01	Scope
79	304.02	The Party's Informational Statement Initial Case Information For Court
80	304.03	Scheduling Order
81	304.04	Amendment
82	304.05	Collaborative Law
83	304.06	Continuances
84	<b>Rule 305.</b>	Prehearing Pretrial Conferences
85	305.01	Prehearing Parenting/Financial Disclosure Statement
86	305.02	Prehearing Pretrial Conference Attendance
87	305.03	Prehearing Conference Order for Trial or Continued Pretrial Conference
88	<b>Rule 306.</b>	Default
89	306.01	Scheduling of Final Hearing
90	306.02	Preparation of Decree [Abrogated]
91	Rule 307.	Final Hearings
92	Rule 308.	Final Order, Judgment or Decree
93	308.01	Notices; Service
94	308.02	Statutorily Required Notices
95	308.03	Sensitive Matters
96	308.04	Joint Marital Agreement and Decree
97	Rule 309.	Contempt
98	309.01	Initiation
99	309.02	Hearing
100	309.03	Sentencing
101	<u>309.04</u>	Findings Proceedings
102	Rule 310.	Alternative Dispute Resolution
103	310.01	Applicability  Part Danie Matters
104	310.02	Post-Decree Matters
105		09 [Deleted effective July 1, 1997]
106	Rule 311.	Forms  Paviary of Deferee's Findings on Decommendations
107	Rule 312.	Review of Referee's Findings or Recommendations  Notice of Assignment to Judge; Parties' Submissions
108	312.01 312.02	— Notice of Assignment to Judge, Parties—Submissions  — Transcript of Referee's Hearing
109	Rule 313.	Confidential Numbers and Tax Returns
110		Parentage Proceedings
111	Rule 314.	ratentage rroceedings
<ul><li>112</li><li>113</li><li>114</li></ul>	APPENDIX	C OF FORMS
115	Effe	ctive January 1, 2008, a All forms previously contained in Title IV have been
116	deleted from	m the rules. Family Court Action forms are currently maintained on the state
117	court websi	te (www.mncourts.gov).

118 119	PART A. PROCEEDINGS, MOTIONS, AND ORDERS
120	RULE 301. SCOPE; TIME
121	Rule 301.01 Applicability of Rules
122	(a) Applicable Rule or Statute. Rules 301 through 3134 and, where applicable,
123	the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure, shall apply to family law practice Family Law
124	Actions except where they are in conflict with applicable statutes or the Expedited Child
125	Support Process Rules, Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 351 through 379.
126	(b) Included Proceedings. Rules 301 through 313 do not apply to proceedings
127	commenced in the Expedited Child Support Process, except for Rules 302.04, 303.05,
128	303.06, 308.02, and 313. The following types of proceedings are referred to in these rules
129	as Family Court Actions:
130	1. Marriage dissolution, legal separation, and annulment proceedings, and
131	child custody actions (Minnesota Statutes, chapter 518, section 260C.201, subd.
132	11(d)(1)(iii));
133	2. Child custody enforcement proceedings (Minnesota Statutes, chapter
134	<u>518D);</u>
135	3. Domestic abuse proceedings (Minnesota Statutes chapter 518B);
136	4. Proceedings to determine or enforce child support obligations
137	(Minnesota Statutes, chapters 518A, 518C- U.I.F.S.A., sections 256.87; 289A.50,
138	subd. 5; and 393.07, subd. 9);

139	5. Contempt actions proceedings in Family Court (Minnesota Statutes,
140	chapter 588);
141	6. Parentage determination proceedings (Minnesota Statutes, sections
142	<u>257.5174);</u>
143	7. Proceedings for support, maintenance or county reimbursement
144	judgments (Minnesota statutes, section 548.091);
145	8. Third-party custody proceedings (Minnesota Statutes, section chapter
146	257C); and
147	9. Proceedings pursuant to the Hague Convention on Civil Aspects of
148	International Child Abductions and the International Child Abduction Remedies
149	Act.
150	Other matters may be treated as family court matters by order of the court.
151	(c) Excluded proceedings. Rules 301 through 314 do not apply to proceedings
152	commenced in the Expedited Child Support Process, except for Rules 302.02, 303.05,
153	308.02, 309, 313, and 314.
154	(d) Applicability of Rules of Civil Procedure. The Minnesota Rules of Civil
155	Procedure apply to Family Court Actions as to matters not addressed by these rules. To
156	the extent there is any conflict in the rules, these rules govern.
157	
158 159	Advisory Committee Comment2011 Amendments Rules 301 through 314 were originally derived primarily from the Rules of
160	Family Court Procedure as they existed in 1992. These rules have been revised
161	in several important ways in the ensuing years, and were revised and completely
162	restated in 2011. The prior Advisory Committee Comments have been
163	incorporated into a single set of Advisory Committee Comments for the benefit
164	of the Minnesota Supreme Court as well as for courts and litigants. As is
165	consistently made clear by the orders that have amended the rules, the Advisory

Committee Comments are not adopted by the Supreme Court and do not have any official status. They reflect the views of the Supreme Court's advisory committees that have recommended amendments of the rules from time to time.

Rules 301 through 314 apply in the enumerated proceedings, comprising the majority of types of cases involving family relations. Adoption proceedings are governed by separate Rules of Adoption Procedure, adopted effective January 1, 2005.

Minn. R. Gen. Prac. 351.01 states that the Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules of Evidence, and General Rules of Practice shall apply to proceedings in the expedited process unless inconsistent with the Expedited Child Support Rules, Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 351 through 379. With the exception of Family Court Rules 302.02, 303.05, 303.06, 308.02, 309, 313 and 314, Rules 301-314 are inconsistent with the Expedited Child Support Rules and therefore do not apply to the expedited process.

#### **Rule 301.02 Time**

# Computation of time under these rules is governed by Rule 6 of the Minnesota

## Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### **Advisory Committee Comment--2011 Amendments**

The rules relating to computation of time are critical, and it is important that they be clear and predictable to all users of the court system. Rule 6 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure provides the appropriate clarity and makes it expressly applicable in family matters thereby eliminating any room for confusion. Rule 6 is consistent with the general day-counting rules set forth in Minn. Stat. § 645.15, and provides additional guidance for counting days where the periods of time are short and for responding to papers served by mail, or facsimile.

The time periods in the rules are intended to apply in most situations. Where unusual circumstances exist and justice so requires, the court may shorten the time limits. *See* Rule 2.05 of these rules.

#### RULE 302. COMMENCEMENT; CONTINUANCE; TIME; PARTIES

## **Rule 302.01** Commencement of Proceedings

(a) Service. Marriage dissolution, legal separation and annulment proceedings

Methods of Commencement. Family Court Actions shall be commenced by service of a summons and petition upon the person of the or other party, by alternate means authorized by statute, or by publication pursuant to court order. Service in other family

206	court proceedings shall be governed by the rules of civil procedure. upon the person of
207	the other party. Commencement can be accomplished by the following means:
208	(1) <b>Personal Service.</b> The summons and petition may be served upon the
209	person of the party to be served.
210	(2) Admission/Acknowledgment. Service may be accomplished when the
211	party to be served signs an admission of service or acknowledges service as permitted in
212	Minn. R. Civ. P. 4.05.
213	(3) Alternate Means. Service of the summons and petition may be made
214	accomplished by alternate means as authorized by statute.
215	(4) <b>Publication.</b> Service of the summons and petition may be made by
216	publication only upon an order of the court. If the respondent subsequently is located and
217	has not been served personally or by alternate means, personal service shall be made
218	before the final hearing.
219	(b) Service After Commencement. After a Family Law Action has been
220	commenced, service may be accomplished in accordance with Minn. R. Civ. P. 5.
221	(b) (c) Joint Petition in Marriage Dissolution Proceedings.
222	(1) No summons shall be required if a joint petition is filed to commence
223	marriage dissolution proceedings. Proceedings shall be deemed commenced when both
224	parties have signed the verified petition.
225	(2) Where the parties to a <u>marriage dissolution</u> proceeding agree on all
226	issues, the parties may proceed using a joint petition, agreement, and judgment and
227	decree for marriage dissolution.

- (3) Upon filing of the "Joint Petition, Agreement and Judgment and Decree," and the Confidential Information Form (Form 11.1 as published by the state court administrator), and a Notice to the Public Authority if required by Minn. Stat. § 518A.44, the court administrator shall place the matter on the appropriate calendar pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 518.13, subd. 5. A Certificate of Representation and Parties and documents required by Rules 306.01and 306.02 shall not be required if the "Joint Petition, Agreement and Judgment and Decree" published by the state court administrator is used.
- (4) The state court administrator shall <u>develop</u> maintain, publish and regularly update, or provide references to, forms that may be used by parties for purposes of this rule to file joint petitions to commence marriage dissolution proceedings. Court Administrators in each Judicial District shall make the forms available to the public at a reasonable cost.
- (c) Service by Alternate Means or Publication. Service of the summons and petition may be made by alternate means as authorized by statute. Service of the summons and petition may be made by publication only upon an order of the court. If the respondent subsequently is located and has not been served personally or by alternate means, personal service shall be made before the final hearing.

#### **Advisory Committee Comment--2011 Amendments**

Family court proceedings are generally governed by statute in Minnesota, and these rules implement the statutory procedures. Proceedings for dissolution, legal separation and annulment are governed in detail by Minnesota Statutes, chapter 518. *See generally* Minn. Stat. § 518.10 (requirements for petition); § 518.11 (service by publication and precluding substitute service or service by mail under Minn. R. Civ. P. 4.05); § 518.12 (requiring respondent's answer to be served within 30 days). Service "by alternate means" as authorized by

statute. See Minn. Stat. § 518.11 (authorizing service by various other means). The rule retains provision for service by publication because publication is authorized for a summons and petition that may affect title to real property. See Minn. Stat. § 518.11(c) (2010).

A joint proceeding is commenced on the date when both parties have signed the petition, and no summons is required. Minn. Stat. §§ 518.09 & 518.11. Rule 308.04 creates a procedure similar to that in Rule 302.01(c)(2) & (3). The Rule 302 procedure is available only in limited circumstances to allow for a completely streamlined procedure—use of a joint petition, agreement and judgment and decree of marriage dissolution without children or with children where the parties have agreed on all issues. The Rule 308 procedure is a more limited streamlined procedure, although it is available in any case, but it does not obviate service of a petition (or use of a separate joint petition). That procedure simply allows the parties to combine the marital termination agreement and judgment and decree into a single document. The decision to use the procedure established in Rule 308.04 may be made at any time, while the procedure in Rule 302.01(c) is, by its nature, limited to a decision prior to commencement of the proceedings.

Custody proceedings under the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act are governed by Minnesota Statutes, chapter 518D. Interstate service and notice must be accomplished at least 20 days prior to any hearing in Minnesota. Service within the state is governed by Minn. R. Civ. P. 4.

Domestic abuse order for protection proceedings are governed by Minnesota Statutes, chapter 518B. Notice and the timing of personal service on the respondent varies according to the circumstances detailed in the statute. "Support proceedings under the revised Uniform Interstate Enforcement of Support Act are governed by Minnesota Statutes, chapter 518C. The time for answer is governed by the law of the responding jurisdiction.

Statutes authorize commencement of certain Family Court Actions other than by summons and petition. Commencement of contempt proceedings under Minn. Stat. § 588.04 is addressed in Rule 309 of these rules. Court decisions set forth in *Rodewald v. Taylor*, 797 N.W.2d 729 (Minn. Ct. App. 2011), also permit commencement by motion following the signing of a Recognition of Parentage under Minn. Stat. § 257.75.

Actions to establish parentage are governed by Minnesota Statutes, chapter 257. Rule 314 of these rules addresses specific procedures applicable in these actions.

A child support proceeding that is not a IV(D) case as defined in Rule 352.01(g)) must be commenced in district court and is subject to Rules 301-314. Actions for reimbursement for public assistance are governed by Minn. Stat. § 256.87 and are governed by the expedited process rules, Rules 351, et seq. The Petitioner must notify the public agency responsible for support enforcement of all proceedings if either party is receiving or has applied for public assistance. Minn. Stat. § 518A.44.

A party appearing pro se is required to perform the acts required by rule or statute in the same manner as an attorney representing a party. An attorney dealing with a party appearing pro se shall proceed in the same manner, including service of process, as in dealing with an attorney.

#### Rule 302.02—Continuances

Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 122 shall be followed in connection with continuances for pre-hearings and trial settings. No continuance of a motion shall be granted unless requested within 3 days of receiving notice under Rule 303.01(a) and unless good cause is shown

#### **Rule 302.03 Time**

Time is governed by Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure, except where a different time is specified by statute. Procedural time limits may be shortened for good cause shown.

# Rule 302.04 Designation of Parties

- (a) Petitioner and Respondent. Parties to dissolution, legal separation, annulment, custody, domestic abuse, U.C.C.J.A., and R.U.R.E.S.A. proceedings Family Court Actions shall be designated as petitioner (joint petitioners or petitioner and copetitioner) and respondent. Parties to parentage and Minnesota Statutes, section 256.87 reimbursement actions shall be designated as plaintiff and defendant. After so designating the parties, it is permissible to refer to them as husband and wife, father and mother, or other designations if applicable by inserting the following in any petition, order, decree, etc.:
  - Petitioner is hereinafter referred to as (wife/husband familial designation), and respondent as (husband/wife familial designation).
- **(b) Guardians Ad Litem.** Appointment of a guardian ad litem <u>for minor</u> children is governed by the Rules of Guardian Ad Litem Procedure in Juvenile and

Family Court (Rules 901-913907). The guardian ad litem shall carry out the responsibilities set forth in the Rules of Guardian Ad Litem Procedure in Juvenile and Family Court. The guardian ad litem shall have the rights set forth in the Rules of Guardian Ad Litem Procedure in Juvenile and Family Court.

A guardian ad litem for minor children may be designated a party to the proceedings in the order of appointment. If the child is made a party to the proceeding, then the child's guardian ad litem shall also be made a party.

#### **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments**

Rule 302.02(a) specifies that the proper designation of parties in family court proceedings is as petitioner and respondent. Where a proceeding is commenced jointly, both parties may be designated as co-petitioners. The rule permits the parties, once properly designated in the appropriate pleadings, to be designated by less formal terms that indicate their relationship. The rule is amended to recognize that those designations are not limited to husband and wife, and other forms of relationships are encountered in family court proceedings. The "petitioner" and "respondent" labels are to be used in parentage cases, despite the historic use of "plaintiff" and "defendant" in these cases. There is no statutory or other requirement for the use of those labels, although at least one statute uses the term "defendant" in specifying the proper venue for these actions. See Minn. Stat. § 257.59. It is particularly helpful to use common terminology given the fact parentage proceedings may be combined with or joined with an action for dissolution, annulment, legal separation, custody under Minn. Stat. ch. 518, or reciprocal enforcement of support pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 257.59, subd. 1.

Rule 302.02(b) deals with guardians at litem. A guardian appointed pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 257.60 becomes a party to the action if the child is made a party. The guardian then would be entitled to initiate and respond to motions, conduct discovery, call and cross-examine witnesses, make oral or written arguments or reports and appeal on behalf of a child without the necessity of applying to the court. This rule applies to appointment of a guardian ad litem for minor children. Appointment of a guardian in other situations is governed by Rule 17.02 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.

A guardian appointed under Minnesota Statutes, section 518.165 is not a party to the proceeding, but may initiate and respond to motions and make oral statements and written reports on behalf of the child. A party has the right to cross-examine as an adverse witness the author of any report or recommendation on custody and visitation of a minor child. *Scheibe\_v. Scheibe*, 308 Minn. 449, 241 N.W.2d 100 (1976); *Thompson v. Thompson*, 288 Minn. 41, 55 N.W. 329 (1952).

# RULE 303. MOTIONS; EX PARTE EMERGENCY RELIEF; ORDERS TO SHOW CAUSE; ORDERS AND DECREES

# **Rule 303.01 Scheduling of Motions**

# (a) Notice. Notice of Obtaining Hearing Date.

- (1) All motions shall be accompanied by either an order to show cause or by a notice of motion which shall state, with particularity, the time and place of the hearing and the name of the judge, referee, or judicial officer, as assigned by the local assignment elerk.
- (2) Except in cases in which the parties reside in the same residence and there is a possibility of abuse, a party who obtains a date and time for hearing a motion shall promptly give written notice of the hearing date and time, and the name of the judicial officer, as assigned by the local assignment clerk, if known, and the primary issue(s) to be addressed at the hearing to all parties in the action. If the parties reside in the same residence and there is a possibility of abuse, notice shall be given in accordance with the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (1)b) Notice of Motion. All motions shall be accompanied by either an order to show cause in accordance with Minn. R. Gen. Prac. 303.05 or by a notice of motion which shall state, with particularity, the <u>date</u>, time, and place of the hearing and the name of the <u>judge</u>, referee, or judicial officer <u>if known</u>, as assigned by the local assignment clerk.
- (2) Except in cases in which the parties reside in the same residence and there is a possibility of abuse, a party who obtains a date and time for hearing a motion shall

promptly give notice of the hearing date and time and the name of the judge or referee, if known, to all other parties in the action. If the parties reside in the same residence and there is a possibility of abuse, notice shall be given in accordance with the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.

(bc) Notice of Time to Respond. All motions and orders to show cause shall contain the following statement:

The Rules establish deadlines for responding to motions. All responsive pleadings shall be served and mailed to or filed with the court administrator no later than five days prior to the scheduled hearing. The court may, in its discretion, disregard any responsive pleadings served or filed with the court administrator less than five days prior to such hearing in ruling on the motion or matter in question.

#### Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments

Rule 303.01 imposes a simple burden on any party, whether or not represented by counsel: to promptly advise the other parties when a hearing date is obtained from the court. The rule codifies common courtesy, but also serves specific purposes of reducing the need to reschedule motion hearings and permitting the other side to submit motions at the same hearing, if appropriate. "Promptly" is intentionally not rigidly defined, but notice should be sent the same day the hearing date is obtained. Notice of the assignment of a judicial officer also starts the time to remove an assigned judicial officer under Minn. R. Civ. P. 63.03 and Minn. Stat. § 542.16.

The Rule exempts a party from giving prior notice if there is a "possibility of abuse" and where the two parties share the same residence. This admittedly subjective standard is retained in the rule for the protection of victims of domestic violence. The trial court retains the authority to impose sanctions for the improper use of this exception.

#### Rule 303.02 Form of Motion

- (a) Specificity and Supporting Documents. Motions shall set out with particularity the relief requested in individually numbered paragraphs. All motions must be supported by appropriate signed, sworn and notarized affidavits that contain facts relevant and material to the issues before the court. The paragraphs of the affidavits should be specific and factual; where possible, they should be numbered to correspond to the paragraphs of the motion.
- (b) Application for Temporary Relief. When temporary financial relief is initially requested, such as child support, maintenance, payment of debt and attorney's fees the application for temporary relief is requested, the Parenting/Financial Disclosure Statement form developed by the state court administrator shall be served and filed by the moving and responding parties. Additional facts, limited to relevant and material matters, shall be added to the application form or by supplemental affidavit, along with their motions and affidavits. Sanctions for failure to comply include, but are not limited to, the striking of pleadings or hearing.

#### **Rule 303.03 Motion Practice**

## (a) Requirements for Motions.

(1) Moving Party, Supporting Documents, Time Limits. No motion shall be heard unless the initial moving party pays any required motion filing fee, properly serves a copy of the following documents on opposing counsel and files the original them with the court administrator at least 14 days prior to the hearing:

441	(i) Notice of motion and motion in the form required by Minn. Gen.
442	R. Prac. 303.01(a) and 303.02;
443	(ii) Motion;
444	(iii) Any relevant Relevant signed, sworn and notarized affidavits
445	and exhibits; and
446	(iviii) Any memorandum of law the party intends to submit.
447	(2) Motion Raising New Issues. A responding party raising new issues
448	other than those raised in the initial motion shall pay any required motion filing fee,
449	properly serve a copy of the following documents on opposing counsel, all parties and
450	file the original them with the court administrator at least 10 days prior to the hearing:
451	(i) Notice of motion and motion in form required by Minn. Gen. R.
452	Prac. 303.01 <del>(a);</del> and 303.02;-
453	(ii) Motion;
454	(iii) Any relevant Relevant signed, sworn and notarized, affidavits
455	and exhibits; and
456	(iv iii) Any memorandum of law the party intends to submit.
457	(3) Responding Party, Supporting Documents, Time Limits. The party
458	responding to issues raised in the initial motion, or the party responding to a motion
459	which that raises new issues, shall pay any required motion filing fee, properly serve a
460	copy of the following documents on opposing counsel all parties, and file the original
461	them with the court administrator at least five 5 days prior to the hearing, inclusive of
462	Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays:

- (i) Any memorandum of law the party intends to submit; and
- 464 (ii) Any relevant Relevant signed, sworn and notarized affidavits
  465 and exhibits.

- (4) Computation of Time for Service and Filing By Mail. Whenever this rule requires documents to be served and filed with the court administrator within a prescribed period of time before a specific event, service and filing may must be accomplished as required by mail, subject to the following: (i) 3 days shall be added to the prescribed period; and (ii) filing shall not be considered timely unless the documents are deposited in the mail within the prescribed period. Service of documents on parties by mail is subject to the provisions of Minn, R. Civ. R.-P. 5.02 and 6.05.
- (5) *Post-Trial Motions*. The timing provisions of Section 303.03(a) do not apply to post-trial motions.
- (b) Failure to Comply. In the event an initial a moving party fails to timely serve and file documents required in this rule, the hearing may be cancelled by the court. If responsive papers are not properly served and filed, the court may deem the initial motion or motion raising new issues unopposed and may issue an order without hearing. The court, in its discretion, may refuse to permit oral argument by the party not filing the required documents, may consider the matter unopposed, may allow reasonable attorney's fees, or may take other appropriate action.
- (c) Settlement Efforts. No motion, except a motion for temporary relief, will be heard unless the parties have conferred Except in parentage cases when there has been no court determination of the existence of the parent and child relationship and in situations

where a court has order that no contact occur between the parties, the moving party shall, within 7 days of filing a motion, initiate a settlement conference either in person, or by telephone, or in writing in an attempt to resolve their differences prior to the hearing. The moving party shall initiate such conference. In matters involving post-decree motions, if the parties are unable to resolve their differences in this conference they shall consider the use the issues raised. This conference shall include consideration of an appropriate ADR process under Rule 114 to attempt to accomplish resolution. The moving party shall certify to the court, before the time of the hearing, compliance with this rule or any reasons for not complying., including lack of availability or cooperation of opposing counsel. The moving party shall file a Certificate of Settlement Efforts in the form developed by the state court administrator not later than 24 hours before the hearing. Unless excused by the Court for good cause, no motion shall be heard unless the parties have complied with this rule. Whenever any pending motion is settled, the moving party shall promptly advise the court.

#### (d) Motion with Request for Oral Testimony.

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

(1) General Rule. Motions, except for contempt proceedings, shall be submitted on affidavits, exhibits, documents subpoenaed to the hearing, memoranda, and arguments of counsel unless otherwise ordered by the court for good cause shown. If demand is made except for contempt proceedings or as otherwise provided for in these rules.

(2) Request for Leave for Oral Testimony. Requests for the taking of oral testimony must be made by motion served and filed not later than the filing of that party's

initial motion papers., and if the matter cannot be heard adequately in the scheduled time, the hearing shall be utilized as a prehearing conference. Requests for hearing time in excess of one-half hour shall be submitted by written motion specifically setting forth the necessity and reason that evidence cannot be submitted by affidavit. The motion shall include names of witnesses, nature and length of testimony, including cross-examination, and types of exhibits, if any. The court may issue an order limiting the number of witnesses each party may call, the scope of their testimony, and the total time for each party to present evidence. Such an order shall be made only after the lawyer for each party has had an opportunity to suggest appropriate limits.

- (3) Request for Hearing Longer Than One-Half Hour. Requests for hearing time in excess of one-half hour must be submitted by separate written motion specifically setting forth the necessity and reason that evidence cannot be submitted by affidavit.
- (4) Conversion to Prehearing Conference. If the matter cannot be heard adequately in the scheduled time, the hearing shall be used as a prehearing conference.
- (5) Court Discretion to Solicit Oral Testimony. If the request required by subdivision (2) of this rule has not been made, the court shall not take oral testimony at the scheduled hearing unless the court in its discretion solicits additional evidence from the parties by oral testimony.
- (6) *Order*. In the event the court permits oral testimony, it may issue an order limiting the number of witnesses each party may call, the scope of their testimony,

and the total time for each party to present evidence. Each party shall be afforded an opportunity to suggest appropriate limits.

(7) *Interviews of Minor Children*. Any motion relating to custody or visitation shall additionally state whether either party desires the court to interview minor children. No child under the age of fourteen years will be allowed to testify without prior written notice to the other party and court approval.

#### **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments**

Motion practice in family law matters is intended to mirror, where appropriate to the needs of family law issues, the procedures followed generally in civil cases in Minnesota courts. The prevailing practice in Minnesota courts is for the submission of evidence relating to motions by written submissions, with sworn testimony provided by affidavit, deposition, or other written submissions. Rule 303.03(d)(1) restates that rule. The balance of Rule 303.03(d) addresses the process to request leave to present oral testimony in the limited circumstances where it may be appropriate. Minn. Stat. § 518.131, subd. 8, provides for allowing oral testimony upon demand of a party in requests for a temporary order or restraining order.

Rule 303.03(a)(5) makes it clear that the stringent timing requirements of the rule need not be followed on post-trial motions, such as a motion for a new trial or for amended findings made shortly after the conclusion of trial. *See* Minn. R. Civ. P. 52 & 59. This change is made to continue the uniformity in motion practice between family court matters and general civil cases, and is patterned on Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 115.01(c). Support, spousal maintenance, and custody modification motions, often brought months or years later, are subject to the general timing rules for motions.

The requirement in subsection (c) of an attempt to resolve motion disputes requires that the efforts to resolve the matter be made concluding the hearing, not before bringing the motion. The rule requires the moving party to initiate settlement efforts. If the motion is resolved, subsection (c) requires the parties to advise the court immediately.

The rule explicitly addresses the requirement for paying a motion filing fee. Since 2003, Minnesota law requires a fee for "filing a motion or response to a motion in civil, family, excluding child support, and guardianship case." *See* Minn. Stat. § 357.021, subd. 2(4).

## Rule 303.04 Ex parte and Emergency Relief

(a) Motion Governing Rules. The court may grant ex parte emergency relief only if requested by a motion with supporting affidavit, properly executed if the

567	requirements in this Rule 303.04 are met. If emergency relief is sought ex parte, the
568	party seeking the relief must demonstrate compliance with Rule 3 of these rules.
569	(b) Order to Show Cause. An order to show cause shall not be used to grant
570	ex parte relief except in those cases where permitted pursuant to Minn. Gen. R. Prac.
571	303.05.
572	(c) Filing. All such orders and supporting documents must be filed with the
573	order appropriately signed out for personal service. A conformed file copy of such order
574	shall be retained by the court administrator in the file.
575	(d) Interim Support Order. To insure support for an unemployed party or a
576	party with children pending a full temporary hearing, an initial order to show cause may,
577	if the situation warrants, contain the following:
578 579 580 581 582 583 584	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pending the aforesaid scheduled hearing, you, shall pay to the (petitioner) (respondent) commencing forthwith percent of your net earnings after the usual deductions for FICA, withholding taxes and group insurance, such payments to be made within 24 hours of your receipt of such earnings for each pay period. These payments are to insure that provision is made by you for the support of your (wife) (husband) (and) (children) pending the aforesaid hearing.
585 586	(c) Requirement of Motion; Form. The party seeking emergency relief must
587	state with specificity in a motion and affidavit:
588	The percentage to be used will be in accordance with the statutory child support
589	guidelines and such other factors related to maintenance as the court deems appropriate.
590	(i) Why emergency relief is required;
591	(ii) The relief requested;

592	(iii) Disclosure of any other attempts to obtain the same or similar relief
593	and the result;
594	(iv) If there was a prior attempt to obtain emergency relief, the name of the
595	judicial officer to whom the request was made;
596	(v) If a prior request was denied for the same or similar relief, explain what
597	new facts are presented to support the current motion.
598	(d) Proposed Order. The party seeking emergency relief must present a
599	proposed order for the court's consideration.
600	(e) Notice. The party seeking emergency relief must serve the motion and
601	affidavit, including notice of the time when and the place where the motion will be heard.
602	on the other party or counsel, unless:
603	(i) the party seeking emergency relief provides a written statement that the
604	party has made a good faith effort to contact the other party or counsel and has
605	been unsuccessful; or
606	(ii) The supporting documents show good cause why notice to the other
607	party should not be required and the court waives the notice requirement.
608	(f) Hearing. An order granting emergency relief without notice shall include a
609	return hearing date before the judicial officer hearing the matter. If the relief obtained
610	affects custody or parenting time, the court shall set the matter for hearing within 14 days
611	of the date the emergency relief is granted.
612	There must be a showing in the Application for Temporary Relief or separate
613	affidavit of the necessity for the interim order for support.

614

615

616

617

618 619

620

621

622 623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

#### **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments**

Rule 303.04 is amended to make clearer the circumstances that justify seeking either emergency or ex parte relief. "Emergency" and "ex parte" are not synonymous, though sometimes both might be justified in a particular situation. Emergency relief may be appropriate where there is urgency, not caused by lack of diligence on the part of the moving party, that makes the normal deadlines in the rules unworkable. Even where exigent circumstances justify shortening the deadlines, they do not generally excuse the giving of notice—or the attempt thereof—to the other side. Rare situations may, however, permit or even demand that notice not be given to the other side before seeking relief from the court. Where destruction of property or evidence is threatened, assets appear to be concealed or are threatened to be concealed, or the abduction of children has occurred or is threatened, or other situations exist where the giving of notice is likely to make any relief impossible to obtain, the court may consider the matter ex parte (without notice to the other side). Rule 3 of these rules provides clear guidelines on seeking ex parte relief. The standards of Rule 65.01 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure also provide guidance for relief in family law manners. See Minn. R. Civ. P. 65.01 (permitting relief without notice if "immediate and irreparable injury loss, or damage will result.").

As is true for temporary restraining orders, any order granted without notice to all parties should be of extremely short duration and the court should hold a hearing upon notice to all parties before continuing or extending the relief. The availability of temporary relief, and the limits on that relief, are set forth in Minn. Stat. § 518.131.

638 639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

### **Rule 303.05 Orders to Show Cause**

Orders to show cause shall be obtained in the same manner specified for ex-parte relief in Rule 3 of these rules. Such orders may require production of limited financial information. deemed necessary by the court. An order to show cause shall be issued only where the motion seeks a finding of contempt <u>under Rule 309</u> or the supporting affidavit makes an affirmative showing of:

- (a) a need to require the party to appear in person at the hearing, or
- (b) the  $\underline{a}$  need for interim support is warranted, or
- 648 (c) the production of limited financial information <u>is</u> deemed necessary by the
- 649 court<del>, or</del>

a need for the issuance of an order to show cause, subject to the discretion (d) 650 of the judge. such other limited relief and appropriate restraining orders, as addressed 651 individually in the separate supportive affidavit for ex-parte relief. 652 All orders to show cause must be appropriately signed out for service. A 653 conformed file copy of such order shall be retained by the court administrator in the file. 654 655 656 **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments** Orders to show cause should be issued only when it is necessary that a party 657 appear at a hearing. In most situations, the provision of notice of a hearing, and 658 allowing parties to appear if they choose to contest entry of the relief sought, is 659 sufficient. Orders to show cause are specifically authorized, in limited 660 circumstances, by statute. See, e.g., Minn. Stat. §§ 256.87, subd. 1; 393.07, 661 subd. 9; 518A.73; and 543.20. It is often preferable to use a notice of motion, 662 and if attendance is required, to issue a subpoena to a non-party. See, e.g., 663 Stevens County Social Service Dept. ex rel. Banken v. Banken, 403 N.W.2d 693 664 (Minn. Ct. App. 1987). Orders to show cause are a recognized part of contempt 665 proceedings. See, e.g., Minn. Stat. § 588.04. 666 Parties should be aware that improper use of an order to show cause can 667 result in the imposition of sanctions. See, e.g., Nelson v. Quade, 413 N.W.2d 668 824 (Minn. Ct. App. 1987). 669 Former rule 303.06 setting forth notices to be included in a final decree have 670 largely been obviated by statutorily required notices. Notices required under 671 statute are discussed in Rule 308.02 and its accompanying advisory committee 672 comment. 673 Rule 303.06 Orders and Decrees Requiring Child Support or Maintenance 674 All orders and judgments and decrees which include awards of child support 675 and/or maintenance, unless otherwise directed by the court, shall include the following 676 provisions: 677 That both parties are hereby notified that: 678 (a) Payment of support or maintenance, or both, is to be as ordered herein, and 679 the giving of gifts or making purchases of food, clothing and the like will not fulfill the 680 obligation. 681

682	(b) Payment of support must be made as it becomes due, and failure to secure,
683	or denial of rights of, visitation is not an excuse for nonpayment, but the aggrieved party
684	must seek relief through proper motion filed with the court.
685	(c) The payment of support or maintenance, or both, takes priority over payment
686	of debts and other obligations.
687	(d) A party who remarries after dissolution and accepts additional obligations of
688	support does so with full knowledge of his or her prior obligations under this proceeding.
689	(e) Child support and maintenance are based on annual income, and it is the
690	responsibility of a person with seasonal employment to budget income so that payments
691	are made regularly throughout the year as ordered.
692	
693	RULE 304. SCHEDULING OF CASES
694	Rule 304.01 Scope
695	The purpose of this rule is to provide a uniform system Rules 304.01 through
696	304.05 provide for scheduling matters for disposition and trial in all proceedings in f
697	<u>Family eCourt Actions</u> , excluding only the following:
698	(a) Actions for reimbursement of public assistance (Minn. Stat. § 256.87);
699	(b) Contempt (Minn. Stat. ch. 588);
700	(c) Domestic abuse proceedings (Minn. Stat. ch. 518B);
701	(d) Child custody enforcement proceedings (Minn. Stat. ch. 518AD);
702	(e) Support enforcement proceedings (Minn. Stat. ch. 518CR.U.RI.EF.S.A.);
703	(f) Withholding of refunds from support debtors (Minn. Stat. § 289A.50, subd. 5);

704	(g) Proceedings to compel payment of child support (Minn. Stat. § 393.07, subd.
705	9);- <del>and</del>
706	(h) Proceedings for support, maintenance or county reimbursement judgments
707	(Minn. Stat. § 548.091); and
708	(i) Expedited Child Support Proceedings.
709	Rule 304.06 applies to all Family Court Actions.
710	Rule 304.02 The Party's Informational Statement Initial Case Management
711	(a) Timing. Within 60 days after filing an action or, if a temporary hearing
712	is scheduled within 60 days of the filing of the action, then within 60 days after a
713	temporary hearing is initially scheduled to occur, whichever is later, each party shall
714	submit, on a form to be available from the court and developed by the state court
715	administrator, the information needed by the court to manage and schedule the case.
716	(b) Content. The information provided shall include:
717	(1) Whether minor children are involved, and if so:
718	(i) Whether custody is in dispute; and
719	(ii) Whether the case involves any issues seriously affecting
720	the welfare of the children;
721	(2) Whether the case involves complex evaluation issues, and/or
722	marital and nonmarital property issues;
723	(3) Whether the case needs to be expedited, and if so, the specific
724	supporting facts:

725	(4) Whether the case is complex, and if so, the specific supporting
726	<del>facts;</del>
727	(5) Specific facts about the case which will affect readiness for trial;
728	(6) Recommended alternative dispute resolution process, the timing of
729	the process, the identity of the neutral selected by the parties or, if the neutral has
730	not yet been selected, the deadline for selection of the neutral. If ADR is believed
731	to be inappropriate, a description of the reasons supporting this conclusion;
732	(7) Identification of interpreter services (specifying language and, if
733	known, particular dialect) any party anticipates will be required for any witness or
734	<del>party: and</del>
735	(8) A proposal for establishing any of the deadlines or dates to be
736	included in a scheduling order pursuant to this rule.
737	(c) Unrepresented Parties. Parties not represented by a lawyer may use forms
738	developed specially by the state court administrator for unrepresented parties.
739	Within 60 days after the initial filing in a case, or sooner if the court requires, the
740	parties shall file an Initial Case Management Statement that substantially conforms to the
741	form developed by the state court administrator.
742 743 744 745 746 747	Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments  Rule 304.02 is amended to reflect the more varied approaches to case management being used in Minnesota courts. The Initial Case Management form replaces the former Party's Information Statement form and is intended to be a more flexible device for obtaining information to be used by the court in making case-management decisions.

#### Rule 304.03 Scheduling Order

- (a) When Issued. Within thirty days after the expiration of the time set forth in Minn. Gen. R. Prae. Rule 304.02 for filing informational statements an Initial Case Management statement, the court shall enter its scheduling order. The court may issue the order after either a telephone or in court conference, or without a conference or hearing if none is needed.
- **(b) Contents of Order.** The scheduling order shall provide for alternative dispute resolution as required by Rule 114.04(c) and may establish any of the following:
  - (1) Deadlines or specific dates for the completion of discovery and other pretrial preparation alternative dispute resolution including but not limited to mediation and early neutral evaluations;
  - (2) Deadlines or specific dates for serving, filing or hearing motions the completion of discovery and other pretrial preparation;
    - (3) Deadlines or specific dates for <u>serving</u>, filing or hearing motions;
  - (4) A deadline or specific date for the prehearing conference; and custody, parenting time or property evaluations;
    - (5) A deadline or specific date for the prehearing pretrial conference; and
    - (6) A deadline or specific date for the trial or final hearing.

#### Rule 304.04 Amendment

A scheduling order pursuant to this rule may be amended at a prehearing any pretrial or settlement conference, or upon motion for good cause shown, or upon approval by authorized court personnel if there is agreement of all parties., or upon stipulation of the parties if approved by the court.

#### Rule 304.05. Collaborative Law

A scheduling order under this rule may include provision for deferral on the calendar pursuant to Rule 111.05(b) of these rules and for exemption from additional ADR requirements pursuant to Rule 111.05(c).

# Rule 304.06 Continuances

- (a) Trial. Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 122 governs continuances for trial settings unless the court directs otherwise.
- (b) Motions and Pretrial. A request for a continuance of a motion or pretrial conference shall be in writing and set forth the basis for the request.

#### RULE 305. PREHEARING PRETRIAL CONFERENCES

## Rule 305.01 Prehearing Parenting/Financial Disclosure Statement

Each party shall complete a prehearing conference Parenting/Financial Disclosure statement substantially in the form developed by the state court administrator which shall be served upon all parties and mailed to or filed with the court at least 107 days prior to the date of the prehearing pretrial conference.

## **Rule 305.02 Prehearing Pretrial Conference Attendance**

- parties and lawyers who will try the proceedings shall attend the prehearing pretrial conference, prepared to negotiate a final settlement. The lawyers attending the pretrial conference must have authority to settle the case. If a stipulation is reduced to writing prior to the prehearing pretrial conference, the case may be heard administratively or as a default at the time scheduled for the conference. In that the event, the matter will proceed as a default, then only the party obtaining the decree need appear.
- **(b) Failure to Appear**—**Sanctions.** If a party fails to appear at a prehearing pretrial conference, the court may dispose of the proceedings without further notice to that party.
- (c) Failure to Comply—Sanctions. Failure to comply with the rules relating to prehearing pretrial conferences may result in the case being stricken from the contested calendar, granting of partial relief to the appearing party, striking of the nonappearing party's pleadings and the hearing of the matter as a default, award of attorney fees and costs, and such other relief as the court finds appropriate, without further notice to the defaulting party.

# Rule 305.03 Prehearing Conference Order for Trial or Continued Pretrial Conference

If the parties are unable to resolve the case, in whole or in part, at the prehearing pretrial conference, the court shall issue an order which that schedules any remaining discovery and any contemplated motions, identifies the contested issues for trial, and

provides for the exchange of witness lists and exhibits to be offered at trial. The order shall identify and describe the resolution of uncontested issues which that have been placed on the record.

#### **RULE 306. DEFAULT**

## Rule 306.01 Scheduling of Final Hearing

Except when proceeding under Rule 302.01(b) by Joint Petition, Agreement and Judgment and Decree, to place a <u>marriage dissolution</u> matter on the default calendar for final hearing or for approval without hearing pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 518.13, subdivision 5, the moving party shall submit a <u>default scheduling request</u> substantially in the <u>Default Scheduling Request</u> form developed by the state court administrator and shall comply with the following, as applicable:

- (a) Without Stipulation—No Appearance. In all default proceedings where a stipulation has not been filed, an affidavit Affidavit of default Default and of nonmilitary status Nonmilitary Status of the defaulting party or a waiver by that party of any rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, as amended, shall be filed with the court.
- **(b) Without Stipulation—Appearance.** Where the defaulting party has appeared by a pleading other than an answer, or personally without a pleading, and has not affirmatively waived notice of the other party's right to a default hearing, the moving party shall notify the defaulting party in writing at least fourteen (14) days before the final hearing of the intent to proceed to Judgment. The notice shall state:

830	You are hereby no	otified that an application has been made for a final
831	hearing to be held on	, 20, at:m. at
832		a date not sooner than fourteen (14) days from the

date of this notice]. You are further notified that the court will be requested 833 to grant the relief requested in the petition at the hearing. You should 834 contact the undersigned and the District Court Administrator immediately if 835 you have any defense to assert to this default judgment and decree. 836 The default hearing will not be held until the notice has been mailed to the defaulting 837 party at the last known address and an affidavit of service by mail has been filed. 838 If the case is to proceed administratively without a hearing under Minn. Stat. § 839 518.13, subdivision 5, then the notice shall be sent after the expiration of the 30-day 840 answer period, but at least fourteen (14) days before submission of a default scheduling 841 request as required by this rule, and shall state: 842 You are hereby notified that an application will be made for a final 843 judgment and decree to be entered not sooner than fourteen (14) days from 844 the date of this notice. You are further notified that the court will be 845 requested to grant the relief requested in the Petition. You should contact 846 the undersigned and the District Court Administrator immediately if you 847 have any defense to assert to this default judgment and decree. 848 **Default with Stipulation.** Whenever a stipulation settling all issues has (c) 849 been executed by the parties, the stipulation shall be filed with an affidavit of nonmilitary 850 status of the defaulting party or a waiver of that party's rights under the Servicemembers 851 Civil Relief Act, as amended, if not included in the stipulation. 852 In a stipulation where a party appears pro se, the following waiver shall be 853 executed by that party: 854 I know I have the right to be represented by a lawyer of my choice. I 855 hereby expressly waive that right and I freely and voluntarily sign the 856 foregoing stipulation. 857 **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments** 858 Rule 306 attempts to make clear the role of notice required to be given to 859 parties who are in default but who have "appeared" in some way in marriage 860 dissolution proceedings. A party is not entitled to prevent entry of judgment if 861

that party is in default by not serving and filing a timely written answer to the

862

Petition. Nonetheless, the court may, in its discretion, consider some appropriate measures to prevent the case from being decided on a default basis and to obviate a motion for relief from the default judgment and decree. Accordingly, the rule is amended to afford more useful notice as to the request for a default. Defaults in other types of family proceedings are governed by Rule 55 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.

The rule does not define how a party might appear either by "a pleading other than an answer," or "personally without a pleading." Both conditions should be limited to actions that approach responding to the Petition despite the fact they may be insufficient as a matter of law to stand as a response. Sending a letter that responds to a Petition might suffice for the first condition, as might a letter to the court. Appearing at a court hearing despite having not answered would certainly meet the "appeared personally" condition. When in doubt as to other circumstances, the party seeking a default should, to comply with Rule 306.01(b), provide the required notice, with the expectation that many of these responses that fall short of an answer will not prevent entry of judgment.

#### 

## Rule 306.02 Preparation of Decree [Abrogated]

Except in a proceeding under <u>Rule 302.01(b)</u> commenced by Joint Petition, Agreement and Judgment and Decree, or in a scheduled default matter, proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, order for judgment and judgment and decree shall be submitted to the court in advance of, or at, the final hearing.

#### 

#### **Advisory Committee Comment—2011 Amendments**

Rule 306.02 is abrogated because it sets forth procedures that do not need to be established by rule and in practice individual judges deal with the preparation of a decree in different ways. The court may still require the submission of proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, order for judgment, and judgment and decree in advance of the hearing.

# 

#### **RULE 307. FINAL HEARINGS**

hearing may result in the case being stricken from the contested calendar, granting of partial relief to the appearing party, striking of the nonappearing party's pleadings and the hearing of the matter as a default, an award of attorney's fees and costs, and such other relief as the court finds appropriate, without further notice to the defaulting party.

a stipulation has been entered orally upon the record, the lawyer directed to prepare the decree shall submit it to the court with a copy to each party. Unless a written, fully executed stipulation is filed or unless the decree contains the written approval of the lawyer for each party or the other party or their legal representative, a transcript of the oral stipulation shall be filed by the lawyer directed to prepare the decree. Responsibility for the cost of the transcript shall be determined by the court. Entry of the decree shall be deferred for fourteen (14) days to allow for objections unless the decree contains the written approval of the lawyer for each party, or the other party if not represented.

# RULE 308. FINAL ORDER, JUDGMENT OR DECREE

# Rule 308.01 Notices; Service

- (a) Awards of Child Support and/or Maintenance. All <u>orders</u>, judgments, and decrees which that include awards of child support and/or maintenance, unless otherwise directed by the court, shall include the provisions set forth in Minnesota Gen. R. Prac. 303.06. Statutes section 518.68 (Appendix A).
- (b) Public Assistance. When a party is receiving or has applied for public assistance, the party obtaining the judgment and decree shall serve a copy of the judgment and decree on the agency responsible for child support enforcement, and the decree shall direct that all payments of child support and spousal maintenance shall be made to the agency providing the assistance Minnesota Child Support Central Payment Center for as long as the custodial parent is receiving assistance.

- (c) Child Support Enforcement. When a private party has applied for or is using the services of the local child support enforcement agency, a copy of the decree shall be served by mail by the party submitting the decree for execution upon the county agency involved.
- (d) Supervised Custody Parenting Time or Visitation. A copy of any judgment and decree or other order directing ongoing supervision of custody parenting time or visitation shall be provided to the appropriate agency by the party obtaining the decree or other order.

# **Rule 308.02 Statutorily Required Notices**

Where statutes require that certain subjects be addressed by notices in an order or decree, the notices <u>may</u> shall not be included verbatim but shall be set forth in an attachment and incorporated by reference.

#### **Rule 308.03 Sensitive Matters**

Whenever the findings of fact include private or sensitive matters as determined by the court, a party may submit a judgment and decree may be supported by separate documents comprising findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order for judgment.

# Rule 308.04. Joint Marital Agreement and Decree

The parties to any <u>marital dissolution</u> proceeding may use a combined agreement and judgment and decree <u>for marriage dissolution</u>. A judgment and decree <u>which that</u> is subscribed to by each party before a notary public and contains a final conclusion of law with words to the effect that "the parties agree that the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law incorporate the complete and full <u>Marital Termination Agreement</u>

agreement" shall, upon approval and entry by the court, constitute an agreement and judgment and decree for marriage dissolution for all purposes.

#### **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendment**

Rule 308.02 refers to statutory notice. The legislature has established numerous forms of notice including those required by Minn. Stat. § 518.68. These requirements are met in a two-page notice form, which is known as Appendix A and labeled as FAM 301 on the state court website (www.mncourts.gov, under "Court Forms" click on "Other").

Rule 308.04 allows parties in any marriage dissolution proceeding, whether commenced by petition or joint petition, to use a combined agreement and judgment and decree. The agreement is often termed a "marital termination agreement," but that label is not required by the rule. The primary benefit of this procedure is to reduce the risk of discrepancy between the terms of a marital termination agreement and the judgment and decree it purports to authorize. This procedure should benefit both the parties and the court in streamlining the court procedure where the parties are in agreement. The rule permits the parties to use this procedure by agreement, but does not require its use.

The procedure in Rule 308.04 is similar to the procedure for use of combined Joint Petition, Agreement and Judgment and Decree under Rule 302.01(b)(2), and is available in all cases where the parties agree on all issues.

The use of this procedure will result in the marital termination agreement becoming an integral part of the judgment and decree, which will render it a public record. To the extent the parties' agreement contains confidential information, they should consider alternative methods of protecting that information, such as use of separate documents as provided for in Rule 308.03 so the agreement is not filed or the use of the confidentiality protection procedures contained in Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 11.

#### **RULE 309. CONTEMPT**

#### **Rule 309.01 Initiation**

(a) Moving Papers—Service; Notice. Contempt proceedings may be initiated by notice of motion and motion or by an order to show cause served upon the person of the alleged contemnor together with motions accompanied by appropriate supporting affidavits. Pursuant to Rule 303.05 an order to show cause may be issued by the court without notice to the alleged contemnor provided the supporting affidavits credibly raise an issue of contempt.

(b) Content of Order to Show Cause or Notice of Motion and Motion. The order to show cause shall direct the alleged contemnor to appear and show cause why he or she should not be held in contempt of court and why the moving party should not be granted the relief requested by the motion. If proceeding by notice of motion and motion, the motion may seek that relief directly.

The notice of motion and motion or the order to show cause shall contain at least the following:

- (1) a reference to the specific order <u>or judgment</u> of the court alleged to have been violated and <u>the</u> date of entry <u>or filing</u> of the order<u>or judgment</u>;
  - (2) a quotation of the specific applicable provisions ordered; and
  - (3) the alleged failures to comply;

- (4) notice to the alleged contemnor that his or her ability to pay is a crucial issue in the contempt proceeding and that a Parenting/Financial Disclosure

  Statement form for submitting ability to pay information is available from the state court website, and this form should be served and filed with the court at or before the contempt hearing; and
- (5) a date to appear for a Rule 309.02 hearing no later than 30 days subsequent to the issuance of the notice of motion or order to show cause.
- (bc) Affidavits. The supportive affidavit of the moving party shall set forth each alleged violation of the order with particularity. Where the alleged violation is a failure to pay sums of money, the affidavit shall state the kind of payments in default and shall

specifically set forth the payment dates and the amounts due, paid and unpaid for each failure.

 The Any responsive affidavit shall set forth with particularity any defenses the alleged contemnor will present to the court. Where the alleged violation is a failure to pay sums of money, the affidavit shall set forth the nature, dates and amount of payments, if any.

The supportive affidavit and the responsive affidavit shall contain numbered paragraphs which shall be numbered to correspond to the paragraphs of the motion where possible.

#### **Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments**

Rule 309.01 does not require that contempt proceeding be commenced by an order to show cause, even though that is the most common and most direct means of commencing the proceedings. Although an order to show cause is an available mechanism for initiating contempt proceedings, the authorizing statute also recognizes that these proceedings may be commenced by motion accompanied by appropriate notice. See Minn. Stat. § 588.04. The amendment to Rule 309.01 is intended simply to recognize that both mechanisms are available. In many situations, proceeding by order to show cause is preferable. Use of an order to show cause, which is court process served with the same formality as a summons, permits the court to impose sanctions directly upon failure to comply. See Minn. Stat. § 588.04. The order to show cause is still the preferred means to commence a contempt proceeding if there is meaningful risk that the alleged contemnor will not to appear in response to a notice of Service of the order to show cause upon the person provides jurisdiction for the issuance of a writ of attachment or bench warrant, if necessary, and meets the requirement for notice of an opportunity to be heard. See Clausen v. Clausen, 250 Minn. 293, 84 N.W.2d 675 (1976); Hopp v. Hopp, 279 Minn. 170, 156 N.W.2d 212 (1968).

The requirement in Rule 309.01(b)(5) that a hearing be held within 30 days of issuance of an order or notice of motion is intended to create the standard rule and to underscore the importance of holding the hearing promptly so that the contempt issues may be resolved. Where exceptional circumstances are found to exist by the court, the hearing may be held later than 30 days from the order or notice, but it should still be heard by the court as promptly as possible.

# Rule 309.02 Hearing

The alleged contemnor must appear in person before the court to be afforded the opportunity to resist respond to the motion for contempt by sworn testimony. The court shall not act upon affidavit alone, absent express waiver by the alleged contemnor of the right to offer sworn testimony.

# Rule 309.03 Sentencing

- (a) Default of Conditions for Stay. Where the court has entered an order for contempt with a stay of sentence and there has been a default in the performance of the condition(s) for the stay, before a writ of attachment or a bench warrant will be issued, an affidavit of noncompliance and request for writ of attachment must be served upon the person of the defaulting party, unless the person is shown to be avoiding service.
- **(b) Writ of Attachment.** The writ of attachment shall direct law enforcement officers to bring the defaulting party before the court for a hearing to show cause why the stay of sentence should not be revoked. A proposed order for writ of attachment shall be submitted to the court by the moving party.

## Rule 309.04 Findings

An order finding contempt must be accompanied by appropriate findings of fact.

Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments

Rule 309.04 requires findings. Findings are required to permit appellate review of a contempt order. In cases where incarceration is a consequence of a contempt finding, due process may require notice to the alleged contemnor of the right to show inability to pay and findings on that issue. See Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. \_\_\_, 131 S. Ct. \_\_\_, 180 L. Ed. 2d 254 (2011).

#### RULE 310. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

## Rule 310.01 Applicability

- (a) When ADR Required. All family law matters in district court are subject to Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) processes as established in Rule 114, except for:
  - 1. actions enumerated in Minn. Stat., ch. 518B (Domestic Abuse Act),
- 2. contempt actions, and
  - 3. maintenance, support, and parentage actions when the public agency responsible for child support enforcement is a party or is providing services to a party with respect to the action.
- (b) ADR When There Is Domestic Abuse. The court shall not require parties to participate in any facilitative process if one of the parties claims to be the victim of domestic abuse by the other party or if the court determines there is probable cause that one of the parties or a child of the parties has been physically abused or threatened with physical abuse by the other party. In circumstances when the court is satisfied that the parties have been advised by counsel and have agreed to an ADR process established in Rule 114 that will not involve require face-to-face meeting of the parties, the court may direct that the ADR process be used.

The court shall not require parties to attempt ADR if they have made an unsuccessful effort to settle all issues previously engaged in an ADR process under Rule

114 with a qualified neutral before the filing of Informational Statement. and reached an impasse.

1081	Rule 310.02 Post-Decree Matters
1082	The court may order ADR under Rule 114 in matters involving post-decree relief.
1083	The parties shall discuss the use of ADR as part of the settlement conference required by
1084	Rule 303.03(c).
1085	Rules 310.03-310.09 (Deleted effective July 1, 1997.)
1086	
1087	RULE 311. FORMS
1088	The forms developed by the state court administrator are sufficient under these
1089	rules. Forms are currently maintained on the state court website (www.mncourts.gov).
1090	Court Administrators in each Judicial District shall make the forms available to the public
1091	at a reasonable cost.
1092	
1092	Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments
1094	Rule 311 establishes that court-established forms for family matters are
1095	deemed sufficient under the rules. These specific forms are not required to be
1096	used, but they contain what is required and are therefore appropriate for use.
1097	These rules direct the state court administrator to develop various forms: See
1098	Rules 303.02(b) (Parenting/Financial Disclosure Statement); 303.03(c)
1099	(Certificate of Settlement Efforts); 304.02(Initial Case Management Statement);
1100	305.01(Parenting/Financial Disclosure statement); and 306.01 (Default
1101	Scheduling Request). By maintaining the forms on the courts' website they can
1102	be readily updated and distributed to all potential users.
1103	
1104 1105	
1105	RULE 312. REVIEW OF REFEREE'S FINDINGS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
1107	Review of decisions of district court referees is controlled by applicable statutes
1108	and orders of the supreme court.
1109	
1110	Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments
1111	Rule 312 is amended to replace the former rule, which established now-

obsolete procedures for review of the findings or recommendations of a district

court referee in family law matters. Family court referees are now used in

limited circumstances in two districts, and the processes followed are

established by statute and supreme court orders. Under Minn. Stat. § 484.65,

1112

1113

1114

1115

subd. 9, recommended orders and findings of Fourth Judicial District referees are subject to confirmation by district court judge, and once confirmed by the district court judge the orders and findings may be appealed directly to the court of appeals. Essentially the same is true in the Second Judicial District under a series of orders establishing a pilot project that is still operating. The history of the pilot project is set forth by the Minnesota Court of Appeals in its Special Term Opinion in *Culver v. Culver*, No. A09-0739 (Minn. Ct. App., Sept. 1, 2009):

The pilot project came into existence in the Second Judicial District in 1996. See 1996 Minn. Laws ch. 365, § 2 (allowing Second Judicial District to implement pilot project assigning related family matters to single judge or referee); In re Second Judicial Dist. Combined Family, Civil Harassment, Juvenile Probate Jurisdiction Pilot Project, No. CX–89–1863 (Minn. Apr. 10, 1996) (suspending, in light of pilot project, Minn. R. Gen. Pract. 312.01, which recites procedure for district-court review upon filing of petition for review). The suspension is still in effect. See 1998 Minn. Laws ch. 367, art. 11, § 26 (extending pilot-project legislation); 2000 Minn. Law ch. 452, § 1 (same); 2002 Minn. Law ch. 242 (same); In re Second Judicial Dist. Combined Family, Civil Harassment, Juvenile Probate Jurisdiction Pilot Project, No. CX–89–1863 (Minn. June 17, 1998) (extending suspension); (Minn. May 23, 2000) (same); (Minn. June 3, 2002) (extending suspension until further order of supreme court).

Slip. Op. 5, n.1.

# Rule 312.01 Notice of Assignment to Judge; Parties' Submissions

Upon the filing of the notice of review of a referee's findings or recommended order, the court administrator shall notify each party:

- (a) of the name of the judge to whom the review has been assigned;
- (b) that the moving party shall have 10 days from the date of mailing the notice of assignment in which to file and serve a memorandum; and
- (c) that the responding party(s) shall have 20 days from the date of mailing the notice of assignment within which to file and serve a responsive memorandum.

Failure to file and serve these submissions on a timely basis may result in dismissal of the review or disallowance of the submissions. No additional evidence may be filed and no personal appearance will be allowed except upon order of the court for good cause shown after notice of motion and motion.

The review shall be based on the record before the referee and additional evidence will not be considered, except for compelling circumstances constituting good cause.

#### Rule 312.02 Transcript of Referee's Hearing

Any party desiring to submit a transcript of the hearing held before the referee shall make arrangements with the court reporter at the earliest possible time. The court reporter must advise the parties and the court of the date by which the transcript will be filed. The order and submission of the transcript shall not delay the due dates for the submissions described in Rule 312.01.

#### RULE 313. CONFIDENTIAL NUMBERS AND TAX RETURNS

The requirements of Rule 11 of these rules regarding submission of restricted identifiers (e.g., social security numbers, employer identification numbers, financial account numbers) and financial source documents (e.g., tax returns, wage stubs, credit card statements) apply to all family court matters.

# **RULE 314. PARENTAGE PROCEEDINGS**

In proceedings to determine parentage, the following additional rules apply:

- (a) Parentage proceedings are commenced by a Summons and Complaint.
- (b) The parties in parentage proceedings are one or more Petitioners and one or more Respondents, and must be so named in the initial pleadings. After so designating the parties, it is permissible to use descriptive labels as allowed by Rule 302.02(a).

#### (c) Upon proper demand, the parties to parentage proceedings may obtain a jury

#### 1176 <u>trial.</u>

#### Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments

Rule 314 is a new rule, included to collect in one place the special procedures followed in parentage (paternity) cases. The rule is not the source of the procedures set forth in the rule; these procedures are either dictated by statute or common law. *See, e.g.*, Minn. Stat. §§ 257.57, 257.67 (commencement of parentage action and specifying that the proper designation of parties in family court proceedings is as petitioner and respondent). Where a proceeding is commenced jointly, both parties may be designated as copetitioners or as petitioner and co-petitioner. The rule permits the parties, once properly designated in the appropriate pleadings, to be designated by less formal terms that indicate their relationship. *See* Rule 302.02(a). Parentage proceedings may be brought by a parent as well as a governmental entity, thus the provision for plural petitioners in Rule 314(b); they are commonly brought against multiple respondents.

Rule 314 provides additional rules applicable to parentage proceedings. As to a wide array of procedural matters not addressed in this rule, other rules govern their use. Rule 301.01; *see*, *e.g.*, Minn. R. Civ. P. 56 (summary judgment); Minn. R. Civ. P. 55 (default).

#### SUPERVISING ATTORNEY

Ron Elwood

# OFFICE MANAGER Colette Tate



#### **ATTORNEYS**

Melinda T. Hugdahl Jessica L. Webster Stacie L. Weeks

#### **LEGAL SERVICES ADVOCACY PROJECT**

OFFICE OF APPELLATE COURTS

NOV 1 4 2011

FILED

November 14, 2011

Ms. Bridget Gernander Clerk of the Appellate Courts 25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155

**RE:** Amendments to the General Rules of Practice – Family Court Rules

Dear Ms. Gernander:

The following are comments submitted on behalf of all of the Minnesota regional legal services programs (Legal Services) in response to the Supreme Court's October 14, 2011 Order inviting comment on the proposed changes to the General Rules of Practice. Legal Services represents or advises thousands of low-income clients across Minnesota each year in a variety of matters, including family law. These comments focus on the proposed changes to the Rules of Family Court.

We appreciate the thoughtful work of the Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General Rules of Practice. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee represent a significant improvement from the original proposal in many areas. We have two remaining concerns, and offer a proposed solution to each for your consideration.

#### 1. Rule 303.03 and Rule 310.01 - Certificate of Settlement Efforts and ADR

The proposed rule requires a pre-hearing settlement conference utilizing alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and requiring the filing of a certificate of settlement efforts. If the certificate is not filed, the motion may not be heard. Our concern is that the lack of ADR resources for low-income litigants will preclude relief by the court. Under current practice, Rule 114.11 of the Rules of General Practice exempts parties from the ADR requirement if: (1) they are unable to pay; and (2) no free or reduced-fee ADR services exist. Because the proposed Family Court Rules provide that the Family Court Rules supersede if they are in conflict with the broader Rules of General Practice, mandatory participation in ADR would appear to override the exemption in the General Rules.

Additionally, it appears that Rule 303.03 is in conflict with Rule 310.01. Rule 310.01 provides multiple exceptions to ADR in the context of family law cases, none of which exist in Rule 303.03, even though Rule 303.03 requires ADR.

A solution to remedy this conflict would simply be to: (1) specifically include the language of Rule 114.11 of the Rules of General Practice in Rule 303.03 and Rule 310.01 (ADR rule in Family Court Procedures); (2) create a cross-reference to Rule 310.01 in Rule 303.03 so that the exceptions apply uniformly; and (3) provide on the proposed Settlement Efforts form prepared by the State Court Administrator a place to designate that ADR was not required.

# 2. Rule 304.02 and Rule 304.03 - Initial Case Management and Scheduling Order

The proposed rule requires parties to file the Initial Case Management Statement within 60 days of filing a family court action. The proposed rules require the court to issue a scheduling order within 30 days of the filing of the Case Management Statement. In comparing the existing and proposed rules and processes, it appears that the rules partially merge the existing rule processes with the Initial Case Management (ICMC) process. However, because they are two completely different processes, we believe that either they should be merged completely or kept completely separate.

The two processes become confused by the proposal to rename the Informational Statement the Initial Case Management Statement, which infers a merger of the current process with the ICMC process. However, it is our experience that they are two distinctly different processes - the ICMC notice (schedule) is sent by the courts immediately after filing, whereas a renamed Initial Case Management Statement can be filed within the first 60 days after filing, and a Scheduling Order is to be filed 30 days after that.

Similarly, the name change creates confusion about whether the scheduling order means the scheduling order as it currently exists, or whether it would now include the ICMC notice. If the intent is to merge the processes, then the scheduling order including the ICMC notice cannot be sent for up to 90 days after filing, which diminishes ICMC's goal of early intervention.

Furthermore, if the processes are combined, the rules must be consistent with the default period for filing an Answer. As currently proposed, the process would put the default timeline in the middle of the Initial Case Management submission timeline. As a result, if an ICMC notice is sent *prior* to the time period to file an Answer or default, but scheduling hearings for *after* the default timeline passes, litigants inadvertently default because they followed the later ICMC notice, rather than the original timeline to file an Answer.

Therefore, it is our suggestion to either: (1) keep the two processes separate and retain the form's designation as the Informational Statement to avoid confusion; or (2) intentionally change the name and merge the two processes. If the process is merged, a shortened time period of filing the Initial Case Management statement must be implemented to keep the early intervention working while recognizing the default timelines. One suggestion to accommodate both goals is to require the Initial Case Management Statement to be filed within 30 days of filing the action, which would trigger the ICMC notice/scheduling order within the following 30 days.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed Rules of Family Court.

Sincerely,

Mkl-It Hugkanl Melinda Hugdahl

Staff Attorney

Legal Services Advocacy Project





NOV 1 0 2011



#### Statewide Steering Committee on Early Case Management / Early Neutral Evaluation

Hon. Sharon Hall
District Court Judge
Anoka County Courthouse
612-241-2811

Hon. Sally Tarnowski
District Court Judge
St. Louis County Courthouse
218-726-2560

To:

Bridget Gernander, Clerk of the Appellate Courts

From:

Hon. Sharon Hall and Hon. Sally Tarnowski

Co-Chairs, Statewide Steering Committee on Early Case Management / Early

**Neutral Evaluation** 

Date:

November 10, 2011

Re:

Proposed Amendment to Rule 304.02 of the Family Court Rules

Recommendations of Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General

Rules of Practice

We are writing on behalf of ourselves and the Statewide ENE Steering Committee to oppose the proposed amendment to Rule 304.02 of the Family Court Rules. The amendment provides that "Initial Case Management Statements" be filed within 60 days of the initial filing or sooner if the court requires. The Initial Case Management Statement will replace the Informational Statement currently contained in the rules.

The Advisory Committee Comments for the proposed Rule describe an intention to reflect the more varied approaches to early case management being used in Minnesota courts at this time. We certainly appreciate that focus. However, we believe this particular rule change will be confusing to parties, attorneys and the courts.

The current practice in courthouses using Early Case Management/Early Neutral Evaluation ("ECM/ENE") is to require the parties to file an ICMC Data Sheet. This document is prepared by the parties on very short time constraints, sometimes as little as 24 hours. The purpose of the ICMC Data Sheet is to give the judicial officer the ability to spot issues prior to meeting with the parties for an Initial Case Management Conference. This issue-spotting is important as it helps to develop and shape the "pitch" given to the parties about early case management and early neutral evaluation. It has no other purpose and, given its short turnaround time, the information provided in it is not binding on the party submitting it for any purpose. The ICMC Data Sheet is not "filed" with the court, entered on MNCIS, or kept in the court file and is often returned to the party at the end of this conference. There is no filing fee attached to submitting an ICMC Data Sheet to the court.

Bridget Gernander November 10, 2011 Page 2

Because of the name given to the new form under the proposed Rule, we have serious concerns that parties and attorneys, as well as courts, will view the Initial Case Management Statement as a substitute for what is now the ICMC Data Sheet. Our Committee has been drafting proposed standards which we hope to present to the Judicial Council in January. Those standards reference the use of a ICMC Data Sheet as described in this letter.

Requiring that the Initial Case Management Statement be filed will make it a pleading that will be binding on the parties and requires a filing fee. The effect of this amendment will likely be that ICMC Data Sheets will not be provided to the Court in advance of the Initial Case Management Conference, leaving the court with only the first-filed pleading to use in preparing for the Conference. Parties who will file the Initial Case Management Statement in advance of the ICMC will be preparing a pleading that is binding on them with very little turnaround time, and respondents, who previously did not pay a filing fee to submit their ICMC Data Sheets, will now have one imposed on them.

Our Committee's recommendations are as follows:

- Do not change Rule 304.02. Those jurisdictions that do still use Informational Statements may continue to do so. Those that do not use Informational Statements will not be affected.
- In the alternative, change the proposed rule to read as follows:

If the court requires, the parties shall file a Case Management Statement that substantially conforms to the form developed by the state court administrator. This form is not intended to replace the ICMC Data Sheet in counties using Early Case Management/Early Neutral Evaluation.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact either or both of us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hon. Sharon Hall

Sharon Hall

District Court Judge

Sally Tarnowski Hon. Sally Tarnowski District Court Judge

On behalf of and as Co-Chairs of the Statewide Steering Committee on Early Case Management/ Early Neutral Evaluation

## AMERICAN ACADEMY OF MATRIMONIAL LAWYERS

Minnesota Chapter

"Protecting the family . . . improving the practice"

OFFICE OF **APPELLATE COURTS** 

NOV 1 4 2011

President

Dan O'Connell

**Administrative Vice President** 

Brian Sobol

**Education Vice President** 

Tom Tuft

External Vice President

Nancy Berg

**Executive Director** 

Barbara Louis 2626 E 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 270 Bloomington, MN 55425 952-858-8875 or 800-958-8875 Fax 952-858-8950 www.aamlmn.com

**BOARD OF MANAGERS** 

Nancy Berg Sonja Eayrs Katy Graves Pamela Green Jeffrey Hicken Susan Lach William Mullin Karen Schreiber Brian Sobol Tom Tuft Gerald Williams

PAST PRESIDENTS

Jeffrey Hicken 2009-2011 Joan Lucas 2007-2009 Susan Rhode 2005-2007 Andrea Niemi 2003-2005 William Mullin 2002-2003 Susan Lach 2001-2002 Robert Zalk 2000-2001 Lorraine Clugg 1999-2000 Jane Binder 1998-99 Joseph Bluth 1997-98 Michael Ormond 1996-97 Nancy Berg 1995-96 Hon. Mary Davidson 1994-95 Robert Schlesinger 1993-94 Martin Swaden 1992-93 James Manahan 1991-92 Patrick McCullough 1990-91 Linda Olup 1989-90 Hon. Mary Louise Klas 1988-89 M. Sue Wilson 1987-88 William Haugh 1986-87

November 14, 2011

Bridget Gernander, Clerk of the Appellate Courts 25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

St. Paul, MN 55155

FILED

Re: Proposed Amendments to General Rules of Practice

Dear Ms. Gernander:

The AAML Minnesota Chapter thanks the Court for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the General Rules of Practice as presented in the report dated September 28, 2011. The AAML MN commends the Committee on its herculean efforts in reviewing the work of the Divorce Camp attendees and incorporating many of the changes that diverse group recommended as well as the thoughtful contributions from the family law community.

The AAML MN believes strongly that these changes are necessary to address the changing demands on Family Court in Minnesota. increasing pro se constituency and the increasing costs of litigation put even more demands on these Rules to be understandable and applicable to current practice.

The AAML reviewers noted some non substantive, clerical corrections which are noted on the attached errata sheet. AAML MN supports the revisions recommended except for the revisions to Rule 303.05.

First, we are concerned that because of the cost and inconvenience that Orders to Show Cause can generate, the use of such Orders should be reduced when at all possible. There has been a history of obtaining these Orders when they were not necessary.

With the new processes in place in most counties, interim support is available early in the process through the early case management systems. Also emergency relief can be obtained that does not require an Order to Show Cause. Based on current practice, we propose deleting section (b) of Rule 303.05.

Also section (c) of Rule 303.05 is already covered in the language in the first paragraph which states "Such orders may require production of limited financial information." There are many other ways to obtain limited financial information including the expanded availability of a subpoena so that an Order to Show Cause is not required.

Ms. Bridget Gernander Clerk of Appellate Courts November 14, 2011 Page 2

We propose the last paragraph regarding signing out of orders be deleted. This is a practice not followed in all counties, it is cumbersome, and incurs additional court administration costs.

Finally, it would appear that the language in Rule 309.01, is inconsistent with the requirements of Rules 303.05. Rule 309.01(a) provides that the court may issue an order to show cause without notice to the alleged contemnor if the "supporting affidavits credibly raise an issue of contempt." Rule 303.05 requires that an order to show cause be obtained in the same manner specified for ex-parte relief in Rule 3, which is a different standard. The standards should be consistent between the rules.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully yours,

Susan C. Rhode

Michael D. Dittberner

Debra E. Yerigan

# AAML MN Suggested clerical corrections:

Page	Line #	Correction	
24	484	court determination of the existence of the parent and child relationship or in situations [there are two separate situations, the rule does not contemplate both situations exist.]	
25	485	Where a court has ordered that no [typographical error]	

# LINDER DITTBERNER BRYANT LTD.

3205 WEST 76<sup>TH</sup> STREET | SUITE 2 | EDINA | MINNESOTA | 55435-5244 | TELEPHONE 952.896.1099 | FAX 952.896.1132 www.ldbfamilylaw.com

November 14, 2011

OFFICE OF APPELLATE COURTS

NOV 1 4 2011

FILEDH

# VIA MESSENGER

Bridget Gernander Clerk of the Appellate Courts 25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

> RE: September 28, 2011 Report of the Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on the General Rules of Practice

Dear Ms. Gernander:

The Family Law Section of the Minnesota State Bar Association has voted to endorse the recommendations for amendments to the Rules of Family Court Procedure made by the Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on the General Rules of Practice in their Report dated September 28, 2011, with two minor caveats. We thank the committee for their hard work in researching, reviewing and making these proposed amendments, which will help bring the practice of family law and adjudication of the family law actions into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. What follows is a detailed explanation of our proposed revisions to the Committee's draft of proposed Rules 303.03(a)(1) and 303.05.

Proposed Rule 303.03(a)(1) Motion Practice (service of initial motion "on all parties")

#### **Requirements for motions**

- (1) Moving Party; Supporting Documents, Time Limits. No motion shall be heard unless the moving party pays any required motion filing fee, properly serves a copy of the following documents on all parties and files them with the court administrator at least 14 days prior to the hearing:
  - (i) Notice of motion and motion in the form required by Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 303.01 and 303.02;
  - (ii) Relevant signed, sworn and notarized affidavits and exhibits; and

KAREN I. LINDER Kate K. Malec, Legal Assistant MICHAEL D. DITTBERNER Joanne M. Nielsen, Legal Assistant ELIZABETH B. BRYANT Carrie L. Mahto, Legal Assistant Bridget Gernander Clerk of Appellate Courts November 14, 2011 Page 2

(iii) Any memorandum of law the party intends to submit.

Reason for proposed revision to committee draft of September 28, 2011: The reference to "service on all parties" that is currently in Rule 303.03 (a)(2)(service of motion pleadings raising new issues) and Rule 303.03(a)(3)(service of responsive motion pleadings) should likewise be included in Rule 303.03 (a)(1)(service of initial motion pleadings).

Proposed Rule 303.05 Orders To Show Cause (discouraging the use of orders to show cause)

Orders to Show Cause shall be obtained in the same manner specified for ex part relief in Rule 3

of these Rules. Such orders may require the production of limited financial information. An

order to show cause shall be issued only where the motion seeks a Finding of contempt under

Rule 309 or the supporting affidavit makes an affirmative showing of:

- (a) need to require the party to appear in person at the hearing,
- (b) a need for interim support is warranted, or
- (b) the production of limited financial information is deemed necessary by the court, or
- (c) a need for the issuance of an order to show cause, subject to the discretion to the discretion of the judge

All orders to show cause must be appropriately signed out for service. A conformed copy of the order shall be retained by the court administrator in the file.

Reasons for proposed revisions to committee draft of September 28, 2011:

(1) We are recommending that the first sentence be eliminated, which states that orders to show cause shall be obtained in the manner specified for ex parte relief in Rule 3 of the Rules of General Practice. If the sentence is not deleted, it would require giving notice to the opposing party of intent to seek order to show cause or, in the alternative, an explanation to the judicial officer as to why no notice should be given. Orders to show cause are not as significant as ex parte orders because they do not grant any substantive

Bridget Gernander Clerk of Appellate Courts November 14, 2011 Page 3

relief, and therefore should not be subject to the same notice requirements. The first sentence is also in conflict with the new proposed language for Rule 309.01 which states: "Pursuant to Rule 303.05 an Order to Show Cause may be issued by the court without notice to the alleged contemnor provided the supporting affidavits credibly raise an issue of contempt."

- (2) The second sentence of the committee's proposed language, i.e., "[s]uch orders may require production of limited financial information" should also be deleted, because it is redundant in light of the fact that the need for limited financial information is a listed ground for the issuance of an order to show cause in the language which follows the first paragraph of proposed Rule 303.05.
- (3) The phrase "need for interim support" should be stricken as one of the grounds for the issuance of an order to show cause. Interim financial support orders, should they ever be warranted, more appropriately fall under the rubric of requests for emergency financial relief rather than orders to show cause. In addition, such orders really do not fit that well within our current "income shares" child support system. Under the old child support system, an obligor could be ordered to pay a certain percentage of their net income. Even then, such orders to show cause were rarely granted. Given the adoption of the income shares statute for calculation of child support, there is no justification for providing for the issuance of interim financial support orders in the form of orders to show cause.
- (4) The last two sentences of proposed Rule 303.05, which deal with the practice of signing out orders to show cause for service on an opposing and the retention of a conformed copy in the court file, should be deleted given the practice in many counties of not requiring the signing out of orders to show cause for service.

Sincerely,
Milan & Detth

Michael Dittberner, Esq.

On Behalf of the Family Law Section of the Minnesota State Bar Association

Linder, Dittberner & Bryant, Ltd.

3205 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street

Edina, Minnesota 55435-5244

cc: Susan Rhode, Esq.

Deb Yerigan, Esq.

Michael Johnson, Esq., Senior Legal Counsel, Legal Counsel Division, State Court

Administration

Steve Snyder, Esq., Chair, MSBA Family Law Section

# DAKOTA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE JAMES C. BACKSTROM COUNTY ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF APPELLATE COURTS

NOV 1 4 2011

# FILED

# CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT DIVISION DAKOTA COUNTY NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER ONE MENDOTA ROAD W., SUITE 220 WEST ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55118 (651) 438-4438

TO:

Bridget Gernander, Clerk of the Appellate Courts

FROM:

Sandra M. Torgerson, Division Head, Dakota County Attorney's Office Child

Support Enforcement Division SWIT

RE:

Comment In Opposition To Proposed Change to Minnesota Rules of General

Practice Rules of Family Court Procedure Rule 309.01

DATE:

November 14, 2011

The following comments are provided in opposition to the amendment of Rule 309.01(b)(5).

Proposed Rule 309.01(b)(5) provides that the notice of contempt motion or the order to show cause shall contain at least the following:

(5) a date to appear for a Rule 309.02 hearing no later than 30 days subsequent to the issuance of the notice of motion or order to show cause.

This proposed rule requires that the hearing beheld on a date no later than 30 days after date of the notice of motion or order to show cause. This rule creates a very limited time period during which proper service and filing of the motion or order to show cause can be effectuated.

The contempt motion or order to show cause must be personally served<sup>1</sup> upon the alleged contemnor and filed with court administration at least 14 days prior to the hearing.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Current and proposed Rule 309.01(a). Contempt proceedings shall be initiated by notice of motion and motion or by an order to show cause served upon the person of the alleged contemnor together with motions accompanied by appropriate supporting affidavits.

rules therefore require the moving party achieve personal service in approximately 7 to 10 days from the signature date of the motion or order to show cause.<sup>3</sup> This window of opportunity to achieve personal service is shortened even further if a holiday falls within the period during which service is attempted.<sup>4</sup> In cases where all parties are cooperative, such a limited period in which to achieve personal service may not be problematic. However, in cases involving nonpayment of child support, which often involves uncooperative alleged contemnors, such a limited time period creates an unintended, prohibitive barrier to achieving proper service.

The Dakota County Attorney, as counsel to the Dakota County Child Support Office, initiates a significant number of civil contempt motions for nonpayment of child support. Achieving personal service upon noncompliant child support obligors is frequently difficult and may require repeated attempts by the process server to effectuate personal service. For example, such obligors typically cannot be served at a place of employment or contacted through a private attorney for purposes of arranging service. While counsel may be later appointed or retained, at the time of service child support contemnors are typically unrepresented.

The proposed rule should be adjusted to permit sufficient time for the initiating party in a child support contempt case to complete the following steps prior to the hearing date:

- a. obtain the signed Order to Show Cause;
- b. transmit the pleadings to a process server;
- c. achieve personal service upon the alleged contemnor;
- d. receive the completed Affidavit of Service from the process server; and
- e. file the documents with court administration no later than 14 days prior to the hearing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Proposed Minn. R. Gen. P. 303.03 (a)(1) No motion shall be heard unless the moving party pays any required motion filing fee, properly serves a copy of the following documents and files the original them with the court administrator at least 14 days prior to the hearing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See attached sample calendar. A one week period would be typical, allowing for minimal internal processing times for obtaining the OTSC and transmittal of the pleadings to the process server.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Minn. Stat. § 645.44, subd. 5 provides that no civil process may be served on a holiday.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> In Dakota County on each Monday a district court calendar is dedicated to civil contempt matters initiated by the Dakota County Attorney's Office. In 2010, the Dakota County Attorney's Office appeared at 557 hearings on the civil contempt calendar.

A service window of 7 to 10 days is impracticable. Dakota County's experience is that a two-month lead time from the date of the motion or order to show cause is usually needed so as to complete these steps and timely file the documents at least 14 days prior to the hearing date.

The proposed rule may also increase costs to the public and the court system. The initiating party may incur higher service costs, as some process servers charge higher rates for attempting service on a "rush" basis. The proposed rule may lead to the necessity of multiple, sequential orders to show cause and rescheduling of hearings, because perfection of personal service upon this group of contemnors is very challenging. The administrative burden on the County Attorney, the bench and court administrators will be increased. The purpose of civil contempt for nonpayment of child support is to force parents who are able to pay child support to actually pay the child support. The ultimate burden of such a proposed rule will fall upon the parent and child to whom the child support is owed.

## **CONCLUSION**

Proposed Rule 309.01(a)(5) should be deleted. In the alternative, the rule should be amended so as to permit at a minimum a 45 day window of opportunity to achieve personal service of civil contempt child support motions prior to the deadline for filing of documents. A date 45 days prior to the filing deadline is approximately 60 days prior to the date of the hearing. A 30 day period is not a viable period with regard to civil contempt child support motions.

November 2011 Calendar - Sample time frame impact.

<b>⋖</b> <u>October</u>		· Personal SelV	ovember 201	1-19-5		<u>December</u> ►
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat .
		date 11/28. (Nov. 28 <sup>th</sup> is latest possible Dakota County Monday	Show Cause transmitted to and received by County Attorney's Office. Pleadings	service. Example assumes next day receipt. However, next day receipt may not always be	personal service could be	5 Day 2 personal service could be attempted.
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
personal service could be	Day 4 personal service could be attempted.	Day 5 personal service could be attempted.	Day 6 personal service could be attempted.	Day 7 personal service could be attempted, so long as affidavit can be returned for timely filing.	Affidavit of Service must be received by County Attorney's Office to allow time for preparation for filing. In November, Court and County offices closed for Veterans Day holiday and information needed to be received the 10th, or early on the 14th to permit timely filing on 11/14.	19
	14 <sup>th</sup> day prior to hearing. Documents must be filed with Court Administration.	13 days prior to hearing	12 days prior to hearing	11 days prior to hearing	10 days prior to hearing	9 days prior to hearing
20 8 days prior to hearing	21 7 days prior to hearing	<b>22</b> 6 days prior to hearing	23 4 days prior to hearing	24 4 days prior to hearing	25 3 days prior to hearing	26 2 days prior to hearing
27 1 day prior to hearing	28 Contempt Hearing.	29	30			

# OCT 19 2011

# Kathleen M. Murphy ATTORNEY AT LAW

#### Family Law Matters®

Tel: (612) 659-9108 www.kmurphylaw.com 701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 500 Minneapolis, MN 55415 Email:

km@kmurphylaw.com

October 17, 2011

Bridget Gernander Clerk of the Appellate Courts 25 Rev. Dr. MartinLuther King Jr. Blvd. St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Re: Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General Rules of Practice, Proposed Amendments to Family Court Rules

Dear Ms. Gernander:

Enclosed please find 12 copies of my comments regarding the proposed amendments to the Family Court Rules recommended by the Minnesota Supreme Court Advisory Committee on General Rules of Practice (Committee). My comments relate solely to Rule 303.03(c).

I wish to bring to the Committee's attention that this proposed provision may create unintended consequences for pro se parties and create a chilling effect on this population's access to and use of the courts to resolve their family law issues. The Committee's proposed language is:

#### Rule 303.03 (c). Settlement Efforts:

(c) Settlement Efforts. No motion, except a motion for temporary relief, will be heard unless the parties have conferred Except in parentage cases when there has been no court determination of the existence of the parent and child relationship and in situations where a court has order that no contact occur between the parties, the moving party shall, within 7 days of filing a motion, initiate a settlement conference either in person, or by telephone, or in writing in an attempt to resolve their differences prior to the hearing. The moving party shall initiate such conference. In matters involving post-decree motions, if the parties are unable to

resolve their differences in this conference they shall consider the use the issues raised. This conference shall include consideration of an appropriate ADR process under Rule 114 to attempt to accomplish resolution. The moving party shall certify to the court, before the time of the hearing, compliance with this rule or any reasons for not complying, including lack of availability or cooperation of opposing counsel. The moving party shall file a Certificate of Settlement Efforts in the form developed by the state court administrator not later than 24 hours before the hearing. Unless excused by the Court for good cause, no motion shall be heard unless the parties have complied with this rule. Whenever any pending motion is settled, the moving party shall promptly advise the court.

I believe that compliance with this provision may be unfairly burdensome for pro se parties and difficult for the courts to enforce unless ADR becomes institutionalized in the self-help systems currently operating in the Minnesota courts. Currently, the self-help centers primarily assist pro se litigants with forms and procedures connected to litigation (summons, petition, motions,...). If ADR is to be added to the mix for pro se parties, it must be done in a planned and thoughtful manner. Otherwise, pro se litigants are unlikely to internalize the requirement that they try to settle before appearing for their day in court.

I have been volunteering at the Family Law Self Help Center in the Fourth District for years and can personally attest to the confusion, frustration, and hopelessness that most clients present when they bring their problems to the consulting attorneys. Most pro se clients at the self-help center live from crisis to crisis. Their relationships with opposing parties are far beyond broken. Locating the self-help center and articulating a (usually) very complex problem to a stranger is already a significant accomplishment for many of these clients. Without sufficient orientation of pro se parties about settlement negotiations and procedural support to help them comply with the proposed requirement, this provision is a setup for failure and may unintentionally reduce, not increase, access to the courts for low income persons.

While I am not advocating that all pro se parties simply be exempted from this mandate, I do urge the Committee to acknowledge this concern – perhaps in the Advisory Committee Comments. My proposed language for the Comments is below and highlighted in yellow. Note also that I am proposing a few word changes to the Comments to make it consistent with what I believe is the Committee's intent:

#### Advisory Committee Comments—2011 Amendments

Motion practice in family law matters is intended to mirror, where appropriate to the needs of family law issues, the procedures followed generally in civil cases in Minnesota courts. The prevailing practice in Minnesota courts is for the submission of evidence relating to motions by written submissions, with sworn testimony provided by affidavit, deposition, or other written submissions. Rule 303.03(d)(1) restates that rule. The balance of Rule 303.03(d) addresses the process to request leave to present oral testimony in the limited circumstances where it may be appropriate. Minn. Stat. § 518.131, subd. 8, provides for allowing oral testimony upon demand of a party in requests for a temporary order or restraining order.

Rule 303.03(a)(5) makes it clear that the stringent timing requirements of the rule need not be followed on post-trial motions, such as a motion for a new trial or for amended findings made shortly after the conclusion of trial. *See* Minn. R. Civ. P. 52 & 59. This change is made to continue the uniformity in motion practice between family court matters and general civil cases, and is patterned on Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 115.01(c). Support, spousal maintenance, and custody modification motions, often brought months or years later, are subject to the general timing rules for motions.

The requirement in subsection (c) of an attempt to resolve motion disputes requires that the efforts to resolve the matter be made eoneluding prior to the hearing, but not before bringing the motion. The rule requires the moving party to initiate settlement efforts. If the motion is resolved, subsection (c) requires the parties to advise the court immediately. The Committee acknowledges the potential for additional challenges that mandated settlement efforts may create for pro se parties. However, because settlement efforts are central to the procedure for resolving family law issues, compliance with this provision, within reason, is expected of all parties.

The rule explicitly addresses the requirement for paying a motion filing fee. Since 2003, Minnesota law requires a fee for "filing a motion or response to a motion in civil, family, excluding child support, and guardianship case." *See* Minn. Stat. § 357.021, subd. 2(4).

Thank you to the Committee for your work, and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Kathleen M. Murphy

Cc: Susan LeDray, Self Help Center Administration, Fourth Judicial District