

# **OPEN SESSION AGENDA ITEM**

## **III.A.2 MAY 2018 REGULATION AND DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** May 17, 2018

**TO:** **Members, Regulation and Discipline Committee**

**FROM:** Steven Moawad, Chief Trial Counsel, Office of Chief Trial Counsel

**SUBJECT:** Request to Circulate for Public Comment Changes in Rules Regarding Judicial Notice of Court Records (Rule 5.104(G), Rules Proc. of State Bar)

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This proposal would amend the Rules of Procedure to allow the State Bar Court to take judicial notice of non-certified court records, thereby saving State Bar Court litigants unnecessary, and significant, effort and expense.

This item requests that the Board circulate, for a 45-day public comment period, proposed rule amendments to State Bar Rules of Procedure 5.140.

---

### **BACKGROUND**

Under current law, it is unclear whether the State Bar Court must require certified court records in order to take judicial notice of the records of other courts. While parties generally stipulate to the authenticity of uncertified records, the uncertainty of whether a stipulation will be forthcoming, combined with the delay in securing certified records, requires parties to obtain certified court records for presentation to the State Bar Court. As a result, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel, and proffering respondents, expend significant time and resources.

### **DISCUSSION**

Rule 5.104, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, sets forth the evidentiary rules applicable in State Bar proceedings. Rule 5.104(C), quoted below, sets out the somewhat relaxed admissibility standard of California administrative and licensing proceedings:

(C) Relevant and Reliable Evidence. The hearing need not be conducted according to technical rules relating to evidence and witnesses, except as hereinafter provided. Any relevant evidence must be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule

which might make improper the admission of the evidence over objection in civil actions.

Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether the State Bar Court must require certified court records in order to take judicial notice of the court records. While parties generally stipulate to the authenticity of uncertified records, in some cases, no stipulation is reached even when there is no legitimate dispute concerning authenticity. For this reason, as part of the investigation process, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel (OCTC) customarily obtains certified court records for presentation to the State Bar Court. This is expensive because the court clerks charge for certification services and because the State Bar has to employ runners to obtain the documents. This process also delays OCTC's completion of investigations (because court clerks are often backlogged with other tasks) and unnecessarily utilizes staff time.

Therefore, OCTC proposes that rule 5.104 be amended to expressly authorize the State Bar Court to take judicial notice of uncertified court records. In a State Bar Court proceeding, there should rarely if ever be a genuine dispute about the authenticity of a State Bar Court record or a California Supreme Court disciplinary order. Legitimate authenticity issues sometimes arise with respect to records from other courts. Therefore, the proposed rule would require the parties to provide advance notice to each other of their intention to use uncertified records from outside courts. This way, in the rare circumstance that there is bona fide dispute concerning the authenticity of such a record, the parties will have an opportunity to settle the matter among themselves or submit the issue for decision by the State Bar Court.

Language similar to this proposal was vetted before the Bench/Bar Committee, chaired by the Honorable Donald Miles, Supervising Judge of the State Bar Court Hearing Department. The attendees, including members of the respondents' bar, did not voice a substantive objection to this proposal. Thereafter, the proposal was modified. The currently proposed language would establish a procedure for mandatory judicial notice of court records that are relevant to the proceeding.

#### **FISCAL/PERSONNEL IMPACT**

Financial and resource savings due to reduced time and cost of securing uncertified court records.

#### **RULE AMENDMENTS**

Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 5, Rule 5.104, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar

#### **BOARD BOOK AMENDMENTS**

None

## **STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

Goal: 2. Ensure a timely, fair, and appropriately resourced admissions, discipline, and regulatory system for the more than 250,000 lawyers licensed in California.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that the Regulation and Discipline Committee approve the following resolution:**

**RESOLVED**, that staff is authorized to make available, for public comment for a period of 45-days, proposed amendments to: Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 5, Rules 5.104, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar; by adding subdivision (G), as set forth in Attachment A; and it is

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this authorization for release for public comment is not, and shall not be construed as, a statement or recommendation of approval of the proposed amended Rules of Procedure or Board policy.

## **ATTACHMENT(S) LIST**

- A.** Proposed rule 5.104(G)

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **PROPOSED RULE 5.104(G)**

#### **(G) Judicial Notice of Court Records and Public Records.**

(1) For purposes of this rule, “court records” means pleadings, declarations, attachments, dockets, reporter’s transcripts, clerk’s transcripts, minutes, orders, and opinions that have been filed with the clerk of any tribunal or court within the United States.

(2) The State Bar Court may take judicial notice of the following:

- (a) court records that have been certified by the clerk of the court or tribunal;
- (b) non-certified court records of the State Bar Court;
- (c) non-certified orders of the California Supreme Court in attorney disciplinary cases;
- (d) non-certified court records that have been copied from the tribunal or court’s official file and timely provided to the opposing party during the course of formal or informal discovery. The party offering such records must provide a declaration stating the date on which the documents were copied and certifying that the documents presented to the State Bar Court are an accurate copy of the court records obtained from the court’s official file; and
- (e) non-certified court records that have been copied from a public access website operated by a court or government agency for the purpose of posting official public records or court records, e.g., the federal court website called “Public Access to Court Electronic Records” and more commonly known as PACER. The party offering such records must provide a declaration stating the date on which the documents were copied and certifying that the documents presented to the State Bar Court are an accurate copy of the court records obtained from the website.

(3) The State Bar Court must take judicial notice of the records mentioned in paragraph (2) if they are relevant to the proceeding unless a party proves, e.g., through certified records, that the proffered records are incomplete or not authentic.

(4) This rule is not intended to limit the judicial notice provisions contained in Evidence Code, section 450 et seq.