

**Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2024–2025**  
**Approved by Rules Committee: October 22, 2024**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Donald J. Proietti, Superior Court of Merced County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	James Barolo, Attorney, Legal Services
<p><b>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</b>  <a href="#">Rule 10.41</a> of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&amp;SCAC), which is to make recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving the administration of justice in civil and small claims proceedings.          Rule 10.41 also sets forth the membership categories for the committee, which currently has 28 voting members and 1 advisory member. The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee’s web page.</p>	
<p><b>Subgroups of the Advisory Committee<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Dispute Resolution Subcommittee</li> <li>2. Case Management and Environmental Law Subcommittee (<i>previously the Rules Subcommittee</i>)</li> <li>3. Forms Subcommittee</li> <li>4. Legislative Subcommittee</li> <li>5. Protective Orders Subcommittee</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Meetings Planned for 2024–2025<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subgroups listed above.)</b>          Full committee meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October 2024 (videoconference to review Annual Agenda and winter cycle proposals)</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year or cycle and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources.

<sup>2</sup>For the definition of “subcommittee” see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.30(c); “working group” see rule 10.70, “workstream,” see rule 10.53(c); and “education curriculum committee,” see rule 10.50(c)(6).

<sup>3</sup> Refer to section IV. 2. of the [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

Note: Because of the current budget and staffing constraints, advisory body chairs and staff must first consider meeting remotely. The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee is suspending advisory body in-person meetings for the 2024–2025 annual agenda cycle. If an in-person meeting is needed, the responsible Judicial Council office head must seek final approval from the advisory body’s internal oversight committee chair. Please see the prioritization memo dated July 1, 2024, for additional details.

- February 2025 (videoconference to review spring cycle proposals and to make final recommendations on winter cycle proposals)
- June 2025 (videoconference to make final recommendations on spring cycle proposals)

Subcommittee Meetings:

- Legislative Subcommittee. Videoconference meetings several times a month as needed from February through July to review proposed legislation.
- Other subcommittees. Multiple telephonic or videoconference meetings of each before each of the full committee meetings.

Other meetings as needed to address proposals implementing new legislation and other urgent matters.

Check here if in-person meeting is approved by the internal committee oversight chair.

## II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Protective Order Forms: Implementation of SB 899 (new project)</b>	<b><i>Priority 1(a)</i></b> <sup>5</sup> <b><i>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</i></b> <sup>6</sup>
<p><b><i>Project Summary:</i></b> Develop rule and form recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">SB 899</a> requires courts to inquire whether a person subject to a civil restraining order has complied with the firearm relinquishment requirement and order the clerk to notify law enforcement if a receipt is not filed within 48 hours of receiving the restraining order. Similar legislation for domestic violence restraining orders was enacted a few years ago <a href="#">SB 320</a> (Stats. 2021, ch. 685). The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee adopted forms to implement the legislation. Similar forms are needed for the other protective types.</p> <p><b><i>Status/Timeline:</i></b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b><i>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</i></b> Committee staff, potentially Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i></b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b><i>AC Collaboration:</i></b> Potentially Joint Protective Order Working Group, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee</p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to or accurately reflect the law; 1(b) Council has directed the committee to consider new or amended rules and forms; 1(c) Change is urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; or 1(d) Proposal is otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk. *For each priority level 1 proposal, the advisory body must provide a specific reason why it should be done this year and how it fits within the identified category.* 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement changes in law; 2(b) Responsive to identified concerns or problems; or 2(c) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives. *If an advisory committee is interested in pursuing any Priority Level 2 proposals, please include justification as to why the proposal should be approved at this time.*

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects</b>	
2.	<b>Protective Order Forms: Implementation of AB 3209 (new project)</b>	<b>Priority 1(a)</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">AB 3209</a> creates two new protective orders. The bill authorizes a court, when sentencing a person for an offense involving retail theft from an establishment, to issue a criminal protective order prohibiting a person from entering the retail establishment. The bill also authorizes a prosecuting attorney representing a retail establishment and specified individuals to file a petition for the issuance of a civil protective order against a person who has been arrested two or more times at the same retail establishment. Existing criminal protective orders forms should be revised, and additional forms may need to be created for the new protective order types.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Winter Cycle, with anticipated effective date of July 1, 2025.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff, Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Joint project with Criminal Law Advisory Committee, potential collaboration with Joint Protective Order Working Group</p>		
3.	<b>Protective Order Forms: Implementation of AB 2096 (new project)</b>	<b>Priority 1(a)</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">AB 2096</a> expands the definition of postsecondary educational institutions in school violence restraining orders to include public institutions, broadens the criteria for seeking restraining orders to include any form of unlawful violence, and removes the condition that the violent conduct must occur off-campus or be construed to occur on campus. The current forms should be revised to reflect the expanded definition and criteria for school violence restraining orders.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff, potentially Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p>		

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects</b>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Potentially Joint Protective Order Working Group, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee</p>	
4.	<p><b>Protective Order Forms: Implementation of SB 554 (new project)</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 1(a)</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">SB 554</a> permits petitioners to file civil harassment restraining orders in the county where the petitioner resides. The civil harassment restraining order petition (form CH-100) should be revised to reflect this new possible venue.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff, potentially Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Potentially Joint Protective Order Working Group, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee</p>	
5.	<p><b>Unlawful Detainer and Small Claims Forms: Repeal of the Statutes and Implementation of Legislation (new project)</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 1(a)</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. Code of Civil Procedure sections 116.223 and 1179.01 through 1179.15 are repealed as of September 30, 2024, or October 1, 2025, by their own terms. Those sections permit recovery of COVID-19 rental debt in small claims courts, require a cover sheet for unlawful detainer filings, and provide other procedures for unlawful detainer filings during a specified period. The council adopted several forms, including forms SC-500 and UD-101 to implement those sections when they were enacted. Because the forms’ statutory authorization sunsets, they should be revoked and any forms referring to the forms, including plaintiff’s claim form for small claims and the unlawful detainer answer form, need to be revised. The committee will also consider revising</p>	

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects</b>	
	<p>the unlawful detainer complaint and answer forms to use plain language. and whether other revisions should be made in response to <a href="#">AB 2347</a>, which extends the time in which a defendant must file a response from 5 to 10 days after the complaint is served.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The committee anticipates this to be a two-year project. An invitation to comment for the revocation and revision of forms related to the sunset of the Code of Civil Procedure sections 116.223 and 1179.01 through 1179.07 is planned for Spring Cycle, with an anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026. Other updates which do not reflect statutory changes would take place the following year.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	
6.	<b>CEQA Rules: Implementation of Legislation (new project)</b>	<p><b>Priority 1(a)</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop rules recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">AB 3265</a> and <a href="#">SB 1342</a> include additional projects and types of projects that receive expedited CEQA judicial review. Specifically, AB 3265 establishes streamlined procedures for judicial review of approvals granted for an environmental leadership media campus project, as defined. SB 1342 includes two specific projects as infrastructure projects, as defined by statute and rules, thereby providing expedited CEQA review for the projects. Rules should be amended to include these new projects and project types.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Winter Cycle, with anticipated effective date of July 1, 2025.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p>	

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects</b>	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee	
7.	<b>Confidential Information Forms: Implementation of AB 1979 (new project)</b>	<i>Priority 1(a)</i> <i>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop forms recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">AB 1979</a> creates a private cause of action against a person who doxes (publishes private information about an individual on the internet) another person. A plaintiff in such a case may use a pseudonym by filing a confidential information form. Courts are required to keep the plaintiff’s name and certain characteristics confidential, and, upon request, limit access to court records.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>		
8.	<b>Enforcement of Judgment Forms: Implementation of AB 2837 and AB 1119 (new project)</b>	<i>Priority 1(a)</i> <i>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop forms recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">AB 2837</a> expands the types of retirement plans exempt from money judgments and exempts such property to the extent necessary to provide support for the judgment debtor. The bill also revises the enforcement provisions by requiring a judgment creditor to take additional steps to verify a judgment debtor’s address and provide notice of enforcement to a judgment debtor. This legislation may require revisions to certain enforcement of judgment forms. At the same time, it may be prudent to create a new form for the judgment creditor declarations required in amended Code of Civil Procedure section 684.130.</p> <p>The committee will also consider whether changes are needed to forms and rules of court related to debtor’s examinations to further implement <a href="#">AB 1119</a> regarding the judgment debtor’s rights when the judgment concerns consumer debt, and whether more education or training is needed in this area.</p>		

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects</b>	
	<p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026, for required revisions. Other updates which do not reflect statutory changes would take place as time and resources permit.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state. The committee will consult with the Center for Judicial Education and Research as appropriate.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	
9.	<p><b>Small Claims Forms: Include Information Required Under Code of Civil Procedure section 116.540 (new project)</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 1(a)</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop forms recommendations as appropriate. A member of the committee pointed out that <i>Authorization to Appear</i> (form SC-109) may need to be revised to more fully comply with the required statements by individuals authorized to appear on behalf of parties in small claims court under Code of Civil Procedure section 116.540.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	

10.	<b>Certifying or Decertifying a Class: Move Deadline to File Reply Briefs (new project)</b>	<b><i>Priority 1(c)</i></b>
	<b><i>Strategic Plan Goals I, III and IV</i></b>	
<p><b><i>Project Summary:</i></b> Develop rules recommendations as appropriate. A member of the committee notes that under California Rules of Court, rule 3.764(c) a reply brief on a motion to certify or decertify a class must be served 5 <i>calendar</i> days before the hearing. If such filing occurs before a long weekend due to a court holiday or holidays the court has virtually no time to review the brief before the hearing. The committee should consider changing this deadline, and possible other deadlines, in the rule.</p> <p><b><i>Status/Timeline:</i></b> Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b><i>Fiscal Impact/Staff Resources:</i></b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i></b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b><i>AC Collaboration:</i></b> N/A</p>		
11.	<b>Jurisdictional Amounts: Amend rule 3.740 (previously approved one-time project)</b>	<b><i>Priority 1(c)</i></b>
	<b><i>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</i></b>	
<p><b><i>Project Summary:</i></b> Develop rule recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">SB 71</a> raised the amount in controversy for limited civil and small claims court cases. Prior to the enactment of SB 71, the monetary threshold in rule 3.740, which provides alternative procedures for certain collection cases, matched the jurisdictional limit for limited civil cases. The committee should consider amending this rule to use the current jurisdictional limit.</p> <p><b><i>Status/Timeline:</i></b> The committee is currently working on a proposal to address this agenda item. Invitation to comment planned for Spring Cycle, with anticipated effective date of January 1, 2026.</p> <p><b><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i></b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		

	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	
12.	<p><b>Complex Coordinated Actions: Amend rule 3.545 to simplify court requirements upon termination (previously approved one-time project)</b></p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop rule recommendations as appropriate. A member of the committee recommends revising rule 3.545 because it places onerous and unnecessary burdens on the court upon the termination of a coordinated action. Specifically, the court must promptly enter any judgment in each underlying coordinated case with the title and case number assigned to the action at the time it was filed included and serve notice of entry of the judgment via certified copy on all parties to the action and on the Chair of the Judicial Council and on the appropriate clerks of each transferor court for filing in each pending coordinated action. Some of those requirements may be superfluous and may strain court resources.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The committee is currently working on a proposal to address this agenda item. Invitation to comment planned for Winter Cycle, with anticipated effective date of July 1, 2025.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>Priority 2(b)</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I, III and IV</b></p>
13.	<p><b>Groundwater Adjudication: Assignment of judges (previously approved one-time project)</b></p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop rule and form recommendations as appropriate. Code of Civil Procedure section 838 requires the Chair of the Judicial Council to assign a judge in a comprehensive adjudication of a groundwater basin. Rule amendments to rule 3.400 and form revisions to form CM-010 to implement the statute may be beneficial.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Anticipated January 1, 2026 effective date of any proposed legislation or California Rule of Court.</p>	<p><b>Priority 2(b)</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>

	<p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	
14.	<p><b>Military Forms: Implementation of SB 1311 (previously approved one-time project)</b></p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. <a href="#">SB 1311</a> clarified that servicemembers in activity duty may not be charged interest on certain financial obligations during their deployment. This project is included as it has been requested repeatedly by the California Department of Justice organizations over the past several years. In preparing the proposal, staff and the committee identified items on form MIL-020 and other forms that may potentially benefit from revision with circulation for public comment. Deferred in light of budget constraints.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Deferred due to budget constraints impacting the judicial branch.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>Priority 2(a) DEFERRED</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>
15.	<p><b>Civil Practice and Procedure: Revise Civil Summons Form (previously approved one-time project)</b></p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop form recommendations as appropriate. The civil Summons (form SUM-100) contains numerous checkboxes for the filer to designate the type of organization the summons has been issued on behalf of. These checkboxes may not best reflect the</p>	<p><b>Priority 2(b) DEFERRED</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b></p>

most common organization types used. Additionally, minor formatting changes may also improve the form’s useability for litigants and courts.

**Status/Timeline:** Deferred due to budget constraints impacting the judicial branch.

**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** Committee staff

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

**Internal/External Stakeholders:** draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.

**AC Collaboration:** N/A

16. **Statements of Decision: Streamline Rule 3.1590 (new one-time project)**

**Priority 2(b) DEFERRED**

**Strategic Plan Goals I, III and IV**

**Project Summary:** Develop rule recommendations as appropriate. California Rules of Court, rule 3.1590 provides a complex set of procedures for courts and parties to follow in requesting and issuing tentative decisions and statements of decisions. The rule may benefit from amendment and simplification.

**Status/Timeline:** Deferred due to budget constraints impacting the judicial branch.

**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** Committee staff

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

**Internal/External Stakeholders:** draft proposals will circulate to seek comments from legal service groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.

**AC Collaboration:** N/A

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities</b>	
1.	<b>Review Suggestions for Rules and Forms</b>	<i>Priority 1</i>
		<i>Strategic Plan Goals III and IV</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> As mandated by rule 10.21(c), review suggestions from members of the judicial branch and the public for improving civil practice and procedure, court-connected ADR, and case management and recommend actions by the council or one of its committees.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing; will only take further action upon approval of Rules Committee.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> As appropriate based on proposal received.</p>		
2.	<b>Review Enacted Legislation</b>	<i>Priority 1</i>
		<i>Strategic Plan Goals II and III</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Review all enacted legislation referred to the committee by the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs office that may have an impact on issues within the advisory committee’s purview and, where appropriate, propose to the council rules and forms to implement the legislation or to bring rules and forms into conformity with it.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing; will only take further action upon approval of Rules Committee.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> As appropriate based on the specific legislation.</p>		

3.	<b>Review Pending Legislation</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goals III and IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Working through the Legislative Subcommittee, review pending legislation affecting civil procedure and court administration, and make recommendations to the Legislation Committee as to whether the Judicial Council should support or oppose the legislation.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff, Governmental Affairs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> California Legislature</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>		
4.	<b>Rules and Forms: Miscellaneous Technical Changes</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Develop rule and form changes as necessary to make corrections and adjustments meeting the criteria of rule 10.22(d)(2): “a nonsubstantive technical change or correction or a minor substantive change that is unlikely to create controversy....” These include revisions to forms that contain dollar figures based on statutory criteria that the Judicial Council is mandated to adjust on a regular basis.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>		

5.	<b>Protective Orders Working Group</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goals I and III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> As a member committee for the Protective Orders Working Group (POWG), work with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Criminal Law Advisory Committee to revise civil and domestic violence protective order forms to ensure they are written in consistent language that is comprehensible to non-attorneys, while maintaining legal accuracy. POWG will work collaboratively on the protective order projects identified in this agenda and the agendas of the other committees that make up the working group.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff, Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts, Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Criminal Law Advisory Committee</p>		
6.	<b>Provide Subject Matter Expertise</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goals III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Serve as subject matter resource for other advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action. Such efforts may include providing civil and small claims procedural expertise and review to working groups, advisory committees, and subcommittees as requested, on projects that have been approved on their annual agendas.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> As appropriate for project on which advice or consultation requested.</p>		

7.	<b>Deskbook on the Management of Complex Civil Litigation</b>	<b>Priority 2 DEFERRED</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Implementation project that the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee will work on as time permits; charge for work was made for CSCAC by the council at the October 22, 1999 meeting in which the council received the report of the Complex Civil Litigation Task Force and voted to adopt the Task Force’s recommendations.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Deferred due to budget constraints impacting the judicial branch.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CJER</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> N/A</p>		
8.	<b>Revision of Judicial Council Forms with a Gender Identity Question or Term</b>	<b>Priority 2(b)</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goals III and IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> The forms within this committee’s purview that include a gendered term or gender identity question are being revised to eliminate or revise those terms where possible.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The vast majority of forms have been updated to eliminate such terms. Any time a form is revised for legislatively mandated reasons or other reasons approved by the Rules Committee, gendered terms are reviewed and revised as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Committee staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> All draft proposal will circulate to seek comments from legal services groups, bar organizations, and court executives and presiding judges throughout the state.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> As appropriate for project on which advice or consultation requested.</p>		

### III. LIST OF 2024 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<i>Protective Order Forms.</i> The committee recommended revising dozens of protective order forms to implement four new laws. The recommended changes included: (1) adding an advisement about a prohibition on possessing body armor if a person is prohibited from possessing firearms; (2) restructuring the Gun Violence Restraining Order petition to more clearly ask for fact supporting an order, including the newly permissible evidence of acquisition of body armor; and (3) reflecting the new basis for a Workplace Violence Restraining Order—harassment—that collective bargaining representatives may now petition for such orders, and that the employee who suffered the harassment, violence, or threat of violence may opt out of being named in such orders.
2.	<i>Judgment Debtor Exams.</i> The committee recommended revising numerous forms and one rule to implement AB 1119, which created a separate set of requirements and a new procedure for judgment creditors to examine judgment debtors with consumer debt. The form revisions included different notices for debtors with consumer debt and the creation of a financial affidavit form for the judgment debtor to serve on the judgment creditor in lieu of appearing for an examination.
3.	<i>Dismissals.</i> Following amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure permitting parties to dismiss cases with retained jurisdiction by the courts to enforce settlement agreements, the committee recommended revising the <i>Request for Dismissal</i> form and updating the rules of court concerning dismissal.
4.	<i>Amount in Controversy.</i> The committee recommended revising numerous forms to implement SB 71, which raised the amount in controversy for limited civil and small claims court cases.
5.	<i>CEQA Rules.</i> The committee recommended amending the California Rules of Court on CEQA actions to reflect a new statutory requirement that courts must schedule a case management conference within 30 days of the filing the complaint.
6.	<i>Memorandum of Costs.</i> The committee recommended revising the trial court memorandum of costs to add a verification under penalty of perjury and to correct the categories of costs to be consistent with statutory provisions and across forms.
7.	<i>Unlawful Use of Personal Information.</i> The committee recommended revising an order form on the unlawful use of personal information to provide additional information on the form so the Secretary of State’s office could take action on such orders.
8.	<i>Tentative Rulings.</i> The committee recommended revising the rule of court on tentative rulings to remove the requirement to make such rulings available by telephone as most court users do not access the rulings through that method.
9.	<i>Complex Coordinated Actions.</i> The committee began work on amending court rules on complex coordinated actions to streamline the process for courts when cases within the actions are closed in order to best use court resources.
10.	<i>Review of Pending Legislation.</i> The committee reviewed and made recommendations regarding council position on dozens of bills with potential impact on the civil courts.