

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

1/17/2018 Agenda:

Cochise

- Discussion item:
 - Should Notice: **Notice: Foreign Judgment & Judgment: Transcript of Judgment** adjudicate a case?

Mohave

- Request for new event – **Minute Entry: Criminal Pretrial Conference**
 - *Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure have been changed as of 1/1/2018 that instead of an Omnibus Hearing, the Courts hold Pretrial Conference. We need an event for Criminal Pretrial Conference so that a form template can be tied to that event. This would be a Pretrial Conference event only used for criminal cases so that a form template can be tied to it.*
 - *We currently use Minute Entry: Pretrial Conference, but if we tie a form to that event, that form will generate for other case types (such as JD cases) when we do not want it to.*

AOC

- New Federal Child Support forms
 - I have submitted a request for following events in the event category of IV-D:
 - IV-D: PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM FOR UIFSA
Restricted
 - IV-D: GENERAL TESTIMONY – UIFSA **Restricted**
 - IV-D: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL REQUESTING REGISTRATION **Restricted**
 - IV-D: NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF CONTROLLING ORDER
 - IV-D: UNIFORM SUPPORT PETITION
 - IV-D: DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ESTABLISHING PARENTAGE

- Additional events will be added to accommodate rule changes (most with an effective date of 7/1/18). Exact descriptions have not yet been determined but will address the following changes:
 - Appearance reasons – Bail Eligibility Hearing (Rule 7.2(b)) & Motion for Order to Protect Electronically Stored Information (Rule 45.2).
 - Events for the new tiering on Civil cases (Rule 26.2)
 - Motion to Exceed Tier Discovery Limit (Rule 26.2)
 - 210 day Tickler (Rule 38.1)

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

1/17/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Fran Ranacelli

Gila – Teri Griego, Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Greenlee – Pam Pollack

Mohave- Della Hiser

Maricopa – Brenda Barton

Mohave – Della Hiser

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Karen Wilkes, Charlotte VanLandingham, Julie Malinowski, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality

Yuma – Michael Bell

AOC- Jennifer Greene, Pat McGrath

Cochise

- Discussion item:
 - Should Notice: **Notice: Foreign Judgment & Judgment: Transcript of Judgment** adjudicate a case?
 - Group agreed to change the case status on **Notice: Foreign Judgment** to **'Adjudicated'** and the party status to **'Terminated – Judgment/Order'**. Status on second event is already adjudicated.

Mohave

- Request for new event – **Minute Entry: Criminal Pretrial Conference**
 - *Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure have been changed as of 1/1/2018 that instead of an Omnibus Hearing, the Courts hold Pretrial Conference. We need an event for Criminal Pretrial Conference so that a form template can be tied to that event. This would be a Pretrial Conference event only used for criminal cases so that a form template can be tied to it.*
 - We currently use Minute Entry: Pretrial Conference, but if we tie a form to that event, that form will generate for other case types (such as JD cases) when we do not want it to.
 - *Request withdrawn. Yavapai recommended that they tie the same docket to multiple forms in AJACS and Mohave agreed that would work for them.*

AOC

- New Federal Child Support forms
 - I have submitted a request for following events in the event category of IV-D:
 - IV-D: PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM FOR UIFSA
Restricted
 - IV-D: GENERAL TESTIMONY – UIFSA Restricted
 - IV-D: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL REQUESTING REGISTRATION Restricted
 - IV-D: NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF CONTROLLING ORDER
 - IV-D: UNIFORM SUPPORT PETITION
 - IV-D: DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ESTABLISHING PARENTAGE
 - There was discussion about adding other child support events to this category but the decision was made to leave them as is.

- Additional events will be added to accommodate rule changes (most with an effective date of 7/1/18). Exact descriptions have not yet been determined but will address the following changes:
 - Appearance reasons – Bail Eligibility Hearing (Rule 7.2(b)) & Motion for Order to Protect Electronically Stored Information (Rule 45.2).
 - Events for the new tiering on Civil cases (Rule 26.2)
 - Motion to Exceed Tier Discovery Limit (Rule 26.2)
 - 210 day Tickler (Rule 38.1)
 - Pat discussed possible changes to comply with legislative updates effective 7/1/18. He said they are still deciding on the appropriate verbiage for the new values. I will be submitting a request for the new appearance reason of ‘Bail Eligibility Hearing’ which was effective 1/1/2018.

Jennifer Green will give us an update on her efforts to have a rule change in the Family Law Rules to clarify that psychological evaluation reports can be treated as confidential by clerks.

- Jennifer provided the following update:
 - The supreme court’s Family Law Task Force is working on updating the Family Law Rules. The Court Service Division of the AOC is staffing this Task Force. To address concerns raised by GJ Code Standardization and Clerk’s User Group regarding psychological evaluation reports in Family Law cases, Family Law Rules Task Force is considering adding the following to ARFLAP Rule 43.1:

“(g) Confidential Records. The clerk may treat as confidential any medical, mental health, or behavioral health records, reports, or evaluations filed with the court.”

- The Task Force will file its rule change petition in March. The User Group can submit informal comments now through the Task Force’s website:
<http://www.azcourts.gov/cscommittees/Family-Law-Rules-Task-Force/FLR- Meeting-Information>. The full draft of the revised rules is also on this website.
 - Psych evals submitted in criminal or probate matters are more specifically protected by the criminal and probate rules already.
 - Jennifer will also ask the Task Force to consider adding warnings on the ARFLAP Financial Affidavit Form 2, where the filer is asked to attach pay stubs or tax documents, reminding the filer to redact SSN’s from the attachments. The Form can be amended via Administrative Order, so, if the Task Force doesn’t want to address forms for some reason, we can try for an amendment via an administrative order.
- Jennifer also asked for clarification on the following:
- (g) Confidential Records. The clerk may treat as confidential any medical, mental health, or behavioral health records, reports, or evaluations filed with the court.
 - Mark Meltzer responded:
 - Our draft rule says, “(g) Confidential Records. The clerk may treat as confidential any medical, mental health, or behavioral health records, reports, or evaluations filed with the court.” I read this as discretionary. It relieves the clerk of looking at each attachment to every filing to determine whether anything is confidential. Shouldn’t the filing party have primary responsibility for determining confidentiality?

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, February 21, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

2/21/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Fran Ranacelli

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee – Pam Pollack, Mary Salazar

Mohave- Della Hiser, Christina Spurlock

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Kathy Montijo

Santa Cruz – Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Karen Wilkes, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality

Yuma – Michael Bell

AOC- Jennifer Albright, Jethro Sheridan, Pat McGrath

AOC

- New Rule 26.2 requires each case be assigned a tier on a scale of 1 – 3 based on how much discovery is required.
 - I have submitted a request for following events to comply with this rule:
 - **Order: To Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Motion: To Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Motion: To Exceed Discovery Limit**
 - **Stipulation: to Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Indicator: Tier 1**
 - **Indicator: Tier 2**
 - **Indicator: Tier 3**
 - **The indicator events will need to be manually docketed. Future functionality should be more automated but we don't have a firm date for that yet.**
 - **There was discussion as to whether the indicator events should display on the ROA or should they be hidden as all other indicators are. Pat was concerned that judges would**

not be able to see them on EBench if they were hidden but Odette pointed out that the judges can select 'All' and the indicators will display. Pat will ask at the Clerk's Association meeting what their preference is.

- **There was also discussion about how efilers would designate a tier and Pat stated that it would be on the civil coversheet and that Marretta is working on that.**
- New Rule 45.2 permits parties to file a request to preserve 'Electronically Stored Information' without having an existing case.
 - I have submitted a request for following event and appearance reason to comply with this rule. We are still discussing which event to use on existing cases for this purpose:
 - **Petition: Verified Rule 45.2 Petition**
 - **New appearance reason – Rule 45.2**
 - **There were not many questions regarding this new rule. The case will be opened as a Civil > Unclassified case type with the normal fee associated to that case type. The 'Petition: Verified Rule 45.2 Petition' must be used as the filing document.**
- A revision to Rule 38.1(d) will be replacing the 270 day Civil Tickler with a new 210 Civil tickler.
 - I have submitted a request for following tickler to comply with this rule change. The old tickler will be end-dated.
 - **CV 210 Day Dismissal Cal Ticklr**
 - **There were no questions on this.**
- The AOC is in the process of standardizing event codes across all production databases. In some cases, alpha characters are being used to make the codes more relatable to the events. Some courts have expressed concern that this will not work with OnBase. The standards below were approved by COT in 2010. Jethro Sheridan has said that if anyone is having problems with this he can send them detailed instructions on how to update their system.

Not Required for CDR but must Conform to Standard When Used

Keyword	Format	Maximum Length	Description	Example
Category	Alphanumeric	25	The classification of a case made by a court and tracked by the CMS	Criminal, CR, Crim Civil, CV, Civ Marriage, TR, Traffic
Event Code	Alphanumeric	20	A CMS code that is attached to the event that describes the general nature of the event and the associated document.	0123

- *Jethro was available to answer questions regarding this but there were no questions. The courts will be seeing more alfa codes as we work to standardize events across production databases.*

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, February 21, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

2/21/2018 Agenda:

AOC

- New Rule 26.2 requires each case be assigned a tier on a scale of 1 – 3 based on how much discovery is required.
 - I have submitted a request for following events to comply with this rule:
 - **Order: To Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Motion: To Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Motion: To Exceed Discovery Limit**
 - **Stipulation: to Change Discovery Tier**
 - **Indicator: Tier 1**
 - **Indicator: Tier 2**
 - **Indicator: Tier 3**

- New Rule 45.2 permits parties to file a request to preserve 'Electronically Stored Information' without having an existing case.
 - I have submitted a request for following event and appearance reason to comply with this rule. We are still discussing which event to use on existing cases for this purpose:
 - **Petition: Verified Rule 45.2 Petition**
 - **New appearance reason – Rule 45.2**

- A revision to Rule 38.1(d) will be replacing the 270 day Civil Tickler with a new 210 Civil tickler.
 - I have submitted a request for following tickler to comply with this rule change. The old tickler will be end-dated.
 - **CV 210 Day Dismissal Cal Ticklr**

- The AOC is in the process of standardizing event codes across all production databases. In some cases, alpha characters are being used to make the codes more relatable to the events. Some courts have expressed concern that this will not work with OnBase. The standards below were approved by COT in 2010. Jethro Sheridan has said that if anyone is having problems with this he can send them detailed instructions on how to update their system.

Not Required for CDR but must Conform to Standard When Used

Keyword	Format	Maximum Length	Description	Example
Category	Alphanumeric	25	The classification of a case made by a court and tracked by the CMS	Criminal, CR, Crim Civil, CV, Civ Marriage, TR, Traffic
Event Code	Alphanumeric	20	A CMS code that is attached to the event that describes the general nature of the event and the associated document.	0123

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

3/21/2018 Agenda:

Mohave

- Requesting a new payment event – **PAYMENT: INVESTIGATIVE COSTS FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL**
 - *Our finance department would like to request that a new Event Code be created for "Investigative Costs for Attorney General" which was recently ordered by a Judge. This particular fee falls outside the Mohave County Treasurers Umbrella and check would be cut directly to the outside agency.*
 - *The judges have also been ordering people to pay investigator costs in both JD cases and GC cases. An event already exists for probate - **PAYMENT: PROBATE INVESTIGATION** – but it is not linked to any fee schedules. I can submit a request to have this linked to a fee schedule but I would need to know what agency it should be linked to. Should we do the same thing for the JD cases or should we just create a new event 'Investigative Costs' to be used across all court/case types?*
 - *Are there any other courts where these types of fees are being ordered and if so, how are you assessing and paying them.*

AOC

- We have requested one more event to comply with the new civil rules effective 7/1/2018. It is **STATEMENT: RULE 26(d) JOINT STATEMENT FOR DISCOVERY/DISCLOSURE DISPUTE.**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

3/21/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Gila – Esther Canez

Maricopa – Angelica Mejia

Mohave- Della Hiser, Heather Yarbrough-Puett

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Kathy Montijo

Santa Cruz – Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality

Yuma – Michael Bell, Lynn Fazz

AOC- Pat McGrath

Mohave

- Requesting a new payment event – **PAYMENT: INVESTIGATIVE COSTS FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL**
 - *Our finance department would like to request that a new Event Code be created for "Investigative Costs for Attorney General" which was recently ordered by a Judge. This particular fee falls outside the Mohave County Treasurers Umbrella and check would be cut directly to the outside agency.*
 - **Tabled until next month**
 - *The judges have also been ordering people to pay investigator costs in both JD cases and GC cases. An event already exists for probate - **PAYMENT: PROBATE INVESTIGATION** – but it is not linked to any fee schedules. I can submit a request to have this linked to a fee schedule but I would need to know what agency it should be linked to. Should we do the same thing for the JD cases or should we just create a new event 'Investigative Costs' to be used across all court/case types?*
 - **Tabled until next month**
 - *Are there any other courts where these types of fees are being ordered and if so, how are you assessing and paying them.*

- *Della asked if any other courts were receiving petitions from probation regarding Rule 19.1 (Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court). She is considering requesting two new events for these documents which are being filed on a regular basis.*
 - *Petition for Reasonable Efforts Finding*
 - *Petition for Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare*

- *Please try to determine if these types of petitions are being filed in your court and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.*

AOC

- We have requested one more event to comply with the new civil rules effective 7/1/2018. It is **STATEMENT: RULE 26(d) JOINT STATEMENT FOR DISCOVERY/DISCLOSURE DISPUTE.**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, April 18, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

4/18/2018 Agenda:

Mohave

- **Tabled from last month** - Requesting a new payment event – **PAYMENT: INVESTIGATIVE COSTS FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL**
 - Mohave is requesting that a new Event Code be created for "Investigative Costs for Attorney General". This particular fee falls outside the Mohave County Treasurers Umbrella and check would be cut directly to the outside agency. Della provided case law for this:

Because the statutes governing reimbursement of costs had substantially changed since *Gelden* was decided, the *Maupin* Court found that the trial court was authorized to enforce the stipulation regarding extradition costs. The Court specifically pointed to A.R.S. §13-804(A) and (H).

Section 13-804(A) provides that a court "may order that all or any portion of the fine imposed be allocated as restitution to be paid by the defendant to any person who suffered an economic loss caused by the defendant's conduct." Based on the definition in A.R.S. §13-105(23) (now 105(30)), the Court concluded that "person" included a governmental entity. Section 13-804(H) allows the State to file a restitution lien if the trial court sentences the defendant to pay a fine or awards costs of investigation or prosecution. (Emphasis added).

Based on the changes in the statute, the *Maupin* Court held that:

The legislature's change in the statutory language of A.R.S. §13-804 after *Gelden* reflects an intent to allow a trial court to require a defendant, as part of a sentence, to reimburse the state for the costs of prosecution. 166 Ariz. at 252, 801 P.2d at 487.

Sections 13-804(A) and (H) have not changed since the decision in *Maupin*. And while *Maupin* addressed extradition costs, the current statute applies equally to investigative costs.

- **This was tabled from last month.** The judges have also been ordering people to pay investigator costs in both JD cases and GC cases. An event already exists for probate - **PAYMENT: PROBATE INVESTIGATION** – but it is not linked to any fee schedules. I can submit a request to have this linked to a fee schedule but I would need to know what agency it should be linked to. Should we do the same thing for the JD cases or should we just create a new event 'Investigative Costs' to be used across all court/case types?
- Are there any other courts where these types of fees are being ordered and if so, how are you assessing and paying them.

AOC

- At the last meeting, we asked the courts to determine if they were receiving filings from probation regarding Rule 19.1. Have any been filed in your court. Is there a need for the following two new events:
 - ***Petition for Reasonable Efforts Finding***
 - ***Petition for Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare***

- We are currently working to clean up our standard codes in anticipation of deploying the Central Case Information Project. In the process of doing that, I have found two court types that were never entered in AJACS. Below is an excerpt from the minutes on 6/5/2011.
 - ***Request to add two new Court types:***
 - ***“Criminal – NC”***
 - ***“Juvenile – NC”***
 - ***There is currently new programming in AJACS that will automatically set the case category, case type and case subtype based on the most severe charge entered.***
 - ***The new functionality will work for Criminal and Juvenile Delinquency cases with charges; however, in order for the court to enter a Criminal or Juvenile Delinquency case without a charge, the system is now requiring these new court types to allow for this functionality. For example, a Search Warrant case would be entered under these new court types and will allow for entry without having to enter a charge. This will then allow the user to manually enter the case category, case type and case subtype.***
 - ***“NC” stands for “No Charge.”***
 - ***There are numerous codes that will need to be added to these new court types that already exist for CR and JV, and others will need to be end dated from CR and JV court types.***
 - ***This will be added as an addendum or on a future agenda.***

- There is a system parameter in AJACS that allows specific case types to be set-up without requiring a charge be added. Do you believe we can end-date these two court types?

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, April 18, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

4/18/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Martha Rivera

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee – Pam Pollack

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon, Kim Cunningham

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Kyrene Felix

Santa Cruz – Dolly Legleu, Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Shannon Shoemake

AOC- Pat McGrath

Mohave

- **Tabled from last month** - Requesting a new payment event – **PAYMENT: INVESTIGATIVE COSTS FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL**
 - Mohave is requesting that a new Event Code be created for "Investigative Costs for Attorney General". This particular fee falls outside the Mohave County Treasurers Umbrella and check would be cut directly to the outside agency. Della provided case law for this:

Because the statutes governing reimbursement of costs had substantially changed since *Gelden* was decided, the *Maupin* Court found that the trial court was authorized to enforce the stipulation regarding extradition costs. The Court specifically pointed to A.R.S. §13-804(A) and (H).

Section 13-804(A) provides that a court "may order that all or any portion of the fine imposed be allocated as restitution to be paid by the defendant to any person who suffered an economic loss caused by the defendant's conduct." Based on the definition in A.R.S. §13-105(23) (now 105(30)), the Court concluded that "person" included a governmental entity. Section 13-804(H) allows the State to file a restitution lien if the trial court sentences the defendant to pay a fine or awards costs of investigation or prosecution. (Emphasis added).

Based on the changes in the statute, the *Maupin* Court held that:

The legislature's change in the statutory language of A.R.S. §13-804 after *Gelden* reflects an intent to allow a trial court to require a defendant, as part of a sentence, to reimburse the state for the costs of prosecution. 166 Ariz. at 252, 801 P.2d at 487.

Sections 13-804(A) and (H) have not changed since the decision in *Maupin*. And while *Maupin* addressed extradition costs, the current statute applies equally to investigative costs.

- This is **tabled** until next month. Mohave will talk to their judges about amending the orders on the 3 existing cases and discuss the process that Yavapai uses. In Yavapai County defendants are ordered to pay the Attorney General directly.
- **This was tabled from last month.** The judges have also been ordering people to pay investigator costs in both JD cases and GC cases. An event already exists for probate - **PAYMENT: PROBATE INVESTIGATION** – but it is not linked to any fee schedules. I can submit a request to have this linked to a fee schedule but I would need to know what agency it should be linked to. Should we do the same thing for the JD cases or should we just create a new event ‘Investigative Costs’ to be used across all court/case types?
- Are there any other courts where these types of fees are being ordered and if so, how are you assessing and paying them.
 - The court has agreed to use ‘Payment: Attorney Reimbursement’. I will request that the court type of ‘Probate’ be enabled for this event so that it can be used in the GC cases.

SANTA CRUZ

- Request to have case status changes added to the following events:
 - ORDER: DISMISSING INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT - **RE-ADJUDICATED**
 - ORDER: DISMISSING INJUNCTION AGAINST WORKAPLACE - **RE-ADJUDICATED**
 - ORDER: DISMISSING ORDER OF PROTECTION - **RE-ADJUDICATED**
 - ORDER: PROTECTION DENIED - **ADJUDICATED**
 - No objection and **granted**. Party statuses will also be changed to Terminated – Re-Adjudicated on the first 3 orders and Terminated – Court Order on the last one.

AOC

- At the last meeting, we asked the courts to determine if they were receiving filings from probation regarding Rule 19.1. Have any been filed in your court. Is there a need for the following two new events:
 - **Petition for Reasonable Efforts Finding**
 - **Petition for Finding of Contrary to the Child’s Welfare**
 - Both are **granted** –
 - **Petition: Reasonable Efforts Finding**
 - **Petition: Finding of Contrary to the Child’s Welfare**
- We are currently working to clean up our standard codes in anticipation of deploying the Central Case Information Project. In the process of doing that, I have found two court types that were never entered in AJACS. Below is an excerpt from the minutes on 6/5/2011.

- Request to add two new Court types:
 - “Criminal – NC”
 - “Juvenile – NC”
 - *There is currently new programming in AJACS that will automatically set the case category, case type and case subtype based on the most severe charge entered.*
 - *The new functionality will work for Criminal and Juvenile Delinquency cases with charges; however, in order for the court to enter a Criminal or Juvenile Delinquency case without a charge, the system is now requiring these new court types to allow for this functionality. For example, a Search Warrant case would be entered under these new court types and will allow for entry without having to enter a charge. This will then allow the user to manually enter the case category, case type and case subtype.*
 - “NC” stands for “No Charge.”
 - *There are numerous codes that will need to be added to these new court types that already exist for CR and JV, and others will need to be end dated from CR and JV court types.*
 - *This will be added as an addendum or on a future agenda.*

- There is a system parameter in AJACS that allows specific case types to be set-up without requiring a charge be added. Do you believe we can end-date these two court types?
 - *This has been **tabled**. The courts felt that these court types might be helpful for Non-Bailable cases that need to have a hearing. A process is needed to comply with legislation regarding 7.2 and the new Bail Eligibility Hearing. This hearing needs to be held before the Probable Cause Hearing and therefore does not have a Superior Court Case number. Pat McGrath will discuss with Don Jacobsen and I will set-up a call to discuss with the courts.*

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, June 20, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

6/20/2018 Agenda:

AOC

- **Documentary Hearings** – This appearance reason is an LJ only value but was inadvertently added to the GJ production databases in August of 2016. I would like to end-date it but want to be sure it is not being used. Please check with you staff.
- **Beth Peterson** will be joining the meeting to discuss the following items regarding updates made for HB2564:
 - The intent of the original scripts
 - Renaming the fees from Base Fees to Filing Fees
 - What caused the issue with the Voiding of receivables after the update was run and where we are with the cleanup
 - Fee schedule update and standardization moving forward
- **Bail Eligibility Hearings**
 - At our last meeting there was discussion about the Bail Eligibility Hearings. Some counties have already devised a process to accommodate these hearings but for those in need of guidance, the AOC has a recommended process. I have attached a document containing the steps. Please review for discussion.
- **End-Dated Events** - On 8/20/2014 this group finalized a list of events to be end-dated and it was submitted to the AJACS group. I recently discovered that these events were never end-dated in AJACS. I would like to submit again but I want to be sure that the events are not being used. Could you please review for discussion at the meeting next week:

Start Date	End Date	Event Category	Event Entry
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	Spousal Affidavit
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	of Expedited Judgment of arrears
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	Concerning Future Contract
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Application	Agreement of Reference

2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Tax Interception: Contact JAU
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Letter Return / Bad Add
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Ready for FARE
9/23/2009	8/20/2014	FARE	Do Not Send to FARE
4/18/2008	8/20/2014	FARE	TIP claim payment has been receipted
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	AZTEC Conversion - FARE Case
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Case Has Entered Delinquency - Collections Processing Will Begin
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Recall FARE
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Judgment	Data Sheet
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	Voluntary Wage Assignment
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	Annual Review of Patient
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	UIFSA Laws
6/17/2008	8/20/2014	Motion	Money in Lieu of Time Served
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Motion	Joinder Judgment Debtor to Appear
3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Motion - Continue
3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Order - Bail Refused (per 13-3961)
3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Order - Evidentiary Hearing
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Authority to Post Bond Reinstated
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Trial Confirmation Conference
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	TIP Balance Letter
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Praecipe re Dismissal Only
2/14/2008	8/20/2014	Notice	Commission
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Community Debts
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Deposit With Clerk
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Association
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Authority to Post Bond Revoked
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Filing Charging Document
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	from ADJC
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Disposition Alternatives
4/17/2013	8/20/2014	Notice	Temporary Legal Decision-Making
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Last Notice
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Two Year Review
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	for Appointment of Independent Evaluator
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Order	Implementing Deferred Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Independent Evaluation
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Attend Violence Awareness Program
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Bail Bond and Release Order

2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Suspending Rule 8
2/22/2012	8/20/2014	Order	Written Findings on Appointment of Guardian / Conservator
1/9/2008	8/20/2014	Order	Revoke Release DNA Conditions
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Order	Implementing Deferred Incarceration & Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Independent Evaluation
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Revoke Letters
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Petition	Implement Deferred Incarceration & Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Hospital Paternity Petition
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Petition	Implement Deferred Community Restitution Sanction
2/3/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	Guidelines
2/12/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	References
2/3/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	Non-Provisional
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Receipt	Monies Due the Spending Court
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Report	Conviction of a Felony
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Medical Director's Request of Continued O / P Treatment
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Revocation of Outpatient Treatment Plan
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Wage Assignment w/o Notice
2/22/2012	8/20/2014	Request	for Written Findings on Appointment of Guardian / Conservator
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Response	to Petition for Review
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	Disposition Summary Report
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	for Subsequent Administration
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	Information Statement for Judgment
4/23/2008	8/20/2014	Stipulation	Transfer Of Probation
8/18/2010	8/20/2014	Waiver	of Non-Waiver of Extradition
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Waiver	of Tax
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Will	Destroyed

○ **New Events for Civil Rule Changes**

- Below are the events that will be pushed to production to comply with Rule 45.2. In addition to the events, there is a new appearance reason - **Rule 45.2** - and the 270-day tickler has been end-dated and replaced with the **210-day Tickler**. There will be a memo distributed after the meeting next week explaining when to use the events. Please make sure the information is shared with the appropriate staff.

ORDER: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

MOTION: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

MOTION: EXCEED DISCOVERY LIMIT

STIPULATION: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 1

INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 2
INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 3
PETITION: VERIFIED RULE 45.2 PETITION
ORDER: EXCEED DISCOVERY LIMIT
STATEMENT: RULE 26(d) JOINT
STATEMENT FOR
DISCOVERY/DISCLOSURE DISPUTE

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, June 20, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

6/20/2018 Agenda:

AOC

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Martha Rivera

Coconino – Val Wyant, Erin Maloney

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Maricopa – Angela Mejia

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pima – John Baird

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes

Yavapai- Donna McQuality, Shannon Shoemake

AOC- Pat McGrath

- **Documentary Hearings** – This appearance reason is an LJ only value but was inadvertently added to the GJ production databases in August of 2016. I would like to end-date it but want to be sure it is not being used. Please check with you staff.
 - **This will be end-dated.**
- **Beth Peterson** will be joining the meeting to discuss the following items regarding updates made for HB2564:
 - The intent of the original scripts
 - Renaming the fees from Base Fees to Filing Fees
 - What caused the issue with the Voiding of receivables after the update was run and where we are with the cleanup
 - Fee schedule update and standardization moving forward
 - **There was concern that end-dating the Cost GL Allocation would cause issues if a judge decided to waive fees that have been deferred. Beth explained that it was common practice to end-date the associations when filing fees were updated. She explained that the only concerns would be for deferred cases filed within the two week period between 5/17/18 and 6/1/18 and those could be addressed by voiding the incorrect receivables and assessing the correct ones during the clean-up period.**

- **Bail Eligibility Hearings**
 - At our last meeting there was discussion about the Bail Eligibility Hearings. Some counties have already devised a process to accommodate these hearings but for those in need of guidance, the AOC has a recommended process. I have attached a document containing the steps. Please review for discussion.
 - **Tabled.** *There was discussion that the minute entry generated from the BEH should be restricted as there might be instances where the defendant had not yet been served. After more discussion, Pat and I believe that the case should be restricted or sealed. We will be discussing with Jennifer Albright and I will provide an update at the next meeting.*

- **End-Dated Events** - On 8/20/2014 this group finalized a list of events to be end-dated and it was submitted to the AJACS group. I recently discovered that these events were never end-dated in AJACS. I would like to submit again but I want to be sure that the events are not being used. Could you please review for discussion at the meeting next week:
 - **I will be submitting a request to end-date these events with the exception of 'Notice: Last Notice' which is used by Graham County.**

Start Date	End Date	Event Category	Event Entry
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	Spousal Affidavit
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	of Expedited Judgment of arrears
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Affidavit	Concerning Future Contract
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Application	Agreement of Reference
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Tax Interception: Contact JAU
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Letter Return / Bad Add
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Ready for FARE
9/23/2009	8/20/2014	FARE	Do Not Send to FARE
4/18/2008	8/20/2014	FARE	TIP claim payment has been receipted
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	AZTEC Conversion - FARE Case
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Case Has Entered Delinquency - Collections Processing Will Begin
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	FARE	Recall FARE
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Judgment	Data Sheet
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	Voluntary Wage Assignment
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	Annual Review of Patient
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Miscellaneous	UIFSA Laws
6/17/2008	8/20/2014	Motion	Money in Lieu of Time Served
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Motion	Joinder Judgment Debtor to Appear
3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Motion - Continue
3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Order - Bail Refused (per 13-3961)

3/19/2008	8/20/2014	Non-Bailable Offense	Order - Evidentiary Hearing
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Authority to Post Bond Reinstated
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Trial Confirmation Conference
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	TIP Balance Letter
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Praecipe re Dismissal Only
2/14/2008	8/20/2014	Notice	Commission
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Community Debts
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Deposit With Clerk
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Association
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Authority to Post Bond Revoked
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Filing Charging Document
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	from ADJC
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Disposition Alternatives
4/17/2013	8/20/2014	Notice	Temporary Legal Decision-Making
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Last Notice
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Notice	Two Year Review
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	for Appointment of Independent Evaluator
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Order	Implementing Deferred Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Independent Evaluation
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Attend Violence Awareness Program
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Bail Bond and Release Order
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Order	Suspending Rule 8
2/22/2012	8/20/2014	Order	Written Findings on Appointment of Guardian / Conservator
1/9/2008	8/20/2014	Order	Revoke Release DNA Conditions
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Order	Implementing Deferred Incarceration & Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Independent Evaluation
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Revoke Letters
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Petition	Implement Deferred Incarceration & Community Restitution Sanction
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Petition	Hospital Paternity Petition
1/18/2011	8/20/2014	Petition	Implement Deferred Community Restitution Sanction
2/3/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	Guidelines
2/12/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	References
2/3/2008	8/20/2014	Process Server	Non-Provisional
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Receipt	Monies Due the Spending Court
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Report	Conviction of a Felony
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Medical Director's Request of Continued O / P Treatment

2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Revocation of Outpatient Treatment Plan
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Request	Wage Assignment w/o Notice
2/22/2012	8/20/2014	Request	for Written Findings on Appointment of Guardian / Conservator
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Response	to Petition for Review
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	Disposition Summary Report
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	for Subsequent Administration
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Statement	Information Statement for Judgment
4/23/2008	8/20/2014	Stipulation	Transfer Of Probation
8/18/2010	8/20/2014	Waiver	of Non-Waiver of Extradition
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Waiver	of Tax
2/22/2006	8/20/2014	Will	Destroyed

○ **New Events for Civil Rule Changes**

- Below are the events that will be pushed to production to comply with Rule 45.2. In addition to the events, there is a new appearance reason - **Rule 45.2** - and the 270-day tickler has been end-dated and replaced with the **210-day Tickler**. There will be a memo distributed after the meeting next week explaining when to use the events. Please make sure the information is shared with the appropriate staff.

ORDER: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

MOTION: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

MOTION: EXCEED DISCOVERY LIMIT

STIPULATION: CHANGE DISCOVERY TIER

INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 1

INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 2

INDICATOR: DISCOVERY TIER 3

PETITION: VERIFIED RULE 45.2 PETITION

ORDER: EXCEED DISCOVERY LIMIT

STATEMENT: RULE 26(d) JOINT

STATEMENT FOR

DISCOVERY/DISCLOSURE DISPUTE

- **Donna wanted to know if the attorneys were going to be trained on using the new events. We will be discussing with the EFiling team. I will provide an update when I get the information.**

○ **Miscellaneous last-minute items**

- **I asked the counties what agency they would like assigned to the new GL 'Provider Reimbursement – Superior Court' and they all agreed to have it display under their County Treasurer. I will be submitting that request.**
- **I asked how Appeal From Arbitration Bonds were being handled in the courts and found that EFiling courts can't accept them as bonds. They must be assessed as a fee on the case and they will just sit there until they are ready to be exonerated. We will be discussing with the EFiling team.**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, August 15, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

8/15/2018 Agenda:

Cochise

- **Notice Impending Dismissal and Order Placing on Dismissal** - *Should Notice of Impending Dismissal or Order Placing on the Dismissal Calendar cause a case status change to Stayed or Inactive? The 30/60/90-day period does not now toll time.*
- **Evidentiary Hearings** - *JAA's are requesting the ability to schedule an EVIDENTIARY HEARING for dependency, delinquency and severance cases. This hearing type is an option on the "appearance reason" for other case categories, but not for these.*

Yavapai

- **Request to add two new interpreter types:**
 - *Yavapai County would like to add two identified interpreters to the drop down interpreter choices in AJACS. The first is Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) and the second is Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI). Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is the instant translation of the spoken word into English text using a stenotype machine. The English text can be displayed on a notebook computer, iPad, tablet, flat screen TV, or projected onto a big screen. This technology is primarily used by people who are hard of hearing. Certified Deaf Interpreter is a deaf person who has been certified to provide interpreting services to deaf consumers who may have linguistic impairments that prevent them from fully utilizing a traditional ASL interpreter.*
 - ***At the GJ Steering Committee on 8/7/2018, the members agreed to add additional language codes to the GJ court standards. Included in those codes are 'Certified Deaf Interpreter' and 'CART'. This will fulfill this request.***

AOC

- **There will be changes to Protective Order case taxonomy in 6.1. There are several reasons for this:**
 - *To more accurately track statistics for Protective Orders*
 - *To be able to use CPOR – These transactions can't be tracked in divorce cases*
 - *For ERRD purposes – Family Law/Child Custody cases have different rules for retention than protective order cases.*

Changes display below:

GJ 3.9 and GJ 6.0 Protective Order Case Taxonomy Comparison

GJ 3.9 – Order of Protection	GJ 6.0 – Order of Protection
Court Type = Family Law	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Domestic Relations	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Order of Protection	Case Type = Order of Protection
GJ 3.9 – Injunction Against Harassment	GJ 6.0 – Injunction Against Harassment
Court Type = Civil	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Civil	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Injunction Against Harassment	Case Type = Injunction Against Harassment
GJ 3.9 – Injunction Against Workplace Harassment	GJ 6.0 – Injunction-Workplace Harassment
Court Type = Civil	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Civil	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Injunction Against Workplace Harassment	Case Type = Injunction-Workplace Harassment

GJ 3.9 and GJ 6.0 Protective Order Case Number Prefix

GJ 3.9 Order of Protection = S1805 DO 2018000002	GJ 6.0 Order of Protection = S1805 PO 201800045
GJ 3.9 Injunction Against Harassment = S1805 CV 201800005	GJ 6.0 Injunction Against Harassment = S1805 PO 2018000256
GJ 3.9 Injunction Against Workplace Harassment = S1805 CV 201800008	GJ 6.0 Injunction-Workplace Harassment = S1805 PO 2018000256

○ **ID Types in ACCESS vs AJACS**

- *GJ Codes Standards contains many more ID Types than does AJACS. Please see comparison below. Does your court use most of the ACCESS values?*

Identification Code - ACCESS	DESCRIPTION - AJACS
ATLAS Number	
Bar Number	
Court Number	
Driver's License	
Driver's License (CDL)	
FBI Number	FBI ID
Fiduciary Certification Number	
	ICE Number
ORI	
Passport Number	
PCN	
Pilot's License	
Resident Alien ID Number	
SID Number	STATE ID
Social Security Number	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
Tax Identification Number	
Tribal Census Number	
Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)	
Vehicle License Plate Number	

○ **Description updates to production databases:**

- *As we are working on standardizing databases, we are finding minor discrepancies that I will be updating. The changes will not affect anything as far as case processing. Below is an example of an update I would make:*

COST_TYP_CD	COST_TYP_DESC
9850T3	TIME PMT \$20 JCEF
9850T3	JCEF TIME PYMT \$20
9850T3	TIME PMT \$20 JCEF

- **New look for the GJ Code Standardization Website**
 - We have made some changes to the website. Most of the relevant code standard tables now display as separate spread sheets that you will be able to sort and filter. The Event Entry Table is one of the available options and because it contains so much information, we have been able to eliminate the following tables/report:
 - GJ Code Standards Event Dictionary - PDF
 - GJ Code Standards Events - EXCEL
 - GJ Case-Party Status Auto Events - EXCEL
 - The link is below:
 - <https://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/Automation-Services-Unit/Code-Standardization-GJ>

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, August 15, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

8/15/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee – Pam Pollack

Maricopa – Chris Driscoll

Mohave- Andrew Dixon

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Elsa Montiel, Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Jonathon Derois

AOC- Pat McGrath, Melanie Cluff

Cochise

- **Notice Impending Dismissal and Order Placing on Dismissal** - Should Notice of Impending Dismissal or Order Placing on the Dismissal Calendar cause a case status change to Stayed or Inactive? The 30/60/90-day period does not now toll time.
- **Evidentiary Hearings** - JAAs are requesting the ability to schedule an EVIDENTIARY HEARING for dependency, delinquency and severance cases. This hearing type is an option on the "appearance reason" for other case categories, but not for these.
 - **We have tabled this item because Cochise did not attend. Several courts had recommendations for Cochise.**

Yavapai

- **Request to add two new interpreter types:**
 - Yavapai County would like to add two identified interpreters to the drop down interpreter choices in AJACS. The first is Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) and the second is Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI). Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is the instant translation of the spoken word into English text using a stenotype machine. The English text can be displayed on a notebook computer, iPad, tablet, flat screen TV, or projected onto a big screen. This technology is

primarily used by people who are hard of hearing. Certified Deaf Interpreter is a deaf person who has been certified to provide interpreting services to deaf consumers who may have linguistic impairments that prevent them from fully utilizing a traditional ASL interpreter.

- **At the GJ Steering Committee on 8/7/2018, the members agreed to add additional language codes to the GJ court standards. Included in those codes are ‘Certified Deaf Interpreter’ and ‘CART’. This will fulfill this request.**

AOC

- **There will be changes to Protective Order case taxonomy in 6.1. There are several reasons for this:**
 - *To more accurately track statistics for Protective Orders*
 - *To be able to use CPOR – These transactions can’t be tracked in divorce cases*
 - *For ERRD purposes – Family Law/Child Custody cases have different rules for retention than protective order cases.*

Changes display below:

GJ 3.9 and GJ 6.0 Protective Order Case Taxonomy Comparison	
GJ 3.9 – Order of Protection	GJ 6.0 – Order of Protection
Court Type = Family Law	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Domestic Relations	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Order of Protection	Case Type = Order of Protection
GJ 3.9 – Injunction Against Harassment	GJ 6.0 – Injunction Against Harassment
Court Type = Civil	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Civil	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Injunction Against Harassment	Case Type = Injunction Against Harassment
GJ 3.9 – Injunction Against Workplace Harassment	GJ 6.0 – Injunction-Workplace Harassment
Court Type = Civil	Court Type = Civil
Case Category = Civil	Case Category = Protective Orders
Case Type = Injunction Against Workplace Harassment	Case Type = Injunction-Workplace Harassment

GJ 3.9 and GJ 6.0 Protective Order
Case Number Prefix

GJ 3.9 Order of Protection = S1805 DO 201800002	GJ 6.0 Order of Protection = S1805 PO 201800045
GJ 3.9 Injunction Against Harassment = S1805 CV 201800005	GJ 6.0 Injunction Against Harassment = S1805 PO 2018000256
GJ 3.9 Injunction Against Workplace Harassment = S1805 CV 201800008	GJ 6.0 Injunction-Workplace Harassment = S1805 PO 2018000256

- *Santa Cruz stated that they have been opening separate cases for quite some time and that it has worked well for them. They have not come across any issues using this practice.*

○ **ID Types in ACCESS vs AJACS**

- *GJ Codes Standards contains many more ID Types than does AJACS. Please see comparison below. Does your court use most of the ACCESS values?*

Identification Code - ACCESS	DESCRIPTION - AJACS
ATLAS Number	
Bar Number	
Court Number	
Driver's License	
Driver's License (CDL)	
FBI Number	FBI ID
Fiduciary Certification Number	
	ICE Number
ORI	
Passport Number	
PCN	
Pilot's License	
Resident Alien ID Number	
SID Number	STATE ID
Social Security Number	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
Tax Identification Number	
Tribal Census Number	
Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)	
Vehicle License Plate Number	

- *We have tabled this so that I can do more review to determine which fields these types of ID's would display in within AJACS.*

○ **Description updates to production databases:**

- *As we are working on standardizing databases, we are finding minor discrepancies that I will be updating. The changes will not affect anything as far as case processing. Below is an example of an update I would make:*

COST_TYP_CD	COST_TYP_DESC
9850T3	TIME PMT \$20 JCEF
9850T3	JCEF TIME PYMT \$20
9850T3	TIME PMT \$20 JCEF

- **New look for the GJ Code Standardization Website**
 - We have made some changes to the website. Most of the relevant code standard tables now display as separate spread sheets that you will be able to sort and filter. The Event Entry Table is one of the available options and because it contains so much information, we have been able to eliminate the following tables/report:
 - GJ Code Standards Event Dictionary - PDF
 - GJ Code Standards Events - EXCEL
 - GJ Case-Party Status Auto Events - EXCEL
 - The link is below:
 - <https://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/Automation-Services-Unit/Code-Standardization-GJ>

- **Are courts using Reconcile Physical Deposit Report??**
 - **Four courts have responded so far and they all use this report for various reasons. Based on what I have so far, I'm going to recommend that it remain on option.**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, October 17, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

10/17/2018 Agenda:

Cochise

- **Notice Impending Dismissal and Order Placing on Dismissal** - Should Notice of Impending Dismissal or Order Placing on the Dismissal Calendar cause a case status change to Stayed or Inactive? The 30/60/90-day period does not now toll time.
- **Evidentiary Hearings** - JAAs are requesting the ability to schedule an EVIDENTIARY HEARING for dependency, delinquency and severance cases. This hearing type is an option on the "appearance reason" for other case categories, but not for these.
 - **We have tabled this item because Cochise did not attend. Several courts had recommendations for Cochise.**

Coconino

- New code request – **Order: Denying Temporary Order:**
 - To more accurately track the "stop" time of a filed Motion/Petition for Temporary Orders that has been denied.
- New code request – **Addendum: to Petition to Revoke:**
 - To accurately distinguish between the filing of a Petition to Revoke Probation and an Addendum to that Petition.
- New code request – **Rule 32: Notice of No Claim:**
 - To accurately document when a Notice for PCR has been reviewed by an attorney, and no colorable claim has been identified. (The Rule 32 remains pending, with the Court allowing time for a Pro Per Petition to be filed.)

Yavapai

- Question from Yavapai:
 - **Notice of Settlement:** This docket code automatically changes the party status to Terminated – Stipulated Judgment/Order. Do you have any record of why this docket code changes the party status?
 - I reviewed meeting minutes from that time of creation (2/2009) to time of workgroup review of cases statuses (8/2014) and was unable to find any mention of when this was updated.

AOC

- Discussion request submitted by Renny and Erica:

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, October 17, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

10/17/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise: Fran Ranacelli, Adilenne Montano

Coconino: Valerie Wyant, Melissa Fittipaldo

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

Maricopa – Nikki Swiss

Mohave- Andrew Dixon, Della Hiser, Fred Shade

Pinal – Mary Bell, Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Shannon Shoemake

AOC- Pat McGrath, Melanie Cluff, Renny Rapier, Tony Sita, Erica Franklin

Cochise

- **Notice Impending Dismissal and Order Placing on Dismissal** - Should Notice of Impending Dismissal or Order Placing on the Dismissal Calendar cause a case status change to Stayed or Inactive? The 30/60/90-day period does not now toll time.
- **Most court noted that they believe these should not be stopping time. Below are the events that have associated case/party statuses set on them. During the discussion, we discovered that they are displaying differently across the courts. Please check your databases to verify that they are displaying correctly and please let me know if they are not.**

AJACS Description	Case Status	Party Status
NOTICE: VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE - CASE	ADJUD	
NOTICE: VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE - CASE	ADJUD	
NOTICE: VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL - CASE	ADJUD	TERM-DO
NOTICE: OF DISMISSAL / PARTY	ADJUD	TERM-DO
NOTICE: PLACING ON DISMISSAL CALENDAR	INACTIVE	
RULE 32: DISMISSAL	READJUD	TERM-AJ
NOTICE: PLACING ON INACTIVE CALENDAR	INACTIVE	INAC-NA
ORDER: PLACING ON INACTIVE CALENDAR	INACTIVE	INAC-NA

- **Evidentiary Hearings** - JAAs are requesting the ability to schedule an EVIDENTIARY HEARING for dependency, delinquency and severance cases. This hearing type is an option on the "appearance reason" for other case categories, but not for these.
 - **Courts agreed to have the Juvenile Court type added to this appearance reason in AJACS. These case types were already approved in ACCESS but in AJACS, appearance reasons are associated to court types not case types. I'm submitting the request to have that court type added to this appearance reason.**

Coconino

- New code request – **Order: Denying Temporary Order:**
 - To more accurately track the "stop" time of a filed Motion/Petition for Temporary Orders that has been denied.
 - **This has been tabled so that I can meet with Marretta to discuss options. I have a meeting set for 10/25/18 at 10:30am.**
- New code request – **Addendum: to Petition to Revoke:**
 - To accurately distinguish between the filing of a Petition to Revoke Probation and an Addendum to that Petition.
 - **This was denied as the users can docket an addendum and relate it to the PTR. I will be attaching instructions on how to do this with the minutes.**
- New code request – **Rule 32: Notice of No Claim:**
 - To accurately document when a Notice for PCR has been reviewed by an attorney, and no colorable claim has been identified. (The Rule 32 remains pending, with the Court allowing time for a Pro Per Petition to be filed.)
 - **This was denied. A recommendation was made to use NOTICE: COMPLETION OF PCR FILE REVIEW. Courts then asked to have this event moved to the event category of Rule 32. I will be end-dating this event and recreating it under the event category of Rule 32.**

Yavapai

- Question from Yavapai:
 - **Notice of Settlement:** This docket code automatically changes the party status to Terminated – Stipulated Judgment/Order. Do you have any record of why this docket code changes the party status?
 - I reviewed meeting minutes from that time of creation (2/2009) to time of workgroup review of cases statuses (8/2014) and was unable to find any mention of when this was updated.
 - **None of the courts could remember why the case status was added but they agreed to remove it. The order issued after the Notice of Settlement is what should change the party status.**

AOC

- Discussion request submitted by Renny and Erica:
 - In our eFiling issues meeting today we determined that we need to present the following AJACS questions in order to attempt uniform standards in the manner that 'Notice: Voluntary Dismissal' will be processed going forward. We face the situation of having different processes for over the counter vs. eFiled submissions unless we can obtain agreement on events. **Scenarios below:**

- When a Notice: Voluntary Dismissal – Case is filed, the event is automatically terminating the party that this is being filed on behalf of. I.E.- John Smith (P-1) files and is automatically terminated as a party. Problems with this include: A defendant currently being allowed to file this electronically and dismissing themselves from a case (rare instance, but it can occur as we have proven in test). Do they wish for it to continue this way? If not, our option is to remove the automatic termination of the party from the event. Clerks will need to terminate the party themselves, but this will prevent a defendant from automatically being terminated (and thus not allow the case to automatically adjudicate only in this instance, other occurrence below).
 - When a Notice: Voluntary Dismissal – Case is filed, the case is automatically adjudicated. Do they want this to continue this way? If there are more than one plaintiffs on the case, and only one dismisses themselves, the entire case adjudicates. The clerk is able to manually adjust the case status after this but it creates more steps than leaving them to do it manually originally. Our option is to remove the case status from the event and the clerk will have to manually adjudicate the case.
 - Third and final option for both: We create a new Notice: Voluntary Dismissal – Case (Efile) event where neither the party status is set to terminate, or the case status is set to adjudicate. The court will have to manually do both after reviewing the document.
 - **Courts believe this is a training issue and prefer to leave the default statuses as is. They stressed that the users should be paying attention to what is being filed.**
- Question regarding Pre-Adoption:
 - How are your courts handling them? Does your Presiding Juvenile Judge require you to assess a fee at time of case initiation if the requestor is not a relative?
 - **Most courts are not assessing any fees for this. I will remove the fee from Cochise's database.**
 - Would anyone be opposed to moving next month's meeting to November 20th?
 - **No objection. I will send out an updated invitation.**
 - Possible discussion on Bail Eligibility Hearings.
 - **We discussed two options. One would be using the 'Unknown' scheduling functionality and the second would be to use a new case type 'Bail Eligibility' under the category type of 'Miscellaneous'. After further testing we decided that the best option is the new case type under the Miscellaneous category. I'm attaching instructions for the recommended process with the minutes. We will need to discuss if we need to add an event for the minute entry at the next meeting.**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, November 20, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3711 Meeting ID: 82751

11/20/2018 Agenda:

Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Motion: Reopen Court File:**
 - *When a case has been dismissed and the attorney files a motion to reopen the case, some of the courts are charging a \$30 fee. In order to do this via eFiling, a document "Motion: Reopen Case File" needs to be created so that the fee can be tied to that event.*
 - *Mohave notes that other courts are using this fee and would like to know what authority can be used for this.*

AOC

- Topics for discussion
 - **Marisa Shaffery –**
 - **Copy and certification fees:**
 - *We will no longer be able to include these fees at case initiation. They do not default with a -0- amount so efilers would not have the option to change the unit to -0-.*
 - **Receipt prefixes:**
 - *Are GJ courts interested in having receipt prefixes set up in 6.1. Below are some prefixes that could be useful in your courts:*
 - **B** - Cash Bond Receipt
 - **C** - Miscellaneous Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **D** - Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **F** - Web/IVR Receipt
 - **H** - Hold Receipt
 - **M** - Miscellaneous Receipt
 - **P** - Payment Receipt
 - **R** - Receipt Generated Using Bond Funds
 - **S** - Cash Bond Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **T** - Receipt Generated Using Overpayment Funds
 - **V** - Void and Hold Receipt (Reverse Receipt)
 - **Z** - Batch Receipting

Having receipt prefixes makes it easy to identify what kind of receipt it is.

Drag a column header here to group by that column.

Receipt #	Manual Rcpt #	Receipt Date
D00000038		11/01/2018
F00000096		11/01/2018
F00000097		11/01/2018
F00000098		11/02/2018
F00000099		11/02/2018
F00000100		11/02/2018
F00000101		11/02/2018
F00000102		11/02/2018
H00000073		11/01/2018
M00000019		11/01/2018

▪ **End-dated Relation Type Values:**

- The values in yellow are in AJACS but not in Code Standards. Does anyone know where these came from? Additionally, the values that are not highlighted are Code Standards but they are end-dated in AJACS. Does anyone know why these may have been end-dated?

DESCRIPTION - AJACS	MODIFIED DATE	EFFECTIVE DATE	END DATE
BROTHER	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
BROTHER-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
CHILD	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
COURT ORDER	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
DATING RELATIONSHIP	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
EMPLOYEE	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
EMPLOYER'S AGENT	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
FORMER MARRIAGE	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRANDCHILD	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRANDPARENT	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRAND PARENT-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
LIVING TOGETHER IN THE PAST	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
LIVING TOGETHER NOW	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
MARRIAGE/SPOUSE	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
PARENT	4/30/2009 8:30 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
PARENT-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:30 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SIGNIFICANT OTHER	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SISTER	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SISTER-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP CHILD	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP GRANDCHILD	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008

STEP GRANDPARENT	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP PARENT	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008

- **Bail Eligibility:**
 - Would we need a minute entry?

- **Beth Peterson –**

- **Person Matching**

- Below are the rules used for person matching

Rule Type	Rule Name	Rule Description
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE1	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE2	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE3	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE4	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE5	FNAME,LNAME,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE6	FNAME,MNAME, LNAME,GENDER
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE7	LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE8	LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE9	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE10	FNAME,LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE11	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,DL...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE12	FNAME,MNAME, SOUNDEX,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE13	FNAME,MNAME, SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER, D...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE14	FNAME,MNAME, LNAME, SUFFIX, DLPLAT...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE15	FNAME, MNAME, LNAME, SUFFIX, ADDRE...
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE16	LNAME,ADDRESS
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE17	LNAME,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE18	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE19	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE20	DLNUMBER,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE21	DOB,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE22	DLNUMBER,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE24	SOUNDEX,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE23	SOUNDEX,ADDRESS

- **New Fee Schedules for 6.1**

- Naming convention for fee schedules – Examples below

SCHEDULES	BF	DOC STORAGE	SPOUSAL MAINT	CONCIL. COURT	DOM REL	AZ LENGTHY	TOTAL
Under ARS 12-284	S		M	C	D	T	
ARS 12-284 A	188						188
ARS 12-284 A DS	188	15					203
ARS 12-284 A DS AZLT	188	15				15	218
ARS 12-284 A DS CC	188	15		65			268

- **Need local fees for all courts**

- **Marretta Mathes**

- Recommendations on relating events for the purpose of time standards.
 - In June we added new indicators in Pinal and Yuma production databases for the ODR pilot. New indicators are being requested for this project. Do the courts have any objection to adding these indicators statewide instead of to just the pilot courts?

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, November 20, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3711 Meeting ID: 82751

11/20/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise - Fran Ranacelli

Gila – Teri Griego

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

Maricopa – Angelica Mejia

Mohave- Christina Spurlock, Fred Shade

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz – Valeria Fuentes, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Shannon Shoemake, Karen Wilkes

AOC- Pat McGrath, Christine Sanchez

Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Motion: Reopen Court File:**
 - When a case has been dismissed and the attorney files a motion to reopen the case, some of the courts are charging a \$30 fee. In order to do this via eFiling, a document "Motion: Reopen Case File" needs to be created so that the fee can be tied to that event.
 - Mohave notes that other courts are using this fee and would like to know what authority can be used for this.
 - **Tabled. Courts wanted to know how efilers would be notified of the new fee. Christine volunteered to add this topic to the monthly meeting with clerks regarding efilings topics. She said there are a few options as far as notifying the attorneys when new fees are approved. The meeting is this week so we will revisit this next month.**

AOC

- Topics for discussion
 - Marisa Shaffery –
 - Copy and certification fees:
 - We will no longer be able to include these fees at case initiation. They do not default with a -0- amount so efilers would not have the option to change the unit to -0-.
 - **I asked if the courts would like an event type fee schedule to include copies and certifications but no one expressed a need for it so we will**

leave the two fees separate and if they are needed, courts will need to create two separate events.

- **Receipt prefixes:**

- Are GJ courts interested in having receipt prefixes set up in 6.1. Below are some prefixes that could be useful in your courts:
 - **B** - Cash Bond Receipt
 - **C** - Miscellaneous Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **D** - Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **F** - Web/IVR Receipt
 - **H** - Hold Receipt
 - **M** - Miscellaneous Receipt
 - **P** - Payment Receipt
 - **R** - Receipt Generated Using Bond Funds
 - **S** - Cash Bond Receipt Generated Using Hold Funds
 - **T** - Receipt Generated Using Overpayment Funds
 - **V** - Void and Hold Receipt (Reverse Receipt)
 - **Z** - Batch Receipting

Having receipt prefixes makes it easy to identify what kind of receipt it is.

Drag a column header here to group by that column.

Receipt #	Manual Rcpt #	Receipt Date
D00000038		11/01/2018
F00000096		11/01/2018
F00000097		11/01/2018
F00000098		11/02/2018
F00000099		11/02/2018
F00000100		11/02/2018
F00000101		11/02/2018
F00000102		11/02/2018
H00000073		11/01/2018
M00000019		11/01/2018

- **The courts would like this. I will check to see how the AJACS group wants them requested.**

- **End-dated Relation Type Values:**

- The values in yellow are in AJACS but not in Code Standards. Does anyone know where these came from? Additionally, the values that are not highlighted are Code Standards but they are end-dated in AJACS. Does anyone know why these may have been end-dated?

DESCRIPTION - AJACS	MODIFIED DATE	EFFECTIVE DATE	END DATE
BROTHER	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
BROTHER-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
CHILD	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
COURT ORDER	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
DATING RELATIONSHIP	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
EMPLOYEE	4/30/2009 8:27 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
EMPLOYER'S AGENT	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
FORMER MARRIAGE	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRANDCHILD	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRANDPARENT	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
GRAND PARENT-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:28 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
LIVING TOGETHER IN THE PAST	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
LIVING TOGETHER NOW	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
MARRIAGE/SPOUSE	4/30/2009 8:29 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
PARENT	4/30/2009 8:30 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
PARENT-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:30 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SIGNIFICANT OTHER	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SISTER	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
SISTER-IN-LAW	4/30/2009 8:31 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP CHILD	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP GRANDCHILD	4/30/2009 8:32 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP GRANDPARENT	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008
STEP PARENT	4/30/2009 8:35 AM	7/11/2008	7/12/2008

- I tabled this for next month. I will check to see if these values are used anywhere in the application and then compile a list of candidates for end-dating.

- **Bail Eligibility:**

- Would we need a minute entry?
 - Courts said they would create a generic one. No need for a new event.

- **Beth Peterson –**

- **Person Matching**

- Below are the rules used for person matching

Rule Type	Rule Name	Rule Description
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE1	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE2	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE3	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE4	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE5	FNAME,LNAME,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE6	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,GENDER
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE7	LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE8	LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE9	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE10	FNAME,LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE11	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,DL...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE12	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE13	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,D...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE14	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,DLPLAT...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE15	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,ADDRE...
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE16	LNAME,ADDRESS
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE17	LNAME,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE18	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE19	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE20	DLNUMBER,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE21	DOB,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE22	DLNUMBER,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE24	SOUNDEX,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE23	SOUNDEX,ADDRESS

- **Many noted that specific rules would not be used in their courts. I asked that the courts each send me an email voicing their specific concerns so that we can discuss at the next meeting.**

- **New Fee Schedules for 6.1**

- Naming convention for fee schedules – Examples below

SCHEDULES Under ARS 12-284	BF	DOC STORAGE S	SPOUSAL MAINT M	CONCIL. COURT C	DOM REL D	AZ LENGTHY T	TOTAL
ARS 12-284 A	188						188
ARS 12-284 A DS	188		15				203
ARS 12-284 A DS AZLT	188		15			15	218
ARS 12-284 A DS CC	188		15		65		268

- **Need local fees for all courts**

- **I asked for local fees to verify that we have correct information for new fee schedules in 6.1**

- **Marretta Mathes**

- Recommendations on relating events for the purpose of time standards.
 - **We were unable to come to a consensus on how to proceed. Discussion was to create a new indicator or to use the generic grant/deny orders that could be programmed to stop the clock for specific pre-decree events. I will meet with Marretta to make that decision.**
- In June we added new indicators in Pinal and Yuma production databases for the ODR pilot. New indicators are being requested for this project. Do the courts have any objection to adding these indicators statewide instead of to just the pilot courts?
 - **Courts had no preference so we will make that decision in-house.**

Does anyone know what these relationship codes are:

Relationship Codes		
Relationship Code	Relationship Name	Start Date
Same	Social Security Number	2/22/2006
Same	SID Number	2/22/2006
Same	Judge Order	2/22/2006
Same	Name	2/22/2006

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, December 19, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

12/19/2018 Agenda:

Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Motion: Reopen Court File:**
 - *When a case has been dismissed and the attorney files a motion to reopen the case, some of the courts are charging a \$30 fee. In order to do this via eFiling, a document "Motion: Reopen Case File" needs to be created so that the fee can be tied to that event.*
 - *Mohave notes that other courts are using this fee and would like to know what authority can be used for this.*
 - ***Tabled from last month – I am still waiting on an update from Christine Sanchez.***

AOC

- Topics for discussion
 - **Relationship type** - The values displayed below will be end-dated.

Relationship Name	Start Date
Aunt	2/22/2006
Boyfriend	2/22/2006
Brother	2/22/2006
Brother-in-Law	2/22/2006
Cleric	2/22/2006
Cousin	2/22/2006
Co-Worker	2/22/2006
Daughter	2/22/2006
Daughter-In-Law	2/22/2006
Domestic partner	2/22/2006
Ex-boyfriend	2/22/2006
Ex-girlfriend	2/22/2006
Ex-spouse	2/22/2006
Father	2/22/2006
Father-in-Law	2/22/2006
Fiancé (male)	2/22/2006

Fiancé (female)	2/22/2006
Friend	2/22/2006
Girlfriend	2/22/2006
Granddaughter	2/22/2006
Grandfather	2/22/2006
Grandmother	2/22/2006
Grandson	2/22/2006
Mother	2/22/2006
Mother-in-law	2/22/2006
Neighbor	2/22/2006
Nephew	2/22/2006
Niece	2/22/2006
Roommate	2/22/2006
Sister	2/22/2006
Sister-in-Law	2/22/2006
Son	2/22/2006
Son-in-Law	2/22/2006
Spouse	2/22/2006
Step-brother	2/22/2006
Step-daughter	2/22/2006
Step-father	2/22/2006
Step-mother	2/22/2006
Step-sister	2/22/2006
Step-son	2/22/2006
Uncle	2/22/2006
Unknown	2/22/2006
Adjudicator	2/22/2006
Doctor	2/22/2006
Employee	2/22/2006
Employer	2/22/2006
Pre-Trial Services Case Worker	2/22/2006
Psychiatrist	2/22/2006
Psychologist	2/22/2006
Supervisor	2/22/2006
Social Security Number	2/22/2006
SID Number	2/22/2006
Judge Order	2/22/2006
Name	2/22/2006

- **Person Matching** – Beth Peterson will provide more detail.

- *Below are the rules used for person matching*

Rule Type	Rule Name	Rule Description
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE1	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE2	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE3	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE4	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE5	FNAME,LNAME,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE6	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,GENDER
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE7	LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE8	LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE9	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE10	FNAME,LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE11	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,DL...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE12	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE13	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,D...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE14	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,DLPLAT...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE15	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,ADDRE...
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE16	LNAME,ADDRESS
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE17	LNAME,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE18	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE19	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE20	DLNUMBER,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE21	DOB,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE22	DLNUMBER,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE24	SOUNDEX,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE23	SOUNDEX,ADDRESS

- **Time Standards**

- *After discussion with Marretta Mathes, we have decided to use the functionality to relate events as triggers from some time standard events. I will be including detailed instructions with the meeting minutes.*

- **ODR Events**

- *We will be adding the following ODR events to all production databases. The courts will not be mandated to use the service but they will have the necessary events if they decide to.*
 - **Refer to ODR** – use when a case has been referred to an Online Dispute Resolution program for online mediation or negotiation
 - **Returned from ODR** – use when a case referred to an Online Dispute Resolution program has been returned to the court for further processing
 - **ODR Successful** – use when parties have reached a full agreement on all matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program
 - **ODR Partial** – use when parties have reached a partial agreement on the matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program
 - **ODR Unsuccessful** – use when parties have not reached an agreement on any matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program

- **Indicator Events**

- *At the last meeting, Fran noted that an indicator event was displaying on the ROA. After some research I have found that the following indicator events are not ROA Hidden. Could you please confirm and be prepared for discussion on this subject:*

Description
INDICATOR: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
INDICATOR: CORRECTIONS CORP OF AMERICA
INDICATOR: DEFENDANT FOUND COMPETENT
INDICATOR: DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INDICATOR: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
INDICATOR: DRUG CASE
INDICATOR: EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: FAMILY LAW COMMISSIONER PROCESSED
INDICATOR: GRANT FUNDED JD INFANT COURT
INDICATOR: GUARDIANSHIP
INDICATOR: INTEGRATED FAMILY COURT
INDICATOR: JD INFANT COURT
INDICATOR: MEDIATION HELD
INDICATOR: MEDIATION NOT HELD
INDICATOR: MEDIATION ORDERED
INDICATOR: MINOR VICTIM
INDICATOR: REMOVE FROM INTEGRATED FAMILY COURT
INDICATOR: REMOVED FROM EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: REMOVING FROM TIMELY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: SEVERANCE
INDICATOR: SEXUAL OFFENSE(S)
INDICATOR: TIMELY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: TITLE 8 GUARDIANSHIP

- **Third Party Complaints:**
 - *What is your criteria for determining whether to charge a filing fee for Third Party Complaints?*
- **Receipt Prefixes:**
 - *Would you like a unique set of numbers for each receipt prefix type or would you prefer that the numbers continue with the next consecutive number?*

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, December 19, 2018

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 996675679

12/19/2018 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise: Fran Ranacelli

Gila – Esther Canez

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Ryan Andersen

Maricopa – Sheri Jaffe

Mohave- Andrew Dixon, Della Hiser

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai- Kelly Gregorio, Shannon Shoemake, Karen Wilkes, Charlotte VanLandingham

AOC- Beth Peterson, Mary Foltz

Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Motion: Reopen Court File:**
 - *When a case has been dismissed and the attorney files a motion to reopen the case, some of the courts are charging a \$30 fee. In order to do this via eFiling, a document "Motion: Reopen Case File" needs to be created so that the fee can be tied to that event.*
 - *Mohave notes that other courts are using this fee and would like to know what authority can be used for this.*
 - **Tabled from last month – I am still waiting on an update from Christine Sanchez.**
 - **Motion: Reopen Dismissed Case is granted. There will be a \$30 fee associated to this event for eFiling purposes and if this is used for over the counter filings, the fee will be assessed using Payment: Miscellaneous Fee. I will notify Mary when this is ready to be pushed to production. EFiling users will be notified by emails sent to registered users, banners within the eFiling application and notices on the azcourts.gov page.**

AOC

- Topics for discussion
 - **Relationship type** - The values displayed below will be end-dated.
 - **No objection**

Relationship Name	Start Date
-------------------	------------

Aunt	2/22/2006
Boyfriend	2/22/2006
Brother	2/22/2006
Brother-in-Law	2/22/2006
Cleric	2/22/2006
Cousin	2/22/2006
Co-Worker	2/22/2006
Daughter	2/22/2006
Daughter-In-Law	2/22/2006
Domestic partner	2/22/2006
Ex-boyfriend	2/22/2006
Ex-girlfriend	2/22/2006
Ex-spouse	2/22/2006
Father	2/22/2006
Father-in-Law	2/22/2006
Fiancé (male)	2/22/2006
Fiancé (female)	2/22/2006
Friend	2/22/2006
Girlfriend	2/22/2006
Granddaughter	2/22/2006
Grandfather	2/22/2006
Grandmother	2/22/2006
Grandson	2/22/2006
Mother	2/22/2006
Mother-in-law	2/22/2006
Neighbor	2/22/2006
Nephew	2/22/2006
Niece	2/22/2006
Roommate	2/22/2006
Sister	2/22/2006
Sister-in-Law	2/22/2006
Son	2/22/2006
Son-in-Law	2/22/2006
Spouse	2/22/2006
Step-brother	2/22/2006
Step-daughter	2/22/2006
Step-father	2/22/2006
Step-mother	2/22/2006
Step-sister	2/22/2006
Step-son	2/22/2006
Uncle	2/22/2006
Unknown	2/22/2006
Adjudicator	2/22/2006
Doctor	2/22/2006

Employee	2/22/2006
Employer	2/22/2006
Pre-Trial Services Case Worker	2/22/2006
Psychiatrist	2/22/2006
Psychologist	2/22/2006
Supervisor	2/22/2006
Social Security Number	2/22/2006
SID Number	2/22/2006
Judge Order Name	2/22/2006

- **Person Matching** – Beth Peterson will provide more detail.

- *Below are the rules used for person matching*

Rule Type	Rule Name	Rule Description
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE1	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE2	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE3	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE4	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE5	FNAME,LNAME,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE6	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,GENDER
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE7	LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE8	LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE9	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER,DLSTATE,DOB
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE10	FNAME,LNAME,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE11	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,DL...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE12	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DOB,SSN
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE13	FNAME,MNAME,SOUNDEX,DLNUMBER,D...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE14	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,DLPLAT...
RULE USED FOR AUTOMATIC MATCHING	RULE15	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,SUFFIX,ADDRE...
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE16	LNAME,ADDRESS
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE17	LNAME,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE18	FNAME,LNAME,DLNUMBER
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE19	FNAME,MNAME,LNAME,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE20	DLNUMBER,DOB
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE21	DOB,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE22	DLNUMBER,SSN
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE24	SOUNDEX,DLPLATE,DLPLATESTATE
RULE USED TO IDENTIFY MATCHES THAT NEED TO BE QUEUED	RULE23	SOUNDEX,ADDRESS

- **There were several questions and concerns regarding this functionality (slated for 6.1). Della noted that when first and last name were entered for a new case, nothing pulls in if those names existed already (same thing for organizations). She stated that they are queued in 3.9 and believes it should function in the same manner in 6.1. Beth is checking to see if a new rule (25) can be added to make that happen. Beth tested and found that if you leave a field blank it will not match with a blank field in the person record. There was also concern voiced about Rule 6 based on the possibility that a parent and child could have the same name and gender. Beth said that this could be changed to be queued instead of matched.**

- **Time Standards**
 - After discussion with Marretta Mathes, we have decided to use the functionality to relate events as triggers from some time standard events. I will be including detailed instructions with the meeting minutes.
 - **No objection. The instructions will follow after the first of the year.**

- **ODR Events**
 - We will be adding the following ODR events to all production databases. The courts will not be mandated to use the service but they will have the necessary events if they decide to.
 - **Refer to ODR** – use when a case has been referred to an Online Dispute Resolution program for online mediation or negotiation
 - **Returned from ODR** – use when a case referred to an Online Dispute Resolution program has been returned to the court for further processing
 - **ODR Successful** – use when parties have reached a full agreement on all matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program
 - **ODR Partial** – use when parties have reached a partial agreement on the matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program
 - **ODR Unsuccessful** – use when parties have not reached an agreement on any matter(s) referred to the Online Dispute Resolution program
 - **No objection**

- **Indicator Events**
 - At the last meeting, Fran noted that an indicator event was displaying on the ROA. After some research I have found that the following indicator events are not ROA Hidden. Could you please confirm and be prepared for discussion on this subject:
 - **Courts agree these should be hidden**

Description
INDICATOR: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
INDICATOR: CORRECTIONS CORP OF AMERICA
INDICATOR: DEFENDANT FOUND COMPETENT
INDICATOR: DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INDICATOR: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
INDICATOR: DRUG CASE
INDICATOR: EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: FAMILY LAW COMMISSIONER PROCESSED
INDICATOR: GRANT FUNDED JD INFANT COURT
INDICATOR: GUARDIANSHIP
INDICATOR: INTEGRATED FAMILY COURT
INDICATOR: JD INFANT COURT
INDICATOR: MEDIATION HELD
INDICATOR: MEDIATION NOT HELD
INDICATOR: MEDIATION ORDERED
INDICATOR: MINOR VICTIM
INDICATOR: REMOVE FROM INTEGRATED FAMILY COURT
INDICATOR: REMOVED FROM EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: REMOVING FROM TIMELY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: SEVERANCE
INDICATOR: SEXUAL OFFENSE(S)
INDICATOR: TIMELY DISPOSITION COURT
INDICATOR: TITLE 8 GUARDIANSHIP

- **Third Party Complaints:**
 - What is your criteria for determining whether to charge a filing fee for Third Party Complaints?
 - **Rule 13 and 14 are the applicable rules. I did a quick review of production databases and found that except for one court, every court charges only the initial appearance (response) fee and not a new complaint fee. It seems to be a matter of interpretation.**
- **Receipt Prefixes:**
 - Would you like a unique set of numbers for each receipt prefix type or would you prefer that the numbers continue with the next consecutive number?
 - **Courts would like the receipts to be consecutive.**
- **Santa Cruz asked for an update regarding opening new PO cases beginning in the new year. Per Susann they are actively working on a script but it may not be ready for the beginning of the year.**