

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

---

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
AMENDING ARIZONA CODE OF	)	Administrative Order
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION	)	No. 2025 - <u>08</u>
§ 1-501: COURT AUTOMATION	)	(Affecting Administrative Order
STANDARDS	)	No. 2017-74)
	)	

---

Proposed amendments to the above-captioned section of the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) came before the Arizona Judicial Council on December 12, 2024, were approved, and recommended for adoption.

Therefore, pursuant to Article 6, Section 3, Constitution of Arizona,

IT IS ORDERED that the amendments to ACJA § 1-501, as indicated on the attached document, are adopted. All other provisions of § 1-501 remain unchanged and in effect.

Dated this 8th day of January, 2025.

---

ANN A. SCOTT TIMMER  
Chief Justice

**ARIZONA CODE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION**

**Part 1: Judicial Branch Administration**

**Chapter 5: Automation**

**Section 1-501: Court Automation Standards**

*(deleted text shown in ~~strikethrough~~, new text as underlined)*

**A. Automation of Courts.** All courts ~~shall~~must automate their business functions, including, at a minimum, case management, court financial cash management, document management, and statistical reporting.

**B. State Sponsored and Authorized Systems.** Courts ~~shall~~must use state-sponsored and authorized automation systems except as provided in subsection C ~~below~~. The state-sponsored and authorized systems include, but are not limited to, the following:

- ~~Arizona Trial Court Automation Project~~ Software Application
- ~~Juvenile On-Line Tracking System~~ Probation Enterprise Automation Software
- ~~Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System~~ Automation Software
- Appellate Court Case Management System
- ~~JURY~~ Jury Management System
- Electronic Filing (e-Filing) System
- Electronic Document and Data Access System

**C. Existing Automation Systems.**

1. Courts operating on systems other than state-sponsored and authorized systems ~~prior to~~ before January 1999 ~~which that~~ otherwise meet the minimum standards for automation and reporting are not required to replace existing systems. These courts ~~shall~~must migrate to state-sponsored systems when they replace their current systems except as provided in subsection D or E.

2. Pursuant to plans adopted by the Commission on Technology (COT), ~~these courts~~ operating on systems other than state-sponsored and authorized systems before January 1999 ~~shall~~must participate in mandated, statewide automation initiatives with no expectation for state funding. -These initiatives include, but are not limited to, statewide projects such as:

- Electronic statistical reporting
- Electronic filing
- Electronic public access to data
- Central case data repository
- Central document repository
- Justice integration
- Electronic document management
- Digital evidence management

**D. New Automation Systems.** A court may petition for the adoption of a new state-sponsored and authorized system due to deficiencies in existing ~~ones~~ systems through the Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) process. ~~The petitioning court shall prepare a functional needs justification and perform a business case analysis of both the state and local return on investment using the Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) document.~~ The process is as follows:

1. The petitioning court must submit a JPIJ to COT. The court must use the most current version of the JPIJ, shall and must include submit a functional needs justification and investment-business case analysis of both the state and local return on investment documents to COT in a format COT prescribes.
2. COT ~~shall~~will review the petitioning court's submitted documentation submission and will develop a recommendation to either adopt a new state-sponsored and authorized system or take other actions. ~~The COT forwards its recommendation shall be forwarded~~ to the chief justice for consideration.
3. The chief justice ~~shall determine whether to will either approve or deny the adoption of a new state-sponsored and authorized system, or to take other actions recommended by the COT recommendation, in whole or in part, or believed take any other action determined to be in the best interests of the judiciary-judicial branch.~~

**E. Local Exception System.** A court may petition for a local exception to any state-sponsored and authorized system ~~based on by~~ establishing a compelling business case. ~~The requesting court shall prepare a detailed comparison of functional needs to the capabilities of the state system along with a business case analysis of both the local and state return on investment.~~ The process is as follows:

1. The requesting court shall must prepare a detailed comparison of functional needs to the capabilities of the state system and a business case analysis of both the local and state return on investment and submit this information to COT using COT's -an-exception request document to COT along with a detailed functional comparison in a format COT prescribes.
2. COT ~~shall~~will review the requesting court's submitted documentation submission and will develop a recommendation in the form of to be made as a formal motion for COT consideration at a scheduled meeting. COT may approve or deny the motion and may place certain conditions on the exception system or project when determined to be in the best interests of the judiciary-judicial branch.
3. ~~Where warranted~~COT may forward its determination on the motion, the-including its recommendation and any conditions, shall be forwarded to the chief justice for final consideration.

**F. Automation Funding.** The administrative office ~~shall~~will fund court automation and technology projects that are part of the state-sponsored and authorized systems and initiatives; if as funds are available for this purpose. Unless state funds are granted, courts must secure local funds ~~For for~~ court automation projects that are not part of ~~the~~ a statewide initiative or to

~~support participation participate in the mandated statewide initiatives which are listed identified in section (C)(2), courts shall secure local funds unless state funds are granted.~~

**G. Information Technology Strategic Plan.** The administrative director on behalf of the supreme court, the chief judges on behalf of each division of the court of appeals, and the presiding judge on behalf of the municipal, justice, and superior courts of the county ~~shall~~must submit a three\_ year information technology strategic plan to COT for review and approval, on a schedule determined by COT. Each plan ~~shall~~must be in the format specified by COT and must include a description of all automation and technology projects and any plans for required migration to state\_sponsored and authorized systems. ~~COT shall specify the plan format.~~