

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, January 15, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

1/15/2020 Agenda:

Mohave

- Request to add new event – **NOTICE: NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO RESTORE CIVIL RIGHTS AND TO POSSESS A FIREARM:**
 - Effective 1/1/2020, new Rule 41 forms take effect which effectively end dates the current criminal form Rule 23 Notice of Rights of Review after Conviction, Rule 24(b) Notice of Post Conviction Relief and replaces them with Form 23(a) Notice of Rights After Sentencing in the Superior Court and Notice of Rights to Restore Civil Rights.
 - *Notice of Rights After Sentencing in the Superior Court was added on 1/1/2020 but the order for Notice of Rights to Restore Civil Rights was still waiting for a signature from the Chief Justice. I have asked for an update on this but have still not received it. Should we end-date Notice of Rights of Review after Conviction and Notice of Post Conviction Relief?*

AOC

- **Rule 33 discussion:**
 - This is new legislation effective 1/1/2020. New legislation for Rule 33 allows “pleading” defendants to have a single, self-contained rule, customized to their procedural circumstances, to guide them through the post-conviction process.
 - AOC recommendation – change name of event category Rule 32 to PCR to allow use with Rule 32 and Rule 33. A clean up script would be needed to change the name of existing events with Rule 32 event category to have the category name changed to PCR.
 - Concerns:
 - ✓ Will this work for time standards?
 - ✓ Will we need to duplicate all Rule 32 events for Rule 33?
 - ✓ Do we need to change case status Rule 32 to PCR?
 - In order to prepare for the eWarrant’s project, we would like to collect information regarding your process for Fugitive Warrants. Please be prepared to discuss.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, January 15, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

1/15/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

La Paz – Ryan Andersen

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon

Pima – John Baird

Pinal –Odette Apodaca, Nikki Felix

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

Yavapai - Donna McQuality, Heather Diaz, Rachel Roehe, Karen Wilkes

AOC- Patrick McGrath, April Smith, Marretta Mathes, Nicole LaConte, Sarah Baker, Melanie Cluff, Marisa Shaffery

Mohave

- Request to add new event – **NOTICE: NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO RESTORE CIVIL RIGHTS AND TO POSSESS A FIREARM:**
 - *Effective 1/1/2020, new Rule 41 forms take effect which effectively end dates the current criminal form Rule 23 Notice of Rights of Review after Conviction, Rule 24(b) Notice of Post Conviction Relief and replaces them with Form 23(a) Notice of Rights After Sentencing in the Superior Court and Notice of Rights to Restore Civil Rights.*
 - *Notice of Rights After Sentencing in the Superior Court was added on 1/1/2020 but the order for Notice of Rights to Restore Civil Rights was still waiting for a signature from the Chief Justice. I have asked for an update on this but have still not received it. Should we end-date Notice of Rights of Review after Conviction and Notice of Post Conviction Relief?*
 - *This was granted. Suggestion to remove “Notice” after colon (NOTICE: NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO RESTORE CIVIL RIGHTS AND TO POSSESS A FIREARM)*
 - *The courts do not want to end-date the two events shown above.*

AOC

- **Rule 33 discussion:**
 - *This is new legislation effective 1/1/2020. New legislation for Rule 33 allows “pleading” defendants to have a single, self-contained rule, customized to their procedural circumstances, to guide them through the post-conviction process.*
 - *AOC recommendation – change name of event category Rule 32 to PCR to allow use with Rule 32 and Rule 33. A clean up script would be needed to change the name of existing events with Rule 32 event category to have the category name changed to PCR.*

- **Options are to start new event category for Rule 33 OR change existing Rule 32 event category to PCR.**
 - **This will not change the old event category Rule 32 on the ROA but it will display PCR in the Event Management screen.**
 - **Example: Go to a case containing Rule 32 event, double click and it will take you to Event Management screen which displays the event category as “Rule 32” on top and below is the event which displays as Rule 32: Completion of PCR File Review. When the event category changes, the top of the event management screen will display “Post-Conviction Relief” the events will still display as Rule 32: completion of PCR file review.**
- **Suggestion to spell out to Post Conviction Relief instead of acronym PCR but this will depend on field’s max character limit.**
 - **This was granted.**
 - Concerns:
 - ✓ Will this work for time standards?
 - **Marretta does not see any issue with changing the description on the Event Category.**
 - ✓ Will we need to duplicate all Rule 32 events for Rule 33?
 - **After meeting with Donna, Della and Marretta, it was decided that we will be creating duplicate events for Rule 33. When the users select the event under the event category of Post Conviction Relief, they will need to be cognizant of whether it’s a Rule 32 or Rule 33 case.**
 - ✓ Do we need to change case status Rule 32 to PCR?
 - **Case and Party Status description will be changed from Rule 32 to Post Conviction Relief.**
 - Below are the events that will be added:

Event Category	Event Entry
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: COMPLETION OF PCR FILE REVIEW
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: DISMISSAL
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: GRANTING OF PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: ORDER GRANTING WITHDRAWAL FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: PETITION TO WITHDRAW PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF EXTENSION OF TIME

POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF NOTICE
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF TRANSCRIPT
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: REPLY TO RESPONSE TO RULE 33 PETITION
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: RESPONSE TO RULE 33 PETITION
POST CONVICTION RELIEF	RULE 33: RULING ON POST CONVICTION RELIEF

Existing event of ‘PCR: RULE 33 PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF’ will have the PCR removed.

- In order to prepare for the eWarrant’s project, we would like to collect information regarding your process for Fugitive Warrants. Please be prepared to discuss.

Fugitive warrants discussion:

- **The issue of processing fugitive warrant was brought up due to the superior court in Yavapai County not being able to issue an FTA warrant on an FW case.**
 - **It is Yavapai County’s usual practice to create a new case when a person is picked up on a fugitive of justice warrant.**
 - **The case type used in this and some other counties (not all) is Criminal, with a “Fugitive Warrant” case category.**
 - **Yavapai County does not add charges to FW cases.**
 - **Donna said that they create this case without charges when the defendant is cited on new misdemeanor charges that could/would be filed in LJ courts instead of GJ**
 - **The defendant is IAd and released on bond which is forwarded to the state where the FOJ warrant was issued**
 - **3 hearings are set**
 - **If/when defendant FTAs on the FW case Yavapai will issue an FW case**
- **Other courts stated that they will create the FW case only if the defendant does not waive extradition**
- **Other courts stated that they would not issue FTA warrant if the defendant FTAs for the review hearing**
- **Other courts stated that if bond is posted on the original FOJ (out of state) warrant, defendant is released and the FW case is dismissed**
- **Pinal and Apache counties have added the 13-3854 to their FOJ cases. This is not a citable offense**

FOJ Warrant Committee to meet initially on 1/30/2020 at 9am. Rule 11 warrants on cases transferred up from LJ courts will also be discussed.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, February 19, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

2/19/2020 Agenda - Amended:

Yuma

- Request to add new appearance reason – **Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**
At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arraignment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.

- *Below are the existing events for EDC court:*

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

AOC

- Question on Rule 33 events:
 - *When I submitted the request to duplicate Rule 32 events for Rule 33, I forgot to remove the end-dated value of **Ruling on Post Conviction Relief**. Santa Cruz noticed that it was there and asked if we could also add that as a Rule 32 event because their judge had just denied one and there wasn't really an event to cover that scenario. When I researched why it had been end-dated, I found the following information from 7/21/2011 minutes:*
 - *Yavapai:*
Request to automatically change the case status for "Rule 32: Ruling on Post Conviction Relief" to "Re-Adjudicated" and the party status to "Terminated – Re-Adjudicated."

- Below is the response from Jennifer Greene
 - Looking at the statutes in ARS § 14-3401 etc. it looks like the Class C fee is to be charged to (a) someone files a case-initiating petition, let's call him John Doe; and (b) someone who files a pleading in John Doe's pre-existing case, let's call him Alan Smith, in which Alan Smith objects to a will being declared valid or objects to a decedent being declared to have died without a will, or objects to a particular person being appointed as the executor, etc. That makes the case a "contested" case. Thereafter, if yet a third person, let's call him Sam Adams, comes in and files a pleading setting forth some kind of objection in John Doe's case, the clerk should charge Mr. Adams the Class D fee. Since estate cases can involve any number of different people who may have been related to the decedent or had some other basis for claiming to be entitled to a distribution from the estate, I would expect the Class C fee to be charged to the initial petitioner and the first person to file an opposition to the initial petition; but the Class D fee could be charged many times to many other people who subsequently appear and seek some relief other than what either John Doe or Alan Smith want the court to do.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, February 19, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

2/19/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Coconino – Valerie Wyant

Gila – Terri Griego

La Paz – Ryan Anderson

Maricopa – Chris Driscoll

Mohave – Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon

Pinal – Odette Apodaca, Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Dolly Legleu

Yavapai – Heather Diaz, Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Charlotte VanLandingham, Karen Wilkes, Jonathon Derois

AOC – Marisa Shaffery, April Smith, Pat McGrath, Christine Sanchez

Yuma

- Request to add new appearance reason – **Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**
At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arraignment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.
 - **Below are the existing events for EDC court:**

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

- **TABLED** – no representatives from Yuma

AOC

- Question on Rule 33 events:

- When I submitted the request to duplicate Rule 32 events for Rule 33, I forgot to remove the end-dated value of **Ruling on Post Conviction Relief**. Santa Cruz noticed that it was there and asked if we could also add that as a Rule 32 event because their judge had just denied one and there wasn't really an event to cover that scenario. When I researched why it had been end-dated, I found the following information from 7/21/2011 minutes:
 - Yavapai:
 - Request to automatically change the case status for "Rule 32: Ruling on Post Conviction Relief" to "Re-Adjudicated" and the party status to "Terminated – Re-Adjudicated."
 - *The regular events for Rule 32 change the case status to "reopened" so we need closure.*
 - Discussion occurred and it was decided that the currently existing code of "Rule 32: Ruling on Post Conviction Relief" will be changed to "Rule 32: Granting of Petition for Post Conviction Relief." There will be no automatic case/party status change attached to this new code as it the case will already be in Reopened/Rule 32 due to the Rule 32 Petition being filed.
 - The courts should be using "Rule 32: Dismissal" as the event denying and dismissing Rule 32 Petitions. This code was approved at the June 15, 2011 Code Standardization meeting and will be pushed with all other codes once all courts are on AJACS 3.6 at the end of August 2011.
 - It was agreed that "Rule 32: Dismissal" will automatically change the case status to "Re-Adjudicated" and the party status to "Terminated – Re-Adjudicated."
 - Do we want t this event end-date for Rule 33 or do we want to reactivate it for Rule 32? Santa Cruz would like to have it reactivated. Please be prepared to discuss.
 - Val and Della noted that there is no language in regards to denials in the Rule. Rule 32.11 (a) Summary of Disposition states that after identifying all precluded and untimely claims, if court determines that no remaining claim presents a material issue of fact or law that would entitle the defendant to relief under this rule, the court must summarily dismiss the petition.
 - Valerie recommends putting denial in the comments.
 - Decision is to leave Rule 32: Dismissal as is and Rule 33 event will be end-dated.
 - Rule 33 events are not yet released.
- Follow up on tabled item from November meeting:
 - Courts would like more clarification. Is PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION different from PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT in that PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION means they are only objecting to the petition and PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT means that they are objecting to the petition and asking to be the person appointed? Should the language say "PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION TO OPPOSING PETITION" or simply opposing? If

somebody is filing an objection to the petition or is there somebody objecting TO an opposing petition?

Superior Court Filing Fees

Effective May 16, 2018

The filing fee schedules offered through this web page reflect the fees established in the Arizona Revised Statutes, A.R.S. § 12-284, with increases approved by the Supreme Court as provided in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) § 3-404. AO 2014-39 reinstated ACJA § 5-109 effective May 19, 2014, resuming the collection of the Arizona Lengthy Trial Fund fee. Please check with the specific court for additional local fees.

Skip to section: [Civil](#)

[Domestic Relations](#)

[Miscellaneous](#)

[Probate, Conservatorship, Guardianship & Fiduciary](#)

[Transfer from Justice Courts](#)

A.R.S. 12-284 CLASS	SERVICE	BASE FEE	DOC. STORAGE FUND (1)	SPOUSAL MAINT ENF ENHANCE FUND (2)	CONCIL. COURT FUND (3)	DOM.REL. ED/MED. FUND (4)	AZ LENGTHY TRIAL FUND (5)	TOTAL
C	Opposing petition in testacy, or appointment proceedings or appointment of guardianship/conservatorship	149.00	15.00					164.00
D	Any person opposing contested petition if no prior payment	74.00	15.00					89.00

- Below is the response from Jennifer Greene
 - Looking at the statutes in ARS § 14-3401 etc. it looks like the Class C fee is to be charged to (a) someone files a case-initiating petition, let's call him John Doe; and (b) someone who files a pleading in John Doe's pre-existing case, let's call him Alan Smith, in which Alan Smith objects to a will being declared valid or objects to a decedent being declared to have died without a will, or objects to a particular person being appointed as the executor, etc. That makes the case a "contested" case. Thereafter, if yet a third person, let's call him Sam Adams, comes in and files a pleading setting forth some kind of objection in John Doe's case, the clerk should charge Mr. Adams the Class D fee. Since estate cases can involve any number of different people who may have been related to the decedent or had some other basis for claiming to be entitled to a distribution from the estate, I would expect the Class C fee to be charged to the initial petitioner and the first person to file an opposition to the initial petition; but the Class D fee could be charged many times to many other people who subsequently appear and seek some relief other than what either John Doe or Alan Smith want the court to do.
 - To state it clearly, **PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION** is filed to oppose **OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT**
 - Della stated that both events carry a base filing fee of \$149 in the Mohave production database. One of the base fees will need to be changed.
 - I will examine the fee schedules in all production databases to determine if the correct fee schedules are attached.
 - Valerie – checked their database and their fees are pulling in correctly.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, March 18, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

3/18/2020 Agenda:

Yuma

- **Tabled from 2/19/2020** - Request to add new appearance reason – **Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**
At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arraignment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.
 - **Below are the existing events for EDC court:**

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

Yavapai

- Request modify event: **Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**
 - Yavapai County would like to modify the existing code of "Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" to "**Order: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**". The document is an order of the court, which would best fit under the "Order" category, rather than the "Statement" category.
 - To properly docket the order titled "Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order" in juvenile dependency cases.
- Request for new event: **Motion for Termination of Parental Rights**
 - Yavapai County would like to add a docket code for Motion for Termination of Parental Rights to correspond with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64A.

- To docket the Motion for Termination of Parental Rights in juvenile dependency cases.
- Currently using "Petition: Terminate Parent / Child Relationship", which conforms to Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64B, but not Rule 64A.

AOC

- Sarah Baker has been working on the eWarrants Project and asked if the GJ courts ever assess the following fee. Please be prepared to discuss:
 - [28-1525. Assessment: failure to pay fine](#)
In addition to any fine, fee, penalty or assessment authorized by law, a person who is convicted in the superior court or a justice court for a violation of this title shall pay an assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars if a warrant for failure to pay a fine, fee, penalty or assessment imposed as a result of the conviction is issued for the arrest of the defendant. The court shall transmit the assessed monies to the county treasurer for deposit in the county general fund. The assessment is not subject to any surcharge.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, March 18, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

3/18/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Mohave – Andrew Dixon

Santa Cruz –Dolly Legleu, Valeria Fuentes

Yavapai – Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality

Yuma – Robert Wilson, Teasha Gunderman

AOC – Marisa Shaffery, Pat McGrath, Sarah Baker, Nicole LaConte, Michelle Gillich, Melanie Cluff

Yuma

- **Tabled from 2/19/2020** - Request to add new appearance reason – **Arrestment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**

At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arrestment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arrestment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.

- *Below are the existing events for EDC court:*

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

- *Tabled for next month when there will be more participants on the call. I will be sending out an email to the courts to determine if they use EDC and what their process is. Please be on the look-out for this email.*

Yavapai

- Request modify event: **Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**
 - Yavapai County would like to modify the existing code of "Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" to "**Order: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**". The

document is an order of the court, which would best fit under the "Order" category, rather than the "Statement" category.

- To properly docket the order titled "Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order" in juvenile dependency cases.
- **Tabled for next month when there will be more participants on the call.**
- Request for new event: **Motion for Termination of Parental Rights**
 - Yavapai County would like to add a docket code for Motion for Termination of Parental Rights to correspond with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64A.
 - To docket the Motion for Termination of Parental Rights in juvenile dependency cases.
 - Currently using "Petition: Terminate Parent / Child Relationship", which conforms to Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64B, but not Rule 64A.
 - **Tabled for next month when there will be more participants on the call.**

AOC

- Sarah Baker has been working on the eWarrants Project and asked if the GJ courts ever assess the following fee. Please be prepared to discuss:
 - **28-1525. Assessment; failure to pay fine**
In addition to any fine, fee, penalty or assessment authorized by law, a person who is convicted in the superior court or a justice court for a violation of this title shall pay an assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars if a warrant for failure to pay a fine, fee, penalty or assessment imposed as a result of the conviction is issued for the arrest of the defendant. The court shall transmit the assessed monies to the county treasurer for deposit in the county general fund. The assessment is not subject to any surcharge.
 - **Tabled for next month when there will be more participants on the call.**
- **Please be advised that the following events have been added to your production databases:**

RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF EXTENSION OF TIME
RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF NOTICE
RULE 33: POST CONVICTION RELIEF TRANSCRIPT
RULE 33: REPLY TO RESPONSE TO RULE 33 PETITION
RULE 33: RESPONSE TO RULE 33 PETITION
RULE 33: DISMISSAL
RULE 33: GRANTING OF PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
RULE 33: PETITION TO WITHDRAW PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
RULE 33: ORDER GRANTING WITHDRAWAL FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF
RULE 33: COMPLETION OF PCR FILE REVIEW

- **In the future, if we do not have a minimum of 8 courts on the court, all items will be tabled until the next meeting. If you know you will not be able to participate, please let me know so that I can determine if I need to cancel the meeting.**

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, April 15, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

4/15/2020 Agenda:

***There were no new requests for this agenda.**

Yuma

- o **Tabled from 3/18/2020** - Request to add new appearance reason – **Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**

At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arraignment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.

- **Below are the existing events for EDC court:**

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

- **I sent an email to the courts requesting information on their EDC processes. Below are the responses**
 - **Pinal** County has an EDC process.
When scheduling hearings for the EDC court calendar, we use the appearance reason most applicable and then if there are any other appearance reasons that need to be included, we will add them in the comments. We do not schedule multiple hearings for the same case.
 - **Yuma** County Process for EDC:
When the county attorney processes each grand jury case they do research to see if the case would qualify for early disposition. Once a decision is made the grand jury cases are heard and either assigned an arraignment hearing or an arraignment/early disposition change of plea hearing. Once I am given the cases to process and add to the system I

then proceed to schedule them. Due to the notices of supervening indictment state arraignment/early disposition change of plea and the court states the same type of hearing on record. I had to come up with a scheduling event that would match what was stated on record.

After discussion with the County Attorney's Office, my lead clerk, and supervisor this is how I schedule the hearings:

- First box: Arraignment
- Second box: Early Disposition Change of Plea

It would easier to schedule these cases if there was one set event showing arraignment/early disposition change of plea

- In **Cochise** we don't use EDC but do indeed utilize ERC, which may be the same thing, so I asked our specialist down here for our ERC process and she responded with the following:

"A sentencing date will be scheduled if the case is going straight to sentencing. Sometimes a Review Hearing will be scheduled depending upon the situation. After I open the case, I will forward it on to the court room clerk who then creates an MEO summarizing the proceedings. It is at that time the arraignment/hearing will be scheduled. I hope this helps."

It is my understanding that we do not schedule multiple ERC hearings for the same case.

The code situation doesn't happen too often here in Cochise if at all, so we take no position on adding it or not.

- In **Yavapai** County we do not open criminal cases until after EDC has occurred. For this reason, nothing is calendared.
- **Navajo** County essentially absorbed ERC/EDC into our Monday preliminary hearings held in Superior Court. If a defendant waives their preliminary hearing, they can go right into change of plea and sentencing on the felony charges or set it out for 1 week. If they do not waive, the case proceeds as a standard 100-day case.

Yavapai

- **Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Request modify event: Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**
 - Yavapai County would like to modify the existing code of "Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" to "**Order: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**". The document is an order of the court, which would best fit under the "Order" category, rather than the "Statement" category.
 - To properly docket the order titled "Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order" in juvenile dependency cases.
- **Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Request for new event: Motion for Termination of Parental Rights**

- Yavapai County would like to add a docket code for Motion for Termination of Parental Rights to correspond with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64A.
- To docket the Motion for Termination of Parental Rights in juvenile dependency cases.
- Currently using "Petition: Terminate Parent / Child Relationship", which conforms to Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64B, but not Rule 64A.

AOC

- **Tabled from 3/18/2020** - Sarah Baker has been working on the eWarrants Project and asked if the GJ courts ever assess the following fee. Please be prepared to discuss:
 - **28-1525. Assessment; failure to pay fine**
In addition to any fine, fee, penalty or assessment authorized by law, a person who is convicted in the superior court or a justice court for a violation of this title shall pay an assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars if a warrant for failure to pay a fine, fee, penalty or assessment imposed as a result of the conviction is issued for the arrest of the defendant. The court shall transmit the assessed monies to the county treasurer for deposit in the county general fund. The assessment is not subject to any surcharge.
- **In the future, if we do not have a minimum of 8 courts on the court, all items will be tabled until the next meeting. If you know you will not be able to participate, please let me know so that I can determine if I need to cancel the meeting.**

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, April 15, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

4/15/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Maricopa – Chris Driscoll

Mohave – Della Hiser

Pinal – Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz – Valeria Fuentes

Yavapai – Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Charlotte VanLandingham, Kelly Gregorio

Yuma – Robert Wilson, Teasha Gunderman

AOC – Marisa Shaffery, Pat McGrath, April Smith

***There were no new requests for this agenda.**

Yuma

- Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Request to add new appearance reason – **Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea:**

At this time I have to schedule two events under each case so that our calendar reflects only one case. I currently schedule as follows: Arraignment then enter on the next line Early Disposition Change of Plea. I am requesting a single code to show as follows Arraignment/ Early Disposition Change of Plea.

- *Below are the existing events for EDC court:*

DESCRIPTION
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT HEARING
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING
IA IN EDC - SET PRELIMINARY HEARING AND REMOVE FROM EDC
IA IN EDC - SET PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND REMOVE FROM EDC

- I sent an email to the courts requesting information on their EDC processes. Below are the responses

- **Pinal** County has an EDC process.
When scheduling hearings for the EDC court calendar, we use the appearance reason most applicable and then if there are any other appearance reasons that need to be included, we will add them in the comments. We do not schedule multiple hearings for the same case.
- **Yuma** County Process for EDC:
When the county attorney processes each grand jury case they do research to see if the case would qualify for early disposition. Once a decision is made the grand jury cases are heard and either assigned an arraignment hearing or an arraignment/early disposition change of plea hearing. Once I am given the cases to process and add to the system I then proceed to schedule them. Due to the notices of supervening indictment state arraignment/early disposition change of plea and the court states the same type of hearing on record. I had to come up with a scheduling event that would match what was stated on record.

After discussion with the County Attorney's Office, my lead clerk, and supervisor this is how I schedule the hearings:

- First box: Arraignment
- Second box: Early Disposition Change of Plea

It would easier to schedule these cases if there was one set event showing arraignment/early disposition change of plea

- In **Cochise** we don't use EDC but do indeed utilize ERC, which may be the same thing, so I asked our specialist down here for our ERC process and she responded with the following:

"A sentencing date will be scheduled if the case is going straight to sentencing. Sometimes a Review Hearing will be scheduled depending upon the situation. After I open the case, I will forward it on to the court room clerk who then creates an MEO summarizing the proceedings. It is at that time the arraignment/hearing will be scheduled. I hope this helps."

It is my understanding that we do not schedule multiple ERC hearings for the same case.

The code situation doesn't happen too often here in Cochise if at all, so we take no position on adding it or not.

- In **Yavapai** County we do not open criminal cases until after EDC has occurred. For this reason, nothing is calendared.
- **Navajo** County essentially absorbed ERC/EDC into our Monday preliminary hearings held in Superior Court. If a defendant waives their preliminary hearing, they can go right into change of plea and sentencing on the felony charges or set it out for 1 week. If they do not waive, the case proceeds as a standard 100-day case.

- Court asked if it would be possible to just change the description on an existing appearance reason and there was no objection. Request was granted. The following appearance reason will be modified from:
 - EARLY DISPOSITION COURT-CHANGE OF PLEA
 - To: EARLY DISPOSITION COURT- CHANGE OF PLEA/ARRAIGNMENT

Yavapai

- Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Request modify event: **Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**
 - Yavapai County would like to modify the existing code of "Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" to "**Order: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**". The document is an order of the court, which would best fit under the "Order" category, rather than the "Statement" category.
 - To properly docket the order titled "Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order" in juvenile dependency cases.
 - Some courts use Statement: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in court types other than Juvenile so recommendation was to add a new event for use in only Juvenile cases. **Order: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law will be added.**
- Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Request for new event: **Motion for Termination of Parental Rights**
 - Yavapai County would like to add a docket code for Motion for Termination of Parental Rights to correspond with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64A.
 - To docket the Motion for Termination of Parental Rights in juvenile dependency cases.
 - Currently using "Petition: Terminate Parent / Child Relationship", which conforms to Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 64B, but not Rule 64A.
 - **Granted. Motion for Termination of Parental Rights will be used in existing cases only. Petition: Terminate Parent / Child Relationship is used to initiate a case.**

AOC

- Tabled from 3/18/2020 - Sarah Baker has been working on the eWarrants Project and asked if the GJ courts ever assess the following fee. Please be prepared to discuss:
 - 28-1525. Assessment; failure to pay fine
In addition to any fine, fee, penalty or assessment authorized by law, a person who is convicted in the superior court or a justice court for a violation of this title shall pay an assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars if a warrant for failure to pay a fine, fee, penalty or assessment imposed as a result of the conviction is issued for the arrest of the defendant. The court shall transmit the assessed monies to the county treasurer for deposit in the county general fund. The assessment is not subject to any surcharge.

I forgot to copy Sarah when I sent out the agenda so she was not at the meeting. **Tabling this for next meeting.**
- In the future, if we do not have a minimum of 8 courts on the court, all items will be tabled until the next meeting. If you know you will not be able to participate, please let me know so that I can determine if I need to cancel the meeting.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, June 17, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

6/17/2020 Agenda:

Coconino

- Request for ability to assess a Deferred Prosecution Fee which would allocate to probation.
 - Do any courts assess this? If so, what event do you use and where does it allocate.
 - If no, there is currently an event 'ORDER: DEFERRED PROSECUTION' to which we can attach a fee schedule. We would have to create a cost type and possibly a new general ledger. If the courts do not want to use the existing event, we could create a payment event. Please be prepared to discuss.

Mohave

- Request for new event – **MISCELLANEOUS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE AGREEMENT**
 - Will be used to docket the Agreement that is introduced in JD cases (every single case) at the Prehearing Conference that is filed in during the Preliminary Protective Hearing.
 - Currently using MISCELLANEOUS: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – AGREEMENT, REPORT: SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE MEDIATION which don't match up very well to a Prehearing Conference Agreement.
 - Arizona Rules of Court, Rules of Juvenile Procedure Rule 49 describes the Prehearing Conference. Arizona Rules of Court, Rules of Juvenile Procedure Rule 50(B)(5) discusses the submission of this document at the Preliminary Protective Hearing.
- Request for new event – **MEMORANDUM: DELINQUENT RESTITUTION:**
 - Probation is tasked with notifying the Court when a probationer becomes delinquent in restitution. They do this with a Petition to Modify (we have a code), a Petition to Revoke (we have a code) or a MEMORANDUM to the Court outlining the reasons for the delinquencies and expected duration thereof.
 - We use MEMORANDUM: MEMORANDUM, but as we move toward paperless files in the criminal case type, we will need to be able to distinguish this memorandum from just any old memorandum.
 - Authority is Arizona Code of Judicial Administration Section 6-103.

AOC

- Event standardization
 - The following events are displaying in some databases and are not code standards. Please review and be ready to discuss:
 - MINUTE ENTRY: SEALED MINUTE ENTRY (CONFIDENTIAL)
 - MINUTE ENTRY: STATUS HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT
 - MINUTE ENTRY: DRUG COURT STATUS HEARING (SEALED)
 - MINUTE ENTRY: DISPOSITION HEARING – recommend **ME: DISPOSITION** or **ME: DISPOSITION/DIVERSION HEARING**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: NON - JURY TRIAL
 - MINUTE ENTRY: SUPPORT HEARING 4 - D
 - MINUTE ENTRY: CRIMINAL MINUTE ENTRY (GENERIC) – recommend **ME: MINUTE ENTRY (STANDARD) CRIMINAL**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV IA PTR – recommend **ME: JV INITIAL APPEARANCE ON A PETITION TO REVOKE**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV COP
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV COP PTR
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV DISPO – recommend **ME: JV DISPOSITION**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JD HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: PB HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: GC HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: FUGITIVE HEARING – recommend **ME: FUGITIVE EXTRADITION**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: ADOPTION HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: DO HEARING
 - MINUTE ENTRY: COP PTR
 - MINUTE ENTRY: COP COMBO – recommend **ME: CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS / VACATION OF CONVICTION / RIGHT TO CARRY – recommend **ME: PETITION RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS / VACATION OF CONVICTION / RIGHT TO CARRY FIREARM** or **ME: PETITION RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS/VACATION OF CONVICTION/RIGHT TO CARRY FIREARM-FED**
 - CHANGE OF VENUE: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED – recommend **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS** or **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - CASE INITIATION** or **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - EXISTING CASE**
 - STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY
 - STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY / CUSTODY
 - STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY / CUSTODY / SUPPORT
 - STATEMENT: PRETRIAL STATEMENT – recommend **ME: PRETRIAL / PREHEARING STATEMENT**
 - NOTICE: RESTITUTION LIEN

- **PETITION: TERMINATE PROBATION** – recommend **ME: TERMINATE / DISCHARGE PROBATION**
- The events below are in code standards but have some issues:
 - *SERVICE OF PROCESS: SUMMONS SERVED* – this has different codes. Can we use a different event?
 - *ORDER: ASFA Finding of Fact Order* - should be end-dated but is not in 100/400/500/800/1400/1500. Recommendation is to use - **Order: ASFA Findings**
 - *ORDER: WAGE ASSIGNMENT* – some courts are end-dated but should not be per Code Standards
 - *PETITION: TERMINATE* – some courts are end-dated but should not be per Code Standards
- Question from court:
 - We are docketing a Notice: Placing on Dismissal Calendar and discovered that the case status is changing to Adjudicated. This notice is done pursuant to Civil Rule of Procedure Rule 38.1(d) which states that the clerk must place a civil action on the dismissal calendar if 210 days have passed and the parties haven't filed a joint report and scheduling order. It goes on to say that if an action remains on the dismissal calendar for 60 days, the court must dismiss it without prejudice and enter an appropriate order regarding bond unless the parties file a joint report or the court continues the case on the dismissal calendar (I am paraphrasing only slightly). In any event, we believe that it is premature for the case status to be changed to 'Adjudicated' and wonder if this is an error.
- Is your court using the functionality to relate events? If not, why? Please be prepared to discuss.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, June 17, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

6/17/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Apache – Delana Waite

Coconino – Val Wyant, Erin Maloney

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

La Paz – Ryan Anderson

Maricopa – Chris Cerrato

Mohave – Della Hiser, Cassandra Overland, Andrew Dixon

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz – Valeria Fuentes

Yavapai – Rachel Roehe, Donna McQuality, Charlotte VanLandingham, Kelly Gregorio, Karen Wilkes, Heather Diaz, Jonathon Derois

AOC – Marisa Shaffery, Pat McGrath, April Smith, Sarah Baker, Christine Sanchez, Beth Peterson

Coconino

- Request for ability to assess a Deferred Prosecution Fee which would allocate to probation.
 - *Do any courts assess this? If so, what event do you use and where does it allocate.*
 - *If no, there is currently an event 'ORDER: DEFERRED PROSECUTION' to which we can attach a fee schedule. We would have to create a cost type and possibly a new general ledger. If the courts do not want to use the existing event, we could create a payment event. Please be prepared to discuss.*
 - ***Adult probation assesses and collects deferred prosecution payments for supervision of defendants that are in the program. Beginning July 1st, the clerk's office will begin collecting the deferred prosecution payments. Currently there is no option for 'Deferred Prosecution' to be assessed.***
 - ***One court recommended using 'PAYMENT: PROSEC REFRL ASSESSMENT' but this is linked to cost type 'PROSEC REFRL ASSESS' whose code is '9237J4' and it allocates to Juvenile Probation. I will be adding a new event of 'PAYMENT: DEFERRED PROSECUTION' which will be linked to cost type 'DEFERRED PROSECION – code 9823Y3'. If your court will be using this, please let me know what General Ledger you would like it to allocate to.***

Mohave

- Request for new event – **MISCELLANEOUS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE AGREEMENT**
 - Will be used to docket the Agreement that is introduced in JD cases (every single case) at the Prehearing Conference that is filed in during the Preliminary Protective Hearing.
 - Currently using MISCELLANEOUS: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – AGREEMENT, REPORT: SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE MEDIATION which don't match up very well to a Prehearing Conference Agreement.
 - Arizona Rules of Court, Rules of Juvenile Procedure Rule 49 describes the Prehearing Conference. Arizona Rules of Court, Rules of Juvenile Procedure Rule 50(B)(5) discusses the submission of this document at the Preliminary Protective Hearing.
 - **GRANTED. This will be a 'Restricted' event**

- Request for new event – **MEMORANDUM: DELINQUENT RESTITUTION:**
 - Probation is tasked with notifying the Court when a probationer becomes delinquent in restitution. They do this with a Petition to Modify (we have a code), a Petition to Revoke (we have a code) or a MEMORANDUM to the Court outlining the reasons for the delinquencies and expected duration thereof.
 - We use MEMORANDUM: MEMORANDUM, but as we move toward paperless files in the criminal case type, we will need to be able to distinguish this memorandum from just any old memorandum.
 - Authority is Arizona Code of Judicial Administration Section 6-103.
 - **GRANTED. If the victim's name and address display on the document and if this is the case, the event should be manually restricted. This will be the Best Practice Recommendation.**

AOC

- Event standardization
 - The following events are displaying in some databases and are not code standards. Please review and be ready to discuss:
 - MINUTE ENTRY: SEALED MINUTE ENTRY (CONFIDENTIAL) - **Keep**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: **STATUS HEARING - Keep**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE - **Keep**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: DRUG COURT STATUS HEARING (SEALED) - **End Date 7/31/2020**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: DISPOSITION HEARING – recommend **ME: DISPOSITION** or **ME: DISPOSITION/DIVERSION HEARING - End Date 7/31/2020**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: NON - JURY TRIAL - **End Date 7/31/2020**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: SUPPORT HEARING 4 – D - **Keep**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: CRIMINAL MINUTE ENTRY (GENERIC) – recommend **ME: MINUTE ENTRY (STANDARD) CRIMINAL - End Date 7/31/2020**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV IA PTR – recommend **ME: JV INITIAL APPEARANCE ON A PETITION TO REVOKE - End Date 7/31/2020**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV COP – **Keep**
 - MINUTE ENTRY: JV COP PTR - **Keep**

- MINUTE ENTRY: JV DISPO – recommend **ME: JV DISPOSITION - End Date 7/31/2020**
- MINUTE ENTRY: JD HEARING - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: PB HEARING - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: GC HEARING - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: FUGITIVE HEARING – recommend **ME: FUGITIVE EXTRADITION - Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: ADOPTION HEARING - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: DO HEARING - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: COP PTR - **Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: COP COMBO – recommend **ME: CHANGE OF PLEA AND SENTENCING - Keep**
- MINUTE ENTRY: APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS / VACATION OF CONVICTION / RIGHT TO CARRY – recommend **ME: PETITION RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS / VACATION OF CONVICTION / RIGHT TO CARRY FIREARM** or **ME: PETITION RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS/VACATION OF CONVICTION/RIGHT TO CARRY FIREARM-FED Review rule, should it be Motion or Petition**
- CHANGE OF VENUE: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED – recommend **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS** or **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - CASE INITIATION** or **ME: CHANGE OF VENUE RECEIVED - EXISTING CASE - Keep**
- STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY - **Keep**
- STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY / CUSTODY-- **End Date 7/31/2020**
- STIPULATION: STIPULATION FOR PATERNITY / CUSTODY / SUPPORT - **End Date 7/31/2020**
- STATEMENT: PRETRIAL STATEMENT – recommend **ME: PRETRIAL / PREHEARING STATEMENT End Date 7/31/2020**
- NOTICE: RESTITUTION LIEN - **End Date 7/31/2020**
- PETITION: TERMINATE PROBATION – recommend **ME: TERMINATE / DISCHARGE PROBATION - End Date 7/31/2020**

- The events below are in code standards but have some issues:

SERVICE OF PROCESS: SUMMONS SERVED – this has different codes. Can we use a different event? - **End Date 7/31/2020**

- ORDER: ASFA Finding of Fact Order - should be end-dated but is not in 100/400/500/800/1400/1500. Recommendation is to use - **Order: ASFA Findings - End Date 7/31/2020**
- ORDER: WAGE ASSIGNMENT – some courts are end-dated but should not be per Code Standards - **End Date 7/31/2020**
- PETITION: TERMINATE – some courts are end-dated but should not be per Code Standards – **Remove End Date**
- NOTICE: ASSIGNMENT OF RIGHTS TO SUPPORT – 12308 – – **Remove End Date**
Should not be end-dated but it is in 10 databases. It was supposed to be removed from a court type not end-dated.

- Question from court:
 - We are docketing a Notice: Placing on Dismissal Calendar and discovered that the case status is changing to Adjudicated. This notice is done pursuant to Civil Rule of Procedure Rule 38.1(d) which states that the clerk must place a civil action on the dismissal calendar if 210 days have passed and the parties haven't filed a joint report and scheduling order. It goes on to say that if an action remains on the dismissal calendar for 60 days, the court must dismiss it without prejudice and enter an appropriate order regarding bond unless the parties file a joint report or the court continues the case on the dismissal calendar (I am paraphrasing only slightly). In any event, we believe that it is premature for the case status to be changed to 'Adjudicated' and wonder if this is an error.
 - **Beth was able to determine that Mohave was the only court with this default case status and the case status was also missing in Navajo. These have been updated.**

- Is your court using the functionality to relate events? If not, why? Please be prepared to discuss.
 - **Courts noted that they don't use it because they have not been trained. I asked if they wanted a demo at a User Group Meeting but they declined. Relating the events might be a necessary step in order to link Under Advisement orders and rulings for reporting purposes.**

- ~~Is your court assessing a deferred prosecution fee for probation and if so, how are you assessing it?~~

- Filing Fees amount for eFiling
 - **When courts submitted their filing fee amounts to the eFiling group, we found some amounts that didn't comply with statute. Nicole will be contacting the courts to discuss the correct fees.**

- Discuss Payment Events:
 - **I asked the courts if they would consider attaching fee schedules to events instead of having to separately assess a payment event. They stated that there are situations where that would not be possible and they didn't want the assessments displaying on the ROA if the event displays on the ROA. I will do some testing to see how it would display and report at the next meeting.**

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, September 16, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

9/16/2020 Agenda:

There is only one request this month. Discussion will be conducted via email.

COCHISE

- Cochise has submitted a request to change 'MARRIAGE LICENSE: APPLICATION' to 'Restricted' because it contains Social Security numbers. They are currently manually restricting them.

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, September 16, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

9/16/2020 Agenda:

There is only one request this month. Discussion will be conducted via email.

Jurisdictions Represented:

Apache – Delana Waite

Cochise – Bran Miller

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Anita Escobedo

La Paz – Megan Spielman

Mohave – Della Hiser

Navajo – Marc Russell

Pinal – Elsa Robbins

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman

Yavapai – Donna McQuality

Yuma – Bobbie Jo Dailey

COCHISE

- Cochise has submitted a request to change 'MARRIAGE LICENSE: APPLICATION' to 'Restricted' because it contains Social Security numbers. They are currently manually restricting them.
 - *The final vote is 10 no objection with 1 objection. This is granted.*

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, November 18, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

11/18/2020 Agenda:

MOHAVE

- Mohave has submitted a request to add a new event - **Certificate: Good Faith Certificate** to comply with change to Civil Rules 12 and 8.1.

4. GJ: Judges, Clerks, Court Admin

[R-20-0028](#)

Civil Rules 12 and 8.1

Rule 12 is amended by adding a new section (j) titled “good faith consultation certificate.” This new section requires a party who files one of the following motions to accompany the motion with a good faith consultation certificate:

- Rule 12(b)(3) motion for improper venue;
- Rule 12(b)(6) motion for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted;
- Rule 12(c) motion for judgment on the pleadings; and
- Rule 12(f) motion to strike.

Because these new Rule 12 provisions also apply in commercial cases governed by Rule 8.1, the Order deleted a now redundant provision in Rule 8.1.

Note that a variety of other Arizona Civil Rules already require a good faith consultation, including discovery motions, motions for sanctions, and motions to seal.

Impact: Judges and judicial assistants should review the aforesaid Rule 12 motions when they are filed to assure the motions are accompanied by the required good faith consultation certificate.

AOC:

- Prop 207 (Smart and Safe Fund): We are in the process of creating codes to comply with Prop 207. Event, Cost Type, GL and new case Sub Type.
 - *New case sub type " **SPECIAL ACTION AGAINST AN ADMINISTRATIVE BODY**" created for prop 207 in order to capture Special Action cases in reference to Department of Health Services.*
- HB 2307 (Scrap Metal): The statutes and events have been added to your production databases
- New event: **Motion: Intervene – Family Law** will be added to for the purpose of efilng Motions to Intervene on Family Law cases. We can't assess the AZ Lengthy Trial Fund on Family Law cases so we needed a different event for that purpose.
- We have added a new event for the transition away from AZTEC. It is – **AZTEC CASE HISTORY.**

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, November 18, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

11/18/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Bran Miller, Vicki Barton, Rebecca Porter

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Anita Escobedo, Esther Canez

Graham – Stephanie Newman

Greenlee - Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Megan Spielman

Maricopa – Chis Cerrato

Mohave – Della Hiser

Yavapai – Donna McQuality, Rachel Roehe

AOC – Pat McGrath, April Smith, Nicole LaConte, Marisa Shaffery

MOHAVE

- Mohave has submitted a request to add a new event - **Certificate: Good Faith Certificate** to comply with change to Civil Rules 12 and 8.1.
 - **Attorneys have been submitting these through eFiling. Nicole noted that we should have an internal discussion to see if configuration needs to be done in AJACS.**
 - **Granted**

4. GJ: Judges, Clerks, Court Admin
R-20-0028
Civil Rules 12 and 8.1

Rule 12 is amended by adding a new section (j) titled “good faith consultation certificate.” This new section requires a party who files one of the following motions to accompany the motion with a good faith consultation certificate:

- Rule 12(b)(3) motion for improper venue;
- Rule 12(b)(6) motion for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted;
- Rule 12(c) motion for judgment on the pleadings; and
- Rule 12(f) motion to strike.

Because these new Rule 12 provisions also apply in commercial cases governed by Rule 8.1, the Order deleted a now redundant provision in Rule 8.1.

Note that a variety of other Arizona Civil Rules already require a good faith consultation, including discovery motions, motions for sanctions, and motions to seal.

Impact: Judges and judicial assistants should review the aforesaid Rule 12 motions when they are filed to assure the motions are accompanied by the required good faith consultation certificate.

AOC:

- Prop 207 (Smart and Safe Fund): We are in the process of creating codes to comply with Prop 207. Event, Cost Type, GL and new case Sub Type.
 - New case sub type " **SPECIAL ACTION AGAINST AN ADMINISTRATIVE BODY**" created for prop 207 in order to capture Special Action cases in reference to Department of Health Services.
 - Previous case type **SPECIAL ACTION AGAINST LOWER COURT** has been ended and **SPECIAL ACTIONS AGAINST LIMITED COURT** as well as **SPECIAL ACTION AGAINST AN ADMINISTRATIVE BODY** have created as a case sub-types. Effective December 1, 2020
- HB 2307 (Scrap Metal): The statutes and events have been added to your production databases
- New event: **Motion: Intervene – Family Law** will be added for the purpose of eFiling Motions to Intervene on Family Law cases. We can't assess the AZ Lengthy Trial Fund on Family Law cases so we needed a different event for that purpose.
- We have added a new event for the transition away from AZTEC. It is – **AZTEC CASE HISTORY**.
- **Some events in AJACS are created but do not go through Code Standards. These events are created for the purpose of projects (E.g., 7 FASTAR events)**
 - FASTAR is a project that was undertaken in Pima County Superior Court in an attempt to speed up the civil process. Yuma County decided to adopt FASTAR. Event codes were made to start FASTAR project in Yuma – currently on hold. AOC was tasked with getting AJACS in FASTAR condition for potential statewide roll out due to proposed rule changes that FASTAR be adopted by the state. However, there are challenges and cases pending in the Court of Appeals that have put the FASTAR project in a "to be determined" status. Codes were created for FASTAR for filing and e-Filing if it becomes a statewide deployment.
- **GJ Fee Schedule Update–**
 - Script will be run in Dev so that eFiling can be tested. Susann asked Gila and Yavapai counties to test. After the last round of testing, Gila and Yavapai counties will probably be the first courts pushed out. Santa Cruz and Navajo will go next. Coconino and Mohave have asked to go after that. The biggest change is that Criminal Fines and Fees will auto-populate based on the statute. Civil filing fees will look the same but will be set up in a manner that will make legislative updates easier to push.

- **How to submit FARE and FTG Revenue funds-**
 - *I have attached a document explaining a process to submit these funds without having to skip a check in AJACS. Your databases have been configured for the process. Please let me know if you have any questions.*
- **Next meeting is December 16, 2020 still on.**

PLEASE HAVE A HAPPY AND SAFE THANKSGIVING!



GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, December 16, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

12/16/2020 Agenda:

There were no Code Standards requests from the courts this month

AOC:

- **State Grand Jury Warrants:**
 - *Leon Li will be discussing options for these types of warrants.*
- **Event Categories – Financial vs Financials:**
 - *When GJ was first deployed both event categories were created with the intention of using one for system events and the other for all other events. Over the course of time these categories were not used as intended. We will be moving all events under the Event Category of Financial. This will have no impact on existing data.*

GJ Code Standardization Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, December 16, 2020

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 997629597

12/16/2020 Agenda:

Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Vicki Barton

Gila – Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newman, Heidi Torrio

Greenlee - Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Ryan Andersen

Mohave – Della Hiser, Cassie Oberlin

Pinal – Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo

Yavapai – Donna McQuality, Karen Wilkes, Kelly Gregorio, Charlotte VanLandingham

AOC – Marisa Shaffery, April Smith, Leon Li, Pat McGrath

There were no Code Standards requests from the courts this month

AOC:

○ State Grand Jury Warrants:

- Leon Li will be discussing options for these types of warrants.
- **There is an eWarrant project underway so that when a warrant is docketed in AJACS using WARRANT ISSUED, that warrant will be electronically transmitted to law enforcement.**
- **Mohave is the pilot court for eWarrants so this issue was identified in this court. Currently the AG's office sends a paper warrant with a signature and seal for the court to issue. When a warrant is issued in AJACS, a form is generated. This means there are two warrants for the same case.**
 - **There was discussion about adding a separate warrant authority for the state grand jury so that it doesn't generate an AJACS warrant form. Then the existing AG's form could be scanned into AJACS and used as the paper warrant.**
 - **Another idea (ideal solution) is if the AG no longer generates the paper warrant and instead sends an order for the court to issue the warrant so**

that it falls under the existing electronic warrant process. The AG warrant does not have warrant number, but if it is issued from AJACS, a warrant number is generated. This number is necessary for electronic transmission.

- Della will speak with AG's office but she wanted to make sure which process would be acceptable to the courts. The courts believe the second idea (no paper warrant from the AG) would be best. Della will contact the AG and then let me know the outcome which I will convey to the group.

○ **Event Categories – Financial vs Financials:**

- When GJ was first deployed both event categories were created with the intention of using one for system events and the other for all other events. Over the course of time these categories were not used as intended. We will be moving all events under the Event Category of Financial. This will have no impact on existing data.

- **No issue with this.**

