

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 1/16/2019 Agenda:

#### Mohave

- Discussion request:
  - *Della has noted that she can't find any events specific to an Application for Court Approval of a Transfer of Structured Settlement. Her citing authority is ARS 12-2901. She has been using Application: Application. What have other courts been using?*

#### Santa Cruz

- Request to auto-trigger case status on **Petition: Modify Support:**
  - *Santa Cruz is requesting that an automatic trigger be set to a **Re-Open** when docketing **Petition: Modify Support.***
  - *Is there another code that can be used in lieu of this request? YES, REQUEST: MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT (THIS ONE IS CURRENTLY SET TO TRIGGER A RE-OPEN STATUS), HOWEVER, THE CLERKS ARE DIRECTED TO USE THE DOCKET CODE AS IT IS FILED BY THE ATTORNEY/PRO PER. AND MOST OF THE PLEADINGS ARE FILED AS A "PETITION" AND NOT A REQUEST, THUS THE CLERK WOULD NEED TO USE THE DOCKET EVENT OF PETITION: MODIFY SUPPORT, AND THIS PARTICULAR EVENT IS NOT SET UP FOR AN AUTOMATIC TRIGGER FOR A REOPEN*
- Request to auto-trigger case status on **Request: Dismiss Order of Protection** and **Request: Dismiss Injunction Against Harassment:**
  - *SANTA CRUZ IS REQUESTING THAT AN AUTOMATIC TRIGGER BE SET TO A RE-OPEN WHEN DOCKETING "REQUEST: DISMISS ORDER OF PROTECTION AND ALSO FOR REQUEST: DISMISS INJUNCTION AGAINST HARRASMENT*

#### AOC

- Topics for discussion
  - **Person Matching** – Beth Peterson will provide an update.
  - **Third Party Complaints** - Pat McGrath did a more thorough review and found that if a Third-Party Complaint is filed, a filing fee should be assessed. The fee should include the answer fee - if it hasn't already been paid (\$130) - as well as the Third Party Complaint fee of \$88 plus the Document Storage and Arizona Lengthy Trial Fund. The fee schedule that was created and currently set up in 4 courts for

eFiling is incorrect as the fee is displaying as \$218 for just the Third-Party Complaint. As I noted on the last meeting minutes, when I did some research on production databases, I found that only one court was charging for the Third-Party Complaint. Based on what Pat has found, we will be associating the correct fee schedule to the event for the Third-Party Complaint for eFiling purposes. I will let you know when that is pushed out.

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 1/16/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise: Martha Rivera

Coconino: Val Wyant

Graham: Stephanie Newton, Cindy Woodman

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Amy Putnam

Mohave- Della Hiser

Pima: John Baird

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz –Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes

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

AOC- Beth Peterson, Pat McGrath, Christine Sanchez

#### Mohave

- Discussion request:
  - Della has noted that she can't find any events specific to an Application for Court Approval of a Transfer of Structured Settlement. Her citing authority is ARS 12-2901. She has been using Application: Application. What have other courts been using?
  - **During discussion Christine Sanchez noted that the document description could be changed when the document is being eFiled but Della noted that was not working in the UAT testing of 6.1. Christine will be testing this. The group decided not to add the event for the time being. Currently there are not that many being filed.**

#### Santa Cruz

- Request to auto-trigger case status on **Petition: Modify Support:**
  - Santa Cruz is requesting that an automatic trigger be set to a **Re-Open** when docketing **Petition: Modify Support**.
  - Is there another code that can be used in lieu of this request? YES, REQUEST: MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT (THIS ONE IS CURRENTLY SET TO TRIGGER A RE-OPEN STATUS), HOWEVER, THE CLERKS ARE DIRECTED TO USE THE DOCKET CODE AS IT IS FILED BY THE ATTORNEY/PRO PER. AND MOST OF THE PLEADINGS ARE FILED AS A "PETITION" AND NOT A REQUEST, THUS THE CLERK WOULD NEED TO USE THE DOCKET EVENT OF PETITION: MODIFY SUPPORT, AND THIS PARTICULAR EVENT IS NOT SET UP FOR AN AUTOMATIC TRIGGER FOR A REOPEN

- **Granted:** *It was determined that at least one of the two events needed to be available without an automatic case status change. After some discussion the decision was made to put the automatic status change on the 'Petition: Modify Support' event and to remove it from the 'Request: Modify Child Support' event. The automatic party status will also be removed from both events.*
  - Request to auto-trigger case status on **Request: Dismiss Order of Protection** and **Request: Dismiss Injunction Against Harassment:**
    - SANTA CRUZ IS REQUESTING THAT AN AUTOMATIC TRIGGER BE SET TO A RE-OPEN WHEN DOCKETING "REQUEST: DISMISS ORDER OF PROTECTION AND ALSO FOR REQUEST: DISMISS INJUNCTION AGAINST HARRASMENT
    - **Granted:** *The group agreed this would be a good update so the following events will be set to automatically change the case status to 'Reopened' (this may already display in some databases):*
      - *Request: Dismiss Injunction Against Harassment*
      - *Request: Dismiss Injunction Against Workplace Harassment*
      - *Request: Dismiss Order of Protection*

## AOC

- Topics for discussion
  - **Person Matching** – Beth Peterson will provide an update.
    - *A new rule will be added so that when first and last names are entered, the results will be queued. This will also pull in middle names. Additionally, Beth requested that results for Rule 6 also be queued.*
  - **Third Party Complaints** - Pat McGrath did a more thorough review and found that if a Third-Party Complaint is filed, a filing fee should be assessed. The fee should include the answer fee - if it hasn't already been paid (\$130) - as well as the Third Party Complaint fee of \$88 plus the Document Storage and Arizona Lengthy Trial Fund. The fee schedule that was created and currently set up in 4 courts for eFiling is incorrect as the fee is displaying as \$218 for just the Third-Party Complaint. As I noted on the last meeting minutes, when I did some research on production databases, I found that only one court was charging for the Third-Party Complaint. Based on what Pat has found, we will be associating the correct fee schedule to the event for the Third-Party Complaint for eFiling purposes. I will let you know when that is pushed out.
  - **Tabled:** *A Third Party Complaint is adding another defendant to the case. The correct fee for additional defendant is \$100. We will discuss with Jennifer Greene whether this is a correct interpretation and if the Document Storage Fee and AZ Lengthy Trial Fund needs to be assessed for each fee if they are being filed together as a Response and Third Party Complaint. Once this is decided, the fee will be applicable statewide.*
  - *It was noted by one of the courts that miscellaneous events displaying on Public Access only show the event category of the event, not the actual event. Beth will talk to Sathya to see if there's anything that can be done to make the entire event display.*

- **Currently in AJACS when a court receives a response for a civil matter, they docket the response and then they assess the fee via a payment event. I questioned if anyone could remember why that was requested and Pat thought it might be a carry-over from AZTEC. No one else could remember. I questioned why we do two events when we could attach the fee schedule to the actual response. I will do some testing to see how this would look on the ROA. We will discuss my findings at the next meeting.**
- **I let the courts know that we will be unable to hide the Indicator events until after the transition from the Data Warehouse to the Central Case Repository.**

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 2/20/2019 Agenda:

#### Mohave

- New code request - **Notice: Pending Dismissal re Service** or **Notice: Regarding Service:**
  - We are requesting a new event code to docket a Notice that our Presiding Judge is requiring for each case pursuant to an Administrative Order. In order to be able to dismiss a case for abatement at the 90-day mark, the rules say notice has to be given to the Plaintiff. Our PJ wants to give that notice at the commencement of the case, so that the case can be dismissed right at 90 days instead of waiting the 90 days and THEN providing notice.
  - Since civil cases are mostly efiled, we are hoping to create a template that we can docket into all civil cases at the time they are created and then just email that notice to the plaintiff.
  - We could use Notice: Notice and then put "Admin Order 2019-04" in the comments, but we can't tie a forms template to Notice: Notice since it is used for so many other things. (Please see attached Admin Order)

#### Yavapai

- New code request - **Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel:**
  - Yavapai County would like to add a new domestic event in AJACS. The event would be Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel. This event should not change case or party status.
  - When a judgment, decree, or other appealable order has become final, the time for appeal has passed, and there are no matters pending before the court, an attorney may withdraw from further representation by filing a notice of withdrawal. An order approving the notice of withdrawal is not required.
  - Currently using Notice: Notice. The current code related to attorney withdraw (motion) implies judicial action is required. This notice will not require judicial action.

- Topics for discussion
  - **Change of Venue Case Types**
    - *Would the courts be opposed to changing this process going forward? I believe these were set up because the fees were different from the regular filing fees. It's very difficult to work with these case types as they all look the same when we are doing legislative updates. I would like to ask for some volunteers to work with me to devise a process for change of venue cases going forward. Anyone interested?*
  
  - **Third Party Complaints**
    - **From:** Greene, Jennifer  
**Subject:** RE: CSD question about third-party complaint filing fee under 28-284  
  
*Pat: I think this statute does not allow the clerk to charge the party who adds the new defendant a fee. It's the new defendant who pays the fee, not the party adding the new defendant.*  
  
**§ 12-312. Fees for intervenors and new parties**  
  
**A.** A person intervening in a civil action in the superior court shall pay the same fees required to be paid by a plaintiff.  
  
**B.** A person brought in as a party plaintiff or defendant by either party to an action or by order of the court shall pay the fee of a plaintiff or a defendant, as the case may be, as provided in § 12-284.
    - Please be prepared to discuss.
  
  - **Payment: Establish 25-502 and Payment: Est. 25-502 Post**
    - *In the process of cleaning up fee schedules we discovered that these two payment events have never been used. Is there any objection to end-dating them?*
  
  - **New 6.1 Events**
    - *These events were just submitted for review. These are all events that will be necessary for new processes in 6.1. Could you please review and be ready to discuss if you believe any on them should display on the ROA. Additionally, we will be adding two new event categories to accommodate some of the new events. Some of the events or categories are still subject to change. I apologize for the late addition to the agenda but the AJACS group needs the information ASAP to make sure it gets into the correct build. Thank you.*

Code	Description	Event Category
POACCSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE
1257073	FINGERPRINTS ORDERED	ORDER
ERRDCSUP	ERRD CASE STATUS CLOSED DATE MODIFIED	ERRD WORK QUEUE
DCCF	FINANCIAL: DISPUTED CREDIT CHARGE FEE IMPOSED	FINANCIALS
ADRSMAN	ADRS REPORTED MANUALLY TO DPS	MISCELLANEOUS
ERRDSAPA	SYSTEM ADD TO PA	ERRD WORK QUEUE
POSTRESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - RESCHEDULED	HEARING
1013346	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE SET	HEARING
POPREISS	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE CONTINUED	HEARING
PRERESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE RESCHEDULED	HEARING
1013345	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE SET	HEARING
POSTCONT	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - CONTINUED	HEARING
ISSUOR	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISPOSITIONED	CIVIL ORDER
FRCPREV	FARE CAP REVOKED	FARE
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER MODIFIED	CIVIL ORDER
POCASETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED	CIVIL ORDER
POEXPDT	PROTECTIVE ORDER EXPIRED	CIVIL ORDER
PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED	CIVIL ORDER
PETQSHD	PROTECTIVE ORDER QUASHED	CIVIL ORDER
POINT	PROTECTIVE ORDER CASE INITIATED	MISCELLANEOUS
PONOTSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER DECLARATION/AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE
ERRDCCR	ERRD CONVERTED CASE REVIEWED	ERRD WORK QUEUE
BRDYSET	BRADY FLAG SET	CIVIL ORDER
CCCGBK	CREDIT CARD CHARGEBACK	FINANCIAL
ARRESTM	ARREST RECORD MODIFIED	MISCELLANEOUS
ARRESTF	ARREST RECORD FILED	MISCELLANEOUS
GCLOSED	GENERAL CLOSED CASE EVENT	MISCELLANEOUS
1257039	ADRS SUCCESSFUL	MISCELLANEOUS
MODPETN	PETITION MODIFIED	SERVICE
CASHEXON	CASH BOND EXONERATED	FINANCIALS
EMAIL	EMAIL SENT WITH ATTACHED DOCUMENT	MISCELLANEOUS
FORFRCPT	RECEIPT FORFEITED	FINANCIAL
ERRDSYS	REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDSSYS	SYSTEM REMOVE FROM CMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDSPA	SYSTEM REMOVE FROM PA	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDPA	REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDPA	REMOVE FROM PUBLIC ACCESS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDNSYS	DO NOT REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDNPA	DO NOT REMOVE FROM PUBLIC ACCESS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
CIVISSDL	CLAIM DELETED	FINANCIALS

<b>CIVISSUP</b>	<b>CLAIM UPDATED</b>	<b>FINANCIALS</b>
13325	NOTICE: CRIMINAL RESTITUTION ORDER	FINANCIAL
ISSUOR	ISSUANCE OF THE ORDER	ACCEPTANCE
FRCPCR	FARE CASE BALANCE CORRECTION	FARE
FRCPCOM	FARE CAP COMPLETION	FARE
FRCPDE	FARE CAP DEFAULT	FARE
FRCPRE	FARE CAP REENTRY	FARE
FRCPEN	FARE CAP ENTRY	FARE

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 2/20/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Martha Rivera

Coconino – Melissa Fittipaldo

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo, Teri Griego

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee – Lisa Stacey

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Amy Putnam, Ryan Andersen

Mohave- Della Hiser

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes

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

AOC- Pat McGrath, Beth Peterson, Christine Sanchez, Nicole LaConte, April Smith

#### Mohave

- New code request - **Notice: Pending Dismissal re Service** or **Notice: Regarding Service:**
  - We are requesting a new event code to docket a Notice that our Presiding Judge is requiring for each case pursuant to an Administrative Order. In order to be able to dismiss a case for abatement at the 90-day mark, the rules say notice has to be given to the Plaintiff. Our PJ wants to give that notice at the commencement of the case, so that the case can be dismissed right at 90 days instead of waiting the 90 days and THEN providing notice.
  - Since civil cases are mostly efiled, we are hoping to create a template that we can docket into all civil cases at the time they are created and then just email that notice to the plaintiff.
  - We could use Notice: Notice and then put "Admin Order 2019-04" in the comments, but we can't tie a forms template to Notice: Notice since it is used for so many other things. (Please see attached Admin Order)
  - **Tabled.** After much discussion we have tabled this item so that I can do some research regarding how Notice: Impending Dismissal was meant to be used. Della noted that perhaps we need an event specific to Rule 41. We will be meeting with Jennifer Greene for more clarification.

## Yavapai

- New code request - **Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel:**
  - Yavapai County would like to add a new domestic event in AJACS. The event would be Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel. This event should not change case or party status.
  - When a judgment, decree, or other appealable order has become final, the time for appeal has passed, and there are no matters pending before the court, an attorney may withdraw from further representation by filing a notice of withdrawal. An order approving the notice of withdrawal is not required.
  - Currently using Notice: Notice. The current code related to attorney withdraw (motion) implies judicial action is required. This notice will not require judicial action.
  - **Granted. I will submit a request for new event NOTICE: WITHDRAWAL OF COUNSEL.**

## AOC

- Topics for discussion
  - **Change of Venue Case Types**
    - Would the courts be opposed to changing this process going forward? I believe these were set up because the fees were different from the regular filing fees. It's very difficult to work with these case types as they all look the same when we are doing legislative updates. I would like to ask for some volunteers to work with me to devise a process for change of venue cases going forward. Anyone interested?
    - **Jonathon Derois and Nikki Felix have volunteered (thank you) to help me with exploring new options for opening Change of Venue cases. We have set up our first meeting for 3/4/2019.**
  - **Third Party Complaints**
    - **From:** Greene, Jennifer  
**Subject:** RE: CSD question about third-party complaint filing fee under 28-284  
  
*Pat: I think this statute does not allow the clerk to charge the party who adds the new defendant a fee. It's the new defendant who pays the fee, not the party adding the new defendant.*  
  
**§ 12-312. Fees for intervenors and new parties**  
  
**A.** A person intervening in a civil action in the superior court shall pay the same fees required to be paid by a plaintiff.  
  
**B.** A person brought in as a party plaintiff or defendant by either party to an action or by order of the court shall pay the fee of a plaintiff or a defendant, as the case may be, as provided in § 12-284.
    - Please be prepared to discuss.

- **Della sent the email below after I sent the agenda. Jennifer was out of the office until 2/25/19 so we could not discuss before.**

**From:** Hiser, Della  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 19, 2019 1:33 PM  
**To:** Shaffery, Marisa <MShaffery@courts.az.gov>  
**Cc:** Tinnell, Virlynn <VTinnell@courts.az.gov>; McQuality, Donna <DMcQualit@courts.az.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Amended Agenda for 2/20/2019

Hello Marisa. I think Jennifer Greene may be referring to the joinder of additional defendants under Rule 18, 19 or even 20 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

However, a Third Party Complaint is filed pursuant to Rule 14 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. It is a Third Party Complaint – which is basically the initiation of a civil case WITHIN an existing case. They are not merely bringing in another defendant, they are actually bringing suit against someone who is not already a party to the case.

Can that clarification be made to Jennifer prior to the meeting to see if her opinion changes? This is something that doesn't happen very often, but when it does, it has historically involved a filing fee. The Defendant would pay their answer fee AND the fee for the Third Party Complaint.

**Yavapai noted at the meeting that they also charge a filing fee. We decided to table this so that we could discuss further with Jennifer Greene.**

- **Payment: Establish 25-502 and Payment: Est. 25-502 Post**
  - In the process of cleaning up fee schedules we discovered that these two payment events have never been used. Is there any objection to end-dating them?
  - **Group agreed these could be end-dated.**
- **New 6.1 Events**
  - These events were just submitted for review. These are all events that will be necessary for new processes in 6.1. Could you please review and be ready to discuss if you believe any on them should display on the ROA. Additionally, we will be adding two new event categories to accommodate some of the new events. Some of the events or categories are still subject to change. I apologize for the late addition to the agenda but the AJACS group needs the information ASAP to make sure it gets into the correct build. Thank you.
  - **The group believes system events should stay hidden. They also stated that they would like to remove the functionality that auto-finalizes documents that are generated in 6.1. Could you please provide more information on which documents you are seeing in 6.1 that are being auto-finalized at your earliest convenience.**

Code	Description	Event Category
POACCSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE
1257073	FINGERPRINTS ORDERED	ORDER
ERRDCSUP	ERRD CASE STATUS CLOSED DATE MODIFIED	ERRD WORK QUEUE
DCCF	FINANCIAL: DISPUTED CREDIT CHARGE FEE IMPOSED	FINANCIALS
ADRSMAN	ADRS REPORTED MANUALLY TO DPS	MISCELLANEOUS
ERRDSAPA	SYSTEM ADD TO PA	ERRD WORK QUEUE
POSTRESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - RESCHEDULED	HEARING
1013346	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE SET	HEARING
POPREISS	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE CONTINUED	HEARING
PRERESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE RESCHEDULED	HEARING
1013345	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE SET	HEARING
POSTCONT	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - CONTINUED	HEARING
ISSUOR	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISPOSITIONED	CIVIL ORDER
FRCPREV	FARE CAP REVOKED	FARE
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER MODIFIED	CIVIL ORDER
POCASETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED	CIVIL ORDER
POEXPDT	PROTECTIVE ORDER EXPIRED	CIVIL ORDER
PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED	CIVIL ORDER
PETQSHD	PROTECTIVE ORDER QUASHED	CIVIL ORDER
POINT	PROTECTIVE ORDER CASE INITIATED	MISCELLANEOUS
PONOTSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER DECLARATION/AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE
ERRDCCR	ERRD CONVERTED CASE REVIEWED	ERRD WORK QUEUE
BRDYSET	BRADY FLAG SET	CIVIL ORDER
CCCGBK	CREDIT CARD CHARGEBACK	FINANCIAL
ARRESTM	ARREST RECORD MODIFIED	MISCELLANEOUS
ARRESTF	ARREST RECORD FILED	MISCELLANEOUS
GCLOSED	GENERAL CLOSED CASE EVENT	MISCELLANEOUS
1257039	ADRS SUCCESSFUL	MISCELLANEOUS
MODPETN	PETITION MODIFIED	SERVICE
CASHEXON	CASH BOND EXONERATED	FINANCIALS
EMAIL	EMAIL SENT WITH ATTACHED DOCUMENT	MISCELLANEOUS
FORFRCPT	RECEIPT FORFEITED	FINANCIAL
ERRDSYS	REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDSSYS	SYSTEM REMOVE FROM CMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDSPA	SYSTEM REMOVE FROM PA	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDPA	REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDPA	REMOVE FROM PUBLIC ACCESS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDNSYS	DO NOT REMOVE FROM CMS/EDMS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
ERRDNPA	DO NOT REMOVE FROM PUBLIC ACCESS	ERRD WORK QUEUE
CIVISSDL	CLAIM DELETED	FINANCIALS

<b>CIVISSUP</b>	<b>CLAIM UPDATED</b>	<b>FINANCIALS</b>
13325	NOTICE: CRIMINAL RESTITUTION ORDER	FINANCIAL
ISSUOR	ISSUANCE OF THE ORDER	ACCEPTANCE
FRCPCR	FARE CASE BALANCE CORRECTION	FARE
FRCPCOM	FARE CAP COMPLETION	FARE
FRCPDE	FARE CAP DEFAULT	FARE
FRCPRE	FARE CAP REENTRY	FARE
FRCPEN	FARE CAP ENTRY	FARE

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, March 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 3/20/2019 Agenda:

#### La Paz

- Requesting new code – **Warrant: Arrested – Post Adjudication:**
  - *Requesting to add Warrant: Arrested - Post Adjudication and for the case status to change to Reopen.*
- Modify existing code - **Warrant: Arrested:**
  - *Requesting to have Warrant: Arrested change the case status to Open.*

#### Pinal

- New code request – **Notice: of Facility Dog Use In Courtroom Proceeding:**
  - *The Pinal County Attorney's Office is starting to file "Notice of Facility Dog Use In Courtroom Proceeding". We wanted to see if other counties are starting to observe the use of Court Facility dogs in the courtroom in their courts and if so, possibly request an event code for the notice.*
  - *A.R.S. 13-4442(A)(B) Use of Facility Dog in Court Proceedings (A) A. The court shall allow a victim who is under eighteen years of age to have a facility dog, if available, accompany the victim while testifying in court. B. The court may allow a victim who is eighteen years of age or more or a witness to use a facility dog*

#### Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Order: Reasonable Efforts Finding and Order: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare:**
  - *Some time ago, we added Petition: Reasonable Efforts Finding and Petition: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare. We failed at the time to add the orders which correspond to these two events, so docketing clerks are forced to use Order: Order and then type all the rest of that text into the comments.*
- Tabled item – request for **Notice: Pending Dismissal re Service** or **Notice: Regarding Service:**
  - *After much discussion we decided to do some research and discuss with Jennifer Greene in Legal. Based on those that research and the discussion with Jennifer, we have decided to add the following events to the agenda:*

- **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Family**
- **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Civil** – This would have the 90-day tickler associated to it.
- **FL 120 Day Service Tickler** – This would be tied to the **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Family**

## AOC

- **Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel:**
  - Summer would like to know if this should be available for eFiling. Going forward, this will be a question on all new events that might be applicable to eFiling.
- **Change of Venue case types:**
  - I met with Jonathon Derois and Nikki Felix to discuss eliminating Change of Venue case types and making 'Change of Venue' a filing type instead. The process going forward would be to open the case as the correct case type and use the filing type of 'Change of Venue'. They felt this would be acceptable but requested the ability to determine how many cases were opened using this filing type. If the group agrees with the change, I will discuss options to make that determination with the AJACS group.
- **Third Party Complaints and Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment:**
  - Jennifer Greene will be joining us to answer any questions about filing fees for these items. Please be prepared to discuss.

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, March 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 3/20/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton, Cindy Woodman

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Ryan Andersen

Maricopa – Chris Driscoll

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Cathy Montijo, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz – Juan Pablo Guzman, Valeria Fuentes

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

AOC- Pat McGrath, Christine Sanchez, April Smith, Marretta Mathes, Jennifer Greene, Melanie Cluff

#### La Paz

- Requesting new code – **Warrant: Arrested – Post Adjudication:**
  - Requesting to add Warrant: Arrested - Post Adjudication and for the case status to change to Reopen.
  - **Granted. Yavapai also requested that the party status default to 'Post Sentence Matters'.**
- Modify existing code - **Warrant: Arrested:**
  - Requesting to have Warrant: Arrested change the case status to Open.
  - **Marretta pointed out to the courts that changing the case status on Warrant: Arrested could impact their excluded time and skew their time standards. The courts decided to move forward with the request.**
  - **Granted. The courts requested that the statuses on both 'Warrant: Arrested' and 'Warrant: Served/Executed' be changed back to 'Open' and the party status to 'Active'**

#### Pinal

- New code request – **Notice: of Facility Dog Use In Courtroom Proceeding:**
  - The Pinal County Attorney's Office is starting to file "Notice of Facility Dog Use In Courtroom Proceeding". We wanted to see if other counties are starting to observe the

use of Court Facility dogs in the courtroom in their courts and if so, possibly request an event code for the notice.

- A.R.S. 13-4442(A)(B) Use of Facility Dog in Court Proceedings (A) A. The court shall allow a victim who is under eighteen years of age to have a facility dog, if available, accompany the victim while testifying in court. B. The court may allow a victim who is eighteen years of age or more or a witness to use a facility dog
- **Tabled. This will be revisited after other courts have experienced this.**

## **Mohave**

- Requesting new code - **Order: Reasonable Efforts Finding** and **Order: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare:**
  - Some time ago, we added *Petition: Reasonable Efforts Finding* and *Petition: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare*. We failed at the time to add the orders which correspond to these two events, so docketing clerks are forced to use *Order: Order* and then type all the rest of that text into the comments.
  - **Tabled. Mohave was not present. Additionally, we have started a dialog with Summer about having the related events display on eBench and eAccess. We have set a meeting with the AJACS group to see if this is even possible. We hope to have more information at the next meeting.**
- Tabled item – request for **Notice: Pending Dismissal re Service** or **Notice: Regarding Service:**
  - After much discussion we decided to do some research and discuss with Jennifer Greene in Legal. Based on those that research and the discussion with Jennifer, we have decided to add the following events to the agenda:
    - **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Family**
    - **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Civil** – This would have the 90-day tickler associated to it.
    - **FL 120 Day Service Tickler** – This would be tied to the **Notice: Dismissal Re: Service – Family**
    - **No objection. Granted.**
    - **The following satisfying events will be associated to each of these new events:**

SERVICE: AFFIDAVIT OF ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF SERVICE
SERVICE: AFFIDAVIT OF DUE DILIGENCE
SERVICE: AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY MAIL
SERVICE: AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY PUBLICATION
SERVICE: CERTIFICATE
SERVICE: NOTICE OF HEARING
SERVICE: PROOF OF NOTICE
SERVICE: PROOF OF PUBLICATION
SERVICE: PROOF OF SERVICE
SERVICE: RETURN OF SERVICE
SERVICE: WAIVER OF SERVICE (01/01/1900-01/01/2058)

**AOC**

- **Notice: Withdrawal of Counsel:**
  - Summer would like to know if this should be available for eFiling. Going forward, this will be a question on all new events that might be applicable to eFiling.
  - **Courts would like this available to eFile. Christine will move forward with this.**
  
- **Change of Venue case types:**
  - I met with Jonathon Derois and Nikki Felix to discuss eliminating Change of Venue case types and making 'Change of Venue' a filing type instead. The process going forward would be to open the case as the correct case type and use the filing type of 'Change of Venue'. They felt this would be acceptable but requested the ability to determine how many cases were opened using this filing type. If the group agrees with the change, I will discuss options to make that determination with the AJACS group.
  - **Granted. I will start the process to add a new the new filing type of 'Change of Venue'. I will determine a start date based on when we can have the new filing type ready to go. I will also submit a request for a new report on filing types.**
  
- **Third Party Complaints and Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment:**
  - Jennifer Greene will be joining us to answer any questions about filing fees for these items. Please be prepared to discuss.
    - **Regarding Third Party Complaints, Jennifer cited the following statute as the deciding factor in her opinion:**
      - **12-312. Fees for intervenors and new parties**

A. A person intervening in a civil action in the superior court shall pay the same fees required to be paid by a plaintiff.

B. A person brought in as a party plaintiff or defendant by either party to an action or by order of the court shall pay the fee of a plaintiff or a defendant, as the case may be, as provided in section 12-284.

**We will be end-dating the fee schedules for this in the near future.**

- **Regarding Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment, Jennifer stated that both the Document Storage and the AZ Lengthy Trial Fund could be applied with this filing fee. We will be adding this to the website for the Superior Court filing fees in the near future.**
  
- **Courts should be collecting a filing fee for OSC's in Family Law cases per statute:**

D	Postadjudication petitions in domestic relations cases (6)	74.00				15.00		89.00
---	--	-------	--	--	--	-------	--	-------

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 4/17/2019 Agenda:

#### Gila

- Requesting new **Commenced By** code – **Complaint:**
  - Our PJ is considering giving the State permission to file long form complaints in Superior Court. This would only be for class 1-3 felonies. He would like the case to reflect that it was commenced by a Complaint.
  - *'Complaint' already exists in AJACS but is only configured for Civil, Family Law and Traffic case types. This would be a simple update if approved.*

#### Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Order: Reasonable Efforts Finding** and **Order: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare:**
  - Some time ago, we added *Petition: Reasonable Efforts Finding* and *Petition: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare*. We failed at the time to add the orders which correspond to these two events, so docketing clerks are forced to use *Order: Order* and then type all the rest of that text into the comments.  
*Tabled from March.*

#### AOC

- **Standardizing code for County Treasurer:**
  - At the User Group meeting on 4/11/2019 we discussed changing the code for the county treasurer to ZCNTY. Most counties already use this but there are some that do not. This causes issues when we are trying to push fee schedule and legislation updates. At the User Group meeting I asked participants to discuss with their court users to see if it would cause any issues to update just the code. Please be prepared to discuss.
- **Fee schedules in 6.1:**
  - At the User Group meeting we also discussed options for assessing the Time Payment and \$13 Additional Fee. One option was to manually add a receivable on the first charge to assess the JCEF and then add a fee to that receivable to select the agency for the \$13 Additional Fee. The additional fee would need to be added to all of the other charges via a new receivable as well. The second option was to have the

*JCEF pull in as a second fee schedule on all charges and manually add the additional fee to that receivable. The downside of this option is having to zero out the \$20 on the JCEF receivable for all but the first charge. Please talk with your court users and be prepared to discuss.*

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 4/17/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Coconino – Val Wyant, Erin Maloney

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton, Cindy Woodman

Greenlee – Madeline Montoya

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Amy Putnam, Ryan Andersen

Maricopa – Chris Driscoll

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon

Navajo – Marla Randall

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Nikki Felix

Santa Cruz –Dolly Legleu

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

AOC- Pat McGrath, Beth Peterson, Melanie Cluff, Mary Foltz, April Smith

#### Gila

- Requesting new **Commenced By** code – **Complaint:**
  - *Our PJ is considering giving the State permission to file long form complaints in Superior Court. This would only be for class 1-3 felonies. He would like the case to reflect that it was commenced by a Complaint.*
  - *'Complaint' already exists in AJACS but is only configured for Civil, Family Law and Traffic case types. This would be a simple update if approved.*
  - ***Granted. Rule 2.2(b) states that permission would be needed from a superior court judge in order to commence a felony action with a complaint. It was decided to make this available so that courts had the option to do this when needed.***

#### Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Order: Reasonable Efforts Finding** and **Order: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare:**

- Some time ago, we added Petition: Reasonable Efforts Finding and Petition: Finding of Contrary to the Child's Welfare. We failed at the time to add the orders which correspond to these two events, so docketing clerks are forced to use Order: Order and then type all the rest of that text into the comments.

**Tabled from March.**

- **The AOC recommendation was to use the functionality to relate events instead of creating specific orders. Mohave stated that though they agree with the idea of using the functionality to relate a motion to the generic order granting/denying, they wanted to proceed with the request for these specific orders due to the long titles and the use by probation of these petitions/orders. With no objection from any courts, this was granted. We have begun discussion with the AJACS team regarding the ability to display related events on eBench and eAccess. We will keep the courts informed on the progress.**

## **AOC**

- **Standardizing code for County Treasurer:**
  - At the User Group meeting on 4/11/2019 we discussed changing the code for the county treasurer to ZCNTY. Most counties already use this but there are some that do not. This causes issues when we are trying to push fee schedule and legislation updates. At the User Group meeting I asked participants to discuss with their court users to see if it would cause any issues to update just the code. Please be prepared to discuss.
  - **No objections. Granted.**
- **Fee schedules in 6.1:**
  - At the User Group meeting we also discussed options for assessing the Time Payment and \$13 Additional Fee. One option was to manually add a receivable on the first charge to assess the JCEF and then add a fee to that receivable to select the agency for the \$13 Additional Fee. The additional fee would need to be added to all of the other charges via a new receivable as well. The second option was to have the JCEF pull in as a second fee schedule on all charges and manually add the additional fee to that receivable. The downside of this option is having to zero out the \$20 on the JCEF receivable for all but the first charge. Please talk with your court users and be prepared to discuss.
  - **Granted. Courts agreed they would rather manually assess the JCEF and additional fee.**
- **Pat and I will both be out of the office on May 15, 2019 therefore there will be no meeting in May.**
  - **It was brought to my attention that the next meeting scheduled for 6/19/2019 will coincide with the training conference scheduled to take place in Coconino County. Would the courts like to hold the meeting on 6/12/2019 instead? Please respond by 4/24/2019 end of day so that I can make the necessary arrangements.**

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, June 12, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 6/12/2019 Agenda:

#### Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Order: Affirming Order of Protection:**
  - *In AJACS 6.1, we cannot manually change the case status in Protective Order cases. It is all event driven. We need an event code for Order: Affirming Order of Protection that will "Re-Adjudicate" a protective order case.*
  - *This event will be used in protective order cases. Currently, if we docket an Order: Protection, the case status automatically changes to adjudicated. Then if a party requests a hearing, the case status automatically changes to Reopened. There is no code in AJACS 6.1 to use to re-adjudicate a case when the judge affirms the order of protection*

#### AOC

- **Miscellaneous questions:**
  - Question from Marretta Mathes:
    - *How are the courts using the event 'Judgment: Consent Judgment? Please be prepared to discuss.*
  - File stamps for eFiled documents:
    - *In the Event Entry AVT there is a field called 'Stamp Flag' and a court asked what the the purpose of this field was for. It controls whether or not the 'Filed On' date/time stamp displays on AJACS forms and it should only be used for items that are eFiled. I noticed that there are many events that are set to yes. For example, most Orders are set to yes as are most of the Warrant events. Are there any users that would be willing to help me identify those events?*
  - Needed information for 6.1 Fee Schedules
    - *We have requested this before but have been unable to get responses from all courts. **Please provide your local fees.***
    - *Have all counties established Conciliation Courts?*

- Question for Pinal County – Have you reached the threshold of 500,000 persons. This will affect your allocations.
- We are in the process of standardizing Payment Sources for 6.1. Below are the proposed values and their tender types. There are some tender types that display in the GJ courts that are not included below. Please be prepared to discuss.

New Standard AJACS Payment Source CD/Descriptions	Tender Types Standard: Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier Check, EFT, DFD
COUNTER/COUNTER	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
CI/COURT IVR	CREDIT CARD
C/COURT WEB	CREDIT CARD
<b>EFT – END DATED</b>	
I/FARE IVR	CREDIT CARD
W/FARE WEB PAYMENT	CREDIT CARD
LCOKBOX/LOCK BOX	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
MAIL/MAIL	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
O/OLCP	CREDIT CARD
<b>OVP/ONLINE VENDOR PAYMENT</b>	<b>EFT</b>
PHONE/TELEPHONE	CREDIT CARD
EUP/EFILING PAYMENT	CREDIT CARD
EACCESS/EACCESS	EFT
D/DEBT SETOFF	EFT

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, June 12, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 6/12/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Bran Miller

La Paz – Megan Spielman, Amy Putnam, Ryan Andersen

Maricopa – Chris Cerrato

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

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

Yavapai - Kelly Gregorio, Donna McQuality, Karen Wilkes, Shannon Shoemake, Jonathon Derois,

AOC- Pat McGrath, Beth Peterson, Melanie Cluff, Mary Foltz, Christine Sanchez

#### Mohave

- Requesting new code - **Order: Affirming Order of Protection:**
  - In AJACS 6.1, we cannot manually change the case status in Protective Order cases. It is all event driven. We need an event code for Order: Affirming Order of Protection that will "**Re-Adjudicate**" a protective order case.
  - This event will be used in protective order cases. Currently, if we docket an Order: Protection, the case status automatically changes to adjudicated. Then if a party requests a hearing, the case status automatically changes to Reopened. There is no code in AJACS 6.1 to use to re-adjudicate a case when the judge affirms the order of protection
    - *After discussion with Judy Rochon and Doug McKenzie, we determined that there was a set of manual events that had been created for the Protective Order Module that did not get added to the 6.1 GJ databases. After further discussion with Marretta Mathes, I found that there are differences between 3.9 and 6.1 as to what events are used for Protective Orders. We will be meeting to determine the best way to move forward with this issue in the two existing 6.1 courts and also how to prevent this in upcoming courts. We will try to have a resolution within the next two weeks. Additionally, we will need to have a bigger discussion to address how we will be moving forward on the 2020 changes.*

#### AOC

- Miscellaneous questions:

- Question from Marretta Mathes:
  - How are the courts using the event ‘Judgment: Consent Judgment?’ Please be prepared to discuss.
  - *This question was raised because courts are using this for different reasons. Some courts are using it for Family Law Cases, Rule 45 – Consent Judgments and it changes the case status. Other courts are using it to comply with ARS 12-302F:*

F. At the time an applicant signs and submits the application for deferral to the court, the applicant shall acknowledge under oath and sign a consent to judgment. By signing the consent to judgment, the applicant consents to judgment being entered against the applicant for all fees and costs that are deferred but that remain unpaid after thirty calendar days following the entry of final judgment or order. A consent judgment may be entered against the applicant unless one of the following applies:

1. The applicant has an established schedule of payment in effect and is current with payments.
2. A supplemental application for further deferral or waiver has been filed and is pending.
3. In response to a supplemental application, the court orders that the fees and costs be further deferred or waived.
4. Within twenty days of the date the court denies the supplemental application, the applicant either pays the fees or requests a hearing on the court's final order denying further deferral or waiver. If the applicant requests a hearing, the court shall not enter a consent judgment unless a hearing is held, further deferral or waiver is denied and payment has not been made within the time prescribed by the court.

- *I propose adding a new event called Miscellaneous: Consent to Judgment for use in the scenario above (no status change to be attached). I will be putting this on the next agenda for discussion.*

- File stamps for eFiled documents:

- In the Event Entry AVT there is a field called ‘Stamp Flag’ and a court asked what the the purpose of this field was for. It controls whether or not the ‘Filed On’ date/time stamp displays on AJACS forms and it should only be used for items that are eFiled. I noticed that there are many events that are set to yes. For example, most Orders are set to yes as are most of the Warrant events. Are there any users that would be willing to help me identify those events? *The courts explained that ‘Order’ events do need file stamps. Additionally, Mary Foltz clarified what does not need to be File Stamped and what needs to be Issue Stamped in civil cases only. Please see below. She will be sending family law and probate case information later:*

- **Issuance stamp/no file stamp:**
- Notice of Provisional Remedy with Notice
- Notice of Provisional Remedy without Notice
- Summons
- Subpoena
- **No file stamp:**
- Proposed Order
- Proposed Judgment
- Proposed Notice of Hearing
- Exhibits/Attachments
- Miscellaneous First Appearance

- *I will be requesting a script to remove the ‘Y’ flag from warrant events.*

- Needed information for 6.1 Fee Schedules
  - We have requested this before but have been unable to get responses from all courts. **Please provide your local fees.**
    - *As of this date I have received local fees from the following courts; Gila, Graham, La Paz and Mohave.*
  - Have all counties established Conciliation Courts?
    - *Santa Cruz, La Paz and Mohave have not established Conciliation Courts. We will update their fee schedules so that the \$65 Conciliation Court fee is not assessed.*
  - Question for Pinal County – Have you reached the threshold of 500,000 persons. This will affect your allocations.
    - *They have not reached that threshold.*
- We are in the process of standardizing Payment Sources for 6.1. Below are the proposed values and their tender types. There are some tender types that display in the GJ courts that are not included below. Please be prepared to discuss.

New Standard AJACS Payment Source CD/Descriptions	Tender Types Standard: Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier Check, EFT, DFD
COUNTER/COUNTER	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
CI/COURT IVR	CREDIT CARD
C/COURT WEB	CREDIT CARD
<b>EFT – END DATED</b>	
I/FARE IVR	CREDIT CARD
W/FARE WEB PAYMENT	CREDIT CARD
LCOKBOX/LOCK BOX	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
MAIL/MAIL	Cash, Credit Card, Check, Cashier's Check
O/OLCP	CREDIT CARD
<b>OVP/ONLINE VENDOR PAYMENT</b>	<b>EFT</b>
PHONE/TELEPHONE	CREDIT CARD
EUP/EFILING PAYMENT	CREDIT CARD
EACCESS/EACCESS	EFT
D/DEBT SETOFF	EFT

- *The courts agreed to the payment sources displayed above and the following tender types:*
  - *Cash, Credit Card, Money Order, Check and EFT. We will also be adding Cashier's Checks.*
  - *There was a request after the meeting to add the tender type of check to the Debt Setoff payment source.*
  - *Some courts were concerned about removing personal checks as they place holds on them but I explained that there is functionality in AJACS where a hold can be placed in the receipt screen for any*

number of days. I tested to make sure this is functioning and it is. I placed a 5 day hold on 6/12/19 and it did not display for disbursement until 6/18/19. I have attached screen shots showing the steps I took to test this.

- A last-minute question came in regarding Search Warrant cases and whether or not they should trigger the warrant flag. After clarifying with the courts, it was determined that it should not. We will be checking the system parameters in all courts to make sure they are set properly to not trigger the flag in Search Warrant cases.

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, July 17, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 7/17/2019 Agenda:

#### AOC

- Regarding a request from Mohave to add a new event 'Order: Affirming' for use when a Hearing on Order of Protection has been held; the new event would change the case status to 'Re-Adjudicated' and the party status to 'Terminated-Re-Adjudicated'. We are still discussing this as it will not work in the Protective Order module. The only case statuses recognized in this module are Open, Adjudicated and Closed. Please be prepared to discuss.
- There was discussion regarding the event 'Judgment: Consent Judgment? After reviewing how the courts are using it, the recommendation is to create a new event – **Miscellaneous: Consent to Judgment** for use when deferring fees.
- **Addition to agenda:**
  - *We have had a question from a court regarding the process to open an appeal on an Order of Protection from a lower court. We believe it would be handled as any other appeal from a lower court so please be prepared to discuss what your process is and how you track the case for time limits.*

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Minutes

Wednesday, July 17, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 7/17/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Bran Miller, Amy Hunley, Martha Rivera

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

La Paz – Amy Putnam, Ryan Andersen

Maricopa – Chris Cerrato

Mohave- Della Hiser, Fred Shade, Christina Spurlock

Pima – John Baird

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz –Dolly Legleu

Yavapai - Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Karen Wilkes, Shannon Shoemake, Heather Diaz, Charlotte VanLandingham

AOC- Pat McGrath, Beth Peterson, Melanie Cluff, Mary Foltz, Christine Sanchez, Doug McKenzie, Susann Holland, Cara Stevens, Heather Williams

### AOC

- Regarding a request from Mohave to add a new event 'Order: Affirming' for use when a Hearing on Order of Protection has been held; the new event would change the case status to 'Re-Adjudicated' and the party status to 'Terminated-Re-Adjudicated'. We are still discussing this as it will not work in the Protective Order module. The only case statuses recognized in this module are Open, Adjudicated and Closed. Please be prepared to discuss.
  - *Mohave voiced concern regarding how all other cases are 'Reopened' if something is filed after adjudication. Pat noted that Protective Orders are only valid for one year and he believed that the case should be left as 'Adjudicated' unless the status changed after a hearing. Time standards are not impacted by the case status when a request for hearing is filed as it's the event and not the status that starts the clock. Yavapai noted that there are other motions that could be filed besides the request for hearing and that those potentially reopen the case. Susann asked if a status change is necessary for the business process or if it is just what the court is used to. There is no rule stating that the case must to be reopened in this circumstance. Val recommended that we **table** this until after the 6.1 courts have had an opportunity to review and make a recommendation. The discussion will take place on the 6.1 calls.*

- There was discussion regarding the event ‘Judgment: Consent Judgment? After reviewing how the courts are using it, the recommendation is to create a new event – **Miscellaneous: Consent to Judgment** for use when deferring fees.
  - **Pat did some research on this and found that this event is valid for use in both cases:**
    - Consent Judgement in Civil- is a judgement entered when a party is granted a deferral of filing fees and costs, and consents to judgment being entered against him for the deferred fees and costs that remain unpaid after thirty calendar days following the entry of final judgement or order. **A.R.S. §12-302F**
    - Consent Judgment in Family Law- is a judgment entered when the petitioner and respondent agree to the terms in a paternity or maternity action. **ARFLP Rule 45(a)**
    - Val recommended adding a new event for use in the Family Law cases – Decree: Consent Decree with a case status of ‘Adjudicated’ and party status of ‘Terminated: Decree’. The courts had no objection so we will be adding this event.
    - Additionally, Marretta will be removing Judgment: Consent Judgment as a stop code. Courts that are relying on this as a stop code should now change the case status to ‘Re-Adjudicated’.
  
- **Addition to agenda:**
  - We have had a question from a court regarding the process to open an appeal on an Order of Protection from a lower court. We believe it would be handled as any other appeal from a lower court so please be prepared to discuss what your process is and how you track the case for time limits.
    - Courts agreed that the hierarchy for opening these cases should be as shown below:

The screenshot shows a 'Case Type Information' form with several dropdown menus. The 'Case Sub Type' dropdown is open, displaying a list of codes and descriptions. The 'LCA' option is highlighted in yellow.

Code	Description
FRC	FEDERAL RESTORATION OF CIVIL RI
C45	FOREIGN JUDGMENT
HC	HABEAS CORPUS
IEC	IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT CHAL
LCJ	LCA - APPEAL OF CIVIL TRAFFIC CA
LCM	LCA - APPEAL OF CIVIL TRAFFIC CA
LCA	LCA - NON TRAFFIC ORIG IN JP OR M
MM	MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, September 18, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 9/18/2019 Agenda:

#### Coconino

- Request to add default case status of **'Re-Adjudicated'** to existing event **'Rule 32: Granting of Petition for Post Conviction Relief'**:
  - *This code should automatically re-adjudicate the case similar to Rule 32: Dismissal.*

#### Santa Cruz

- Court asked if new events were being created to comply with **HB 2055** and **HB 2080**. I recommended using the events highlighted below and that this be added to the agenda for discussion.
  - *Application to Set Aside Juvenile Adjudication - Motion – Set Aside / Vacate*
  - *Application for Destruction of Juvenile Records – Application for Destruction of Records*
  - *Application to Restore Firearm Rights – Petition to Restore Right to Own or Carry Firearms*
  - *Legal Requirements for Destruction of Juvenile Records, Set Aside Adjudication, and Restoration of Right to Possess a Firearm*
  - *Notice of Important Rights*
  - *Order Regarding Application [ ] Modify Monetary Obligations [ ] Destruction of Juvenile Records [ ] Set Aside Juvenile Adjudication [ ] Restoration of Firearm Rights – Order: Granting or Order: Denying*
  - *Instructions – Setting Aside Juvenile Adjudication*
  - *Instructions – Destruction of Juvenile Court Records*
  - *Instructions – Restoration of Firearm Rights*
  - *Notice for Destruction of Juvenile Court Records (from Juvenile Probation Officer) – Application: for Destruction of Records*

#### Yavapai

- Request to add new event **Notice: Important Rights** to comply with ARS 8-349(G) and ARS 8-348(A) - also noted in request by Santa Cruz.

- Yavapai County would like to add a docket code of "Notice: Important Rights" to be used in connection with the newly implemented requirements developed by AOC to comply with the revised ARS 8-349(G) and 8-348(A) which went into effect on August 27, 2019.

## **AOC**

- Follow up to request from Mohave for new event **Order: Affirming**.
  - After discussion with the pilot courts, Della agreed that she was ok with removing the case status change from the **Request: Hearing on Order of Protection**. The default case statuses are being removed from protective order events only. Doug has created the TFS and Susann is assigning it to Development.

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, September 18, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 9/18/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Bran Miller

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo, Teri Griego

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee - Madeline Montoya

Maricopa – Chris Cerrato

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon, Christina Spurlock

Pinal – Nikki Felix, Odette Apodaca

Santa Cruz –Valeria Fuentes, Juan Pablo Guzman

Yavapai - Kelly Gregorio, Rachel Roehe, Charlotte VanLandingham, Donna McQuality, Karen Wilkes, Jonathon Derois

AOC- Beth Peterson, Mary Foltz

#### Coconino

- Request to add default case status of '**Re-Adjudicated**' to existing event '**Rule 32: Granting of Petition for Post Conviction Relief**':
  - *This code should automatically re-adjudicate the case similar to Rule 32: Dismissal.*
  - *There was discussion regarding how the process was so different across the courts so a vote was taken to determine if this should be granted. The vote was 5 yes and 3 opposed. This was granted.*

#### Santa Cruz

- Court asked if new events were being created to comply with **HB 2055** and **HB 2080**. I recommended using the events highlighted below and that this be added to the agenda for discussion.
  - Application to Set Aside Juvenile Adjudication - Motion – Set Aside / Vacate
    - *Bran from Cochise asked that a new event be created for this as the recommended event was used in their court for hearings. Other courts stated they used Motion: Set Aside/Vacate and some recommended this be used. Another vote was taken with an outcome of 8 for and 1 opposed. This was granted. The new event will be '**Application:***

**Set Aside Juvenile Adjudication'**. The case status will default to **'Reopened'** and the party status will be **'Post-Adjudication Matters'**.

- Application for Destruction of Juvenile Records – **Application for Destruction of Records**
- Application to Restore Firearm Rights – **Petition to Restore Right to Own or Carry Firearms**
- Legal Requirements for Destruction of Juvenile Records, Set Aside Adjudication, and Restoration of Right to Possess a Firearm
- Notice of Important Rights
  - **See below**
- Order Regarding Application [ ] Modify Monetary Obligations [ ] Destruction of Juvenile Records [ ] Set Aside Juvenile Adjudication [ ] Restoration of Firearm Rights – **Order: Granting or Order: Denying**
- Instructions – Setting Aside Juvenile Adjudication
- Instructions – Destruction of Juvenile Court Records
- Instructions – Restoration of Firearm Rights
- Notice for Destruction of Juvenile Court Records (from Juvenile Probation Officer) – **Application: for Destruction of Records**

### Yavapai

- Request to add new event **Notice: Important Rights** to comply with ARS 8-349(G) and ARS 8-348(A) - also noted in request by Santa Cruz.
  - Yavapai County would like to add a docket code of "Notice: Important Rights" to be used in connection with the newly implemented requirements developed by AOC to comply with the revised ARS 8-349(G) and 8-348(A) which went into effect on August 27, 2019.
    - **This was granted.**

### AOC

- Follow up to request from Mohave for new event **Order: Affirming**.
  - After discussion with the pilot courts, Della agreed that she was ok with removing the case status change from the **Request: Hearing on Order of Protection**. The default case statuses are being removed from protective order events only. Doug has created the TFS and Susann is assigning it to Development.
    - **Della stated that she was told that with the 2020 update, case statuses are not what will be used for time standards, but wanted the other courts to weigh in. The event 'Request: Hearing on Order of Protection' is what starts the clock for time standards. The clock is stopped when the order is amended/modified, quashed/dismissed or the event of 'Civil Order: Protective Order Remains in Effect' is docketed. There was no opposition from the other courts so this request is considered closed.**

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 11/20/2019 Agenda:

#### Yuma

- Request to add new appearance reason - **Dissolution of Marriage:**
  - *Requesting a new appearance code of 'Dissolution of Marriage' for use in calendaring divorce hearings in AJACS. Divorces represent a major percentage of domestic cases yet, there is currently no appearance reason for divorce hearings. A 'Dissolution of Marriage' appearance reason would be used Judicial Assistants and Courtroom Clerks to calendar a divorce hearing that are clearly distinguishable from other hearings for unmarried parties and children. The appearance reason 'Court Trial' is currently used for calendaring divorce cases. This code is also used for a myriad of other domestic hearings that are not divorce, as all hearings technically are court trials.*

#### AOC

- **Change of Venue to this County – Family Law** – Process to add the fees for these case types:
  - Void the statewide receivables ONLY. DO NOT void the local receivables.
  - Post the event: PAYMENT: CHG VENUE TO THIS COUNTY – FAMILY LAW
  - This will post the correct statewide receivables
  - ~~Apply the hold receipt~~
- **We received the following question from Pinal:**
  - *Nikki and I have a question on an event code – we're hoping you can provide some clarification. PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION. The way this event is worded is extremely confusing. Is it supposed to mean that this is actually a person filing an objection to a previously filed opposing petition? Or, it is supposed to mean that the person is filing an objection/opposing petition to the petition that initiated the case? If you have any info on this event, we would greatly appreciate some insight.*
    - I determined the following:

Below is the statewide fee schedule:

PROBATE, CONSERVATORSHIP, GUARDIANSHIP & FIDUCIARY								
C	Petition in formal testacy or appointment proceeding	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Application for informal probate or informal appointment	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition for supervised administration	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition to appoint guardian	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition to appoint conservator or make protective order	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Single estate application or petition under Title 14, Chapter 3 (A.R.S. § 14-3938)	149.00	15.00					164.00
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
D	Postjudgment activities in probate cases	74.00						

**The payment event for 'D' is:** PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION

**The payment event for 'C' is:** PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT PROCEEDING / GUARDIANSHIP / CONSERVATORSHIP

PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION – is for a person filing an objection to a previously filed opposing petition. Therefore - PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT PROCEEDING / GUARDIANSHIP / CONSERVATORSHIP – is for a person filing an objection/opposition to a petition that initiated the case.

Do any courts use these differently?

- **Receipt Prefixes** – We will be adding prefixes to your receipt numbers on 1/1/2020. This will enable you to easily identify what the receipt was for such as bonds, counter receipts, hold receipts or miscellaneous receipts. We will get more information to you before the end of the year.
- **To comply with requirements for CCR, we will be making the following changes to some case categories.**
  - The description for the category of **Out of County Juvenile** will be changed to **Juvenile - Other**
  - We will be end-dating **Certificate of Magistracy**. This has never been used since AJACS was deployed.
  - We will be end-dating **Traffic**. Only Santa Cruz processes civil traffic cases and they use the category type of **Juvenile**.
- **Protective Order Appearance Reasons:**
  - GJ courts have more PO appearance reasons than LJ does. GJ is currently using these GJ specific appearance reasons in PO cases but GJ should be able to do everything they need to do with the PO appearance reasons they share in common with LJ. In the interim, brady is not applying to these GJ specific appearance reasons. Should we have these appearance reasons available for GJ to use when they can accomplish what they need with the new appearance reasons? Please be prepared to discuss end-dating existing appearance reason

**GJ PO Appearance Reasons (Hearing types):**

APPR_REASON_CD	APPR_DESCRIPTION
131	REQUEST DISMISS ORDER OF PROTECTION
395	REQUEST FOR PROTECTED ADDRESS
53	MOTION - PROTECTIVE ORDER
108	PETITION - ORDER OF PROTECTION
378	PRELIMINARY PROTECTIVE HEARING
604	PRE PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE
854	ORDER OF PROTECTION HEARING
POHRNG	PROTECTIVE ORDER - EX PARTE
POPOST	PROTECTIVE ORDER - POST ISSUANCE
POPPE	PROTECTIVE ORDER - PRE ISSUANCE

**LJ PO appearance Reasons (Hearing Types):**

APPR_REASON_CD	APPR_DESCRIPTION
POHRNG	PROTECTIVE ORDER - EX PARTE
POPOST	PROTECTIVE ORDER - POST ISSUANCE
POPPE	PROTECTIVE ORDER - PRE ISSUANCE

- Below are the events we previously discussed and agreed should be hidden. At the User Group Meeting on 11/14/2019, there was a request to revisit this as there are some events that have associated documents. Please review and be prepared to discuss.

Code	Description	Event Category
POACCSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
1257073	FINGERPRINTS ORDERED	Order (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
DCCF	FINANCIAL: DISPUTED CREDIT CHARGE FEE IMPOSED	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
ADRSMAN	ADRS REPORTED MANUALLY TO DPS	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
POSTRESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - RESCHEDULED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
1013346	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE SET	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
POPPEISS	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE CONTINUED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
PRERESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE RESCHEDULED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
1013345	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE SET	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
POSTCONT	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - CONTINUED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
ISSUOR	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISPOSITIONED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
FRCPREV	FARE CAP REVOKED	FARE (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER MODIFIED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POCASETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POEXPDT	PROTECTIVE ORDER EXPIRED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)

PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
PETQSHD	PROTECTIVE ORDER QUASHED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POINT	PROTECTIVE ORDER CASE INITIATED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
PONOTSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER DECLARATION/AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
BRDYSET	BRADY FLAG SET	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
CCCGBK	CREDIT CARD CHARGEBACK	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
ARRESTM	ARREST RECORD MODIFIED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
ARRESTF	ARREST RECORD FILED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
GCLOSED	GENERAL CLOSED CASE EVENT	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
1257039	ADRS SUCCESSFUL	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
MODPETN	Petition Modified	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
CASHEXON	CASH BOND EXONERATED	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
EMAIL	EMAIL SENT WITH ATTACHED DOCUMENT	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FORFRCPT	RECEIPT FORFEITED	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
CIVISSDL	Claim Deleted	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
CIVISSUP	Claim Updated	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
13325	NOTICE:Criminal Restitution Order	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPCR	FARE CAP CORRECTION RECALL	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPCOM	FARE CAP COMPLETION	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPDE	FARE CAP DEFAULT	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPRE	FARE CAP REENTRY	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPEN	FARE CAP ENTRY	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)

# GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting

## Agenda

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

1:30 – 3:30

(602) 452-3533 Meeting ID: 992587841

### 11/20/2019 Agenda:

#### Jurisdictions Represented:

Cochise – Bran Miller, Amy Hunley

Coconino – Val Wyant

Gila – Esther Canez, Anita Escobedo

Graham – Stephanie Newton

Greenlee - Madeline Montoya

Maricopa – Chris Cerrato, Nancy Rodriguez, Jessica Fotinos, Jeff Fine

Mohave- Della Hiser, Andrew Dixon, Virlynn Tinnell

Navajo – Deanne Romo, Marc Russell

Pima – Gary Harrison, Roger Murray

Pinal –Odette Apodaca, Amanda Stanford, Elsa Robbins

Santa Cruz –Valeria Fuentes, Juan Pablo Guzman

Yavapai - Kelly Gregorio, Charlotte VanLandingham, Donna McQuality, Karen Wilkes, Heather Diaz

Yuma – Lawrence Tortora, Robert Wilson

AOC- Beth Peterson, Doug McKenzie, Patrick McGrath, April Smith, Marisa Shaffery

### Yuma

- Request to add new appearance reason - **Dissolution of Marriage:**
  - *Requesting a new appearance code of 'Dissolution of Marriage' for use in calendaring divorce hearings in AJACS. Divorces represent a major percentage of domestic cases yet, there is currently no appearance reason for divorce hearings. A 'Dissolution of Marriage' appearance reason would be used Judicial Assistants and Courtroom Clerks to calendar a divorce hearing that are clearly distinguishable from other hearings for unmarried parties and children. The appearance reason 'Court Trial' is currently used for calendaring divorce cases. This code is also used for a myriad of other domestic hearings that are not divorce, as all hearings technically are court trials.*
  - **Courts voted to deny this request.**

### AOC

- **Change of Venue to this County – Family Law** – Process to add the fees for these case types:
  - Void the statewide receivables ONLY. DO NOT void the local receivables.
  - Post the event: PAYMENT: CHG VENUE TO THIS COUNTY – FAMILY LAW
  - This will post the correct statewide receivables
  - ~~Apply the hold receipt~~

- We received the following question from Pinal:
  - Nikki and I have a question on an event code – we’re hoping you can provide some clarification. PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION. The way this event is worded is extremely confusing. Is it supposed to mean that this is actually a person filing an objection to a previously filed opposing petition? Or, it is supposed to mean that the person is filing an objection/opposing petition to the petition that initiated the case? If you have any info on this event, we would greatly appreciate some insight.
    - I determined the following:

**Below is the statewide fee schedule:**

PROBATE, CONSERVATORSHIP, GUARDIANSHIP & FIDUCIARY								
C	Petition in formal testacy or appointment proceeding	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Application for informal probate or informal appointment	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition for supervised administration	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition to appoint guardian	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Petition to appoint conservator or make protective order	149.00	15.00					164.00
C	Single estate application or petition under Title 14, Chapter 3 (A.R.S. § 14-3938)	149.00	15.00					164.00
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
D	Postjudgment activities in probate cases	74.00						

**The payment event for ‘D’ is:** PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION

**The payment event for ‘C’ is:** PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT PROCEEDING / GUARDIANSHIP / CONSERVATORSHIP

PAYMENT: PROBATE OBJECTION OPPOSING PETITION – is for a person filing an objection to a previously filed opposing petition. Therefore - PAYMENT: OPPOSING TESTACY, APPOINTMENT PROCEEDING / GUARDIANSHIP / CONSERVATORSHIP – is for a person filing an objection/opposition to a petition that initiated the case.

Do any courts use these differently?

- **Tabled.** 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?
- Pat will review.

- **Receipt Prefixes** – We will be adding prefixes to your receipt numbers on 1/1/2020. This will enable you to easily identify what the receipt was for such as bonds, counter receipts, hold receipts or miscellaneous receipts. We will get more information to you before the end of the year.
  - **Courts wanted to make sure that the receipts would be generated in sequence across all of the receipt types and Beth verified that they would be.**
- **To comply with requirements for CCR, we will be making the following changes to some case categories.**
  - The description for the category of **Out of County Juvenile** will be changed to **Juvenile - Other**
  - We will be end-dating **Certificate of Magistracy**. This has never been used since AJACS was deployed.
  - We will be end-dating **Traffic**. Only Santa Cruz processes civil traffic cases and they use the category type of **Juvenile**. **Santa Cruz wanted to verify that this case category was not used in the civil traffic cases they process for Juveniles. Beth ran a query to confirm that it was not.**
  - **Courts agreed these could be end-dated/updated.**
- **Protective Order Appearance Reasons:**
  - GJ courts have more PO appearance reasons than LJ does. GJ is currently using these GJ specific appearance reasons in PO cases but GJ should be able to do everything they need to do with the PO appearance reasons they share in common with LJ. In the interim, brady is not applying to these GJ specific appearance reasons. Should we have these appearance reasons available for GJ to use when they can accomplish what they need with the new appearance reasons? Please be prepared to discuss end-dating existing appearance reason
  - **Della stated that she had no issue with appearance reasons and their names but when Post Issuance hearings are scheduled, it automatically generates a document in AJACS: Notice of Hearing. Doug stated that forms can be turned off when hearings are scheduled. All courts agreed that they want them turned off. He also noted that he had entered a TFS from the issues list to remove the file stamp from the Pre and Post Issuance notices.**
  - **The appearance reasons below that are red and crossed off will remain active as they are used for case types other than Protective Orders. The remaining 4 (highlighted in yellow) will be end-dated. The end-dated appearance reasons that were used in the past will still be visible. Going forward, when Protective Orders are scheduled, they will be using one of the three options referenced below (highlighted in green). All courts agreed**

**GJ PO Appearance Reasons (Hearing types):**

APPR_REASON_CD	APPR_DESCRIPTION
131	REQUEST DISMISS ORDER OF PROTECTION
395	REQUEST FOR PROTECTED ADDRESS
53	<del>MOTION—PROTECTIVE ORDER</del>
108	PETITION - ORDER OF PROTECTION
378	<del>PRELIMINARY PROTECTIVE HEARING</del>

604	<del>PRE-PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE</del>
854	ORDER OF PROTECTION HEARING
POHRNG	PROTECTIVE ORDER - EX PARTE
POPOST	PROTECTIVE ORDER - POST ISSUANCE
POPPE	PROTECTIVE ORDER - PRE ISSUANCE

**LJ PO appearance Reasons (Hearing Types):**

APPR_REASON_CD	APPR_DESCRIPTION
POHRNG	PROTECTIVE ORDER - EX PARTE
POPOST	PROTECTIVE ORDER - POST ISSUANCE
POPPE	PROTECTIVE ORDER - PRE ISSUANCE

- **Additionally, the following Harassment Injunction appearance reasons will be end-dated:**

- DISMISS INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT
- DISMISS INJUNCTION AGAINST WORKPLACE HARASSMENT
- PETITION - INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT
- PETITION - INJUNCTION AGAINST WORKPLACE HARASSMENT
- INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT HEARING
- INJUNCTION AGAINST WORKPLACE HARASSMENT HEARING

- Below are the events we previously discussed and agreed should be hidden. At the User Group Meeting on 11/14/2019, there was a request to revisit this as there are some events that have associated documents. Please review and be prepared to discuss.

- **Doug has entered TFS 55649 to display Protective Order events below that have attached documents on the ROA. There is a secondary issue regarding the verbiage on some of these events. I will be sending an invitation to meet early next week to participants whose names are submitted by the COC's. We will discuss if there is a description that will better fit the GJ process.**

Code	Description	Event Category
POACCSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
1257073	FINGERPRINTS ORDERED	Order (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
DCCF	FINANCIAL: DISPUTED CREDIT CHARGE FEE IMPOSED	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
ADRSMAN	ADRS REPORTED MANUALLY TO DPS	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
POSTRESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - RESCHEDULED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
1013346	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE SET	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
POPPEISS	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE CONTINUED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
PRERESC	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - PRE ISSUANCE RESCHEDULED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
1013345	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE SET	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)

POSTCONT	PROTECTIVE ORDER HEARING - POST ISSUANCE - CONTINUED	HEARING (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
ISSUOR	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISPOSITIONED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
FRCPREV	FARE CAP REVOKED	FARE (01/01/1900-12/31/2999)
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER MODIFIED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POCASETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POEXPDT	PROTECTIVE ORDER EXPIRED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
PETQSHD	PROTECTIVE ORDER QUASHED	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
POINT	PROTECTIVE ORDER CASE INITIATED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
PONOTSER	PROTECTIVE ORDER DECLARATION/AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE FILED	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
BRDYSET	BRADY FLAG SET	CIVIL ORDER (01/01/1900-12/31/2099)
CCCGBK	CREDIT CARD CHARGEBACK	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
ARRESTM	ARREST RECORD MODIFIED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
ARRESTF	ARREST RECORD FILED	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
GCLOSED	GENERAL CLOSED CASE EVENT	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
1257039	ADRS SUCCESSFUL	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
MODPETN	Petition Modified	SERVICE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
CASHEXON	CASH BOND EXONERATED	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
EMAIL	EMAIL SENT WITH ATTACHED DOCUMENT	MISCELLANEOUS (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FORFRCPT	RECEIPT FORFEITED	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
CIVISSDL	Claim Deleted	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
CIVISSUP	Claim Updated	FINANCIALS (01/01/1900-07/01/2008)
13325	NOTICE:Criminal Restitution Order	Financial (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPCR	FARE CAP CORRECTION RECALL	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPCOM	FARE CAP COMPLETION	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPDE	FARE CAP DEFAULT	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPRE	FARE CAP REENTRY	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)
FRCPEN	FARE CAP ENTRY	FARE (01/01/1900-12/30/2099)

- ***We will be cancelling the meeting for December 18th. An invitation for the 2020 meetings will be sent out sometime in December.***