



LEONIDAS RALPH MECHAM
Director

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS

CLARENCE A. LEE, JR.
Associate Director

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544



February 20, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO ALL UNITED STATES JUDGES

SUBJECT: ABA Resolution on Citations (ACTION REQUESTED)

RESPONSE DUE DATE: March 14, 1997

In August 1996, the American Bar Association (ABA) approved a resolution made by its Special Committee on Citation Issues calling for state and federal courts to develop a standard citation system and recommending a format that could be used by state and federal courts. That resolution calls for courts to identify the citation on each decision at the time the decision is made available to the public. The ABA resolution is attached, and the full report of the Committee is available from the Administrative Office (202/273-1543) or through the J-Net (the judiciary's Intranet site) or Internet at (<http://www.abanet.org/citation/home.html>).

At the suggestion of members of the Judicial Conference's Executive Committee, the Committee on Automation and Technology is seeking written public comments from judges, court personnel, the bar, and the public as to:

- (1) whether the federal courts should adopt the form of official citation for court decisions recommended by the ABA resolution; and,
- (2) the costs and benefits such a decision would have on the courts, the bar, and the public.

The Committee on Automation and Technology has prepared the brief survey of judges attached to this memorandum and asks that judges complete the form and return it by March 14.

ABA Resolution on Citations

2

Anyone wishing to submit additional written comments may send them via e-mail, fax, or mail to the following addresses:

Mail: Appellate Court and Circuit Administration Division
ATTN: ABA Citation Resolution
Suite 4-512
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Washington, D.C. 20544

cc:mail: citation --AOHUB

Fax: (202) 273-1555

Submission of written comments is preferred in electronic form, using cc:mail. Any attachments to e-mail messages should be in WordPerfect 6.1 or earlier versions, or in ASCII. Alternatively, comments may be submitted in printed form through mail or facsimile. Written comments are due no later than Friday, March 14, 1997. All comments received will be considered public information.

In addition, a public hearing will be held on Thursday, April 3, beginning at 9 a.m. in the ceremonial courtroom of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 3rd and Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. to address issues (1) and (2) stated above. Judges on the Policy and Programs Subcommittee of the Judicial Conference Committee on Automation and Technology will preside at the hearing.

Anyone submitting written comments who also is interested in testifying at the public hearing should submit a written request to the above address no later than Friday, March 14, 1997. Since it is expected that only a limited number of requests can be granted, the request should set forth reasons why an oral presentation, in addition to written comments, would be helpful to consideration of these issues. The request should identify the persons who wish to testify, the subjects to be addressed, the amount of time desired (the maximum is 15 minutes), phone number, and fax number. If possible, advance copies of testimony should be submitted. The Subcommittee will select representative witnesses to testify.

If you have any questions about the opportunity to submit comments or the public hearing, please contact Joan Countryman of the Appellate Court and Circuit Administration Division at 202/273-1543.


Leonida Ralph Mecham

Attachments: Survey Form
ABA Citation Resolution

**ABA RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSAL CITATION SYSTEM
FEDERAL COURT JUDGE SURVEY FORM**

1. Should the clerk of your court be required to add an official citation number beyond the case number to each opinion?

2. Should the federal judiciary require the use of the official citation?

Permit it?

3. Should federal judges number the paragraphs in an opinion so that there may be pinpoint citations in which no private sector company can have a copyright?



Name of Judge: _____ Circuit: _____
 Court: _____ Date: _____

Please return this form to: Appellate Court and Circuit Administration Division
 ATTN: ABA Citation Resolution

Fax Telephone Number: (202) 273-1555

Mailing Address: Suite 4-512
 Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
 Washington, D.C. 20544

Please return this form by March 14, 1997.

March 20, 1997



**SUMMARY OF FEDERAL JUDGE SURVEY ON ADOPTION
OF THE
ABA CITATION RESOLUTION**

Legends

Judge Type - Cir = Circuit Dist = District Bank = Bankruptcy Mag = Magistrate CFC = Court of Federal Claims CIT = Court of International Trade ... = Sec Comments Column

Judge Type	Cir.	#1	#2a	#2b	#3	Comments
Bank	9	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	5	no	no	no	no...	#1. <u>No</u> . Unnecessary and <u>disruptive</u> . #3. No - it's another layer of work on top of other work to be done.
Bank	9	no			no	
Bank	9	no	no	yes	yes	
Bank	5	no..	no	yes	...	#1. No-The present system is adequate #3. I would not want to do this-
Bank	3	yes	yes	yes	no....	#3. No. Aesthetic considerations outweigh any factors supporting the numbering of paragraphs by judges.
Bank	9	Yes	yes	#1. At this point, it should be recommended, not required. #2a. At this point it should be recommended or requested, but not required.
Bank	4	no	no	yes	yes...	#3. Yes. I believe that this would be a good practice to follow.
Bank	7	no	no	no	no	
Bank	yes				yes	
Bank	6	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Bank	4	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Bank	3	No...	Yes..	..									
						<p>#1. NOT THE PROPOSED ONE. If the standard were changed so that each judge could use it, it would be helpful* Also, the use of a sequential opinion number in the location where page numbers currently are used will cause <u>immense</u> confusion unless it is preceded by a # symbol or some other character (like "n" or "no." for numbers). Moreover, there is no proposed citation for opinions by bankruptcy courts and no apparent way to distinguish magistrate judge opinions from district court judge opinions in the same case. "Our clerks are already overburdened with increases in case filings. They should not be burdened with this task, nor should they change a judge's opinion, even to add a number.</p> <p>* An appropriate standard would sequentially number each judge's opinion but not the court's. An example could be Smith v. Jones, 1996 Bkr WDTx JGK #1, ¶1, n4</p> <p>This equates to:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>1996 Year</th> <th>BkrWDTx Court</th> <th>JGK Judge's Initials</th> <th># Number of Judge's Opinions</th> <th>l Numerical Opinion in Year (to be sequential for opinions released to public)</th> <th>¶ Paragraph Sign (or use para")</th> <th>1 Number of Cited</th> <th>n Footnote</th> <th>4 Number of Footnote Cited</th> </tr> </thead> </table> <p>#2a. <u>NOT THIS ONE.</u> This standard as proposed is not administratively easy to use in trial courts. Another standard should be used that has each judge numbering opinions. In appellate courts, per curiam opinions can be designated, for example, as a 3dCirPC (i.e., substituting "PC" for the judge's initials); en banc can be designated with "EB" rather than a judge's initials, etc. (see above).</p> <p>#2b. No. An appropriate one, when developed, should be required to assist the courts in keeping track, in automated fashion, of the case as it travels through the appeal process. The proposed standard is NOT feasible.</p> <p>#3. Yes. Although I see nothing untoward with an entity choosing to take the risk of analyzing our opinions and copyrighting their work, a pinpoint citation to a ¶ number eliminates any need to refer to a page number.</p>	1996 Year	BkrWDTx Court	JGK Judge's Initials	# Number of Judge's Opinions	l Numerical Opinion in Year (to be sequential for opinions released to public)	¶ Paragraph Sign (or use para")	1 Number of Cited	n Footnote	4 Number of Footnote Cited
1996 Year	BkrWDTx Court	JGK Judge's Initials	# Number of Judge's Opinions	l Numerical Opinion in Year (to be sequential for opinions released to public)	¶ Paragraph Sign (or use para")	1 Number of Cited	n Footnote	4 Number of Footnote Cited							
Bank	9	yes	yes		yes										
Bank	3	no	no	no..	no	#2b..no-that would defeat its purpose									
Bank	3	no	no	yes	no										
Bank	9	no	no	yes	yes										
Bank		no	no	yes	no										
Bank	2	no	no	#2b. Only as long as the printed citation is also supplied. #3. Absolutely not.									
Bank	5	no	no	yes	no										

March 20, 1997

Bank	1	no	no..	Yes	no..	#2a. No, Blue Book is satisfactory and adequate. #3. No, I find the present system adequate. Although I promote automation, an overly structured system may detract from the quality (overall) of the opinions.
Bank	3	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	7	yes	yes		yes	
Bank	4	no	no	no	no	
Bank	9	no..	No	no...	#1. No. Not absent a consistent citation form. I believe the current format is completely acceptable. #2b. No. I think that all opinions ought to be filed in the case and with the clerk's office (with a designation as to the decision being "publishable" or not) Anyone with an interest can then obtain the clerk's copy and apply its own citation format. #3. Does this mean judicially provided/produced head notes? I am opposed to any change in citation method and I wonder why the courts are letting themselves be dragged into this dispute.
Bank	11th	no..	no..	no...		#1. No. The case numbers in our Court have four distinct components. (e.g. 96-354-BKC-3P7), and adding an additional citation number would only further complicate the recording process. #2a. No. The federal judiciary should continue to utilize the uniform system of citation taught in law schools across the country - The Bluebook. #2b. Discretionary use of an alternate citation system would only serve to upset the uniformity. #3. Sequential numbering of paragraphs would not place an undue burden on the judiciary, and could be provided to assist with pinpoint citations.
Bank	9	no	no	no	no	
Bank	10	no	no	no	no	
Bank	10	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Bank	9	no	no	no	no	
Bank	6	no	no	no	no	
Bank	11	no..	no..	no..	no..	#1. No. An additional number would only cause confusion to practitioners. #2a. No. The courts should continue to use the uniform citation. #2b. No. To allow the use of another form of citation would destroy any uniformity that is now in place with the Bluebook. #3. No. Pinpoints that reference page numbers in the reporters suffice.
Bank	10	#1. I guess its ok - rather a hassle. #3. We can do that.

March 20, 1997



Bank	4	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	6	no!	no!		no	
Bank	5	no	no		no	
Bank	5	no	no	Perh aps	no	
Bank	9	No.	yes...	yes...	#1. No-only those designated for publication (otherwise, there will be huge gaps in the number sequences, and practitioners, scholars and courts will be uncertain whether they have all precedent) #2a. Yes, if we're going to use them on our own decisions. #3. Require only if we're adopting the system.
Bank	3	no	no		no	
Bank	9	no	no	no opini on	no...	#3. No-This appears to be an attempt to have the courts do the research for lawyers and publishers. A lawyer should read an <u>entire</u> decision-not simply a paragraph-in order to understand a court's reasoning in a contextual sense. This is little more than research by headnotes for the lazy. The time and cost burden would be significant and of little, if any, benefit to the judiciary. Of course, it would provide lawyers with a new excuse-"The Judge didn't properly number his or her paragraphs."
Bank	5	No	no	yes	no	
Bank	5	no	no	no	no	
Bank	8	no	no		no	
Bank	9	no	no	no	no	
Bank	7	no..	No...		no...	#1. The legal community has already developed a satisfactory way of citing slip opinions - one that does not require any input from the clerk or a change in writing format - consequently there is no need for a mandatory citation number. #2a. An "official citation" is only useful if there is an official reporter that is readily available. Without access to (or the existence of) such a reporter (or database) an official citation is relatively useless. Given the ready availability of official reporters, enforcement of any such requirement would seem to be a problem. #3. Anyone that wants to is able to number paragraphs if they wish it. I shouldn't have to do it for them, and if they don't want it, my doing it won't help.

March 20, 1997

Bank	5	no	no	no	no	
Bank	5	no	no	all right	no!	
Bank	6	no	no	yes	#3. Without a universally accepted research method (such as West key number), this would appear to be unnecessary. Likewise, if there is an alternative to the West system, then it is also unnecessary.
Bank	9	no	no	no...	no	#2b. No position
Bank	9	no	no	yes	no..	#3. No, the burden would exceed any perceived benefit to the public.
Bank	10	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	11	no!	No	Not necessary	no	
Bank	5	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	7	no..	No	yes..	...	#1. No. Cases would be no easier to find under the proposed system and would add another opportunity for mistakes in citation. #3. No opinion
Bank	10					(Faxed form was so light we could not read it. Called secretary.) Judge's secretary called back and said the judge said his comments are: "he thinks the resolution sounds like a lot more trouble than it is worth."
Bank	10	no	no	no	no	
Bank	7	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	9	yes	yes		yes	
Bank	9	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	1					

March 20, 1997

Bank		<p>This court recognized that the form of official citation, as proposed, will be equally effective for printed case reports and for case reports electronically published on computer disks or network services. However, at this point in time, the Court relies almost exclusively on printed case reports which are retrieved by reference to the volume, the publication and the page number. In the event the Court cites to a case which is available only on Westlaw and/or Lexis, the Bluebook provides a standard form of citation.</p> <p>The suggestion that the Court add an additional citation as proposed, which shall become the official citation, is premature and burdensome. The above methods of citation currently in use adequately provide for uniformity and there is no need to mandate the use of a new system of citation. At some point in the future, when cases which are available only by electronic means are relied on to a greater extent, the additional citation as proposed may be appropriate.</p> <p>The portion of the resolution contained in I.D. which requires counsel to provide printed copies of cited authority not available in printed case reports to opposing counsel and the court is an appropriate suggestion. Certain parties, especially those who are acting <i>pro se</i> may not have access to such cited authority. These parties should not be prejudiced for their inability to obtain the cited authority, and such requirement of opposing counsel would provide a more level playing field. This Court is keenly aware of the difficulty <i>pro se</i> parties may have in adequately representing themselves, and any requirement which would assist them without causing an undue burden to the opposing party should be implemented.</p>
Bank	7	...	-	yes	...	<p>#1. No opinion #3. No opinion</p>
Bank	11	<p>#1. This would not cause any unnecessary administrative burden. #2a. In my view, the federal judiciary should require one official form of citation. #3. No. I do not see a need for it, and I am of the opinion that it would just add an administrative burden to the opinion writing process. I see no benefit to be derived from this.</p>
Bank	6	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	4	no	no	yes	no	
Bank						<p>I do not want the clerk of my court to add to their workload an official number beyond the case number of any opinion. The Federal Judiciary should not be required to use an official citation. It would be permissible to make it optional. Federal judges should not be required to number paragraphs. Comment: I have been following this proposal very carefully and I think it is just another make work scheme that will add to the workload of the Judiciary and our employees. Moreover, with the expanding pace of increased technological change our implementation of a new and additional system will more than likely be outdated before we implement it. Indeed, with the new word search engines that are being developed on a daily basis, the entire citation system may be outdated.</p>

March 20, 1997

Bank	6	yes	yes		yes	
Bank	9	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	11	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	10	no	no	no	no	
Bank	4	yes ...	yes		yes	#1. Yes, so long as there are clear guidelines within the court for determining which rulings are to be so treated.
Bank	8	no	no		no...	#3. No - this is just a lot of unnecessary work with very little purpose to it.
Bank	11	no	no	no	no	
Bank	7	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	11	no	no	o.k.	No..	#3. Shouldn't be <u>Required</u> . Some may wish to do so.
Bank	8	no	no		no	
Bank	1	no	no	yes	no opinion	
Bank	11	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	9	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	4	no		no	no	
Bank	6	no	no	...	no	#2b. Not opposed
Bank	9	no.	...	See abo ve	no	#1. No. Too burdensome and disruptive for court and chambers staff - at least as to bankruptcy courts. 2a. Not now, but maybe in the future.

March 20, 1997

Bank	11	no	no	N/A if not one	no	
Bank	5	no	no	yes	no	
Bank	4	...	yes		yes..	#1. Not to each opinion. The official citation number should be added only to those opinions identified by the court as available for publication and citation. #3. Yes, but please provide judges with some software that automatically puts these numbers out of the way in the margins rather than destroying the continuity of the text.
Bank	8	yes	yes		yes	
Bank	11	yes	no	yes	yes	
Bank	9	no	no	no	no	
CFC	Fed	no. ..	no..	no	no...	Judges shall not be required to reformat opinions and their own citations in order to provide computer access. Judges do use citations and computer services when an opinion has not yet been published.
CFC		no	no	yes..	No	#2b. Yes, if such procedure is adopted.
Cir	7	no. ..	No..	yes	#1. No. Very little benefit and unnecessary work. #2a. No. Very little benefit. Need to use parallel citations adds much work. #3. If purpose is to eliminate West's ability to have copyright, o.k., but seems unnecessary otherwise.
Cir	11	no	no	no	no	
Cir	5	no	no	ok	ok	
Cir	10	no	no		no	
Cir	1	yes	yes	-	yes..	#3. This seems to be a sensible solution arrived at after much deliberation by knowledgeable and concerned practitioners.
Cir	5	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Cir	2	no	no	yes	no	
Cir	D.C.	No	no	yes	no	
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	
Cir	10	no	no	no...	No	#2b We have no control over what someone else will do.
Cir	6					Sounds ok but I'll rely on the more informed judgement of the active Judges.
Cir	1	yes	yes		yes	
Cir	8	no	no		No	
Cir	8	no	no	no	no	
Cir	7	#1. Probably yes, but I have no opinion as to the appropriate effective date. #2a. Probably yes, but I have no opinion as to the appropriate effective date. #3. Probably yes, but I have no opinion as to the appropriate effective date.
Cir	1	no	no	...	No	#2b. Indifferent - but I doubt the regime would work if permissive.
Cir	11	no. ..	no..	no	no...	#1. Absolutely <u>not</u> #2. Absolutely <u>not</u> #3. No. More work for the judiciary - West copyright in pinpoint cites will not survive any further judicial scrutiny in my <u>studied</u> opinion.
Cir						
Cir	10	no	no	no	no	
Cir	3rd	no	no	no	no	
Cir	D.C.	No	no	yes	no	
Cir	9	yes	yes		yes	
Cir	10	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Cir	6	no	no	No	2b. Perhaps, if overwhelmingly approved!
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	
Cir	Fed	no	...	No	...	#2a. The citation system we have now appears to be satisfactory. #3. This appears to be unnecessary.
Cir	5	no	no	open	no	
Cir	6	no. ..	No	yes.. ..	no	#1. No. It is just more work to put on the clerk. #2b. Yes. It is like the use of parallel citations
Cir	4	...				#1. I am not certain that I see the need to change the present system of citations. It appears to me that the present system is working well and effectively from the standpoint of the courts, and the burden should be upon those seeking change to demonstrate the need. As of now, I fear the proposed change will create more administrative work without a corresponding increase in benefits to the profession.
Cir	10	no.	no..	no...	no...	#1. No. Additional identifiers beyond the official court docket number should be assigned by the database provider, not the court. The sequential numbering of decisions serves no legitimate purpose for internal case management and, therefore, would add an unnecessary burden to offices already working with reduced staff. #2a. No. See answer to 1. Citations not to the official reporter should include the "docket number, the court, and the full date of the most recent major disposition of the case," as set forth in Bluebook Rule 10.8.1(b). #3. No. The court provides the text on numbered pages and any other service beyond that should be provided by the database provider
Cir	3	no	no	yes	no	I have great concern as to how rehearing opinions and not-for-publication opinions feed into this citation summary. I am not sure that the report is as refined as it should be and takes into account the various federal publications.
Cir	5	no	no	...	No	#2b. Don't need permission
Cir	D.C.	No	no	no	no	
Cir	9	#1. Not until the system is modified to distinguish between citable and non citable authority and between different opinions in same case. #2a. See above #2b. See above #3. See above

March 20, 1997

Cir	8	no	no	no	no	
Cir	Fed	no	no	no	no	
Cir	7	yes			yes	
Cir	7	yes	yes	yes	no	
Cir	9	#1. Not at this time-we have no solid information on costs or benefits. #2a. If a system becomes "official", yes #3. No-not with present work load. We have no information on costs for added staff.
Cir	D.C.	yes		yes	no...	
Cir	D.C.	No	no	yes	no	
Cir	3	no!	no!	no opin ion	no!	
Cir	10	no	yes		no	
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	
Cir	2	no. ..	No	yes	no...	#1. No, it sounds to me like additional paper work and red tape. #3. No, pinpoint citations, in any event, should give no private sector company any copyrights. <u>See Feist Publications, Inc. V. Rural Telephone Service Company, Inc., 499 U.S. 340, 111 S. Ct. 1282</u>
Cir	8	no	no	...	No	#2b. Only if it also includes a citation to the presently used National reporter system.
Cir	6	no	no	yes	yes	
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Cir	2	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Cir	9	no	no	...	no	#2b. Perhaps
Cir	6	no	no	yes	no	
Cir	Fed.	No	no	yes	no	
Cir	5	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Cir	8	no	no	yes	no	
Cir	9	No	No	...	No..	#2b. Only if parallel to, e.g., F.3d. #3. No. I see no good reason to create that cacophony of numbers. Few books have such a thing. (Incidentally, I see nothing evil about a private company having a copyright on copyrightable material.)
Cir	10	no	no	...	no	#2b. No opinion
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	
Cir	7	no	no	why	no	
Cir	4	no	no	no	no	
Cir	Fed	no	no	yes	no	
Cir	1	yes	yes		no	
Cir	8	no	no	no	no	
Cir	10	no	no	..	No	#2b. I do not care
Cir	7	yes	yes		yes	
Cir	9	no.	no..		no...	#1. No-no-no-no-no #2. No - This is a <u>bad</u> idea. #3. Absolutely not. This is crazy. This thing should be killed--and for good.

March 20, 1997

Cir	6	no	#1. No. The Court of Appeals number should be an adequate identification of the case. No reason to assign some new number to the case except to have a smaller number. 2a. Until we know the data base that lawyers can use to get the official citation, no. Substantial burden on lawyers to get this additional information. #3. See no objection to numbering the paragraphs. That should make an even playing field.
Cir	Fed	no	no	yes	...	#3. Absolutely not!
Cir	9	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Cir	11	no	no	open	open	
CIT		...	No	yes	...	#1. We use sequential opinion numbers but no paragraph numbers. #3. Probably a decent idea, but not of great concern.
CIT		...	yes		no	#1. An official citation number beyond the case number has been added to each opinion of the U.S. Court of International Trade
CIT	Fed	...	No	yes	no	#1. The Clerk already does so.
Dist	4	yes	yes	-	yes	
Dist	6	no	no	no	no	
Dist	6	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	1	no	no	no	no	
Dist	10	no	no	no	no	
Dist	3	no	no		no	
Dist	7	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	11	no	no	...		#1. No, absent adequate funding from the ABA. The District's resources are already spread too thin to require the clerk to devise and implement an official citation number system. Additionally, the proponents of the "uniform" citation system fail to realize the inordinate number of written orders--from the brief (i.e. orders to show cause) to the lengthy (i.e., memorandum opinions) ones--generated by the judges in any particular dist. On any given day. Any attempt to consecutively number such a voluminous number of orders would be impracticable. #2b, yes, provided that the citing party provides the proper parallel citation
Dist	1	no	no	no	no	
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no		no	
Dist	3	#1. Absolutely not. #2a. Heavens, no! #2b. Sure #3. Forget it. No one should so constrict the form of what we write.
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	...	no	#2b. undecided
Dist	10	no.	no..	no...	no...	1. Others will need to address what additional work and expense would be required if the clerk were to monitor and record an "official citation number." In the court's opinion, any additional work in this regard would not yield an appreciable benefit to the courts. The court has no complaints with the current system of opinion publishing and its reliance on <u>The Blue Book: A Uniform System of Citation</u> (16th ed.) (1996) for citations. 2. The court finds the standard form of citation recommended in the ABA resolution to be awkward and contrary to current practices of citation and legal research. Until some real and appreciable benefit or advantage from these changes is shown, the court would oppose any requirement or tolerance of this citation form. 3. The court's opinions are written first for the parties and second as a contribution to a growing body of case law. The court is not disturbed that certain private entities profit from assembling and publishing the case law and that our legal system protects their work in this respect. It seems hardly satisfying that a court should assume additional work for no other reason than to frustrate these efforts of private sector companies. The court opposes the numbering of paragraphs.
Dist	1	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	D.C.	No	no	no	no	
Dist	3	no	no	o.k., yes	no	
Dist	10	no!	no!		no!	

March 20, 1997

Dist	2	no	no	yes	yes	
Dist	8	yes	yes		no	
Dist		No	no	...	no	#2b. No opinion
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	yes ..	yes..	#1. Yes, if the official citation number will improve public access to court documents. #2a. Yes. This citation system should be uniform throughout the federal judiciary. 2b. I think it would be better if the system was implemented nationwide, but perhaps a pilot project would be useful. #3. I am not opposed to numbering paragraphs in opinions, although I am not enthusiastic about the idea. If it would improve access, however, it would be worth doing.
Dist	7	yes	yes	#1. Yes, as long as the system for doing so accommodates the facts that (1) not all federal district court opinions are submitted for publication in case reporters, and (2) many districts are divided into divisions and have several district judges who may be producing opinions virtually simultaneously at different geographic locations. #2b. <u>Encourage</u> it, but not require it.
Dist	6	yes	yes	no	no	
Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	10	no	no	no	no	
Dist	1	no	no	no	no	
Dist	10	no	#2a. If the clerk is required to add the official citation, it should be required. #2b. It should be either required or not permitted. It should not be used permissively. #3. Only if the universal citation system is adopted.

March 20, 1997

Dist		no. ...	No	no...	no...	
						#1. No. There is no reason to deviate from the citation form used in the Blue Book. This is a universal system that is taught in law school and is easy to apply. #2b. No. The proposed citation system will create too many administrative problems for the courts. The current citation system is easy to apply and has been effectively used for years. #3. No. West has spent a great deal of time and effort to create a workable and thorough citation system. The courts should not be inconvenienced because other companies are attempting to compete with West.
Dist	2	no. ..	yes	yes	yes	#1. No. An easier way to deal with this is to have the official citation to any opinion be the docket number and date of decision. With this information there should be no need for a special number to identify the opinion.
Dist	6					#1. No strong feeling. If others think it sensible to do so, I have no problem. #2b. Yes, if there's concurrence re: utility of such practice. #3. Probably a good idea-But only if there is a program to add numbers before final print out.
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	8	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	1	yes	yes	-	yes	#1. Yes, but "opinion" needs to be defined. There are many forms of orders with and without explanatory materials that may be covered.
Dist		yes	no..	Yes.	yes	#2a. (Phase in new system over 5 years) - i.e. until it works fluidly #2b. Yes, with a parallel cite to readily available citator (West, or even CC#, etc.)
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist	8	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no	no	no..	#3. This method of citation would take extra time to prepare. We are not on the billable cycle!! There is nothing wrong with the current system which is easy and informative.
Dist	4	No	yes		no	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	...	yes, if..		...	#1. Not in District Courts #2a yes, if there comes to be one. #3. No opinion
Dist	10	yes	yes...		yes	#2a. Yes, it should be required.
Dist	D.C.	No	no	yes	no..	#3. Many opinions at the District Court level are Bench opinions later printed out by court reporter and any # of paragraphs would be difficult and expensive.
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	
Dist	7	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	yes	yes	no	yes	
Dist	9	yes	yes	yes	no	
Dist	4	no	no	yes..	No	
Dist	7	#1, 2a., 2b., 3...No opinion
Dist		no	no	no	no	This appears to be a lot to do about nothing!
Dist	11	...	No	yes		#1. The Clerk, who is understaffed and overworked, should not be burdened with a new unfunded requirement. #2a. No, but encourage it. #3. No. It is added unnecessary work, unless more law clerks or other staff is added to Chambers.
Dist	4	no	no	yes	#3. Undecided
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no		no	
Dist	6	no	no	yes	...	#3. If distribution and/or dissemination to the public or access is a problem in current format, yes. Otherwise, probably not.

March 20, 1997

Dist	5	...	No	yes..	...	#1. Not unless the judges have agreed that the clerk should add an official citation number beyond the case number to each opinion. #2b. Yes. Each court should have the discretion to decide whether or not to use the ABA citation system. This approach recognizes that courts may view the importance of implementing the ABA citation system differently because of differences among them as to such matters as fiscal priorities and local bar reaction to the ABA citation system. #3. Numbering of paragraphs in an opinion should occur because it will assist future review of the opinion.
Dist	11	no!	no	yes	no...	#3. Absolutely not!
Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	7	no.	No	yes..	no...	#1. No. It adds unnecessary additional work and possible error and confusion. #2b. Yes, but only if standard citations also provided. #3. No. It adds unnecessary additional work and possible error and confusion.
Dist		no		yes	no	
Dist	2	No	no	Does n't matter	no	This whole idea is just more work for nothing because somebody is unhappy because a "private sector company" might make some money. More useless work for Judges and their staffs.
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist		no	no	yes	no	
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	10	no	no	o.k.	No	
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	Leave well enough alone. What we have works well. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
Dist	6	no	no		no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	...	#3. No opinion
Dist	8	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	11	no	no	yes	...	#3. Should be optional
Dist	3	no	no	no	---	
Dist	1	no	no	yes..	No	#2b. Yes, possibly, but only <u>in addition</u> to BlueBook citation.
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	These proposals are unnecessary and fail any cost/benefit analysis and are likely unenforceable. The ABA should stay out of interfering with judge's work.
Dist	no	yes		yes		
Dist	11	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	10	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	7	no	no	no	no	
Dist	yes	yes	#1. Yes, provided that the clerks would be able to develop a method for ensuring that cases are numbered consecutively, and that two or more cases don't get assigned the same number. #2. I think there should be a transition period, perhaps three to five years, during which the official citation is permitted but not required, and the case reporter citation, with a pinpoint, is still required. This will leave a period of time during which any problems with the standard citation system can be resolved. #3. A better time to add the paragraph numbers might be when the opinion is actually put onto the internet. I'm not sure what the process would be for putting the case on-line, but it just seems to be a more efficient time to do it. This is assuming that numbering paragraphs <u>cannot</u> be done automatically with WordPerfect.

March 20, 1997

Dist	9	no. ..	No	no...	<p>#1. No. Certainly this requirement should not apply to unpublished dispositions, in any event. In a district court with a number of district judges it seems like a useless exercise. It makes more sense for a court of appeals published opinions. In a district where there are separate divisions widely separated, numbering district court opinions sequentially will present bookkeeping problems. In an average year we issue hundreds of orders and publish a few. It seems impractical and to serve no particular purpose to number all orders.</p> <p>Aside from published orders and decisions the remaining orders are not going to be accessible on computer, even if the official citation can be located. These decisions may be on chambers' computers but they are going to be erased periodically because of lack of capacity. The printed order in the official clerk's file obviously is not going to be on any computer.</p> <p>#2b. It seems a waste because it seems from a district court viewpoint it would be virtually impossible to locate the decisions, except for those that are published.</p> <p>#3. No. For published opinions this might be useful but for the vast number of unpublished orders and decisions we issue in a year it will add one more thing to our work load with very little benefit.</p>
Dist	11	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	8	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	7	yes		yes	yes	
Dist	7	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no. ..	no..	...	no	<p>#1. No. It will result in total confusion with every clerk of court creating citations.</p> <p>#2a. No, the current system works too well.</p> <p>#2b. Depends on the final plan</p>
Dist	9	no	no		no	
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	8	no	no	?	No	
Dist	2	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	4	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	2	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	6	no	no	no	no	
Dist	3	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist		no	no		no	
Dist	7	no	no	no	no	
Dist	7	no	no	...	No	#2b. I would prefer otherwise
Dist	6	no. ..	no	yes	...	#1. No-only the published opinions. #3. In the published opinions only.
Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	3	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	yes	yes.	No	yes	#2a. <u>It should be required</u> not permissive,

March 20, 1997

Dist	DC	no	yes		no..	
						#3. While I understand the motivation behind the ABA's resolution (see <u>USA, et al. V. The Thomson Corporation and West Publishing Company</u> , No. 96-1415, December 23, 1996), I still believe that the easiest way for both judges and lawyers to cite cases is the old-fashioned way, to F.3d or F. Supp. It makes no sense either to burden the Clerk's Office or individual judges or to confuse lawyers and courts or make their work more difficult. Any suggestions that judges number the paragraphs in their opinions simply will not be followed and will not work. The result will be that some courts and some judges will follow the new suggestion and others will not, and this will create confusion. Please reject this proposal.
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	
Dist	8	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5					#1. Absolutely Not #2a. Absolutely not #2b. No opinion #3 Absolutely not
Dist	8	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	11	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	...	No	yes	no...	#1. 1. How would this work for district courts? #1. 2. The docket numbers are cumbersome and use of them is prone to frequent error. #1. 3. This system is arguably acceptable to me for appellate decisions. #3. No. This would be unduly burdensome.
Dist	5	no	no..	No..	no	#2a Not at the Dist. Level #2b Not at the Dist. Level
Dist	3	no	no		no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	4	no	no	...	no	#2b. No opinion
Dist	1	no	no	no	no	
Dist	3	yes	yes		yes	

March 20, 1997

Dist	7	no	no	no	no	
Dist	8	yes	yes		no	
Dist	11	yes	no	yes	no	
Dist	10	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	...	No	#2b. Yes, but only with the explicit statement that use of the official citation is entirely optional on the part of the court issuing the opinion.
Dist	1	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no. ..	No	no	no...	#1. No. I see no compelling reason to do so and it would impose additional burdens on the Clerk's Office and add confusion. #3. No. The Blue Book system remains satisfactory for locating cases and I see no justification for change.
Dist	5	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Dist	11	no!	no!	yes	no	
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	yes	yes		no	
Dist	5	no	no	no...	No..	#2b. No, because it will be <u>done</u> if "permitted". Spending resources on developing and maintaining a system wholly unnecessary. #3. No. I am <u>not</u> in the business of stifling business. "Official pinpoint" citations only exacerbate mindless citations.
Dist	7	no	no	no	no	The present system is not broken and doesn't need to be fixed. I think Federal Judges are busy enough without getting involved in this issue.
Dist		yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	10	no	no		no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	11	no	no	no	no	
Dist	11	no	no	yes	...	#3. I would prefer <u>not</u> having to number every paragraph --- or having to read long opinions with every paragraph numbered.
Dist	11	yes	no	yes	yes	
Dist	11	no	no		no	
Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no	no		no	
Dist	9	no	no..	yes	no	#2a. I see no reason to abandon the use of the uniform citation form in the Bluebook.
Dist	8	yes	Yes. ...	#1. Yes. The court should lead by example so that attorneys will become acquainted with the new form. #2b. Courts should at first permit it, since the standard form will include both old and new versions. At some point, the new form should be required. #3. Yes. There is no real point in using the new form unless paragraph numbers are included.
Dist	6	no	no	no	no	
Dist	4	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	Is there not enough work for everyone? Who spends time thinking up this kind of thing?
Dist	1	no	yes		...	#3. Should not be required.
Dist	7	...		Yes	yes	#1. Unsure, would first desire to discuss matter with the clerk for her views as to the feasibility and concerns.
Dist	5	yes	no	yes..	...	#3. No opinion on this, Page Number should be adequate
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	no	no	no	no		
Dist	3	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	5	no	no	...	No	#2b. Only for unofficial or unreported decisions and copy of decision should be furnished to court.
Dist	2	no.	No	no	#1. No. The docket number is sufficient. #2a. Not the proposed official citation, but a citation form similar to or the same as the form suggested by the <u>Bluebook</u> . The concept of an official citation is a good one.
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	I have reviewed the proposal of the ABA to develop a "universal" citation system. I am opposed to any change in this regard. I believe that these alterations would place an unnecessary burden on the Court and would not result in any improvement in the system. The Louisiana Supreme Court has changed its system of citation, and most lawyers with whom I am in contact find it more time consuming and of little value. I believe that this proposal should be rejected in its totality.
Dist	2	no	no	no	no	
Dist	2	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	8				...	I believe it is acceptable to require numbering. However, I seriously doubt that the government will be able to organize and disseminate the court decisions as efficiently as the private sector. My fear is that our research capabilities will suffer if the courts are no longer permitted to subscribe to private sector services.
Dist	6	no	no	no	no	
Dist	3	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	2	yes	yes	-	yes	
Dist	3	No	No	yes	No	
Dist	7	No	No	Yes	No	

March 20, 1997

Dist	5	no.	<p>#1. Without knowing more about the ABA proposal, I must answer "No." The ABA resolution refers to "each decision." This question uses the term "each opinion." "Each decision" could be read to mean every order. I am not in favor of using an official citation number for every single order I sign or even every memorandum opinion.</p> <p>#2a. If the federal judiciary should adopt this ABA proposal and begin numbering opinions and paragraphs, then lawyers should be required to use the official citation.</p> <p>But again, each judge must be able to decide which opinions and orders should be given an official citation number for citation by lawyers as authority. The system we have now whereby each judge decides which opinions to send to West Publishing for publication seems to be working fine for both bench and bar.</p> <p>#3. Same answer to question 2.</p>
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	4	no.	yes..		yes..	<p>#1. No, not at the U.S. District court level.</p> <p>#2a. Yes. Uniformity will aid overall.</p> <p>#3. Yes. If adopted, uniformity of citation and paragraph reference will help with the ease of retrieval.</p>
Dist		No	No	yes	No	
Dist	4	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	DC	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	yes	yes		yes	
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	11	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	11	No	#1. Absolutely not. #2b. Citations are standards which should be generated by the publishers and the market place-- not by the courts #3. Federal judges should write their opinions any way they choose. (Cite)
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	10	no	no	yes	no	
Dist		no	no	yes	no	
Dist	10	no	no		no	
Dist	4	no	no	yes..	No	#2b. Yes, but only where complete citation to published volumes are used as well.
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	yes	yes		no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	7	no	no	no...	No	#2b. No. Parties should be required to use "The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation.
Dist	1	no	no	no opin ion	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	6	no	yes		no	
Dist	5	No	no..	...	#1. Absolutely Not!! #2b. No, it is a waste of time! #3. Absolutely not. But if this is adopted by The Conference, then it should require the attorneys to number each paragraph in their briefs. And number their witnesses, too.
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	7	No. ...	No	#1. ...o. We have enough to cite already. #2b. Could permit - but it's a waste of time. #3. Paragraphs-who has time? This is not a deposition transcript. People can look up the case if they want information.
Dist	8	no	no	no	no	
Dist	6	no	no	no	no	
Dist	9	no	no		no	
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	no	no	no	no		
Dist	5	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	6	yes	yes			
Dist	2	yes ...	Yes. ..		No.. ..	#1. Yes, as long as this procedure is uniform and easy to apply. Often a single file will have multiple opinions and this would serve to eliminate confusion over which opinion is being referenced. #2a. Yes, but it would be much easier if the 'official citation' followed the traditional Bluebook form that is largely in place and is most familiar to all attorneys. Furthermore, the use of parallel citations would place a heavy burden upon law clerks. #3. No. Private sector number systems are very efficient and numbering paragraphs in an opinion may result in confusion with those numbering systems that are already in place.
Dist	2	no	no	no	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	My answers are predicated on the view that publication of opinions at the district court level should not be encouraged. The implication of a numbering system is that opinions so numbered and paragraphed will be published or available for citation. I am also of the opinion that there is likely to be a deterioration in the reporting of decisions and citation of precedents in the effort to achieve a "universal citations system." I find nothing wrong in the current system. I am particularly concerned that headnotes will disappear from the current system. Electronic search of precedents has limitations.
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	9	no	no	no	no	
Dist	5	No! ...	#1. Absolutely <u>not</u> ! #2. Absolutely <u>not</u> ! #3. No! This is needless additional work for the courts and a remarkably <u>stupid</u> idea!
Dist	11	yes ...		Yes	no	#1. Yes or the judge's secretary - depends on whether the sequential # applies to each judge in a multi-judge district or whether the #s are sequential to all District opinions.
Dist	9	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	8	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	6	yes		...	yes	#2b. Permit it, for now.
Dist	5	no	no	no	no...	#3. I am disappointed at the bias displayed in this question against the private sector. It should be governmental policy to encourage, not discourage entrepreneurs. If persons in the private sector by wits and determination can develop a case reference or research system, let them proceed--if people are employed as a result, so much the better. If copyright protection or any other lawful protection can be extended to such entrepreneurs, why should we discourage the application of those laws to such lawful and beneficial conduct? If we discourage the private sector, then the public sector will have to do the job. I suggest that would be an expensive and fruitless effort. I suggest we leave this debate and spend our energy and budget on other issues of more significance and relevance to our public charge of providing judicial services.
Dist	1	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Dist	4	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	6	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	3	no	no	no...	no	#2b. No. We are being asked to intervene in a dispute between the bar and West Publishing Co. We should stay out of it.
Dist	2	no	no	yes	no	
Dist	5	no.	no	yes	no	#1. It is alright for the Circuit Courts but not practical for many district courts. We have many judges scattered over several divisions and hundreds of miles. Each opinion by each judge is a decision of our "court", but there is no central clearing house.
Dist	9	yes		yes	#1. Only as to cases the judges designates "for publication"
Distri ct	4	Ye s...	yes	yes	yes..	#1. Yes. My clerk doesn't feel that it will be a problem. #3. Yes. It would be very easy with existing technology.
Distt	5	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	9	yes ...	yes..	...	yes..	#1. Yes. I favor a uniform system of citation that is controlled by the courts and not by legal publishers, and that produces a citation shortly after the opinion is published which stays with the opinion permanently. #2a. Yes. The present system which can have multiple citations to the same case is unnecessarily cumbersome. #2b. Require it. #3. Yes. There is no reason why the citation system should be at the mercy of legal publishers. I favor a uniform citation system for pinpoint cites. I have no view on how this can best be accomplished.
Mag	5	no	no		no	
Mag	2	yes	yes..		yes..	#2b. Yes, as suggested by Committee #3. Yes, as suggested by ABA
Mag	2	no	no	n/a	no	
Mag	11	yes..	yes		#1. Because a multi judge/magistrate judge/bankruptcy judge District issues numerous opinions any such requirement may require additional personnel. I am opposed to the concept unless adequate funding is also provided. #2a. If adopted, yes. #3. Although such a requirement is not onerous in light of computer/word processing, I have no specific opinions-one way or the other. I also recognize that its implementation may eliminate copyright problems.

March 20, 1997

Mag	5	no.	#1. No-I think that would be meaningless since most of our opinions aren't published and there is no official reporter for our court. #2a. I don't understand the question. #3. That would be fine - and probably helpful
Mag	3	no.	No	yes	no...	#1. Would lead to confusion and is unnecessary. #3. No-perhaps federal courts should tell these private companies that we will not cite to them anymore.
Mag	6	no.	No	no...	...	#1. No - this creates a logistical nightmare. For example, our magistrate judge opinions do not flow through the clerk's office. Would a Report & Recommendation have a number? Does even a discovery order get a number? The problems are endless. #2b. No-at the risk of sounding old-fashioned, Blue Book citations have served us well for a long time. #3. Not if the proposed cite form is not adopted, but yes if adopted.
Mag	6	#1. Definitely not. Our clerk's staff are already overworked and understaffed. I am opposed to the addition of any citation format beyond the name of the court and the case number. These two items should themselves provide a sufficiently unique denomination for any given name. #2a. I am not opposed. See 1. Above. #2b. See above #3. Possibly the use of pre-printed sheets numbered on one edge would be appropriate, similar to the practice presently undertaken by some courts.
Mag	5	no	no	no	no	
Mag		no.	No	no...	no...	#1. No, impractical for trial courts. Too many and various types of opinions. #2b. No, It would be too confusing and frustrating to attorneys and Judge because of the interactions between the different districts and circuits. #3. No. Too much energy for too little gain. If opinion is "unpublished" the page number of the actual opinion may be used.
Mag	5	no	no	No	#2b. I have no opinion on that--it should be discretionary with the court.
Mag	5	No	No	No	No	
Mag	8	yes	...	Yes.	yes	#2a. - Not until it is more widely used. #2b. - yes-in conjunction with a citation to some book or computer research source when this can be found.
Mag	8	No	No	No	No	

March 20, 1997

Mag		no	no	yes	no	
Mag	11	no	no	no	no	
Mag	4	no	no	no	no	
Mag		no	no	yes	no	
Mag	6	no	no		no	
Mag	8	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	2	no	no	no	...	#3. Only if absolutely necessary to permit pinpoint citations without copyright problems.
Mag	6	yes	yes	yes	no	
Mag	9	no	no		no	
Mag	6	no	no	no	no	
Mag	9	no	no		no	
Mag	8	no	no	no	no...	#3. No. Many orders and reports and recommendations contain numbered findings of fact. Each finding of fact may be more than one paragraph long. Numbering the paragraphs of an order or report and recommendation would interfere with this standard practice and would make it more difficult for parties to object to specific findings of fact.
Mag	6	yes	...		Yes	#2a. The judiciary should require the use of the official citation, but also require parallel citations.
Mag	7	yes	yes	yes	o.k.	
Mag	8	no	no	no	no	
Mag	5	no	no	yes..	no	#2b. Yes, but should also require traditional citations
Mag	4	no	no		no...	#3. Absolutely <u>no</u>

March 20, 1997

Mag		No.	no..	yes	yes..	
	11	No.	no..	yes	yes..	#1. No, but I do not strenuously object. #2a. No, but I do not strenuously object. #3. Yes, if cite is required.
Mag	1	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	5	yes	yes		yes	
Mag	11	no	no	no	no	
Mag	4	No	No	yes	no	
Mag	5	no	no		no	
Mag	6	yes	yes		yes	
Mag	5	No	No	No	No	
Mag	8	Yes	yes		yes	
Mag	8	yes	yes		yes	
Mag	8	no	no	yes	...	#3. If they (the federal judges) desire to do so.
Mag	11	No	No	yes	No	
Mag	7	yes	yes	...	yes	#2b. If we do not elect to require it we should certainly permit it.
Mag	9	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	10	no. ...	No		no	#1. (a) A persuasive argument has not been made for a need for an additional, official citation. (b) For each court to add official citation numbers would create unnecessary confusion by the use of numerous, diverse numbering systems, absent adoption of some uniform system for all courts. (c) Creation of another citation system would unnecessarily add work to the Office of the Clerk. That office already has enough to do for the staff it has.
Mag	8	no	no	yes	no	

March 20, 1997

Mag	1	no	no	no	no	
Mag	9		yes	#1. It has not been convincingly demonstrated to me that the existing citation system is inadequate. Assuming, however, that it is inadequate, then my answer is: yes. #2a. Yes, uniformity should be strongly encouraged or required.
Mag	5	yes	...	yes	yes	#2a. It should be an option.
Mag	5	no.	No	no	no	#1. No. The current system is reasonably effective. The additional expense and effort is not justified.
Mag	3	no	no	yes..	No..	#2b. Yes, on a court by court basis #3. No. It's a tremendous amount of unnecessary work. If it's not broke don't fix it. Currently citation systems are the least problematic area of judicial business.
Mag		no	no	no	no	
Mag	5	no	no	...	No	#2b. I have no opinion on this other than to suggest that such permission either be granted or disallowed throughout the entire federal court system. To me consistency is the most salient factor.
Mag	5	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	4	yes	..	Yes	yes..	#2a. Perhaps - after a designated period of time so that attorneys and the public may first become accustomed to the form and use of the official citation. #3. Yes. This would be helpful and yet, not too heavy of a burden on judges and their staff.
Mag	5	yes	yes		yes	
Mag	9	yes	no	yes	no	
Mag	2	#1. I think not. Magistrate Judges write hundreds of one or two page decisions every year which may (or may not) qualify as "opinions." To create a system that would catalogue and number each such decision filed within the District Court in a given year would be a monstrous burden. #2a. No. See above. #2b. Where litigants choose to do extra work to increase clarity of their work, it should certainly be permitted. #3. No. Although it is a good idea in theory, it will cost a great deal in time expended to number the paragraphs. I work with 2 law clerks but no secretary. To have myself or a law clerk add paragraph numbers to every opinion would be a waste of time better spent on the actual cases before me.



March 20, 1997

Mag	10	no	no	...	No	#2b. If the specific district believes it will be of substantial assistance, yes.
Mag	7	no. ...	no	no	no	#1. No - Official Reporters <u>are sufficient.</u>
Mag	3	yes	yes		yes	
Mag	11	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	2					PT Magistrate Judges do not issue opinions
Mag	7	yes	yes	..	yes	#2b. No, require it.
Mag	11	no	no	no	no	
Mag	5	no	no	no	no	
Mag	11	yes	no..	Yes	yes	#2a. No, unless the opinion is only available in electronic, machine-readable format.
Mag	11	no	no	no	no	
Mag	8	no	no	yes	no	
Mag	10	yes	yes..		Yes	#2a. Yes. Uniformity is the purpose of the ABA Resolution
Mag	5	no	no	no	no	