

**UTAH SUPREME COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

**Summary Minutes – March 18, 2026
via Webex**

THIS MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA WEBEX

Committee members	Present	Excused	Guests/Staff Present
Rod N. Andreason, Chair	X		Stacy Haacke, Staff
Justin T. Toth, Vice Chair	X		Sonia Sweeney, Staff
Ash McMurray		X	Paige Nelson, OLRGC
Michael Stahler	X		
Loni Page	X		
Joshua Jewkes	X		
Meagan Rudd	X		
Laurel Hanks	X		
Tonya Wright	X		
Judge Rita Cornish	X		
Judge Catherine Conklin	X		
Jonas Anderson	X		
Heather Lester	X		
J. Brett Chambers	X		
Judge Blaine Rawson	X		
Judge Ronald Russell		X	
Judge Patrick Corum	X		
Rachel Sykes	X		
Michael Young		X	
Tyler Lindley		X	
Commissioner Marian Ito	X		
Judge Laura Scott, <i>Emeritus</i>	X		
James Hunnicutt, <i>Emeritus</i>	X		

(1) INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting began at 4:03 p.m. after forming a quorum. Mr. Rod Andreason welcomed the Committee Members.

(2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Andreason called for approval of the February 25, 2026 meeting minutes that had been circulated via email. Judge Rita Cornish moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Justin Toth seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously with all members voting in favor.

(3) NEW COMMITTEE STAFF

Ms. Stacy Haacke announced her departure from staffing the committee, a role she has filled for nearly five years. She reflected on the complex work accomplished by the group and officially introduced Ms. Sonia Sweeney, Associate General Counsel, as the new staff member assigned from the Administrative Office of the Courts. Mr. Andreason expressed deep gratitude on behalf of the committee for Ms. Haacke’s exceptional dedication. Ms. Sweeney subsequently introduced herself to the members, outlined her professional background, and expressed her eagerness to assist the committee in navigating its detailed and vital work.

(4) NEW RULE 110 – JUDICIAL INTERVIEWS OF CHILDREN

Judge Catherine Conklin presented the draft Rule 110, which governs judicial interviews of children. The draft was adapted from a uniform act previously presented by former Justice Michael Wilkins, heavily modified by the subcommittee to align with the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure. Prior to the meeting, Mr. Andreason circulated proposed edits to the draft rule via email. Judge Conklin supported Mr. Andreason’s edits. Ms. Laurel Hanks sought clarification on whether the rule's scope sufficiently encompassed all relevant proceedings, such as protective orders; the committee agreed the broad phrase “district court proceeding” was appropriate and purposefully excluded juvenile court matters. Mr. Brett Chambers questioned the record-keeping requirement under subsection (c)(2). The committee agreed that maintaining an actual audio record, rather than a mere minute entry, was vital for appellate purposes, and amended the text to explicitly require the court to “record the interview.” Ms. Meagan Rudd and Judge Cornish led a discussion to ensure the draft adhered to the plain language style guide, confirming the use of “will” for court obligations and “must” for party obligations. Ms. Sweeney will make those changes.

Judge Blaine Rawson raised concerns regarding the mandate in subsection (b)(4) that judges receive training before conducting such interviews, questioning what constitutes

sufficient training given the current lack of offerings for district court judges. Ms. Loni Page and Mr. Andreason proposed modifying the language to state judges must have “any training required by the Judicial Council,” ensuring the rule does not inadvertently halt proceedings while training programs are developed. Finally, Judge Rawson highlighted subsection (d)(6), which required the court to inform the Division of Child and Family Services if abuse was suspected, noting the severe conflicts and recusal issues this would trigger for the presiding judge. Judge Patrick Corum, Judge Cornish, and Mr. James Hunnicutt argued that judicial officers are already bound by statutory mandatory reporting requirements. Consequently, the committee agreed to strike subsection (d)(6) in its entirety. Furthermore, the committee agreed to strike the word “minor” throughout the rule's body, retaining it only in the title and scope, to reduce redundancy.

Judge Cornish moved to pass the amended Rule 110 up to the Supreme Court for review. Ms. Rachel Sykes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(5) RULES BACK FROM PUBLIC COMMENT - RULES 62, 74, 76, AND 102

Mr. Andreason facilitated review of the public comments received regarding Rules 74 and 102, both submitted by former committee member, Leslie Slaugh. Regarding Rule 74, Mr. Slaugh suggested that the strict cautionary language warning clients of the consequences of proceeding unrepresented, which is required when an attorney files a motion to withdraw in Rule 74(b), should also be required when an attorney simply files a notice of withdrawal as outlined in Rule 74(a). Mr. Michael Stahler and Ms. Rudd evaluated this proposal, noting that a notice of withdrawal under Rule 74(a) is strictly utilized when there are no pending motions or trial dates, drastically reducing the imminent prejudice to the client. Commissioner Marian Ito pointed out that deadlines could technically still loom without a formal pending motion. The committee ultimately concluded, however, that the circumstances surrounding a motion to withdraw uniquely necessitate the strict cautionary warning and that the updated contact information required in Rule 74(a) offers sufficient protection. As a result, the committee did not find a change was needed.

Regarding Rule 102, Mr. Slaugh submitted a comment arguing that the word “will” should be changed to “must.” Judge Cornish confirmed that under the committee's plain language style guide, “will” is the correct terminology when referring to actions taken by the court. Consequently, the committee did not make the suggested change. During the discussion, Ms. Hanks briefly noted a separate, systemic issue regarding unrepresented parties struggling to formally remove non-responsive attorneys, but acknowledged this substantive issue requires future, separate rulemaking.

Mr. Joshua Jewkes moved to submit Rules 62, 74, 76, and 102 to the Supreme Court to be made final with an effective date. Mr. Stahler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(6) DISCUSSION AND SCHEDULING OF AN IN-PERSON MEETING

Mr. Andreason initiated a brief discussion regarding the scheduling of the committee's in-person gathering. Ms. Sweeney reported the results of a previously circulated Doodle poll, confirming that the proposed May meeting date garnered the highest number of positive responses from the membership. The committee agreed to proceed with scheduling the May 27, 2026 meeting as an in-person meeting, with a hybrid option for those who require remote access.

(7) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:21 p.m. The next meeting will be April 22, 2026, at 4:00 p.m.