

**UTAH JUDICIAL COUNCIL
POLICY, PLANNING and TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

Webex video conferencing
May 1, 2026 – 12 p.m.

MEMBERS:

PRESENT

EXCUSED

Judge James Gardner, <i>Chair</i>	✓	
Judge Jon Carpenter	✓	
Judge Angela Fonnesbeck	✓	
Judge Christine Johnson	✓	

GUESTS:

Melissa Kennedy
Keri Sargent
Shane Bahr
Jon Puente
Jessica Vázquez-Leavitt
Ramon Rudecindo
Michael Samantha Starks
Jace Willard

STAFF:

Brody Arishita
Keisa Williams
Cindy Schut

(1) Welcome and approval of minutes:

Judge Gardner welcomed the committee members to the Policy, Planning, and Technology Committee (PP&T). PP&T considered the minutes from the March 6, 2026 meeting. With no changes, Judge Johnson moved to approve the minutes as presented. Judge Fonnesbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(2) Rule back from public comment:

CJA 4-510.04 ADR Training

The public comment period on the above rule has closed. No comments were received.

Judge Fonnesbeck moved to send rule 4-510.04 to the Judicial Council with a recommendation that it be approved as final with a May 18, 2026 effective date. Judge Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(3) CJA 3-306.04. Interpreter appointment, payment, and fees:

Jon Puente and Jessica Vázquez-Leavitt presented amendments to rule 3-306.04 regarding interpreter scheduling. To address several issues, including the increasing number of cases requiring interpreter services, contract interpreter double booking, and payment efficiency, the Language Access Program (LAP) recently purchased interpreter scheduling software. During the last four months, the LAP has been piloting the software to make sure that it meets the needs of the Judiciary. LAP sought feedback from all

stakeholders and received concerns from the justice court administration team that some justice courts may be scheduling interpreters outside of the software, which may cause disruptions. The amendments to the rule require interpreters to utilize a scheduling platform approved by the Council.

The committee requested clarification on the language concerning Limited English Proficiency (LEP). LEP is the industry term for people whose native language is not English. Following discussion, the committee removed “a primary language other than English and” on lines 11 and 67 and changed “has a primary language other than English” and LEP to “has LEP” on line 19.

With no further discussion, Judge Gardner moved to send rule 3-306.04 to the Judicial Council with a recommendation that it be posted for a 45-day public comment period. Judge Carpenter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(4) S.B. 257. Domestic relations amendments:

- **CJA 4-102. Case, calendar, and panel assignments**

Keri Sargent introduced discussions surrounding S.B. 257, which mandates that, to the extent possible, cases involving the same family should be assigned to a single judge. The committee discussed allowing each district to manage this via local supplemental rules rather than a sweeping statewide rule, to accommodate logistical differences. The committee also discussed the risks of delegating this task to each district. After further discussion, the committee added the following to line 29, “To the extent possible, district courts should assign any civil case or proceeding involving the same child or family to a single judge.”

Judge Gardner moved to recommend to the Judicial Council that rule 4-102 be approved on an expedited basis with a May 18, 2026 effective date, followed by a 45-day public comment period. Judge Fannesbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(5) H.B. 102. Victim Privacy Amendments:

- **CJA 4-202.02. Records classification**
- **CJA 4-202.12. Request by victim to use initials rather than name**

Keri Sargent and Jace Willard presented amendments to rule 4-202.02 and new rule 4-202.12 in response to the passage of H.B. 102. The bill gives crime victims the choice to have their initials, instead of their names, in public-facing documents. Victims must submit requests to law enforcement, prosecutors, or the court to make this switch. The working group focused on best practices for both training and technological modifications and determined that time limits must be established for when a victim is permitted to make a request and that prosecutors should be responsible for filing corrected charging documents if a request is made after the initial document was filed. Amendments to rule 4-202.02 allow charging documents listing the victim’s name to be classified as “private” pending the receipt of an amended charging document.

The committee discussed adopting a blanket policy utilizing initials for all victims versus requiring a formal request but determined that a blanket policy would be a significant restriction on public access to court records. Melissa Kennedy noted that CARE does not currently have a programmatic mechanism for reclassifying records similar to the programming in CORIS, but juvenile court teams are working to ensure those records are classified as “private.”

Following discussion, the committee defined “Court Record” in line 11 to include “publicly accessible court filings or documents,” to clarify that the rule does not apply to audio or video recordings. That term was capitalized throughout the rule.

Following further discussion, Judge Carpenter moved to recommend to the Judicial Council that all amendments to rule 4-202.02 and new rule 4-202.12 be approved on an expedited basis with a May 18, 2026 effective date, followed by a 45-day public comment period. Judge Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(6) S.B. 283. Court fees and administration amendments:

- **CJA 4-202.08. Fees for records, information, and services**

In lines 480-481 of S.B. 283, all fees (copy and filing) are waived for Utah government entities and political subdivisions. Keri Sargent advocated for a narrow interpretation of the waiver, noting that a broad interpretation would overwhelm Judicial Assistants with audio requests from outside agencies. This issue will be resolved when H.B. 540 takes effect in January 2027. The bill restructures audio request processes and allocates funds for the fulfillment of audio requests.

Following discussion, the committee took no action on rule 4-202.08 at this time.

(7) H.B. 540 Judicial transparency and information access amendments

- **CJA 3-110. Judicial Officer Financial Disclosure**

Under H.B. 540, the Council must “by rule” require judges and commissioners in courts of record and not of record to submit annual financial disclosures that are “comparable to” the conflict-of-interest disclosures in Utah Code section 20A-11-1604. The disclosures must be posted on the court’s website. Before November 1, 2026, the Council must submit a written report to the Judiciary Interim Committee “describing the actions the Judicial Council has taken” to comply with H.B. 540. The relevant portion of H.B. 540 will be effective on 5/6/2026.

The committee raised concerns about including too much detail in a court rule. Ms. Williams will draft a simplified rule and create a more detailed disclosure form using language from the statute and this initial rule draft. Some committee members expressed safety concerns regarding the disclosure of confidential information about family members, particularly young adults still living in a judge’s home. The committee also discussed the definition of “income” and Judge Carpenter noted that justice court judges are not paid by the state.

Following further discussion, Judge Carpenter moved to recommend to the Judicial Council that rule 3-110 be approved on an expedited basis with a May 18, 2026 effective date, followed by a 45-day public comment period, and that the financial disclosure form be placed on the Council’s main agenda for discussion. Judge Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(8) H.B. 372. Child welfare changes (GAL Oversight)

- **CJA 1-205. Standing and ad hoc committees**
- **CJA 4-906. Guardian ad litem program**

The proposed amendments to rules 1-205 and 4-906 are in response to H.B. 372. In rule 1-205, the committee removed “Judicial” in line 240, removed the statutory reference in line 238, and changed

“not terminate” to “be dissolved” in line 504. Many of the Guardian ad Litem (GAL) Oversight Committee’s and GAL Director’s duties currently in rule 4-906 are now set forth in H.B. 372. To avoid overlap, the committee determined that the rule should refer primarily to duties outlined in statute.

The committee discussed the importance of protecting nonpublic court records, particularly juvenile court records, and records in pending cases. Proposed language stipulates that court record reviews may only include cases that have reached final disposition and are no longer pending or impending before any court. The committee discussed CJA rule 4-202.03 governing access to juvenile court records and asked Ms. Williams to include language from Rule 2.10 of the Utah Code of Judicial Conduct guarding against interference with a fair trial or hearing, including words or actions which may affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a pending or impending matter.

The committee also made the following changes:

- in line 42 removed, “In addition to responsibilities under the Utah Code,” and replaced it with “perform the duties established in Utah Code;”;
- under qualifications and responsibilities, “admitted to the practice of law” was replaced with “be a member in good standing with the Utah State Bar”; and
- removed “with or without a complaint” in line 185.

The committee discussed language to clarify that the Council is the ultimate arbiter in the event of a conflict between the State Court Administrator and the Oversight Committee regarding the GAL Director. The committee also discussed including an appellate review process for complaints against GALs. Ms. Williams will revise the draft of rule 4-906 in accordance with the committee’s feedback and put it on the Council’s main agenda for discussion.

Judge Gardner moved to recommend to the Judicial Council that rules 1-205 and 4-906 (as amended) be approved on an expedited basis with a May 18, 2026 effective date, followed by a 45-day public comment period. Judge Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(9) CJA 3-412. Procurement of goods and services

Ms. Williams presented updates to the procurement rule to mirror similar provisions in the Utah Code. The committee asked whether a “written” determination in line 93 was required. Ms. Williams noted that the requirement is set forth in the Utah Code.

Judge Johnson moved to recommend to the Judicial Council that rule 3-412 be approved on an expedited basis with a May 18, 2026 effective date, followed by a 45-day public comment period. Judge Fannesbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Technology report/proposals:

None.

Old Business/New Business:

None.

Adjourn: With no further items for discussion, the meeting adjourned at 2:24 p.m. The next meeting will be held on June 1, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. via Webex video conferencing.