Utah Rules of Juvenile Procedure Committee- Meeting Minutes

July 9, 2010

Noon to 2:00 p.m.

Conference Rooms B & C

MEETING D	ATE	TIME	LOCATION	
MEMBERS:	Present Absent Ex	cused MEMBERS	Present	Absent Excused
Judge Elizabeth Lindsley		Renee Jimene	ez 🔲	
Judge Larry Steele		David Johnso	n 🗵	
Carol Verdoia		Narda Beas-N	lordell	
Brent Bartholomew		Alan Sevision		
Joan Carroll		Pam Vickrey		
Angela Fonnesbeck		Paul Wake		
Brent Hall				
AOC STAFF:	Present Absent	GUESTS:	Presen	t. Absent
Katie Gregory				
Whitney Kania				
Tim Shea				

AGENDA TOPIC

A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A			
I. Welcome & Approv	al of minutes	CHAIR: CAROL VERDO	A
Corrections to the Mir	nutes: None		kahadakan menga Saran dian mengalah Salah Sarah Kebada pengan Kasalaun dalam Panasatan, dalam dalam dalam dalam
Motion: To approve the minutes of March 26, 2010 as written.	By: Renee Jimenez	Second:	Narda Beas-Nordell
Approval	□ Unanimous	☐ Vote: In Favor	Opposed

AGENDA TOPIC

MOLIUM IOTAC		
II. Expungement Issues—URJP 56	[PRESENTER] TIM SHEA	

Discussion: Tim Shea reviewed his June 7, 2010 memorandum regarding proposed revisions to court rules governing expungement. He reported that CJA Rule 7-308 will be repealed because it is already covered in other rule or statute.

Mr. Shea's work group on forms and the Board of Juvenile Court Judges recommended that certain provision of URJP 56 be deleted. Included were URJP 56(b), 56(d) (2) and (d) (3). Rule 56(d)(2) and (3) address how law enforcement and clerks, respectively, seal expunged records. He noted that CJA Rule 4-205 also addresses the sealing of court records. 78A-6-1105(3) deals with an agency's requirement to seal records.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding whether URJP 56(b) should be deleted, as advocated by Mr. Shea and the Juvenile Board. It is not currently being enforced and law enforcement verification is not required in statute. It may also duplicate the criminal history report obtained from BCI. Ultimately, the committee decided that the provision of URJP 56(b) should be discretionary and passed the two motions outlined below.

Motion #1: Amend the last sentence of URJP 56(b) to delete the word "shall" and add "may be required to" and further delete the phrase "during the entire time period covered in the minor's record"	By: Judge Lindsley	Second: Judge	Steele
Approval	☑ Unanimous	☐ Vote: In Favor	Opposed
Motion #2: Delete URJP 56(d)(2) and (d)(3) in their entirety and renumber (d)(4) as (d)(2).	By: Judge Steele	Second: Brent	Hall
Approval	□ Unanimous	☐ Vote: In Favor	Opposed

AGE

NDA TOPIC		
III. URJP 29A Issues		[PRESENTER] CAROL VERDOIA
County District Attorney's Of incorporated into URCrP 15. URCrP 15.5 was amended. pre-trial and again at trial, s	fice. The Legislature 5. He expressed conc Currently, a juvenile j ince no jury is presen eeded and requested	received from Matthew Janzen with the Salt Lake repealed section 76-5-411 and it was ern that URJP 29A was not updated at the time udge must review a CJC interview tape twice, at t. After discussion, the committee determined that Mr. Janzen be invited to attend a future
Action Item:	research on the imp 2. Katie Gregory wi	rill email the juvenile court law clerk to request act of the repeal of 76-5-411 on URJP 29A. Il invite Matthew Janzen to attend the October 1, ther discuss his concerns

AGENDA TOPIC

IV. Discussion re: need to deto URCrP 15A	create URJP parallel	[PRESENTER] PAUL WAKE	
Discussion: Paul Wake reviewed his email of March 23, 2010 requesting the committee consider whether a juvenile rule should be created similar to the new URCrP 15A. MOTION: Paul Wake made a motion to create a URJP 43A similar to URCrP 15A. The motion was not seconded. A lengthy discussion followed regarding the potential application of such a rule to child welfare cases. An additional question was raised regarding whether URCrP 15A includes only typical "samples" such as hair and fluid, or whether it goes further to include other physical evidence such as samples from computers, documents, etc. The committee tabled the issue to the next meeting so members can seek additional information from colleagues.			
Action Item:	l	bers to obtain additional information from ir respective areas of practice.	

AGENDA TOPIC

V. Old or New Business

[PRESENTER] ALL

Discussion:

The next two meetings will be held on August 6 and October 1, 2010. The August 6 agenda will include the continued discussion of the URCrP 15A issue and the issue of consent by a parent/guardian/custodian prior to a juvenile's waiver of constitutional rights if interrogated by law enforcement. Susan Eisenman will be invited to attend and join in the discussion. Matthew Janzen will be invited to the Oct. 1 meeting to continue the discussion of URJP 29A and URCrP 15.5.