Utah Rules of Juvenile Procedure Committee- Meeting Minutes

Αι	ugust 2, 20	13		Noor	n to 2:00 p.m.	Executive Din	ing Room
M	EETING DA	TE		TIME		LOCATION	
MEMBERS:	15 1	Present	Absent	Excused	MEMBERS:	Present A	bsent Excused
Judge Elizabeth Line	dsley	\boxtimes			Brent Hall		
Carol Verdoia		\boxtimes			Narda Beas-Nordell		
Maybell Romero		\boxtimes			Alan Sevison		
Diane Abegglen				\boxtimes	Pam Vickrey		
Brent Bartholomew		\boxtimes			Paul Wake		
Joan Carroll		\boxtimes					
Sterling Corbett				\boxtimes			
David Fureigh		\boxtimes					
AOC STAFF:	开心	Present	Absent	111	GUESTS:	Present	Absent
Katie Gregory		\boxtimes					
Alison Adams-Perla		\boxtimes					

AGENDA TOPIC

I. Professional Practic of Minutes	ce Disclosures & Appi	roval CHAIR: CARC	DL VERDOTA	
Carol Verdoia introduced Maybell Romero who was appointed to the committee in July, 2013. Members made the professional practice disclosures required by Rule 11-101(4) of the Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice. The committee reviewed and approved the minutes of November 2, 2012.				
Motion: To approve the minutes of November 2, 2012 as written.	By: Judge Elizabeth	n Lindsley	Second: Joan Carroll	
Approval	□ Unanimous	☐ Vote: In Favor	Opposed	

AGENDA TOPIC

710211271 101 20		
II. Admissibility of Hearsay Evidence in Child	[PRESENTER] CAROL VERDOIA	
Protective Order Proceedings-Continued		
Discussion		

Judge Noonan asked the committee to review the admissibility of hearsay evidence in child protective proceedings last year after the Utah Court of Appeals issued its decision in *Barnett v. Adams*. In footnote 9 of the decision, the Court noted "To the extent the statutory framework and the Rules of Juvenile Procedure are unclear as to the general applicability of the Rules of Evidence in matters like this, such uncertainty is best resolved by the legislature or relevant rule-making authority." Carol Verdoia review the committee's discussions on whether a rule revision is needed. She also recapped information that Judge Lindsley solilcited from members of the juvenile bench and the research performed by Alison Adams-Perlac regarding how other states handle evidentiary issues in child protective order cases.

After the last meeting, Judge Lindsley sent correspondence to all juvenile judges to let them know that the committee had reviewed the issue and was not planning further action. She invited them to comment and send proposed language if they felt the rule should be revised, but no comments were

	received.						
	The committee reiterated concerns that an evidentiary proceeding should not be mandated and that parties should be able to stipulate to a proffer in appropriate circumstances. Ultimately, the committee confirmed its decision to take no further action on the issue. Carol Verdoia will convey the committee's decision to Judge Noonan.						
	Action Item:	Carol Verdoia to ema discussions.	ail Judge Noonan regarding outcome of				
AGE	NDA TOPIC						
	III. Rule 47-Reviews and M Orders	lodifications of	[PRESENTER] CAROL VERDOIA				
	Appeals indicated that Rule 4' modify a prior order in a revise custodian or minor if the mod The Court ruled that a father' the hearing as the court was "odd" to the extent it allowed objection until the outcome h After discussion, Judge Lindsl suggested revisions, if any.	7(b)(3) may require re ew hearing that would lification is objected to s objection was timely preparing to adjourn. a party to participate ad been determined. ey, Alan Sevison and E They will send their wo	ase of <i>In re P.D.</i> 2013 UT App. 151. The Court of evision. Rule 47(b)(3) states "The court shall not further restrict the rights of the parent, guardian by any party prior to or in the review hearing." under the rule, even though made at the end of However, the Court noted that the result was in a non-evidentiary hearing and hold their. Brent Hall volunteered to review Rule 47 and draft ork product to Narda Beas-Nardell and Pam Vickrey to the entire committee prior to the committee's				
	Action Item:		n Sevison and Brent Hall to prepare draft for the September 27 th meeting.				
AGE	NDA TOPIC						
	IV. Rule 50-Presence at Co	urt Hearings	[PRESENTER] ALISON ADAMS-PERLAC				
	Ms. Adams-Perlac explained that the standard in 78A-6-114 regarding who may be present at hearings is different than the standard set forth in URJP 50. The committee discussed the 2004 legislation which opened child welfare proceedings to the public, and considered possible solutions to coordinate the language of Rule 50 with statute. The first sentence of Rule 50(a) will be revised to read "In abuse, neglect and dependency cases the court shall admit persons as provided by Utah Code Section 78A-6-114."						
	Action Item:	Katie Gregory will fo sent out for comme	orward the proposed revisions to Tim Shea to be ent.				
	Motion: To revise the first sentence of Rule 50(a) to read "In abuse, neglect and dependency cases the court shall admit persons as provided by Utah Code Section 78A-6-114.	By: Alan Sevison	Second: Brent Bartholomew				
	Approval	× Unanimous [□ Vote:				

In Favor_

Opposed

AGENDA TOPIC

V. Old Business/New Business

[PRESENTER] ALL

The committee briefly discussed whether the juvenile competency statute had created any procedural issues that should be included in the URJP. After determining that the statute contained the necessary procedure, the committee agreed to take no further action.

Next meetings were scheduled for September 27, 2013 and November 22, 2013 from Noon to 2:00 p.m.