



# Utah Supreme Court's Advisory Committee on the Rules of Juvenile Procedure

## Meeting Agenda

*Matthew Johnson, Chair*

Location: Webex Meeting  
Date: June 7, 2024  
Time: 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm

<b>Action:</b> Welcome and approval of May 3, 2024, meeting minutes.	Tab 1	Matthew Johnson
<b>Discussion &amp; Action:</b> <a href="#">Rule 50</a> . Presence at hearings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Comment period</a> closed on May 17, 2024, and one comment was received.</li></ul>	Tab 2	All
<b>Discussion:</b> Old business or new business.		All

[URJP Committee Site](#)

### Meeting Schedule:

August 2, 2024

November 1, 2024

September 6, 2024

December 6, 2024

October 4, 2024 (in-person)

# TAB 1



1  
2  
3 **Utah Supreme Court's**  
4 **Advisory Committee on the Rules of Juvenile Procedure**

5 **Draft Meeting Minutes**

6  
7 *Matthew Johnson, Chair*

8  
9 Location: Webex Meeting

10  
11 Date: May 3, 2024

12  
13 Time: 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

14  
**Attendees:**

Matthew Johnson, Chair  
William Russell, Co-Chair  
Thomas Luchs  
Dawn Hautamaki  
Judge Paul Dame  
Janette White  
Michelle Jeffs  
James Smith  
Elizabeth Ferrin  
Judge Debra Jensen  
David Fureigh, Emeritus Member

**Excused Members:**

Adrianna Davis  
Sophia Moore  
Arek Butler  
Jordan Putnam

**Guests:**

Jacqueline Carlton, Office of Legislative  
Research and General Counsel  
Blake Murdoch  
Sonia Sweeney  
Daniel Meza-Rincon

**Staff:**

Randi Von Bose, Juvenile Law Clerk  
Lisa McQuarrie, Juvenile Law Clerk  
Raymundo Gallardo  
Kiley Tilby, Recording Secretary

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

**1. Welcome and approval of the April 5, 2024 Meeting Minutes:** (Matthew Johnson)

Mr. Johnson expressed his appreciation for everyone coming to the meeting. Mr. Johnson asked the Committee for approval of the April 5, 2024, meeting minutes. Janette White moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Russell seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**2. Discussion & Action: New Rule on In-person, Remote, and Hybrid Hearings: (All)**

Mr. Johnson stated there have been multiple versions of this rule sent out to the participants who have been working on it. Mr. Gallardo stated there is a draft dated May 2, 2024, which is the current version of the rule. Mr. Gallardo indicated the Supreme Court and Mr. Russell have been working on some language related to written motions. Mr. Johnson stated another thing the Supreme Court asked this committee to consider is whether there needs to be a special carve-out for problem-solving courts. Mr. Johnson indicated that he discussed it with Mr. Russell, and they did not believe it was necessary to have a special carve-out, but they wanted this committee to weigh in. The other request by the Supreme Court is for this committee to consider whether a Notice/Request to Submit should be included in the rule.

Ms. Hautamaki stated that normally a request to submit would state if there was opposition and to let them know it is ready. Ms. Hautamaki thinks it would be helpful to have a request to submit so it would trigger the court clerks to get it to the bench. Judge Dame does not believe we need specific language as it is covered in Rule 19A. Judge Dame's preference is to rely on other rules that deal with the issues. If the language is included, it could make it messier. Judge Jensen agreed and stated that being able to refer back to Utah Rules of Civil Procedure would be better. Judge Dame states Rule 7(l) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure sets out rules that allows the court to act on a motion without waiting for a response time, but he isn't sure if there has been discussion with that committee to amend the rules for this new rule.

Mr. Russell states under subsection (d) related to the resolution of the request, it allows the court to rule on a request without waiting for a response. Mr. Russell believes that statement supplements and overrules Rule 7 and Juvenile Rule 19A as there is not a briefing period. Mr. Russell stated these requests under the proposed rule will be on a very condensed timeline and all will be less than the 14 days required by Rule 19A of the juvenile rules. Mr. Russell also pointed out that many of the requests will not have briefing period in it, or anticipated, because of the language the Supreme Court put in. Mr. Russell stated when he files a request to submit for decision, he must indicate that the time for briefing is complete, that no opposition has been filed, and that there hasn't been a request for hearing. Under this rule, none of that will be applicable because of the language of the Supreme Court that they can be submitted without waiting for a response. Mr. Russell stated it is not an ex parte request because it still has to be served on all parties, but it is a motion that the Court does not have to wait for the other parties to respond.

63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108

Mr. Russell stated his initial position is that no request to submit was necessary because it is self-executing under (d)(1), and he doesn't think there needs to be language requesting a proposed order. Mr. Russell is concerned that if a proposed order is submitted, they won't know what factors the court will consider in either granting or denying the request. Mr. Russell indicated that his initial thought is if the court is going to be firm in its statement that it can be ruled on as soon as the request is received, then the request to submit is not applicable. His second thought is that if the Supreme Court wants a request to submit, that the request to submit would just state the time and manner of service since the other factors are not applicable. Mr. Fureigh stated that in subsection (d)(1), it states "the court may rule," so his concern is how will the court know that the moving party wants them to rule without a request to submit. Mr. Fureigh inquired if the judges will automatically review it and decide, or if it is triggered by a party requesting that the court immediately review and rule on it through a request to submit.

Judge Dame stated he understands the argument that Mr. Russell made about how they won't know what findings to include in the proposed order, but the Court can amend the proposed order rather than the Court or judicial assistant preparing their own. Judge Dame thinks the language should be left as is. Ms. Hautamaki agrees with Judge Dame that the court will rely on the request to submit. Ms. Hautamaki stated that if there is not a request to submit, it could get missed. Ms. Hautamaki stated they often see requests to submit even on stipulated motions. Mr. Russell stated if the request to submit is the trigger to get the motion in front of the judge to review, then he is fine with that language as written.

Mr. Johnson stated the next issue is the suggested languages regarding the succinct timely motions outlined in Paragraph (B) under "Request for written motion." Ms. McQuarrie proposed a grammatical change to add a comma after "submit for decision" or change it to read "...a request to submit for decision that states the time and manner of service of the motion, and a proposed order." Mr. Russell prefers the latter suggestion. The committee agrees, and the change was made.

Mr. Johnson stated the other issue for the committee to consider is related to Rule 29B and Rule 37B as they both deal with remote hearings. The Supreme Court asked that this committee look at having those repealed or decide whether this committee wanted to add language into the new rule from the existing rules. Judge Dame thinks these rules need to be repealed, as it is confusing to have different rules that address the same thing. Mr. Russell supports Judge Dame that these rules should be repealed. Mr. Russell believes the proposed rule covers everything outlined in Rule 29B, and believes Rule 37B would be similar, but he has not reviewed it recently. Judge Dame states Rule 37B does not cover it in detail, and only states the court can have remote hearings for good cause, lists the four requirements for the remote hearing, and states that the party can make arrangements for remote conferencing. Mr. Fureigh stated Rule 37B was a pre-COVID rule prior to Webex development so the burden was on the party that appears virtually because the court didn't have that ability, but that is

109 not the case any longer. Mr. Fureigh believes both should be repealed as it wouldn't  
110 make sense to have them.

111  
112 Mr. Russell inquired if there is a different rule in the Code of Judicial Administration  
113 that if they are doing Webex it needs to be recorded, interpretation services provided,  
114 etc. as outlined in Rule 37B. Judge Dame doesn't know that there is, but he believes it  
115 is implicit. Mr. Fureigh stated there is a rule that requires the court to record the  
116 proceedings as that issue recently came up because the court is asking the Attorney  
117 General's office to put in their orders that parties cannot record the proceeding and it  
118 is the duty of the court to do so. The committee had a discussion regarding Rule 4-201  
119 of the Code of Judicial Administration.

120  
121 Mr. Johnson indicated this committee will need to make a motion to repeal Rule 29B  
122 and Rule 37B once the new rule is published and adopted. Mr. Gallardo stated it was  
123 his understanding that the Supreme Court wanted to do this simultaneously. Mr.  
124 Johnson requests a motion from the committee to repeal Rule 29B and Rule 37B. Mr.  
125 Russell made the motion that, upon the adoption of the manner of appearance rule by  
126 the Supreme Court, there be a repeal of Rule 29B and Rule 37B. Elizabeth Ferrin  
127 seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

128  
129 Mr. Johnson stated the Supreme Court also wanted this committee to discuss how this  
130 new rule would be numbered and where it would fit in. Mr. Johnson stated there were  
131 a few suggestions. One of them was to add Rule 50A, or to add an entirely new rule  
132 as Rule 61 under the Miscellaneous Rules. Judge Dame's vote is to add a new Rule 61.  
133 Judge Dame understands why there was a suggestion to add Rule 50A, but he does  
134 not believe there is enough of a nexus between the type of hearing and the details  
135 regarding who can be in a hearing or which hearings are closed. Mr. Fureigh agrees.  
136 Mr. Russell is also in support of it being a new Rule 61. Mr. Johnson requests a motion  
137 from the committee to number this rule as Rule 61. Ms. Hautamaki made the motion,  
138 Judge Dame seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

139  
140 Judge Dame stated he had a few other issues he wanted to discuss. In subsection (c)(1),  
141 under request to appear by a different format, he inquired if it might be a good idea  
142 to change the language to specify a witness that a participant has subpoenaed. Judge  
143 Dame wanted to clarify that not just any participant could make a request for a  
144 witness, but that only the individual who subpoenaed the witness can request that  
145 witness appear in a different format. Judge Dame stated that if nobody else sees an  
146 issue with that, it can be left as is. Judge Dame's proposed language would state, "A  
147 participant may request that the court allow the participant or a witness the  
148 participant has subpoenaed to appear at a hearing by a different format than that set  
149 by the court..." Mr. Russell agrees with Judge Dame and supports the change. Mr.  
150 Russell believes he should be able to ask for his own witness(es) to appear in a  
151 different manner, but he shouldn't be allowed to mess with the DA's witnesses, or the  
152 DA to mess with his witnesses. Mr. Russell believes the one who subpoenas the  
153 witness should make the call as a matter of fairness.

154

155 Ms. Von Bose requested clarification and stated she believed under this rule that the  
156 witnesses themselves could make the request. Judge Dame stated that is not the case,  
157 as a witness is not included in the definition of “participant.”  
158

159 Judge Dame stated he had another thing he wanted to discuss. Judge Dame indicated  
160 he has explained his position on this before and doesn’t want to be obstinate, but  
161 under subsection (d)(1), resolution of the request, it stated that if the request is made  
162 by e-mail, the court will make a record of the request if the request is denied. Judge  
163 Dame proposed that “if the request is denied” be removed. Judge Dame does not  
164 know why it is limiting to only if the request is denied. If there are communications  
165 with the court that the court relies on to make an order, Judge Dame wants those  
166 communications to be made part of the record regardless of whether it is denied or  
167 granted. Judge Dame stated that if the Supreme Court justices have rejected his  
168 position, he will accept it, but he doesn’t know why it is only part of the record if the  
169 request is denied.  
170

171 Mr. Gallardo stated it is his understanding the Supreme Court is moving towards only  
172 making those emails part of the record if it is denied. Judge Dame inquired if the  
173 Supreme Court gave any reasoning behind that decision. Mr. Fureigh suggested the  
174 Supreme Court is assuming that if it is granted, there would be some sort of order that  
175 is entered in. Judge Dame stated there is an order even if it is denied. Mr. Fureigh  
176 agrees both should be made part of the record. Judge Dame wants a record of what  
177 was relied on, regardless of whether it is denied or entered. Judge Jensen stated she  
178 remembers discussing this with the Supreme Court and it seemed like they were  
179 thinking it was a lot of work for the judicial assistants and they were concerned about  
180 the workload to upload all those emails. Judge Jensen also recalls that another reason  
181 why they thought it would be okay is because if it was denied, it might be appealed,  
182 but if it was granted, it wouldn’t be appealed. Judge Jensen doesn’t necessarily agree  
183 with that as she agrees with Judge Dame, but she recalls those were some of the  
184 discussions.  
185

186 Ms. Hautamaki inquired if an attorney could e-mail the request as well, and stated  
187 that if the attorneys can e-mail, they may need to ask the courts to review the Code of  
188 Judicial Administration and look at those items that are included in mandatory e-  
189 filing. Ms. Hautamaki assumed a pro se party would submit their request by e-mail  
190 and it would be accepted, but she would expect it would be filed by motion if it was  
191 an attorney. Judge Dame doesn’t think the rule differentiates between pro se and  
192 counsel so the intent would be that counsel could e-mail their request. Ms. Hautamaki  
193 asked if Rule 4-901 of the Code of Judicial Administration would be relied on. Judge  
194 Dame would think this rule would supersede that because it is more specific. Judge  
195 Dame stated that under the concepts of rule construction, if two rules conflict, it  
196 would be the more specific one that would supersede the less specific. If the Court  
197 had to do that analysis, if it is a specific type of request under Rule 61, it would  
198 supersede 4-901. Mr. Gallardo stated the intent was to allow these under exigent  
199 circumstances, but he believes it also allows attorneys to make the request via e-mail.  
200 The committee expressed concern about the request not being in the record, even if it

201 is granted. Ms. Hautamaki expressed concern about the additional workload it would  
202 place on the judicial assistants.

203  
204 Mr. Russell appreciates Judge Jensen's comments, and he doesn't want to be  
205 insensitive to the judicial assistant workload, but he believes that the best way, to  
206 preserve the integrity of the trial court and the court record, is that they all be included  
207 in the record. Mr. Russell stated that if there is a request that is made to the court by  
208 e-mail, or an objection by e-mail, regardless of the ruling, it all needs to be in the  
209 record. Mr. Russell strongly joins in Judge Dame's request. Whether the request is  
210 granted or denied, the record needs to be preserved. Mr. Russell does not believe the  
211 Court of Appeals would be happy that part of the record is missing, and he would  
212 support the language being omitted.

213  
214 Mr. Johnson stated he doesn't have a problem with omitting the language and sending  
215 it back up to the Supreme Court. Mr. Russell will respect the decision of the Supreme  
216 Court if they disagree, but he has a duty to express his opinion.

217  
218 Mr. Gallardo addressed the issue related to whether there needs to be a specific carve-  
219 out for problem-solving courts. Mr. Johnson stated he and Mr. Russell did not feel it  
220 needed to be included. Mr. Fureigh stated subsection (L) includes "any other relevant  
221 factor," so he doesn't see a reason to include a specific carve-out. Judge Jensen and  
222 Judge Dame agree.

223  
224 Mr. Johnson requests a motion to submit Rule 61 as written with the changes made.  
225 Ms. Hautamaki stated she feels like she should represent the clerks and oppose the  
226 removal of the language in paragraph (d)(1) related to making a record of the request  
227 only if it is denied. Ms. Hautamaki states she believes attorneys should be required to  
228 e-file the request, and if they don't have to e-file the request, the workload will be  
229 shifted to the judicial assistant. Ms. Von Bose states the Supreme Court was concerned  
230 about how fast these requests are coming into the court if they come in via e-filing.  
231 Ms. Hautamaki states she believes the requests would be seen faster if they were  
232 through e-filing.

233  
234 Mr. Johnson states with regard to omitting the language and sending Rule 61 up as  
235 written, he requests a motion to submit that rule to the Supreme Court for publication.  
236 Mr. Russell made the motion and Judge Dame seconded the motion. Ms. Hautamaki  
237 voiced her concerns and abstained from voting. Mr. Johnson will take it to the  
238 Supreme Court.

239  
240 **3. Discussion & Action: Rule 19C. Motion practice for delinquency, traffic, and adult**  
241 **criminal matters: (All)**

242  
243 Mr. Johnson states there is a proposal to amend Rule 19C based on some legislative  
244 changes. Mr. Johnson indicated Ms. Von Bose has additional information. Ms. Von  
245 Bose stated this originated from House Bill 369 addressing justification hearings and  
246 adding a justification defense. Ms. Von Bose stated that Utah Code 76-2-309(3)(a) is



247 where it comes from and provided some additional background information. Ms. Von  
248 Bose stated the question has been raised through discussion whether the juvenile rule  
249 should reference Rule 12 of the Utah Rules of Criminal Procedure based on those  
250 changes.

251  
252 Mr. Gallardo stated the amendments made to Rule 19C went into effect two days ago,  
253 as of May 1, 2024. Mr. Gallardo indicated they wanted to have a discussion whether  
254 Rule 19C should remain the same, or whether this committee should entertain a  
255 possible second amendment. Judge Dame stated he doesn't feel strongly about this  
256 either way. Judge Dame indicated the impetus of looking at this is that an individual  
257 could be relying on the statute in juvenile court, and if there isn't some reference to  
258 Rule 12 of the Utah Rules of Criminal Procedure, it could be confusing. Mr. Russell  
259 states even though it is disappointing that the legislature has excluded the juvenile  
260 court, the reference to Rule 12(c)(3) would make it cleaner. If it is not included in the  
261 juvenile rules, there is ambiguity.

262  
263 Mr. Gallardo stated the proposal would be to change the language to state, "(f)  
264 Motions on the justification of the use of force pursuant to Utah Code section 76-2-309  
265 must be filed in accordance with Rule 12(c)(3) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure.  
266 Rule 12(c)(3) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure is hereby adopted by the Rules of  
267 Juvenile Procedure."

268  
269 Mr. Gallardo states the Rules of Criminal Procedure could amend their rules or  
270 renumber their rules. Judge Dame states that is always a danger with adopting a rule,  
271 but he believes it could get worked out. Mr. Russell states the only work around he  
272 sees would be to import the process and burden language as outlined in the statute  
273 which would be cumbersome and long. Mr. Russell does not believe that is preferable  
274 to just adopting Rule 12(c)(3). Ms. Von Bose states in looking at the other rules that  
275 have incorporated the Rules of Criminal Procedure, the language "hereby adopted"  
276 isn't present in any of the other rules (Rules 7, 18, 20, 25, 27 and 38). Judge Dame stated  
277 he likes the language as written because he believes it is very clear that it has been  
278 specifically adopted and there is no question.

279  
280 Mr. Johnson requests a motion from the committee to take it back up to the Supreme  
281 Court for public comment to make the change. Judge Dame made the motion,  
282 Elizabeth Ferrin seconded, and it passed unanimously. Mr. Johnson inquired if the  
283 committee is okay with it being immediately published. Mr. Russell made the motion  
284 for it to be published immediately, Judge Jensen seconded, and it passed  
285 unanimously.

286  
287 **4. Old business/new business: (All)**

288  
289 Mr. Johnson inquired if there was any old or new business.

290  
291 Mr. Gallardo stated they have been tracking the bilingual notice and they are ready,  
292 but they are not available on the website. Mr. Gallardo stated on a related note, in the

293 district court, there is a summons for pro se litigants. There was a question of whether  
294 there was a need for that in the juvenile court. Mr. Luchs stated he believes it would  
295 be helpful, and Ms. Ferrin agreed.

296  
297 The committee then discussed whether the in-person meeting should remain  
298 scheduled for June, or whether it should be pushed out to the fall. After some  
299 discussion, Mr. Johnson stated the in-person meeting will be moved to October 4,  
300 2024.

301  
302 No additional old or new business was discussed.

303  
304  
305 The meeting adjourned at 1:44 PM. The next meeting will be held on June 7, 2024 via  
306 Webex.

# TAB 2

1 **Rule 50. Presence at hearings.**

2 (a) In abuse, neglect, and dependency cases the court ~~will~~~~shall~~ admit persons as provided  
3 by Utah Code sections 80-3-104 and 80-4-106. If a motion is made to deny any person  
4 access to any part of a hearing, the parties to the hearing, including the person challenged,  
5 may address the issue by proffer, but are not entitled to an evidentiary hearing. A person  
6 denied access to a proceeding may petition the Utah Court of Appeals under Rule 19 of  
7 the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. Proceedings are not stayed pending appeal. As  
8 provided under Utah Code sections 80-3-10~~6~~~~7~~ and 80-4-107, a person may file a petition  
9 requesting a copy of a record of ~~a~~~~the~~ proceedings, setting forth the reasons for the request.  
10 Upon fee payment and the ~~C~~ourt's finding of good cause, the ~~court~~ ~~person~~ will provide  
11 ~~receive~~ an audio recording of ~~a~~~~the~~ proceeding. The ~~C~~ourt may place under seal  
12 information received in an open proceeding.

13 (b) In delinquency cases the court ~~will~~~~shall~~ admit all persons who have a direct interest  
14 in the case and may admit persons requested by the parent or legal guardian to be  
15 present.

16 (c) In delinquency cases in which the minor charged is 14 years of age or older, the court  
17 ~~will~~~~shall~~ admit any person unless the hearing is closed by the court upon findings on the  
18 record for good cause if:

19 (1) the minor has been charged with an offense which would be a felony if  
20 committed by an adult; or

21 (2) the minor is charged with an offense that would be a class A or B misdemeanor  
22 if committed by an adult and the minor has been previously charged with an  
23 offense which would be a misdemeanor or felony if committed by an adult.

24 (d) If any person, after having been warned, engages in conduct that disrupts the  
25 ~~hearing~~~~court~~, the person may be excluded from the ~~hearing~~~~courtroom~~. Any exclusion of  
26 a person who has the right to attend a hearing ~~will~~~~shall~~ be noted on the record and the

27 reasons for the exclusion given. Counsel for the excluded person has the right to remain  
28 and participate in the hearing.

29 (e) Videotaping, photographing, or recording court proceedings ~~must~~shall be as  
30 authorized by the Code of Judicial Administration.

31 (f) In proceedings subject to the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978, 25 U.S.C. sections 1901-  
32 63:

33 (1) The Indian child's tribe is not required to formally intervene in the proceeding  
34 unless the tribe seeks affirmative relief from the court.

35 (2) If an Indian child's tribe does not formally intervene in the proceeding, official  
36 tribal representatives from the Indian child's tribe have the right to participate in  
37 any court proceeding. Participating in a court proceeding includes:

38 (A) being present at the hearing;

39 (B) addressing the court;

40 (C) requesting and receiving notice of hearings;

41 (D) presenting information to the court and other parties that is relevant to  
42 the proceeding;

43 (E) submitting written reports and recommendations to the court and other  
44 parties; and

45 (F) performing other duties and responsibilities as requested or approved  
46 by the court.

47 (3) The designated representative must provide the representative's contact information  
48 in writing to the court and other parties.

49 (4) As provided in Rule 14-802 of the Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice, before  
50 a nonlawyer may represent a tribe in the proceeding, the tribe must designate the  
51 nonlawyer representative by filing a written authorization. If the tribe changes its

52 designated representative or if the representative withdraws, the tribe must file a written  
53 substitution of representation or withdrawal.

1 **Rule 50. Presence at hearings.**

2 (a) In abuse, neglect, and dependency cases the court will admit persons as provided by  
3 Utah Code sections 80-3-104 and 80-4-106. If a motion is made to deny any person access  
4 to any part of a hearing, the parties to the hearing, including the person challenged, may  
5 address the issue by proffer, but are not entitled to an evidentiary hearing. A person  
6 denied access to a proceeding may petition the Utah Court of Appeals under Rule 19 of  
7 the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. Proceedings are not stayed pending appeal. As  
8 provided under Utah Code sections 80-3-106 and 80-4-107, a person may file a petition  
9 requesting a copy of a record of a proceeding, setting forth the reasons for the request.  
10 Upon fee payment and the court's finding of good cause, the court will provide an audio  
11 recording of the proceeding. The court may place under seal information received in an  
12 open proceeding.

13 (b) In delinquency cases the court will admit all persons who have a direct interest in the  
14 case and may admit persons requested by the parent or legal guardian to be present.

15 (c) In delinquency cases in which the minor charged is 14 years of age or older, the court  
16 will admit any person unless the hearing is closed by the court upon findings on the  
17 record for good cause if:

18 (1) the minor has been charged with an offense which would be a felony if  
19 committed by an adult; or

20 (2) the minor is charged with an offense that would be a class A or B misdemeanor  
21 if committed by an adult and the minor has been previously charged with an  
22 offense which would be a misdemeanor or felony if committed by an adult.

23 (d) If any person, after having been warned, engages in conduct that disrupts the hearing,  
24 the person may be excluded from the hearing. Any exclusion of a person who has the  
25 right to attend a hearing will be noted on the record and the reasons for the exclusion  
26 given. Counsel for the excluded person has the right to remain and participate in the  
27 hearing.

28 (e) Videotaping, photographing, or recording court proceedings must be as authorized  
29 by the Code of Judicial Administration.

30 (f) In proceedings subject to the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978, 25 U.S.C. sections 1901-  
31 63:

32 (1) The Indian child's tribe is not required to formally intervene in the proceeding  
33 unless the tribe seeks affirmative relief from the court.

34 (2) If an Indian child's tribe does not formally intervene in the proceeding, official  
35 tribal representatives from the Indian child's tribe have the right to participate in  
36 any court proceeding. Participating in a court proceeding includes:

37 (A) being present at the hearing;

38 (B) addressing the court;

39 (C) requesting and receiving notice of hearings;

40 (D) presenting information to the court and other parties that is relevant to  
41 the proceeding;

42 (E) submitting written reports and recommendations to the court and other  
43 parties; and

44 (F) performing other duties and responsibilities as requested or approved  
45 by the court.

46 (3) The designated representative must provide the representative's contact information  
47 in writing to the court and other parties.

48 (4) As provided in Rule 14-802 of the Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice, before  
49 a nonlawyer may represent a tribe in the proceeding, the tribe must designate the  
50 nonlawyer representative by filing a written authorization. If the tribe changes its  
51 designated representative or if the representative withdraws, the tribe must file a written  
52 substitution of representation or withdrawal.



# UTAH COURT RULES – PUBLISHED FOR COMMENT

The Supreme Court and Judicial Council invite comments about amending these rules. To view the proposed amendment, click on the rule number.

To submit a comment or view the comments of others, click on “Continue Reading.” To submit a comment, scroll down to the “Leave a Reply” section, and type your comment in the “Comment” field. Type your name and email address in the designated fields and click “Post Comment.”

Comments cannot be acknowledged, but all will be considered. Comments are saved to a buffer for review before publication.

[HOME](#)

[LINKS](#)

Posted: April 2, 2024	<b>Utah Courts</b>
<h2>Rules of Juvenile Procedure – Comment Period Closes May 17, 2024</h2> <p><b>URJP050.</b> Presence at hearings. Amend. The proposed amendments to Rule 50 include: (1) a correction to referenced statute in paragraph (a); (2) replacing “court” and “courtroom” with “hearing” in paragraph (d), allowing the court to exclude a person from a hearing, including a remote hearing; and (3) stylistic and grammatical changes.</p> <hr/> <p>This entry was posted in <a href="#">-Rules of Juvenile Procedure, URJP050.</a></p>	
« <a href="#">Utah Rules of Business and Chancery Court Procedure – Comment Period Closes June 9, 2024</a>	<a href="#">Code of Judicial Administration – Comment Period Closed »</a>

 **SEARCH**

To view all comments submitted during a particular comment period, click on the comment deadline date. To view all comments to an amendment, click on the rule number.

- ### CATEGORIES
- [-Alternate Dispute Resolution](#)
  - [-Code of Judicial Administration](#)
  - [-Code of Judicial Conduct](#)
  - [-Fourth District Court Local Rules](#)
  - [-Licensed Paralegal Practitioners Rules of Professional Conduct](#)
  - [-Rules Governing Licensed Paralegal Practitioner](#)
  - [-Rules Governing the State Bar](#)

UTAH COURTS

[View more posts from this author](#)

One thought on “Rules of Juvenile Procedure – Comment Period Closes May 17, 2024”

**Chris Yannelli**  
April 2, 2024 at 9:03 am

These changes look good! This Committee continues to do good work. I hope someone is keep Bill Russell in check?!

[Reply](#)

### Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked \*

**Comment \***

**Name \***

**Email \***

**Website**

**POST COMMENT**

- -Rules of Appellate Procedure
- -Rules of Civil Procedure
- -Rules of Criminal Procedure
- -Rules of Evidence
- -Rules of Juvenile Procedure
- -Rules of Professional Conduct
- -Rules of Professional Practice
- -Rules of Small Claims Procedure
- ADR101
- ADR103
- Appendix B
- Appendix F
- CJA Appendix F
- CJA01-0201
- CJA01-0204
- CJA01-0205
- CJA01-0205
- CJA01-0302
- CJA01-0303
- CJA01-0304
- CJA01-0305
- CJA010-01-0404
- CJA010-1-020
- CJA02-0101
- CJA02-0103
- CJA02-0104
- CJA02-0106.01
- CJA02-0106.02
- CJA02-0106.03
- CJA02-0106.04
- CJA02-0106.05
- CJA02-0204
- CJA02-0206
- CJA02-0208
- CJA02-0208
- CJA02-0211
- CJA02-0212
- CJA03-0101
- CJA03-0102
- CJA03-0103
- CJA03-0103
- CJA03-0104
- CJA03-0105
- CJA03-0106
- CJA03-0106
- CJA03-0107
- CJA03-0108
- CJA03-0109
- CJA03-0111
- CJA03-0111.01