

Katie Gregory - Abortion Bypass Rule

From: Brent Bartholomew
To: Katie Gregory
Date: 8/4/06 7:57AM
Subject: Abortion Bypass Rule
CC: Brewer, Kristin

The following are concerns and questions I have about the Abortion Bypass Rule, some of which already have been identified by Kristin:

1. It appears that the rule expands the role of the GAL beyond the current statutory duties. If the rule goes into effect, the Office of the GAL needs not only specific guidance on what is expected, but it also needs additional resources, particularly funding, to carry out its duties.
2. I definitely support have such hearings closed to the public.
3. I also support exceptions to notifying parents being well defined. There are instances I can perceive that notifying parents would be harmful, not helpful, to the minor girl.

Brent

Katie Gregory - Re: URJP Agenda for August 4th

From: Claudia Page
To: Katie Gregory
Date: 8/3/06 9:49AM
Subject: Re: URJP Agenda for August 4th

I've been reading over the materials you sent out and it looks like you've covered the only concerns that have been raised at Clerks of Court meetings, i.e., whom notice has to be provided to, court personell "shall" provide assistance and etc. At our last Clerks of Court meeting no issues were discussed regarding the abortion statue so I'm assuming the same as you, it's to new to know. If there is anything I can do for the committee from here I will be more than happy to do so. I'll be in court this afternoon and will be in the Monticello office tomorrow, but let me know and I'll do what I can. Thanks for all you do.

Claudia

>>> Katie Gregory 08/03/06 09:40AM >>>

Claudia--I understand..sounds like you are really short handed. Given the agenda, I think sending another clerk is optional---unless the clerks are having problems with the new abortion bypass procedures. If this is the case, you could have the clerks send me any problems by email. It may just be too new to have raised issues yet.
Katie

>>> Claudia Page 08/03/06 07:42AM >>>

Katie:

I just had a call from one of my clerks who has had a family emergency and will be out of the office for at least a week. I have two clerks on vacation and one clerk was picked for jury duty on a 4 day trial that started Tuesday. Consequently we are running two offices with 3 people; and I am one of the three. I won't be able to attend the meeting on Friday.

If you would like I will see if I can't get another Clerk of Court to come in my place. Please let me know what your preference is.

I apologize for any inconvenience this may cause. Unfortunately life happens!.

Claudia Page

From: Carol Verdoia
To: Gregory, Katie
Date: 4/10/06 1:00PM
Subject: Re: URJP--new legislation

I don't know what else we can do -- April and May were problematic for the committee members' schedules to begin with, and that's why we didn't schedule a meeting. Until a rule is in place, the statute will have to govern. If we see problems with that, we will ask the Supreme Court to do emergency rulemaking.

Carol

>>> Katie Gregory 4/10/2006 12:56 PM >>>

Sounds like we should just put them on the June agenda and get the discussion going at that point. Let me know if you think otherwise.

Katie

>>> Carol Verdoia 04/10/06 12:54PM >>>

The May 1 deadline is simply the date these bills will go into effect, right? When we had this situation with the substantiation bill, we did emergency rulemaking and the rules went into effect in August after the Supreme Court reviewed them. I don't see how we can do it any other way this year -- certainly not by May 1st. I think the rule implications are complicated enough that the Committee will need time to review these bills and discuss them. I, too, am out of the office for spring break this Thursday-Monday.

>>> Katie Gregory 4/10/2006 12:48 PM >>>

Carol,

The AOC has asked me to have URJP look at two issues pertaining to legislation passed in the 2006 session. I wanted to get your thoughts on how the URJP should approach this since the deadline is May 1 and we do not meet again until June 2.

The two areas are:

1. SB 7-Child Protection Amendments:

--do the hearings described on page 5 of the enrolled bill and the expedited provisions on page 6 require any change to the URJP?

2. HB 103--Changes to the Definitions of a Child and a Minor

--URJP has been asked to review the entire bill for rules implications.

Let me know what you think. I know time is short and to make matters worse, I am out of the office most of next week for my daughter's spring break.

Katie

From: Matty Branch
To: Gregory, Katie
Date: 5/3/06 9:29AM
Subject: Fwd: fyi

Here is a suggestion from one of the staff attorneys in the Court of Appeals related to child welfare appeals. The juvenile rules committee may want to consider. Thanks.

>>> Mary Westby 05/02/06 12:02PM >>>
Matty,

Reading the rules of juvenile procedure, I noticed that rule 52 still notes an appeal time of thirty days. The rule would need revision and clarification of delinquency versus welfare appeals. Or, maybe it is not an issue due to the phrase "as otherwise provided by law," but I think that's misleading. If I recall correctly, you are on the rules committee. Would you add it to the list if you think appropriate? Thanks, Mary