

COURT DOCUMENTS

Mary Ann Cleary, Director
Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 4532 (Substitute H-2)

Sponsor: Rep. Amanda Price

Committee: Judiciary

Complete to 4-23-13

A REVISED SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 4532 AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE

House Bill 4532 would amend the Revised Judicature Act to:

- make several changes in the manner probate court records are maintained and by whom;
- allow for the digitization of court documents;
- allow electronic signatures on court filings and documents;
- allow courts to provide, and charge a fee for, enhanced access to court documents through electronic means; and
- establish records management policies and procedures for the maintenance and disposal of court records.

Specifically, the bill would do the following:

Section 832 changes: Currently, the probate judge or chief probate judge of each respective county or probate court district maintains possession of the court seal, records, books, files, and papers belonging to the probate court. The bill would instead require the clerk of the probate court to fulfill this duty.

The RJA requires that each judge keep a true and correct record of each order, sentence, and decree of the court; of his or her other official acts; and of all wills and letters of authority that are to be recorded in the court. The bill would delete this provision and instead require the clerk of the probate court, in accordance with state Supreme Court rules, to maintain every record created by or filed with the probate court.

A provision allowing the records, except as otherwise provided by law, to be inspected without charge by all interested persons would be eliminated. A provision requiring the probate court to maintain an alphabetical index to the records of probate court proceedings in each county would also be eliminated.

Section 859 changes: The probate court is required to record certain testimony, keep sufficient index of the testimony, and keep the index and the original notes for at least 10

years. The bill would delete the 10-year retention period and instead require these materials to be kept as prescribed by state Supreme Court rules.

The bill would delete the following provisions pertaining to transcriptions of testimony:

- Requiring a transcription of testimony only when ordered by the court or a party.
- Requiring notes pertaining to a hearing for the admission of a person to a hospital or other place of detention as a mentally ill or developmentally disabled person or as a person with a contagious disease to be destroyed only after the discharge of the person from the institution (the provision applies except in cases in which the testimony was transcribed and filed with the case record).
- Prohibiting the destruction of notes until after 10 years after the date of the hearing or as provided above, whichever is longer.

Section 1427 changes: With some exceptions (such as technical words or the proper and known names of process) writs, process, proceedings, and records in any state court must be in the English language. The provision goes on to specify that these documents must be made out on paper, not abbreviated (with some exceptions), and numbers expressed by Arabic figures or Roman numerals. The bill would delete the latter provision and instead specify that the documents would be required to be made out in the manner and on any medium authorized by state Supreme Court rules.

The bill would also allow an electronic signature as prescribed by Supreme Court rules to satisfy a signature requirement on any document filed with or created by a court.

Section 1426 (new): The bill would authorize a court to charge a reasonable fee, as established by the state Supreme Court, for providing enhanced access. However, if enhanced access (which is not defined in the bill) is provided to another court or to a public agency, no fees could be charged. Certain information would have to be included in a written agreement between the court and the court or public agency to which it is providing enhanced access, as specified in the bill.

Before providing enhanced access, a court would have to adopt a policy under requirements prescribed by the Supreme Court. Further, if the Supreme Court amended or adjusted the fee established for providing enhanced access, the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) would have to notify the chairpersons of the Senate and House of Representatives appropriations subcommittees on the Judiciary of the change not more than 30 days after the fee change took effect.

Section 1428 (new): The bill would require the SCAO to establish and maintain records management policies and procedures for the courts, including a records and retention and disposal schedule, in accordance with Supreme Court rules. However, the retention and disposal schedule would have to be developed and maintained as prescribed in Section 5 of Public Act 271 of 1913, which created the Michigan Historical Commission and prescribed its powers and duties.

Disposal of records under the bill would be subject to provisions of the Records Reproduction Act. Regardless of its medium, a record could not be disposed of until the record had been in the custody of the court for the retention period established by SCAO under the bill's provisions. "Record" would mean information of any kind, recorded in any manner, and created by a court or filed with a court in accordance with Supreme Court rules.

A court would be authorized by the bill to assess a reasonable fee associated with the creation, reproduction, retrieval, and retention of its records, but only as prescribed by the Supreme Court. A court could not charge a fee to retrieve and inspect a record on site.

If the Supreme Court amended or adjusted the records retention and disposal schedule established under this new provision, the SCAO would have to notify the chairpersons of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations subcommittees on the Judiciary of the change not more than 30 days after the fee change took effect.

MCL 600.832 et al.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The bill is similar to House Bill 4064. That bill previously passed the House of Representatives.

FISCAL IMPACT:

According to the State Court Administrative Office, the bill would have no fiscal impact on the state, but there could be costs to local units. The fiscal impact is indeterminate until the Supreme Court rules have been finalized.

POSITIONS:

A representative of the 20th Circuit Court and Ottawa County Probate Court testified in support of the bill. (4-18-13)

The Michigan Judges Association indicated support for the bill. (4-18-13)

The Michigan District Judges Association indicated support for the bills. (4-18-13)

The County of Ottawa indicated support for the bill. (4-18-13)

Legislative Analyst: Susan Stutzky
Fiscal Analyst: Robin Risko

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.